Selection of HIV-1 for Resistance to Fourth Generation Protease Inhibitors Reveals Two

Independent Pathways to High-Level Resistance

Ean Spielvogel[1,2], Sook-Kyung Lee[2], Shuntai Zhou[2], Gordon J. Lockbaum[3], Mina Henes[3], Amy

Sondgeroth[1,2], Klajdi Kosovrasti[3], Akbar Ali[3], Nese Kurt Yilmaz[3], Celia A. Schiffer[3*], Ronald

Swanstrom[2,4*]

[1]Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,

Chapel Hill, NC, 27599, USA

[2]Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel

Hill, NC, 27599, USA

[3]Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Pharmacology, University of Massachusetts

Medical School, Worcester, MA 01605, USA

[4]Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,

Chapel Hill, NC, 27599, USA

*Corresponding Author

Ronald Swanstrom: Phone: +1 919 966 5710; ron_swanstrom@med.unc.edu

Celia A. Schiffer: Phone: +1 508 856 8008; Celia.Schiffer@umassmed.edu

Summary

Well-designed viral protease inhibitors (PIs) potently inhibit replication as well as create

a high genetic barrier for resistance. Through in vivo selective pressure, we have generated

high-level resistance against ten HIV-1 PIs and their precursor, the FDA-approved drug

darunavir (DRV), achieving 1,000-fold resistance over the starting EC50. The accumulation of

mutations revealed two pathways to high-level resistance, resulting in protease variants with up

to 14 mutations in and outside of the active site. The two pathways demonstrate the interplay

between drug resistance and viral fitness. Replicate selections showed that one inhibitor could

select for resistance through either pathway, although subtle changes in chemical structure of

the inhibitors led to preferential use of one pathway over the other. Viral variants from the two

pathways showed differential selection of compensatory mutations in Gag cleavage sites. These

results reveal the high-level of selective pressure that is attainable with these fourth-generation

protease inhibitors, and the interplay between selection of mutations to confer resistance while

maintaining viral fitness.

Introduction

Highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) against HIV-1 with combinations of three or more drugs effectively block viral replication and preclude the evolution of drug resistance. Each drug by itself can select for resistance, and successive addition of the same three drugs that together are suppressive would lead to multi-drug resistance. Thus, only fully suppressing viral replication allows successful therapy, while sub-optimal inhibition leads to selection of resistance. Accordingly, the population size of the replicating virus is an important determinant of the evolution of resistance. In an early clinical study of monotherapy with a protease inhibitor, the time to the appearance of resistance was correlated with the nadir of viral load before rebound (Kempf et al., 1998), i.e. the lower the nadir viral load, the longer the time to the appearance of resistant rebound virus. Three major factors interplay to define the emergence of resistance *in vivo*: i) the active drug concentration relative to its inhibitory activity; ii) the level of resistance conferred by one or more mutations; and iii) the fitness cost of the resistance mutations.

The early identification of the retroviral protease as a member of the aspartyl proteinase family and the determination of a number of cleavage site sequences led to the development of first generation inhibitors that validated the HIV-1 protease as a drug target (Katoh et al., 1987, Richards et al., 1989, Seelmeier et al., 1988). A second generation of inhibitors was quickly developed for use in humans, becoming the third drug in a three-drug regimen that achieved sustained suppression of viral load with no evolution of resistance (Gulick et al., 1997). The third generation of inhibitors had improved properties with regard to side effects and efficacy. In addition, the strategy of "boosting" protease inhibitor levels with ritonavir (RTV), which at low doses inhibits cytochrome P450-3A4 metabolizing HIV-1 PIs, allowed for increased drug

levels needed to inhibit replication. These properties have been further enhanced with a fourth-

generation PI, darunavir (DRV), which achieves drug levels in plasma (>1 µM) that is 1,000

fold greater than its inhibitory activity in cell culture (Ali et al., 2010, Nalam et al., 2013,

Yilmaz et al., 2009). The high efficacy of a fourth-generation inhibitor such as DRV can be

inferred from an attempt to use this drug in monotherapy (Katlama et al., 2010, Pulido et al.,

2011). In the cases of virologic failure there was no significant resistance to DRV in the

rebound virus (Katlama et al., 2010, Pulido et al., 2011). Thus the observed rebound is most

easily attributed to issues with adherence or possibly poor drug penetration in some tissues.

69   Under selective pressure, such as inhibition with small molecules, for survival the virus

has to maintain a balance between mutations that confer inhibitor resistance while maintaining

the enzyme's necessary catalytic function to allow viral replication. Typically, at low inhibitor

concentrations a less resistant but more fit virus will be selected, while at higher inhibitor

concentrations a more resistant but less fit virus may have to be selected. A clear example of

this is with HIV-1 PI nelfinavir (NFV) where in patient isolates the resistance mutation D30N

was typically observed, while in cell culture I84V was readily selected and provides greater

resistance and cross-resistance (Grossman et al., 2004, De Meyer et al., 2005, Ntemgwa et al.,

2007) but lower fitness. When resistance can only be achieved by one or more mutations that

are deleterious to enzyme function, requiring the selection of additional compensatory

mutations to restore fitness, such inhibitors are considered to have a high genetic barrier to

resistance. Thus, it becomes increasingly difficult for virus in a small population size to survive

the fitness loss long enough to accumulate the additional needed mutations, either as the

population size is rapidly declining during therapy initiation or in sites where there might be

low level replication on therapy.

We have previously designed a series of highly potent protease inhibitors, UMASS1-10,

that fit within the substrate envelope, which is the shared volume occupied by natural protease

substrates when bound to the active site (Nalam et al., 2013). These inhibitors are less

susceptible to resistance because a mutation affecting such inhibitors will simultaneously affect

substrate processing. The designed inhibitors share a common chemical scaffold with DRV but

have modified chemical moieties that further fill the substrate envelope, and all bind tighter than

<5 pM to purified wildtype HIV-1 protease. These inhibitors retained robust binding to many

multi-drug resistant protease variants and viral strains. Thus, the substrate envelope proved to

be a powerful tool to guide the design of potent and robust inhibitors, by minimizing

susceptibility to resistance mutations.

In this study we have examined the evolutionary path that HIV-1 follows to attain high

level resistance to a panel of fourth-generation PIs by selecting for resistance under conditions

of escalating inhibitor concentration during viral replication in cell culture. While DRV and

UMASS1-10 potently inhibit wild-type and single mutant variants, under persistent pressure of

sub-optimal inhibition the virus evolves to accumulate mutations and escape inhibition. In most

cases, selection was carried out until the inhibitor concentration was over 1,000 times the

starting EC50, with the final concentration approximating that achieved by DRV *in vivo*. While

it is possible to select for high level resistance to second and third generation protease

inhibitors, these high levels of resistance are not relevant given that these drugs do not reach

comparably high concentrations *in vivo* (Watkins et al., 2003). Selections against the UMASS

series of protease inhibitors were performed twice, in the presence and absence of an initial pool

of common single-site resistance mutations, which had a long-term impact on the sequence

diversity in the culture. Resistance overall followed one of two pathways, one defined by

higher drug resistance but lower viral fitness and the other defined by higher viral fitness but

lower drug resistance. Relatively minor modifications in inhibitor structure influenced selection

of one or the other pathway to resistance, although both pathways eventually led to high levels

of cross-resistance between inhibitors. The viral passaging experiments resulted in proteases

with up to 14 resistance-associated mutations, and deep sequencing analysis showed persistent

heterogeneity in the viral population within the culture. These results reveal the extremely high

genetic barrier to resistance for fourth-generation protease inhibitors at inhibitor concentrations

that can be achieved *in vivo*, and the complex evolutionary pathways required to achieve

resistance.

Results

Panel of highly potent and analogous HIV-1 protease inhibitors

HIV-1 protease inhibitors were designed by modifications to DRV to increase favorable

interactions within the substrate envelope thereby increasing potency while minimizing

evolution of resistance (Nalam et al., 2013). A panel of ten DRV analogues were chosen with

enzymatic inhibition constants (K_i) in the single or double-digit picomolar range to wild-type

NL4-3 protease and the I84V and I50V/A71V drug resistant variants, respectively [**Table 1**]

(Mittal et al., 2013, Lockbaum et al., 2019). These PIs contained modified P1' positions with

(S)-2-methylbutyl or 2-ethyl-n-butyl groups (R1-1 and R1-2, respectively) in combination with

five diverse P2′ phenyl-sulfonamides (R2-1 to R2-5), with the inhibitors named UMASS-1

through -10 [**Table 1**]. These inhibitors and DRV were tested in a cell culture-based viral

inhibition assay. The EC50 constants (the amount of inhibitor needed to inhibit 50% of the

infectivity of the virus when the drug was present during virus production) for DRV and

UMASS analogues ranged from 2.4 to 9.1 nM, significantly more potent than the second and

third generation protease inhibitors (**Figure S1**).

Table 1. Inhibition constants (K_i) in enzymatic assays and half maximal effective

concentrations (EC50) in viral inhibition assays of DRV and analogous protease inhibitors.

