Title: A modular platform to display multiple hemagglutinin subtypes on a single immunogen

Authors: Dana Thornlow Lamson[1,2], Faez Amokrane Nait Mohamed[1], Mya Vu[1], Daniel P. Maurer[1,2], Larance Ronsard[1], Daniel Lingwood[1], Aaron G. Schmidt[1,2*]

Affiliations: [1]Ragon Institute of Mass General, MIT, and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, 02139, USA

[2]Department of Microbiology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA

Correspondence:
Aaron G. Schmidt
Tel: 857-268-7118
E-mail: aschmidt@crystal.harvard.edu

ABSTRACT

Next-generation influenza vaccines aim to elicit cross-reactive humoral responses to multiple influenza subtypes. Such increased breadth would not only improve seasonal vaccines but may afford 'universal' protection against influenza subtypes including those with pandemic potential. Here, we describe a "beads-on-a-string" (BOAS) immunogen, that tandemly links up to eight distinct hemagglutinin (HA) head domains from circulating and non-circulating influenzas. These BOAS are immunogenic in the murine model and elicit comparable serum responses to each individual component. Notably, we also find that BOAS elicit cross-reactive responses to influenza subtypes not included in the immunizing immunogen. Furthermore, BOAS conjugation to protein-based ferritin nanoparticles does not significantly augment serum responses suggesting that our BOAS platform is sufficient for eliciting cross-reactive responses without off-target effects induced by the nanoparticle scaffold. Finally, vaccination with a mixture of the same HA head domains is not sufficient to elicit the same neutralization profile as the BOAS immunogens or nanoparticles. This mix-and-match immunogen design strategy is a robust platform for eliciting responses to multiple influenza subtypes via a single immunogen, and a potential platform for other viral glycoproteins.

INTRODUCTION

Influenza viruses, despite continuous surveillance and annual vaccination, are a significant public health problem resulting in ~500,000 deaths per year[1]. This is largely a consequence of viral evolution and antigenic drift as it circulates seasonally within humans and ultimately impacts vaccine effectiveness. Additionally, the chance for spillover events from animal reservoirs (*e.g.,* avian, swine) is increasing as population and connectivity also increase. To combat this, global surveillance is necessary to inform re-formulation of influenza vaccines to match circulating strains. However, long lead times for vaccine preparation in eggs and mutations acquired during that process[2] can lead to vaccine mismatch and subsequent ineffectiveness. The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has additionally underscored the need for pandemic preparedness as humans increasingly come into contact with animal reservoirs. Indeed, several avian influenzas, such as H5N1, H7N9 and H9N2, are currently being monitored for their pandemic potential. Thus, there is an urgent need to develop so-called "universal" influenza vaccines that provide protection against both currently circulating (*e.g.,* H1N1s, H3N2s, and Bs) and potentially pandemic viruses.

Several approaches have been taken to improve upon current influenza vaccines, largely focused on the influenza surface glycoprotein, hemagglutinin (HA). A major goal of immunogen design efforts is to elicit antibodies toward conserved epitopes on HA, including the receptor binding site (RBS)[3–9], trimer interface[10–14], and stem[15–20]; antibodies targeting such epitopes are often broadly protective. Indeed, RBS-directed antibodies often are potently neutralizing, as they directly inhibit HA engagement with host cell sialic acid, while TI- and stem-directed antibodies generally protect via Fc-dependent mechanisms (*e.g.,* ADCC, ADCP). Several rational immunogen design approaches[21] such as epitope removal[22,23], domain chimeras[24], computational sequence optimization (COBRAs)[25–29], epitope resurfacing[30] and hyperglycosylation[14,31,32] attempt to focus to these epitopes.

An additional strategy to enrich for cross-reactive antibodies includes increasing antigen valency by displaying multiple antigens on a scaffold, such as a nanoparticle[33–35]. Such multivalency is thought to enhance immunogenicity and antigenicity by spacing antigens near one another in order to effectively cross-link B cell receptors (BCRs)[36]. Ferritin, which can display 24 antigens at its 8 three-fold axes, has been used for influenza, Epstein-Barr virus, coronavirus, and HIV

glycoproteins[37–43]. For influenza, following immunization with a mixture of homotypic full-length

seasonal H1, H3, and influenza B HA trimers displayed on ferritin nanoparticles, mice elicited

responses with enhanced potency and breadth relative to the trivalent inactivated influenza vaccine

(TIV) standard[38]. Based on this success, they then designed "mosaic" ferritin nanoparticles that

displayed up to eight antigenically distinct H1 subtype HA receptor binding domains (RBDs) on

a single particle, which outperformed admixtures of homotypic nanoparticles and elicited cross-

reactive H1 broadly neutralizing antibodies[41]. Further iterations of nanoparticle immunogens have

co-displayed multiple full-length HA antigens on virus-like particles (VLPs)[44] and *de novo*

designed particles[45], and the latter is currently in clinical trials[45,46,47].

An alternative approach for multivalent display involves tandemly linking antigens into a single

polypeptide. This method may alleviate manufacturing challenges related to preparing multiple

individual components for mosaic nanoparticles while still increasing size and valency of antigens.

For example, using domain III from the dengue envelope surface glycoprotein, a bivalent[46] or

quadrivalent[47] tandemly linked immunogen elicited neutralizing antibody responses to all four

dengue serotypes and provided protection upon challenge. An analogous approach tandemly

linked four different coronavirus RBDs into a single immunogen[48]. These "quartets" elicited

responses to each individual components similar to a "mosaic-4" nanoparticle that displayed

monomeric RBDs on the surface of a virus like particle (VLP) nanoparticle[49,50]; these approaches

were then combined and quartets displaying four or eight unique RBDs were multivalently

displayed on VLP nanoparticles. This combinatorial approach augmented both neutralization titers

and cross-reactive responses.

Here, we tandemly linked multiple HA subtypes into a single immunogen via short, flexible linkers

in a "plug and play" platform we call "beads-on-a-string" or BOAS. These recombinantly

produced, protein-based immunogens have between three and eight unique HA heads including

circulating and non-circulating A and B influenzas. Mice immunized with either 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, or

8mer BOAS elicited responses to matched and mismatched HA components and could neutralize

subsequent replication-restricted reporter (R3) viruses[51]. To further enhance valency, we generated

two 4mer BOAS that included 8 different HA heads, conjugated both to ferritin nanoparticles using

SpyTag-SpyCatcher[52,53], and showed that the serum responses elicited similar responses to the

8mer. Additionally, we showed that a mixture of the same HA head components was not sufficient

to recapitulate the neutralizing responses elicited by the BOAS or BOAS NP. Collectively, these

BOAS immunogens could serve as a means to elicit responses to multiple HA subtypes as a single

immunogen and represents a general approach for multivalent display of other viral antigens.

RESULTS

Design and characterization of beads-on-a-string (BOAS)

Monomeric hemagglutinin (HA) heads representing antigenically distinct subtypes were tandemly

linked together as a single linear construct, separated by a short, flexible glycine-serine-serine

(GSS) linker, which we termed beads-on-a-string (BOAS) immunogens. Eight unique HA

subtypes spanning group 1 and 2 influenza A viruses, as well as an influenza B virus, from

seasonal, circulating, and non-circulating influenzas were selected to understand the permissibility

of the platform to express different HAs (**Figure 1A**). We found that monomeric HA head domains

varied in expression levels depending on the boundaries selected: H1, H5, and H7 HA monomers

spanned residues 57-261 (H3 numbering), whereas H2, H3, H4, H9, and B HA monomers spanned

residues 37-316 (H3 numbering) (**Figure 1B**). We then asked whether we could tandemly link

multiple HA heads together as a single construct. Using linkers with either two, three, or four GSS

repeats, we tandemly linked representative H1, H3, and B HAs (**Supplemental Figure 1A**)

together for recombinant expression in mammalian cells. Each construct, regardless of linker

length expressed to similar levels (**Supplemental Figure 1B**) and each individual HA component

could be detected with a conformation specific and subtype specific monoclonal antibody (mAb)

(**Supplemental Figure 1C**). We next assessed whether the order of the HA heads adversely

affected expression or accessibility to the conformation-specific mAb. Using H5, H7, and H9 HA

heads we created two constructs 1) H5-H9-H7 and 2) H9-H5-H7 each with a four GSS linker.

