medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Title

R21 malaria vaccine is protective against intradermal but not intravenous *Plasmodium falciparum* sporozoites in a randomized controlled human malaria infection study in Kenyan adults

Suggested author list

Melissa C Kapulu[1,4]*, Francesca Orenge[1], Domtila Kimani[1], Elizabeth Kibwana[1], Hillary Kibet[1], Mary Mutahi[1], Mehreen S Datoo[2], Duncan Bellamy[2], Janet Musembi[1], Omar Ngoto[1], Hamisi Rashid[1], Stellamaris Akinyi[1], Mwaganyuma H Mwatasa[1], Lydia Nyamako[1], Kelvias Keter[1], Rose Gatheru[1], Agnes Mutiso[1], Jennifer Musyoki[1], Jedidah Mwacharo[1], Yonas Abebe[3], Eric J James[3], Peter F Billingsley[3], Caroline Ngetsa[1], Moses Mosobo[1], Johnstone Makale[1], Brian Tawa[1], Kevin Wamae[1], Lynette I Ochola-Oyier[1], Juliana Wambua[1], Alison Lawrie[2], Fernando Ramos-Lopez[2], Rachel Roberts[2], Thomas L Richie[3], B. Kim Lee Sim[3], Stephen L Hoffman[3], Katie J Ewer[2], Adrian V S Hill[2], Mainga Hamaluba[1], Philip Bejon[1, 4]

Affiliations:

[1]KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme, Kilifi, Kenya

[2]Jenner Institute, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

[3]Sanaria Inc., Rockville, MD, USA

[4]Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author: mkapulu@kemri-wellcome.org

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Falciparum malaria is a substantial public health problem. Vaccines and monoclonal antibodies targeting the *Plasmodium falciparum* (Pf) circumsporozoite protein (CSP) are promising control strategies. The protective mechanisms of anti-PfCSP antibodies are incompletely understood, and levels of anti-PfCSP antibodies are inconsistently predictive of protection. We undertook controlled human malaria infections in volunteers vaccinated with the PfCSP-based vaccine R21/Matrix-M, using either intradermal injection (ID) or direct venous inoculation (DVI) of *P. falciparum* sporozoites (PfSPZ Challenge). R21/Matrix-M was highly protective against intradermal inoculation of PfSPZ Challenge (i.e. 100%, 12 out of 12) but not protective against PfSPZ Challenge by DVI (i.e. 0%, 0 out of 5). These findings imply that the variable delivery of Pf sporozoites into capillaries rather than the subdermal layers by infectious mosquito bites can account for the inconsistent protection provided by anti-PfCSP antibodies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Falciparum malaria remains a pressing public health problem. It is hoped that the recently stalled progress in malaria control[1] might be renewed by the recent approval of two efficacious vaccines (i.e. RTS,S/AS01 and R21/Matrix-M)[2–4]. Both vaccines are recombinant subunit vaccines presented as virus like particles, self-assembled from the C-terminal and NANP repeat regions of the circumsporozoite antigen fused to the hepatitis B surface antigen (i.e. "R21" or "RTS,S") combined with either the adjuvant Matrix-M (i.e. R21/Matrix-M)[3] or the adjuvant AS01E (i.e. RTS,S/AS01)[2], respectively. These vaccines induce antibody responses to the NANP repeat region of the circumsporozoite protein (CSP) and inhibit *Plasmodium falciparum* sporozoites injected by infected mosquitoes from establishing human infections. The passive transfer of anti-NANP antibodies is also partially protective[5]. Sporozoites which evade vaccine-induced humoral immunity invade hepatocytes and give rise to thousands of merozoites, leading to a blood-stage infection. It is unclear why antibody-based protection remains partial despite highly immunogenic vaccines or high concentrations of circulating monoclonal antibodies. Thus, protection appears to be "leaky"[6] with given antibody levels being inconsistently protective[7], and with vaccinated individuals experiencing a reduction in infection rates over time but with few individuals appearing to be completely protected[8].

