High and low efficiency neutralization epitopes on the haemagglutinin of type A influenza virus
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The relationship between the efficiency of the neutralization process and the affinity of five monoclonal IgG antibodies specific for the haemagglutinin of type A influenza virus has been investigated by determining their neutralization rate constants (k\text{neut.}) and affinities (k\text{dissoc.}). We addressed the hypothesis that if antibody affinity alone determined the efficiency of neutralization, then the k\text{neut.}:k\text{dissoc.} ratio would be the same for all antibodies. However, we found that the k\text{neut.}:k\text{dissoc.} ratio varied by up to 125-fold, suggesting that properties unique to the epitope are of major importance in determining the efficiency of neutralization. These data suggest that vaccines should preferentially stimulate antibodies to epitopes that mediate the most efficient neutralization, and that a high k\text{dissoc.} should be an important but secondary consideration.

Introduction

Type A influenza virus causes near-annual epidemics of respiratory disease in the human population which result in severe economic losses and serious mortality in certain high-risk groups (mainly the over-65s and those suffering chronic conditions of the heart, lungs and kidneys). The frequency of influenza epidemics arises from the continual evolution of the major virus surface glycoproteins, the haemagglutinin (HA) and the neuraminidase (NA), under the selective pressure of neutralizing antibody which renders immunity, gained from infection, ineffective within about 4 years. In addition, there are irregular pandemics of influenza resulting from the emergence of new sub-types of virus having an HA (and sometimes NA) never before experienced by the current human population. There were pandemics of H1N1 virus in 1918, H2N2 virus in 1957 and H3N2 virus in 1968. The spread of the virus in an immunologically virgin population causes widespread illness which, in the 1918 pandemic, reached cataclysmic proportions and killed 20 million people worldwide in 1 year. The main reservoir of influenza A viruses is not man but aquatic birds, and these are host to 126 subtypes, most of which have not yet crossed the species barrier into man. In addition, influenza viruses are an important economic threat to the poultry and horse-racing industries; they also infect pigs, which may act as a half-way house in the transfer of influenza virus genes into the human population (Kilbourne, 1987; Webster et al., 1992).

Major protective immunity to influenza is thought to be mainly mediated through neutralizing antibody specific to the viral HA, although CD8+ T cell immunity is probably important in recovery from infection (Wells et al., 1981; Kilbourne, 1987; Askonas et al., 1988; Webster et al., 1992). Wiley et al. (1981) defined five neutralization antigenic sites on the crystal structure of the HA of an H3 subtype virus, but it is uncertain if these are discrete sites or represent the immunodominant regions of an antigenic continuum. Current prophylaxis is via an inactivated vaccine which is administered parenterally. This gives 60–90% protection through stimulating systemic neutralizing antibody (Potter, 1994). A vaccine which gives better protection is clearly desirable, and this is likely to be achieved by stimulating a local respiratory tract immunity which preferably gives some measure of cross-protection.

One of the current problems in assessing antibody immunity is that there is no information on the efficacy of neutralization epitopes and little on the importance of antibody affinity. However, it is widely assumed that neutralization epitopes are of equal efficiency, and that antibody affinity is the...
major determinant of neutralization. Here we have investigated the
relationship between neutralization and affinity by deter-
mapping the ratio of the neutralization rate constant ($K_{\text{neut.}}$) (used here as a measure of neutralization
efficiency) and the affinity ($K_{\text{dissoc.}}$) of each of a panel of five neutralizing MAb directed to three of the antigenic sites
present on the haemagglutinin. If efficiency of neutralization is
determined solely by antibody affinity, then the ratio of neutralization:affinity should be constant for all antibodies. Our
data showed that although the best neutralizing antibodies
had the highest affinity, the ratio of $K_{\text{neut.}}:K_{\text{dissoc.}}$ varied by
125-fold, suggesting that in this system the epitope itself is the
pre- eminent determinant of neutralization, and that affinity of
the antibody is an important, but secondary, consideration.

Methods

**Virus and cells.** Influenza virus A/fowl plague/Rostock/34
(H7N1) was grown in embryonated chicken’s eggs. Virus was purified
from allantoic fluid by differential centrifugation and rate zonal
centrifugation on gradients of sucrose (Kelly & Dimmock, 1974). Aliquots
were stored at −70 °C. Infectivity was determined by plaque assay
under agar on monolayers of MDCK cells.