Each construct had comparable levels of expression and reactivity to the respective mAbs

(**Supplemental Figure 2**).

Based on these initial data, we next designed six constructs with three to eight individual HA head

components from representative H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, H7, H9, and B influenzas; to maximize

spacing between each HA component we used the 4x GSS linker. Each BOAS was cloned into a
single polypeptide chain with a protease-cleavable C-terminal purification tag (**Figure 1C**). We
synthesized six different BOAS, and define each construct as 3mer, 4mer, etc., referencing the
number of HA components (**Figure 1D**). Each BOAS construct could be purified to homogeneity
as assayed by SDS-PAGE after immobilized metal affinity chromatography (**Figure 2A**) and
correspond to the expected molecular weight following proteolytic cleavage of native glycans with
PNGase-F (**Figure 2B**). After size-exclusion chromatography (SEC), the non-PNGase-treated
BOAS were monodispersed (**Figure 2C**). Following SEC, affinity tags were removed with HRV-
3C protease; cleaved tags, uncleaved BOAS, and His-tagged enzyme were removed using cobalt
affinity resin and snap frozen in liquid nitrogen before immunizations. BOAS maintained
monodispersity upon thawing, though over time, degradation was observed following longer term
(>1 week) storage at 4C (**Supplemental Figure 3**). This degradation became more significant as
BOAS increased in length (**Supplemental Figure 3**).
149
We then analyzed the BOAS using negative stain electron microscopy (NS-EM). Individual HAs
were readily discernable and equal to the number of components in the respective BOAS (**Figure
2D and 2E**); we observed that the 3mer could adopt both extended and collapsed, triangular-like
conformations (**Figure 2D**), whereas longer BOAS, such as the 8mer, adopted a rosette-like
conformation (**Figure 2E**). This is likely a consequence of the flexible GSS linker separating the
individual HA head components as well as the addition of significantly more HA head components
to the construct.
157
To assess conformational integrity and ensure that each HA present was properly folded, we
assembled a panel of conformation- and subtype-specific mAbs to assay each individual
component. This included mAb S5V2-29[12] a broadly-reactive TI-directed positive control
antibody and mAbs 5J8[4,6], 2G1[5], K03.12[54], P2-D9[55] (**Supplemental Figure 4**), H5.3[56], H7.167[57],
and H1209[58] which are specific to H1, H2, H3, H5, H5, H7 and B subtypes, respectively; an H9
conformation-specific mAb was not available. Each individual HA component was detected using
subtype-specific mAb in ELISA, and overall affinity for each component was comparable
regardless of BOAS length (**Figure 2F**). Collectively, these data support a plug-and-play platform
that can readily exchange HA components while retaining conformational integrity.

Immunogenicity of BOAS

To determine immunogenicity of each BOAS immunogen, we performed a prime-boost-boost vaccination regimen in C5BL/6 mice at two-week intervals with 20μg of immunogen and adjuvanted with Sigma Adjuvant (**Figure 3A**). We compared these BOAS to a control group immunized with a mixture of the eight HA heads present in the 8mer. We then tested serum reactivity to both BOAS immunogen as well as individual full-length HA trimers of each component. Serum titers against the immunogen were detectable after a single prime, and increased following a boost, and stayed relatively level until day 42 (**Figure 3B**). Serum responses varied for differing BOAS lengths, with the 4mer and 5mer BOAS being the most immunogenic (**Figure 3C**). Each of the BOAS, regardless of its length, elicited binding titers to all matched full-length HAs representing individual components (**Figure 3D**). For example, the 6mer, which contains heads of H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, and H7, elicited reactivity to full length matched HAs. Interestingly, some BOAS elicited cross-reactivity to mis-matched components not present in the immunogen. For example, the 3mer, which contained H1, H2, and H3 HA heads, elicited detectable titers to H4 and H5 HAs (**Figure 3D**). Additionally, all groups elicited binding titers to mismatched historical H3 and H1 HAs (Figure 3D). When comparing the 8mer and mix groups, the 8mer tended to elicit stronger binding titers to matched and mismatched components than an equal molar mixture of the same components (**Figure 3E**). Similar binding trends were also observed with d28 serum, though the difference between the 8mer and mix groups was more pronounced at d28 (**Supplemental Figure 5**).

Cross-reactivity of immune responses

To understand potential cross-reactivity observed in the serum analyses, across we used a Consurf-like[59,60] method to assess sequence conservation across the eight HA components in the BOAS. Each component of the BOAS was aligned structurally to the H2 head domain and scored at each position for their amino acid conservation at each position on a scale of 1 to 9. These were then pseudo-colored on the structure to visualize conserved and variable epitopes on the head domain surface (**Figure 4A**). We observed regions of both significant variability as well as conservation, notably the TI epitope, as well as the core sialic acid interacting residues in the receptor binding site (RBS), the latter which remained nearly 100% conserved in all BOAS (**Figure 4A**). This was

quantitated by taking the average amino acid (AA) conservation score across both the RBS and TI
epitopes as well as the entire sequence, and we see that these epitopes retain higher conservation
relative to the overall sequence as BOAS length increases. We then determined approximate
degrees of focusing to the TI and RBS via a serum competition ELISA using mAbs. All the BOAS
maintained, approximately, between 15-35% focusing to the TI epitope, whereas focusing the RBS
was more variable (**Figure 4C**). Both RBS focusing (**Figure 4D**) and TI focusing (**Figure 4E**)
trended similarly with homology scores for each epitope, indicating epitope conservation may be
influencing immune focusing to particular epitopes.

Design of BOAS-conjugated nanoparticles
To further increase avidity affects as well as potential immunogenicity, we split our 8mer BOAS
into two 4mer BOAS and attached both in an equal molar ratio to *H. pylori* ferritin nanoparticles
(NPs) using SpyTag-SpyCatcher[52], herein referred to as BOAS-NPs (**Figure 5A**). The two 4mer
BOAS efficiently conjugated to nanoparticles as determined by SEC and SDS-PAGE
(**Supplemental Figure 6**), Further biophysical characterization using dynamic light scattering
(DLS) showed a shift of from 9.8 ± 1.1 nm to 21.3 ± 2.0 nm and NS-EM showed spherical particles
with projections. (**Figure 5D and 5E**). We verified the presence and structural integrity of each
BOAS component on the nanoparticles using an ELISA with the same panel of conformation and
subtype-specific mAbs, (**Figure 5E**).

