Immunization of mice with chimeric antigens displaying selected epitopes confers protection against intestinal colonization and renal damage caused by Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (STEC).

David A. Montero[1,2], Felipe Del Canto[1], Juan C. Salazar[1], Sandra Cespedes[1], Leandro Cádiz[1], Mauricio Arenas-Salinas[3], José Reyes[4], Ángel Oñate[4], Roberto M. Vidal [1,5] *

1. Programa de Microbiología y Micología, Instituto de Ciencias Biomédicas, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile
2. Programa Disciplinario de Inmunología, Instituto de Ciencias Biomédicas, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile
3. Centro de Bioinformática y Simulación Molecular, Facultad de Ingeniería, Universidad de Talca, Talca, Chile
4. Departamento de Microbiología, Facultad de Ciencias Biológicas, Universidad de Concepción, Concepción, Chile
5. Instituto Milenio de Inmunología e Inmunoterapia, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile

* Corresponding author. Correspondence should be addressed to R.V. (email: rvidal@uchile.cl)

Keywords: Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli*, STEC, chimeric antigen-based vaccine, Hemolytic uremic syndrome.

Abstract

Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (STEC) cause diarrhea and dysentery, which may progress to hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS). Vaccination has been proposed as a preventive approach against STEC infection; however, there is no vaccine for humans and those used in animals reduce but do not eliminate the intestinal colonization of STEC. The OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins are widely distributed among clinical STEC strains and are recognized by serum IgG and IgA in patients with HUS. Here, we develop a STEC vaccine candidate based on two chimeric antigens containing epitopes of OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins. Intramuscular and intranasal immunization of mice with these chimeric antigens elicited systemic and local long-lasting humoral responses. However, the class of antibodies generated was dependent on the adjuvant and the route of administration. Moreover, while intramuscular immunization with the combination of the chimeric antigens conferred protection against colonization by STEC O157:H7, the intranasal conferred protection against renal damage caused by STEC O91:H21. This study strongly supports the potential use of this vaccine candidate as a preventive strategy against STEC infections.

Introduction

Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (STEC) are a group of food-borne pathogens causing acute and bloody diarrhea, which may progress to life-threatening complications such as hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS).[1] To date there is no specific treatment for STEC infection and antibiotic use is contraindicated due to increased risk of HUS development.[2] While STEC O157:H7 is the serotype most frequently associated with diarrhea outbreaks and HUS cases worldwide, there are other serotypes, the incidence and impact of which on public health and the food industry have increased.[3,4]

STEC colonizes the human colon and produces Shiga toxins (Stx) that can enter the blood stream and disseminate to organs such as the kidneys and central nervous system. Once Stx reach the target organs and enter the cells, the toxins inhibit protein synthesis, leading to autophagy and apoptosis and ultimately tissue damage, which may lead to HUS.[5]

To colonize the human colon, STEC requires several virulence factors like those encoded in the locus of enterocyte effacement (LEE) pathogenicity island (PAI). LEE-mediated adherence causes the formation of the "attaching and effacing" lesion and loss of microvilli of the intestinal epithelial cells.[6] In addition, STEC strains lacking LEE (LEE-negative STEC) harbor other PAIs like the Locus of Adhesion and Autoaggregation (LAA), which encodes virulence factors involved in intestinal colonization.[7,8] In fact, the presence of two or more PAIs in single isolates of clinically relevant STEC serotypes is common, suggesting that the cumulative acquisition of mobile genetic elements encoding virulence factors may contribute additively or synergistically to pathogenicity.[8,9]

Vaccination of the infant population, which is the highest-risk group for STEC infections, and animal reservoirs have been proposed as a preventive approach that could reduce their incidence and prevalence. However, there is no approved STEC vaccine for humans, and commercial vaccines used in cattle reduce but do not eliminate colonization and shedding of these bacteria.[10] Therefore, the development of an effective STEC vaccine is still underway. STEC proteins involved in attachment to host tissues are eligible targets for vaccine development, as they determine initial steps during infection; however, the selection of antigens that may provide a broadly and protective immune response among their diverse adhesion and colonization mechanisms is a pivotal point to consider.[11] An additional difficulty for the development of an effective STEC vaccine has been the lack of an animal model of infection that can reproduce the pathologies caused in humans.[12] Despite these limitations, several STEC vaccine candidates have been evaluated in laboratory animals (mice, rats and rabbits) and in cattle, with promising

results. They include Stx subunit-based vaccines,[13–15] protein and peptide-based

vaccines,[15–19] attenuated bacteria-based vaccines,[20] bacterial ghost-based vaccines,[21]

DNA-based vaccines,[22,23] and more recently nanoparticle-based vaccines.[24] While most

of these vaccine candidates are based on LEE-encoded antigens and Stx subunits, there

are several antigens encoded outside LEE that are expressed *in vivo* during human

infection that could be suitable targets for vaccine development.[11,25]

For instance, Outer membrane protease T (OmpT) and Calcium binding antigen 43

homologue (Cah) proteins have been shown to be recognized by IgG and IgA antibodies

present in sera from patients who develop HUS (hereinafter referred to as HUS sera).

Notably, the *ompT* gene has been identified in almost all clinical STEC strains and, in

the case of the *cah* gene, its detection frequency is higher than 70%.[11] Another promising

antigen is the Hemagglutinin from STEC (Hes), which is recognized by IgG present in

HUS sera.[11] In addition, the *hes* gene, which is carried by the LAA PAI, is identified in

about 40% and 46% of LEE-negative STEC strains isolated from humans and cattle,

respectively.[7,8,26] Thus, these three antigens are widespread among clinical STEC

strains, but it is also important to note that they are mostly absent in commensal *E. coli*

strains,[7,8,11] which could diminish the probability of cross-reactivity with commensal

microbiota. Nevertheless, the production and purification of outer membrane proteins

(OMPs) such as OmpT, Cah and Hes poses a challenge due to their partially

hydrophobic surfaces, flexibility and lack of stability that affect their solubility and efficient

purification. In addition, strong detergents are used in the purification of this class of

proteins and therefore the loss of conformational epitopes may impair their antigenicity

and efficiency as immunogens.[27]

To circumvent these issues and to develop a novel STEC vaccine targeting the OmpT,

Cah and Hes proteins, we implemented a vaccine development approach based on the

identification of linear B-cell epitopes for the design of chimeric antigens that include

them. Here we demonstrate that the immunization of mice with chimeric antigens

displaying selected epitopes of OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins induces immune responses

that reduce intestinal colonization and prevent renal damage caused by STEC. Overall,

this study revealed the feasibility of using such vaccines against STEC and other

pathogens. We anticipate that our comprehensive experimental approach will contribute

to the development and evaluation of future chimeric antigen-based vaccines.

Results

The OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins have several linear B-cell epitopes that are recognized by IgG and IgA from HUS sera but not from control sera.

An overview of our vaccine development approach is shown in Figure 1. We carried out a high-throughput screening of linear B-cell epitopes in the OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins by using a peptide microarray assay (see Methods). A total of 6, 6 and 5 epitope-like spot patterns were identified in the peptide slides of OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins (**Fig. 2a-2c**), respectively. As a complementary approach, we used a number of immunoinformatics tools and found that 13 out of 17 of the experimentally identified B-cell epitopes were predicted *in silico* by one or more algorithms (**Table 1**). This result highlights the advances in the accuracy of these bioinformatics tools. On the other hand, it is known that MHC class II (MHC-II) epitopes included in peptide vaccines enhance T-cell-dependent antibody responses [28]. Thus, we also performed an *in silico* analysis for the prediction of MHC-II binding peptides and found two putative T-cell epitopes in the OmpT and Cah proteins (**Table 2**).

Because the peptide microarray assay was performed with a mix of three HUS sera, we sought to confirm the reactivity of these epitopes using a larger number of sera. We also tested the reactivity of the epitopes against three sera obtained from children with no medical record of STEC-related disease (hereinafter referred to as control sera). For this, short peptides ranging from 15 to 24 amino acids (aa) which include each epitope were chemically synthesized, and their reactivity to IgG and IgA was assessed by ELISA. In general, the peptides were recognized at higher levels by IgG than by IgA from HUS sera (**Fig. 2d-i**). Furthermore, the peptides derived from the same antigen were recognized by similar levels of IgG or IgA, with the exception of Cah_5 and Hes_5, which showed a higher level of reactivity to IgG compared to Cah_4 and Hes_4, respectively (**Fig. 2f and 2h**). The frequency of reactivity of the peptides to IgG ranged from 60% (Hes_4) to 100% (Cah_5, Cah_6 and Hes_5), while for IgA it was between 29% (Cah_2) and 100% (Hes_5) (**Table 1**). As expected, a polyclonal antibody response was observed within individuals, evidenced by the variable concentration of IgG and IgA antibodies that recognize each tested peptide (**Fig. 2j-k**). Importantly, none of the peptides was recognized by IgG or IgA from control sera (**Table 1, Fig. 2j-k**). Taken together, these results indicate that the identified linear B-cell epitopes are broadly recognized and immunodominant during immune responses against STEC.