Inhibitor	Structure	K_i (pM)			EC50 (nM)
		WT	I84V	I50V/A71V	WT
DRV		< 5.0	25.6 ± 5.6	74.5 ± 5.6	7.7
UMass 1		< 5.0	26.1 ± 3.7	110.3 ± 8.8	5.9
UMass 2		< 5.0	< 5.0	15.0 ± 2.7	2.4
UMass 3		< 5.0	9.9 ± 2.7	79.9 ± 5.9	9.1
UMass 4		< 5.0	10.5 ± 1.8	32.9 ± 3.0	3.2
UMass 5		< 5.0	7.0 ± 1.7	7.8 ± 0.9	4.0
UMass 6		< 5.0	12.8 ± 3.1	100.0 ± 9.9	5.2
UMass 7		< 5.0	12.1 ± 4.5	18.2 ± 3.0	3.1
UMass 8		< 5.0	< 5.0	55.4 ± 4.0	4.2
UMass 9		< 5.0	7.6 ± 1.6	42.3 ± 2.6	6.4
UMass 10		< 5.0	14.3 ± 9.3	5.8 ± 1.1	4.1

Selection for high-level resistance *in vitro*

To evaluate the potential of each inhibitor to select for mutations that would confer high-level resistance and to compare these mutations across analogous inhibitors, we performed viral passaging under conditions of escalating inhibitor concentration in cell culture. Virus in the cultures was periodically sequenced after selection to specific inhibitor concentrations. The selection experiments were performed under two separate starting conditions, a mixture of 26 viruses with known single-site mutations associated with drug resistance in an NL4-3 background, or with virus generated from only the wild-type NL4-3 clone (which closely approximates the clade B consensus sequence for the protease amino acid sequence). Notably, only about one-half of the selected mutations were present in the initial mixture, indicating that even in the selection that was seeded with the pool of resistance mutations there was sufficient evolutionary capacity to explore additional mutational space. Inhibitor/Selective pressure started at low nanomolar concentrations and increased by a factor of 1.5 with each subsequent viral passage. All of the selections starting with wild type virus reached at least 5 µM of inhibitor concentration. For technical reasons, only 5 of the selections starting with the mixture of mutants reached an inhibitor concentration of 400 nM and are included in this report (**Figure S2**). To assess variability in the selection scheme, selection against DRV was replicated four separate times starting with the same mutant mixture.

Two major mutational pathways to resistance determined by next generation sequencing (NGS) of viral culture during *in vitro* selection

Resistance mutations selected in the protease coding domain during the escalating

selective pressure of increased protease inhibitor concentration were examined at various time-

points using a next generation sequencing (NGS) protocol that included Primer ID with the

MiSeq platform (Zhou et al., 2015). In this approach, individual cDNA molecules are tagged

with 11 random degenerate bases in the cDNA primer to give a unique molecular identifier to

each cDNA/RNA template before the PCR step, allowing quantification of the number of

templates sequenced (by the number of different Primer ID identifiers recovered). A Template

Consensus Sequences (TCS) was generated using the multiple reads associated with each

Primer ID identifier/template, which greatly lowers the error rate. The abundance of viral RNA

templates recovered from the culture supernatants made it possible to sequence thousands of

templates, which validated the sampling sensitivity by detecting several copies of minor

variants representing less than 0.1% of the population.

Each of the viral cultures showed an accumulation of protease mutations with increasing

selective pressure. NGS analysis revealed very few fixed variants until the inhibitor

concentration reached 3 nM, with some exceptions occurring at sub-EC50 concentrations.

Multiple resistance variants were observed in relatively high abundance after the drug

concentration surpassed the EC50 values above 3 nM, highlighting the high genetic diversity in

the culture. Additional compensatory mutations became linked at higher drug concentrations,

which was followed by a fairly stable population through the rest of the time points. An

average of 6 mutations were present by the time the drug concentration reached 100 nM, while

an average of 10 mutations (and up to 14) were seen for the selections that reached greater than

1 μM inhibitor concentration (**Figure S3, S4**).

The mutations observed in the most abundant protease variant present at the highest

inhibitor concentration achieved in each selection are shown in **Figure 1**. These end-point

protease variants illustrate two largely independent pathways to resistance, centered around the

active site mutations I84V or I50V, although in some cases both mutations were observed.

Also, the most abundant and the second most abundant genotypes in each culture typically

differ by a single compensatory mutation, indicative of a necessary "backbone" of resistance

mutations shared by a majority of successful variants (not shown). Finally, certain mutations are

linked to one or the other pathway while others are shared (see below).

Both resistance pathways confer high levels of cross-resistance to all PIs

To quantify the resistance associated with each selection pathway, a subset of viruses

that reached the 5 µM inhibitor concentration in the selection cultures were chosen to be tested

in an EC50 infectivity assay. The EC50 values were obtained using pools of viruses that

contained mostly homogenous populations, which aimed to minimize any confounding

variables in the dose-response curve, although there was some sequence heterogeneity in the

cultures. The pools were sequenced and all viral pools used in the EC50 experiments had a

single variant representing at least 80% of their population.

The viruses tested revealed EC50 values 100 to over 10,000-fold higher than WT virus

(ND) across the different inhibitors [**Figure 2**]. Cross-resistance against all inhibitors was

observed at high levels. The virus pool that contained both 50V and 84V mutations showed the

highest levels of resistance across the panel of inhibitors. Thus, the selections were successful

in generating highly resistant variants to these fourth-generation inhibitors after the

accumulation of mutations in over 10% of the sequence of the protease or more.

Sequence diversity (entropy) varied over the course of selection

As previously mentioned, on average 6 mutations were observed at 100 nM inhibitor

concentration, and on average 10 mutations were observed when the selective pressure was

above 1 µM, indicating the increasing number of mutations necessary for viability under

increasing selective pressure. However, deep sequencing at selected inhibitor concentrations

revealed mutations accumulated in complex patterns. We assessed the sequence complexity of

each culture by calculating the Shannon Entropy to allow comparison of changes in diversity in

the cultures. Entropy profiles are shown for all of the selections in **Figure 3**. When we

examined the entropy values for all selections that reached 1 µM in inhibitor concentration we

found that cultures starting with the mixture of resistant viruses averaged a nearly two-fold

higher entropy value compared to the cultures where the selection started with just the virus

generated from the NL4-3 clone (3.0 vs 1.6, $P<0.0001$ Mann-Whitney test). This was

unexpected, as both sets of selections passed through many genetic bottlenecks. This result is

most easily explained if the rates of recombination were fairly high throughout the culture

period.

The additional entropy plots of each individual selection with the times when mutations

appeared (**Figure 3**) in the culture show the early appearance of the I84V mutation was

associated with peaks in entropy, reflecting high genetic diversity, followed by a decrease in

entropy when the mutation became fixed. The I50V mutation was not associated with drops in

entropy when it entered the population, rather these populations maintained high genetic

diversity even at higher drug concentrations. We interpret these patterns as indicative of I84V

conferring some level of resistance without a dramatic loss in fitness, allowing a more

homogeneous culture (i.e. less entropy). In contrast, I50V confers a higher level of resistance

but at a greater fitness cost, thus requiring greater diversity in the culture either as compensatory

mutations or as other combinations of mutations with lesser resistance but higher fitness. We

previously showed I50V significantly reduces the fitness of the virus relative to the fitness loss

of a virus with I84V (Henderson et al., 2012). In contrast, I50V (with A71V) was on average

significantly less sensitive to inhibition by this series of inhibitors (Table 1).

Inhibitor structure influences the resistance pathway

Selections were performed with 11 analogous inhibitors derived from a common

scaffold (**Table 1**) (Nalam et al., 2013, Paulsen et al., 2017). We were interested to see if subtle

chemical differences between the inhibitors could impact selection for different resistance

pathways. We found the P1' group, either (S)-2-methylbutyl (R1-1) or 2-ethyl-n-butyl (R1-2),

influenced the resistance pathway. With the UMASS 1-5 series (the smaller R1-1 group), the

I84V pathway was favored. In contrast, the UMASS 6-10 series with the larger R1-2 group,

favored the I50V mutation. Overall, 7 of the 8 cultures with an R1-1 inhibitor first had I84V,

while 8 of 9 cultures with R1-2 had I50V (P=0.003, Fisher's Exact Test). We considered the

possibility that the mixture of mutant viruses in the first selection might skew the pathway

selected. However, in only 1 of the 8 cultures with sufficient data from both selections was

there a switch from the I84V pathway to the I50V pathway between the first and second

selections (cultures of UMASS 6 with an R1-2 group). Thus, we conclude that the P1' group of

the inhibitor is a strong determinant of the pathway selected.

While the cultures of inhibitors with R1-1 groups favored I84V there was also some

selection of I50V; this is in contrast to cultures with the R1-2 group inhibitors which strongly

favored the I50V pathway and excluded the I84V pathway. This preference is explained with

analysis of the protease-inhibitor cocrystal structures. The R1-1 has one more methyl group

than DRV which packs against residue 82, but this group loses significant vdW contacts with

residue I84 due to I84V mutation. The R1-2 group has one more methyl than the R1-1 group

which packs against residue 84 and thus better maintains vdW contacts [**Figure 4**] (Lockbaum

et al., 2019). Similar to I84V, the I50V mutation causes a steric reduction of a residue side

chain in the hydrophobic S1' pocket. Like I84V, the I50V mutation causes loss of vdW contacts

with the R1-1 group, but unlike with the I84V mutation, the R1-2 is unable to accommodate the

I50V mutation due to the flaps adopting a subtly different conformation in the presence of the

mutation.

To examine the broader pattern of mutations selected based on the R1 group, the

abundance data from UMASS1-5 and UMASS6-10 was pooled and examined sequentially at

different levels of drug concentration. In this analysis (**Figure 5**), the mutations selected against

UMASS1-5 are depicted pointing upwards, while the mutations resulting from UMASS6-10

point downwards. These data show the strong preference for the I50V pathway for the R1-2-

containing inhibitors, and suggest there may be specific and shared mutations in the two

pathways (see below). Since the R1 group was a strong determinant of resistance pathway

chosen, we did not analyze the data for the larger set of R2 groups.

We further explored how deterministic pathway choice was by analyzing the four

replicates of DRV selection starting from a pool of 26 single resistance-associated mutation

variants (**Figure S5**). In one of the cultures the virus was lost during the escalation of inhibitor

concentration, suggesting the selection protocol provides strong selection pressure at or near

levels that can extinguish the virus. The sequence analysis for the other three cultures showed

that HIV-1 can evolve DRV resistance using both pathways. Of the replicate selections, two

out of the three selections followed the I84V pathway, with I50V in the remaining selection.