Immunogenicity of BOAS-conjugated nanoparticles
We next immunized mice with BOAS-NP and a SpyCatcher NP control to assess immunogenicity.
Mice were immunized with an equal amount of NP relative to the BOAS (20µg), in an equivalent
homologous prime-boost-boost regimen (**Figure 6A**). The BOAS-NP was significantly more
immunogenic than the SpyCatcher NP control, eliciting titers approximately an order of magnitude
greater by d42 (**Figure 6B**). The BOAS NP, however, elicited significantly reduced titers to the
SpyCatcher NP scaffold relative to the control (**Figure 6C**). When each group was evaluated for
titers against both the BOAS components, the SpyCatcher nanoparticle scaffold, or BOAS-NP
(**Figure 6D,E**), the BOAS-NP elicited equivalent titers to each set of BOAS, and greater titers to
the decorated nanoparticle relative to the ferritin scaffold (**Figure 6E**). When we examined titers
to individual HA components, we observed detectable titers over baseline to all eight HAs present

on the BOAS-NPs (**Figure 6F**). When compared to the immunogenicity of the 3mer to 8mer

BOAS immunogens, the BOAS-NP showed comparable titers to each component relative to

BOAS that contained a given component (**Figure 6G**).

Neutralization of influenza viruses by BOAS-elicited sera

We next determined serum neutralization titers to matched and mis-matched influenza viruses

based on the BOAS components (**Figure 7**). We tested serum from mice immunized with all

BOAS against H1/Michigan/2015 H1N1 and H3/Kansas/2017 H3N2 viruses, whose HA was

present in all the BOAS. These showed varying neutralization titers to both viruses, with all

matched BOAS neutralizing virus except for the 7mer and H1N1 virus. Additionally, we tested

serum against H5/Vietnam/2004 H5N1 and H7/Shanghai/2013 H7N9 viruses. Neutralization of

H5N1 virus was variable, though individual mice from 4mer, 5mer, 6mer, 7mer, 8mer, and BOAS

NP groups were able to strongly neutralize this virus. Weak neutralization titers were detected for

6mer, 7mer, and 8mer BOAS. This neutralization was only slightly above the high background

neutralization of the negative control NP serum. Serum from the BOAS-conjugated nanoparticle

group elicited similar neutralization titers relative to the BOAS alone. In most cases, neutralization

titers elicited from the BOAS and BOAS NP cohorts were greater than that from the mix cohort.

The scaffold control serum did not neutralize any viruses tested.

DISCUSSION

Here we engineered "beads-on-a-string" (BOAS) that included tandemly linked, antigenically

distinct HA heads as a single construct. This platform allows a mixing-and-matching of up to eight

distinct HA heads from both influenza A and B viruses. Furthermore, we showed that the order

and number of HA heads can vary without losing reactivity to conformation-specific mAbs *in*

vitro, highlighting the flexibility of this platform. Mice immunized with BOAS had comparable

serum reactivity to each individual component; though relative binding and neutralization titers

varied between immunogens; this is likely a consequence of length and/or composition. Further

oligomerization for increased multivalent display was accomplished by conjugating two 4mer

BOAS inclusive of eight distinct HA heads to a ferritin nanoparticle via SpyTag/SpyCatcher

ligation. Similar to the BOAS, these conjugated nanoparticles elicited similar titers to all eight HA

components and could neutralize matched viruses.

Thus, tandemly linking HA heads is a robust method for displaying multiple influenza subtypes in

a single protein-based immunogen. Binding titers were elicited to all components present in the

immunogen, and there was no significant correlation between HA position within the BOAS (*i.e.,*

terminal or internal) and immunogenicity. However, relative immunogenicities of each HA varied

despite the guaranteed equimolar display of each subtype. There were qualitatively

immunodominant HAs, notably H4 and H9, and these were relatively consistent across BOAS in

which they were a component. This effect was reduced in the mix cohort. Further studies using the

modularity of the BOAS could further deconvolute relative immunodominances of HA subtypes.

Despite similar binding titers across multiple BOAS lengths, expression levels and neutralization

titers were quite variable. While all 3mer to 8mer BOAS could be overexpressed, expression

inversely correlated with overall length. To mitigate this, multiple BOAS (*e.g.,* two 4mers) or

conjugation to protein-based nanoparticles, as was done here, could be used to ensure coverage of

each desired HA subtype. Furthermore, neutralization titers were quite variable across different

BOAS lengths despite similar binding titers. This may be related to multiple factors including

homology, stability, and accessibility of neutralizing epitopes for different BOAS lengths.

Notably, for longer BOAS we observed degradation following longer term storage at 4C, which

may reflect their overall stability. Studies manipulating BOAS composition at intermediate lengths

could optimize neutralizing responses to particular influenzas of interest.

Based on the immunogenicity of the various BOAS and their ability to elicit neutralizing

responses, it may not be necessary to maximize the number of HA heads into a single immunogen.

Indeed, it qualitatively appears that the intermediate 4-, 5-, and 6mer BOAS were the most

immunogenic and this length may be sufficient to effectively engage and crosslink BCR for potent

stimulation. These BOAS also had similar or improved binding cross-reactivity to mis-matched

HAs as compared to longer 7- or 8mer BOAS. Notably, the 3mer BOAS elicited detectable cross-

reactive binding titers to H4 and H5 mismatched HAs in all mice. This observed cross-reactivity

could be due to sequence conservation between the HAs, as H3 and H4 share ~51% sequence

identity, and H1 and H2 share ~46% and ~62% overall sequence identity with H5, respectively

(**Supplemental Figure 7**). Additionally, the degree of surface conservation decreased

considerably beyond the 5mer as more antigenically distinct HAs were added to the BOAS. These

data suggest that both antigenic distance between HA components and BOAS length play a key

role in eliciting cross-reactive antibody responses, and further studies are necessary to optimize

BOAS valency and antigenic distance for a desired response.

Potential enrichment of antibodies targeting the conserved RBS and TI epitopes may also be

contributing to observed cross-reactivity. Both epitopes are relatively conserved across all BOAS

lengths (**Figure 4C**), and the two BOAS showing the most cross-reactivity, the 3mer and 5mer,

elicit a significant portion of the serum response toward both RBS and TI epitopes as determined

via a serum competition assay with available epitope-directed antibodies (**Figure 4B**). Notably,

this proportion is approximate, as at the time of reporting, antibodies that bind the receptor binding

site of all components were not available. RBS-directed antibodies to the H4 and H9 component

were not available, and the RBS-directed antibodies used targeting the other HA components have

different footprints around the periphery of the RBS. Additionally, there are currently no reported

influenza B TI-directed antibodies in the literature. Therefore, this may be an underestimate of the

serum proportion focused to the conserved RBS and TI epitopes. Isolated TI-directed antibodies,

in particular, can engage more than nine unique subtypes across both group 1 and 2 influenzas[10,12],

and our monomeric head-based BOAS immunogens, have the otherwise occluded TI epitope

exposed[10–12]. Furthermore, we have previously shown that this TI epitope, when exposed, is

immunodominant in the murine model[14]. Further studies with different combinations of HAs could

aid in understanding how length and composition influences epitope focusing. For example, a

BOAS design with a cluster of group 1 HAs followed by a cluster of group 2 HAs, rather than our

roughly alternating pattern could impact which HAs are in close proximity to one other or could

be potentially shielded in certain conformations, and thus could affect antigenic results. Combining

the BOAS platform with other immune-focusing approaches[32] such as hyperglycosylation[14,31,61,62]

or resurfacing[30,63] could enhance cross-reactive responses. Additionally, modifying linker spacing

and rigidity can also be used as a mechanism to enhance BCR cross-linking and thus enhance

cross-reactive B cell activation and elicitation[64].