Chimeric proteins displaying linear B-cell epitopes of OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins are recognized by IgG and IgA from HUS sera but not from control sera.

We consider that the best epitopes for vaccine development are those that are conserved, broadly distributed among clinical isolates, with higher levels of reactivity and surface exposition in the native antigen. Consequently, the Hes_4 (lower reactivity and detection frequency) and OmpT_5 (limited surface exposition) epitopes were discarded and not used in further assays. For the *in silico* design of proteins we implemented two different approaches. Firstly, we noticed that the linear B-cell epitopes of OmpT and Hes are overlapped or consecutively arranged along the protein (**Fig. 2a and 2c**), suggesting that they form antigenic domains (AD). We took advantage of this and designed a chimeric protein containing these AD through the fusion of 135 AA and 127 AA from OmpT and Hes proteins, respectively (**Fig. 3a**). We named this protein Chimera 1 (Chi1; 262 AA and 29 kDa), which includes a total of eight B-cell epitopes (OmpT_1, OmpT_2, OmpT_3, OmpT_4, Hes_1, Hes_2, Hes_3 and Hes_5) and two predicted T-cell epitopes (**Table 2**). In the second approach, we used the passenger domain of Cah (αCah) as a carrier (keeping its epitopes) and incorporated several B-cell epitopes of OmpT and Hes (**Table 2, Fig. 3d**). Thus, this second protein named Chimera 2 (Chi2; 559 AA and 56 kDa) includes a total of eleven B-cell epitopes (OmpT_1, OmpT_6, Hes_1, Hes_2 and Hes_5, Cah_1, Cah_2, Cah_3, Cah_4, Cah_5, Cah_6) and two predicted T-cell epitopes (**Table 2**).

We predicted the 3D structures for both chimeric proteins, which were refined and validated (see Methods) (**Fig. 3a and 3d**). A Ramachandran plot analysis revealed that 94.6% and 86.6% of amino acid residues from the Chi1 and Chi2 modeled structures were in favored regions, respectively (**Fig. 3b and 3e**). In addition, the Z-score of the Chi1 and Chi2 modeled structures were -2.52 and -7.01 respectively, which are within the range of scores found for native proteins of similar size (**Fig. 3c and 3f**). The predicted solubility, *in vivo* half-life and instability index of both chimeric proteins suggested that their expression and purification could be feasible (**Table 2**). Consistent with the above, the production of these recombinant proteins in *E. coli* showed that they are stable, water-soluble and have the predicted molecular weight (**Fig. 3g**). Further, we confirm that both the Chi1 and Chi2 proteins are recognized by IgG and IgA of HUS sera (**Fig. 3h and 3i**). We also found that the reactivity of Chi2 to IgG of HUS sera was significantly higher than αCah (**Fig. 3h**), indicating that the incorporation of B-cell epitopes of OmpT and Hes increased the seroreactivity. However, this difference was

not observed in the reactivity to IgA of HUS sera (**Fig. 3i**). Importantly, none of the

proteins was seroreactive to IgG and IgA of control sera (not shown).

Chi1 and Chi2 antigens, administered alone or in combination, trigger long-lasting

systemic and local humoral responses in mice.

Having established that the Chi1 and Chi2 proteins are seroreactive to HUS sera, we

sought to evaluate them as immunogens. For this, BALB/c mice were immunized

following the scheme described in Figure 1d. Immunity achieved by vaccination is

influenced to a large extent by the administration route and the type of adjuvant[29–31].

Therefore, we also compared systemic and local immune responses triggered by the

chimeric antigens when administered with Imject Alum or Sigma adjuvants by

intramuscular or intranasal route, respectively.

The measurement of Chi1 and Chi2-specific IgG antibodies in serum showed that mice

immunized with Chi2 or Chi1 plus Chi2 by either intramuscular or intranasal route elicited

significantly higher levels of IgG on days 28 and 42 than the PBS control group (**Fig. 4a**).

In general, intramuscular immunization induced higher levels of specific IgG antibodies

than the intranasal route, this difference being significant in mice immunized with Chi1

plus Chi2. Similarly, specific IgA antibodies in serum were significantly higher in mice

immunized with Chi2 or Chi1 plus Chi2 by both administration routes on days 14, 28 and

42 than in the PBS control group (**Fig. 4b**). It was also observed that intramuscular

immunization with Chi1 plus Chi2 induced higher levels of specific IgA antibodies than

the intranasal route, this difference being significant on day 42. In contrast, there were

no differences on the levels of specific IgG and IgA antibodies in serum between mice

immunized with Chi1 and the PBS control group (**Fig. 4a-b**). Regarding specific IgM

antibodies in serum, all vaccine formulations and administration routes induced

significant higher antibody levels on days 14, 28 and 42 than the PBS control group (**Fig.**

4c).

To evaluate the induction of mucosal responses, specific secretory IgA (sIgA) antibodies

were determined in feces. Mice immunized with Chi1 and Chi1 plus Chi2 by intranasal

route elicited significantly higher levels of specific sIgA on days 14 and 28 than the PBS

control group (**Fig. 4d**). However, the sIgA levels for both experimental groups were

similar on day 42 compared to the PBS control group. On day 42, only mice immunized

with Chi2 by intranasal route elicited significantly higher levels of specific sIgA than the

PBS control group. Taken together, these results indicate that immunization with Chi1,

Chi2 or Chi1 plus Chi2 induces long-lasting systemic and local humoral responses
influenced by the type of adjuvant and the administration route.

Chi1 and Chi2 antigens administered in combination by intramuscular route
reduce intestinal colonization and fecal shedding of STEC O157:H7

We next evaluated whether immune responses elicited by vaccination with the chimeric
antigens may confer protection against intestinal colonization by STEC. For this, two
weeks after the last booster immunization, mice were treated with streptomycin and then
orally challenged with STEC O157:H7 str. 86-24 (**Fig. 1d;** see Methods). Notably, mice
immunized with Chi1 plus Chi2 by intramuscular route showed a significantly lower fecal
shedding of the STEC 86-24 strain from day 8 post-infection to the end of the experiment
(day 12) compared to the PBS control group (**Fig. 5a**). In mice immunized by the
intranasal route, only the Chi2 group showed a slight but significant decrease in fecal
shedding of STEC 86-24 strain on days 7 and 8 compared to the PBS control group.
However, on day 9 and later, this difference was not observed (**Fig. 5b**).

On day 12 post-infection, mice were euthanized and the level of colonization of the
challenge strain in the cecum was determined. Consistent with the above results,
recovery of the STEC 86-24 strain was significantly lower in mice immunized with Chi1
plus Chi2 by intramuscular route than in the PBS control group, which corresponded to
2.1 log of protection (**Table 3**). The other experimental groups presented levels of
colonization similar to the PBS control group. These data demonstrate that immunization
of mice with Chi1 plus Chi2 by intramuscular route induces protective immune responses
against intestinal colonization of STEC O157:H7.

Chi1 and Chi2 antigens administered alone or in combination by intranasal route
avoid renal damage caused by STEC O91:H21

Kidney damage is one of the most severe clinical outcomes that can occur during STEC
infection due to the action of Shiga toxins. In streptomycin-treated mice, Stx2d-producing
E. coli strains have been shown to affect renal function leading to death.[32,33] For instance,
in a previous study we showed that the Stx2d-producing *E. coli* O91:H21 str. V07-4-4 is
lethal to mice when they are orally inoculated with a dose of 10^9 CFU.[8] However, with a
dose lower than 10^5 CFU of the STEC V07-4-4 strain, mice develop renal pathologies
but survive for at least 12 days (unpublished results). Therefore, we conducted further
work to investigate whether immunization with the chimeric antigens confers protection

against renal damage caused by the STEC V07-4-4 strain. For this, two weeks after the
last booster immunization, mice were treated with streptomycin and orally challenged
with 10^5 CFU of the STEC V07-4-4 strain. Our results showed that on days 7 and 12
post-infection, mice intranasally immunized with Chi1, Chi2 or Chi1 plus Chi2 had
creatinine levels in urine similar to uninfected mice (**Fig. 5c and 5d**). This was particularly
evident in mice immunized with Chi1 plus Chi2. In contrast, mice immunized by
intramuscular route and the PBS control group showed significantly higher levels of
creatinine in urine than uninfected mice. Moreover, the histopathological analysis of
kidney tissue obtained on day 12 post-infection showed that mice immunized by
intranasal route had mild or no evident tissue injuries (**Fig 5e**). Conversely, mice
immunized by intramuscular route and the PBS control group showed moderate and
severe tissue injuries, respectively (**Fig 5e**). Urinary clinical markers such as the number
of leukocytes and urobilinogen levels on day 12 post-infection also evidenced the
protection achieved by intranasal immunizations (**Table 4**). Together, these results
indicate that immunization with the chimeric antigens by intranasal route protects against
kidney damage caused by the STEC V07-4-4 strain.

