Long lived liver-resident memory T cells of biased specificities for abundant sporozoite

antigens drive malaria protection by radiation-attenuated sporozoite vaccination

Maria N. de Menezes[1], Zhengyu Ge[1]; Anton Cozijnsen[2], Stephanie Gras[3,4,5], Patrick Bertolino[6],

Irina Caminschi[5], Mireille H. Lahoud[5], Katsuyuki Yui[7], Geoffrey I. McFadden[2], Lynette

Beattie[1], William R. Heath[1,#], Daniel Fernandez-Ruiz[1,8,9,#]

[1] Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The Doherty Institute for Infection and

Immunity, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

[2] School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia.

[3] Infection and Immunity Program, La Trobe Institute for Molecular Science (LIMS), La Trobe

University, Bundoora, Victoria, Australia.

[4] Department of Biochemistry and Chemistry, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria,

Australia.

[5] Monash Biomedicine Discovery Institute and Department of Biochemistry and Molecular

Biology, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia.

[6] Centenary Institute, The University of Sydney and AW Morrow Gastroenterology and Liver

Centre, Newtown, New South Wales, Australia.

[7] Division of Immunology, Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Graduate

School of Biomedical Sciences, Nagasaki University, Sakamoto, Nagasaki, Japan.

[8] Department of Molecular Medicine, School of Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine &

Health, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

[9] UNSW RNA Institute, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales,

Australia

[#]Correspondence: danielfr@unsw.edu.au, wrheath@unimelb.edu.au

Short title

RAS protects through long-lived sporozoite-specific liver T_{RM} cells

Abstract

Vaccination with radiation-attenuated sporozoites (RAS) can provide highly effective

protection against malaria in both humans and mice. To extend understanding of malaria

immunity and inform the development of future vaccines, we studied the protective response

elicited by this vaccine in C57BL/6 mice. We reveal that successive doses of *Plasmodium*

berghei RAS favour the generation of liver $CD8^+$ tissue-resident memory T cells (T_{RM} cells)

over circulating memory cells, and markedly enhance their longevity. Importantly, RAS

immunisation strongly skews the composition of the liver $CD8^+$ T_{RM} compartment towards

cells specific for abundant sporozoite antigens, such as thrombospondin-related adhesive

protein (TRAP) and circumsporozoite protein (CSP), which become major mediators of

protection. The increased prevalence of sporozoite specificities is associated with limited

intrahepatic parasite development and inhibition of naïve T cell responses to all parasite

antigens in previously vaccinated mice. This leads to the exclusive expansion of effector T

cells formed upon initial immunisation, ultimately reducing the diversity of the liver T_{RM} pool

later established. These findings provide novel insights into the mechanisms governing malaria

immunity induced by attenuated sporozoite vaccination and highlight the susceptibility of this

vaccine to limitations imposed by strain-specific immunity associated with the abundant, yet

highly variable sporozoite antigens CSP and TRAP.

Author Summary

Malaria remains a significant global health challenge. An efficient vaccine could significantly

enhance malaria control. Vaccination with radiation-attenuated sporozoites (RAS) can induce

highly efficient protection against malaria, and our study brings critical insights into the

protective mechanisms elicited by this vaccine. We show that RAS stimulates the formation of

parasite-specific cytotoxic memory T cells that permanently reside in the liver (liver T_{RM} cells).

These cells are critical mediators of protection. Interestingly, multiple doses of RAS extend the

lifespan of these memory cells, potentially improving long term immunity. However, we found

that the induced memory T cell response is strongly skewed towards abundant, but highly

variable, sporozoite proteins. Thus, this phenomenon exposes a potential limitation of the RAS

vaccine against the great parasite diversity in the field, as it focuses the T cell response away

from less abundant, but more conserved, parasite antigens.

Keywords

Tissue-resident memory T cells, CD8 T cells, T cell biology, immunodominance, liver

immunity, malaria vaccine, radiation-attenuate sporozoites.

Introduction

Malaria still kills over 600,000 individuals annually, with 75% of these fatalities occurring among children under five years of age in low income countries [1]. Vaccines stand out as one of the most efficient and cost-effective public health interventions against infectious diseases [2], particularly in resource-limited regions. Radiation attenuated sporozoites (RAS) is one of the most effective malaria vaccines, demonstrating long lived sterilising protection across mice, non-human primates (NHP), and humans against *Plasmodium* spp. sporozoite infection [3-5]. This vaccination approach involves the inoculation of sporozoites attenuated through exposure to either X- or gamma-irradiation. Attenuation is achieved by a carefully calibrated sublethal radiation dose that enables parasites to invade the liver after injection into the host but induces their subsequent arrest in this organ, inhibiting progress to the blood stage [6-8].

Considerable research has been dedicated to elucidating the protective mechanisms that underlie RAS-induced protection. RAS vaccination requires multiple doses for maximal efficacy [9], and elicits both humoral and cellular immunity. Although the former can contribute to protection [10-13], cellular immunity, mediated by CD8^{+} T cells, is a pivotal component of RAS-mediated immunity, as demonstrated by the susceptibility to infection of different strains of vaccinated mice, and NHP, when these cells are removed [14-16]. RAS vaccination of mice and NHP was found to induce the accumulation of memory CD8^{+} T cells in the liver [13, 17-19]. Memory T cells can be subdivided into two major subtypes: circulating memory cells (T_{CIRCM}), in turn separated into central (T_{CM}) and effector (T_{EM}) memory T cells depending on their recirculating pattern, and tissue-resident memory T cells (T_{RM}), which remain in the organ wherein they are formed [20]. Although both types of memory CD8^{+} T cells are elicited by RAS vaccination and can contribute to protection [21, 22], tissue-resident

memory T cells appear to be critical in C57BL/6 mice [22], which are highly susceptible to

infection by *P. berghei* and require higher doses of RAS for sterilising immunity than other

strains [23, 24]. This notion is also supported in humans, as sterilising protection is still

detected in repeatedly vaccinated individuals despite their antibody levels or numbers of

circulating memory CD8$^+$ T cells being comparable to those in their unprotected counterparts

[13, 19, 25].

CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cells must find and kill parasites during the brief period of residence in the liver,

which lasts 2 days in mice and 7 days in humans [26-28]. An essential determinant of the

capacity of CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cells to exert anti-parasitic protection is their antigen specificity, as

parasite antigens must be presented via Major Histocompatibility Complex class I (MHC-I)

molecules on hepatocytes to enable CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cell recognition of infected cells. *Plasmodium*

protein expression vastly changes throughout different stages of the parasite's life cycle [29,

30], and T$_{RM}$ cells specific for antigens with contrasting expression patterns therefore differ in

their protective capacity. Thus, T$_{RM}$ cells that recognise the 60S ribosomal protein L6 (RPL6),

an antigen predominantly expressed during liver stage, exhibit heightened protective efficacy

relative to those specific for thrombospondin-related adhesive protein (TRAP) [31], which is

mainly expressed by sporozoites [30, 32]. A broad diversity of T cell specificities is thought to

promote better protection [33], as late antigens with prolonged expression patterns provide a

longer window of opportunity for T cells to find and eliminate parasites before they progress

to the blood. Other requirements defining an antigen's immunogenicity and protective capacity

are its efficient processing by the proteasome for the generation of peptides that can be loaded

onto MHC-I molecules, the strong and stable binding of these peptides to MHC molecules, and

the presence of naïve T cells in the endogenous repertoire capable of responding to the

peptide/MHC-I complexes generated [34, 35]. Notably, C57BL/6 mice are not known to mount

CD8$^+$ T cell responses specific for *P. berghei* circumsporozoite protein (CSP) [36], another

major sporozoite antigen that is also expressed during liver stage.

Dissecting the dynamics of the protective T cell responses elicited by RAS is crucial for

understanding immunity to liver stage malaria. In this study, we sought to investigate the

landscape of memory T cell specificities triggered by successive *P. berghei* RAS vaccinations

in C57BL/6 mice. Our findings reveal a progressive skewing of the liver T$_{RM}$ response towards

sporozoite antigen specificities, which undergo robust expansion and become major mediators

of protection against live sporozoite challenge. Surprisingly, this immunodominance is

established even for T cells targeting the sporozoite antigen TRAP, despite the modest intrinsic

protective capacity of these cells. Additionally, repeated immunisations significantly extend

the half-life of the parasite-specific T$_{RM}$ cells generated while suppressing naïve T cell

responses to any parasite antigen. These elements limit the breadth of the ensuing memory

response by largely constraining the induced liver T$_{RM}$ cell pool to cells specific for previously

encountered sporozoite antigens.

Results

Liver CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cells protect RAS-vaccinated C57BL/6 mice against *P. berghei* sporozoite infection

Using MHC-I restricted, TCR transgenic PbT-I cells [37], specific for the *Plasmodium* antigen RPL6 [31], we previously showed that the protection provided by two doses of RAS, administered 30 days apart, is largely mediated by a liver-resident subset of memory CD8$^+$ T cells [22]. However, the vaccination schedule utilised was suboptimal, only providing ~40% of sterilising protection, and the presence of adoptively transferred PbT-I cells might have altered the endogenous protective responses naturally elicited by this vaccine [38]. Thus, to further characterise the mechanisms responsible for malaria immunity induced by RAS, we injected mice with smaller doses of irradiated parasites (10,000 sporozoites) at shorter intervals (one week apart), as this immunisation strategy is known to provide highly efficient sterilising protection against *P. berghei* sporozoite infection in C57BL/6 mice [39]. Mice were injected with 1, 2 or 3 weekly doses of 10,000 *P. berghei* RAS, and challenged with 200 live, fully infectious *P. berghei* sporozoites 30 days after the last RAS injection. A single injection of RAS (1xRAS) failed to induce sterilising protection against sporozoite infection, but mice in this group displayed significantly reduced parasitemia compared to unvaccinated controls on day 7 after challenge (Figure 1A, B). Protection was improved in mice vaccinated with two doses of RAS (2xRAS), which showed significant sterile protection and further reduced day 7 parasitemia. Three RAS injections (3xRAS) conferred even higher sterilising protection against sporozoite challenge (Figure 1A, B). Importantly, in line with previous findings in C57BL/6 mice and non-human primates [14, 16], depletion of CD8$^+$ T cells in 3xRAS vaccinated mice completely removed protection (Figure S1A-C). Furthermore, parasitemia on day 7 in depleted mice was similar to that in unvaccinated controls, underscoring the major

role of CD8$^+$ T cells in protection in this system (Figure S1A-C). Next, we sought to define the

contribution of liver T$_{RM}$ cells to protection. These cells were selectively depleted in 3xRAS

vaccinated mice via treatment with monoclonal antibodies specific for the T$_{RM}$ surface marker

CXCR3 [22] prior to challenge with *P. berghei* sporozoites. This treatment efficiently removed

endogenous CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cells in the liver, but left numbers of effector memory CD8$^+$ T cells

unaltered (Figure S1D-H). Numbers of central memory T cells were moderately reduced in the

spleen, as some of these cells also express CXCR3, but not in the liver. As previously observed

[22], parasite-specific T$_{CM}$ cells are minimally induced by RAS vaccination in this model and

are hence unlikely to play a significant role in protection (Figure S1F-H). Vaccinated mice

treated with αCXCR3 mAb and depleted of liver T$_{RM}$ cells became fully susceptible to

sporozoite challenge, their parasitemias approaching those of unvaccinated mice (Figure 1C,

D). This result strongly indicated that protection in this system is largely CD8$^+$ liver T$_{RM}$-

dependent. Overall, these experiments confirmed that multiple RAS vaccinations can confer

highly efficient protection against *Plasmodium* sporozoite infection in C57BL/6 mice and

provided strong evidence that this protection is mediated by CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cells.

RAS boosting favours generation of liver CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cells specific for abundant sporozoite

antigens

As a whole parasite vaccine, RAS stimulates CD8$^+$ T cell responses of multiple specificities

[18, 33]. To better understand the features of the protective CD8$^+$ T cell response elicited by

repeated RAS vaccination, we next sought to determine the relative abundance of endogenous

memory T cells specific for known parasite antigens generated in 3xRAS vaccinated mice. We

focused on antigens with contrasting expression patterns during parasite development in the

mouse; i) Thrombospondin-related anonymous protein (TRAP, PBANKA_1349800),

containing the $PbTRAP_{130-138}$ epitope [40], which is expressed at high levels by sporozoites

[32, 41]; ii) the putative 60S ribosomal protein L6 *(*RPL6, PBANKA_1351900), an antigen

predominantly expressed during liver and blood stage, but less abundantly in sporozoites, that

contains the cognate antigen of PbT-I cells, $PbRPL6_{120-127}$ [31, 37]; and iii) the replication

protein A1   (RPA1, PBANKA_0416600), originally identified as a blood stage T cell antigen

[42] but also expressed during liver stage   (Figure S2A), that contains the $PbRPA1_{199-206}$

epitope, also known as F4 [42]. Intriguingly, the size and composition of the memory $CD8^+$ T

cell compartment generated was markedly different depending on the number of RAS doses

administered. Thus, one dose of 10,000 RAS generated similar numbers of RPL6-specific and

TRAP-specific liver T_{RM} cells (Figure 2A, S2B), as well as circulating cells of these

specificities in the liver and the spleen (Figure S2B). RPA1-specific cells were also expanded,

indicating that this antigen is immunogenic during pre-erythrocytic stages, and this was also

the case for total numbers of memory $CD8^+$ T cells of undefined specificities (Figure 2A-C,

S2B). However, a second injection of RAS profoundly changed the relative abundance of

memory T cell specificities. TRAP-specific cells, particularly TRAP T_{RM} cells in the liver,

were significantly boosted, with an average 23-fold increase vs a single RAS injection (Figure

2A-C, S2B). In comparison, RPL6-specific cells were only increased 3.6-fold, and RPA1-

specific cells, or those of undefined specificities, remained largely unchanged (Figure 2C). This

trend became more pronounced in mice injected with three doses of RAS (Figure 2A-C, S2B).