BOAS can be further multimerized via conjugation to a surface of a nanoparticle. Interestingly,

this only had a marginal effect on immunogenicity. The BOAS conjugated-nanoparticle elicited

titers of ~10^5 (**Figure 6B**), whereas the best BOAS alone reached an order of magnitude greater

(**Fig 3C**). This appears in contrast with other studies where attaching an antigen to a nanoparticle

scaffold enhanced immunogenicity and neutralization potency[38,65–68]. One recent example

designed quartets of antigenically distinct SARS-like betacoronavirus RBDs coupled to an mi3-

VLP scaffold via a similar SpyCatchter/SpyTag system and showed increased binding and

neutralization titers following conjugation to the NP compared to quartet alone[48]. This discrepancy

may be in part due to the larger mi3 nanoparticle[69] which displays 60 copies of the antigen rather

than the 24 copies displayed on the ferritin nanoparticle used in this study. Nevertheless, HA-

specific responses were similar whether the BOAS were conjugated to the nanoparticle or not,

indicating that HA proximity to the NP surface did not impact responses to each component. This

observation is consistent with betacoronavirus quartet nanoparticles as well. Additionally, BOAS

conjugation to the nanoparticle significantly reduced the scaffold-directed response to near

baseline. The addition of the large BOAS projections to the surface of the nanoparticle likely

masked the immunogenic scaffold epitopes[70].

Collectively, this study demonstrates the versatility of the BOAS platform to present multiple HA

subtypes as a single immunogen. This "plug-and-play" approach can readily exchange HAs to

elicit desired immune responses. BOAS are potentially advantageous over other multivalent

display platforms such as protein-based nanoparticles, which can produce off-target responses due

to their inherent immunogenicity[38]. Furthermore, when genetic fusions of the antigen to

nanoparticles is not possible, SpyCatcher/SpyTag (or another suitable conjugation approach) must

be used, further contributing to scaffold-specific responses as well as additional multi-step

manufacturing and purification challenges. Not only does our BOAS platform circumvent these

potential caveats, but because this is a single polypeptide chain, this immunogen could readily be

formulated as an mRNA lipid nanoparticle (LNP)[71]. The BOAS platform forms the basis for next-

generation influenza vaccines and can more broadly be readily adapted to other viral antigens.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Beads-on-a-string (BOAS) immunogen and full-length hemagglutinin (HA) expression and purification

Hemagglutinin (HA) head for BOAS immunogens were designed based on the following sequences from the following subtypes: H1 (H1/A/Michigan/45/2015) (GenBank: AMA11475.1) , H2 (H2/A/Japan/305/1957) (GenBank: AAA43185), H3 (H3/A/Kansas/14/2017) (GenBank: AVG71503), H4 (H4/A/American Black Duck/New Brunswick/00464/2010) (GenBank: AGG81749), H5 (H5/A/Viet Nam/1203/2004) (GenBank: ADD97095), H7 (H7/A/Shanghai/01/2014) (GenBank: AHK10800), H9 (H9/A/Guangdong/MZ058/2016) (GenBank: AOR17625.1), and B (B/Malaysia/2506/2004) (GenBank: ABU99194). Head subdomains from these HAs were used in the BOAS immunogens, and full-length soluble ectodomain (FLsE) trimers were used in ELISAs. Additional H1 (H1/A/Solomon Islands/3/2006) and H3 (H3/A/Hong Kong/1/1968) FLsEs were used in ELISAs as mismatched, antigenically distinct HAs for all BOAS. Sequences were codon optimized using IDT and subcloned into pVRC vectors for expression in mammalian cells. For BOAS immunogens, all HA heads were separated by a "GA(GSS)$_4$AS" spacer. Specific head domain regions for each subtype were selected based on expression levels in expi293F cells. All protein sequences contained a C-terminal 8x-His tag for purification with an upstream 3C-protease cleavage site. Full-length HA trimers contained an additional C-terminal foldon (Fd) trimerization domain for expression as soluble trimers. BOAS immunogens and HA trimers were transfected in expi293F cells using Expifectamine transfection reagent and enhancers based on manufacturer's instructions. Five days post-transfection, supernatant was harvested and clarified via centrifugation, then purified on a TALON cobalt resin via the 8x-His Tag. Recovered proteins were then purified on a Superdex 200 (S200) Increase 10/300 GL (for trimeric HAs) or Superose 6 Increase 10/300 GL (for BOAS) size-exclusion column in Dulbecco's Phosphate Buffered Saline (DPBS) within 48 hours of cobalt resin elution. Pooled fractions of BOAS were then treated with HRV-3C protease to remove tags for 16 hours at 4°C, then passed over a TALON cobalt resin to remove any remaining protease, cleaved tags, and uncleaved protein. Trimeric HAs were used for ELISAs with purification tags present.

IgG expression and purification

All antibody variable regions were codon optimized for mammalian cell expression and subcloned

into pVRC vectors containing either heavy or light (kappa or lambda) with humanized constant

regions. Equimolar heavy and light chain plasmids were co-transfected into HEK293F cells using

polyethylenimine (PEI). Five days following transfection, supernatants were harvested, clarified

via centrifugation, and purified on a Protein G resin. Purified antibodies were then buffer

exchanged into DPBS for use in ELISA assays.

Nanoparticle Assembly

C-terminally SpyTagged BOAS and N-terminal SpyCatcher nanoparticles were subcloned into

pVRC expression vectors, then expressed in expi293F cells and purified via TALON cobalt resin

as above. SpyTagged BOAS were further purified via size-exclusion chromatography on a

Superose 6 column, as above, followed by cleavage of the C-terminal His tag via 3C HRV protease

to yield a C-terminal SpyTag. SpyCatcher nanoparticles were purified on a HiPrep Sephacryl S400

column in DPBS. Purified SpyCatcher nanoparticles was when mixed with an equimolar ratio

mixture of each 4mer BOAS (H1, H2, H3, H4 and H5, H7, H9,B) at a 1.2 molar excess relative to

the nanoparticle overnight at 4°C. The mixture was then re-purified over an S400 column,

concentrated, aliquoted, and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen until use.

Negative Staining procedure for TEM

5μl of the sample was adsorbed for 1 minute onto a carbon-coated grid made hydrophilic by a 20

second exposure to a glow discharge (25mA). Excess liquid was removed with filter paper

(Whatman #1), the grid was then floated briefly on a drop of water (to wash away phosphate or

salt), blotted again on a filer paper and then stained with 0.75% uranyl formate or 1% uranyl acetate

for 20-30 seconds. After removing the excess stain with a filter paper the grids were examined in

a JEOL 1200EX Transmission electron microscope or a TecnaiG² Spirit BioTWIN and images

were recorded with an AMT 2k CCD camera.

Immunizations

C57BL/6 mice (Jackson Laboratory) (n=8 per group for 3-, 4-, 5-, 6-, 7-, and 8mer cohorts; n=5

for BOAS NP, NP, and mix cohorts) were immunized with 20μg of BOAS immunogens of varying

length and adjuvanted with 50% Sigmas Adjuvant for a total of 100μL of inoculum. Immunogens

and adjuvant were administered intramuscularly (IM) at day 0, day 14, and day 28. Serum samples

were collected at days 0, 14, 28, and 42 (prior to immunogen administration). All experiments

were conducted in 6-10 week old female mice under the institutional IACUC protocol

(2014N000252).

