A bivalent Adenovirus-Vectored Vaccine induces a measurable humoral response, but does not protect cynomolgus macaques against a lethal challenge with Sudan virus

Sarah van Tol[1], Paige Fletcher[1], Friederike Feldmann[2], Reshma K. Mukesh[1], Julia R. Port[1],

Robert J. Fischer[1], Shane Gallogly[1], Jonathan E. Schulz[1], Joseph F. Rhoderick[1], Rebecca

Makinson[3], Aaron Carmody[4], Lara Myers[4], Jamie Lovaglio[2], Brian J. Smith[2], Atsushi Okumura[1],

Carl Shaia[2], Greg Saturday[2], Andrea Marzi[1], Teresa Lambe[3], Vincent J. Munster[1], Neeltje van

Doremalen[1*]

1. Laboratory of Virology, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Hamilton, MT, USA

2. Rocky Mountain Veterinary Branch, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Hamilton, MT, USA

3. Oxford Vaccine Group, Department of Paediatrics, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

4. Research Technologies Branch, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Hamilton, MT, USA

*Corresponding author: Neeltje van Doremalen, 903 south 4th street, Hamilton, MT, USA.

neeltje.vandoremalen@nih.gov

Manuscript word count: 3300

Abstract

The most recent Sudan virus (SUDV) outbreak in Uganda was first detected in September 2022

and resulted in 164 laboratory-confirmed cases and 77 deaths. Currently, there are no approved

vaccines or therapeutics against SUDV. In the current study, we investigated the protective

efficacy of ChAdOx1-biEBOV in cynomolgus macaques using a prime or a prime-boost

regimen. ChAdOx1-biEBOV is a replication-deficient simian adenovirus vector encoding SUDV

and Ebola virus (EBOV) glycoproteins (GPs) at the E1 and E4 loci, respectively. Intramuscular

vaccination induced SUDV and EBOV GP-specific IgG responses and neutralizing antibodies.

Upon challenge with SUDV, vaccinated animals, regardless of vaccination scheme, showed

signs of disease like those observed in control animals, and no difference in survival outcomes

were measured among all three groups. Viral load in blood samples and in tissue samples

obtained after necropsy were not significantly different between groups. Overall, this study

highlights the importance of evaluating vaccines in multiple animal models, including nonhuman

primates, and demonstrates the importance of understanding protective efficacy in both animal

models and human hosts.

Background

Of the six viruses described in the genus *Orthoebolavirus (1)*, four are known to cause

Ebolavirus disease in humans, namely Ebola virus (EBOV), Sudan virus (SUDV), Bundibugyo

virus (BDBV), and Taï Forest virus (TAFV). Although EBOV is responsible for most outbreaks

(*2*), SUDV has caused eight outbreaks in Sudan and Uganda since first discovered in 1976 (*3–9*).

SUDV disease (SVD) has been documented in nearly 1,000 human cases and has a combined

case fatality rate (CFR) of 50% (*3–9*). The most recent SUDV outbreak was first detected in

Uganda's Mubende district in September 2022 (*9*, *10*). During the months-long outbreak, there

were 164 laboratory-confirmed cases and 77 deaths (CFR 47%). The severity of SVD and the

increasing potential for wider spread of SUDV outbreaks warrant the development of medical

countermeasures.

Current licensed vaccines and therapeutics against EBOV exist, but the cross-protection against

SVD in humans has not been demonstrated. The United States Food and Drug Administration

(FDA)-approved EBOV vaccine, Ervebo®, utilizes a recombinant vesicular stomatitis virus

(rVSV) backbone expressing EBOV Kikwit's glycoprotein (GP) (*11*). In the pre-clinical stage,

Ervebo® protects against lethal EBOV challenge but not SVD in cynomolgus macaques (*12*). A

second EBOV vaccine approved by the European Medical Agency utilizes a prime-boost

approach of replication-incompetent adenovirus (Ad26) encoding the EBOV Mayinga GP

(Ad26.ZEBOV, Zabdeno) followed by non-replicating modified vaccinia Ankara–vectored

vaccine encoding the EBOV Mayinga, SUDV Gulu, and MARV Musoke GPs and the

nucleoprotein of the Tai Forest virus (MVA-BN-Filo, Mvabea). The animal rule regulatory

pathway, which allows for efficacy data generated in well-characterized animal models of human

disease to demonstrate effectiveness in place of phase II or III efficacy trails in humans,

facilitated the licensure of the Zabdeno/Mvabea prime-boost vaccination regimen (*13*). This two-

shot vaccination is efficacious against SUDV in non-human primates (NHPs) (*14*), but the

effectiveness against SVD in humans is unknown.

Furthermore, the two FDA-approved immunotherapeutics, InmazebTM and EbangaTM, target

the GP of multiple EBOV strains but do not cross-protect against SUDV (*15*). This lack of

protection is expected, given that EBOV and SUDV GPs share less than 56% amino acid

identity. A bivalent vaccine that targets both EBOV and SUDV could provide protection against

both viruses which have historically caused most outbreaks. Several vaccines that target SUDV

(*16–20*) or multiple filoviruses (*12*, *21*, *22*) are being developed and tested in clinical trials,

including ChAdOx1-biEBOV vaccine.

The ChAdOx1 platform is a replication-deficient simian adenovirus vector, that has been used to

generate vaccines which are efficacious against multiple pathogens (*23–26*), including severe

acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) . The ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine

against SARS-CoV-2 has been approved in more than 170 countries. ChAdOx1-biEBOV uses

the same backbone as ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 but encodes SUDV GP and EBOV GP at the E1 and

E4 loci, respectively. ChAdOx1-biEBOV protects type I interferon receptor (Ifnar1^{-}) knockout

mice against challenge with SUDV Boniface. Here, we evaluated the ChAdOx1-biEBOV

efficacy in cynomolgus macaques using either a prime only or prime boost vaccination regimen

with SUDV challenge occurring 28 days after the last vaccination. Despite eliciting binding and

neutralizing antibodies against SUDV GP, neither vaccine regimen protected against a lethal

challenge with SUDV.

<u>Results</u>

Eighteen female cynomolgus macaques were divided into three groups of six. One group

received ChAdOx1-biEBOV 28 days prior to challenge (D-28; prime), one group received

ChAdOx1-biEBOV at D-56 and D-28 (prime boost), and one group received ChAdOx1 GFP at

D-28 (control). Vaccines were administered via the intramuscular (IM) route with 2.5 x 10^{10}

virus particles/animal (Figure 1A). Exams were conducted at the time of vaccination and 14 days

thereafter. Serum was collected on days of vaccination, exam, and challenge, and the levels of

binding antibodies against SUDV and EBOV GP were measured. Fourteen days post-prime

vaccination, antibody levels against SUDV GP varied between 62-1084 arbitrary ELISA units

(geometric mean of 294). Fourteen days post-boost vaccination, antibody levels against SUDV

GP had increased to 1346-4824 arbitrary ELISA units (geometric mean of 2179). At time of

challenge, antibody levels against SUDV GP varied between 30-241 arbitrary ELISA units

(geometric mean of 92) for the prime group and 206-882 arbitrary ELISA units (geometric mean

of 419) for the prime boost group, 4.6-fold increase over the prime group (Figure 1B). Binding

antibodies against EBOV GP followed a similar trend: Antibodies could be detected 14 days post

prime vaccination, with arbitrary ELISA units between 50 and 604 (geometric mean of 192) and

were increased upon boost vaccination (between 262-1200 arbitrary ELISA units, geometric

mean of 618). On the day of challenge, antibodies in the prime boost group were significantly

higher (2.3 fold) compared with the prime group (Figure 1C). We investigated the ability of

serum antibodies to neutralize SUDV or EBOV using a pseudo-neutralization assay based on

rVSV, as previously reported (*17*). Virus-neutralizing (VN) antibodies against SUDV could be

detected 28 days after a single vaccination, the VN titers varied between 1:10-1:40. At the time

of challenge, all prime-boost sera had a VN titer of 1:40 against SUDV (Figure 1D). Twenty-

eight days after a single vaccination, VN titers against EBOV were between 1:10-1:80, whereas

all prime-boost sera at time of challenge had VN titers varying between 1:40-1:160 (Figure 1E).