Numbers of TRAP-specific T_{RM} cells were 77-fold higher in 3xRAS vaccinated mice compared

to 1xRAS (Figure 2C) and constituted on average more than 30% of total liver T_{RM} cells

(Figure 2B). In contrast, RPL6 and RPA1 specific cells expanded 7.5 to 3.5-fold vs 1xRAS

(Figure 2C) and only accounted for 4.5% and 2% of all liver T_{RM} cells respectively (Figure

2B). For all specificities, repeated injections of RAS progressively favoured the generation of

T_{RM} cells in the liver over circulating memory cells (T_{CIRCM}, comprising T_{EM} and T_{CM} cells),

as exemplified by the increasing ratios of liver T_{RM} vs spleen T_{CIRCM} cell numbers upon

successive rounds of RAS vaccination (Figure 2D). These results showed that repeated

vaccination with RAS favoured the generation of liver-resident memory $CD8^+$ T cells specific

for an abundant sporozoite antigen (i.e. TRAP) over those responding to antigens more

prominently expressed at later stages.

To consolidate these findings, we next determined whether a similar bias occurred for T cells

specific for sporozoite-associated antigens other than TRAP. We focused on a prototypical,

abundant sporozoite antigen, the circumsporozoite protein (CSP). As C57BL/6 mice do not

respond to *P. berghei* CSP, we utilised *P. berghei* CS5M parasites (termed CS5M henceforth)

for RAS immunisations. In these parasites, CSP was mutated to encode the $OVA_{257-264}$

(SIINFEKL) peptide, recognised by endogenous $CD8^+$ T cells in C57BL/6 mice [43]. Mice

were vaccinated with 1 or 3 doses of CS5M RAS and the numbers of memory $CD8^+$ T cells

specific for OVA, TRAP, RPL6 or RPA1 were measured 30 days later (Figure 2E-H, S3).

OVA-specific, as well as TRAP specific T_{RM} cells, expanded to much higher numbers

(approximately 46 and 51-fold increases respectively, Figure 2G) than RPL6- or RPA1-specific

T_{RM} cells (3.5 and 1.6-fold increase respectively) in 3x vs 1x CS5M RAS vaccinated mice,

with T_{RM} cells of other specificities increasing 4.3-fold (Figure 2E-G, S3). The combined

frequencies of CS5M-CSP and TRAP-specific cells accounted for close to half of all liver T_{RM}

cells (Figure 2F). Interestingly, in this case, OVA-specific T cells formed substantially higher

numbers of memory cells (4-fold more on average) than those specific for TRAP (Figure 2E,

F, S3), which did not expand to comparable numbers as when WT RAS were used for

immunisations (Figure 2A) and hence no known, potent competing sporozoite-specific T cell

response was elicited. This suggested that CS5M-CSP specific responses outcompeted those

against TRAP, even though both specificities were preferentially expanded in comparison to

RPL6 or RPA1. As observed previously (Figure 2D), for all specificities, repeated RAS

vaccinations biased memory T cell formation towards liver T_{RM} cells over T_{CIRCM} cells (Figure

2H). Together, these results verified that multiple RAS vaccinations favoured the generation

of resident memory CD8$^+$ T cells specific for abundant sporozoite antigens over those

responding to other antigens.

Repeated RAS vaccination generates long lived liver T_{RM} cells

Having observed that repeated RAS vaccination altered the memory T cell phenotype by

progressively favouring the development of T_{RM} cells, we next aimed to investigate whether

boosting could modify other intrinsic properties of these cells. To this end, we assessed the

impact of multiple RAS immunisations on the maintenance of liver T_{RM} cells of different

specificities over time. Mice were injected with either one dose of 5×10^4 RAS, or three doses

of 10^4 RAS administered weekly, and the numbers of TRAP-, RPL6- and RPA1-specific

memory T cells were measured in the liver and spleen at several time points extending up to

100 days post-immunisation (Figure 3). Remarkably, T_{RM} cells of all specificities examined in

mice vaccinated with 3xRAS displayed markedly increased half-lives (Figure 3A-C), though

this trend was not significant for RPA-1 (p=0.1023). Specifically, the half-lives of liver T_{RM}

cells in 1xRAS vaccinated mice ranged from 47 to 81 days, while those in 3xRAS vaccinated

mice extended to nearly 230 days for TRAP-specific cells (Figure 3A), and exceeded a

thousand days for the later antigens, RPL6 and RPA1 (Figure 3B, C). Interestingly, this

increase in longevity was less pronounced and failed to reach significance for T_{EM} cells. For

all specificities, spleen T_{EM} cells displayed much shorter half-lives than liver T_{RM} cells and

exhibited moderate increased half-lives in 3xRAS mice, reaching 30-85 days, up from 20-50

days in 1xRAS mice (Figures 3D-F). In summary, these results showed that repeated RAS

vaccination increased the life span of parasite-specific memory T cells, with liver T_{RM} cells

displaying much larger increases.

TRAP-specific immunity dominates protection

To understand the implications of these findings, we sought to determine the contribution of

TRAP-specific T_{RM} cells to protection against challenge with *P. berghei* sporozoites in RAS

vaccinated mice. To do this, we suppressed the development of TRAP specific responses by

sporozoite vaccination through injection of $PbTRAP_{130-138}$ peptide in the absence of adjuvant,

which leads to the removal of T cells specific for this peptide [40, 44]. Mice received 3 doses

of TRAP peptide diluted in PBS prior to the first dose of RAS, and then received additional

injections a day before administration of the second and third doses of the vaccine (Figure 4A).

This resulted in efficient deletion of TRAP-specific cells (Figure S4A). In contrast,

administration of an irrelevant peptide (SIINFEKL, i.e. $OVA_{257-264}$) did not alter the generation

of TRAP specific memory cells (Figure S4A). Vaccination with three doses of RAS induced

strong protection against sporozoite challenge in untreated and SIINFEKL-treated control

mice. However, TRAP-tolerised mice displayed markedly reduced levels of sterile protection,

comparable to unvaccinated mice, and higher parasitemia 7 days after challenge (Figure 4B,

C). Those TRAP-tolerised mice that became infected had significantly lower parasitemias than

unvaccinated mice, suggesting that T_{RM} cells of other specificities contributed moderately to

protection (Figure S4B). Enumeration of liver T_{RM} cells in challenged mice (Figure 4D)

showed that, as expected, 3xRAS vaccination induced substantial numbers of TRAP-specific

liver T_{RM} cells, except in the single mouse that remained unprotected (a second unprotected

mouse could not be analysed as it developed cerebral malaria and had to be euthanised). TRAP

tolerization efficiently impaired formation of TRAP-specific liver T_{RM} cells in unprotected

mice, but two of the TRAP-tolerised mice that remained protected had high numbers of TRAP

T_{RM} cells, indicating that, in these mice, tolerisation did not work efficiently (Figure 4D). Also,

one out of the two non-protected mice in the OVA-tolerised control group tended to have low

numbers of TRAP specific cells (similarly to the unprotected mouse in the RAS group),

indicating that either RAS immunisation, or expansion of TRAP-specific cells, were

suboptimal in this mouse (Figure 4D). Together, these results demonstrated a key role for

TRAP-specific T_{RM} cells in protection against sporozoite challenge in C57BL/6 mice

vaccinated multiple times with RAS.

RAS preferentially boosts previously activated T cells

A potential mechanism to explain the T cell memory bias towards sporozoite antigen

specificities generated by repeated RAS vaccination was the rapid elimination of incoming

irradiated sporozoites by $CD8^+$ T cells induced by prior doses of RAS. This elimination would

particularly curtail the expression of late antigens by booster RAS, thereby limiting their

immunogenicity compared to the readily available antigens present in the sporozoite [45]. To

test whether prior RAS vaccination limited the development of parasites subsequently

administered in booster doses, mice were vaccinated with one or two consecutive doses of RAS

up to 8 days apart. Then, coinciding with the timing of the final dose in our established RAS

vaccination schedule, mice were instead challenged with an equivalent dose (10,000 parasites)

of non-irradiated, fully infectious sporozoites. We then assessed protection to evaluate whether

the pre-existing immune response interfered with the development of these live sporozoites

(Figure 5A). Mice that received a single dose of RAS prior to infection displayed marked

decreases in parasitemia on day 7 compared to unvaccinated controls, and some sterilising

protection (Figure 5B, C). Moreover, two doses of RAS provided complete sterilising

protection (Figure 5B, C). In agreement with previous work [45], these results indicated that

the effector response elicited by prior doses of RAS has the capacity to efficiently eliminate

incoming sporozoite infections, potentially impairing the generation of T cell responses against

liver stage antigens upon administration of subsequent doses of RAS.

Given the strong bias towards the development of sporozoite-specific responses observed in

figure 2, we reasoned that not all T cell responses elicited by RAS would be equally impaired

by this inhibitory mechanism. Particularly, we anticipated that responses targeting abundant

antigens in the incoming sporozoites would be less affected by quick parasite killing that those

specific for later or less abundant antigens. To test this hypothesis, we sought to define the

capacity of RAS to activate naïve T cells of different specificities for parasite antigens, in mice

that had been previously vaccinated with RAS, and hence had an ongoing T cell response

capable of killing further incoming parasites. In a first series of experiments, we adoptively

transferred naive PbT-I cells, i.e. RPL6-specific TCR transgenic T cells [31, 37], into mice that

had received no prior RAS vaccination, or one or two doses of RAS one week apart. Mice then

received a final dose of RAS one day after PbT-I T cell transfer, and the numbers of memory

cells generated by these transgenic T cells were examined 30 days after the last RAS injection

(Figure 5D). As expected, when PbT-I cells were transferred one day before a single RAS

vaccination, substantial numbers of memory PbT-I cells formed in the spleen and the liver,

including T_{RM} cells (Figure 5E, S5A). However, when naïve PbT-I cells were transferred one

day before a second RAS vaccination, fewer PbT-I liver T_{RM} cells formed. Furthermore, when

transferred prior to the third RAS immunisation, virtually no memory PbT-I cells were detected

(Figure 5E, S5A). Importantly, although PbT-I responses were strongly inhibited, endogenous

memory CD8$^+$ T cells of the same specificity (i.e. RPL6-specific) increased in numbers upon

successive RAS vaccinations (Figure 5F, S5A), and the same occurred for RPA1-specific cells

(Figure S5A). As observed before, large numbers of TRAP T_{RM} cells formed in these mice

(Figure 5G, S5A). Note that, in agreement with previous reports [37], PbT-I cells did not

detectably respond to persisting antigen when adoptively transferred into mice vaccinated with

RAS 6 days earlier (Figure S5B), and therefore the observed responses were induced by RAS

administered after adoptive T cell transfer. At an early time point (7 days) after the last injection

of RAS, PbT-I cells were virtually undetectable in the blood of mice receiving several doses

of RAS prior to PbT-I transfer, while numbers of endogenous TRAP- or RPL6-specific T cells

increased in the same mice upon administration of every additional dose of RAS (Figure S5C).

This indicated that diminished early expansion of PbT-I cells was responsible for the low

numbers of memory PbT-I cells subsequently detected. Moreover, this occurred while

endogenous CD8$^+$ T cells of the same specificity, activated by prior RAS vaccination,

continued expanding.

To extend these findings and better understand the mechanisms contributing to sporozoite

antigen immunodominance, we next sought to determine whether this inhibitory effect also

applied to other T cell specificities. To do this, we performed similar experiments as those

explained for PbT-I cells, but instead using naïve T cells of a different specificity, i.e. OVA-

specific OT-I cells [46]. To provide a target antigen for these cells, we utilised *P. berghei*

HsOVA (termed HsOVA henceforth) parasites for vaccination. In these parasites, a C-terminal

fragment of OVA (aa 150-386) was fused to the N terminus of a truncated version of the

parasite protein Hsp70 (retaining aa 201-398) [47]. This construct is expressed under the

control of the Hsp70 promoter, which induces high levels of transcription in sporozoites and

during the liver stage (Figure S5D) [30]. However, as mRNA is not necessarily indicative of

protein expression [48] or immunogenicity, we first sought to determine the T cell

immunogenicity of this antigen in sporozoites. Mice received OT-I cells and were

intravenously injected with heat killed sporozoites (HKS), thereby limiting the repertoire of

presentable antigens to T cells to those already existing in the sporozoite. Expansion of OT-I

cells was assessed in the spleen after 4 days. PbT-I cells were utilised as positive controls, as

they can respond to HKS [49]. We found that, indeed, OT-I cells moderately responded to

HsOVA HKS (Figure S5E), confirming the immunogenicity of this antigen in sporozoites. We

then proceeded to assess whether repeated RAS vaccination resulted in the inhibition of naïve

T cell responses specific for Hsp70-OVA. As with the previous experiments with PbT-I cells,

mice were vaccinated 1-3 times with HsOVA RAS, and naïve OT-I cells were transferred one

day prior to the last HsOVA RAS vaccination. Although OT-I cells generated strong memory

in 1xHsOVA RAS vaccinated mice, this response was completely inhibited in mice previously

vaccinated once or twice with HsOVA RAS (2xHsOVA RAS and 3xHsOVA RAS

respectively) (Figure 5H, S5F), appearing even more strongly inhibited than the response by

PbT-I cells (Figure 5E). As expected, endogenous TRAP specific cells formed substantially

increasing numbers of T_{RM} cells upon every additional RAS injection (Figure 5I, S5F), with

RPL6-specific T_{RM} cells, as well as T_{RM} cells of undefined specificity, displaying more

moderate increases (Figure S5F).