These results show there is a stochastic element in which resistance pathway is used under these

conditions of escalating selective pressure. These results are also consistent with the smallest

R1 group (even smaller than in the R1-1 series) in DRV being able to use both resistance

pathways, while the larger R1-2 is more selective for the I50V pathway.

Linked versus shared mutations in evolution of high-level resistance through the two

pathways

To examine the order in which the 8 to 14 mutations accumulated in the protease gene to

confer high level resistance, and determine if there was specificity between the two pathways

(I50V and I84V), the abundance data from multiple selections that ended in one or the other

pathway were pooled and examined sequentially at different levels of drug concentration. In

this analysis (**Figure** 6), the selections resulting in the I84V pathway point up, with I84V

reaching 100% penetrance, by definition. Similarly, those selections that fixed I50V are shown

pointing downward, with I50V reaching 100% penetrance.

The mutational data grouped by I50V and I84V penetrance show that the mutations are

often close in three-dimensional space. The I84V pathway shows a strong correlation with

V32I (specifically) and V82I, two hydrophobic residues that have a direct steric relationship

with residue 84 and most likely participate in hydrophobic sliding [**Figure 7A**] (Foulkes-

Murzycki et al., 2007, Ragland et al., 2014, Ragland et al., 2017, Mittal et al., 2012).

Hydrophobic repacking has been observed when I84V mutates and adopts an alternate rotamer

in the B chain which also affects the rotamer of residue 32 (Lockbaum et al., 2019). The V32I

mutation has been shown to work cooperatively with the L33F mutation to achieve higher levels

of resistance than either mutation on their own (Ragland et al., 2014), although L33F was

observed in both pathways. Active site hydrophobic packing is also altered with the I47V

mutation which is selected mostly in the I50V pathway, while L76V is unique to the I84V

pathway, although it appears at a low frequency. In addition to being in close proximity to

I84V, the V82I mutation is also near the L10F mutation, observed in both pathways [**Figure**

7B]. Lastly the I54L mutation has been shown to be critical in conferring very high levels of

drug resistance at the expense of catalytic efficiency, which is probably why that mutation is

only observed at high inhibitor concentrations (Henes et al., 2019).

While both pathways have an L33F mutation which adds steric bulk to the hydrophobic

core of the protease, the I50V mutation uniquely utilizes the I13V mutation to relieve that steric

pressure [**Figure 7B**]. Both pathways also have an M46I mutation a critical site for resistance

(Ragland et al., 2014) which modulates flap dynamics. Only the I50V pathway has the F53L

mutation that directly interacts with residue 46 on the outer surface of the flap, likely providing

flap stability. L10I, G16E, I47A, L76S, I85V, and L89T/I mutations appear at lower frequency,

making it challenging to assess if they are specific or critical to either pathway.

To further evaluate the loss in potency, HIV-1 protease variants with high levels of drug

resistance from viral selection were chosen to span the diversity in sequence, and represent the

I50V, I84V and I50V/I84V pathways. The protease variants were expressed/purified, and

enzymatic activity and inhibition assayed against DRV and the ten inhibitor analogs. Although

the enzymatic activity of some of the proteases is ~10-fold compromised relative to wildtype

(~17 $(s*\mu M)^{-1}$) some have retained near-WT activity (Sel-U5s-7Mut). The chosen set of 9

protease variants (**Table 2**) includes 4 that contain I50V (red), 3 that contain I84V (blue), and 2

that have both I84V/I50V (purple). These proteases contain 6–14 mutations relative to the

wildtype enzyme, and the potency of the inhibitors has dropped from pM range to 1–100 nM

(**Figure 8**). U5 and U10 retain potency against some of the variants, but all 11 inhibitors are

compromised by two highly resistant proteases. Very high levels of resistance occur with

proteases that the contain I50V pathway variants (red), the I84V pathway variants (blue) or the

variants with both I50V/I84V (purple).

Table 2: Highly mutated inhibitor resistant end-point protease variants chosen to quantify

inhibitor resistance and catalytic efficiency.

	L	V	I	I	V	L	N	K	K	M	I	I	F	I	L	I	A	I	G	T	L	V	I	I	L	T	Q	Avg. Inhib. Res. Ki (nM)	Catalytic Eff. Kcat/Km (s*uM)^-1
	10	11	13	15	32	33	37	43	45	46	47	50	53	54	63	66	71	72	73	74	76	82	84	85	89	91	92		
Sel-U9s-6Mut	F									I		V	L		P				S									4.62 ± 0.51	3.53 ± 0.28
Sel-U3-12Mut	F			F						I	V	V	L		P	V				S	I			V	I			24.90 ± 1.18	0.56 ± 0.27
Sel-U8-10Mut	F									I	V	V	L		P			V	S		I			V				39.61 ± 1.98	1.91 ± 0.40
Sel-U9e-14Mut	F	V		F			R			I	V	V	L	L		F	V	A		S	I							40.36 ± 1.82	0.60 ± 0.18
Sel-U5s-7Mut	F		I	F	I											V						I	V					3.61 ± 0.23	17.94 ± 0.23
Sel-DRV3-10Mut	F		I	F		D				I					P				S	V			V	M				9.80 ± 0.82	9.14 ± 0.30
Sel-U4-14Mut	F	I	V		I	F		T		L						L	V					I	V	M	S	R		35.38 ± 1.84	1.04 ± 0.40
Sel-U2-9Mut	I		I	F			I	I				V				V						I	V					14.51 ± 0.57	10.67 ± 0.45
Sel-U5e-10Mut	F		V							I	V	V	L			V						I	V		T			85.85 ± 4.47	1.12 ± 0.29

Analysis of Gag cleavage-site mutations

HIV-1 protease is responsible for cleaving 10 different substrates during viral

maturation. Although these substrates do not have high sequence identity, the amino acids

corresponding to each cleavage site have a similar/conserved size and shape when bound to

protease active site (Prabu-Jeyabalan et al., 2002). Under inhibitor selective pressure, the

protease accumulates mutations that alter the active site, which may perturb the binding affinity

and processing of substrates. As the protease mutates to confer drug resistance, certain cleavage

sites are known to co-evolve to maintain protease binding affinity and the relative rates at which

the substrates are cleaved (Doyon et al., 1996, Zhang et al., 1997, Mammano et al., 1998, Kolli

et al., 2009a, Ozen et al., 2012b). Protease-substrate coevolution particularly occurs at the

cleavage sites flanking the spacer peptide SP2 in Gag (NC/SP2 and SP2/p6) (Prabu-Jeyabalan et

al., 2004, Kolli et al., 2006, Kolli et al., 2014, Kolli et al., 2009b, Lee et al., 2012, Ozen et al.,

2011, Ozen et al., 2012a, Ozen et al., 2014a). We sequenced the protease cleavage sites

encoded in the viral *gag* gene in the pools of selected viruses where the inhibitor concentration

had reached a level of greater than 1 µM [**Figure 9**].

An analysis of four cultures that had I84V as the major resistance mutation showed they all had

a mutation at the NC/SP2 cleavage site at position P2, with a change from the wild type alanine

amino acid to either of the larger hydrophobic amino acids valine or isoleucine. In addition,

three of the four I84V cultures had a mutation at the adjacent SP2/p6 cleavage site, either at P1'

(leucine to phenylalanine) or P5' (proline to leucine). Conversely, all seven cultures where the

I50V mutation was the major resistance mutation there was a mutation in the SP2/p6 cleavage

site, but not in the NC/SP2 site. Four of the seven cultures had leucine to phenylalanine

mutations at the P1' position, two had proline to leucine mutations at the P5' position, and one

had both of these mutations together. Finally, in the three cultures where the protease evolved

both the I50V and I84V mutations, Gag mutations were observed only at the SP2/p6 cleavage

site. One culture had the proline to leucine mutation at the P5' position, while the other two had

both the P1' (leucine to phenylalanine) and P5' (proline to leucine) mutations.

The patterns of protease-substrate coevolution from these cultures suggest two

phenomena are at work. First, P2 mutations in the NC/SP2 cleavage site are compensatory for

the I84V resistance mutation but are likely to be antagonistic for the I50V mutation, since they

do not appear in the cultures with I50V either alone or in combination with I84V. Second, the

effects of the SP2/p6 mutations at the P1' and P5' positions may be mechanistically related. The

P1' leucine to phenylalanine mutation increases the size of the P1' side chain and thus occupies

more space in the S1' subsite of the protease. Combining the I84V and I50V selections, nine of

ten cases have either the SP2/p6 P1' or the P5' position is mutated, with only one I50V culture

where they appear together. This suggests the proline to leucine P5' mutation may indirectly

increase wild type P1' leucine interactions with the S1' subsite. Consistent with this, we

previously found by solving crystal structures that the proline to leucine mutation at the P5′

position causes a distal conformational change in the protease flap and alters substrate–protease

interactions (Ozen et al., 2014b). When both I50V and I84V were present in the protease

together, the P1' and P5' mutations appeared together (in 2 of 3 cultures), which we would

predict further increased S1' subsite interactions to compensate for the smaller amino acids at

both protease residues, 50 and 84.

Previous work has shown that the I84V variant will more rapidly cleave NC/SP2 when

alanine is mutated to valine at position P2 (Kolli et al., 2009a). I50V was also shown to cleave

the SP2/p6 site more rapidly when leucine is mutated to phenylalanine at position P1' and when

proline is mutated to leucine at position P5' (Ozen et al., 2014b). To understand the molecular

basis of HIV-1 protease coevolution with SP2/p6 cleavage site mutations, crystal structures

were examined. In our model, when alanine was substituted for valine, we observed that the P2

residue in the NC/SP2 site occupies the vdW space in the substrate pocket previously filled with

a methyl group on isoleucine at position 84 of protease. This mutation is not observed in the

I50V pathway, possibly due to the fact that the isoleucine does not occupy the same space.