The cellular response from peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) after vaccination with

ChAdOx1-biEBOV was investigated using ELIspot at D-14. Surprisingly, although a robust

humoral response was detected, minimal to no interferon-producing T cells were detected upon

stimulation with peptides specific for either SUDV GP (Figure 1F) or EBOV GP (Figure 1G) at

14 days post final vaccination.

Each macaque was challenged with 10^3 focus-forming units (FFU) SUDV Gulu, administered in

1 mL via the IM route (*17*). Clinical scores for all three groups increased starting on D4, with no

significant differences observed between groups (Figure 2A). All macaques developed clinical

signs of SVD, including petechial rash in four of six macaques for each group. All were

euthanized between D5-7 when they reached end point criteria, and no significant differences in

survival were observed between groups (Figure 2B). Viremia was first detected on D3 in two out

of six controls and was present in all eighteen macaques on D6, with no significant differences

between groups (Figure 2C). Infectious virus was detected in the blood of all 18 macaques at

necropsy, with no differences in titers between groups (Figure 2D). Serum chemistry values were

significantly different on D6 compared to D0 for the following analytes (Figure 2): increased

concentrations of aspartate aminotransferase (AST), increased alkaline phosphatase (ALP),

increased blood urea nitrogen (BUN), and decreased albumin. Hematologic values were

significantly different on D6 compared to D0 for the following analytes (Figure 2): decreased

platelet count, decreased lymphocyte count, and on D3 compared to D0 for increased neutrophil

count. Levels of AST and ALP were significantly decreased in the prime boost group compared

to the control or prime groups on D6 (Figure 2E-F). Increased blood urea nitrogen (BUN) was

observed in all macaques by D6, albeit significantly less in the prime boost group (Figure 2G).

Platelet levels in the control group were significantly lower than in the prime boost group on D6

(Figure 2I). Lymphocytes were significantly higher in the prime boost group compared to the

control and prime groups on D3 (Figure 2J). Neutrophils were significantly higher in the prime

boost group compared to the control group on D3 (Figure 2K).

Although high binding antibody levels against SUDV GP and EBOV GP were detected at

challenge, by necropsy the levels of binding antibody had dropped in both vaccine groups, albeit

to a lower extent in the prime boost group (Figure 3A-B). We hypothesize that this is due to the

presence of sGP and virus with GP on its surface in serum, which would affect our ability to

detects SUDV-specific antibodies. Using a SUDV sGP-specific ELISA, sGP was detected in

most serum samples obtained on the day of necropsy but not at earlier time points (Figure 3C).

Interestingly, we were unable to detect sGP in one sample each for the prime and prime boost

group. In these serum samples, SUDV GP-specific binding antibody levels were the highest

within the respective vaccine group.

A panel of twenty-six different cytokines and chemokines was measured in sera (D-28, 0, 1, 3,

and endpoint) as well as in liver and lung tissue homogenates collected at necropsy. In serum

(Supplementary Figure 1), an upregulation of multiple cytokines and chemokines could be

measured at time of necropsy compared to earlier timepoints (interferon alpha 2 (IFN-α2),

interleukin-1 beta (IL-1β), IL-4, IL-6, IL-10, IL-15, IL-16, interferon gamma inducible protein-

10 (IP-10), monocyte chemoattractant protein-1 (MCP-1), macrophage inflammatory protein-1

alpha (MIP-1α), MIP-1β, thymus and activation-regulated chemokine (TARC), tumor necrosis

factor alpha (TNF-α), and TNF-β). Multiple significant differences were observed between

groups at different timepoints, including an increased expression of IFN-γ, and decreased

expression of IL-4, IL-6, IL-8, IL-15, and IP-10 in the prime boost group compared to the other

two groups on D3 or day of necropsy (Supplementary Figure 1).

In liver tissue, multiple cytokines and chemokines were significantly elevated in the prime boost

group compared to the prime and control groups (Supplementary Figure 2, IFN-α2, IFN-γ, IP-10,

MIP-1α, MIP-1β). No differences in cytokines and chemokines levels were observed between

groups in lung tissues.

At time of necropsy, sixteen different samples (liver, spleen, adrenal gland, six lung lobes,

inguinal, axillary, mesenteric and mediastinal lymph nodes, aqueous humor, and urine) were

collected and investigated for the presence of SUDV viral RNA. Viral RNA was detected in all

tissues with no differences between groups detected (Figure 4). The highest viral load was

detected in liver, spleen, adrenal gland, and inguinal lymph node. Viral RNA was lowest in

aqueous humor.

Histologically, all animals demonstrated lesions typical of SUDV infection including multifocal

to coalescing hepatocellular degeneration and necrosis with acute inflammation. Splenic lesions

consist of abundant micro-fibrin thrombi and splenic white pulp necrosis and loss with abundant

fibrin effacing the red pulp. Pulmonary lesions in the control group were minimal and included

rare microthrombi in two of six animals and minimal neutrophilic infiltrates in one animal. Prime

and prime boost vaccinated animals showed minimal to mild neutrophilic interstitial infiltrates

and mild subacute perivascular inflammation in all animals across all pulmonary lobes (Figure

5).

Discussion

We have investigated the efficacy of ChAdOx1-biEBOV against a uniformly lethal challenge

with SUDV in cynomolgus macaques. Despite the presence of antigen-specific binding and

neutralizing antibodies, we did not observe differences in the clinical signs of disease in

vaccinated macaques compared to controls. All macaques reached endpoint criteria and had to be

euthanized.

Correlates of protection have not yet been determined for SUDV but have been investigated for

EBOV. Recombinant adenovirus serotype 5 (rAd5) encoding EBOV GP is protective against

lethal EBOV challenge in cynomolgus macaques. Despite the vaccine eliciting robust EBOV-

specific antibodies, passive transfer of purified IgG only protected one out of four macaques. In

contrast, CD8+ T cell depletion in vaccinated macaques four days prior to challenge resulted in

loss of protection, highlighting the need for T cell mediated responses (*27*). These results parallel

with our findings that ChAdOx1-biEBOV immunization resulted in the production of a robust

humoral response but did not elicit strong T cell-mediated immunity. Another study utilized

immunogenicity and protective efficacy data of the heterologous two-dose vaccine regimen of

Ad26.ZEBOV followed by MVA-BN-Filo in a lethal EBOV cynomolgus macaque model and

identified binding antibodies against GP as the strongest correlate to survival post-EBOV

challenge (*28*). In a previous study using VSV-EBOV vaccination, cynomolgus macaques were

T or B cell-depleted before and after vaccination. When they were CD8+ T cell-depleted, they

survived a subsequent EBOV challenge four weeks later. CD4+ T cell-dependent survival was

time-related: If CD4+ T cells were depleted before vaccination, it reduced EBOV GP-specific

antibody development, and macaques did not survive EBOV challenge; whereas, if CD4+ T cells

were depleted after vaccination, and macaques were able to develop a normal EBOV-specific

antibody response, they survived an EBOV challenge (*29*). Thus, correlates of protection appear

to be vaccine platform- and animal model-dependent but suggest an important role for both

humoral and cellular immunity dependent on platform.

It should be noted that the virus neutralizing antibody response was higher against EBOV than it

was against SUDV using a pseudotype neutralization assay (Figure 1D/E). It is unknown what

level of neutralizing antibody is needed to protect against overt disease. A previous VSV-SUDV

vaccination study in cynomolgus macaques demonstrated complete protection against a lethal

SUDV challenge despite low levels of serum neutralizing antibody titers (*17*). It is therefore

likely that a multi-component immune response with high levels of cellular and humoral

immunity will be best placed to confer protection in the macaque challenge model.

Without knowledge of correlates of protection against SUDV, which are likely animal model and

vaccine platform dependent, NHP studies are helpful to inform selection of vaccine candidates

for clinical development. If needed, NHP studies can be performed relatively fast and challenge

outcome can be known within five weeks of study start if utilizing a prime only regimen.