Preferential boosting of pre-activated T cells extends to abundant sporozoite antigens

We hypothesised that suppression of naïve responses in this system would be less pronounced

if the adoptively transferred naïve T cells were specific for a readily available, abundant

sporozoite antigen, such as CSP (Figure S6A). To test this, we examined the expansion of naive

CD8$^+$ T cell responses targeting CSP in mice previously vaccinated with RAS. Here, we again

used CS5M RAS, where the OT-I epitope is embedded within CSP and OT-I cells can be used

as a readout for responses to *P. berghei* CSP. To demonstrate the immunogenicity of CS5M-

CSP expressed on these sporozoites, we adoptively transferred naïve OT-I cells into recipient

mice, which were injected with heat killed CS5M sporozoites a day later. Expansion of OT-I

cells was then assessed in the spleen after 6 days. CS5M HKS induced substantial OT-I

proliferation, indicating that sporozoite-derived surface CS5M-CSP could be captured and

presented to responding T cells by host antigen presenting cells (Figure S6B). In a new set of

experiments, mice then either received a single injection of CS5M RAS, or three injections,

with OT-I cells being transferred one day before the last RAS vaccination. Surprisingly, *de*

novo OT-I responses in 3xCS5M RAS vaccinated mice were again strongly suppressed (Figure

5J), even when endogenous SIINFEKL-specific responses strongly expanded (Figure S6C).

TRAP specific, as well as RPL6 and T cells of undefined specificities, formed large numbers

of memory cells in 3xRAS vaccinated mice (Figure 5K, S6D). Moreover, mice that, in a

separate experiment, received two doses of WT RAS, followed by OT-I transfer before a last

dose of CS5M RAS, in which therefore no OVA specific response was generated by prior to

CS5M RAS vaccination, also displayed strongly diminished OT-I T_{RM} cell numbers (Figure

S7). These results confirmed that naive T cell responses are strongly inhibited by ongoing

responses elicited by prior RAS vaccination. This is the case, even for responses specific for

an abundant sporozoite antigen that can be cross-presented without requiring liver invasion

(Figure S6B), and can even occur when the challenge antigen has not been encountered during

previous vaccinations. Furthermore, this inhibition of naïve T cell responses occurs while

previously activated T cells of the same specificity continue to respond to each RAS

vaccination.

Inhibition of naïve T cell activation by RAS boosting does not require TRAP-specific T

cells

Having established that TRAP-specific T cells dominate the protective response elicited by

multiple WT *P. berghei* RAS vaccinations in C57BL/6 mice, we sought to determine whether

these cells were also responsible for the observed inhibition of naïve T cell responses. To do

this, we transferred naïve PbT-I cells into mice vaccinated with 1x, 2x or 3xWT RAS, one day

before the last RAS vaccination, as done before, but in this case, vaccinated mice were tolerised

for TRAP or OVA prior to RAS vaccination as done before (Figure 4A). Memory formation

by PbT-I cells was measured 30 days after the last RAS vaccination (Figure 5L, M, SF8). Naïve

PbT-I cells were impeded from forming memory (Figure 5L, S8A), despite TRAP tolerisation

having efficiently removed the TRAP-specific response in most mice (Figure 5M, S8B). As

observed in previous experiments (Figure 4D), TRAP tolerization did not work efficiently in

all mice, yet a clear inhibition of PbT-I responses could be observed in those mice in which

TRAP tolerization was efficiently achieved (Figure S8C, D). T_{RM} cells of undefined

specificities (other than RPL6 or TRAP) progressively increased in numbers after each dose of

RAS (Figure S8E, F), independently of the presence or absence of TRAP specific cells. These

results show that, although TRAP specific cells contribute decisively to protection, inhibition

of naïve T cell responses in 3xRAS mice was not exclusively mediated by effector T cells of

this specificity. Taken together, these data suggested that immunity generated after the initial

RAS immunisation hindered the boosting of effector CD8$^+$ T cell responses to late epitopes,

and dramatically inhibited the priming of new T cell responses to any antigen, either sporozoite

or liver stage derived. Overall, this resulted in a strong bias of the T cell response towards

sporozoite-derived immunogenic antigens associated with the primary exposure to RAS.

Liver T_{RM} cells specific for abundant sporozoite antigens can confer potent protection

To better understand the implications of the skewed T_{RM} specificities towards sporozoite

proteins, we next sought to explore the protective capacity of liver T_{RM} cells specific for the

major sporozoite antigen CSP, and benchmarked this protection with that provided by T_{RM}

cells specific for Hsp70. This was achieved by evaluating the ability of OT-I T_{RM} cells to

protect against challenges with either CS5M or HsOVA parasites. This experimental design

allowed us to directly compare the efficacy of T_{RM} cells of the same specificity (SIINFEKL)

against two modified antigens containing this epitome, namely CS5M-CSP and Hsp70-OVA.

As reported above, Hsp70 is present in the sporozoite and, although it is moderately

immunogenic at this stage (Figure S5D), it is prominently transcribed during liver stage

(Figure S5C) and can be targeted for protection [50]. In turn, CSP combines abundant

expression and immunogenicity in sporozoites (Figure S6A) with prolonged expression during

liver stage [51]. To ensure protective responses were only specific for the relevant OVA

peptide, SIINFEKL, expressed by HsOVA and CS5M parasites, and not for other parasite

antigens, we generated OVA-specific responses using our previously developed prime-and-

trap (P&T) approach [22]. Mice either received OT-I cells or not (and hence relied on

endogenous SIINFEKL-specific CD8$^+$ memory T cells for protection), and were challenged

with CS5M or HsOVA parasites. Large numbers of OT-I T_{RM} (Figure 6A-C), or SIINFEKL-

specific endogenous cells (Figure 6D-F), were generated in mice receiving the complete P&T

vaccine. When these mice were challenged with CS5M or HsOVA parasites, high levels of

sterile protection were achieved (Figure 6G, H). As T_{RM} cell numbers generated with this

vaccination strategy provided exceedingly efficient protection against both parasites, we

decided to vaccinate mice suboptimally, to better gauge the numbers of T_{RM} cells required for

protection against these parasites. Thus, we injected mice with a low dose of Clec9A-OVA

(0.5 μg) plus 5 nmol CpG B-P adjuvant. This induced lower numbers of liver OT-I T_{RM} cells,

averaging 5×10^4 cells (Figure 6I). These mice displayed substantial sterile protection against

CS5M CSP, which was superior to that of Hsp70-OVA (Figure 6J). This result showed that

T_{RM} cells specific for sporozoite antigens, particularly those abundantly expressed, can provide

highly efficient protection against infection. Overall, this supported the view that bias towards

sporozoite-specific T_{RM} cells induced by repeated RAS vaccination provided highly efficient

protection against infection.

Together, this study shows that repeated RAS vaccination enhances the development of long-

lived liver-resident memory CD8$^+$ T cells of biased specificity for abundant sporozoite

antigens, some of them highly protective, but fails to fully exploit the protective potential of T

cells specific for less abundant or later antigens.

Discussion

RAS can induce efficient protection against malaria across a diverse range of species, including humans [9, 13], non-human primates, and mice. The rodent model provides the opportunity to expand our understanding of this vaccine, as well as to investigate fundamental immunology processes, to inform the design of more effective malaria vaccines.

Once inside hepatocytes, malaria parasites become targets of $CD8^+$ T cell immunity. The pivotal role of memory $CD8^+$ T cells in protecting mice [10, 14, 15] and NHP [16] during the liver stage of malaria has been well established. However, not all types of memory $CD8^+$ T cells are equally efficient at providing protection. We here show that liver T_{RM} cells, which afford highly focused and efficient responses to infection [22], are critical mediators of the immunity to *P. berghei* conferred by this vaccination strategy in C57BL/6 mice. Existing data also supports a prominent protective role for liver $CD8^+$ T_{RM} cells in primates. $CD8^+$ T cells had been observed to accumulate in the liver in NHP vaccinated with RAS [19], prior to the identification of liver T_{RM} cells. In humans, protection was maintained in RAS-vaccinated individuals a year after vaccination, a time when numbers of circulating T cells and antibodies had declined to background levels [13]. Further studies showed that numbers of parasite-specific circulating $CD8^+$ T cell numbers generated by RAS are low, and do not discriminate between protected and non-protected individuals [19, 25, 52]. The results presented here mirror these observations, as repeated RAS vaccination in mice does not prominently increase numbers of circulating memory cells but comparatively enhances liver T_{RM} numbers and protection. Additionally, protection increases with successive RAS injections, mirroring observations in humans [9]. This mouse model hence presents strong analogies with humans and is a valuable tool to study immunity to pre-erythrocytic malaria in the liver.

T_{RM} cells are more abundant than circulating memory T cells [53], and have been identified

and comprehensively characterised in humans as analogous to those in mice [54]. These cells

express high levels of cytokines and cytotoxicity mediators [22, 55, 56] and exert rapid effector

function [57, 58] for potent, protective responses against infection [22, 59-62]. The significant

protective capacity of liver T_{RM} cells against malaria has been previously demonstrated [22,

63, 64], although circulating, effector memory CD8^{+} T cells also infiltrate the liver and were

shown to contribute to protection against *P. berghei* infection in CB6F1 mice [21]. In C57BL/6

mice, which are highly susceptible to infection by *P. berghei* [23], liver T_{RM} cells appear to be

critical for protection, with T_{CIRCM} cells failing to provide substantial protection even at

considerable numbers [22]. In line with these findings, we here show that depletion of T_{RM}

cells rendered RAS vaccinated mice devoid of sterile protection, and the parasitemia developed

by depleted mice, although slightly lower, was statistically comparable to that of unvaccinated

mice. Additionally, the increase in protection observed upon administration of successive doses

of RAS was associated with a comparably more pronounced increase in T_{RM} cells than T_{CIRCM}

cells, as exemplified by the improved ratio of the former cells vs the latter. As T cell responses

derived from naïve T cells are strongly inhibited in repeatedly vaccinated mice (discussed

below), the observed increase in the T_{RM}/T_{CIRCM} ratio may be due to local proliferation of liver

T_{RM} cells upon antigen encounter [65, 66], or to conversion of T_{CIRCM} cells into T_{RM} cells [67,

68]. In line with our findings, repeated immunisation with *Listeria monocytogenes* has been

previously found to progressively increase the accumulation of specific memory T cells in the

liver [69]. Together, our findings showcase the capacity of RAS to generate T_{RM} immunity and

underscore a major role of these cells in the induced protection against malaria.

Despite their intrinsic ability for efficient pathogen control, T_{RM} cells are constrained by their

antigen specificity in their capacity to provide protection against infection. Thus, defining the

specificities that drive immunity in RAS vaccinated mice is critical to understand the

mechanism of protection of this vaccine, and can be invaluable for antigen selection for subunit

vaccine development. Upon invasion of the liver as sporozoites, parasites proliferate massively

within hepatocytes and progressively develop towards the merozoite form, able to invade

erythrocytes. This process entails pronounced variations in protein expression [41, 51, 70], and

therefore in available immune targets. Vaccination with genetically modified parasites

engineered to interrupt their intrahepatic development at a late stage after hepatocyte invasion

induces more protective T cell responses than early arresting parasites, which express a more

limited antigen breadth [33]. Similarly, as RAS parasites die quickly upon hepatocyte invasion

[8], the repertoire of antigens they present to the immune system is limited [33]. In addition to

inducing responses of comparably lower protective quality, the logical consequence of this

phenomenon, as we have observed, is that the expansion of T cells specific for early antigens,

such as those present in the sporozoite, is favoured, introducing a bias for these specificities in

the T_{RM} cell repertoire generated. Our results parallel prior observations in RAS-vaccinated

BALB/c mice [45], where responses specific for a sporozoite antigen (CSP), but not those

recognising a liver stage antigen, were enhanced through repeated *P. yoelii* short-interval RAS

immunisations. Importantly, *P. yoelii* CSP features an immunodominant K^d-restricted epitope

in BALB/c mice [71], which hence becomes a clear target of T cell immunity, whereas

C57BL/6 mice do not mount CD8$^+$ T cell responses to *P. berghei* CSP [36]. As we have found

here, the response elicited by RAS in this mouse strain is instead dominated by T cells specific

for TRAP, another major sporozoite antigen [41, 72]. Although expected on the basis of the

evidence presented above, this is particularly striking because TRAP is poorly recognised by

the CD8$^+$ T cell compartment of C57BL/6 mice, with only about 1 cell per million naïve CD8$^+$

T cells specific for its single known MHC-I-restricted epitope [31, 73]. Indeed, when *P. berghei*

CSP is modified to contain SIINFEKL, a much more immunogenic antigen in C57BL/6 mice

[35], and therefore both CSP- and TRAP-derived CD8^{+} T cell antigens are concurrently present

in the same, early sporozoite stage at approximately similar levels [41], then CSP-specific cells

clearly outcompete TRAP specific cells (Figure 2D, E), evidencing the comparative weakness

of the latter antigen. Nevertheless, TRAP-specific cells expand to much greater numbers than

RPL6-specific cells in mice vaccinated with three doses of WT RAS, even though the

frequency of the latter cells in the naïve repertoire is about 100-fold higher [31]. These results

underline the surprising strength of the bias towards T cells specific for early antigens induced

by RAS.

A straightforward explanation for this phenomenon is that proliferation of parasite-specific T

cells is strongly dictated by early antigen availability, whereby T cells specific for abundant

sporozoite antigens are preferentially expanded. Premature death, or quick elimination, of RAS

parasites after hepatocyte invasion hence disfavours the expression and immunogenicity of

later epitopes. Indeed, Murphy *et al.* monitored parasite mRNA expression in mice repeatedly

vaccinated with RAS and found reduced mRNA expression of non-sporozoite antigens [45].