Discussion

Here we demonstrated that immunization of mice with chimeric antigens displaying selected epitopes of OMPs confers protection against intestinal colonization and renal damage caused by STEC. It is well established that a suitable vaccine must be composed of different antigens to boost the immune response with a wide range of protection. Thus, since the OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins are widespread among STEC strains, the use of these proteins as targets could confer protection against LEE-positive and LEE-negative STEC strains. To our knowledge, this is the first STEC vaccine candidate that includes a virulence factor of LEE-negative STEC strains.

In general, subunit and protein-based vaccines have proven to be safe and to have a defined and homogeneous composition between production batches. This is an important advantage over other types of vaccines, which may present complex manufacturing processes, with subsequent regulatory and safety issues.[34–36] In Gram-negative bacteria, OMPs are primary components interacting with host cells; therefore, vaccines targeting these proteins may be effective by blocking key pathogenic mechanisms.[11,37] However, as previously mentioned, the purification and efficient production of OMPs pose a major challenge. Thus, construction of water-soluble and stable chimeric antigens displaying epitopes from OMPs is an approach worth exploring.

Our vaccine development approach takes advantage of immunoinformatics tools and *in vitro* assays (epitope mapping, ELISA) to predict and identify linear B-cell epitopes, respectively (**Fig. 1**). Previous studies have also demonstrated the usefulness of immunoinformatics tools for the development of vaccine candidates against STEC and other pathogens.[22,38] Additional work conducted to evaluate the seroreactivity of the epitopes using a large set of HUS sera allowed us to select the best epitopes based on their frequency and level of reactivity (**Fig. 2, Table 1**). Another important parameter we considered for the selection of epitopes was the surface exposition in the native antigen, which could facilitate their recognition by immune cells. Predicted T-cell epitopes were also included in the structure of chimeric proteins to enhance T-cell-dependent antibody responses (**Table 2**).

Importantly, our results provide proof-in-principle that incorporating selected linear B-cell epitopes into a carrier protein, such as aCah, may result in an increase in antigenicity (**Fig. 3h**). Many autotransporter (AT) proteins and especially their passenger domains are potential vaccine targets.[39,40] In fact, the pertactin AT from *Bordetella pertussis* is a component of licensed pertussis vaccines.[41] Thus, other passenger domains from AT proteins could be used as carriers to design chimeric antigens.

The immunization studies showed that the Chi1 and Chi2 antigens, administered alone or in combination, induce long-lasting humoral responses (**Fig 4**). However, the class of antibodies generated was in general dependent on the adjuvant and the administration route. This dependency was most obvious in mice immunized with Chi1 plus Chi2, which elicited significantly higher levels of specific IgG and IgA antibodies in serum when intramuscularly immunized than when intranasally immunized (**Fig. 4a-b**). Conversely, the intranasal but not the intramuscular administration of Chi1 plus Chi2 led to the production of significant levels of fecal sIgA compared to the PBS control group (**Fig. 4d**).

Secretory IgA is the most abundant immunoglobulin of the mammalian mucosa, playing a fundamental role in the immunity of the gastrointestinal tract.[42] Therefore, the development of vaccines against intestinal pathogens has traditionally given priority to immunogens that induce significant levels of sIgA. However, since some gastrointestinal infections can be eliminated in the absence of sIgA; other classes of antibodies such as IgM and IgG may also play an important role in the intestinal immunity.[43] Unfortunately, the presence and effector functions of IgG in the intestinal mucosa have been largely ignored in the literature.[44] A recent study by Kamada et al., 2015,[45] revealed that IgG in the murine intestine leads to the selective elimination of a virulent *Citrobacter rodentium* subpopulation by luminal neutrophils. The protective role of IgG against other enteropathogens such as rotavirus has also been demonstrated.[46] Our challenge experiments using the STEC O157:H7 strain showed that only immunization with Chi1 plus Chi2 by intramuscular route confers protection against intestinal colonization (**Fig. 5a-b, Table 3**). Since intramuscular immunization with Chi1 plus Chi2 did not lead to significant production of specific fecal sIgA antibodies (**Fig. 4d**), it is possible to correlate the protection achieved with other classes of immunoglobulins and more likely with the IgG. Other vaccine candidates that generated significant levels of specific IgG antibodies in serum but not fecal sIgA antibodies have also conferred protection to mice against colonization by STEC O157:H7.[47] Consequently, our results and those reported by others support the idea of a pivotal role of the IgG antibodies in the defense against enteropathogens. This is a major finding that will be relevant to the development of vaccines against these pathogens by avoiding biases in the selection of the "best" immunogens based mainly on the ability to induce sIgA antibody responses.

Because the challenge studies were performed only to day 12 post-inoculation, it was not possible to determine whether the immune responses triggered by the intramuscular immunization with Chi1 and Chi2 may lead to complete clearance of STEC O157:H7.

Long-term protection experiments in mice and other animal models will complement the
evaluation of this vaccine candidate.

An effective STEC vaccine may also confer protection against the action of the Stx.
STEC export the Shiga toxins along with a number of OMPs and cytoplasmic proteins
via outer membrane vesicles (OMVs).[48–50] These OMVs may be endocytosed in a
dynamin-dependent manner by intestinal epithelial cells, and then OMV-associated
virulence factors are differentially separated from vesicles during intracellular trafficking.
[50,51] Recently, it was reported that in the case of Stx2 but not Stx1, once the toxin is
internalized, it can be released from eukaryote cells in microvesicles that have exosome
markers.[52] Therefore, immunity against Stx may be mediated by neutralizing Stx-specific
antibodies or by immune mechanisms that prevent the toxin from entering the eukaryotic
cell.

Our chimeric antigens did not display Stx-associated epitopes. Consequently, the
protection conferred by intranasal immunizations against renal damage caused by STEC
O91:H21 (**Fig. 5c-e, Table 4**) could be explained by two different mechanisms. The first
one, which is the simplest explanation, is that the generated immune response
decreased the intestinal colonization of the STEC O91:H21 strain, which could be
correlated with a lower release and amount of OMVs and Stx. However, in the challenge
experiments with the STEC O157:H7 strain, only intramuscular immunization with Chi1
plus Chi2 was able to confer protection against intestinal colonization (**Fig. 5a and 5b**).
In addition, because the levels of intestinal colonization of the STEC O91:H21 strain
were not measured, we cannot conclude that in our experiments a decrease in
colonization correlates with protection against renal damage. The second possible
explanation, although a bit more complex, is that sIgA antibodies generated by intranasal
immunizations could prevent the release and/or the endocytosis of OMVs via immune
exclusion. The latter explanation is supported by the fact that OmpT and Ag43 (a Cah
homologue protein) are transported in OMVs.[51,53] In fact, it has been reported that OmpT
regulates the biogenesis of OMVs.[54]

In some vaccines, it has been shown that the combination of administration routes, for
example mucosal priming followed by systemic boosting or systemic priming followed by
mucosal boosting, leads to robust humoral and cellular responses that improve their
efficacy.[55,56] In future studies we will investigate whether the combination of systematic
and mucosal immunizations with the Chi1 and Chi2 antigens leads to a more robust and
complete immune response characterized by the production of both systemic and
secretory antibodies. Also, we will endeavor to reveal the mechanism by which intranasal

immunization with Chi1 and Chi2 confers protection against renal damage caused by
STEC O91:H21.

In conclusion, we developed a promising STEC vaccine candidate that confers protection
against intestinal colonization and renal damage. Our results strongly support the
potential use of this vaccine as a preventive strategy against STEC infections.

Materials and methods

Bacterial strains and growth conditions

Spontaneously derived streptomycin resistant (Str^r) mutants of STEC O157:H7 86-24 and STEC O91:H21 V07-4-4 strains were used in this study. Bacterial cultures were routinely grown at 37 °C in Luria-Bertani (LB) broth.

Human sera

Sera were obtained from 20 pediatric patients in the convalescent phase who presented diarrhea within two weeks prior to HUS diagnosis (HUS sera). Control sera were obtained from two patients with no history of STEC-associated diarrhea. These sera were collected from 1990 to 1993 and from 1999 to 2003 in various healthcare centers in Santiago, Chile, with the informed consent of the parents or legal guardians. All procedures were approved by the Ethics Committee of the Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Chile.

Peptide Microarray

Epitope mapping assays were performed by PEPperPRINT (Heidelberg, Germany). Briefly, the *ompT*, *cah* and *hes* sequences were translated into 15, 12 and 10 amino acid peptides with peptide-peptide overlaps of 14, 11 and 9 amino acids. The microarray contained peptides printed in duplicate framed by HA (YPYDVPDYAG) control peptides. Peptide slides were incubated with a mix of three HUS sera at a dilution of 1:100 followed by secondary antibody Goat anti-human IgA (DyLight800) at a dilution of 1:1000, in the presence of the monoclonal anti-HA (12CA5)-DyLight680 control antibody at a dilution of 1:2000. The read-out was performed with a LI-COR Odyssey Imaging System and the image analysis with the PepSlide® Analyzer.

In silico prediction of B-cell and T-cell epitopes

Prediction of B-cell epitopes was done using several tools available at the IEDB server [57], including BepiPred 2.0 [58], Kolaskar and Tongaonker antigenicity method [59] and Ellipro [60]. Peptides binding to MHC-II molecules were also predicted on the IEDB server [57].