Preclinical vaccine studies in NHPs do not necessarily correlate with results obtained in small

animal models. Although ChAdOx1-biEBOV was protective against lethal SUDV challenge in

Ifnar1[-] mice, this was not the case in cynomolgus macaques. Guinea pigs vaccinated with

VSV-EBOV, which provides full protection against guinea pig-adapted (GPA-) EBOV

challenge, are partially protected against GPA-SUDV (*30*). However, this finding is not

replicated in NHPs (unpublished work). Likewise, we previously showed low immunogenicity of

Curevac's CVnCoV SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine candidate in NHPs (*31*), despite the induction

of a humoral response in mice and hamsters and a subsequent reduction in replication of SARS-

CoV-2 in hamsters (*32*). Ensuing Phase III clinical trials failed to reach the threshold of 50%

vaccine efficacy set by the WHO (*33*). Although small animal models are an essential initial

model for vaccine evaluation, when possible, efficacy in NHPs should be evaluated ideally

before large-scale clinical trial studies.

Unfortunately, it is not clear from our results why vaccination with ChAdOx1-biEBOV did not

provide protection against challenge. Considering that the amino acid identity between SUDV

Gulu GP (AAP88031.1), the challenge strain, and Boniface GP (Q66814.1), included in

ChAdOx1-biEBOV is 94.67%, we cannot exclude that protective epitopes differ between these

strains; however, vaccination with a rVSV expressing SUDV Boniface has conferred protection

against SUDV Gulu (*22*). Since the Uganda 2022 outbreak strain's (OQ672950.1) nucleotide

identity is 99.3% with the Gulu strain (KU182912.1) and 94.82% with the Boniface strain

(FJ968794.1), SUDV Gulu was selected as the challenge strain. Binding and neutralizing

antibodies were elicited against SUDV GP; however, the role of antibodies in protecting

cynomolgus macaques against filoviruses when vaccination is done with an adenovirus differs

depending on the study design (*27*, *28*). Both binding antibody levels and VN titers were

significantly higher in the prime-boost macaques than the prime only, but we did not observe

substantial changes in measurements of disease. We measured a minimal T cell response,

through ELIspot, after vaccination, even though human volunteers develop a robust cellular

response following vaccination with ChAdOx1-biEBOV (unpublished data). We have seen a

weak cellular immune response following vaccination of NHPs with the ChAdOx1 vector

previously (*23*), in contrast with what has been shown in human volunteers (*34*). This suggests

that either the response to ChAdOx1 in NHPs differs from that observed in humans, or that

PBMCs are not the correct sample to investigate cellular responses in NHPs vaccinated with

ChAdOx1.

As for EBOV, translation of the SUDV GP gene results in three different products: soluble GP

(sGP, 70-80%), GP (20-30%), and small sGP (low frequency) (*35*). Furthermore, the presence of

sGP reduces neutralizing antibody titer *in vitro* (*36*). Thus, we hypothesized that the presence of

SUDV sGP and GP in NHP sera after challenge would be able to bind SUDV GP antibodies and

thereby reduce the detection of binding antibodies via ELISA. In line with this hypothesis, the

two samples in the prime and prime boost group in which we could not detect SUDV sGP had

the highest binding SUDV GP antibody levels at the day of necropsy.

Finally, the EBOV GP-specific response may play a role in the lack of protection against SUDV.

In vitro, antibodies against EBOV GP have been associated with enhanced cellular entry (*37*).

However, it is unclear whether this plays a role *in vivo,* and in this study, no disease

enhancement was observed in vaccinees compared to controls. Indeed, when significant

differences were observed, they pointed towards a slight improvement of vaccinees over

controls, such as in the platelet count. Furthermore, the efficacy of vaccines that combine

filovirus antigens in NHPs has yielded variable results depending on the challenge filovirus.

Callendret *et al*. mixed Ad26 or Ad35 adenoviral vector-based filovirus GP vaccines expressing

Marburg virus (MARV) Angola GP, EBOV Mayinga GP, or SUDV Gulu GP. Cynomolgus

macaques were primed with a mixture of vaccines expressing the different GPs in Ad26 vectors,

primed with a mixture of vaccines expressing the different GPs in Ad35 vectors four weeks later,

and finally challenged four weeks later. Upon lethal challenge with SUDV Gulu, three out of

four animals survived (*38*). In a follow-up study with an increased vaccination dose of 4×10^{10}

virus particles/vector (1.2×10^{11} total virus particles/animal), 100% of animals survived a SUDV

Gulu challenge, which was significantly correlated to binding antibodies to GP (*14*). A bivalent

recombinant protein vaccine that included EBOV Kikwit and SUDV GPs protected all

vaccinated cynomolgus macaques from SVD and elicited GP binding antibodies, but the cellular

immune response was not evaluated (*39*). A quadrivalent VesiculoVax platform combines four

distinct, attenuated rVSVs encoding the GPs of EBOV, SUDV, MARV, and Lassa virus (*22*) or

Bundibugyo (*40*) into a single shot. When delivered using a prime-boost regimen, the

quadrivalent VesiculoVax protects against SUDV, EBOV, and MARV, elicits production of

binding and neutralizing antibodies, and activates antigen-specific T cells in cynomolgus

macaques. Of note, IFN-γ producing antigen-specific T cells were only detected in a subset of

animals (*22*). When administered a week prior to challenge, all vaccinated animals infected with

SUDV, BDBV, or MARV were protected while 80% of macaques challenged with EBOV

survived (*40*). Thus, combining different antigens in one vaccine has protected cynomolgus

macaques against SUDV in previous studies. A notable difference here is that both antigens were

expressed in the same vector; whereas, in the studies described above vaccines encoding a single

GP were mixed. When antigens are expressed in the same vector, they will be produced by the

same cells, whereas if they are not expressed in the same vector, they may be produced by

different cells, potentially resulting in a stronger immune response.

The lack of protection despite vaccine-elicited SUDV GP-specific responses in this model and

protection in small animal models suggests that we need a better understanding of the correlates

of protection for SUDV vaccines. Overall, this study highlights the importance of evaluating

Ebolavirus disease vaccines in multiple models and demonstrates the importance of

understanding protective efficacy for any infectious agent in both animal models and human

hosts.

<u>Materials and Methods</u>

Ethics statement

The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of Rocky Mountain Laboratories, National

Institutes of Health (NIH) approved all animal experiments. Experiments were carried out in an

AAALAC International–accredited facility, following the guidelines and basic principles in the

Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, the Animal Welfare Act, U.S. Department of

Agriculture, and the U.S. Public Health Service Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory

Animals. Cynomolgus macaques were singly housed in adjacent primate cages, which allowed

for social interactions. The animal room was climate-controlled with a fixed light-dark cycle (12-

hour light/12-hour dark). Commercial monkey chow was provided twice daily. The diet was

supplemented with treats, vegetables, or fruit daily. Water was available *ad libitum*.

Environmental enrichment consisted of a variety of human interaction, manipulanda, commercial

toys, videos, and music. Animals were monitored at least twice daily. The Institutional Biosafety

Committee approved work with SUDV under biosafety level 4 conditions and subsequent sample

inactivation for removal of specimens from high containment (*41*, *42*).

Generation of ChAdOx1-biEBOV

Generation of ChAdOx1-biEBOV was done as described previously (Flaxman GP paper if

published). Briefly, EBOV GP (Makona-Kissidougou-C15 GenBank:KJ660346.1) and SUDV

GP (Boniface, UniProtKB Q66814.1) were codon-optimized for humans. Antigen cassettes were

cloned into an ENTRY plasmid and recombined *in vitro* with ChAdOx1-biDEST containing a

Gateway destination cassette in both the E1 and the E4 loci, respectively. E1 and E4 expression

cassettes both contained the TetR-repressible CMV promoter; E1 cassettes contained the BGH

polyA sequence, while E4 expression cassettes contained the SV40 polyA sequence. SUDV GP

was encoded in the E1 cassette, whereas EBOV GP was encoded in the E4 cassette. Viral vectors

were produced at the Viral Vector Core Facility at the Jenner Institute. All adenovirus vectors

were produced in the T-REx-293 cell line (Thermo Fisher Scientific), which allows for

transcriptional repression of the vaccine antigens during vector production. Vectors underwent

quality control (including titration, identity PCR, and sterility testing) before being used in *in*

vitro and *in vivo* studies.