In line with these findings, we found that existing immunity generated during initial RAS

vaccination strongly reduced the infectivity of subsequent sporozoite infections, potentially

limiting the immunogenicity of later doses of RAS and likely reinforcing the T cell bias towards

readily available early antigens. Possible sources of sporozoite antigens for CD8^{+} T cell

immunity at early stages of infection are the parasite proteins that leak to the cytoplasm of the

invaded hepatocyte and are presented via MHC-I molecules, as well as dying parasites that do

not reach the liver and are captured by antigen presenting cells in lymphoid organs [74].

Although parasites can partially develop and express later antigens in these organs [32], we

injected RAS intravenously, and therefore parasite development outside the liver is unlikely to

have occurred [75]. Additionally, several sporozoite proteins, including CSP and TRAP, are

cleaved and released as the parasites traverse hepatocytes [76, 77], generating a "gliding trail"

of potential antigens that could potentially be captured by antigen presenting cells, or presented

via MHC-I by the traversed hepatocytes. Moreover, those sporozoites that either die while

traversing hepatocytes, or inside the final hepatocyte in which they settle for further

development [78], may also become sources of additional antigen. We and others observed that

HKS immunisation is markedly less immunogenic than RAS [19, 49, 74] and, although heat-

induced damage to sporozoite proteins may explain these results, it is also possible that the

simple cross-presentation of antigen that is readily available in sporozoites is not sufficient to

induce potent immunogenicity. Liver invasion, or the presence of metabolically active

parasites, may be required for maximal expansion of sporozoite-specific $CD8^+$ T cell

responses.

As mRNA levels can be poor indicators of immunogenicity, we attempted an alternative

method to more accurately measure the immunogenicity of T cell antigens of interest with

contrasting expression patterns. We did this by evaluating the memory formation capacity of

adoptively transferred naïve TCR transgenic T cells in mice previously vaccinated with RAS.

This led to our identification of another factor strongly contributing to sporozoite-specific T_{RM}

cell bias, namely the strong inhibition of naïve T cell responses by prior RAS immunisation.

This inhibition occurred progressively and was broad. It affected responses to all antigens

examined, including those targeting abundant sporozoite antigens available for cross-

presentation such as CSP, even when these antigens had not been encountered previously.

Moreover, removing TRAP-specific responses, although significantly impacting protection,

did not prevent inhibition of naïve T cell expansion. Notably, while naïve PbT-I cell activation

was strongly inhibited, endogenous cells of the same specificity (RPL6), activated after the

first RAS injection, continued to expand, albeit moderately, upon subsequent RAS injections

(Figure S5A). Similarly, naïve OT-I cell expansion was hindered in CS5M RAS vaccinated

mice (figure 3C) while the endogenous SIINFEKL-specific response continued to grow (Figure

S6C). These findings suggested that this inhibition was not necessarily exerted by sporozoite-

specific T cells over those specific for late antigens, but potentially by effector cells activated

upon previous RAS injections, which outcompeted naïve T cells. Naïve CD8$^+$ T cells have the

capacity to proliferate massively over a few days following activation [38]. However, as

pronounced changes in the naïve T cell, including a significant increase in size and a switch to

glycolytic metabolism, must occur to enable such fast expansion, a period of about 24 hours is

needed before proliferation commences [79]. This places naïve T cells at a disadvantage

compared to already activated and expanding effector T cells. Additionally, activated T cells

require factors such as IL-2 that enable further proliferation and subsequent formation of

memory [80], and the more numerous effector T cells likely outcompete naïve T cells for these

factors. Our results mirror those obtained by Hafalla *et al*, who observed that naïve CD8$^+$ T

cells specific for *P. yoelii* CSP expanded poorly when injected into mice immunised with a

single dose of RAS 1-4 days earlier [81]. Subsequent work showed that competition for antigen

presenting cells was another mechanism whereby effector T cells outcompeted naïve T cells

[82]. Interestingly, this work observed that inhibition of naïve T cell responses by effector T

cells only occurred when both responses were of the same specificity. However, we here

present evidence that this suppression is broad and not restricted to specific antigens. In

contrast to the scenario presented here, Hafalla *et al* utilised two different infection systems to

create a competition between effector and naïve T cells (namely RAS and influenza infection).

These systems may differ in parameters such as antigen availability or strength or quality of

inflammatory signals, which could influence whether a *de novo* response can form. In

summary, the effector T cell response generated upon primary RAS exposure constrains the

breadth of the parasite-specific T_{RM} compartment generated by this vaccine, contributing to the

establishment of a strong immunodominance biased towards early antigens that influences the

quality of the protective liver T_{RM} response elicited by multiple RAS vaccinations.

Our work establishes sporozoite proteins as dominant antigens for naturally occurring T cell

immunity to malaria in the liver. Notably, removing the TRAP response in 3xRAS vaccinated

mice results in loss of protection. This finding was unexpected, given that $2x10^5$ TRAP T_{RM}

cells generated by prime-and-trap vaccination, similar in number to those in 3xRAS mice, only

conferred around 15% sterile protection against challenge with 200 *P. berghei* sporozoites in

C57BL/6 mice [31]. This discrepancy could be attributed to the fact that RAS vaccination

generates T_{RM} cells of multiple specificities [33], which can collectively contribute to

protection to variable extents (Figure S4B), hence lowering the numeric requirements for

TRAP-specific cells for sterilising protection. When a dominant specificity such as TRAP is

removed, then the total number of protective T_{RM} cells is reduced below the threshold required

for sterile protection, rendering mice susceptible to infection. Our results contrast with

observations that substitution of *P. berghei* CSP for its ortholog in *P. falciparum*, which

removes an immunodominant K^d-restricted epitope in the rodent parasite [83], does not

abrogate protection of BALB/c mice against challenge with WT sporozoites [84]. BALB/c

mice are inherently more resistant that C57BL/6 mice to *P. berghei* sporozoite infection [18,

23], and can be efficiently protected by a comparably lower number of parasite-specific $CD8^+$

T cells [18]. Hence, a potential explanation is that the pool of minor T_{RM} specificities suffice

to exert protection in these mice.

Regarding further antigens, we found SIINFEKL-specific responses targeting Hsp70-OVA to

be highly protective. This aligns with previous reports comparing vaccination targeting OVA

expressed under the liver stage UIS4 promoter, and CSP, which found both antigens to be

protective [85], yet we could determine by suboptimal vaccination that CS5M CSP responses

induced more efficient protection than those against Hsp70-OVA. Comparatively strong

protection by $CD8^+$ T cells targeting sporozoite antigens has also been found by other groups

[86]. However, the intrinsic protective capacity of an antigen depends on several factors, and

not exclusively on its expression pattern. Thus, other immunogenic antigens with diverse

expression patterns, including in the sporozoite, such as GAP50 or S20, or the liver stage, such

as RPL3, were found not to be protective [40, 45, 86], a critical element for some of these

antigens being antigen availability for MHC-I presentation in the hepatocyte [86].

Another important aspect of repeated RAS vaccination identified in this work is the extension

of the lifespan of liver T_{RM} cells. Our results align with those obtained by van Braeckel-

Budimir *et al.* on lung T_{RM} cells, whose lifespan is also significantly enhanced upon repeated

influenza infection [68]. In that model, T_{EM} cells convert into T_{RM} cells after infection [67],

themselves progressively decreasing in numbers [68], and consequently maintaining the T_{RM}

compartment. Conversion of T_{EM} cells into T_{RM} cells has also been observed in the skin of

Herpes Simplex virus infected mice [65], and a decrease in the lifespan of T_{EM} cells was also

detected upon repeated stimulation with attenuated *Listeria monocytogenes* [87]. Our

observation that lifespan extension is induced in T_{RM} cells, but not in circulating memory cells,

is compatible with the occurrence of a similar phenomenon in our system. As naïve T cell

responses are strongly inhibited by repeated RAS vaccination, this potential source of new T_{RM}

cells is likely minor. In addition to recruitment from circulating memory cells, expansion of

the T_{RM} compartment can also be due to *in situ* proliferation in the tissue in response to repeated

antigen encounter [65]. Finally, repeated antigen stimulation induces intrinsic changes in

memory T cells [69], including moderate changes in molecules involved in survival [68].

Access to antigen in the liver by T_{RM} cells might foster preferential antigen stimulation leading

to the expression of pro-survival genes in these cells.

Although our results demonstrate that sporozoite-specific liver T_{RM} cells can provide highly

efficient protection against infection, the preferential development of sporozoite specific T cell

responses by RAS may have some drawbacks. Firstly, certain late antigens such as RPL6,

which are highly protective [31], are not expanded as much upon RAS vaccination, and their

full protective potential is therefore missed. This issue may be more prominent in human

infections, where the liver stage lasts longer than in mice (7 days vs 2 days), and therefore T_{RM}

cells targeting parasites during intrahepatic development may be comparably more relevant for

protection. Secondly, reducing the generation of late-stage antigen-specific T cells may impair

immunity against parasites with delayed development in the liver. Sporozoite-specific CD8$^+$ T

cells, such as those specific for CSP, are less efficient at protecting against *P. yoelii* than *P.*

berghei, and this is associated to strongest late replication of the former parasite [24].

Moreover, unlike *P. berghei* RAS, repeated long interval *P. yoelii* RAS immunisation fails to

improve protection in C57BL/6 mice [18]. Thirdly, we and others have observed that TRAP is

highly variable across *P. falciparum* field isolates [31], and this is also true for CSP [88, 89].

Sporozoite surface antigens such as CSP or TRAP are directly exposed to immune attack and

hence subjected to intense immune selection, which likely results in increased variability.

Biasing the immune response towards highly polymorphic sporozoite antigens may increase

the strain-specificity of RAS-mediated protection (or, similarly, of immunity from natural

infection), reducing the capacity of memory T_{RM} cells generated to recognise and combat new

infections. Administration of high doses of RAS, however, may aid initial expansion of

protective T cells specific for less abundant sporozoite antigens and increase cross-strain

immunity [25]. And fourthly, we have observed that the lifespan of liver T_{RM} cells generated

by repeated RAS vaccination is strongly increased. This could potentially perpetuate the

suppression of naïve responses to new antigens, not only further hindering the generation of T

cell responses to liver stage antigens upon natural infection, but also to new sporozoite antigens

from genetically diverse parasite haplotypes [90]. As we have seen here, those T cells are still

able to respond to the new parasite, even when unable to exert protection. This could prevent

the generation of immunity to novel epitopes, thereby reducing the breadth of immunity

generated against newly encountered parasite strains. Together, these elements may establish

a potent screen that prevents the generation of T_{RM} cell immunity of maximal efficacy against

malaria parasite infection in the liver.

Materials and Methods

Mice, mosquitos, parasites and infections

All procedures were performed in strict accordance with the recommendations of the

Australian code of practice for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes. The protocols

were approved by the Melbourne Health Research Animal Ethics Committee, University of

Melbourne (ethic project IDs: 1112347, 1814522, 20088).

Female C57BL/6 (B6), GFP [91], OT-I [46] and PbT-I [37] mice were used between 6-12

weeks of age and were bred and maintained at the Department of Microbiology and

Immunology, The University of Melbourne. Animals used for the generation of the sporozoites

were 4-5-week-old male Swiss Webster mice purchased from the Monash Animal Services

(Melbourne, Victoria, Australia) and maintained at the School of Botany, The University of

Melbourne, Australia. *Anopheles stephensi* mosquitoes (strain STE2/MRA-128 from The

Malaria Research and Reference Reagent Resource Center) were reared and infected with *P.*

berghei ANKA (*P. berghei*) as described [92]. *P. berghei* ANKA WT, *P. berghei* ANKA

HsOVA [47] and *P. berghei* ANKA CS5M [43] sporozoites were dissected from mosquito

salivary glands and resuspended in cold PBS. Freshly dissected *P. berghei* sporozoites were

injected intravenously (i.v.) as indicated in the figure legends. Parasitemia was assessed by

microscopic analysis of blood smears or by flow cytometry. Mice showing no evidence of

blood-stage infection by day 11 after infection were considered sterilely protected. For blood

stage infections, mice were injected i.v. with the indicated amount of *P. berghei* infected red

blood cells (iRBC).

Heat killing of sporozoites was done by incubating freshly isolated sporozoites at 56°C for 45

minutes.

Adoptive transfer of CD8⁺ T cells

PbT-I and OT-I CD8$^+$ T cells were negatively enriched from the spleens and lymph nodes of mice from various genetic crosses as described [93]. 50,000 purified PbT-I cells in 0.2 mL PBS were injected i.v. into recipient mice. CellTrace^{TM} violet (CTV, Thermofisher) was used to coat PbT-I and OT-I cells following manufacturer's instructions.

Prime-and-trap vaccination

B6 mice were injected i.v. with the indicated doses of rat anti-Clec9A (clone 24/04-10B4) genetically fused to OVA (containing the OVA$_{257-264}$ epitope) via a 4 Alanine linker to make the αClec9A-OVA mAb construct [94]. Recombinant adeno-associated virus (rAAV-OVA) was prepared and purified in house at the Centenary Institute or by the Vector and Genome Engineering Facility (at the Children Medical Research Institute, Sydney, Australia) over cesium chloride (CsCl)-density gradient centrifugation followed by dialysis as previously described (. This vector expresses a membrane bound form of OVA protein bicistronically with green fluorescent protein (GFP). αClec9A was injected with 5 nmol of a CpG oligonucleotide (CpG) generated by linking (5' to 3') CpG-2006 to CpG-21798 [95] (Integrated DNA Technologies, Coralville, IA, USA). For P&T vaccination, mice were injected i.v. with Clec9A mAb and the indicated vector gene copies (vgc) of rAAV-OVA on the same day.