**Antibodies.** Five neutralizing mouse monoclonal IgG antibodies
were used. All have been mapped to three antigenic sites by serology of
antibody escape mutants and by sequencing the HA gene of the mutants
(Sugrue et al., 1990). These sites correspond exactly with those proposed
for the H3 crystal structure: antigenic site A, amino acid 128 (MAb
HC3W; IgG2b) and amino acid 144 (MAb HC2; IgG2a); site B, amino
acid 161 (MAb HC10; IgG2a); site D, amino acid 198 or 250 (MAb
HC38; IgG2a) and amino acid 210 (MAb HC61; IgG2a). Hybridomas
were grown using pretested batches of foetal calf serum which
contributed less than 15% to the total immunoglobulin present. MAbS
were purified from tissue culture fluid on protein A (Ey et al., 1978)
covalently bound to acrylic beads (Sigma) and the protein concentration
was measured by a dye-binding assay (Bio-Rad).

**Rate of neutralization.** The rate of neutralization was determined
by assessing the loss of infectivity over time (Dulbecco et al., 1956). Virus
(800 p.f.u./ml) and MAb were incubated together at 37 °C for up to 2 h,
and samples taken initially at 5 min intervals and then every 15 min. The
rate of neutralization was derived from the slope of the line from a plot of
log$_{10}$V/$V_0$ versus time (t), where $V_0$ is the infectivity titre at time zero,
and $V_i$ is the titre after incubation for time t at 37 °C. The neutralization
rate constant ($K_{\text{neut.}}$) was calculated using equation 1:

$$K_{\text{neut.}} = -|\log_{10} V_i / V_0| / t|2.3D$$  

where $D$ is the reciprocal of the molar concentration of antibody.

**Antibody affinity.** Antibody affinity was represented by the
antibody dissociation constant ($K_{\text{dissoc.}}$), and was determined by ELISA
(Friguet et al., 1985) using whole virus particles. In brief, a known amount
of antibody was allowed to react in solution to equilibrium with a range
of antigen concentrations (16 h at 20 °C). For the capture phase, this
equilibrium mixture was incubated for 90 min at 37 °C with a virus-
coated microtitre plate to determine the unbound fraction of antibody.
Antigen ($8 \times 10^{-8}$ M) was in at least 100-fold molar excess over antibody
(e.g. HC2 = 1.2 × 10^{-11} M maximum). The plates were then washed and
the amount of MAb bound to the plate was determined by ELISA. The
relationship between antibody concentration and the ELISA absorbance
was linear (data not shown). $K_{\text{dissoc.}}$ is perceived as a better measure of
affinity than association, since only $K_{\text{dissoc.}}$ takes no account of whether
or not the antibody binds bivalently, a property that depends on the
spatial separation of epitopes as well as the angle of the epitope to the
paratope. $K_{\text{dissoc.}}$ values were derived from Scatchard plots modified
according to Stevens (1987):

$$\frac{\sqrt{A_0 - A}}{\sqrt{A_0 - A} - A_0} = \frac{1}{K_{\text{dissoc.}}} \left(1 - \frac{A_0 - A}{\sqrt{A_0}}\right)$$  

where $A_0$ is the maximum ELISA absorbance of input antibody on the
virus-coated microtitre plate, and $A$ is the ELISA absorbance of the
unbound fraction of antibody in the equilibrium reaction. The values for
$A_0$ and $A_0 - A$, respectively, are, the concentrations of input antigen and input
antibody (M) in the equilibrium reaction. For the plot, the ordinate is the
left-hand side of equation 2 (abbreviated as Y), and the abscissa is $\sqrt{A_0}$.

Results

**Rate of neutralization.**

Two examples of the determination of the rate of neutralization are shown in Fig. 1. The rate of neutralization
was proportional to antibody concentration (data not shown). Neutralization
rate constants ($K_{\text{neut.}}$) for five MAbS were calculated using equation 1 and are shown in Table 1. These
values range by 38-fold, from a highest value of $-1.5 \times 10^5$ M$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$ for MAb HC61 to a lowest value of $-4.0 \times 10^3$ M$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$ for MAb HC10.

**Antibody affinity.**

Fig. 2 shows data obtained for a representative MAb, HC2. The $K_{\text{dissoc.}}$, obtained from the slope of the line, was
$4.9 \times 10^{-10}$ M. Values for the $K_{\text{dissoc.}}$ of each of the five MAbS are shown in Table 1. Affinities ranged from a high value of
$4.1 \times 10^{-10}$ M for MAb HC61 to the lowest of $1.4 \times 10^{-9}$ M
for MAb HC10.

Neutralization and antibody affinity are not directly
proportional

Data in Table 1 allowed us to determine the relationship
between affinity and the efficiency of neutralization. In the first
place, ranking the antibodies by $K_{\text{neut.}}$ or $K_{\text{dissoc.}}$ places them
in approximately the same order, showing that, broadly
speaking, the rate of neutralization and antibody affinity are
directly related. However, our data permit a more exact
analysis through calculation of the $K_{\text{neut.}}:K_{\text{dissoc.}}$ ratio. In this
way, if antibody affinity alone determined the rate of
neutralization, all the ratios would be the same. In Table 1 the
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Fig. 1. Kinetics of neutralization of influenza virus A/fowl plague/Rostock/34 by MAbs HC2 and HC3W. Virus and MAb (HC2: 0±21 µg/ml; HC3W: 0±11 µg/ml) were incubated together at 37 °C for the times indicated. V_t/V_0 represents the loss of infectivity, where V_0 is the titre of virus at time zero, and V_t is the titre of virus after incubation for time t. R is the correlation coefficient. The SD was within the size of each datum point.