Study design

Eighteen cynomolgus macaques of Indonesian origin, all female, were sorted by weight and then

randomly divided into three groups of six animals each (prime group 8-11 years old, 3.2-6.0kg;

prime boost group 8-13 years old, 3.2-5.2kg; control group 7-11 years old, 3.4-4.7kg). Animals

were vaccinated with 2.5 x 10^{10} virus particles per animal of ChAdOx1-biEBOV or ChAdOx1

GFP intramuscularly (250 µl in each caudal thigh), as done previously (*23*). Vaccine was diluted

in sterile phosphate-buffered saline (PBS). All animals received a vaccination at D-28, and the

prime boost group received an additional vaccination at D-56. On D0, animals received 1 x 10^4

$TCID_{50}$ of SUDV Gulu (500 µl in each caudal thigh). Clinical scoring was done daily post

challenge and based on the evaluation of the following criteria: general appearance and activity,

appearance of skin and coat, discharge, respiration, feces and urine output, and appetite. Clinical

exams were conducted on D−56, −42, −28, −14, 0, 1, 3, and 6. All animals reached endpoint

criteria between D5-7. Hematology analysis was completed on a ProCyte DX (IDEXX

Laboratories, Westbrook, ME, USA) and the following parameters were evaluated: red blood

cells (RBC), hemoglobin (Hb), hematocrit (HCT), mean corpuscular volume (MCV), mean

corpuscular hemoglobin (MCH), mean corpuscular hemoglobin concentration (MCHC), red cell

distribution weight (RDW), platelets, mean platelet volume (MPV), white blood cells (WBC),

neutrophil count (abs and %), lymphocyte count (abs and %), monocyte count (abs and %),

eosinophil count (abs and %), and basophil count (abs and %). Serum chemistries were

completed on a VetScan VS2 Chemistry Analyzer (Abaxis, Union City, CA) and the following

parameters were evaluated: glucose, blood urea nitrogen (BUN), creatinine, calcium, albumin,

total protein, alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), alkaline

phosphatase (ALP), total bilirubin, globulin, sodium, potassium, chloride, and total carbon

dioxide. Upon reaching endpoint criteria, animals were euthanized, and necropsy was performed.

The following tissues were collected: muscle at injection site, liver, spleen, adrenal gland, 6 lung

lobes, inguinal, axillary, mesenteric and mediastinal lymph nodes, aqueous humor, and urine.

Urine was not collected from three of the macaques, one in each study group.

Cells and Virus

SUDV Gulu (NC_006432.1) was obtained from the US Army Medical Research Institute of

Infectious Diseases and propagated once on Vero E6 cells. Deep sequencing revealed no

contaminants; however, compared to the reference sequence, four base pair changes (two in NP,

one in VP40, and one non-coding in GP (*17*)) were noted. VeroE6 cells were maintained in

DMEM supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum, 1 mM l-glutamine, penicillin (50 U/ml), and

streptomycin (50 µg/ml; DMEM10). Mycoplasma testing is performed at regular intervals, and

no mycoplasma was detected.

RNA extraction and quantitative reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction

RNA was extracted from whole blood using a QiaAmp Viral RNA kit (Qiagen) according to the

manufacturer's instructions. Tissue was homogenized and extracted using the RNeasy kit

(Qiagen) according to the manufacturer's instructions. A SUDV GP viral RNA–specific assay

(F: CAAAGGGAAGAATCTCCGACC, R: CAGGGGAATTCTTTGGAACC, P: FAM-

GGCCACCAGGAAGTATTCGGACC-BHQ; designed using the Sudan ebolavirus isolate Ebola

virus/H.sapiens-tc/UGA/2000/Gulu-808892 (KR063670.1) sequence) was used for the detection

of viral RNA. RNA (5 µl) was tested with QuantStudio (Thermo Fisher Scientific) according to

instructions of the manufacturer. To create standards, SUDV Gulu stocks were extracted using

QIAamp viral RNA kits per manufacturer's instructions. RNA was serially diluted and

quantified using the One-Step RT-ddPCR system (Bio-Rad). Briefly, 5 µL of RNA was

combined with recommended volumes and concentrations of supermix, reverse transcriptase,

DTT, primers, probe, and molecular grade water. This mix was then combined with Automated

Droplet Generation Oil for Probes using the Automated Droplet Generator. Once the droplets

were generated, PCR was performed using recommended cycling conditions. Reverse

transcription was performed at 50°C and anneal/extension was performed at 60°C. After thermal

cycling, positive droplets were quantified with the QX200 Droplet Reader. Finally, a range of

copies/rxn that gave cycle threshold values between 20-30 were selected as controls and used to

quantify RNA in this study.

SUDV GP and EBOV GP ELISA

The presence of SUDV GP- and EBOV GP-specific binding antibodies in macaque sera was

determined using ELISA, carried out in Nunc MaxiSorp flat bottom 96-well plates (Thermo Fisher

Scientific) coated with 50 ng/well of trimeric ectodomain SUDV GP or EBOV GP

(NativeAntigen) in DPBS followed by overnight incubation at 4°C. The wells were blocked with

100 µl of casein in PBS (ThermoFisher) for 1 h at room temperature and then incubated with

diluted sera in triplicate for 1 h at 37°C. Serially diluted (1:100 to 1:51200) sera obtained from a

SUDV-challenged macaques at 40 days post challenge was utilized as a standard curve and diluted

1:1600 as an internal control. IgG antibodies were detected by using affinity-purified polyclonal

antibody peroxidase labelled goat-anti-monkey IgG (Seracare) at a dilution of 1:2500 in casein in

PBS for 1 h at 37°C. The absorbance was measured at 405 nm after the addition of TMB two

component peroxidase substrate (Seracare, 5120-0047) for 5-10 min followed by the addition of

stop solution (Seracare, 5150-0021). Wells were washed 6x with PBST 0.1% Tween in between

each step. Arbitrary ELISA units were calculated based on the standard curve. All samples diluted

at 200x with an OD value of less than 0.250 were given a value of 1.

sGP ELISA

The SUDV sGP-specific sandwich ELISA was performed as previously described (*43*) with

minor differences. SUDV sGP was captured using the 1 µg/mL polyclonal rabbit anti-SUDV

sGP antibody (cat. # 0302-030, IBT Bioservices). Dilutions of recombinant SUDV sGP (cat. #

0570-001, IBT Bioservices) at known concentrations served as standards.

Pseudovirus neutralization

Neutralization assays with VSV-EBOV-GFP and VSV-SUDV-GFP were performed as

previously described (*17*). The VSV-SUDV-GFP assay was optimized to include incubation of

serum dilution mix on the Vero E6 cells for 16 hours at 37ºC. Samples were analyzed on the

FACSymphony^{TM} A5 Cell Analyzer (BD Biosciences, San Jose, CA, USA) and the GFP-

positive cell count was analyzed using FlowJo v10 Software (BD Life Sciences).

ELIspot assay

Peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) were isolated from ethylene diamine

tetraaceticacid (EDTA) whole blood on certain exam days (D-56, -42, -28, -14, and 0) using

Leucosep tubes (Greiner Bio-one International) and Histopaque-1077 density-gradient cell-

separation medium (Sigma-Aldrich) according to the manufacturers' instructions and frozen in

liquid nitrogen. After thawing of cells, cells were plated at a concentration of approximately

100,000 cells per well and were stimulated for 6 hours with contiguous peptide pools that

spanned the length of the EBOV or SUDV GP at a concentration of 2 µg/mL per peptide. As a

positive control, cells were stimulated with eBioscience™ Cell Stimulation Cocktail

(ThermoFisher). As a negative control, cells were incubated in media with equivalent amounts of

DMSO. The ImmunoSpot Human IFNγ Single-Colour Enzymatic ELISpot Assay Kit was

performed according to the manufacturer's protocol (Cellular Technology). Analysis was

performed using the CTL ImmunoSpot Analyzer and ImmunoSpot Software (Cellular

Technology).