Serum ELISAs

High-binding 96-well plates (Corning) were coated with 200ng per well of BOAS immunogen,

nanoparticle, or trimeric HAs overnight at 4°C in DPBS. The following day, plates were blocked

with 1% BSA in PBS-T (DPBS+0.1% Tween-20) for 1 hour at RT, rocking. Diluted serum in

DPBS were generated starting at a 1:50 dilution, followed by 10-fold serial dilutions for a total of

7 dilutions. After one hour, blocking buffer was discarded, and 40µL of diluted serum was added

and incubated for 1 hour at RT, rocking. Serum was then discarded, and plates were washed 3

times with PBS-T, after which 100µL of HRP-conjugated anti-mouse secondary antibody (Abcam)

at a 1:20,000 dilution was added and incubated for 1 hour at RT rocking. Following secondary

antibody incubation, plates were again washed 3 times with PBS-T. Slow TMB development

solution was then added to plates and incubated for 30-40 mins at RT, then stopped with an equal

volume of 0.2M sulfuric acid stop solution. Developed plates were then analyzed via absorbance

measurements at 450nm. Each condition was blank subtracted with a secondary only control and

plotted in GraphPad Prism 10 (v10.0.2). Serum endpoint titer (EPT) were determined using a non-

linear regression (sigmoidal, four-parameter logistic (4PL) equation, where x is concentration) to

determine the dilution at which dilution the blank-subtracted 450nm absorbance value intersect a

0.1 threshold. Serum titers for individual mice against respective antigens are reported as log

transformed values of the EPT dilution.

Serum Competition ELISAs

Serum competition ELISAs were performed following a similar protocol to serum ELISAs

described above. Following blocking with BSA in PBS-T, blocking solution was discarded and

40µL of either DPBS (no competition control), a cocktail of humanized antibodies targeting the

RBS and periphery (5J8, 2G1, K03.12, H5.3, H7.167, H1209), a cocktail of humanized TI-directed

antibodies (S5V2-29, D1 H1-17/H3-14, D2 H1-1/H3-1), or a negative control antibody

(MEDI8852) were added at a concentration of 100µg/mL per antibody. Plates were incubated with

competing antibodies or controls for 1 hour at RT. Serum from mice from respective BOAS

cohorts were diluted by 1:5,000 (3mer and 6mer) or 1:10,000 (4mer, 5mer, 7mer, and 8mer) in

DPBS, then 40μL added on top of competing antibody for a final dilution of 1:10,000 (3mer and

6mer) or 1:20,000 (4mer, 5mer, 7mer, and 8mer). These dilutions were selected based on a dilution

range in serum ELISAs in which serum reactivity behaved linearly. Plates were incubated with

serum and competing antibodies for an additional 1 hour at RT, washed 3 times with PBS-T, then

incubated with an HRP-conjugated human/bovine/horse cross-adsorbed anti-mouse secondary

antibody (Southern Biotech) at a 1:20,000 dilution for 1 hour at RT. The remaining wash and

development steps were performed as in the serum ELISA.

Microneutralization Assays

Serum microneutralization assays using R3 viruses followed the published protocol in Creanga et

al[51]. Briefly, MDCK-SIAT1-PB1/H5/H7 cells were thawed into D10 media with penicillin and

streptomycin (P/S) and 10% heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS) three days prior to

infection. Cells were seeded two days later at 1.5×10^4 cells/well in flu media (Opti-MEM + 0.01%

FBS + P/S + 0.3% Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) + Ca/Mg) overnight at 37°C. Serum was also

treated with receptor destroying enzyme (RDE) II at a 1:3 dilution overnight at 37°C, followed by

inactivation at 56°C for 30-60 mins. Treated serum was then diluted in media at 1:3 for a final

starting dilution of 1:32. On the day of infection, cells were treated with 60μL of virus in flu media

+ TPCK-trypsin for 1 hour at 37°C with 5% CO_2. After one hour, media was removed via

aspiration and cells were treated with 100μL treated serum. The following day, fluorescent foci

were counted on a Zeiss Celldiscoverer 7 + LSM900 + Airyscan 2 (CD7+LSM900) to determine

neutralization. Counts were normalized to a cell control and untreated virus control, and IC50

values for neutralization were determined via a fit to a 4PL non-linear regression in technical

duplicate in Prism v10.0.2 (GraphPad).

Homology Analyses

Homology analyses on HA BOAS was conducted using a manual method analogous to

Consurf[59,60]. HA head domain structures (or closely related variants) were aligned in Pymol to the

H2 JP-57 structure (PDB: 2WRE). Structures used for alignments were as follows: H1 (PDB:

6XGC), H3 (PDB: 4O5N), H4 (PDB: 5XL3), H5 (PDB: 6CFG), H7 (PDB: 6FYU), H9 (PDB:

1JSI), B (PDB: 4FQJ). Any mis-matches in specific amino acids were adjusted using the

mutagenesis wizard in Pymol. Following structural alignment, each position on the HA head

domain was scored for % aa identity at each position on a scale of 1-9, where 1 = 10-19% identical,

2 = 20-29% identical … to 9 = 90-100% identical, which we refer to as a "conservation score".

This was repeated for each composition of BOAS (i.e. 3mer, 4mer, 5mer, … 8mer). Each position

on the H2 structure was then pseudo colored based on the conservation score. Average amino acid

conservation scores were defined as the average of conservation score over the whole sequence

(overall), or of amino acids within a given epitope. TI epitope amino acids were defined as residues

60, 86-106, and 212-232 (H1 numbering), and RBS epitope amino acids were defined as residues

94-96, 128-146, 153-161, 182-194, and 222-229 (H1 numbering).

Statistical Analysis

Significance for ELISAs and microneutralization assays were determined using Prism (GraphPad

Prism v10.2.3). ELISAs comparing serum reactivity and microneutralization and comparing >2

samples were analyzed using a Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's post-hoc test to correct for

multiple comparisons. Multiple comparisons were made between each possible combination or

relative to a control group, where indicated. ELISAs comparing two samples were analyzed using

a Mann-Whitney test. Significance was assigned with the following: * = $p<0.05$, ** = $p<0.01$,

*** = $p<0.001$, and **** = $p<0.0001$. Where conditions are compared and no significance is

reported, the difference was non-significant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the mouse facility at the Ragon Institute for mouse maintenance. We also thank Nicholas

Lamson for helping with DLS measurements for nanoparticle characterization. We would like to

also thank Maria Ericcson for acquiring NS-EM images. We acknowledge support from R01

AI146779 and P01 AI089618 (AGS) and R01AI137057, R01AI153098, and R01AI155447 (DL).

This research has been funded in whole or part with federal funds under a contract from the

National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, NIH contract 75N93019C00050 (AGS).

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Author Contributions:

DTL and AGS designed research; DTL, FAMN, MLV, DPM, and LR performed research; DTL

and AGS analyzed data; DTL and AGS wrote the paper. All authors edited and commented on the

paper.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to: Aaron G. Schmidt

(aschmidt@crystal.harvard.edu)

Competing financial interest: DTL and AGS have filed a provisional patent covering the work

described here.

REFERENCES

1. Wei, C.-J. *et al.* Next-generation influenza vaccines: opportunities and challenges. *Nat Rev*
Drug Discov **19**, 239–252 (2020).

2. Raymond, D. D. *et al.* Influenza immunization elicits antibodies specific for an egg-adapted
vaccine strain. *Nature Medicine* **22**, 1465–1469 (2016).

3. Ekiert, D. C. *et al.* Cross-neutralization of influenza A viruses mediated by a single antibody
loop. *Nature* **489**, 526–532 (2012).

4. Hong, M. *et al.* Antibody recognition of the pandemic H1N1 Influenza virus hemagglutinin
receptor binding site. *Journal of Virology* **87**, 12471–12480 (2013).

5. Krause, J. C. *et al.* Human Monoclonal Antibodies to Pandemic 1957 H2N2 and Pandemic
1968 H3N2 Influenza Viruses. *J. Virol.* **86**, 6334–6340 (2012).

6. Krause, J. C. *et al.* A broadly neutralizing human monoclonal antibody that recognizes a
conserved, novel epitope on the globular head of the influenza H1N1 virus hemagglutinin.
Journal of Virology **85**, 10905–10908 (2011).