Validation of epitopes by ELISA assay

Seventeen short peptides from 15 to 24 amino acids (**Table 1**) containing linear B-cell epitopes were chemically synthesized at Genic Bio Ltd (Shanghai, China). These short peptides were evaluated for their reactivity to IgG and IgA of individual HUS sera by ELISA. Briefly, 96-well ELISA plates (Nunc Maxisorp or Nunc Immobilizer Amino Plates,

ThermoFisher, USA) were incubated with 1.2 µg of each peptide diluted in 100 µl of
phosphate-buffered saline (PBS; pH 7.2) overnight at 4 °C. Standard curves were
obtained by dilutions in PBS of purified human IgG (Cat. 02-7102, Invitrogen, USA) or
IgA (Cat. 3860-1AD-6, Mabtech, USA) ranging from 1.2 µg/ml to 0,0047 µg/ml. Plates
were washed three times with PBS containing 0.05% Tween 20 (TPBS) and then
incubated with blocking solution (TPBS + 0.5% bovine serum albumin) for 15 min at room
temperature (RT). The HUS and control sera were diluted 1:25 (dilution determined from
serum titration experiments in a range of 1:10 to 1:100) in blocking solution (100 µl / well)
and incubated for 60 min at 37 °C. After six washes with T-PBS, goat anti-human IgG (H
+ L), peroxidase-labeled (Cat. 04-10-06, KPL, USA) or goat anti-human IgA alpha chain
(alkaline phosphatase) (Cat. Ab97212, Abcam, UK), diluted 1:1000 in blocking solution,
were added and plates were incubated for 60 min at 37 °C. After six washes with Tris-
buffered saline (TBS; pH 7.5) containing 0.05% Tween 20, ABTS® peroxidase substrate
(Cat. 50-66-18, KPL, USA) or pNPP substrate (Cat. N2600-10, USBiological, USA) were
added and plates were incubated for 12 or 30 min at RT, respectively. The reaction was
stopped with 5% sodium dodecyl sulfate or 3M sodium hydroxide dissolved in distilled
water. The absorbance was determined at 405 nm (A_{450}) using a Synergy HT microplate
reader (Biotek Instruments, USA). Each sample was determined twice in duplicate. The
relation between absorbance values and the IgG or IgA concentration of each well was
calculated from standard curves using a four-parameter logistic regression in GraphPad
Prism 8 software.
507
***In silico* modeling and design of chimeric proteins**
Predicted three-dimensional structure of Chimera 1 was constructed based on the crystal
structures of the Opa60 (PDB_ID: 2MLH)[61] and OmpT (PDB_ID: 1I78)[62] proteins. The
template for Chimera 2 structure was the crystal structure of the Ag43 protein (PDB_ID:
4KH3).[63] Comparative modeling of chimeric proteins was performed in Modeller v9
software[64], using default parameters. The modeled structures were solvated and
embedded in a water box using ions (Na+, Cl-) to neutralize the system with the TCL
script using VMD software.[65] The models were optimized with cycles of energy
minimization and dynamics using the NAMD 2.12 software.[66] A molecular dynamics
simulation was performed under periodic bordering conditions and isobaric-isothermal
set (NPT). The entire system was relaxed by molecular dynamics (MD) simulations using
NAMD 2.12 software for 10 ns and subsequently balanced for 30 ns, using the force field
CHARMM v2.7.[67] Quality evaluation and validation of the models were carried out by
Ramachandran   plot   analysis   on   the   RAMPAGE   server
(http://mordred.bioc.cam.ac.uk/~rapper/rampage.php) and ProSA-web.[68] Chemical and

physical properties of the chimeric proteins were predicted by Protein-Sol[69] and
ProtParam[70] tools. The modelled structures were visualized with UCSF Chimera
1.10.2.[71]
526

Purification of proteins

Synthetic genes and production of Chimera 1, Chimera 2 and αCah proteins were
ordered to GenScript (USA). Synthetic genes were optimized for *E. coli* expression and
cloned into vector pET30a with N-terminal 6xHis-tag. *E. coli* strain BL21(DE3) was then
transformed with recombinant plasmids containing synthetic genes. For purification of
recombinant proteins, transformant BL21(DE3) strains were grown in Terrific Broth
containing kanamycin (50 µg/ml) at 37° C. When the culture reached an optical density
at 600 nm of ~1.2, it was supplemented with IPTG for 4 h. Later, cells were harvested by
centrifugation, resuspended with lysis buffer followed by sonication. The sediment
obtained after centrifugation was dissolved using urea. Denatured protein was obtained
by one-step purification using a Ni-column. The target protein was refolded and sterilized
by 0.22 µm filter before being stored in aliquots. The concentration was determined by
Bradford protein assay with BSA as standard. The protein purity and molecular weight
were determined by standard SDS-PAGE along with Western blot confirmation. Target
proteins were obtained with purity >85% and endotoxin level <2 EU/mg (LAL Endotoxin
Assay Kit, GenScript, Cat. No. L00350). In addition, reactivity of Chimeric and αCah
proteins to IgG and IgA of individual HUS was assessed by ELISA assay as described
above.
545

Immunization studies

All animal experiments were performed at the Universidad de Concepción, Concepción,
Chile, following protocols and guidelines approved by the Bioethics Committee of the
Faculty of Biological Sciences. Female BALB/c mice (5 to 6 weeks old; purchased from
the Instituto de Salud Pública, Santiago, Chile) were randomly distributed into seven
experimental groups (each group n=20) and housed in conventional animal facilities with
water and food *ad libitum*. Mice were anesthetized with 10 mg/ml of ketamine and 250
µg/ml of acepromazine and immunized by intramuscular (i.m.) or intranasal (i.n.) route
with the corresponding protein formulation along with 50 µl of Imject™ Alum Adjuvant
(ThermoFisher Scientific, USA) or 20 µl of Sigma Adjuvant System® oil (Sigma-Aldrich,
USA), respectively (**Fig. 1d**). Experimental groups 1, 3 and 5 were i.m. immunized with
either 20 µg of Chi1, 20 µg of Chi2 or 10 µg of Chi1 plus 10 µg of Chi2, respectively.
Experimental groups 2, 4 and 6 were i.n. immunized with either 20 µg of Chi1, 20 µg of
Chi2 or 10 µg of Chi1 plus 10 µg of Chi2, respectively. The control group were injected

with PBS plus adjuvants. Two booster immunizations were performed on days 15 and

30 using similar amounts of protein formulations and adjuvants.

Sera and feces collection

Sera were obtained from five mice per group by tail vein bleeding on days -2, 14 and 28

before each immunization and at day 42 (two weeks after the last booster immunization),

according to conventional techniques. Briefly, blood samples were left at 37 °C for 30

min and then centrifuged at 1,000 x g for 10 min. Supernatant was collected, the

complement was inactivated at 56 °C for 30 min and aliquots were stored at -80 °C until

IgG, IgA and IgM determinations by ELISA. For secretory IgA (sIgA) measurement, feces

were collected on days -2, 14, 28 and 42. Feces were weight, homogenized and diluted

to 0.1 g/ml with PBS containing 0.1% sodium azide and 1 mM of phenylmethylsulfonyl

fluoride (PMSF). Fecal suspension was centrifuged at 15,000 x g for 5 min at 4 °C, the

supernatant fluid recovered and again centrifuged at 15,000 x g for 15 min at 4 °C and

stored at -80 °C until use.

Measurement of humoral response

Chimeric proteins were diluted to 1 µg/ml in carbonate buffer (pH 9.6) and used to coat

polystyrene 96-well high-binding ELISA plates (100 µl/well; Nunc-Immuno plate with

MaxiSorp surface). After overnight incubation at 4 °C, plates were washed with washing

buffer (Tris-buffered saline [pH 7.4] with 0.05% Tween 20) and blocked with 0.8% gelatin

in TPBS for 1 h at 37 °C and then incubated with either sera or supernatant from fecal

suspensions, at a dilution of 1:100, for 2.5 h at room temperature and washed four times.

Next, isotype-specific goat anti-mouse HRP conjugates (BioLegend, USA) were added

(100 µl/well) at a dilution of 1:1000 and incubated for 1 h min at room temperature

followed by washing with TPBS. Then, 200 µl/well of OPD Peroxidase Substrate (Cat.

P9187-5SET, Sigma-Aldric, USA) was added for 30 min. The reaction was stopped with

50 µl/well of 2N H_2SO_4 and the absorbance at 450 nm was measured on a microplate

reader.