Organ processing for T cell analysis

Tissues were harvested from mice at different time points after immunization and finely chopped using curved scissors to generate single cell suspensions. For spleen cell preparations, red blood cells were lysed, and remaining cells were filtered through a 70 μm mesh. Liver cell suspensions were passed through a 70 μm mesh and resuspended in 35% isotonic Percoll. Cells

were then centrifuged at 500g for 20 min at room temperature (RT), the pellet harvested, and

then red cells lysed before further analysis.

Flow cytometry

CD11a (2D7), CD8α (53-6.7) mAb were purchased from BD; CD44 (IM7), CD62L (MEL-

14), CD69 (H1.2F3), from ThermoFisher Scientific (Waltham, MA, USA); CXCR3

(CXCR3-173), CXCR6 (SA05D1), CX3CR1 (SA011F11), from BioLegend (San Diego, CA,

USA); H2-K^b-PbRPL6$_{120-127}$, H2-K^b-PbRPA1$_{199-206}$, H2-K^b-OVA$_{257-264}$ and H2-D^b-

PbTRAP$_{130-138}$ tetramers were made in house. Dead cells were excluded by propidium iodide

(PI) staining. For the analysis of memory CD8$^+$ T cell populations in the spleen and the liver,

tetramer$^+$, PbT-I or OT-I CD8$^+$ CD44^{hi} cells were subdivided into T$_{CM}$, T$_{EM}$ or T$_{RM}$ based on

CD69 and CD62L expression (T$_{CM}$ CD62L$^+$ CD69$^-$, T$_{EM}$ CD62L$^-$ CD69$^-$ and T$_{RM}$ CD62L$^-$

CD69$^+$, see Figure S1H). Parasitaemia was assessed by incubating ~2μl tail blood with a 5

pg/mL Hoechst 33258 solution (ThermoFisher Scientific) in FACS buffer for 1 hour at 37°C.

Parasites were discriminated from uninfected RBC using a 405 violet laser and a 450/50 filter.

Cells were analyzed by flow cytometry on a FACS Canto, Fortessa or Fortessa X20 (BD

Immunocytometry Systems, San Jose, CA, USA), using FACSDiva (BD Immunocytometry

Systems) or FlowJo software (Tree Star, Ashland, OR, USA).

Depletion of liver T cells

To deplete CXCR3$^+$ cells, mice were intravenously injected with 2 doses (200 μg and then

100 μg) of anti-CXCR3 antibody (CXCR3-173, eBioscience) or Armenian Hamster IgG

isotype control (eBio299Arm, eBioscience) 3 and 1 days before challenge with 200 live

sporozoites [22]. To deplete CD8$^+$ cells, mice were intravenously injected with 100 μg of anti-

CD8 antibody (clone 2.43) or isotype control (GL117, IgG2a) one day before challenge.

CD8 T cell tolerisation

777 Removal of TRAP specific T cells was achieved by injection of PbTRAP$_{130-138}$ peptide in the

778 absence of adjuvant [40, 44]. Mice received 3 intravenous doses of TRAP peptide diluted in

779 PBS on days 7, 4 and 1 prior to the first dose of RAS, and then received additional injections

780 a day before administration of subsequent doses of the vaccine. The first peptide dose was

781 300μg, and the rest were 100μg.

Statistical analyses

Figures were generated using GraphPad Prism 10 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA, USA).

Data are shown as mean values ± standard error of the mean (SEM). Statistical analyses were

performed using GraphPad Prism 10. Unless otherwise stated, statistical comparisons of cell

numbers in different groups were performed by log-transforming the data and using a Student's

t-test (2 groups) or one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparisons test (>2

groups). Cell number values equal to 0 were converted to 1 to enable log transformation.

P<0.05 was considered to indicate statistical significance. *, *P*<0.05; **, *P*<0.01; ***,

P<0.001; ****, *P*<0.0001; n.s., not significant (*P*>0.05). Asterisks directly over groups denote

statistical differences with the unvaccinated control group. Rates of sterile protection were

compared using Fisher's exact tests.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

The authors used the AI-powered language models Perplexity AI and Microsoft Copilot for

editorial suggestions to assist with improving the language and readability of this manuscript.

The authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the

content of the publication.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Prof. Ian Cockburn for providing the CS5M parasites used in this work.

We also thank Melanie Damtsis for technical assistance, the members of the W.R.H., L.K.M.,

S.M. and J.B. labs for discussions, the Doherty's animal facility staff for mice husbandry and

the Melbourne Brain Centre and ImmunoID Flow Cytometry Facilities for technical assistance.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: D.F.R, W.R.H., L.B., M.N.dM. ; Investigation: M.N.dM., D.F.R, Z.G.;

Resources: S. G., G.I.M, A. C., M.H.L., P.B., I.C., K.Y.; Supervision: D.F.R, W.R.H., L.B.;

Writing draft: D.F.R, W.R.H.; Writing -review and editing: M.N.dM., Z.G., S.G., M.H.L.,

K.Y., G.I.M., L.B.; Funding Acquisition: D.F.R., W.R.H.

Data availability

All relevant data are within the manuscript and its supporting information files

 Figure legends

Figure 1. Repeated RAS vaccination of C57BL/6 mice provides efficient protection

against *P. berghei* sporozoite infection that is dependent on CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cells. (**A-B**) Mice

were vaccinated with 1, 2 or 3 doses of 10,000 RAS (1xRAS, 2xRAS and 3xRAS respectively),

one week apart and were challenged with 200 *P. berghei* sporozoites 30 days after the last dose

of RAS. (**A**) Rates of sterile protection. Numbers above columns denote numbers of protected

mice / total numbers of mice per group (**B**) Parasitemia at day 7 post-challenge. (**C-D**) Mice

were vaccinated using three doses of 5,142-10,000 RAS, one week apart, and treated with

αCXCR3 mAb 3 and 1 days prior to challenge with 200 live sporozoites, which was performed

on day 30-34 after the last vaccination. Parasitemia was monitored to evaluate protection. (**C**)

Rates of sterilising protection. (**D**) Parasitemia on day 7 after sporozoite infection. Data were

pooled from 2 independent experiments. Comparisons of sterile protection rates were done

using Fisher's exact tests. Parasitemia data were log-transformed and compared using one-way

ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test.

Figure 2. Abundance of liver CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cells specific for known *Plasmodium* antigens in

mice vaccinated multiple times with WT RAS. A-D. CD8$^+$ T$_{RM}$ cell responses specific for

TRAP, RPL6, RPA1, or other specificities (tetramer-negative T$_{RM}$ cells) in the livers of mice

vaccinated with 1, 2 or 3 rounds of 10,000 RAS, one week apart. Cell numbers were assessed

30 days after the last round of immunisation. Data were log-transformed and compared using

two-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test. **A.** Liver T$_{RM}$ cell numbers. Data

were log transformed and statistically compared using two-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple

comparisons test. **B.** Frequencies of liver T$_{RM}$ cells of different specificities amongst all T$_{RM}$

cells in the liver. **C.** Fold change in the number of T$_{RM}$ cells of the indicated specificities

compared to those in 1xRAS vaccinated mice. Data were log transformed and statistically

compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test. Data in A-C were

pooled from two independent experiments. **D.** Ratios of T_{RM} cell numbers in the liver vs

numbers of circulating memory T cells (T_{CIRCM}, calculated by adding T_{CM} and T_{EM} cells) in the

spleen. Data were compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test.

E-H. CD8$^+$ T_{RM} cells specific for mutated CSP (SIINFEKL), TRAP, RPL6, RPA1, or other

specificities in the livers of mice vaccinated with 1 or 3 rounds of 5,050-7,700 CS5M RAS,

4-8 days apart. Cell numbers were assessed 30-63 days after the last round of immunisation.

E. Liver T_{RM} cell numbers. Data were log transformed and statistically compared using two-

way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test.   **F.** Percentages of liver T_{RM} cells of

different specificities amongst all T_{RM} cells in the liver. **G.** Fold change in the number of T_{RM}

cells of the indicated specificities compared to those in 1xCS5M RAS vaccinated mice. Data

were log transformed and statistically compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple

comparisons test. Data in D-F were pooled from two independent experiments. **H.** Ratios of

T_{RM} cell numbers in the liver vs numbers of circulating memory T cells (T_{CIRCM}, calculated by

adding T_{CM} and T_{EM} cells) in the spleen. Data were log-transformed and compared using

unpaired Student's t-tests.

Figure 3. Repeated RAS vaccination generates long lived memory T cells. Numbers of

CD8$^+$ T_{RM} cells in the liver (**A-C**) or T_{EM} cells in the spleen (**D-F**) specific for TRAP (**A, D**),

RPL6 (**B, E**) and RPA1 (**C, F**) in mice vaccinated with one dose of 50,000 RAS (dotted line)

or three doses of 10,000 RAS (solid line), one week apart. Cell numbers were assessed up to

day 101 after the last round of immunisation. Data were pooled from 5 independent

experiments for 1xRAS and 8 independent experiments for 3xRAS. Data were log-2

transformed and linear regression analyses of the log-transformed data were performed. Slopes

were compared using F-tests.

Figure 4. TRAP-specific liver T_{RM} cells substantially contribute to protection induced by

3xWT RAS in C57BL/6 mice. A. Experimental design. Red arrows denote intravenous

injection of $PbTRAP_{130-138}$ or $OVA_{257-264}$ peptide dissolved in PBS. Numbers denote days after

the first RAS vaccination. **B.** Sterile protection to live sporozoite challenge in 3xRAS

vaccinated mice in which TRAP-specific cells (3xRAS-TRAPtol), or T cells specific for an

irrelevant antigen (3xRAS-OVAtol) were removed (tol=tolerated). Data were compared using

Fisher's exact test. **C.** Parasitemia on day 7. Data were log-transformed and compared using

one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test. **D.** Number of TRAP-specific liver

$CD8^+$ T_{RM} cells in protected vs non-protected mice. Data were log-transformed and compared

using two-way ANOVA and uncorrected Fisher's LSD test. Data in this figure were pooled

from two independent experiments.

Figure 5. Mechanisms contributing to T cell specificity bias towards sporozoite antigens.

A-C. Protective capacity of effector responses elicited by RAS against incoming sporozoites.

A. Representative experimental design. **B-C.** Mice received one or two doses of $5-10 \times 10^3$ RAS

4-8 days apart, and 8-9 days later were injected with 1×10^4 live sporozoites. Emergence of

parasitemia was measured to evaluate protection. Data were pooled from two independent

experiments. **B.** Parasitemia on day 5 after liver sporozoite challenge. Data were log-

transformed and compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test. **C.**

Sterile protection. Data were compared using Fisher's exact test. Numbers above columns

denote numbers of protected mice / total numbers of mice per group. **D-K.** Inhibition of naïve

$CD8^+$ T cell responses by prior RAS vaccination. **D.** Representative experimental design. Red

arrows denote the time point in which mice were intravenously injected with 5×10^4 naïve

transgenic T cells (PbT-I cells in D-F; OT-I cells in F-L). **E-G.** Inhibition of naïve RPL6-

specific (PbT-I) T cell responses by prior RAS vaccination. Distribution of memory PbT-I (**E**)

and endogenous, RPL6- (**F**) and TRAP-specific (**G**) T cells in the liver 30-35 days after the

last RAS injection. Mice received 1-3 doses of $5\text{-}10 \times 10^3$ RAS. Data were pooled from two

independent experiments. Statistical analyses, denoted by dark green and purple asterisks,

denote comparisons of T_{RM} numbers. **H-I.** Inhibition of naïve HsOVA-specific (OT-I) T cell

responses by prior HsOVA RAS vaccination. Distribution of memory OT-I (**H**) and

endogenous, TRAP-specific (**I**) T cells in the liver 30 days after the last HsOVA RAS injection.

Mice received 1-3 doses of $5.9\text{-}10 \times 10^3$ HsOVA RAS. Data were pooled from two independent

experiments. Statistical analyses, denoted by brown and purple asterisks, denote comparisons

of T_{RM} numbers. **J-K.** Inhibition of naïve CSP-specific (OT-I) T cell responses by prior CS5M

RAS vaccination. Distribution of memory OT-I (**J**) and endogenous, TRAP-specific (**K**) T

cells in the liver 30 days after the last CS5M RAS injection. Mice received 1 or 3 doses of 5.9-

10×10^3 CS5M RAS. Data were pooled from two independent experiments. Statistical analyses,

denoted by brown and purple asterisks, denote comparisons of T_{RM} numbers. **L-M.** Naïve

CD8$^+$ T cell responses to RPL6 are inhibited in the absence of TRAP-specific T cells. Mice

were vaccinated with 1-3 doses of $5\text{-}10 \times 10^3$ WT RAS and received intravenous injections of

either PbTRAP$_{130\text{-}138}$ (TRAPtol) or OVA$_{257\text{-}264}$ peptide (OVAtol) dissolved in PBS as

explained in Figure 4A. PbT-Is were transferred 1 day before the last RAS vaccination and, on

day 36 after the last RAS vaccination, mice were euthanised and numbers of memory PbT-I or

TRAP-specific memory CD8$^+$ T cells were examined in the liver. **L.** Number of memory PbT-I

cells in the liver. **M.** Numbers of TRAP-specific memory T cells in the liver. Data were pooled

from two independent experiments, log-transformed and analysed using two-way ANOVA and

Tukey's multiple comparisons test.