7. Lee, P. S. *et al.* Receptor mimicry by antibody F045-092 facilitates universal binding to the
H3 subtype of influenza virus. *Nature Communications* **5**, 3614–9 (2014).

8. Lee, P. S. *et al.* Heterosubtypic antibody recognition of the influenza virus hemagglutinin
receptor binding site enhanced by avidity. *Proc National Acad Sci* **109**, 17040–17045 (2012).

9. Schmidt, A. G. *et al.* Preconfiguration of the antigen-binding site during affinity maturation of
a broadly neutralizing influenza virus antibody. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
Sciences of the United States of America **110**, 264–269 (2013).

10. McCarthy, K. R. *et al.* A Prevalent Focused Human Antibody Response to the Influenza
Virus Hemagglutinin Head Interface. *Mbio* **12**, e01144-21 (2021).

11. Bangaru, S. *et al.* A Site of Vulnerability on the Influenza Virus Hemagglutinin Head
Domain Trimer Interface. *Cell* **177**, 1136-1152.e18 (2019).

12. Watanabe, A. *et al.* Antibodies to a Conserved Influenza Head Interface Epitope Protect by
an IgG Subtype-Dependent Mechanism. *Cell* **177**, 1124-1135.e16 (2019).

13. Dong, J. *et al.* Anti–influenza H7 human antibody targets antigenic site in hemagglutinin
head domain interface. *J Clin Invest* **130**, 4734–4739 (2020).

14. Bajic, G. *et al.* Influenza Antigen Engineering Focuses Immune Responses to a Subdominant
but Broadly Protective Viral Epitope. *Cell Host Microbe* **25**, 827-835.e6 (2019).

15. Corti, D. *et al.* A Neutralizing Antibody Selected from Plasma Cells that Binds to Group 1
and Group 2 Influenza A Hemagglutinins. *Science* **333**, 850–856 (2011).

16. Dreyfus, C., Ekiert, D. C. & Wilson, I. A. Structure of a classical broadly neutralizing stem
antibody in complex with a pandemic H2 influenza virus hemagglutinin. *Journal of Virology* **87**,
7149–7154 (2013).

17. Dreyfus, C. *et al.* Highly conserved protective epitopes on influenza B viruses. *Science* **337**,
1343–1348 (2012).

18. Ekiert, D. C. *et al.* Antibody Recognition of a Highly Conserved Influenza Virus Epitope.
Science **324**, 246–251 (2009).

19. Friesen, R. H. E. *et al.* A common solution to group 2 influenza virus neutralization. *Proc.*
Natl. Acad. Sci. **111**, 445–450 (2014).

20. Kallewaard, N. L. *et al.* Structure and Function Analysis of an Antibody Recognizing All
Influenza A Subtypes. *Cell* **166**, 596–608 (2016).

21. Caradonna, T. M. & Schmidt, A. G. Protein engineering strategies for rational immunogen
design. *Npj Vaccines* **6**, 154 (2021).

22. Impagliazzo, A. *et al.* A stable trimeric influenza hemagglutinin stem as a broadly protective
immunogen. *Science* **349**, 1301–1306 (2015).

23. Yassine, H. M. *et al.* Hemagglutinin-stem nanoparticles generate heterosubtypic influenza
protection. *Nature Medicine* **21**, 1065–1070 (2015).

24. Nachbagauer, R. *et al.* A chimeric hemagglutinin-based universal influenza virus vaccine
approach induces broad and long-lasting immunity in a randomized, placebo-controlled phase I
trial. *Nature Medicine* 1–20 (2020) doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1118-7.

25. Giles, B. M. & Ross, T. M. A computationally optimized broadly reactive antigen (COBRA)
based H5N1 VLP vaccine elicits broadly reactive antibodies in mice and ferrets. *Vaccine* **29**,
3043–3054 (2011).

26. Skarlupka, A. L., Reneer, Z. B., Abreu, R. B., Ross, T. M. & Sautto, G. A. An Influenza
Virus Hemagglutinin Computationally Optimized Broadly Reactive Antigen Elicits Antibodies
Endowed with Group 1 Heterosubtypic Breadth against Swine Influenza Viruses. *J. Virol.* **94**,
(2020).

27. Reneer, Z. B., Jamieson, P. J., Skarlupka, A. L., Huang, Y. & Ross, T. M. Computationally
Optimized Broadly Reactive H2 HA Influenza Vaccines Elicited Broadly Cross-Reactive
Antibodies and Protected Mice from Viral Challenges. *J. Virol.* **95**, (2020).

28. Wong, T. M. *et al.* Computationally Optimized Broadly Reactive Hemagglutinin Elicits
Hemagglutination Inhibition Antibodies against a Panel of H3N2 Influenza Virus Cocirculating
Variants. *J. Virol.* **91**, (2017).

29. Carter, D. M. *et al.* Design and Characterization of a Computationally Optimized Broadly
Reactive Hemagglutinin Vaccine for H1N1 Influenza Viruses. *J. Virol.* **90**, 4720–4734 (2016).

30. Bajic, G. *et al.* Structure-Guided Molecular Grafting of a Complex Broadly Neutralizing
Viral Epitope. *Acs Infect Dis* **6**, 1182–1191 (2020).

31. Thornlow, D. N. *et al.* Altering the Immunogenicity of Hemagglutinin Immunogens by
Hyperglycosylation and Disulfide Stabilization. *Front Immunol* **12**, 737973 (2021).

32. Dosey, A. *et al.* Combinatorial immune refocusing within the influenza hemagglutinin head
elicits cross-neutralizing antibody responses. *bioRxiv* 2023.05.23.541996 (2023)
doi:10.1101/2023.05.23.541996.

33. Bachmann, M. F. & Jennings, G. T. Vaccine delivery: a matter of size, geometry, kinetics
and molecular patterns. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* **10**, 787–796 (2010).

34. Nguyen, B. & Tolia, N. H. Protein-based antigen presentation platforms for nanoparticle
vaccines. *npj Vaccines* **6**, 70 (2021).

35. Curley, S. M. & Putnam, D. Biological Nanoparticles in Vaccine Development. *Front.*
Bioeng. Biotechnol. **10**, 867119 (2022).

36. Bachmann, M. F. & Jennings, G. T. Vaccine delivery: a matter of size, geometry, kinetics
and molecular patterns. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* **10**, 787–796 (2010).

37. Joyce, M. G. *et al.* A SARS-CoV-2 ferritin nanoparticle vaccine elicits protective immune
responses in nonhuman primates. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **14**, eabi5735 (2021).

38. Kanekiyo, M. *et al.* Self-assembling influenza nanoparticle vaccines elicit broadly
neutralizing H1N1 antibodies. *Nature* **498**, 102–106 (2013).

39. Georgiev, I. S. *et al.* Two-Component Ferritin Nanoparticles for Multimerization of Diverse
Trimeric Antigens. *ACS Infectious Diseases* **4**, 788–796 (2018).

40. He, L. *et al.* Presenting native-like trimeric HIV-1 antigens with self-assembling
nanoparticles. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 12041 (2016).

41. Kanekiyo, M. *et al.* Mosaic nanoparticle display of diverse influenza virus hemagglutinins
elicits broad B cell responses. *Nature Immunology* 1–18 (2019) doi:10.1038/s41590-018-0305-x.

42. McLeod, B. *et al.* Vaccination with a structure-based stabilized version of malarial antigen
Pfs48/45 elicits ultra-potent transmission-blocking antibody responses. *Immunity* (2022)
doi:10.1016/j.immuni.2022.07.015.