Challenge studies

Two weeks after the last booster immunization (day 45), the infection experiments were

performed in the streptomycin-treated mouse model of STEC infection as described

elsewhere[72,73] with minor modifications. Briefly, mice were given water *ad libitum*

containing streptomycin (5 g/l) 24–48 h prior to inoculation and for the duration of the

experiment. Feces were documented to be free of streptomycin-resistant *E. coli* at the

time of inoculation. STEC O157:H7 86-24 and STEC O91:H21 V07-4-4 strains were

grown overnight in agitated LB broth containing 50 μg/ml streptomycin at 37 °C. Cultures

were centrifuged, washed once with PBS and resuspended in a 20% sucrose (w/v) and

10% NaHCO3 (w/v) solution in sterile water to 1 x 10^{10} CFU/ml (STEC 86-24 strain) or 1

x 10^6 CFU/ml (STEC V07-4-4 strain). Prior to inoculation, mice were starved of food and

water overnight (12 h). The next morning mice were orally infected by pipette feeding

with 100 μl of bacterial suspension containing 10^9 CFU or 10^5 CFU of STEC 86-24 or

STEC V07-4-4 strains, respectively. After challenge, food and water were reintroduced

and provided *ad libitum*. The fecal shedding of the 86-24 strain was recorded daily for 12

days. For this, feces were collected, weighed, homogenized, suspended in 1 ml PBS

and, after serial dilutions, plated on MacConkey agar plates supplemented with

streptomycin (50 μg/ml) for bacterial counts. For determination of intestinal colonization

of the STEC 86-24 strain, 12 days after challenge (day 57), mice were euthanized, and

cecum was collected under aseptic conditions, homogenized and diluted in PBS.

Suspensions were serially diluted and plated on MacConkey supplemented with

streptomycin (50 μg/ml) for bacterial counts. Log_{10} units of protection were obtained by

subtracting the mean Log_{10} CFU for each experimental group from the mean Log_{10} CFU

of the PBS control group. Mice inoculated with the STEC V07-4-4 strain were used to

measure kidney damage (*vide infra*).

Urinalysis

Urine samples were collected as previously described [74], on days 45, 51 and 57 (0, 7

and 12 post-infection, respectively) from mice infected with the STEC V07-4-4 strain.

Biochemical estimation of urine creatinine concentration was assessed using the

Creatinine Kit (BioSystems, Spain) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Other

clinical urine markers were measured by using Combur10 Test®M semiquantitative test

strips (Roche Diagnostics GmbH, Germany). Each test strip consists of colorimetric

reaction spots for 10 markers: specific gravity (1.000 to 1.030), pH (5.0 to 9.0),

leukocytes (range, negative to 500 cells/μL), nitrites (negative or positive), proteins

(negative to 500 mg/dl), glucose (negative to 55 mmol/l), ketones (negative to 15

mmol/L), urobilinogen (normal to 200 μmol/L), bilirubin (negative to +3) and blood

(negative; trace of non-hemolyzed; or hemolyzed, 10 to 250 cells/μL). Each square was

wet with a drop of urine and the marker value was determined through comparison with

a colorimetric standard.

Histopathological analysis of kidney tissue

For the histological analysis of kidney tissue, mice infected with the STEC V07-4-4 strain

were euthanized at day 57, the kidneys collected, fixed in 10% formaldehyde (pH 6.9),

embedded in paraffin wax for sectioning at 5 µm and stained with hematoxylin and eosin
(H/E). Pathological evaluation of H/E-stained tissue sections was carried out by a
pathologist blinded to the experimental design. Histopathological changes were
evaluated by the degree of perivascular edema, leukocyte infiltration, vascular
congestion, mesangial cell expansion and injury of the glomerular filtration barrier
(glomerular hypertrophy or glomerular hypoperfusion). Each sample was quantitated by
ten randomly selected fields with the following criteria: 0, no damage; 1, <25%; 2, 25–
50%; 3, >50%; 4, >75% of damage. Differences between experimental groups were
evaluated by a one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparisons test.

Fig. 1. Experimental design for the development and evaluation of the chimeric-based STEC vaccine. **a**) We selected the OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins as suitable targets against STEC based on their antigenic properties, frequency of detection among clinical STEC strains and absence among commensal *E. coli* strains. **b**) The proteins were analyzed by immunoinformatics tools and a peptide microarray assay for B-cell epitope prediction and mapping, respectively. MHC-II epitopes were also predicted *in silico*. Several B-cell epitopes were validated by ELISA using a collection of HUS sera. **c**) Selected epitopes were used to design two chimeric proteins that were expressed and purified. The reactivity of the chimeric proteins to IgG and IgA present in HUS sera was also confirmed. **d**) BALB/c mice were immunized with different vaccine formulations by intramuscular or intranasal route using Imject Alum (IA) or Sigma adjuvant (SA), respectively. Systemic and local humoral responses were subsequently determined. The protection conferred by immunizations was evaluated in the streptomycin-treated mouse model by challenge with STEC O157:H7 and O91:H21 strains. Bacterial shedding and intestinal colonization were determined for the STEC O157:H7 infected mice. Renal damage was examined in the STEC O91:H21 infected mice.

Fig. 2. Identification and validation of linear B-cell epitopes of the OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins. a, b and c) Peptide microarray assays. Peptide slides containing 15, 12 and 10 AA peptides derived from de OmpT (a), Cah (b) and Hes (c) proteins were incubated with a mix of three HUS sera at a dilution of 1:100. After washing, staining was performed with secondary anti-human IgA DyLight800 antibody at a dilution of 1:1000. Control peptides (red spots) framing the peptide slides were staining with specific monoclonal DyLight680 antibody at a dilution of 1:2000. Control peptide slides incubated with anti-human IgA DyLight800 antibody and the specific monoclonal DyLight680 antibody are shown in the left panels. Epitope-like spot patterns are indicated by white arrows. **d-i)** Tukey box plots showing concentrations of IgG and IgA present in individual HUS sera (n=20) that are reactive to short peptides containing B-cell epitopes of the OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins. A lower number of HUS sera and Hes epitopes were assessed due to sera availability. Tukey box plots show the 25th to 75th percentiles, with the median indicated by the horizontal line inside the box. Data analysis was by Kruskal-

Wallis test, followed by Dunn's multiple comparison test. *P < 0.0 5 was considered
significant. **j** and **k**) Heatmaps show the logarithm of the IgG and IgA concentration of
each serum (HUS or control sera) that recognizes a specific short peptide, respectively.
Data were clustered hierarchically using Euclidean distance and complete linkage
analyses. Each row represents a different serum and each column a specific epitope.
The average (dotted line) and histogram (solid line) of the values obtained by each
peptide are indicated in the columns. The color key indicates the value of the logarithm
of the antibody concentration. The figure was made using the "gplots" [75] package in R [76].

746
747
Figure 3. Design and production of the chimeric antigens. a) Predicted 3D structure
of the Chimera 1 (Chi1) antigen. OmpT- and Hes-derived peptides are shown as
indicated in the legend at the left. **b and c**) Quality validation of modeled Chi1 structure.
Ramachandran plot (b) shows that 94.6% residues were in favored regions. Z-score plot
(c) for Chi1 model obtained by ProSA-web.[68] Dark blue and light blue regions represent
z-scores of native protein structures determined by NMR and X-ray, respectively. Black
spot shows z-score for the Chi1 model. **d)** Predicted 3D structure of the Chimera 2 (Chi2)
antigen. OmpT- and Hes-derived peptides are shown as indicated in the legend at the
left. **e and f**) Quality validation of modeled Chi2 structure. Ramachandran plot (e) shows
that 86.6% residues were in favored regions. Z-score plot (f) for Chi2 model. **g**) SDS-
PAGE of purified Chi11 and Chi2 proteins. M, Molecular weight standard. **h-i**) Tukey box
plots showing concentrations of IgG (h) and IgA (i) present in individual HUS sera (n=20)
that are reactive to Chi1, Chi2 and aCah proteins. Tukey box plots show the 25th to 75th
percentiles, with the median indicated by the horizontal line inside the box. Data analysis
was by Kruskal-Wallis test, followed by Dunn's multiple comparison test. *P < 0.0 5 was
considered significant.
764
765
766

767
Figure 4. Humoral immune responses triggered by immunization with the chimeric antigens. Sera obtained at days -2, 14, 28 and 42 post-immunization were diluted 1:100 and used for the determination of specific IgG (a), IgA (b) and IgM (c) by ELISA. Fecal sIgA (d) was also determined from feces collected on days -2, 14, 28 and 42. The results are expressed as means ± SD of absorbance values at 450 nm (A_{450}), which were obtained from individual sera or fecal suspensions of five mice per group. Experimental groups are shown as indicated by legend at the bottom. Data analysis was by a two-way ANOVA, followed by Tukey's multiple comparison test. P < 0.0 5 was considered significant. Asterisks (*) indicate significant differences between the immunized mice and the PBS control group. Number signs (#) indicate significant differences between administration routes.