Measurement of cytokines and chemokines

Sera was collected on all exam days. Tissue (Lower left lung lobe, and liver) was weighted,

homogenized in 750 µl of DMEM, spun down for 10 min at 8000 rpm, after which supernatant

was collected. Sera and tissue supernatant were irradiated (4 MRad) and analyzed on the

MesoQuick Plex (MSD, K15203D) at a 4x and 10x dilution, respectively. The U-PLEX

Biomarker Group 1 (NHP) Assay kit (MSD, K15068L) was used to test the presence of twelve

cytokines (GM-CSF, IFNα2a, IFN-γ, IL-1β, IL-4, IL-6, IL-10, IL-12 p70, IL-15, IP-10, MCP-1,

and TNF-α), the V-PLEX Cytokine Panel 1 Human kit (MSD, K15050D) was used to test the

presence of seven additional cytokines (IL-5, IL-7, IL-12/IL-23p40, IL-16, IL-17A, TNF-β, and

VEGF-A), and the V-PLEX Chemokine Panel 1 Human kit (MSD, K15047D) was used to test

the presence of seven additional chemokines (Eotaxin-3, IL-8 (HA), MCP-1, MDC, MIP-1α,

MIP-1β, and TARC). Data were extracted from the plates using the MSD Workbench 4.0

software and qualitative lower limit of detection (QLOD) were calculated for each parameter. All

values below the QLOD were changed to the QLOD. Cytokine and chemokine concentrations

were calculated per mg of tissue and mL of sera.

Histology and immunohistochemistry

Necropsies and tissue sampling were performed according to IBC-approved protocols. Tissues

were perfused with 10% neutral-buffered formalin and fixed for a minimum of 7 days. Tissues

were placed in cassettes and processed with a Sakura VIP-6 Tissue Tek, on a 12-hour automated

schedule, using a graded series of ethanol, xylene, and PureAffin. Embedded tissues are

sectioned at 5 μm and dried overnight at 42°C prior to staining. Specific anti-Ebolavirus

immunoreactivity was detected using an in-house rabbit polyclonal anti-Ebola Zaire VP40

antibody at a 1:2000 dilution. Vector Laboratories ImmPress VR horse anti-rabbit IgG polymer

(# MP-6401) was used as a secondary antibody. The tissues were stained using the Discovery

Ultra automated stainer (Ventana Medical Systems) with a Roche Tissue Diagnostics Discovery

purple kit (#760-229). The tissue slides were examined by a board-certified veterinary anatomic

pathologist blinded to study group allocations. Pulmonary pathology was evaluated in three

histological sections from each of the six lung lobes resulting in eighteen evaluated sections for

each macaque. Histologic lesion severity was scored according to a standardized scoring system

evaluating the presence of pathology: 0, no lesions; 1, minimal (1-10% of lobe affected); 2, mild

(11-25%); 3, moderate (26-50%); 4, marked (51-75%); 5, severe (76-100%). Presence of viral

antigen was scored per lung lobe according to a standardized scoring system: 0, none; 1,

rare/few; 2, scattered; 3, moderate; 4, numerous; 5, diffuse. A representative lesion from each

group was selected for figures.

Statistical analysis

Kruskall-Wallis analysis was conducted to compare differences between groups, followed by

Mann-Whitney test if differences were found to be significant using GraphPad Prism version

8.3.0. Statistical tests used are identified in the figure legends.

Author contributions: SvT, AM, TL, VJM, and NvD designed the study; AM, TL and VJM

acquired funding; SvT, PF, FF, RKM, JRP, RJF, SG, JES, JR, RM, AC, LM, JL, BJS, AO, CS,

GS, AM, NvD acquired, analyzed, and interpreted the data; SvT and NvD wrote the manuscript.

All authors have approved the submitted version.

Funding: This work was supported by the Division of Intramural Research of the National

Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the

University of Oxford.

Acknowledgements: We thank Brandon Bailes, Viviane Callier, Lydia Crawford, Richard Cole,

Kathy Cordova, Allison Darrow, Dean Follmann, Corey Henderson, Taylor Lippincott, Kay

Menk, Kyle O'Donnell, and Taylor Saturday for their assistance during the study.

1.   N. Biedenkopf, A. Bukreyev, K. Chandran, N. Di Paola, P. B. H. Formenty, A. Griffiths, A.
J. Hume, E. Mühlberger, S. V. Netesov, G. Palacios, J. T. Pawęska, S. Smither, A. Takada,
V. Wahl, J. H. Kuhn, Renaming of genera Ebolavirus and Marburgvirus to Orthoebolavirus
and Orthomarburgvirus, respectively, and introduction of binomial species names within
family Filoviridae. *Arch Virol* **168**, 220 (2023).

2.   S. T. Jacob, I. Crozier, W. A. Fischer, A. Hewlett, C. S. Kraft, M.-A. de L. Vega, M. J.
Soka, V. Wahl, A. Griffiths, L. Bollinger, J. H. Kuhn, Ebola virus disease. *Nat Rev Dis*
Primers **6**, 13 (2020).

3.   Report of a WHO/International Study Team, Ebola haemorrhagic fever in Sudan, 1976.
Report of a WHO/International Study Team. *Bull World Health Organ* **56**, 247–270 (1978).

4.   R. C. Baron, J. B. McCormick, O. A. Zubeir, Ebola virus disease in southern Sudan:
hospital dissemination and intrafamilial spread. *Bull World Health Organ* **61**, 997–1003
(1983).

5.   S. I. Okware, F. G. Omaswa, S. Zaramba, A. Opio, J. J. Lutwama, J. Kamugisha, E. B.
Rwaguma, P. Kagwa, M. Lamunu, An outbreak of Ebola in Uganda. *Trop Med Int Health*
7, 1068–1075 (2002).

6.   Outbreak of Ebola haemorrhagic fever in Yambio, south Sudan, April - June 2004. *Wkly*
Epidemiol Rec **80**, 370–375 (2005).

7.   C. G. Albariño, T. Shoemaker, M. L. Khristova, J. F. Wamala, J. J. Muyembe, S. Balinandi,
A. Tumusiime, S. Campbell, D. Cannon, A. Gibbons, E. Bergeron, B. Bird, K. Dodd, C.
Spiropoulou, B. R. Erickson, L. Guerrero, B. Knust, S. T. Nichol, P. E. Rollin, U. Ströher,
Genomic analysis of filoviruses associated with four viral hemorrhagic fever outbreaks in
Uganda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 2012. *Virology* **442**, 97–100 (2013).

8.   T. Shoemaker, A. MacNeil, S. Balinandi, S. Campbell, J. F. Wamala, L. K. McMullan, R.
Downing, J. Lutwama, E. Mbidde, U. Ströher, P. E. Rollin, S. T. Nichol, Reemerging
Sudan Ebola Virus Disease in Uganda, 2011. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **18** (2012).

9.   P. Musoke, F. Bongomin, Sudan virus disease outbreak in Uganda in 2022: the case of
patient zero. *Int J Infect Dis* **128**, 318–320 (2023).

10.   T. Kiggundu, A. R. Ario, D. Kadobera, B. Kwesiga, R. Migisha, I. Makumbi, D. Eurien, Z.
Kabami, J. Kayiwa, B. Lubwama, D. Okethwangu, S. Nabadda, G. Bwire, S. Mulei, J. R.
Harris, E. Dirlikov, A. G. Fitzmaurice, S. Nabatanzi, Y. Tegegn, A. N. Muruta, D.
Kyabayinze, A. L. Boore, A. Kagirita, H. Kyobe-Bosa, H. G. Mwebesa, D. Atwine, J. R.
Aceng Ocero, Uganda Ebola Response Team, Uganda Ebola Response Team, N. E. Brown,
B. Agaba, S. R. Ahirirwe, R. Akunzirwe, A. Asio, I. Atuhaire, S. Elayeete, D. Gonahasa, E.
J. Nsubuga, P. King, S. Kizito, A. Komackech, V. Masanja, S. M. Migamba, P. Mwine, H.
N. Naiga, P. Nakamya, R. Nampeera, M. Ninsiima, A. Ndybakira, L. Oonyu, B. N.
Simbwa, H. Tendo, M. W. Wanyana, J. F. Zalwango, M. G. Zalwango, R. Zavuga, I.
Asiimwe, R. Mafigiri, E. Muwanguzi, S. Balinandi, L. Nyakarahuka, J. Baluku, J. Kyando,
A. Tumusiime, C. Cossaboom, C. Eggers, J. D. Klena, L. Nelson, M. Osinubi, K. Sadigh,

W. Vosburgh, M.-C. Worrell, P. Kabagambe, C. Okot, G. Nsereko, O. Namusisi, *Notes*
from the Field: Outbreak of Ebola Virus Disease Caused by *Sudan ebolavirus* — Uganda,
August–October 2022. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **71**, 1457–1459 (2022).