43. Kanekiyo, M. *et al.* Rational Design of an Epstein-Barr Virus Vaccine Targeting the
Receptor-Binding Site. *Cell* **162**, 1090–1100 (2015).

44. Cohen, A. A. *et al.* Construction, characterization, and immunization of nanoparticles that
display a diverse array of influenza HA trimers. *Plos One* **16**, e0247963 (2021).

45. Boyoglu-Barnum, S. *et al.* Quadrivalent influenza nanoparticle vaccines induce broad
protection. *Nature* 1–6 (2021) doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03365-x.

46. Zhao, H. *et al.* Induction of Neutralizing Antibodies against Four Serotypes of Dengue
Viruses by MixBiEDIII, a Tetravalent Dengue Vaccine. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e86573 (2014).

47. Etemad, B. *et al.* An envelope domain III-based chimeric antigen produced in Pichia pastoris
elicits neutralizing antibodies against all four dengue virus serotypes. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **79**,
353–63 (2008).

48. Hills, R. A. *et al.* Proactive vaccination using multiviral Quartet Nanocages to elicit broad
anti-coronavirus responses. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* 1–8 (2024) doi:10.1038/s41565-024-01655-9.

49. Cohen, A. A. *et al.* Mosaic nanoparticles elicit cross-reactive immune responses to zoonotic
coronaviruses in mice. *Sci New York N Y* **371**, 735–741 (2021).

50. Cohen, A. A. *et al.* Mosaic RBD nanoparticles protect against challenge by diverse
sarbecoviruses in animal models. *Science* (2022) doi:10.1126/science.abq0839.

51. Creanga, A. *et al.* A comprehensive influenza reporter virus panel for high-throughput deep
profiling of neutralizing antibodies. *Nat Commun* **12**, 1722 (2021).

52. Zakeri, B. *et al.* Peptide tag forming a rapid covalent bond to a protein, through engineering a
bacterial adhesin. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **109**, E690–E697 (2012).

53. Sutherland, A. R., Alam, Md. K. & Geyer, C. R. Post-translational Assembly of Protein Parts
into Complex Devices by Using SpyTag/SpyCatcher Protein Ligase. *ChemBioChem* **20**, 319–328
(2019).

54. McCarthy, K. R. *et al.* Memory B Cells that Cross-React with Group 1 and Group 2
Influenza A Viruses Are Abundant in Adult Human Repertoires. *Immunity* **48**, 174-183.e9
(2018).

55. Caradonna, T. M. *et al.* An epitope-enriched immunogen expands responses to a conserved
viral site. *Cell Rep.* **41**, 111628 (2022).

56. Winarski, K. L. *et al.* Vaccine-elicited antibody that neutralizes H5N1 influenza and variants
binds the receptor site and polymorphic sites. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
of the United States of America **112**, 9346–9351 (2015).

57. Thornburg, N. J. *et al.* H7N9 influenza virus neutralizing antibodies that possess few somatic
mutations. *J Clin Invest* **126**, 1482–1494 (2016).

58. Bajic, G. & Harrison, S. C. Antibodies That Engage the Hemagglutinin Receptor-Binding
Site of Influenza B Viruses. *Acs Infect Dis* **7**, 1–5 (2020).

59. Glaser, F. *et al.* ConSurf: Identification of Functional Regions in Proteins by Surface-
Mapping of Phylogenetic Information. *Bioinformatics* **19**, 163–164 (2003).

60. Ashkenazy, H. *et al.* ConSurf 2016: an improved methodology to estimate and visualize
evolutionary conservation in macromolecules. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, W344–W350 (2016).

61. Ingale, J. *et al.* Hyperglycosylated Stable Core Immunogens Designed To Present the CD4
Binding Site Are Preferentially Recognized by Broadly Neutralizing Antibodies. *J Virol* **88**,
14002–14016 (2014).

62. Eggink, D., Goff, P. H. & Palese, P. Guiding the Immune Response against Influenza Virus
Hemagglutinin toward the Conserved Stalk Domain by Hyperglycosylation of the Globular Head
Domain. *J Virol* **88**, 699–704 (2014).

63. Hai, R. *et al.* Influenza viruses expressing chimeric hemagglutinins: globular head and stalk
domains derived from different subtypes. *Journal of Virology* **86**, 5774–5781 (2012).

64. Veneziano, R. *et al.* Role of nanoscale antigen organization on B-cell activation probed using
DNA origami. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **15**, 716–723 (2020).

65. Jardine, J. *et al.* Rational HIV immunogen design to target specific germline B cell receptors.
Science **340**, 711–716 (2013).

66. Tokatlian, T. *et al.* Innate immune recognition of glycans targets HIV nanoparticle
immunogens to germinal centers. *Science* **363**, 649–654 (2019).

67. Kato, Y. *et al.* Multifaceted Effects of Antigen Valency on B Cell Response Composition
and Differentiation In Vivo. *Immunity* **53**, 548-563.e8 (2020).

68. Marcandalli, J. *et al.* Induction of Potent Neutralizing Antibody Responses by a Designed
Protein Nanoparticle Vaccine for Respiratory Syncytial Virus. *Cell* **176**, 1420-1431.e17 (2019).

69. Bruun, T. U. J., Andersson, A.-M. C., Draper, S. J. & Howarth, M. Engineering a Rugged
Nanoscaffold To Enhance Plug-and-Display Vaccination. *ACS Nano* **12**, 8855–8866 (2018).

70. Kraft, J. C. *et al.* Antigen- and scaffold-specific antibody responses to protein nanoparticle
immunogens. *Cell Reports Medicine* 100780 (2022) doi:10.1016/j.xcrm.2022.100780.

71. Chaudhary, N., Weissman, D. & Whitehead, K. A. mRNA vaccines for infectious diseases:
principles, delivery and clinical translation. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **20**, 817–838 (2021).

677
678
679

Figure 1: Design of Beads-on-a-string (BOAS) immunogens- (A) Phylogenic tree of influenza

hemagglutinin (HA) subtypes. Subtypes are further categorized as group 1, group 2 or influenza

B, and stars indicate subtypes included in the BOAS. **(B)** Native trimeric HA structure

(A/H3/Hong Kong/1968; PDB: 4FNK) is shown on the left, with the HA1 domain in light grey,

and HA2 in dark grey. A construct diagram of full-length HA is shown at the top with the locations

of head domain segments within HA1. Head domains of H1, H3, and H7 span residues 57-261,

and head domains of H2, H3, H4, H9, and B span 37-316 of the HA1 region of HA. **(C)** Construct

diagram of HA BOAS. BOAS are assembled by linking HA head domains (light grey) into a single

polypeptide chain where HA head domains are separated by a flexible linker with 4 (GSS) repeats.

The C-terminus consists of an HRV-3C protease cleavable His tag and streptavidin-binding-

protein (SBP) tag for purification and other affinity tags. **(D)** BOAS used in this study.

691
692
693

Figure 2: Biochemical Characterization of BOAS- A) SDS-PAGE analysis of 3mer-8mer BOAS under non-reducing conditions. **B)** SDS-PAGE analysis of 3mer-8mer BOAS under non-reducing conditions following glycan digestion with PNGase-F. **C)** Size exclusion chromatography traces of 3mer-8mer BOAS on an Superdex 200 column in PBS. **D)** Negative stain electron microscopy (NS-EM) images of the 3mer. Arrows point to individual HA monomers. Inset image is 2.5X zoomed enlarged image of boxed area. **E)** Negative stain electron microscopy (NS-EM) images of the 8mer. Arrows point to individual HA monomers. Inset image is 2.5X zoomed enlarged image of boxed area. **F)** Characterization via ELISA of BOAS components with subtype-specific antibodies. Apparent K_D values in µM are reported for each antibody for each BOAS immunogen. Antibodies corresponding to each component are as follows: S5V2-29 (interface, all components except B/Mal/04), 5J8 (RBS, H1), 2G1 (RBS, H2), K03.12 (RBS, H3), P2-D9 (H4), H5.3 (RBS, H5), H7.167 (RBS periphery, H7), H1209 (RBS, B).