However, the SP2/p6 cleavage site mutations in P1' and P5' the I50V pathway result in

increased cleavage of SP2/p6, which would provide more starting product required for cleavage

of the NC/SP2 site, the least active site in all of Gag. Analyses of the protease–substrate

interactions indicated that restoration of active site dynamics is an additional constraint in the

selection of coevolved mutations. Additionally, compensatory coevolved mutations such as

ProP5'Leu in the substrate do not directly restore interactions lost due to protease mutations but

induce distal changes. Hence, protease–substrate coevolution permits mutational, structural,

and dynamic changes via molecular mechanisms that involve distal effects contributing to drug

resistance.

Patterns of mutation beyond protease and cleavage sites that occur during resistance

selection.

When HIV-1 evolves drug resistance, resistance is being evolved by the whole viral

system in the environment where the virus is replicating. Thus although HIV-1 protease

inhibitors target the viral protease, for viruses to attain high level resistance the entire virus

likely adapts to this selective pressure. Over recent years there have been a number of reports

of site mutations in the cleavage sites as well as other locations within the Gag polyprotein and

potentially Env gp41 (Doyon et al., 1996, Cote et al., 2001, Prabu-Jeyabalan et al., 2004, Kolli

et al., 2006, Banke et al., 2009, Dam et al., 2009, Parry et al., 2011). However the mechanism

by which these changes contribute to protease inhibitor drug resistance (Rabi et al., 2013) or

how co-evolution may otherwise compensate as the virus acquires high levels of drug resistance

is unknown.

Our viral selection experiments provide a unique opportunity to examine both the

mutations that occur both within the protease gene, and throughout the viral genome and

potential alterations in host response. Given the large number of selections performed we can

begin to elucidate the role of compensatory changes outside protease. Mutations that were

observed in more than 2 selections and/or involved a change in charge (shaded yellow) are

shown in **Figure 10**, with reversions to consensus subtype B or mutations observed in the no-

drug control (i.e. simply adaptation to tissue culture passage) not included. Overall this involved

changes at 99 different sites: 31 sites in Gag, 29 sites in RT/integrase, 30 sites in Envelope

(Env) and 9 in Vif. Only 5 changes were in cleavage sites, one in Nucleocapsid and 4 in p6

(**Figure 9**). Approximately 35% of the selection-associated mutations are consistent with

APOBEC3G/F (A3G/F) driven mutations. In total, 48 sites involved changes in charge, most

often making the resistant selected virus more positively charged. A total of 14 mutations were

observed in five or more drug selection experiments; these include: Capsid (<u>V27I</u>, <u>Q67H</u>,

P207S); Nucleocapsid (*R32K*); p6 (L1F, P5L, F17S); RT (*E194K*, *D237N*, *E297K*); Integrase

(D6H, *D41N*, M154I) and Vif (I31N) – (italics indicate likely APOBEC mutations, underlined

previously reported, and bold cleavage site mutation).

The Capsid mutation H87Q in the cyclophilin A (CypA) loop is well-known and allows

HIV-1 to escape the Trim5α restriction factor (Kootstra et al., 2007, Bosco et al., 2010). We

observed this mutation in our passaging experiments, including in the no-drug control indicating

an adaptation to cell culture (data not shown). Three other mutations were observed in 5 or more

of the viral drug selections in Capsid (V27I, Q67H, P207S) as described above. Using the

available crystal and cryoEM structures (Bhattacharya et al., 2014, Zhao et al., 2013), we analyzed

where these three positions are physically located within the Capsid structure (Fig **11**). All three

sites appear to be at pivotal locations: V27I is located in a region between the N and C-terminal

domains, facing a hydrophobic region that is not optimally packed (Fig **11**). The V27I mutation

may improve this packing and was previously observed to rescue infectivity (Rong et al., 2001).

This pocket is also targeted by a number of antiretroviral inhibitors which also elicit resistance as

V27A/I (Lemke et al., 2012). Q67H is located on a capsid-capsid interface within the capsid

hexamer. Modeling suggests that Q67H may act by improving inter-capsid monomer interactions

with Y169' and by forming intramolecular hydrogen bonds with Q63. Q67H was previously

observed to both confer resistance and enhance infectivity (Shi et al., 2015) to PF-3450074 (PF74)

which targets capsid assembly. P207S is located prominently at the pentameric interface between

capsid hexamers of the viral structure. Structurally, P207S can potentially form either direct or

water-mediated hydrogen bonds with the other subunits. The P207S mutation has been identified

as critical for evading the host restriction factors MxB (Busnadiego et al., 2014) and possibly

SUN2 (Donahue et al., 2016). Thus all three mutations we observed frequently within resistant

viruses have been previously associated with enhanced infectivity often by evading host factors.

Discussion

The development of anti-HIV-1 therapeutics has been a successful endeavor to control

viral replication and restore long term health to those living with HIV-1. To prevent the

emergence of resistance, combination therapies targeting multiple viral targets (RT, PR, IN) are

successfully used in the clinic. However, rather than the number of targets, the combined

potency of the drugs is important to effectively suppress viral replication. The initial

demonstration of suppressive therapy was accomplished with three drugs directed at two

targets. As the potency of the individual inhibitors has increased there has been an interest in

exploring reducing the number of drugs in a regimen. This includes initial suppression with a

combination of three drugs then maintenance therapy with fewer drugs. To date attempts at

maintenance with a single potent drug, an HIV-1 protease inhibitor, have been partially

successful ,with some people maintaining suppression while others experience virologic

rebound (Katlama et al., 2010, Pulido et al., 2011). Since incomplete suppression leads to

resistance, any strategy that can cause virologic failure/rebound is not tenable.

Virologic failure can result from several causes. In one case the virus is able to replicate

in the presence of subinhibitory concentrations of drug and evolve resistance, which leads to

higher levels of replication. This situation is easily recognized by the presence of resistance

mutations in the target gene. In another case there can be failure due to poor adherence leading

to uncontrolled virus growth and viral rebound without the presence of resistance mutations. A

more confusing situation is rebound without resistance mutations but under circumstances

where there is reason to believe adherence was high. The first two cases can be distinguished

by the presence or absence of resistance mutations, while the last case is a challenge to account

for. It is worth knowing that when DRV was clinically tested in monotherapy 85% of

participants maintained virologic suppression and those who did experience virologic failure

had no evidence of significant DRV resistance (Katlama et al., 2010, Pulido et al., 2011).

DRV and the UMASS series of inhibitors have EC50 values in the range of 1-10 nM in

cell culture, and DRV reaches a level of >1µM as the maximum plasma concentration *in vivo*,

in the range of 1000-fold over the EC50. In this manuscript we have selected for resistance to

DRV and to 10 analogues of DRV with similar or increased potency to the drug levels that can

be achieved *in vivo*. To select for viral replication at this level of drug the viral protease

incorporated between 8 and 14 mutations, remodeling over 10% of its entire sequence. In

culture this was achieved over 50-60 passages of the virus under conditions of escalating drug

concentration to allow the sequential addition of mutations. This is not how the virus

experiences drug selective pressure *in vivo*. There exposure to high levels of drug (relative to

the EC50) is achieved quickly and largely sustained. Under these circumstances there is no

opportunity for the virus to undergo the significant evolution required to fix the large number of

mutations needed for resistance to DRV. The near absence of resistance mutations in the

virologic failures in the DRV monotherapy trial (Katlama et al., 2010, Pulido et al., 2011)

suggests that there was selective problems with adherence in that arm, that the drug was

differentially metabolized in a subset of people such that there was virtually no systemic drug

exposure to the virus, or that there were compartments within the body that had very low drug

exposure and allowed the production of enough virus to appear in the blood as virologic failure.

Given the extremely large differential of EC50 and blood drug concentration it will be

important to distinguish among these reasons for virologic failure as dual therapy combinations

are entertained.

We tested 10 DRV analogues for pathways to resistance, in addition to DRV. Mutations

accumulated over most of the course of the increasing selective pressure and revealed two

distinct pathways to high-level resistance, i.e. the major resistance mutation I50V or I84V.

Replicate selections showed that HIV-1 can evolve PI resistance to these inhibitors using both

pathways, confirming that selections with the same inhibitor can produce different outcomes

and that variants maintain a dynamic behavior over the course of a selection. However, with the

largest P1'-equivalent moiety we found a strong preference for the I50V pathway while the

smaller P1'-equivalent moieties were able to utilize either the I50V or the I84V pathway to high

level resistance. In the first set of selections the I50V mutation was not included in the starting

mixture, while the second selection was started with a homogeneous unmutated population.

Thus these cultures were not limited in their ability to select among the familiar resistance

mutation pathways even with different starting points. Selection to >1 μM inhibitor

concentration resulted in broad cross resistance across the entire panel of inhibitors.

Although these pathways generally developed independently, they are not mutually

exclusive. Several highly-selected cultures assembled linked "hybrid" variants with both I50V

and I84V at the higher drug concentrations. Although there were only a few examples of this,

they appeared to add I84V into the I50V pathway rather than the reverse.

In all of the cultures with the early appearance of the I84V mutation, this was coincident

with or quickly followed by the addition of a mutation at position 32. Mutation V32I surfaced

early in each culture, simultaneously or after the mutation at I84V. Mutations selected at the

highest drug concentrations show I84V linked to mutations at positions 10, 33, 46, 71, and 82.

Early appearance of mutations at I84V are associated with peaks in entropy, reflecting high

diversity at that time point. This was followed by a decrease in entropy when the mutation

becomes fixed as other populations died off. There appears to be a temporal order in one

pathway where I50V is added first followed by I47V then F53L and I13V (or I85V). The I50V

mutation was not associated with drops in entropy like the 84V mutation, and was followed by

an increase entropy with higher drug concentrations. The selection for specific mutations could

be interpreted based on structural studies.