799
800
Figure 5. Protection conferred by immunizations with the chimeric antigens. a and
b) Determination of fecal shedding of STEC O157:H7. Eight mice per group were orally
inoculated with 10^9 CFU of the challenge strain. Fecal pellets were collected daily,
weighed, homogenized, and plated on MacConkey agar containing streptomycin. Data
are showed as the number of CFU of the challenge strain per 100 mg feces. Differences
between immunized mice and the PBS control group were analyzed by a two-way
ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparison test. Experimental groups are shown as
indicated by legend at the bottom. **c and d)** Tukey box plots showing creatinine
concentrations (mg/dl) in urine determined from five mice per group on days 7 (c) and
12 (d) post-infection with STEC O91:H21. Differences between experimental groups and
uninfected mice were analyzed by Mann-Whitney U test. Dotted green line indicates
normal creatinine concentration of 1.5 mg/dl. **e)** Histopathology analysis from kidney
tissue obtained from five mice per group on day 12 post-infection with STEC O91:H21.
Cellular injuries were classified as not evident, mild, moderate or severe as described in
the Methods. Cellular injuries are color coded as indicated in the legend at the top.
Differences between experimental groups and uninfected mice were analyzed by a two-
way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparison test. For all statistical analyses P
< 0.0 5 was considered significant.
819

Table 1. Linear B-cell epitopes identified in the OmpT, Cah and Hes proteins

Protein	Epitope name	Epitope Mapping	*In silico* B-cell prediction tools			Reactivity to HUS sera by ELISA. No (%)		Reactivity to control sera by ELISA. No (%)	
			BepiPred 2.0	Kolaskar and Tongaonker	Ellipro	IgG	IgA	IgG	IgA
OmpT	OmpT_1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	17/20 (85)	5/7 (71)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	OmpT_2	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	18/20 (90)	5/7 (71)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	OmpT_3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	16/20 (80)	6/7 (86)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	OmpT_4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	18/20 (90)	3/7 (43)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	OmpT_5	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	16/20 (80)	4/7 (57)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	OmpT_6	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	18/20 (90)	5/7 (71)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
Cah	Cah_1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	18/20 (90)	3/7 (43)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	Cah_2	Yes	No	No	No	16/20 (80)	2/7 (29)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	Cah_3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	19/20 (95)	5/7 (71)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	Cah_4	Yes	No	No	No	16/20 (80)	5/7 (71)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	Cah_5	Yes	No	No	No	20/20 (100)	4/7 (57)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	Cah_6	Yes	No	No	No	20/20 (100)	6/7 (86)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
Hes	Hes_1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	14/20 (70)	5/7 (71)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	Hes_2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	17/20 (85)	5/7 (71)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)
	Hes_3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	14/20 (70)	N.E.	0/3 (0)	N.E.
	Hes_4	Yes	No	No	Yes	12/20 (60)	N.E.	0/3 (0)	N.E.
	Hes_5	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	20/20 (100)	7/7 (100)	0/3 (0)	0/3 (0)

 N.E. Not evaluated

 Table 2. Epitopes and chemical and physical properties of the chimeric proteins

Protein	B-cell epitopes	Predicted T-cell epitopes	MW (kDa)	Theoretical pI	Solubility [1]	Estimated half-life [2]	Instability index [3]
Chimera 1	OmpT_1, OmpT_2, OmpT_3, OmpT_4, Hes_1, Hes_2, Hes_3 and Hes_5	Two of OmpT	29.6	4.51	0.693	>10 hours	21.30
Chimera 2	OmpT_1, OmpT_6, Cah_1, Cah_2, Cah_3, Cah_4, Cah_5, Cah_6, Hes_1, Hes_2 and Hes_5	Two of Cah	56.7	4.52	0.666	>10 hours	8.02

 [1] Predicted by Protein-Sol tool [69]. Scaled solubility value (0-1). A value greater than 0.45 predicts that the protein is soluble.

 [2] Prediction of the time it takes for half of the amount of protein in *E. coli* to disappear after its synthesis. [3] The instability

 index provides an estimate of the stability of a protein in a test tube. A protein whose instability index is smaller than 40 is

 predicted as stable [77].

 Table 3. Intestinal colonization of STEC O157:H7 and protection conferred by

 immunization with chimeric proteins

Chimeric protein + Adjuvant	Log10 CFU of STEC O157:H7 in Cecum (mean ± SD)	Log10 units of protection
Chi1 + Imject Alum	5.45 ± 0.24	0
Chi1 + Sigma Adjuvant	4.70 ± 0.56	0.68
Chi2 + Imject Alum	5.08 ± 0.54	0.30
Chi2 + Sigma Adjuvant	4.70 ± 0.86	0.68
Chi1 + Chi2 + Imject Alum	3.28 ± 0.10	2.10 *
Chi1 + Chi2 + Imject Alum	4.94 ± 0.81	0.44
PBS + Imject Alum + Sigma Adjuvant	5.38 ± 0.24	0

 * P < 0.001 as compared to the control PBS group.

Table 4. Urinalysis clinical markers assessed at day 12 post-infection

Urinary marker	Chimeric protein + Adjuvant							Not challenged
	Chi1 + IA	Chi1 +SA	Chi2 + IA	Chi2 +SA	Chi1 + Chi2 + IA	Chi1 + Chi2 + SA	PBS + IA + SA	
Specific gravity	1,025	1,025	1,025	1,025	1,025	1,025	1,025	1,025
pH	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Leukocytes (cells/µl)	75	25	75	25	75	25	500	25
Nitrite	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
Protein	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative
Glucose (mmol/l)	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8
Ketones	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative
Urobilinogen (µmol/l)	Normal	Normal	17	Normal	17	Normal	70	Normal
Bilirubin	3+	3+	3+	3+	3+	3+	3+	3+
Blood	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative

Funding and acknowledgments

This study was supported by FONDEF ID16I10140 and FONDECYT 1161161 grants. We thank Dr. Helen Lowry for the careful revision and edition of the manuscript. We thank Dr. Mauricio Farfan for sharing the STEC O157:H7 str. 86-24.

Conflict of interest

Currently, an application for an international patent had been presented for the chimeric antigens developed and uses thereof.

Author contributions

Conceptualization and experimental design: Roberto Vidal, David A. Montero, Felipe Del Canto, Juan C. Salazar and Angel Oñate. Data acquisition: Sandra Céspedes, Leandro Cádiz, José Reyes, Mauricio Arenas and David A. Montero. Data analysis and interpretation: Roberto Vidal, David A. Montero, Felipe Del Canto, Juan C. Salazar and Angel Oñate. Writing – original draft: David A. Montero; Review and edition: Roberto Vidal, Felipe Del Canto, Juan C. Salazar, Mauricio Arenas and Angel Oñate.

References

Nataro JP, Kaper JB. Diarrheagenic Escherichia coli. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 1998; **11**: 142–201.

Freedman SB, Xie J, Neufeld MS, Hamilton WL, Hartling L, Tarr PI. Shiga Toxin–Producing Escherichia coli Infection, Antibiotics, and Risk of Developing Hemolytic Uremic Syndrome: A Meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis* 2016; **62**: 1251–1258.

Majowicz SE, Scallan E, Jones-Bitton A, Sargeant JM, Stapleton J, Angulo FJ *et al.* Global incidence of human Shiga toxin–producing Escherichia coli infections and deaths: A systematic review and knowledge synthesis. *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 2014; **11**: 447–455.

Hazard Identification and Characterization: Criteria for Categorizing Shiga Toxin–Producing Escherichia coli on a Risk Basis †. *J Food Prot* 2019; **82**: 7–21.

Lee MS, Tesh VL. Roles of shiga toxins in immunopathology. *Toxins (Basel)* 2019; **11**: 1–26.

Farfan MJ, Torres AG. Molecular mechanisms that mediate colonization of Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli strains. *Infect Immun* 2012; **80**: 903–913.

Montero DA, Velasco J, Del Canto F, Puente JL, Padola NL, Rasko DA *et al.* Locus of Adhesion and Autoaggregation (LAA), a pathogenicity island present in emerging Shiga Toxin-producing Escherichia coli strains. *Sci Rep* 2017; **7**: 7011.

Montero DA, Canto F Del, Velasco J, Colello R, Padola NL, Salazar JC *et al.* Cumulative acquisition of pathogenicity islands has shaped virulence potential and contributed to the emergence of LEE-negative Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli strains. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2019; **8**: 486–502.

Coombes BK, Wickham ME, Mascarenhas M, Gruenheid S, Finlay BB, Karmali M a. Molecular analysis as an aid to assess the public health risk of non-O157 shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli strains. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2008; **74**: 2153–2160.

O'Ryan M, Vidal R, del Canto F, Carlos Salazar J, Montero D. Vaccines for viral and bacterial pathogens causing acute gastroenteritis: Part II: Vaccines for Shigella , Salmonella, enterotoxigenic E. coli (ETEC) enterohemorragic E. coli (EHEC) and Campylobacter jejuni. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2015; **11**: 601–619.

11   Montero D, Orellana P, Gutiérrez D, Araya D, Salazar JC, Prado V *et al.*
Immunoproteomic analysis to identify Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli
outer membrane proteins expressed during human infection. *Infect Immun* 2014;
82: 4767–77.

12   Garcia-Angulo V a, Kalita A, Torres AG. Advances in the development of
enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli vaccines using murine models of infection.
Vaccine 2013; **31**: 3229–35.

13   Cai K, Gao X, Li T, Wang Q, Hou X, Tu W *et al.* Enhanced immunogenicity of a
novel Stx2Am-Stx1B fusion protein in a mice model of enterohemorrhagic
Escherichia coli O157:H7 infection. *Vaccine* 2011; **29**: 946–952.