709
Figure 3: Murine immunizations with 3mer-8mer BOAS- A) Schematic of immunization
regimen with 3mer-8mer BOAS and a Mix control containing an equal molar of the 8 individual
HA heads not connected with a linker. Mice were primed with 20μg of immunogen, followed by
two homologous boosts two weeks apart. **B)** Immunogenicity of BOAS over time as determined
by serum ELISA. Serum reactivity to each immunogen is reported as the endpoint titer (EPT)
dilution factor for each group (n=8) and d14, d28, and d42. Data points are an average of n=8 mice
and error bars are +/- 1 s.d. **C)** Serum titers to each BOAS at the final time point, d42. Data points
for single time point antigen titers are from individual mice (n=8, bars represent mean titers and
error bars are +/- 1 s.d., * = p<0.05 as determined by Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple
comparison post hoc test relative to the 3mer. **D)** Serum titers to full-length HA trimers elicited by

3mer-8mer BOAS. Solid bars below each plot indicate a matched sub-type, and striped bars

indicate a mis-matched subtype (i.e. not present in the BOAS). Data points are serum EPTs from

individual mice (n=8) and error bars are +/- 1 s.d., * = $p<0.05$, ** = $p<0.01$, *** = $p<0.001$, ****

= $p<0.0001$ as determined by a Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparison post hoc test.

Figure 4: BOAS component epitope homology and serum competition A) Amino acid conservation of each BOAS projected on the A/H2/Japan/1957 head domain structure (PDB: 2WRE). Variability and conservation scores were determined as the % conservation of each

residue at each position for each BOAS composition. Cut-outs are RBS and Trimer interface (TI)

epitopes with their respective conservation. **B)** Homology score as determined by the average %

conservation of each residue across the entire protein sequence (overall, circle), and the RBS

(square) and TI (triangle) epitopes. **C)** Serum competition to RBS and TI epitopes as determined

via competition with a cocktail of RBS-directed antibodies, TI-directed antibodies, or a stem-

directed negative control antibody. % competition is determined by the relative decrease in serum

binding to each BOAS normalized to an untreated control. Each data point represents a mean from

n=3 mice and error bars are +/- 1 s.d. **D)** Trend overlay of % serum competition with RBS-directed

antibodies and homology score of the RBS epitope as a function of BOAS length. **E)** Trend overlay

of % serum competition with TI-directed antibodies and homology score of the TI epitope as a

function of BOAS length.

744
745
746

Figure 5: Design of BOAS nanoparticle (NP) immunogens- A) Schematic of design of BOAS nanoparticles. The eight original 8mer components were split into two 4mers, the first containing H1, H2, H3, and H4 (H1-H2-H3-H4), and the second containing H5, H7, H9, and B (H5-H7-H9-B). Each were expressed with an N-terminal SpyTag, then attached at equal molar ratios to an N-terminally fused SpyCatcher ferritin nanoparticle (SpyCatcher NP). This yields a ferritin nanoparticle with both 4mer BOAS conjugated to its surface (2x4mer BOAS NP). **B)** Dynamic light scattering (DLS) distributions of SpyCatcher NP and 2x4mer BOAS NP. Curves represent an average of 3 technical replicate measurements and error bars are +/- 1 s.d. **C)** Size exclusion traces of SpyCatcher NP and 2x4mer BOAS NP on an S400 column. **D)** Representative NS-EM image of SpyCatcher NP. Arrows indicate individual nanoparticles, and the inset is a 2X zoom of the boxed area. Representative NS-EM image of BOAS NP. Arrows indicate individual

nanoparticles, and the inset is a 2X zoom of the boxed area. **E)** ELISA of BOAS components,

SpyCatcher NP, and 2x4mer BOAS NP with structure-dependent subtype-specific antibodies and

a negative control stem-directed antibody, MEDI8852. Antibodies corresponding to each

component are as follows: 5J8 (RBS, H1), 2G1 (RBS, H2), K03.12 (RBS, H3), P2-D9 (H4), H5.3

(RBS, H5), H7.167 (RBS periphery, H7), H1209 (RBS, B).

ELISA data points are technical duplicates and error bars are +/- 1 s.d.

Figure 6: Murine Immunizations with BOAS NP A) Schematic of immunization regimen with 2x4mer BOAS NP and SpyCatcher NP control. Mice were primed with 20μg of NP, followed by two homologous boosts two weeks apart. **B)** Serum reactivity to each immunizing antigen at d42. ** p<0.01 as determined by Mann-Whitney test. **C)** Serum reactivity to Control NP scaffold by both groups. ** p<0.01 as determined by Mann-Whitney test. **D)** Serum reactivity elicited by BOAS NP group (n=5) at d42 to both individual BOAS components (H1-H2-H3-H4 and H5-H7-H9-B), Control NP, and BOAS NP. *** p < 0.001 as determined by Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparison post hoc test. **E)** Serum reactivity elicited by Control NP group (n=5) at d42 to both individual BOAS components (H1-H2-H3-H4 and H5-H7-H9-B), Control NP, and BOAS NP. ** p < 0.01 as determined by Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparison post hoc test. **F)** Serum reactivity elicited by BOAS NP group (n=5) to individual full-length HA components of BOAS at d42. * = p<0.05, ** = p<0.01, *** = p<0.001 as determined by Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparison post hoc test. **G)** Serum reactivity to each matched and mis-matched individual full-length HA component of BOAS (H1/MI/15 light green, H2/JP/57 blue, H3/KS/17 light orange, H4/NB/10 purple, H5/VN/04 yellow, H7/SH/13 pink, H9/GD/16 maroon, B/Mal/04 salmon, H3/HK/68 dark orange, and H1/SI/06 dark green) by 3mer-8mer BOAS and BOAS NP. Solid bars below each plot indicate a matched sub-type, and striped bars indicate a mis-matched subtype (i.e. not present in the BOAS or NP). * = p<0.05, ** = p<0.01,

786   *** = p<0.001, **** = p<0.0001 as determined by Kruskal-Wallis test with multiple comparisons

787   relative to the mix control group. In all plots, data points for single time point antigen titers are

788   from individual mice (n=5 for BOAS NP and Mix cohorts, n=8 for 3mer-8mer BOAS studies),

789   bars represent mean titers and error bars are +/- 1 s.d.

Figure 7: Microneutralization titers to matched and mis-matched virus- Microneutralization of matched and mis-matched psuedoviruses: H1N1 (green, top left), H3N2 (orange, top right), H5N1 (yellow, bottom left), and H7N9 viruses (pink, bottom right) with d42 serum. Solid bars below each plot indicate a matched sub-type, and striped bars indicate a mis-matched subtype (i.e. not present in the BOAS). NP negative controls were used to determine threshold for neutralization. Upper and lower dashed lines represent the first dilution (1:32) (for H1N1, H3N2, and H5N1) or neutralization average with negative control NP serum (H7N9), and the last serum dilution (1:32,768), respectively, and points at the dashed lines indicate IC50s at or outside the limit of detection. Individual points indicate IC50 values from individual mice from each cohort (n=5). The mean is denoted by a bar and error bars are +/- 1 s.d., * = p<0.05 as determined by a Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparison post hoc test relative to the mix group.