Protease cleavage site mutations are known to coevolve with protease inhibitor

resistance within the protease itself REF. The two resistance pathways were associated with

distinctive patterns of evolution within the NC/SP2 and SP2/p6 cleavage sites (Doyon et al.,

1996, Zhang et al., 1997, Mammano et al., 1998). The NC/SP2 site has a suboptimal alanine at

the P2 site in the cleavage site sequence, with the resistance associated mutation placing a more

favorable valine or isoleucine in that position to make the cleavage site sequence more

favorable (Potempa et al., 2018). This interaction can be accounted for in the structure of

protease bound to substrate. However, selection at this position does not occur in the I50V

pathway, even in those viruses where both I50V and I84V are present, suggesting an

antagonistic effect on I50V or an absence of any benefit in cleavage site rate with this P2

change. In contrast, the mutations in the P1' site and the P5' site seem to have similar effects

even though the P5' change is outside of the cleavage recognition sequence. The P1' change in

the SP2/p6 site is leucine to phenylalanine, with larger hydrophobic amino acids in the P1'

position being preferred (Pettit et al., 2002). The P5' change in this site from proline to leucine

must effect a similar change by allowing the P1' leucine to move further into the S1' subsite to

improve the rate of cleavage. In the most resistant viruses, with both I50V and I84V, both the

P1' and P5' mutations appeared together.

We found an array of mutations across the genome in the resistant viruses. The presence

of mutations that appear to be the result of APOBEC3G modifications suggest the cultures went

through significant bottlenecks to fix these likely deleterious mutations. In contrast, some

sequence changes represented reversion to the consensus subtype B mutations, suggesting

selection for improved fitness. A more interesting set of mutations were in the capsid sequence

frequently appearing at subunit interfaces. This raises the possibility that one of the

compensatory mechanisms of a less active protease may be in the subunit recognition/assembly

of the capsid.

In this manuscript we have examined the evolutionary pathways that confer high level

resistance to DRV and a series of DRV variants. We showed that resistance to the level of

DRV that is achieved in plasma *in vivo* requires extensive mutagenesis both within the outside

of the protease. These levels of evolution are not attainable during the rapid decline of the viral

population size with the initiation of multidrug therapy nor likely to occur during sporadic,

isolated viral replication in tissue. While monotherapy even with potent drugs has not been as

robust in achieving viral suppression as triple drug therapy, there is potential for two drug

therapies. To date dual therapy often includes the nucleoside analog 3TC which has a very low

genetic barrier (a single mutation M184V in RT). A more reasonable strategy would be to pair

two drugs where both drugs have a high genetic barrier, with a protease inhibitor such as DRV

as an obvious choice. Finally, given the high level of drug that can be obtained in the blood

there is the potential to use DRV as a platform for a fifth generation of protease inhibitors that

have additional properties such as reduced protein binding or enhance blood-brain-barrier

penetration.

Materials and Methods

Cell lines and viruses.

CEMx174 cells were maintained in RPMI 1640 medium with 10% fetal calf serum and

penicillin-streptomycin. TZM-bl and 293T cells were maintained in Dulbecco's modified

Eagle-H medium supplemented with 10% fetal calf serum and penicillin-streptomycin.

CEMx174 cell line was obtained from the National Institutes of Health AIDS Research and

Reference Reagent Program. A wild-type virus stock NL4-3 was prepared by transfection of

the pNL4-3 plasmid (purified using the Qiagen plasmid Maxikit) into HeLa cells.

Selections.

An aliquot of 3×10^6 CEMx174 cells was incubated at 37°C for 2 to 3 h with 250 µl of a virus

stock generated from the HIV-1 infectious molecular clone pNL4-3. The culture volume was

then brought to 10 ml with RPMI medium. Each flask received one of the following inhibitors

at escalating concentrations: UMass1, UMass2, UMass3, UMass4, UMass5, UMass6, UMass7,

UMass8, UMass9, UMass10, DRV and no drug (ND). After 48 h and every 48 h after, the cells

were pelleted by centrifugation and 10ml of fresh medium and inhibitors were added. When the

culture had undergone extensive cytopathic effect (CPE) indicative of viral replication, the

supernatant medium and the cells were harvested separately and stored at -80°C. The virus-

containing supernatant was used to start the next round of infection, and after several rounds at

the initial concentration, the inhibitor concentration was increased 1.5-fold at each subsequent

round of virus passage. The level of resistance (50% inhibitory concentration [EC50]) of the

single inhibitor-selected virus pools was determined by a TZM infection assay in which the

protease inhibitor is added to productively infected cells and the titers of supernatant virus made

in the presence of the inhibitor are determined.

TZM Infection Assay

Protease inhibitor dilutions were prepared by taking 10 µM stocked and performing a 5-fold

serial dilution using RPMI media (final drug concentration is 100 µM). One dilution of drug

was added to each well of a 24 well plate and repeated so each virus would have a full set of

dilutions. Viruses for the assay were made by seeding 3×10^6 CEM cells in a 24 well plate and

incubating with 250 µl of virus at 37°C for 2 to 3 h before bringing the culture to 10ml with

RPMI media. After 48 h the medium was changed and repeated every 48 h after until the

culture had undergone CPE. Infected CEM cells were collected and diluted so that 1ml of cells

could be plated in each well containing a unique drug dilution. Then 24 hours later the virus

supernatant was collected from each well followed by filtering through a 0.45 µM filter then

placed in -80°C. Viruses were thawed and added to 96 well plates in triplicate. TZM-bl cells

were collected and diluted to a concentration of 2×10^5 cells/ml, 100 µl were added on top of the

pre-plated viruses. Plates were kept in 37°C, 5% CO_2 in an incubator for 48 hours. After 48

hours, the cells in the plates were lysed by removing the medium, washing two times with 100

µl PBS and then lysed with 1x lysis buffer (made from 5x Promega Firefly Lysis Buffer).

Plates were frozen for at least 24 hours and then thawed for 2 hours before analyzing with

Promega Firefly Luciferase Kit on a luminometer.

DNA preparation and amplification of the protease-coding region.

Total cellular DNA was isolated from infected cell pellets by using the QIAamp blood kit

(Qiagen). The protease-coding domain of viral DNA was amplified by nested PCR. The PCR

conditions are available on request. PCR products were purified by using QIAquick PCR

purification kit (Qiagen) and directly sequenced or cloned into the pT7Blue vector (Novagen)

and sequenced.

Primer-ID Deep Sequencing of viral RNA

We used the PID protocol to prepare MiSeq PID libraries with multiplexed primers. Viral RNA

was extracted from plasma samples using the QIAamp viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden,

Germany). Complementary DNA (cDNA) was synthesized using a cDNA primer mixture

targeting protease (PR) with a block of random nucleotides in each cDNA primer serving as the

PID, and SuperScript III RT (ThermoFisher). After 2 rounds of bead purification of the cDNA,

we amplified the cDNA using a mixture of a forward primer that targeted the upstream coding

region, followed by a second round of PCR to incorporate the Illumina adaptor sequences. Gel-

purified libraries were pooled and sequenced using the MiSeq 300 base paired-end sequencing

protocol (Illumina). The sequencing covered the HIV-1 PR region (HXB2 2648–2914, 3001–

3257).

We used the Illumina bcl2fastq pipeline for the initial processing and constructed

template consensus sequences (TCSs) with TCS pipeline version 1.33

(https://github.com/SwanstromLab/PID). We then aligned TCSs to an HXB2 reference to

remove sequences not at the targeted region or that had large deletions.

Protease expression and purification

The highly mutated, resistant, protease variant genes were purchased on a pET11a plasmid with

codon optimization for protein expression in *E. coli* (Genewiz). A Q7K mutation was included

to prevent autoproteolysis (Rose et al., 1993). The expression, isolation, and purification of WT

and mutant HIV-1 proteases used for enzymatic assays were carried out as previously described

(Ozen et al., 2014b, King et al., 2002, Henes et al., 2019). Briefly, the gene encoding the

desired HIV-1 protease was subcloned into the heat-inducible pXC35 expression vector

(ATCC) and transformed into *E. coli* TAP-106 cells. Cells grown in 6 L of Terrific Broth were

lysed with a cell disruptor twice, and the protein was purified from inclusion bodies (Hui et al.,

1993). Inclusion bodies, isolated as a pellet after centrifugation, were dissolved in 50% acetic

acid followed by another round of centrifugation at 19,000 rpm for 30 minutes to remove

insoluble impurities. Size exclusion chromatography was carried out on a 2.1-L Sephadex G-75

Superfine (Sigma Chemical) column equilibrated with 50% acetic acid to separate high

molecular weight proteins from the desired protease. Pure fractions of HIV-1 protease were

refolded using a 10-fold dilution of refolding buffer (0.05 M sodium acetate at pH 5.5, 5%

ethylene glycol, 10% glycerol, and 5 mM DTT). Folded protein was concentrated to 0.5–3

mg/ml and stored. The stored protease was used in K_M and K_i assays.

Enzymatic Assays

K_m Assay. K_m values were determined as previously described (Lockbaum et al., 2019, Henes et

al., 2019, Windsor and Raines, 2015, Matayoshi et al., 1990). Briefly, a 10-amino acid

substrate containing the natural MA/CA cleavage site with an EDANS/DABCYL FRET pair

was dissolved in 8% DMSO at 40 nM and 6% DMSO at 30 nM. The 30 nM substrate was 4/5

serially diluted from 30 nM to 6 nM. HIV-1 protease was diluted to 120 nM and, and 5 µl were

added to the 96-well plate to obtain a final concentration of 10 nM. Fluorescence was observed

using a PerkinElmer Envision plate reader with an excitation at 340 nm and emission at 492 nm,

and monitored for 200 counts. A FRET inner filter effect correction was applied as previously

described (Liu et al., 1999). Data corrected for the inner filter effect was analyzed with Prism7.

K_i Assay. Enzyme inhibition constants (K_i values) were determined as previously described

(Lockbaum et al., 2019, Henes et al., 2019, Windsor and Raines, 2015, Matayoshi et al., 1990).