14   Mejias MP, Ghersi G, Craig PO, Panek CA, Bentancor L V, Baschkier A *et al.*
Immunization with a chimera consisting of the B subunit of Shiga toxin type 2
and brucella lumazine synthase confers total protection against Shiga toxins in
mice. *J Immunol* 2013; **191**: 2403–2411.

15   Martorelli L, Garimano N, Fiorentino GA, Vilte DA, Garbaccio SG, Barth SA *et al.*
Efficacy of a recombinant Intimin, EspB and Shiga toxin 2B vaccine in calves
experimentally challenged with Escherichia coli O157:H7. *Vaccine* 2018; **36**:
3949–3959.

16   Gu J, Liu Y, Yu S, Wang H, Wang Q, Yi Y *et al.* Enterohemorrhagic Escherichia
coli trivalent recombinant vaccine containing EspA, intimin and Stx2 induces
strong humoral immune response and confers protection in mice. *Microbes
Infect* 2009; **11**: 835–841.

17   Cheng Y, Feng Y, Luo P, Gu J, Yu S, Zhang W *et al.* Fusion expression and
immunogenicity of EHEC EspA-Stx2AI protein: implications for the vaccine
development. *J Microbiol* 2009; **47**: 498–505.

18   Gao X, Cai K, Li T, Wang Q, Hou X, Tian R *et al.* Novel fusion protein protects
against adherence and toxicity of enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli O157:H7
in mice. *Vaccine* 2011; **29**: 6656–63.

19   Wan C, Zhou Y, Yu Y, Peng LJ, Zhao W, Zheng X. B-cell epitope KT-12 of
enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli O157:H7: a novel peptide vaccine
candidate. *Microbiol Immunol* 2011; **55**: 247–53.

20   Liu J, Sun Y, Feng S, Zhu L, Guo X, Qi C. Towards an attenuated
enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli O157:H7 vaccine characterized by a deleted

ler gene and containing apathogenic Shiga toxins. *Vaccine* 2009; **27**: 5929–
5935.

21 Cai K, Tu W, Liu Y, Li T, Wang H. Novel fusion antigen displayed-bacterial
ghosts vaccine candidate against infection of Escherichia coli O157:H7. *Sci Rep*
2015; **5**: 17479.

22 García-Angulo VA, Kalita A, Kalita M, Lozano L, Torres AG. Comparative
genomics and immunoinformatics approach for the identification of vaccine
candidates for enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli O157:H7. *Infect Immun* 2014;
82: 2016–2026.

23 Riquelme-Neira R, Rivera A, Sáez D, Fernández P, Osorio G, del Canto F *et al.*
Vaccination with DNA Encoding Truncated Enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli
(EHEC) Factor for Adherence-1 Gene (efa-1′) Confers Protective Immunity to
Mice Infected with E. coli O157:H7. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2016; **5**: 1–9.

24 Escherichia E. Development of a Gold Nanoparticle Vaccine against. 2019; **10**:
1–16.

25 John M, Kudva IT, Griffin RW, Dodson AW, McManus B, Krastins B *et al.* Use of
in vivo-induced antigen technology for identification of Escherichia coli O157:H7
proteins expressed during human infection. *Infect Immun* 2005; **73**: 2665–79.

26 Colello R, Vélez MV, González J, Montero DA, Bustamante A V, Canto F Del *et*
al. First report of the distribution of Locus of Adhesion and Autoaggregation
(LAA) pathogenicity island in LEE-negative Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia
coli isolates from Argentina. *Microb Pathog* 2018; **123**: 259–263.

27 Carpenter EP, Beis K, Cameron AD, Iwata S. Overcoming the challenges of
membrane protein crystallography. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 2008; **18**: 581–586.

28 Kaumaya PTP, Kobs-Conrad S, Seo YH, Lee H, Vanbuskirk AM, Feng N *et al.*
Peptide vaccines incorporating a 'promiscuous' T-cell epitope bypass certain
haplotype restricted immune responses and provide broad spectrum
immunogenicity. *J Mol Recognit* 1993; **6**: 81–94.

29 Reed SG, Orr MT, Fox CB. Key roles of adjuvants in modern vaccines. *Nat Med*
2013; **19**: 1597–1608.

30 Mohanan D, Slütter B, Henriksen-Lacey M, Jiskoot W, Bouwstra JA, Perrie Y *et*
al. Administration routes affect the quality of immune responses: A cross-

sectional evaluation of particulate antigen-delivery systems. *J Control Release* 993 2010; **147**: 342–349.

31 Belyakov IM, Ahlers JD. What Role Does the Route of Immunization Play in the 995 Generation of Protective Immunity against Mucosal Pathogens? *J Immunol* 996 2009; **183**: 6883–6892.

32 Melton-Celsa AR, O'Brien AD, Feng PCH. Virulence Potential of Activatable 998 Shiga Toxin 2d-Producing Escherichia coli Isolates from Fresh Produce. *J Food* 999 *Prot* 2015; **78**: 2085–2088.

33 Melton-Celsa AR, Darnell SC, O'Brien AD. Activation of Shiga-like toxins by 1001 mouse and human intestinal mucus correlates with virulence of 1002 enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli O91:H21 isolates in orally infected, 1003 streptomycin-treated mice. *Infect Immun* 1996; **64**: 1569–76.

34 Cox MMJ. Recombinant protein vaccines produced in insect cells. *Vaccine* 2012; 1005 **30**: 1759–1766.

35 Hollingshead S, Jongerius I, Exley RM, Johnson S, Lea SM, Tang CM. 1007 Structure-based design of chimeric antigens for multivalent protein vaccines. *Nat* 1008 *Commun* 2018; **9**: 1–10.

36 Li W, Joshi M, Singhania S, Ramsey K, Murthy A. Peptide Vaccine: Progress 1010 and Challenges. *Vaccines* 2014; **2**: 515–536.

37 Chang YF, Chen CS, Palaniappan RUM, He H, McDonough SP, Barr SC *et al.* 1012 Immunogenicity of the recombinant leptospiral putative outer membrane proteins 1013 as vaccine candidates. *Vaccine* 2007; **25**: 8190–8197.

38 Tapia D, Ross BN, Kalita A, Kalita M, Hatcher CL, Muruato LA *et al.* From In 1015 silico Protein Epitope Density Prediction to Testing Escherichia coli O157:H7 1016 Vaccine Candidates in a Murine Model of Colonization. *Front Cell Infect* 1017 *Microbiol* 2016; **6**: 1–8.

39 Wells TJ, Tree JJ, Ulett GC, Schembri M a. Autotransporter proteins: novel 1019 targets at the bacterial cell surface. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 2007; **274**: 163–72.

40 Harris J a., Roy K, Woo-Rasberry V, Hamilton DJ, Kansal R, Qadri F *et al.* 1021 Directed Evaluation of Enterotoxigenic Escherichia coli Autotransporter Proteins 1022 as Putative Vaccine Candidates. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2011; **5**: e1428.

41 Klein NP. Licensed pertussis vaccines in the United States. *Hum Vaccin*

Immunother 2014; **10**: 2684–2690.

42   Brandtzaeg P. Mucosal immunity: Induction, dissemination, and effector
functions. *Scand J Immunol* 2009; **70**: 505–515.

43   Eckmann L, Stappenbeck TS. IgG 'detoxes' the intestinal mucosa. *Cell Host*
Microbe 2015; **17**: 538–9.

44   Horton RE, Vidarsson G. Antibodies and Their Receptors: Different Potential
Roles in Mucosal Defense. *Front Immunol* 2013; **4**.
doi:10.3389/fimmu.2013.00200.

45   Kamada N, Sakamoto K, Seo S-U, Zeng MY, Kim Y-G, Cascalho M *et al.*
Humoral Immunity in the Gut Selectively Targets Phenotypically Virulent
Attaching-and-Effacing Bacteria for Intraluminal Elimination. *Cell Host Microbe*
2015; **17**: 617–27.

46   Westerman LE, McClure HM, Jiang B, Almond JW, Glass RI. Serum IgG
mediates mucosal immunity against rotavirus infection. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2005;
102: 7268–7273.

47   Amani J, Salmanian AH, Rafati S, Mousavi SL. Immunogenic properties of
chimeric protein from espA, eae and tir genes of Escherichia coli O157:H7.
Vaccine 2010; **28**: 6923–6929.

48   Kolling GL, Matthews KR. Export of virulence genes and Shiga toxin by
membrane vesicles of Escherichia coli O157:H7. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1999;
65: 1843–1848.

49   Kim SH, Lee SR, Kim KS, Ko A, Kim E, Kim YH *et al.* Shiga toxin A subunit
mutant of Escherichia coli O157:H7 releases outer membrane vesicles
containing the B-pentameric complex. *FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol* 2010; **58**:
412–420.

50   Kunsmann L, Rüter C, Bauwens A, Greune L, Glüder M, Kemper B *et al.*
Virulence from vesicles: Novel mechanisms of host cell injury by Escherichia coli
O104:H4 outbreak strain. 2015. doi:10.1038/srep13252.