11.   T. W. Geisbert, K. M. Daddario-Dicaprio, J. B. Geisbert, D. S. Reed, F. Feldmann, A.
512   Grolla, U. Ströher, E. A. Fritz, L. E. Hensley, S. M. Jones, H. Feldmann, Vesicular
513   stomatitis virus-based vaccines protect nonhuman primates against aerosol challenge with
514   Ebola and Marburg viruses. *Vaccine* **26**, 6894–6900 (2008).

515   12.   T. W. Geisbert, J. B. Geisbert, A. Leung, K. M. Daddario-DiCaprio, L. E. Hensley, A.
516   Grolla, H. Feldmann, Single-injection vaccine protects nonhuman primates against
517   infection with marburg virus and three species of ebola virus. *J Virol* **83**, 7296–7304
518   (2009).

519   13.   K. L. Taylor, L. Lanning, L. Wolfraim, S. Shrivastava Gales, C. Sico, W. E. Dowling, L. A.
520   Ward, W. C. Florence, E. Nuzum, P. R. Bryant, A U.S. Government-Coordinated Effort to
521   Leverage Non-Human Primate Data to Facilitate Ebolavirus Vaccine Development.
522   *Vaccines (Basel)* **10**, 1201 (2022).

523   14.   M. M. Tiemessen, L. Solforosi, L. Dekking, D. Czapska-Casey, J. Serroyen, N. J. Sullivan,
524   A. Volkmann, M. G. Pau, B. Callendret, H. Schuitemaker, K. Luhn, R. Zahn, R.
525   Roozendaal, Protection against Marburg Virus and Sudan Virus in NHP by an
526   Adenovector-Based Trivalent Vaccine Regimen Is Correlated to Humoral Immune
527   Response Levels. *Vaccines* **10**, 1263 (2022).

528   15.   O. Tshiani Mbaya, P. Mukumbayi, S. Mulangu, Review: Insights on Current FDA-
529   Approved Monoclonal Antibodies Against Ebola Virus Infection. *Front Immunol* **12**,
530   721328 (2021).

531   16.   R. W. Cross, Z. A. Bornholdt, A. N. Prasad, C. Woolsey, V. Borisevich, K. N. Agans, D. J.
532   Deer, D. M. Abelson, D. H. Kim, W. S. Shestowsky, L. A. Campbell, E. Bunyan, J. B.
533   Geisbert, N. S. Dobias, K. A. Fenton, D. P. Porter, L. Zeitlin, T. W. Geisbert, Combination
534   therapy with remdesivir and monoclonal antibodies protects nonhuman primates against
535   advanced Sudan virus disease. *JCI Insight* **7**, e159090 (2022).

536   17.   A. Marzi, P. Fletcher, F. Feldmann, G. Saturday, P. W. Hanley, H. Feldmann, Species-
537   specific immunogenicity and protective efficacy of a vesicular stomatitis virus-based Sudan
538   virus vaccine: a challenge study in macaques. *The Lancet Microbe* **4**, e171–e178 (2023).

539   18.   J. Froude, A. Herbert, T. Pelat, S. Miethe, S. Zak, J. Brannan, R. Bakken, A. Steiner, G.
540   Yin, T. Hallam, A. Sato, M. Hust, P. Thullier, J. Dye, Post-Exposure Protection in Mice
541   against Sudan Virus by a Two Antibody Cocktail. *Viruses* **10**, 286 (2018).

542   19.   A. S. Herbert, J. W. Froude, R. A. Ortiz, A. I. Kuehne, D. E. Dorosky, R. R. Bakken, S. E.
543   Zak, N. M. Josleyn, K. Musiychuk, R. M. Jones, B. Green, S. J. Streatfield, A. Z. Wec, N.
544   Bohorova, O. Bohorov, D. H. Kim, M. H. Pauly, J. Velasco, K. J. Whaley, S. W. Stonier, Z.
545   A. Bornholdt, K. Chandran, L. Zeitlin, D. Sampey, V. Yusibov, J. M. Dye, Development of

an antibody cocktail for treatment of Sudan virus infection. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **117**,
3768–3778 (2020).

20.   E. P. Thi, A. C. H. Lee, J. B. Geisbert, R. Ursic-Bedoya, K. N. Agans, M. Robbins, D. J.
Deer, K. A. Fenton, A. S. Kondratowicz, I. MacLachlan, T. W. Geisbert, C. E. Mire,
Rescue of non-human primates from advanced Sudan ebolavirus infection with lipid
encapsulated siRNA. *Nat Microbiol* **1**, 16142 (2016).

21.   S. Malik, S. Kishore, S. Nag, A. Dhasmana, S. Preetam, O. Mitra, D. A. León-Figueroa, A.
Mohanty, V. K. Chattu, M. Assefi, B. K. Padhi, R. Sah, Ebola Virus Disease Vaccines:
Development, Current Perspectives & Challenges. *Vaccines (Basel)* **11**, 268 (2023).

22.   R. W. Cross, R. Xu, D. Matassov, S. Hamm, T. E. Latham, C. S. Gerardi, R. M. Nowak, J.
B. Geisbert, A. Ota-Setlik, K. N. Agans, A. Luckay, S. E. Witko, L. Soukieh, D. J. Deer, C.
E. Mire, H. Feldmann, C. Happi, K. A. Fenton, J. H. Eldridge, T. W. Geisbert, Quadrivalent
VesiculoVax vaccine protects nonhuman primates from viral-induced hemorrhagic fever
and death. *J Clin Invest* **130**, 539–551 (2020).

23.   N. van Doremalen, T. Lambe, A. Spencer, S. Belij-Rammerstorfer, J. N. Purushotham, J. R.
Port, V. A. Avanzato, T. Bushmaker, A. Flaxman, M. Ulaszewska, F. Feldmann, E. R.
Allen, H. Sharpe, J. Schulz, M. Holbrook, A. Okumura, K. Meade-White, L. Perez-Perez,
N. J. Edwards, D. Wright, C. Bissett, C. Gilbride, B. N. Williamson, R. Rosenke, D. Long,
A. Ishwarbhai, R. Kailath, L. Rose, S. Morris, C. Powers, J. Lovaglio, P. W. Hanley, D.
Scott, G. Saturday, E. de Wit, S. C. Gilbert, V. J. Munster, ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine
prevents SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in rhesus macaques. *Nature*, doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-
2608-y (2020).

24.   N. van Doremalen, E. Haddock, F. Feldmann, K. Meade-White, T. Bushmaker, R. J.
Fischer, A. Okumura, P. W. Hanley, G. Saturday, N. J. Edwards, M. H. A. Clark, T.
Lambe, S. C. Gilbert, V. J. Munster, A single dose of ChAdOx1 MERS provides protective
immunity in rhesus macaques. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaba8399 (2020).

25.   N. van Doremalen, V. A. Avanzato, K. Goldin, F. Feldmann, J. E. Schulz, E. Haddock, A.
Okumura, J. Lovaglio, P. W. Hanley, K. Cordova, G. Saturday, E. de Wit, T. Lambe, S. C.
Gilbert, V. J. Munster, ChAdOx1 NiV vaccination protects against lethal Nipah Bangladesh
virus infection in African green monkeys. *npj Vaccines* **7**, 171 (2022).