Briefly, in a 96-well plate, inhibitors were serially diluted down from 2000-10,000 nM

depending on protease resistance. All samples were incubated with 5 nM protein for 1 hour. A

10-amino acid substrate containing an optimized protease cleavage site (Windsor and Raines,

2015), purchased from Bachem, with an EDANS/DABCYL FRET pair was dissolved in 4%

DMSO at 120 mM. Using a PerkinElmer Envision plate reader, 5 µl of the 120 mM substrate

were added to the 96-well plate to a final concentration of 10 mM. Fluorescence was observed

with an excitation at 340 nm and emission at 492 nm and monitored for 200 counts. Data was

analyzed with Prism7.

References

ALI, A., BANDARANAYAKE, R. M., CAI, Y., KING, N. M., KOLLI, M., MITTAL, S.,
MURZYCKI, J. F., NALAM, M. N., NALIVAIKA, E. A., OZEN, A., PRABU-
JEYABALAN, M. M., THAYER, K. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2010. Molecular Basis for
Drug Resistance in HIV-1 Protease. *Viruses,* 2**,** 2509-35.
BANKE, S., LILLEMARK, M. R., GERSTOFT, J., OBEL, N. & JORGENSEN, L. B. 2009.
Positive selection pressure introduces secondary mutations at Gag cleavage sites in
human immunodeficiency virus type 1 harboring major protease resistance mutations. *J*
Virol, 83**,** 8916-24.
BHATTACHARYA, A., ALAM, S. L., FRICKE, T., ZADROZNY, K., SEDZICKI, J.,
TAYLOR, A. B., DEMELER, B., PORNILLOS, O., GANSER-PORNILLOS, B. K.,
DIAZ-GRIFFERO, F., IVANOV, D. N. & YEAGER, M. 2014. Structural basis of HIV-
1 capsid recognition by PF74 and CPSF6. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A,* 111**,** 18625-30.
BOSCO, D. A., EISENMESSER, E. Z., CLARKSON, M. W., WOLF-WATZ, M.,
LABEIKOVSKY, W., MILLET, O. & KERN, D. 2010. Dissecting the microscopic
steps of the cyclophilin A enzymatic cycle on the biological HIV-1 capsid substrate by
NMR. *J Mol Biol,* 403**,** 723-38.
BUSNADIEGO, I., KANE, M., RIHN, S. J., PREUGSCHAS, H. F., HUGHES, J., BLANCO-
MELO, D., STROUVELLE, V. P., ZANG, T. M., WILLETT, B. J., BOUTELL, C.,
BIENIASZ, P. D. & WILSON, S. J. 2014. Host and viral determinants of Mx2
antiretroviral activity. *J Virol,* 88**,** 7738-52.
COTE, H. C., BRUMME, Z. L. & HARRIGAN, P. R. 2001. Human immunodeficiency virus
type 1 protease cleavage site mutations associated with protease inhibitor cross-
resistance selected by indinavir, ritonavir, and/or saquinavir. *J Virol,* 75**,** 589-94.
DAM, E., QUERCIA, R., GLASS, B., DESCAMPS, D., LAUNAY, O., DUVAL, X.,
KRAUSSLICH, H. G., HANCE, A. J., CLAVEL, F. & GROUP, A. S. 2009. Gag
mutations strongly contribute to HIV-1 resistance to protease inhibitors in highly drug-
experienced patients besides compensating for fitness loss. *PLoS Pathog,* 5**,** e1000345.
DE MEYER, S., AZIJN, H., SURLERAUX, D., JOCHMANS, D., TAHRI, A., PAUWELS, R.,
WIGERINCK, P. & DE BETHUNE, M. P. 2005. TMC114, a novel human
immunodeficiency virus type 1 protease inhibitor active against protease inhibitor-
resistant viruses, including a broad range of clinical isolates. *Antimicrob Agents*
Chemother, 49**,** 2314-21.
DONAHUE, D. A., AMRAOUI, S., DI NUNZIO, F., KIEFFER, C., PORROT, F., OPP, S.,
DIAZ-GRIFFERO, F., CASARTELLI, N. & SCHWARTZ, O. 2016. SUN2
Overexpression Deforms Nuclear Shape and Inhibits HIV. *J Virol,* 90**,** 4199-4214.
DOYON, L., CROTEAU, G., THIBEAULT, D., POULIN, F., PILOTE, L. & LAMARRE, D.
1996. Second locus involved in human immunodeficiency virus type 1 resistance to
protease inhibitors. *J Virol,* 70**,** 3763-9.
FOULKES-MURZYCKI, J. E., SCOTT, W. R. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2007. Hydrophobic
sliding: a possible mechanism for drug resistance in human immunodeficiency virus
type 1 protease. *Structure,* 15**,** 225-33.

GROSSMAN, Z., PAXINOS, E. E., AVERBUCH, D., MAAYAN, S., PARKIN, N. T.,
ENGELHARD, D., LORBER, M., ISTOMIN, V., SHAKED, Y., MENDELSON, E.,
RAM, D., PETROPOULOS, C. J. & SCHAPIRO, J. M. 2004. Mutation D30N is not
preferentially selected by human immunodeficiency virus type 1 subtype C in the
development of resistance to nelfinavir. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother,* 48**,** 2159-65.
GULICK, R. M., MELLORS, J. W., HAVLIR, D., ERON, J. J., GONZALEZ, C.,
MCMAHON, D., RICHMAN, D. D., VALENTINE, F. T., JONAS, L., MEIBOHM, A.,
EMINI, E. A. & CHODAKEWITZ, J. A. 1997. Treatment with indinavir, zidovudine,
and lamivudine in adults with human immunodeficiency virus infection and prior
antiretroviral therapy. *N Engl J Med,* 337**,** 734-9.
HENDERSON, G. J., LEE, S. K., IRLBECK, D. M., HARRIS, J., KLINE, M., POLLOM, E.,
PARKIN, N. & SWANSTROM, R. 2012. Interplay between single resistance-associated
mutations in the HIV-1 protease and viral infectivity, protease activity, and inhibitor
sensitivity. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother,* 56**,** 623-33.
HENES, M., LOCKBAUM, G. J., KOSOVRASTI, K., LEIDNER, F., NACHUM, G. S.,
NALIVAIKA, E. A., LEE, S. K., SPIELVOGEL, E., ZHOU, S., SWANSTROM, R.,
BOLON, D. N. A., KURT YILMAZ, N. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2019. Picomolar to
Micromolar: Elucidating the Role of Distal Mutations in HIV-1 Protease in Conferring
Drug Resistance. *ACS Chem Biol.*
HUI, J. O., TOMASSELLI, A. G., REARDON, I. M., LULL, J. M., BRUNNER, D. P.,
TOMICH, C. S. & HEINRIKSON, R. L. 1993. Large scale purification and refolding of
HIV-1 protease from Escherichia coli inclusion bodies. *J Protein Chem,* 12**,** 323-7.
KATLAMA, C., VALANTIN, M. A., ALGARTE-GENIN, M., DUVIVIER, C., LAMBERT-
NICLOT, S., GIRARD, P. M., MOLINA, J. M., HOEN, B., PAKIANATHER, S.,
PEYTAVIN, G., MARCELIN, A. G. & FLANDRE, P. 2010. Efficacy of
darunavir/ritonavir maintenance monotherapy in patients with HIV-1 viral suppression:
a randomized open-label, noninferiority trial, MONOI-ANRS 136. *AIDS,* 24**,** 2365-74.
KATOH, I., YASUNAGA, T., IKAWA, Y. & YOSHINAKA, Y. 1987. Inhibition of retroviral
protease activity by an aspartyl proteinase inhibitor. *Nature,* 329**,** 654-6.
KEMPF, D. J., RODE, R. A., XU, Y., SUN, E., HEATH-CHIOZZI, M. E., VALDES, J.,
JAPOUR, A. J., DANNER, S., BOUCHER, C., MOLLA, A. & LEONARD, J. M. 1998.
The duration of viral suppression during protease inhibitor therapy for HIV-1 infection
is predicted by plasma HIV-1 RNA at the nadir. *AIDS,* 12**,** F9-14.
KING, N. M., MELNICK, L., PRABU-JEYABALAN, M., NALIVAIKA, E. A., YANG, S. S.,
GAO, Y., NIE, X., ZEPP, C., HEEFNER, D. L. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2002. Lack of
synergy for inhibitors targeting a multi-drug-resistant HIV-1 protease. *Protein Sci,* 11**,**
418-29.
KOLLI, M., LASTERE, S. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2006. Co-evolution of nelfinavir-resistant
HIV-1 protease and the p1-p6 substrate. *Virology,* 347**,** 405–409.
KOLLI, M., OZEN, A., KURT-YILMAZ, N. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2014. HIV-1 protease-
substrate coevolution in nelfinavir resistance. *J. Virol.,* 88**,** 7145–7154.
KOLLI, M., STAWISKI, E., CHAPPEY, C. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2009a. Human
immunodeficiency virus type 1 protease-correlated cleavage site mutations enhance
inhibitor resistance. *J Virol,* 83**,** 11027-42.