51   Bielaszewska M, Rü Ter 2 C, Bauwens A, Greune L, Jarosch K-A, Steil D *et al.*
Host cell interactions of outer membrane vesicle-associated virulence factors of
enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli O157: Intracellular delivery, trafficking and
mechanisms of cell injury. 2017. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1006159.

52   Watanabe-Takahashi M, Yamasaki S, Murata M, Kano F, Motoyama J, Yamate
J *et al.* Exosome-associated Shiga toxin 2 is released from cells and causes
severe toxicity in mice. *Sci Rep* 2018; **8**: 10776.

53   Boysen A, Borch J, Krogh J, Hjernø K, Møller-Jensen J. SILAC-based
comparative analysis of pathogenic Escherichia coli secretomes. *J Microbiol*
Methods 2015; **116**: 66–79.

54   Premjani V, Tilley D, Gruenheid S, Le Moual H, Samis JA. Enterohemorrhagic
Escherichia coli OmpT regulates outer membrane vesicle biogenesis. 2014.
doi:10.1111/1574-6968.12463.

55   Ralli-Jain P, Tifrea D, Cheng C, Pal S, de la Maza LM. Enhancement of the
protective efficacy of a Chlamydia trachomatis recombinant vaccine by
combining systemic and mucosal routes for immunization. *Vaccine* 2010; **28**:
7659–7666.

56   Vajdy M, Singh M, Ugozzoli M, Briones M, Soenawan E, Cuadra L *et al.*
Enhanced mucosal and systemic immune responses to Helicobacter pylori
antigens through mucosal priming followed by systemic boosting immunizations.
Immunology 2003; **110**: 86–94.

57   Kim Y, Ponomarenko J, Zhu Z, Tamang D, Wang P, Greenbaum J *et al.* Immune
epitope database analysis resource. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2012; **40**: 525–530.

58   Jespersen MC, Peters B, Nielsen M, Marcatili P. BepiPred-2.0: Improving
sequence-based B-cell epitope prediction using conformational epitopes. *Nucleic*
Acids Res 2017; **45**: W24–W29.

59   Kolaskar a S, Tongaonkar PC. A semi-empirical method for prediction of
antigenic determinants on protein antigens. *FEBS Lett* 1990; **276**: 172–4.

60   Ponomarenko J, Bui H-H, Li W, Fusseder N, Bourne PE, Sette A *et al.* ElliPro: a
new structure-based tool for the prediction of antibody epitopes. *BMC*
Bioinformatics 2008; **9**: 514.

61   Horst R, Stanczak P, Wüthrich K. NMR Polypeptide Backbone Conformation of
the E. coli Outer Membrane Protein W. *Structure* 2014; **22**: 1204–1209.

62   Vandeputte-Rutten L, Kramer RA, Kroon J, Dekker N, Egmond MR, Gros P.
Crystal structure of the outer membrane protease Ompt from Escherichia coli
suggests a novel catalytic site. *EMBO J* 2001; **20**: 5033–5039.

63   Heras B, Totsika M, Peters KM, Paxman JJ, Gee CL, Jarrott RJ. The antigen 43
1089   structure reveals a molecular Velcro- like mechanism of autotransporter-
1090   mediated bacterial clumping. 2014; **111**: 457–462.

1091   64   Sánchez R, Šali A. Evaluation of comparative protein structure modeling by
1092   MODELLER-3. *Proteins Struct Funct Genet* 1997; **29**: 50–58.

1093   65   Ricker EW. Stoch and Recruitrnent. *J Fish Res Board Canada* 1954; **11**: 559–
1094   623.

1095   66   Biller JR, Elajaili H, Meyer V, Rosen GM, Eaton SS, Eaton GR. Electron spin–
1096   lattice relaxation mechanisms of rapidly-tumbling nitroxide radicals. *J Magn*
1097   *Reson* 2013; **236**: 47–56.

1098   67   Foloppe N, Mackerell AD. Acids : I . Parameter Optimization Based on Small
1099   Molecule and Condensed Phase Macromolecular Target Data. *J Comput Chem*
1100   2000; **21**: 86–104.

1101   68   Wiederstein M, Sippl MJ. ProSA-web: Interactive web service for the recognition
1102   of errors in three-dimensional structures of proteins. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2007; **35**:
1103   407–410.

1104   69   Hebditch M, Carballo-Amador MA, Charonis S, Curtis R, Warwicker J. Protein-
1105   Sol: A web tool for predicting protein solubility from sequence. *Bioinformatics*
1106   2017; **33**: 3098–3100.

1107   70   Wilkins MR, Gasteiger E, Bairoch A, Sanchez JC, Williams KL, Appel RD *et al.*
1108   Protein identification and analysis tools in the ExPASy server. *Methods Mol Biol*
1109   1999; **112**: 531–552.

1110   71   Pettersen EF, Goddard TD, Huang CC, Couch GS, Greenblatt DM, Meng EC *et*
1111   *al.* UCSF Chimera - A visualization system for exploratory research and
1112   analysis. *J Comput Chem* 2004; **25**: 1605–1612.

1113   72   Wadolkowski E a., Burris J a., O'Brien a. D. Mouse model for colonization and
1114   disease caused by enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli O157:H7. *Infect Immun*
1115   1990; **58**: 2438–45.

1116   73   Lindgren SW, Melton AR, O'Brien AD. Virulence of enterohemorrhagic
1117   Escherichia coli O91:H21 clinical isolates in an orally infected mouse model.
1118   *Infect Immun* 1993; **61**: 3832–42.

74   Kurien BT, Hal Scofield R. Mouse urine collection using clear plastic wrap. *Lab*

Anim 1999; **33**: 83–86.

75   Warnes GR, Bolker B, Bonebakker L, Gentleman R, Huber W, Lumley T *et al.* R

Package ' gplots '. 2016.https://cran.r-

project.org/web/packages/gplots/gplots.pdf.

76   R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R

Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria., 2014http://www.r-

project.org.

77   Guruprasad K, Reddy BVB, Pandit MW. Correlation between stability of a

protein and its dipeptide composition: A novel approach for predicting in vivo

stability of a protein from its primary sequence. *Protein Eng Des Sel* 1990; **4**:

155–161.

1131

(a) Antigens

OmpT   Cah   Hes

- Reactive to IgG and IgA from HUS sera
- Expressed during human infection
- Widespread among clinical STEC strains
- Mainly absent in commensal *E. coli* strains

(b) Identification and validation of epitopes

- Epitope mapping

overlapping peptides

Sera from patients

Peptide microarray

- *In silico* prediction of B and T cell epitopes

- Validation of B-cell epitopes by ELISA

(c) Design and purification of chimeric proteins

Chimera 1   Chimera 2

Chimera 1 (Chi1):
8 B-cell epitopes
2 MCH-II epitopes

Chimera 2 (Chi2):
11 B-cell epitopes
2 MHC-II epitopes

- Confirmation of seroreactivity of chimeras by ELISA

(d) Immunization, determination of immune responses and challenge experiments

BALB/c

Intramuscular immunization   vs.   Intrasal immunization

Group 1: Chi1 + IA
Group 3: Chi2 + IA
Group 5: Chi1 + Chi2 + IA
Group 7: PBS + IA + SA

Group 2: Chi1 + SA
Group 4: Chi2 + SA
Group 6: Chi1 + Chi2 + SA

days

-2   0   14   15   28   30   42   45   57

Immunization scheme

Challenge

STEC

Prime   Boost   Boost

Samples collection:

Blood   Feces   Urine   Organs

(a)

OmpT antigenic domain
Hes antigenic domains

(b)

A212 PRO
A159 ARG
A158 GLU
A7 ARG

f
y

General/Pre-Pro/Proline Favoured | General/Pre-Pro/Proline Allowed
Glycine Favoured | Glycine Allowed

Number of residues in favoured region (~98.0% expected) : 244 (94.6%)
Number of residues in allowed region (~2.0% expected) : 10 (3.9%)
Number of residues in outlier region : 4 (1.6%)

(c)

Z-Score: -2.52
X-ray
NMR

Z-score
Number of residues

(d)

OmpT derived peptides
Hes derived peptides
αCah carrier

(e)

A449 GLY
A123 GLY
A390 GLY
A462 THR

f
y

General/Pre-Pro/Proline Favoured | General/Pre-Pro/Proline Allowed
Glycine Favoured | Glycine Allowed

Number of residues in favoured region (~98.0% expected) : 458 (86.6%)
Number of residues in allowed region (~2.0% expected) : 65 (12.3%)
Number of residues in outlier region : 6 (1.1%)

(f)

Z-Score: -7,01
X-ray
NMR

Z-score
Number of residues

(g)

kDa   M   Chi1   Chi2

(h)

Specific serum IgG (µg/ml)
*
Chi1   Chi2   αCah

(i)

Specific serum IgA (ng/ml)
Chi1   Chi2   αCah

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

Chi1+ IA   Chi2 + IA   Chi1 + Chi2 + IA   PBS + IA + SA
Chi1 + SA   Chi2 + SA   Chi1 + Chi2 + SA