26.   R. J. Fischer, J. N. Purushotham, N. van Doremalen, S. Sebastian, K. Meade-White, K.
Cordova, M. Letko, M. Jeremiah Matson, F. Feldmann, E. Haddock, R. LaCasse, G.
Saturday, T. Lambe, S. C. Gilbert, V. J. Munster, ChAdOx1-vectored Lassa fever vaccine
elicits a robust cellular and humoral immune response and protects guinea pigs against
lethal Lassa virus challenge. *npj Vaccines* **6**, 32 (2021).

27.   N. J. Sullivan, L. Hensley, C. Asiedu, T. W. Geisbert, D. Stanley, J. Johnson, A. Honko, G.
Olinger, M. Bailey, J. B. Geisbert, K. A. Reimann, S. Bao, S. Rao, M. Roederer, P. B.
Jahrling, R. A. Koup, G. J. Nabel, CD8+ cellular immunity mediates rAd5 vaccine
protection against Ebola virus infection of nonhuman primates. *Nat Med* **17**, 1128–1131
(2011).

28. R. Roozendaal, J. Hendriks, T. van Effelterre, B. Spiessens, L. Dekking, L. Solforosi, D.
Czapska-Casey, V. Bockstal, J. Stoop, D. Splinter, S. Janssen, B. van Baelen, N.
Verbruggen, J. Serroyen, E. Dekeyster, A. Volkmann, Y. Wollmann, R. Carrion, L. D.
Giavedoni, C. Robinson, M. Leyssen, M. Douoguih, K. Luhn, M. G. Pau, J. Sadoff, A.
Vandebosch, H. Schuitemaker, R. Zahn, B. Callendret, Nonhuman primate to human
immunobridging to infer the protective effect of an Ebola virus vaccine candidate. *npj*
Vaccines **5**, 112 (2020).

29. A. Marzi, F. Engelmann, F. Feldmann, K. Haberthur, W. L. Shupert, D. Brining, D. P.
Scott, T. W. Geisbert, Y. Kawaoka, M. G. Katze, H. Feldmann, I. Messaoudi, Antibodies
are necessary for rVSV/ZEBOV-GP–mediated protection against lethal Ebola virus
challenge in nonhuman primates. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **110**, 1893–1898 (2013).

30. W. Cao, S. He, G. Liu, H. Schulz, K. Emeterio, M. Chan, K. Tierney, K. Azaransky, G.
Soule, N. Tailor, A. Salawudeen, R. Nichols, J. Fusco, D. Safronetz, L. Banadyga, "The
rVSV-EBOV vaccine provides limited cross-protection against Sudan virus in guinea pigs"
(preprint, Microbiology, 2022); https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.11.516195.

31. N. van Doremalen, R. J. Fischer, J. E. Schulz, M. G. Holbrook, B. J. Smith, J. Lovaglio, B.
Petsch, V. J. Munster, Immunogenicity of Low-Dose Prime-Boost Vaccination of mRNA
Vaccine CV07050101 in Non-Human Primates. *Viruses* **13**, 1645 (2021).

32. S. Rauch, K. Gooch, Y. Hall, F. J. Salguero, M. J. Dennis, F. V. Gleeson, D. Harris, C. Ho,
H. E. Humphries, S. Longet, D. Ngabo, J. Paterson, E. L. Rayner, K. A. Ryan, S. Sharpe, R.
J. Watson, S. O. Mueller, B. Petsch, M. W. Carroll, "mRNA vaccine CVnCoV protects
non-human primates from SARS-CoV-2 challenge infection" (preprint, Immunology,
2020); https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.23.424138.

33. P. G. Kremsner, R. A. Ahuad Guerrero, E. Arana-Arri, G. J. Aroca Martinez, M. Bonten, R.
Chandler, G. Corral, E. J. L. De Block, L. Ecker, J. J. Gabor, C. A. Garcia Lopez, L.
Gonzales, M. A. Granados González, N. Gorini, M. P. Grobusch, A. D. Hrabar, H. Junker,
A. Kimura, C. F. Lanata, C. Lehmann, I. Leroux-Roels, P. Mann, M. F. Martinez-Reséndez,
T. J. Ochoa, C. A. Poy, M. J. Reyes Fentanes, L. M. Rivera Mejia, V. V. Ruiz Herrera, X.
Sáez-Llorens, O. Schönborn-Kellenberger, M. Schunk, A. Sierra Garcia, I. Vergara, T.
Verstraeten, M. Vico, L. Oostvogels, L. Lovesio, F. Diez, F. Grazziani, M. C. Ganaha, V. J.
Zalatnik, R. J. Dittrich, L. Espínola, S. Lambert, A. Longhi, C. Vecchio, M. Mastruzzo, A.
Fernandez, S. Borchowiek, R. Potito, R. A. Ahuad Guerrero, F. M. Guardiani, S. Castella,
M. Foccoli, A. Pedernera, A. Braida, V. Durigan, C. Martella, A. Bobat, B. E. Boggia, S. A.
Nemi, J. G. Tartaglione, F. C. Piedimonte, J. De Bie, H. Reynales Londoño, P. A.
Rodríguez Ordoñez, J. M. García Cruz, L. Bautista Toloza, M. C. Ladino González, A. P.
Zambrano Ochoa, I. Prieto Pradera, D. Torres Hernandez, D. P. Mazo Elorza, M. F.
Collazos Lennis, B. Vanegas Dominguez, L. M. Solano Mosquera, R. Fendel, W. A.
Fleischmann, E. Koehne, A. Kreidenweiss, C. Köhler, M. Esen, C. Horn, S. Eberts, A.
Kroidl, K. Huber, V. Thiel, S. Mazara Rosario, G. Reyes, L. Rivera, Y. Donastorg, F.
Lantigua, D. Torres Almanzar, R. Candelario, L. Peña Mendez, N. Rosario Gomez, A.
Portolés-Pérez, A. Ascaso del Río, L. Laredo Velasco, M. J. Bustinduy Odriozola, I. Larrea
Arranz, L. I. Martínez Alcorta, M. I. Durán Laviña, N. Imaz-Ayo, S. Meijide, A. García-de-

Vicuña, A. Santorcuato, M. Gallego, G. M. Aguirre-García, J. Olmos Vega, P. González Limón, A. Vázquez Villar, J. Chávez Barón, F. Arredondo Saldaña, J. de D. Luján Palacios, L. J. Camacho Choza, E. G. Vázquez Saldaña, S. J. Ortega Dominguez, K. S. Vega Orozco, I. A. Torres Quiroz, A. Martinez Avendaño, J. Herrera Sanchez, E. Guzman, L. Castro Castrezana, G. M. Ruiz Palacios y Santos, R. F. J. de Winter, H. K. de Jonge, J. L. Schnyder, W. Boersma, L. Hessels, R. Djamin, S. van der Sar, R. DeAntonio, M. Peña, G. Rebollon, M. Rojas, J. Escobar, B. Hammerschlag Icaza, D. Y. Wong T, P. Barrera Perigault, S. Ruiz, M. Chan, D. J. Arias Hoo, A. I. Gil, C. R. Celis, M. P. Balmaceda, O. Flores, M. Ochoa, B. Peña, C. de la Flor, C. M. Webb, E. Cornejo, F. Sanes, V. Mayorga, G. Valdiviezo, S. P. Ramírez Lamas, G. A. Grandez Castillo, J. R. Lama, M. E. Matta Aguirre, L. A. Arancibia Luna, Ó. Carbajal Paulet, J. Zambrano Ortiz, A. Camara, F. Guzman Quintanilla, C. Diaz-Parra, J. Morales-Oliva, R. E. Cornejo, S. A. Ricalde, J. Vidal, L. Rios Nogales, D. Cheatham-Seitz, G. Gregoraci, A. Brecx, L. Walz, D. Vahrenhorst, T. Seibel, G. Quintini, Efficacy and safety of the CVnCoV SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine candidate in ten countries in Europe and Latin America (HERALD): a randomised, observer-blinded, placebo-controlled, phase 2b/3 trial. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **22**, 329–340 (2022).