KOLLI, M., STAWISKI, E., CHAPPEY, C. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2009b. Human
immunodeficiency virus type 1 protease-correlated cleavage site mutations enhance
inhibitor resistance. *J. Virol.,* 83**,** 11027–11042.
KOOTSTRA, N. A., NAVIS, M., BEUGELING, C., VAN DORT, K. A. & SCHUITEMAKER,
H. 2007. The presence of the Trim5alpha escape mutation H87Q in the capsid of late
stage HIV-1 variants is preceded by a prolonged asymptomatic infection phase. *AIDS,*
21**,** 2015-23.
LEE, S. K., POTEMPA, M., KOLLI, M., OZEN, A., SCHIFFER, C. A. & SWANSTROM, R.
2012. Context surrounding processing sites is crucial in determining cleavage rate of a
subset of processing sites in HIV-1 Gag and Gag-Pro-Pol polyprotein precursors by viral
protease. *J. Biol. Chem.,* 287**,** 13279–13290.
LEMKE, C. T., TITOLO, S., VON SCHWEDLER, U., GOUDREAU, N., MERCIER, J. F.,
WARDROP, E., FAUCHER, A. M., COULOMBE, R., BANIK, S. S., FADER, L.,
GAGNON, A., KAWAI, S. H., RANCOURT, J., TREMBLAY, M., YOAKIM, C.,
SIMONEAU, B., ARCHAMBAULT, J., SUNDQUIST, W. I. & MASON, S. W. 2012.
Distinct effects of two HIV-1 capsid assembly inhibitor families that bind the same site
within the N-terminal domain of the viral CA protein. *J Virol,* 86**,** 6643-55.
LIU, Y., KATI, W., CHEN, C. M., TRIPATHI, R., MOLLA, A. & KOHLBRENNER, W.
1999. Use of a fluorescence plate reader for measuring kinetic parameters with inner
filter effect correction. *Anal Biochem,* 267**,** 331-5.
LOCKBAUM, G. J., LEIDNER, F., RUSERE, L. N., HENES, M., KOSOVRASTI, K.,
NACHUM, G. S., NALIVAIKA, E. A., ALI, A., YILMAZ, N. K. & SCHIFFER, C. A.
2019. Structural Adaptation of Darunavir Analogues against Primary Mutations in HIV-
1 Protease. *ACS Infect Dis,* 5**,** 316-325.
MAMMANO, F., PETIT, C. & CLAVEL, F. 1998. Resistance-associated loss of viral fitness in
human immunodeficiency virus type 1: phenotypic analysis of protease and gag
coevolution in protease inhibitor-treated patients. *J Virol,* 72**,** 7632-7.
MATAYOSHI, E. D., WANG, G. T., KRAFFT, G. A. & ERICKSON, J. 1990. Novel
fluorogenic substrates for assaying retroviral proteases by resonance energy transfer.
Science, 247**,** 954-8.
MITTAL, S., BANDARANAYAKE, R. M., KING, N. M., PRABU-JEYABALAN, M.,
NALAM, M. N., NALIVAIKA, E. A., YILMAZ, N. K. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2013.
Structural and thermodynamic basis of amprenavir/darunavir and atazanavir resistance
in HIV-1 protease with mutations at residue 50. *J Virol,* 87**,** 4176-84.
MITTAL, S., CAI, Y., NALAM, M. N., BOLON, D. N. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2012.
Hydrophobic core flexibility modulates enzyme activity in HIV-1 protease. *J Am Chem
Soc,* 134**,** 4163-8.
NALAM, M. N., ALI, A., REDDY, G. S., CAO, H., ANJUM, S. G., ALTMAN, M. D.,
YILMAZ, N. K., TIDOR, B., RANA, T. M. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2013. Substrate
envelope-designed potent HIV-1 protease inhibitors to avoid drug resistance. *Chem Biol,*
20**,** 1116-24.
NTEMGWA, M., BRENNER, B. G., OLIVEIRA, M., MOISI, D. & WAINBERG, M. A. 2007.
Natural polymorphisms in the human immunodeficiency virus type 2 protease can
accelerate time to development of resistance to protease inhibitors. *Antimicrob Agents
Chemother,* 51**,** 604-10.

OZEN, A., HALILOGLU, T. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2011. Dynamics of preferential substrate
recognition in HIV-1 protease: redefining the substrate envelope. *J. Mol. Biol.,* 410**,**
726–744.
OZEN, A., HALILOGLU, T. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2012a. HIV-1 Protease and Substrate
Coevolution Validates the Substrate Envelope As the Substrate Recognition Pattern. *J.*
Chem. Theory Comput., 8**,** 703–714.
OZEN, A., HALILOGLU, T. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2012b. HIV-1 Protease and Substrate
Coevolution Validates the Substrate Envelope As the Substrate Recognition Pattern. *J*
Chem Theory Comput, 8.
OZEN, A., LIN, K. H., KURT YILMAZ, N. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2014a. Structural basis and
distal effects of Gag substrate coevolution in drug resistance to HIV-1 protease. *Proc.*
Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 111**,** 15993–15998.
OZEN, A., LIN, K. H., KURT YILMAZ, N. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2014b. Structural basis and
distal effects of Gag substrate coevolution in drug resistance to HIV-1 protease. *Proc*
Natl Acad Sci U S A, 111**,** 15993-8.
PARRY, C. M., KOLLI, M., MYERS, R. E., CANE, P. A., SCHIFFER, C. & PILLAY, D.
2011. Three residues in HIV-1 matrix contribute to protease inhibitor susceptibility and
replication capacity. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.,* 55**,** 1106–1113.
PAULSEN, J. L., LEIDNER, F., RAGLAND, D. A., KURT YILMAZ, N. & SCHIFFER, C. A.
2017. Interdependence of Inhibitor Recognition in HIV-1 Protease. *J Chem Theory*
Comput, 13**,** 2300-2309.
PETTIT, S. C., HENDERSON, G. J., SCHIFFER, C. A. & SWANSTROM, R. 2002.
Replacement of the P1 amino acid of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 Gag
processing sites can inhibit or enhance the rate of cleavage by the viral protease. *J Virol,*
76**,** 10226-33.
POTEMPA, M., LEE, S. K., KURT YILMAZ, N., NALIVAIKA, E. A., ROGERS, A.,
SPIELVOGEL, E., CARTER, C. W., JR., SCHIFFER, C. A. & SWANSTROM, R.
2018. HIV-1 Protease Uses Bi-Specific S2/S2' Subsites to Optimize Cleavage of Two
Classes of Target Sites. *J Mol Biol,* 430**,** 5182-5195.
PRABU-JEYABALAN, M., NALIVAIKA, E. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2002. Substrate shape
determines specificity of recognition for HIV-1 protease: analysis of crystal structures of
six substrate complexes. *Structure,* 10**,** 369-81.
PRABU-JEYABALAN, M., NALIVAIKA, E. A., KING, N. M. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2004.
Structural basis for coevolution of a human immunodeficiency virus type 1
nucleocapsid-p1 cleavage site with a V82A drug-resistant mutation in viral protease. *J.*
Virol., 78**,** 12446–12454.
PULIDO, F., ARRIBAS, J. R., HILL, A., VAN DELFT, Y. & MOECKLINGHOFF, C. 2011.
Analysis of drug resistance during HIV RNA viraemia in the MONET trial of
darunavir/ritonavir monotherapy. *Antivir Ther,* 16**,** 59-65.
RABI, S. A., LAIRD, G. M., DURAND, C. M., LASKEY, S., SHAN, L., BAILEY, J. R.,
CHIOMA, S., MOORE, R. D. & SILICIANO, R. F. 2013. Multi-step inhibition explains
HIV-1 protease inhibitor pharmacodynamics and resistance. *J Clin Invest,* 123**,** 3848-60.
RAGLAND, D. A., NALIVAIKA, E. A., NALAM, M. N., PRACHANRONARONG, K. L.,
CAO, H., BANDARANAYAKE, R. M., CAI, Y., KURT-YILMAZ, N. & SCHIFFER,
C. A. 2014. Drug resistance conferred by mutations outside the active site through

alterations in the dynamic and structural ensemble of HIV-1 protease. *J Am Chem Soc,*
136**,** 11956-63.
RAGLAND, D. A., WHITFIELD, T. W., LEE, S. K., SWANSTROM, R., ZELDOVICH, K. B.,
KURT-YILMAZ, N. & SCHIFFER, C. A. 2017. Elucidating the Interdependence of
Drug Resistance from Combinations of Mutations. *J Chem Theory Comput,* 13**,** 5671-
5682.
RICHARDS, A. D., ROBERTS, R., DUNN, B. M., GRAVES, M. C. & KAY, J. 1989.
Effective blocking of HIV-1 proteinase activity by characteristic inhibitors of aspartic
proteinases. *FEBS Lett,* 247**,** 113-7.
RONG, L., RUSSELL, R. S., HU, J., GUAN, Y., KLEIMAN, L., LIANG, C. & WAINBERG,
M. A. 2001. Hydrophobic amino acids in the human immunodeficiency virus type 1 p2
and nucleocapsid proteins can contribute to the rescue of deleted viral RNA packaging
signals. *J Virol,* 75**,** 7230-43.
ROSE, J. R., SALTO, R. & CRAIK, C. S. 1993. Regulation of autoproteolysis of the HIV-1 and
HIV-2 proteases with engineered amino acid substitutions. *J Biol Chem,* 268**,** 11939-45.
SEELMEIER, S., SCHMIDT, H., TURK, V. & VON DER HELM, K. 1988. Human
immunodeficiency virus has an aspartic-type protease that can be inhibited by pepstatin
A. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A,* 85**,** 6612-6.
SHI, J., ZHOU, J., HALAMBAGE, U. D., SHAH, V. B., BURSE, M. J., WU, H., BLAIR, W.
S., BUTLER, S. L. & AIKEN, C. 2015. Compensatory substitutions in the HIV-1 capsid
reduce the fitness cost associated with resistance to a capsid-targeting small-molecule
inhibitor. *J Virol,* 89**,** 208-19.
WATKINS, T., RESCH, W., IRLBECK, D. & SWANSTROM, R. 2003. Selection of high-level
resistance to human immunodeficiency virus type 1 protease inhibitors. *Antimicrob*
Agents Chemother, 47**,** 759-69.
WINDSOR, I. W. & RAINES, R. T. 2015. Fluorogenic Assay for Inhibitors of HIV-1 Protease
with Sub-picomolar Affinity. *Sci Rep,* 5**,** 11286.
YILMAZ, A., IZADKHASHTI, A., PRICE, R. W., MALLON, P. W., DE MEULDER, M.,
TIMMERMAN, P. & GISSLEN, M. 2009. Darunavir concentrations in cerebrospinal
fluid and blood in HIV-1-infected individuals. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses,* 25**,** 457-61.
ZHANG, Y. M., IMAMICHI, H., IMAMICHI, T., LANE, H. C., FALLOON, J.,
VASUDEVACHARI, M. B. & SALZMAN, N. P. 1997. Drug resistance during
indinavir therapy is caused by mutations in the protease gene and in its Gag substrate
cleavage sites. *J Virol,* 71**,** 6662-70.
ZHAO, G., PERILLA, J. R., YUFENYUY, E. L., MENG, X., CHEN, B., NING, J., AHN, J.,
GRONENBORN, A. M., SCHULTEN, K., AIKEN, C. & ZHANG, P. 2013. Mature
HIV-1 capsid structure by cryo-electron microscopy and all-atom molecular dynamics.
Nature, 497**,** 643-6.
ZHOU, S., JONES, C., MIECZKOWSKI, P. & SWANSTROM, R. 2015. Primer ID Validates
Template Sampling Depth and Greatly Reduces the Error Rate of Next-Generation
Sequencing of HIV-1 Genomic RNA Populations. *J Virol,* 89**,** 8540-55.
877