Figure 6. Memory T cell generation of prime-and-trap targeting OVA, and protection against challenge with parasites expressing SIINFEKL under the Hsp70 promoter or within CSP. A-H. Mice received 50,000 naïve OT-I/uGFP cells (**A-C, G, H**) or not (**D-F, G, H**) and were vaccinated with either 2 μg Clec9A-OVA plus 5 nmol CpG B-P, 10^9 rAAV-OVA, or all components combined. OT-I (**A-C**) or SIINFEKL-specific memory cells (**D-F**) were enumerated in the liver and the spleen 35 days later. Data were pooled from two independent experiments, log transformed and compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test. Mice vaccinated with full P&T-OVA were challenged with 200 HsOVA (**G**) or CS5M (**H**) sporozoites on day 35 after vaccination, and rates of sterile protection were determined. Data were pooled from two independent experiments and compared using Fisher's exact test. Asterisks over columns denote comparisons with the unvaccinated control group. Numbers over columns denote numbers of protected mice vs total numbers of mice. **I-J.** Generation of OVA-specific memory T cells in suboptimally vaccinated mice. Mice received 50,000 naïve OT-I/uGFP cells and were vaccinated with a low dose of 0.5 μg Clec9A-OVA plus 5 nmol CpG B-P. Numbers of OT-I T_{RM} cells were measured in the liver 30 days later (**I**). Separate cohorts of mice were challenged with 200 HsOVA or CS5M sporozoites (**J**), and rates of sterile protection were determined. Data were pooled from two independent experiments and compared using Fisher's exact test.

Supplementary figures

Figure S1. Related to figure 1. CD8^{+} T cell depletion removes protection conferred by repeated RAS vaccination. Mice vaccinated thrice with 10,000 RAS, one week apart, were treated with anti-CD8 antibodies on day 27 after the third RAS immunisation and were

challenged with 200 live *P. berghei* sporozoites on day 30. (**A**) Rates of sterile protection.

Numbers above columns denote numbers of protected mice / total numbers of mice per group.

(**B**) Parasitemia at day 7 post-challenge. (**C**) Mice were bled on day 29 after the third RAS

vaccination (i.e. 2 days after αCD8 treatment) and percentages of $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cells

(showed as numbers above the $CD8^+$ T cell gate) were measured in the blood using flow

cytometry to verify $CD8^+$ T cell depletion. An example of $CD8^+$ T cell percentages in an

untreated (top) and a treated (bottom) mouse are shown. One experiment was performed.

Comparisons of sterile protection rates were done using Fisher's exact tests. Parasitemia data

were log-transformed and compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple

comparisons tests. (**D-H**) Related to figure 1C, D. Distribution of memory T cell populations

in the liver (**D, F**) and the spleen (**E, G**) in mice treated with αCXCR3 or isotype control mAb.

D and **E** show total memory $CD8^+$ T cells, whereas **F** and **G** show $PbTRAP_{130-138}$ tetramer-

specific memory $CD8^+$ T cells. Cell numbers were log-transformed and compared using

unpaired t-tests. Dark purple, pale purple and grey stats over the columns denote comparisons

of T_{RM}, T_{EM} and T_{CM} numbers respectively. (**H**) Representative gating strategy of liver cells,

including lymphocytes, single cells, live $CD8^+$ T cells ($CD8^+$ Propidium Iodide $[PI]^-$), memory

T cells ($CD44^{high}$), TRAP-tetramer$^+$ cells (gated from memory T cells) and total (middle row)

or TRAP-specific (bottom row) memory T cell subsets T_{CM} $CD62L^+$ $CD69^-$, T_{EM} $CD62L^-$

$CD69^-$ and T_{RM} $CD62L^-$ $CD69^+$. Panels titled "Isotype" and "αCXCR3" show total (middle

row) or TRAP-specific (bottom row) memory T cells in the livers of a representative, isotype-

treated and αCXCR3-treated mouse respectively. Numbers beside gates represent percentages

over total cells in the plot.

Figure S2. Related to figure 2. Abundance of liver CD8 T_{RM} cells specific for known

***Plasmodium* antigens in mice vaccinated multiple times with WT RAS. A.** Expression of

TRAP, RPL6 and RPA1 proteins in salivary gland sporozoites (sgSpz), injected sporozoites

(bbSpz), exo-erythrocytic forms (EEF), merozoite and ring forms of *P. berghei*, as per the

Malaria Cell Atlas [30]. **B.** Related to Figure 2A-C. Detailed distribution of memory CD8^{+} T

cells of known (tetramer-positive, as indicated) or unknown (tetramer-negative) specificities

in the spleen and the liver. Data were compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple

comparisons test. The statistical analysis performed on liver data (dark asterisks) compared

numbers of T_{RM} cells, and that in spleen data (pale asterisks) compared numbers of T_{EM} cells.

Figure S3. Related to figure 2E-H. Detailed distribution of memory CD8^{+} T cells of known

specificities in the spleen in mice vaccinated with 1x CS5M RAS or 3x CS5M RAS. Data

were compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test. The statistical

analysis performed on liver data (dark asterisks) compared numbers of T_{RM} cells.

Figure S4. Related to figure 4. Tolerisation of TRAP-specific CD8^{+} T cells in RAS

vaccinated mice. A. Related to figure 4B-D. Representative flow cytometry charts showing

depletion efficacy of TRAP specific cells. **B.** Related to figure 4C. Comparison of the

parasitemias of those mice that were not sterilely protected.

Figure S5. **Related to figure 5. Distribution of TCR transgenic and endogenous T cells in**

RAS vaccinated mice. A. Related to figure 5D-G. Distribution of PbT-I and endogenous,

TRAP-, RPL6- and RPA1-specific memory T cells in the spleen and the liver as indicated.

Numbers of T_{EM} cells were statistically compared in the spleen (pale green or purple asterisks),

and numbers of T_{RM} cells were compared in the liver (dark asterisks). PbT-I and TRAP specific

cell data were pooled from two independent experiments, and RPL6 and F4 cell data come

from one experiment. Data were log-transformed and compared using one-way ANOVA and

Tukey's multiple comparisons test. **B.** Memory PbT-I cells in the liver on day 30 after transfer

of 50,000 naïve PbT-I cells into mice that had been vaccinated with 10,000 RAS 6 days earlier

(RAS + PbT-I), or one day later (PbT-I+RAS). Data were pooled from two independent

experiments. **C.** Number of PbT-I cells, TRAP- and RPL6-specific CD8$^+$ T cells in the blood

on day 7 after the last RAS vaccination. Data come from one experiment and were log-

transformed and compared using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test. **D-**

F. Related to figure 5H, I. **D.** Expression of Hsp70 across different life stages of the parasite,

as per the Malaria Cell Atlas [30]. sgSpz, salivary gland sporozoites; bbSp, injected

sporozoites; EEF, exo-erythrocytic forms. **E.** OT-I and PbT-I cell expansion after HsOVA

HKS injection. Mice received 5x10^5 naïve CellTrace Violet-coated OT-I and PbT-I cells one

day before injection of 5.2-8x10^4 HsOVA HKS, and numbers of divided OT-I and PbT-I cells

were quantified in the spleen 4 days later. Data were pooled from two independent experiments,

log-transformed and analysed using unpaired Student's T-tests. **F.** Distribution of memory T

cells of the indicated specificities in the liver and the spleen. Data were pooled from two

independent experiments, log-transformed and analysed using two-way ANOVA and Tukey's

multiple comparisons test.

1007

Figure S6. Related to figure 5. Distribution of TCR transgenic and endogenous T cells in

CS5M RAS vaccinated mice. A. Expression of CSP across different life stages of the parasite,

as per the Malaria Cell Atlas [30]. **B.** OT-I and PbT-I cell expansion after CS5M HKS injection.

Mice received 5x10^5 naïve CellTrace Violet-coated OT-I and PbT-I cells one day before

injection of 4.2-4.5x10^4 CS5M HKS, and numbers of divided OT-I and PbT-I cells were

quantified in the spleen 6 days later. Data were pooled from two independent experiments, log-

transformed and analysed using unpaired Student's T tests. **C-D.** Related to figure 5I, J.

Distribution of OVA-specific endogenous memory T cells (**C**) and other specificities as

indicated (**D**) in the liver and the spleen. Data were pooled from two independent experiments,

log-transformed and analysed using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparisons test.

The statistical analysis performed on liver data compared numbers of T_{RM} cells

1019

Figure S7. Related to figure 5. Distribution of TCR transgenic and endogenous T cells in

mice vaccinated with WT and CS5M RAS. Memory CD8$^+$ T cells were enumerated in the

liver and the spleen of mice vaccinated with 2 doses of 5x10^3 and 10x10^3 RAS 4 days apart,

then transferred with 50x10^3 naïve OT-I cells and given a final dose of 5.1x10^3 CS5M RAS 8

days later, or control mice receiving OT-I cells and one dose of 5.1x10^3 CS5M RAS. Mice

were euthanised on day 62 after the last sporozoite injection. Data were generated in one

experiment, log-transformed and analysed using one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple

comparisons test. The statistical analysis performed on liver data compared numbers of T_{RM}

cells.

1029

Figure S8. Related to figure 5K, L. Distribution of TCR transgenic and endogenous

memory T cells in RAS-vaccinated mice that were efficiently or suboptimally tolerised

for PbTRAP$_{130-138}$. A. Memory PbT-I cells in the spleen. **B.** TRAP-specific memory CD8$^+$ T

cells in the spleen. **C-D**. Numbers of TRAP-specific (**C**) and PbT-I (**D**) memory cells in the

liver as in figure 5K, L, but mice in the 3xRAS group in which TRAP tolerisation worked

efficiently (effT) or suboptimally (subT) were separated into different columns. **E.** Endogenous

memory CD8$^+$ T cells of undefined specificities (non-TRAP) in the liver. **F.** Endogenous

memory CD8$^+$ T cells of undefined specificities (non-TRAP) in the spleen.

1038

1039 **References**

1040

1.   Geneva: World Health Organization W. World malaria report 2023. Licence: CC BY-
NC-SA 3.0 IGO2023.

2.   Bloom DE. The Value of Vaccination. Springer New York; 2011. p. 1-8.

3.   Nussenzweig RS, Vanderberg J, Most H, Orton C. Protective Immunity produced by
the Injection of X-irradiated Sporozoites of Plasmodium berghei. Nature. 1967;216(5111):160-
2. doi: 10.1038/216160a0.

4.   Gwadz RW, Cochrane AH, Nussenzweig V, Nussenzweig RS. Preliminary studies on
vaccination of rhesus monkeys with irradiated sporozoites of Plasmodium knowlesi and
characterization of surface antigens of these parasites. Bull World Health Organ. 1979;57
Suppl   1(Suppl):165-73.   PubMed   PMID: 120766;   PubMed   Central   PMCID:
PMCPMC2395714.

5.   Clyde DF, Most H, McCarthy VC, Vanderberg JP. Immunization of man against
sporozite-induced   falciparum   malaria.   Am   J   Med   Sci.   1973;266(3):169-77.   doi:
10.1097/00000441-197309000-00002. PubMed PMID: 4583408.

6.   Mellouk S, Lunel F, Sedegah M, Beaudoin RL, Druilhe P. Protection against malaria
induced   by   irradiated   sporozoites.   Lancet.   1990;335(8691):721.   doi: 10.1016/0140-
6736(90)90832-p. PubMed PMID: 1969073.

7.   Scheller LF, Stump KC, Azad AF. Plasmodium berghei: production and quantitation
of hepatic stages derived from irradiated sporozoites in rats and mice. J Parasitol.
1995;81(1):58-62. PubMed PMID: 7876979.

8.   Silvie O, Semblat JP, Franetich JF, Hannoun L, Eling W, Mazier D. Effects of
irradiation on Plasmodium falciparum sporozoite hepatic development: implications for the

design of pre-erythrocytic malaria vaccines. Parasite Immunol. 2002;24(4):221-3. Epub 2002/05/16. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-3024.2002.00450.x. PubMed PMID: 12010486.

9.   Seder RA, Chang LJ, Enama ME, Zephir KL, Sarwar UN, Gordon IJ, et al. Protection against malaria by intravenous immunization with a nonreplicating sporozoite vaccine. Science. 2013;341(6152):1359-65. Epub 2013/08/10. doi: 10.1126/science.1241800. PubMed PMID: 23929949.

10.   Schofield L, Villaquiran J, Ferreira A, Schellekens H, Nussenzweig R, Nussenzweig V. γ Interferon, CD8+ T cells and antibodies required for immunity to malaria sporozoites. Nature. 1987;330(6149):664-6. doi: 10.1038/330664a0.

11.   Oliveira GA, Kumar KA, Calvo-Calle JM, Othoro C, Altszuler D, Nussenzweig V, et al. Class II-restricted protective immunity induced by malaria sporozoites. Infect Immun. 2008;76(3):1200-6. Epub 2007/12/28. doi: 10.1128/IAI.00566-07. PubMed PMID: 18160479; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2258813.

12.   Schmidt NW, Butler NS, Harty JT. CD8 T cell immunity to Plasmodium permits generation of protective antibodies after repeated sporozoite challenge. Vaccine. 2009;27(44):6103-6. Epub 2009/08/29. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2009.08.025. PubMed PMID: 19712771; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2759845.

13.   Ishizuka AS, Lyke KE, DeZure A, Berry AA, Richie TL, Mendoza FH, et al. Protection against malaria at 1 year and immune correlates following PfSPZ vaccination. Nat Med. 2016;22(6):614-23. Epub 2016/05/10. doi: 10.1038/nm.4110. PubMed PMID: 27158907.

14.   Weiss WR, Sedegah M, Beaudoin RL, Miller LH, Good MF. CD8+ T cells (cytotoxic/suppressors) are required for protection in mice immunized with malaria sporozoites. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1988;85(2):573-6. Epub 1988/01/01. doi: 10.1073/pnas.85.2.573. PubMed PMID: 2963334; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC279593.

15.   Doolan DL, Hoffman SL. The complexity of protective immunity against liver-stage

malaria. J Immunol. 2000;165(3):1453-62. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.165.3.1453. PubMed

PMID: 10903750.