Table 1. Summary of the properties of anti-influenza A virus monoclonal IgGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibody</th>
<th>Rate of neutralization K_neut. (M⁻¹ s⁻¹)</th>
<th>Affinity K_dissoc. (M)</th>
<th>Ratio K_neut.:K_dissoc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC2</td>
<td>-1±1 ± 0.3 × 10⁶ (2)*</td>
<td>4.9 ± 9 × 10⁻¹⁰ (2)</td>
<td>0.63†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC10</td>
<td>-4±0 ± 2.1 × 10⁴ (5)</td>
<td>1±4 ± 0.7 × 10⁻⁹ (5)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC3W</td>
<td>-7±1 ± 0.1 × 10³ (3)</td>
<td>5±3 ± 1.3 × 10⁻¹⁰ (4)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCS8</td>
<td>-8±0 ± 1.0 × 10¹ (4)</td>
<td>5±0 ± 0.5 × 10⁻¹⁰ (3)</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC61</td>
<td>-1±5 ± 0.7 × 10⁸ (1)</td>
<td>4±1 ± 2.2 × 10⁻¹⁰ (1)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in parentheses show the ranking order of antibodies with respect to the property listed at the head of the column. (1) denotes highest activity.
† The ratio for HC61 is arbitrarily defined as 1.0, and all other ratios are calculated relative to this.

Discussion

In this paper we have determined the K_neut. and K_dissoc. for five monoclonal IgGs specific for the HA of type A influenza virus. Few data on K_neut. are available, but our values are within the range published for other viruses. For example, the K_neut. of a poliovirus MAb (Icenogle et al., 1983) was 6-fold lower than that of our highest MAb HC61, while the K_neut. value of MAb b12, one of the most effective HIV-1 gp120-specific MAbs, derived from a human combinatorial library (Burton et al., 1994; Moore et al., 1995; Parren et al., 1995; McInerney et al., 1997) was nearly 5-fold lower than that of HC61, and ICR39.3b, a rat MAb (McLain & Dimmock, 1994) was 2400-fold lower than that of HC61.

All our MAbs had a relatively high affinity by the equilibrium method used in this report (K_dissoc. < 10⁻⁹ M).
Values determined by surface plasmon resonance (SPR) were lower as is usually the case (0·1–14×10^{-9} M), but ranked the MAbs similarly (Schofield & Dimmock, 1996). No data were obtained with HC58 by SPR, possibly because of the orientation of its binding on the virion surface, although it ranked third in Table 1. Values obtained by equilibrium filtration with polyclonal anti-influenza virus antibody averaged 10^{-8} M (Fazekas de St Groth & Webster, 1963), while data obtained by radioimmunoassay with MAbs gave values up to 10^{-10} M (Frankel & Gerhard, 1979) and for 12 different MAbs averaged 6×10^{-9} M (Brown et al., 1990). Values for neutralizing IgG antibodies specific to viruses other than influenza, and assayed by ELISA with virions or virus proteins ranged from 1·2×10^{-10} M for rabies virions (Ueki et al., 1990) down to 2·7×10^{-9} M obtained for HIV-1 recombinant (r) gp120 (Nakamura et al., 1993). Other $K_{\text{dissoc.}}$ values for HIV-1-specific IgGs and rgp120 protein were calculated from rate constants determined by SPR. These ranged from <10^{-10} M to 6×10^{-8} M (Burton et al., 1994; Conley et al., 1994; VanCott et al., 1994). Values for Fab fragments overlap this range at 7·7×10^{-10} M to 1·2×10^{-8} M (Barbas et al., 1994; Roben et al., 1994; Ditzel et al., 1995). However, the highest value reflects an 8-fold increase engineered into the Fab through modification of the amino acid sequence of one of the complementarity determining regions (Barbas et al., 1994). The degree of oligomerization of gp120, which is so crucial to its interaction with antibody (Moore et al., 1994; Stamatas & Cheng-Mayer, 1995; Sattentau & Moore, 1995), is not stated in these reports, so the relevance of these data to the interaction of antibodies with HIV-1 virions is not known.