 Figures

1st Selection: Most Abundant Variants Detected at the Last Time Point

Passage #	Drug Conc. (nM)	R1	R2	PIs	Most Abundant Variants Detected at the Last Time Point	Abundance
53	4000	1	2	UMASS-2	10I 28S 32I 33F 46I 71V 82I 84V	31.0%
45	1275	1	4	UMASS-4	10F 28S 46I 84V	9.4%
53	5000	2	1	UMASS-6	13V 16E 32I 33F 45I 46I 54L 71V 76V 82F 84V	57.4%
58	400	2	2	UMASS-7	10F 46I 50V 63P 85V	21.0%
61	1300	2	3	UMASS-8	10F 46I 47V 50V 53L 63P 72V 73S 82I 85V	63.9%
39	3000	-	1	DRV	13V 16E 32I 33F 45I 46I 82F 84V	45.3%
61				ND	93L	36.7%

2nd Selection: Most Abundant Variants Detected at the Last Time Point

Passage #	Drug Conc. (nM)	R1	R2	PIs	Most Abundant Variants Detected at the Last Time Point	Abundance
75	5000	1	1	UMASS-1	10I 16E 32I 33F 46I 54L 71V 76V 82I 84V	55.4%
82	5000	1	2	UMASS-2	10F 33F 46I 47V 50V 71V 82I 84V	37.5%
93	5000	1	3	UMASS-3	10F 33F 46I 47V 50V 53L 63P 71V 76S 82I 85V 89I	85.7%
81	5000	1	4	UMASS-4	10F 11I 13V 32I 33F 43T 46L 54L 71V 82I 84V 89M 91S 92R	87.3%
77	5000	1	5	UMASS-5	10F 15V 46I 47V 50V 53L 71V 82I 84V 89T	67.9%
46	5000	2	1	UMASS-6	10F 13V 33F 46I 47A 50V 53L 71V	45.1%
76	5000	2	2	UMASS-7	10F 13V 33F 46I 47V 50V 53L 54L 71V 82I	94.5%
67	5000	2	3	UMASS-8	10F 12K 33F 46I 47V 50V 53L 54L 63P 71V 82I 85V	55.4%
78	5000	2	4	UMASS-9	10F 13V 33F 45R 46I 47V 50V 53L 54L 66F 71V 74A 76S 82I	92.3%
77	5000	2	5	UMASS-10	10F 13V 33F 43T 46I 47V 50V 54L 71V 82L 88S	91.2%
43	1350	-	1	DRV	32I 41I 47V 82I 84V 85V	62.8%
75	0			ND	WT 82.9%	

Figure 1. Point mutations of the most abundant variant observed at the highest drug concentration from each selection pool. The green shaded box and the blue shaded box indicate R1-1 and R1-2 side chains, respectively. The red lettering is for mutations and abundance in the first selection started with the 26 mutants; the blue lettering is for the mutations and abundance in the second selection started with just the wild type virus.

Drug Conc. (nM)	R1	R2	PIs	Most Abundant Variants Detected at the Last Time Point											Abund ance
5000	1	3	UMASS-3	10F		33F	46I 47V 50V 53L	63P	71V		76S 82I	85V	89I		85.7%
5000	1	4	UMASS-4	10F 11I	13V	32I 33F 43T	46L	54L	71V		82I 84V		89M 91S 92R		87.3%
5000	1	5	UMASS-5	10F	15V		46I 47V 50V 53L		71V		82I 84V		89T		67.9%
5000	2	4	UMASS-9	10F	13V	33F	45R 46I 47V 50V 53L 54L	66F 71V		74A 76S 82I				92.3%

Figure 2. EC50 values of select highly resistant end-point variants vs all 11 inhibitors. V3, V4, etc. refer to the virus pool for the specific UMASS inhibitor culture (e.g. UMASS-3 is V3, etc.). Each virus pool, with the most abundant sequence in the pool shown, was tested against all 10 UMASS inhibitors with the EC50 values shown as points along with the mean, inner quartile in the box, and the total range as whiskers. ND is the culture passaged with no drug selection. 12-mut is a recombinant virus with just 12 mutations in the protease.

Figure 3. Shannon entropy of the viral pools for 15 selections of U1-10 – each trajectory was

passaged between 40-80 times to attain high resistance.

Figure 4. Hydrophobic packing in the S1' subsite. A) DRV in WT protease (PDB: 6DGX). B)

UMass6 in WT protease (PDB: 6DGZ). C) UMass6 in I84V variant (PDB: 6DH2). Inhibitor

and surrounding residues are identical to UM6-WT. D) UMass6 in I50V variant (PDB: 6DH8).

Inhibitor and I50V residue both adopt alternate conformations, ultimately reducing protease-

inhibitor vdW contacts.

Figure 5. The abundance data from multiple selections pooled and examined sequentially at different levels of drug concentration/selective pressure. Mutations resulting from selections that were challenged with an inhibitor containing a R1 moiety (UMASS1-5) point upwards, while mutations derived from selections that were challenged with an inhibitor containing a R2 moiety (UMASS6-10) point downwards.

Figure 6. The abundance data from multiple selections that ended in one or the other pathway was pooled and examined sequentially at different levels of drug concentration/selective pressure. The selections resulting in the I84V pathway point up, with I84V reaching 100% penetrance by definition. Similarly, those selections that fixed I50V are shown pointing downward, with I50V reaching 100% penetrance.

Figure 7. **A)** Mutations associated with I84V penetrance. **B)** Mutations associated with I50V

penetrance. Key mutation shown in red (I84V or I50V), outer flap residues in blue (M46I and

F53L), inner flap residues in orange (V32I, I47V, L76V), Hydrophobic Core in yellow (L33F

and I13V), V82I in purple, and Darunavir shown as green sticks.

Figure 8. Ki of chosen end-point protease variants vs all 11 inhibitors. Variants with and I50V

mutation are colored red, variants with I84V are colored blue, and variants with both I50V/I84V

are colored purple.

			NC P2	SP2 -	P6 P1'	P6 P5'
D1 *wt*	5000	84V	V			L
D4 *mut*	1275	84V	V		F	
D4 *wt*	5000	84V	I			I
D6 *mut*	5000	84V	V			
D3 *wt*	5000	50V			F	L
D6 *wt*	5000	50V				L
D7 *wt*	5000	50V			F	
D8 *mut*	1300	50V				L
D8 *wt*	5000	50V			F	
D9 *wt*	5000	50V			F	
D10 *wt*	5000	50V			F	
D2 *mut*	4000	50V+84V				L
D2 *wt*	5000	50V+84V			F	L
D5 *wt*	5000	50V+84V			F	L

Figure 9. Mutations observed near protease cleavage sites for different inhibitors at the noted

inhibitor concentrations. Inhibitors are grouped by possession of one or both of the I50V and

I84V mutations.

Figure 10. Observed sequence changes at endpoint bulk sequencing from 24 viral cultures.

Mutations that occur in 2 or more (unless there is a charge change) drug selections and are not

present in the no-drug control or consensus sequence are shown. <u>14 changes observed in 5 or</u>

<u>more sequence are boxed in bold</u>. Yellow shading highlights a charge change. Red font in

mixed virus initiated selection, blue in NL4-3 initiated selection and black observed in both

selections.

Figure 11. Observed changes in Capsid appear likely to stabilize the capsid structure.

Specifically V27I packs (Val in yellow vdW) more tightly filling a pocket (left), Q67H may

form additional hydrogen bonding between monomers in the capsid hexamer (middle)(4YWM)

and P207S occurs at the interface of hexamers in the viral pentamer (shown in orange spheres)

(3J3Q) (right).

Supplemental Figures

     A   **B**

Figure S1. EC50 inhibition curves for **A)** old and new protease inhibitors and **B)** analogs of

DRV.

Figure S2. Viral selections with DRV and UMASS1-10 have increasing inhibitor

concentrations during passaging. Passages are increased when extensive CPE is observed

during PI selection. Virus generated from the 26 single mutants or NL4-3 molecular clone was

passaged in the presence of increasing inhibitor concentration as described in the text. The

period of time (in days) until the virus-infected culture displayed maximal CPE (massive

syncytia) was 4-7 days on average.

Mann Whitney test

Median of column A   1.385, n=94
Median of column B   3.220, n=46
Difference: Actual   1.435

981   **Figure S3.** Mann-Whitney rank sum test for Shannon's entropy of the viral pools for 4 26-

982   mutant selections and 10 wild-type selections.

Number of Mutations

985   **Figure S4**. Average number of mutations for each resistance pathway. Mutation numbers at

986   drug concentrations of 100 nM and 5000 nM are shown.

Figure S5. Shannon entropy of the viral pools for 20 selections of U1-10 – each trajectory was

passaged between 40-80 times to attain high resistance

991   **Fig. S6** Changes of average entropy within the protease region through three DRV selections.

992   When mutations are fixed they are labeled in the bottom part of the figure. All the underlined

993   mutations were eventually fixed in the viral population.