16.   Weiss WR, Jiang CG. Protective CD8+ T lymphocytes in primates immunized with

malaria sporozoites. PLoS One. 2012;7(2):e31247. Epub 2012/02/23. doi:

10.1371/journal.pone.0031247. PubMed PMID: 22355349; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC3280278.

17.   Guebre-Xabier M, Schwenk R, Krzych U. Memory phenotype CD8+ T cells persist in

livers of mice protected against malaria by immunization with attenuatedPlasmodium

bergheisporozoites. European Journal of Immunology. 1999;29(12):3978-86. doi:

10.1002/(sici)1521-4141(199912)29:12<3978::aid-immu3978>3.0.co;2-0.

18.   Schmidt NW, Butler NS, Badovinac VP, Harty JT. Extreme CD8 T cell requirements

for anti-malarial liver-stage immunity following immunization with radiation attenuated

sporozoites. PLoS Pathog. 2010;6(7):e1000998. Epub 2010/07/27. doi:

10.1371/journal.ppat.1000998. PubMed PMID: 20657824; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC2904779.

19.   Epstein JE, Tewari K, Lyke KE, Sim BK, Billingsley PF, Laurens MB, et al. Live

attenuated malaria vaccine designed to protect through hepatic CD8(+) T cell immunity.

Science. 2011;334(6055):475-80. Epub 2011/09/10. doi: 10.1126/science.1211548. PubMed

PMID: 21903775.

20.   Fernandez-Ruiz D, de Menezes MN, Holz LE, Ghilas S, Heath WR, Beattie L.

Harnessing liver-resident memory T cells for protection against malaria. Expert Rev Vaccines.

2021;20(2):127-41. Epub 22/01/2021. doi: 10.1080/14760584.2021.1881485. PubMed PMID:

33501877.

21.   Lefebvre MN, Surette FA, Anthony SM, Vijay R, Jensen IJ, Pewe LL, et al. Expeditious

recruitment of circulating memory CD8 T cells to the liver facilitates control of malaria. Cell

Rep. 2021;37(5):109956. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2021.109956. PubMed PMID: 34731605;

PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8628427.

22.   Fernandez-Ruiz D, Ng WY, Holz LE, Ma JZ, Zaid A, Wong YC, et al. Liver-Resident

Memory CD8(+) T Cells Form a Front-Line Defense against Malaria Liver-Stage Infection.

Immunity. 2016;45(4):889-902. Epub 2016/10/21. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2016.08.011.

PubMed PMID: 27692609.

23.   Jaffe RI, Lowell GH, Gordon DM. Differences in Susceptibility Among Mouse Strains

to Infection with Plasmodium Berghei (Anka Clone) Sporozoites and its Relationship to

Protection by Gamma-Irradiated Sporozoites. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and

Hygiene. 1990;42(4):309-13. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.1990.42.309.

24.   Schmidt NW, Butler NS, Harty JT. Plasmodium-host interactions directly influence the

threshold of memory CD8 T cells required for protective immunity. J Immunol.

2011;186(10):5873-84. Epub 2011/04/05. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1100194. PubMed PMID:

21460205; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3087867.

25.   Lyke KE, Ishizuka AS, Berry AA, Chakravarty S, DeZure A, Enama ME, et al.

Attenuated PfSPZ Vaccine induces strain-transcending T cells and durable protection against

heterologous controlled human malaria infection. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

2017;114(10):2711-6. Epub 2017/02/23. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1615324114. PubMed PMID:

28223498; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5347610.

26.   Landau I, Boulard Y. Life cycles and morphology. In: Killick-Kendrick R, Peters W,

editors. Rodent Malaria. London: Academic Press Inc.; 1978. p. 53-84.

27.   Sturm A, Amino R, van de Sand C, Regen T, Retzlaff S, Rennenberg A, et al.

Manipulation of host hepatocytes by the malaria parasite for delivery into liver sinusoids.

Science. 2006;313(5791):1287-90. Epub 2006/08/05. doi: 10.1126/science.1129720. PubMed

PMID: 16888102.

28.   Vaughan AM, Mikolajczak SA, Wilson EM, Grompe M, Kaushansky A, Camargo N,

et al. Complete Plasmodium falciparum liver-stage development in liver-chimeric mice. J Clin

Invest. 2012;122(10):3618-28. Epub 2012/09/22. doi: 10.1172/JCI62684. PubMed PMID:

22996664; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3461911.

29.   Reid AJ, Talman AM, Bennett HM, Gomes AR, Sanders MJ, Illingworth CJR, et al.

Single-cell RNA-seq reveals hidden transcriptional variation in malaria parasites. Elife.

2018;7. Epub 20180327. doi: 10.7554/eLife.33105. PubMed PMID: 29580379; PubMed

Central PMCID: PMCPMC5871331.

30.   Howick VM, Russell AJC, Andrews T, Heaton H, Reid AJ, Natarajan K, et al. The

Malaria Cell Atlas: Single parasite transcriptomes across the complete Plasmodium life cycle.

Science. 2019;365(6455). Epub 2019/08/24. doi: 10.1126/science.aaw2619. PubMed PMID:

31439762; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7056351.

31.   Valencia-Hernandez AM, Ng WY, Ghazanfari N, Ghilas S, de Menezes MN, Holz LE,

et al. A Natural Peptide Antigen within the Plasmodium Ribosomal Protein RPL6 Confers

Liver TRM Cell-Mediated Immunity against Malaria in Mice. Cell Host Microbe.

2020;27(6):950-62 e7. Epub 2020/05/13. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2020.04.010. PubMed PMID:

32396839.

32.   Amino R, Thiberge S, Martin B, Celli S, Shorte S, Frischknecht F, et al. Quantitative

imaging of Plasmodium transmission from mosquito to mammal. Nat Med. 2006;12(2):220-4.

Epub 2006/01/24. doi: 10.1038/nm1350. PubMed PMID: 16429144.

33.   Butler NS, Schmidt NW, Vaughan AM, Aly AS, Kappe SH, Harty JT. Superior

antimalarial immunity after vaccination with late liver stage-arresting genetically attenuated

parasites.   Cell   Host   Microbe.   2011;9(6):451-62.   Epub   2011/06/15.   doi:

10.1016/j.chom.2011.05.008. PubMed PMID: 21669394; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC3117254.

34.   Yewdell JW. Confronting Complexity: Real-World Immunodominance in Antiviral
CD8+ T Cell Responses. Immunity. 2006;25(4):533-43. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2006.09.005.

35.   Jenkins MK, Moon JJ. The role of naive T cell precursor frequency and recruitment in
dictating immune response magnitude. J Immunol. 2012;188(9):4135-40. Epub 2012/04/21.
doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1102661. PubMed PMID: 22517866; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC3334329.

36.   Kumar KA, Sano G, Boscardin S, Nussenzweig RS, Nussenzweig MC, Zavala F, et al.
The circumsporozoite protein is an immunodominant protective antigen in irradiated
sporozoites. Nature. 2006;444(7121):937-40. Epub 2006/12/08. doi: 10.1038/nature05361.
PubMed PMID: 17151604.

37.   Lau LS, Fernandez-Ruiz D, Mollard V, Sturm A, Neller MA, Cozijnsen A, et al. CD8+
T cells from a novel T cell receptor transgenic mouse induce liver-stage immunity that can be
boosted by blood-stage infection in rodent malaria. PLoS Pathog. 2014;10(5):e1004135. Epub
2014/05/24. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1004135. PubMed PMID: 24854165; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMCPMC4031232.

38.   Badovinac VP, Haring JS, Harty JT. Initial T cell receptor transgenic cell precursor
frequency dictates critical aspects of the CD8(+) T cell response to infection. Immunity.
2007;26(6):827-41. Epub 2007/06/09. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2007.04.013. PubMed PMID:
17555991; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1989155.

39.   Nganou-Makamdop K, van Gemert GJ, Arens T, Hermsen CC, Sauerwein RW. Long
term protection after immunization with P. berghei sporozoites correlates with sustained
IFNgamma responses of hepatic CD8+ memory T cells. PLoS One. 2012;7(5):e36508. Epub

2012/05/09. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0036508. PubMed PMID: 22563506; PubMed Central

PMCID: PMCPMC3341355.

40.   Hafalla JC, Bauza K, Friesen J, Gonzalez-Aseguinolaza G, Hill AV, Matuschewski K.

Identification of targets of CD8(+) T cell responses to malaria liver stages by genome-wide

epitope profiling. PLoS Pathog. 2013;9(5):e1003303. Epub 2013/05/16. doi:

10.1371/journal.ppat.1003303. PubMed PMID: 23675294; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC3649980.

41.   Hall N, Karras M, Raine JD, Carlton JM, Kooij TW, Berriman M, et al. A

comprehensive survey of the Plasmodium life cycle by genomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic

analyses. Science. 2005;307(5706):82-6. Epub 2005/01/08. doi: 10.1126/science.1103717.

PubMed PMID: 15637271.

42.   Lau LS, Fernandez-Ruiz D, Davey GM, de Koning-Ward TF, Papenfuss AT, Carbone

FR, et al. Blood-stage Plasmodium berghei infection generates a potent, specific CD8+ T-cell

response despite residence largely in cells lacking MHC I processing machinery. J Infect Dis.

2011;204(12):1989-96. Epub 2011/10/15. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jir656. PubMed PMID:

21998471.

43.   Cockburn IA, Tse SW, Radtke AJ, Srinivasan P, Chen YC, Sinnis P, et al. Dendritic

cells and hepatocytes use distinct pathways to process protective antigen from plasmodium in

vivo.   PLoS   Pathog.   2011;7(3):e1001318.   Epub   2011/03/30.   doi:

10.1371/journal.ppat.1001318. PubMed PMID: 21445239; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC3060173.

44.   Redmond WL, Marincek BC, Sherman LA. Distinct requirements for deletion versus

anergy during CD8 T cell peripheral tolerance in vivo. J Immunol. 2005;174(4):2046-53. doi:

10.4049/jimmunol.174.4.2046. PubMed PMID: 15699134.

45. Murphy SC, Kas A, Stone BC, Bevan MJ. A T-cell response to a liver-stage

Plasmodium antigen is not boosted by repeated sporozoite immunizations. Proc Natl Acad Sci

U S A. 2013;110(15):6055-60. Epub 2013/03/27. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1303834110. PubMed

PMID: 23530242; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3625320.

46. Hogquist KA, Jameson SC, Heath WR, Howard JL, Bevan MJ, Carbone FR. T cell

receptor antagonist peptides induce positive selection. Cell. 1994;76(1):17-27. doi:

10.1016/0092-8674(94)90169-4.

47. Miyakoda M, Kimura D, Yuda M, Chinzei Y, Shibata Y, Honma K, et al. Malaria-

specific and nonspecific activation of CD8+ T cells during blood stage of Plasmodium berghei

infection. J Immunol. 2008;181(2):1420-8. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.181.2.1420. PubMed

PMID: 18606696.

48. Rios KT, McGee JP, Sebastian A, Moritz RL, Feric M, Absalon S, et al. Global Release

of Translational Repression Across Plasmodium's Host-to-Vector Transmission Event.

bioRxiv. 2024. Epub 20240316. doi: 10.1101/2024.02.01.577866. PubMed PMID: 38352447;

PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10862809.

49. Ghilas S, Enders MH, May R, Holz LE, Fernandez-Ruiz D, Cozijnsen A, et al.

Development of Plasmodium-specific liver-resident memory CD8(+) T cells after heat-killed

sporozoite immunization in mice. Eur J Immunol. 2021;51(5):1153-65. Epub 23/01/2021. doi:

10.1002/eji.202048757. PubMed PMID: 33486759.

50. Kimura K, Kimura D, Matsushima Y, Miyakoda M, Honma K, Yuda M, et al. CD8+ T

cells specific for a malaria cytoplasmic antigen form clusters around infected hepatocytes and

are protective at the liver stage of infection. Infect Immun. 2013;81(10):3825-34. Epub

2013/07/31. doi: 10.1128/IAI.00570-13. PubMed PMID: 23897612; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC3811763.

51.   Zhou Y, Ramachandran V, Kumar KA, Westenberger S, Refour P, Zhou B, et al.

Evidence-based annotation of the malaria parasite's genome using comparative expression

profiling. PLoS One. 2008;3(2):e1570. Epub 2008/02/14. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0001570.

PubMed PMID: 18270564; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2215772.

52.   Jongo SA, Church LWP, Mtoro AT, Schindler T, Chakravarty S, Ruben AJ, et al.

Increase of Dose Associated With Decrease in Protection Against Controlled Human Malaria

Infection by PfSPZ Vaccine in Tanzanian Adults. Clin Infect Dis. 2020;71(11):2849-57. Epub

2019/11/30. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciz1152. PubMed PMID: 31782768; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC7947995.

53.   Steinert EM, Schenkel JM, Fraser KA, Beura LK, Manlove LS, Igyarto BZ, et al.

Quantifying Memory CD8 T Cells Reveals Regionalization of Immunosurveillance. Cell.

2015;161(4):737-49. Epub 2015/05/11. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2015.03.031. PubMed PMID:

25957682; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4426972.

54.   Kumar BV, Ma W, Miron M, Granot T, Guyer RS, Carpenter DJ, et al. Human Tissue-

Resident Memory T Cells Are Defined by Core Transcriptional and Functional Signatures in

Lymphoid and Mucosal Sites. Cell Rep. 2017;20(12):2921-34. Epub 2017/09/21. doi:

10.1016/j.celrep.2017.08.078. PubMed PMID: 28930685; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC5646692.

55.   Steinbach K, Vincenti I, Kreutzfeldt M, Page N, Muschaweckh A, Wagner I, et al.

Brain-resident memory T cells represent an autonomous cytotoxic barrier to viral infection. J

Exp Med. 2016;213(8):1571-87. Epub 2016/07/06. doi: 10.1084/jem.20151916. PubMed

PMID: 27377586; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4986533.