We do not understand how the epitopes of the HA of influenza A virus differ so that neutralization but not affinity is affected. In general, neutralizing antibodies vary in a number of ways, which include the order of the kinetics of neutralization, the number of antibody molecules per virion required for neutralization, and the mechanism by which neutralization is mediated (Dimmock, 1993, 1995). All MAbs used in this study neutralize influenza virus infectivity at 37 °C by pseudo-first order kinetics (Fig. 1 and data not shown), in agreement with earlier data (Taylor et al., 1987; Outlaw & Dimmock, 1991). At $1/e$ (63%) neutralization 67 and 76 antibody molecules of HC2 and HC10 respectively were bound per virion (Taylor et al., 1987), showing that kinetics cannot be directly interpreted in terms of molecules of antibody. The mechanisms of neutralization of MAbs HC2, HC10 and HC61 have been investigated in some detail. The picture is frustratingly complex and the antibodies do not behave identically. However, as a generalization it appears that, at relatively low levels of neutralization, infectivity is reduced by aggregation of virions, some inhibition of attachment of neutralized virus to the target cell, and some inhibition of fusion of viral and cell membranes. None of these alone is sufficient to account for the loss of infectivity observed, but if added together could account for much of the neutralization (Outlaw et al., 1990; Outlaw & Dimmock, 1993). It is difficult to know if such a calculation is justified. A clearer picture emerges when HC2 and HC61 were used at concentrations that give high (>99%) levels of neutralization. Under these conditions aggregation no longer takes place, and inhibition of attachment and of fusion are insignificant compared with the loss of infectivity. Thus another mechanism of neutralization must be operating. Further studies with highly neutralizing amounts of these antibodies and with neutralizing IgA (Armstrong & Dimmock, 1992) concluded that neutralized virions went through all stages up to and including secondary uncoating (dissociation of the M1 protein from the viral core structure) normally, and RNA from neutralized virus moved to its correct location in the nucleus. However, no transcription ensued. Thus it appears that these antibodies all inhibited a post-entry step in infection. It was postulated that these neutralizing antibodies caused a defect in tertiary uncoating, suggested to be the adoption by the viral RNP of a conformation consonant with the needs of transcription (Rigg et al., 1989; Outlaw & Dimmock, 1991; Armstrong et al., 1992). However no detailed information about this stage of virus replication is yet available. It is possible that antibodies HC2, HC10 and HC61 bring about the postulated defect in tertiary uncoating in different ways, or act with differing degrees of efficiency. There are no data on the mechanism of action of HC3W and HC58.

Thus data in this report suggest for the first time that epitopes of the HA of influenza A virus differ in the efficiency with they mediate neutralization, and that neutralization is not determined solely by the affinity of the antibody concerned. Our data are consistent with those of Brown et al. (1990) who noted the absence of correlation between neutralization of influenza A virus and antibody affinity. The situation is less clear in regard to other viruses. While neutralization by HIV-1 MAbs specific for various antigenic sites on gp120 correlated with the rate of association (Sattentau & Moore, 1995), others have found that there was a correlation with the $K_{\text{dissoc.}}$. Specifically, these data were obtained with MAbs directed against the C4 region of gp120 using an ELISA format and rgp120 (Nakamura et al., 1993), and with V3-specific MAbs using SPR (VanCott et al., 1994). Neutralization by the V3 MAbs correlated with the rate of dissociation ($k_d$) from rgp120 but as the rate of association ($k_a$) was relatively invariant, this correlation is also reflected in the equilibrium value ($K_{\text{dissoc.}}$) as this is calculated from $k_d/k_a$. However values for non-neutralizing antibodies (∼6×10^{-9} M) were very similar to that (4·1×10^{-9} M) of a good neutralizing MAb, 2F5 (Conley et al., 1994), suggesting that other factors are important. Neutralization by Fab fragments showed no or little correlation with affinity (Roben et al., 1994; Ditzel et al., 1995). However, engineered amino acid changes in the heavy chain CDR1 improved the dissociation rate of a Fab and gave better neutralization (Barbas et al., 1994). It seems that neutralization mediated through some, though not necessarily all, antigenic sites/epitopes can be improved by decreasing the $K_{\text{dissoc.}}$ of
the antibodies concerned, but that improvements in affinity are not sufficient to compensate for the intrinsic neutralization inefficiency of an epitope.

Although our data relate to neutralization in vitro, they are likely to be relevant also to protection mediated by antibody in vivo. This realization is a step forward in the rational approach to protective immunity, since it means that vaccines should now aim to stimulate primarily antibodies to those epitopes which allow the most efficient neutralization. This may be especially relevant to those vaccines which are not particularly effective, and it will be interesting to determine if the problem with the latter is that they stimulate a preponderance of antibodies to the less efficient neutralizing epitopes. It appears that in the future, the best vaccines will stimulate high affinity antibodies directed against the most efficient neutralizing epitopes.
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