34. P. M. Folegatti, K. J. Ewer, P. K. Aley, B. Angus, S. Becker, S. Belij-Rammerstorfer, D. Bellamy, S. Bibi, M. Bittaye, E. A. Clutterbuck, C. Dold, S. N. Faust, A. Finn, A. L. Flaxman, B. Hallis, P. Heath, D. Jenkin, R. Lazarus, R. Makinson, A. M. Minassian, K. M. Pollock, M. Ramasamy, H. Robinson, M. Snape, R. Tarrant, M. Voysey, C. Green, A. D. Douglas, A. V. S. Hill, T. Lambe, S. C. Gilbert, A. J. Pollard, C. V. T. G. Oxford, Safety and immunogenicity of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2: a preliminary report of a phase 1/2, single-blind, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* **396**, 467–478 (2020).

35. W. Furuyama, K. Shifflett, H. Feldmann, A. Marzi, The Ebola virus soluble glycoprotein contributes to viral pathogenesis by activating the MAP kinase signaling pathway. *PLoS Pathog* **17**, e1009937 (2021).

36. H. Ito, S. Watanabe, A. Takada, Y. Kawaoka, Ebola Virus Glycoprotein: Proteolytic Processing, Acylation, Cell Tropism, and Detection of Neutralizing Antibodies. *J Virol* **75**, 1576–1580 (2001).

37. A. Takada, H. Feldmann, T. G. Ksiazek, Y. Kawaoka, Antibody-Dependent Enhancement of Ebola Virus Infection. *J Virol* **77**, 7539–7544 (2003).

38. B. Callendret, J. Vellinga, K. Wunderlich, A. Rodriguez, R. Steigerwald, U. Dirmeier, C. Cheminay, A. Volkmann, T. Brasel, R. Carrion, L. D. Giavedoni, J. L. Patterson, C. E. Mire, T. W. Geisbert, J. W. Hooper, M. Weijtens, J. Hartkoorn-Pasma, J. Custers, M. Grazia Pau, H. Schuitemaker, R. Zahn, A prophylactic multivalent vaccine against different filovirus species is immunogenic and provides protection from lethal infections with Ebolavirus and Marburgvirus species in non-human primates. *PLoS ONE* **13**, e0192312 (2018).

668   39.   A. T. Lehrer, E. Chuang, M. Namekar, C. A. Williams, T. A. S. Wong, M. M. Lieberman,
669   A. Granados, J. Misamore, J. Yalley-Ogunro, H. Andersen, J. B. Geisbert, K. N. Agans, R.
670   W. Cross, T. W. Geisbert, Recombinant Protein Filovirus Vaccines Protect Cynomolgus
671   Macaques From Ebola, Sudan, and Marburg Viruses. *Front Immunol* **12**, 703986 (2021).

672   40.   C. Woolsey, V. Borisevich, K. N. Agans, R. O'Toole, K. A. Fenton, M. B. Harrison, A. N.
673   Prasad, D. J. Deer, C. Gerardi, N. Morrison, R. W. Cross, J. H. Eldridge, D. Matassov, T.
674   W. Geisbert, A highly attenuated pan-filovirus VesiculoVax vaccine rapidly protects
675   nonhuman primates against Marburg virus and three species of Ebolavirus. *J Infect Dis*,
676   jiad157 (2023).

677   41.   F. Feldmann, W. L. Shupert, E. Haddock, B. Twardoski, H. Feldmann, Gamma Irradiation
678   as an Effective Method for Inactivation of Emerging Viral Pathogens. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*
679   **100**, 1275–1277 (2019).

680   42.   E. Haddock, F. Feldmann, H. Feldmann, Effective Chemical Inactivation of Ebola Virus.
681   *Emerg Infect Dis* **22**, 1292–1294 (2016).

682   43.   W. Furuyama, A. Marzi, Development of an Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay to
683   Determine the Expression Dynamics of Ebola Virus Soluble Glycoprotein during Infection.
684   *Microorganisms* **8**, 1535 (2020).

Figure 1. Immunological responses in cynomolgus macaques upon vaccination with

ChAdOx1-biEBOV. A. Overview of experimental design. B/C. Binding antibodies against

trimeric SUDV GP (B) or EBOV GP (C) at different time points post vaccination and challenge.

Log10 transformed values are shown, which were compared to a standard curve of positive sera.

D/E. Virus neutralizing antibodies against pseudovirus VSV-SUDV (D) or VSV-EBOV (E) at

different time points post challenge. $FRNT_{50}$ of green fluorescence protein-positive cell count is

shown. F/G. SUDV GP (F) or EBOV GP (G) specific T cell responses in PBMCs isolated from

vaccinated or controls animals at D-14 normalized to D−56 or D-28 days post-challenge

response. Significance was determined using Kruskall Wallis test followed by Mann Whitney

test. The dotted line shows the limit of detection. GP = glycoprotein. FRNT50=50% fluorescence

reduction. SUDV=Sudan virus. EBOV=Ebola virus. VSV=vesicular stomatitis virus, SFU=spot-

forming units.

Figure 2. Survival and clinical signs upon challenge of macaques with SUDV Gulu. Clinical

score (A) survival (B), and viremia (C) are shown. The following parameters were measured in

702   blood of NHPs: Aspartate aminotransferase (AST, E), alkaline phosphatase (ALP, F), blood urea

703   nitrogen (BUN, G), albumin (H), platelets (I), lymphocytes (J), and neutrophils (K). Significance

704   was determined using Kruskall Wallis test followed by Mann Whitney test. Dotted line shows

705   (A) clinical score at which euthanasia is required, (C) or lower limit of detection.

Figure 3. Binding antibody levels and sGP in serum obtained from macaques post

challenge. Binding antibody levels against SUDV GP (A) and EBOV GP (B) are shown for the

prime and prime boost group post challenge. No binding antibody was detected in control

animals. The dotted line shows the limit of detection. C. Soluble GP (sGP) levels were

determined in sera using capture ELISA. Significance was determined using Kruskall Wallis test

followed by Mann Whitney tests. E = Endpoint. GP = glycoprotein. SUDV=Sudan virus.

EBOV=Ebola virus.

Figure 4. Presence of SUDV viral RNA in tissues obtained from NHPs at necropsy. Viral

RNA load was determined in liver, spleen, adrenal gland (A), lung (B), multiple lymph nodes

(C), and aqueous humor collected from the eye as well as urine (D). Log10 transformed values

are shown, which were compared to a standard curve of known copies of viral SUDV RNA.

Significance was determined using Kruskall Wallis test followed by Mann Whitney tests. QLOD

= Qualitative limit of detection.

Figure 5. Histopathological effects of ChAdOx1-biEBOV vaccine in the cynomolgus macaque model of SUDV infection. Tissue sections were stained with hematoxylin and eosin (H&E- A,C,E,G,I,K,M,O,Q,S,U,W) or polyclonal rabbit serum against Ebola virus viral protein 40 for detection of viral antigen (purple) by immunohistochemistry (IHC-B,D,F,H,J,L,N,P,R,T,V,X). Liver pathology was similar in all groups consisting of mild-moderate acute inflammation with multifocal hepatocellular necrosis and abundant Kupffer cell and hepatocyte IHC immunoreactivity. Splenic pathology was similar in all groups consisting of minimal-moderate acute inflammation with moderate numbers of red pulp fibrin thrombi; IHC immunoreactivity was prevalent in numerous macrophages. Pulmonary pathology in the prime and prime boost vaccinated animals had minimal-mild neutrophilic interstitial infiltrates shown in the black box (M-P) at 20X magnification and enlarged in S-V at 200X magnification. Control animals did not show evidence of pathology in 5/6 animals with one showing minimal interstitial infiltrates. IHC immunoreactivity in all groups was scatted-numerous in macrophages and

endothelial cells. The following magnification was used; liver 200X, spleen 100X, lung 20X and

200X. Bar 200X=50 µm, 100X=100 µm and 20X=500 µm.

Supplementary Figure 1. Cytokines and chemokines in serum from cynomolgus macaques

challenged with SUDV. Serum was collected at exam and cytokine and chemokine

concentrations were measured using the Meso Quickplex.

Supplementary Figure 2. Cytokines and chemokines in tissues from cynomolgus macaques

challenged with SUDV. Tissues were collected at necropsy and cytokine and chemokine

concentrations were measured using the Meso Quickplex.