56.   Hombrink P, Helbig C, Backer RA, Piet B, Oja AE, Stark R, et al. Programs for the

persistence, vigilance and control of human CD8(+) lung-resident memory T cells. Nat

Immunol. 2016;17(12):1467-78. Epub 2016/11/01. doi: 10.1038/ni.3589. PubMed PMID:

27776108.

57.   Oja AE, Piet B, Helbig C, Stark R, van der Zwan D, Blaauwgeers H, et al. Trigger-

happy resident memory CD4(+) T cells inhabit the human lungs. Mucosal Immunol.

2018;11(3):654-67. Epub 2017/11/16. doi: 10.1038/mi.2017.94. PubMed PMID: 29139478.

58.   Schenkel JM, Fraser KA, Beura LK, Pauken KE, Vezys V, Masopust D. T cell memory.

Resident memory CD8 T cells trigger protective innate and adaptive immune responses.

Science. 2014;346(6205):98-101. Epub 2014/08/30. doi: 10.1126/science.1254536. PubMed

PMID: 25170049; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4449618.

59.   Wu T, Hu Y, Lee YT, Bouchard KR, Benechet A, Khanna K, et al. Lung-resident

memory CD8 T cells (TRM) are indispensable for optimal cross-protection against pulmonary

virus   infection.   J   Leukoc   Biol.   2014;95(2):215-24.   Epub   2013/09/06.   doi:

10.1189/jlb.0313180.   PubMed   PMID: 24006506;   PubMed   Central   PMCID:

PMCPMC3896663.

60.   Shin H, Iwasaki A. A vaccine strategy that protects against genital herpes by

establishing local memory T cells. Nature. 2012;491(7424):463-7. Epub 2012/10/19. doi:

10.1038/nature11522.   PubMed   PMID: 23075848;   PubMed   Central   PMCID:

PMCPMC3499630.

61.   Teijaro JR, Turner D, Pham Q, Wherry EJ, Lefrancois L, Farber DL. Cutting edge:

Tissue-retentive lung memory CD4 T cells mediate optimal protection to respiratory virus

infection.   J   Immunol.   2011;187(11):5510-4.   Epub   2011/11/08.   doi:

10.4049/jimmunol.1102243.   PubMed   PMID: 22058417;   PubMed   Central   PMCID:

PMCPMC3221837.

62.   Gebhardt T, Wakim LM, Eidsmo L, Reading PC, Heath WR, Carbone FR. Memory T

cells in nonlymphoid tissue that provide enhanced local immunity during infection with herpes

1283 simplex virus. Nat Immunol. 2009;10(5):524-30. Epub 2009/03/24. doi: 10.1038/ni.1718.

1284 PubMed PMID: 19305395.

1285 63. Ganley M, Holz LE, Minnell JJ, de Menezes MN, Burn OK, Poa KCY, et al. mRNA

1286 vaccine against malaria tailored for liver-resident memory T cells. Nat Immunol.

1287 2023;24(9):1487-98. Epub 20230720. doi: 10.1038/s41590-023-01562-6. PubMed PMID:

1288 37474653.

1289 64. Holz LE, Chua YC, de Menezes MN, Anderson RJ, Draper SL, Compton BJ, et al.

1290 Glycolipid-peptide vaccination induces liver-resident memory CD8(+) T cells that protect

1291 against rodent malaria. Sci Immunol. 2020;5(48):eaaz8035. Epub 2020/06/28. doi:

1292 10.1126/sciimmunol.aaz8035. PubMed PMID: 32591409.

1293 65. Park SL, Zaid A, Hor JL, Christo SN, Prier JE, Davies B, et al. Local proliferation

1294 maintains a stable pool of tissue-resident memory T cells after antiviral recall responses. Nat

1295 Immunol. 2018;19(2):183-91. Epub 2018/01/10. doi: 10.1038/s41590-017-0027-5. PubMed

1296 PMID: 29311695.

1297 66. Beura LK, Wijeyesinghe S, Thompson EA, Macchietto MG, Rosato PC, Pierson MJ,

1298 et al. T Cells in Nonlymphoid Tissues Give Rise to Lymph-Node-Resident Memory T Cells.

1299 Immunity. 2018;48(2):327-38 e5. Epub 2018/02/22. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2018.01.015.

1300 PubMed PMID: 29466758; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5828517.

1301 67. Slutter B, Van Braeckel-Budimir N, Abboud G, Varga SM, Salek-Ardakani S, Harty

1302 JT. Dynamics of influenza-induced lung-resident memory T cells underlie waning

1303 heterosubtypic immunity. Sci Immunol. 2017;2(7). Epub 2017/08/08. doi:

1304 10.1126/sciimmunol.aag2031. PubMed PMID: 28783666; PubMed Central PMCID:

1305 PMCPMC5590757.

1306 68. Van Braeckel-Budimir N, Varga SM, Badovinac VP, Harty JT. Repeated Antigen

1307 Exposure Extends the Durability of Influenza-Specific Lung-Resident Memory CD8(+) T

Cells and Heterosubtypic Immunity. Cell Rep. 2018;24(13):3374-82 e3. Epub 2018/09/27. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2018.08.073. PubMed PMID: 30257199; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6258017.

69.   Wirth TC, Xue H-H, Rai D, Sabel JT, Bair T, Harty JT, et al. Repetitive Antigen Stimulation Induces Stepwise Transcriptome Diversification but Preserves a Core Signature of Memory CD8+ T Cell Differentiation. Immunity. 2010;33(1):128-40. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2010.06.014.

70.   Tarun AS, Peng X, Dumpit RF, Ogata Y, Silva-Rivera H, Camargo N, et al. A combined transcriptome and proteome survey of malaria parasite liver stages. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2008;105(1):305-10. Epub 2008/01/04. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0710780104. PubMed PMID: 18172196; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2224207.

71.   Weiss WR, Mellouk S, Houghten RA, Sedegah M, Kumar S, Good MF, et al. Cytotoxic T cells recognize a peptide from the circumsporozoite protein on malaria-infected hepatocytes. The Journal of experimental medicine. 1990;171(3):763-73. doi: 10.1084/jem.171.3.763.

72.   Rogers WO, Malik A, Mellouk S, Nakamura K, Rogers MD, Szarfman A, et al. Characterization of Plasmodium falciparum sporozoite surface protein 2. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 1992;89(19):9176-80. doi: 10.1073/pnas.89.19.9176.

73.   Van Braeckel-Budimir N, Gras S, Ladell K, Josephs TM, Pewe L, Urban SL, et al. A T Cell Receptor Locus Harbors a Malaria-Specific Immune Response Gene. Immunity. 2017;47(5):835-47 e4. Epub 2017/11/19. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2017.10.013. PubMed PMID: 29150238; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5724374.

74.   Chakravarty S, Cockburn IA, Kuk S, Overstreet MG, Sacci JB, Zavala F. CD8+ T lymphocytes protective against malaria liver stages are primed in skin-draining lymph nodes. Nat Med. 2007;13(9):1035-41. Epub 2007/08/21. doi: 10.1038/nm1628. PubMed PMID: 17704784.

75.   Wen-yue X, Xing-xiang W, Jie Q, Jian-hua D, Fu-sheng H. Plasmodium yoelii:

influence of immune modulators on the development of the liver stage. Exp Parasitol.

2010;126(2):254-8. Epub 20100521. doi: 10.1016/j.exppara.2010.05.005. PubMed PMID:

20493849.

76.   Coppi A, Pinzon-Ortiz C, Hutter C, Sinnis P. The Plasmodium circumsporozoite

protein is proteolytically processed during cell invasion. J Exp Med. 2005;201(1):27-33. doi:

10.1084/jem.20040989.   PubMed   PMID: 15630135;   PubMed   Central   PMCID:

PMCPMC1995445.

77.   Silvie O, Franetich J-F, Charrin S, Mueller MS, Siau A, Bodescot M, et al. A Role for

Apical Membrane Antigen 1 during Invasion of Hepatocytes by Plasmodium falciparum

Sporozoites.   Journal   of   Biological   Chemistry.   2004;279(10):9490-6.   doi:

10.1074/jbc.m311331200.

78.   Kaushansky A, Metzger PG, Douglass AN, Mikolajczak SA, Lakshmanan V, Kain HS,

et al. Malaria parasite liver stages render host hepatocytes susceptible to mitochondria-initiated

apoptosis. Cell Death & Disease. 2013;4(8):e762-e. doi: 10.1038/cddis.2013.286.

79.   Kaech SM, Ahmed R. Memory CD8+ T cell differentiation: initial antigen encounter

triggers a developmental program in naive cells. Nat Immunol. 2001;2(5):415-22. doi:

10.1038/87720. PubMed PMID: 11323695; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3760150.

80.   Mitchell DM, Ravkov EV, Williams MA. Distinct Roles for IL-2 and IL-15 in the

Differentiation and Survival of CD8+ Effector and Memory T Cells. The Journal of

Immunology. 2010;184(12):6719-30. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.0904089.

81.   Hafalla JC, Sano G, Carvalho LH, Morrot A, Zavala F. Short-term antigen presentation

and single clonal burst limit the magnitude of the CD8(+) T cell responses to malaria liver

stages. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2002;99(18):11819-24. Epub 2002/08/20. doi:

10.1073/pnas.182189999. PubMed PMID: 12185251; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC129352.

82.   Hafalla JC, Morrot A, Sano G, Milon G, Lafaille JJ, Zavala F. Early self-regulatory

mechanisms control the magnitude of CD8+ T cell responses against liver stages of murine

malaria. J Immunol. 2003;171(2):964-70. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.171.2.964. PubMed PMID:

12847268.

83.   Romero P, Maryanski JL, Corradin G, Nussenzweig RS, Nussenzweig V, Zavala F.

Cloned cytotoxic T cells recognize an epitope in the circumsporozoite protein and protect

against malaria. Nature. 1989;341(6240):323-6. doi: 10.1038/341323a0.

84.   Gruner AC, Mauduit M, Tewari R, Romero JF, Depinay N, Kayibanda M, et al. Sterile

protection against malaria is independent of immune responses to the circumsporozoite protein.

PLoS One. 2007;2(12):e1371. Epub 2007/12/27. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0001371. PubMed

PMID: 18159254; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2147056.

85.   Muller K, Gibbins MP, Roberts M, Reyes-Sandoval A, Hill AVS, Draper SJ, et al. Low

immunogenicity of malaria pre-erythrocytic stages can be overcome by vaccination. EMBO

Mol Med. 2021;13(4):e13390. Epub 2021/03/13. doi: 10.15252/emmm.202013390. PubMed

PMID: 33709544; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8033512.

86.   Doll KL, Pewe LL, Kurup SP, Harty JT. Discriminating Protective from Nonprotective

Plasmodium-Specific CD8+ T Cell Responses. J Immunol. 2016;196(10):4253-62. Epub

2016/04/17. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1600155. PubMed PMID: 27084099; PubMed Central

PMCID: PMCPMC4868661.

87.   Rai D, Martin MD, Badovinac VP. The Longevity of Memory CD8 T Cell Responses

after Repetitive Antigen Stimulations. The Journal of Immunology. 2014;192(12):5652-9. doi:

10.4049/jimmunol.1301063.

88.   Kidgell C, Volkman SK, Daily J, Borevitz JO, Plouffe D, Zhou Y, et al. A Systematic

Map of Genetic Variation in Plasmodium falciparum. PLoS Pathogens. 2006;2(6):e57. doi:

10.1371/journal.ppat.0020057.

89.   Gandhi K, Thera MA, Coulibaly D, Traoré K, Guindo AB, Ouattara A, et al. Variation

in the Circumsporozoite Protein of Plasmodium falciparum: Vaccine Development

Implications. PLoS ONE. 2014;9(7):e101783. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0101783.

90.   Naung MT, Martin E, Munro J, Mehra S, Guy AJ, Laman M, et al. Global diversity and

balancing selection of 23 leading Plasmodium falciparum candidate vaccine antigens. PLOS

Computational Biology. 2022;18(2):e1009801. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009801.

91.   Okabe M, Ikawa M, Kominami K, Nakanishi T, Nishimune Y. 'Green mice' as a source

of ubiquitous green cells. FEBS Letters. 1997;407(3):313-9. doi: 10.1016/s0014-

5793(97)00313-x.

92.   Benedict MQ. Care and maintenance of anopheline mosquito colonies. In: Crampton

JM, Beard CB, Louis C, editors. The Molecular Biology of Insect Disease Vectors: A Methods

Manual. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 1997. p. 3-12.

93.   Smith CM, Belz GT, Wilson NS, Villadangos JA, Shortman K, Carbone FR, et al.

Cutting edge: conventional CD8 alpha+ dendritic cells are preferentially involved in CTL

priming after footpad infection with herpes simplex virus-1. J Immunol. 2003;170(9):4437-40.

Epub 2003/04/23. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.170.9.4437. PubMed PMID: 12707318.

94.   Lahoud MH, Ahmet F, Kitsoulis S, Wan SS, Vremec D, Lee CN, et al. Targeting

antigen to mouse dendritic cells via Clec9A induces potent CD4 T cell responses biased toward

a follicular helper phenotype. J Immunol. 2011;187(2):842-50. Epub 2011/06/17. doi:

10.4049/jimmunol.1101176. PubMed PMID: 21677141.

95.   Li J, Panetta F, O'Keeffe M, Leal Rojas IM, Radford KJ, Zhang J-G, et al. Elucidating

the Motif for CpG Oligonucleotide Binding to the Dendritic Cell Receptor DEC-205 Leads to

Improved Adjuvants for Liver-Resident Memory. The Journal of Immunology.

2021:ji2001153. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.2001153.

1408

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6