The events immediately following exposure to malaria parasites are difficult to study in the field, and such variable exposure complicates analysis[9]. On the other hand, parasite exposure is uniform in controlled human malaria infection studies (CHMI), where volunteers are deliberately inoculated with a defined dose of sporozoites (Sanaria® PfSPZ Challenge)[10–13] to induce an

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

experimental infection, and the subsequent blood stage infection is monitored by serial quantitative PCR[14,15].

Individuals who are not fully protected by vaccination with RTS,S appear to be infected by one, or at most two, sporozoites that evade anti-circumsporozoite antibodies, in comparison to the presumed eleven sporozoites that invade hepatocytes in unvaccinated volunteers[14]. The mechanisms by which a few sporozoites evade immunity and most do not are unknown, and in particular to our knowledge there are no CHMI studies that compare vaccine efficacy against different routes of inoculation of sporozoites.

We undertook a CHMI efficacy study in volunteers vaccinated with R21/Matrix-M in Kilifi on the Kenyan Coast, recruiting adult volunteers resident in areas of low malaria transmission, and hence with modest blood-stage immunity. The vaccinated volunteers were compared with unvaccinated volunteers, and in addition we compared volunteers vaccinated with R21/Matrix-M according to route of inoculation: i.e. direct intravenous versus intradermal PfSPZ Challenge.

Methods

Study design

We undertook a Phase IIb open label, unblinded, randomised single centre study between July 2022 and February 2023 at the KEMRI Wellcome Trust Research Programme in Kilifi Kenya. Prior to commencing activity, approvals were obtained from a National IRB in Kenya and the relevant Oxford IRB (i.e. SERU (KEMRI/SERU/CGMR-C/158/3844) and OxTREC (OxTREC 32-19)) and from the medicines regulatory authority in Kenya (i.e. Pharmacy and Poisons Board

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

(ECCT/19/11/01)). The study was registered with the ClinicalTrials.gov identifier NCT03947190 and alternative registration with PACTR identifier PACTR202108505632810 to comply with in-country regulatory requirements. Use of Sanaria® PfSPZ Challenge (NF54) is done in accordance with an investigational new drugs application (IND) with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. A total of n=56 volunteers were randomized into one of three groups (R21/Matrix M ID, R21/Matrix-M DVI, and Control ID) across two cohorts to assess the safety, immunogenicity, and protective efficacy in CHMI of R21 adjuvanted with Matrix-M (R21/Matrix-M) in a 0-, 1-, 2-month schedule (Supplementary Methods). The 56 volunteers were divided into 2 cohorts, the first of which was also enrolled into CHMI and the second cohort did not participate in CHMI. For CHMI, we used *P. falciparum* NF54 sporozoites (Sanaria® PfSPZ Challenge (NF54)) using two alternative inoculation routes: injecting either 22,500 PfSPZ Challenge intradermally (ID) or 3,200 PfSPZ Challenge by direct venous inoculation (DVI).

Study volunteers and eligibility

Following informed consent, we recruited healthy adult men and women aged between 18-45 years from Kilifi North on the Kenyan Coast, where there is currently very low malaria transmission but with previous low to moderate malaria transmission[16]. Clinically significant medical conditions were identified by interview, physical examination, and laboratory screening for renal function, liver function, and serology for HIV, Hepatitis B and C. Volunteers were excluded for clinically significant conditions or blood tests, for likelihood of migration out of the study area, sickle cell disease and trait, pregnancy, and receipt of an investigational product 30 days preceding enrolment (Supplementary Methods).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Vaccines and vaccination

R21 is a pre-erythrocytic protein-in-adjuvant malaria vaccine candidate. It is adjuvanted with Matrix-M™ based on the circumsporozoite protein (CSP) produced by using recombinant Hepatitis B surface antigen (HBsAg) particles expressing the central NANP repeat and the C-terminus[17–20]. As previously described, volunteers received three vaccinations with R21 at four-week intervals. R21 was thawed to room temperature then mixed with Matrix-M™ before administration (10 µg mixed with Matrix-M 50 µg) and administered intramuscularly.

Controlled human malaria infection (CHMI)

CHMI was undertaken four weeks after the final vaccination. Volunteers were tested for malaria blood stage infection by qPCR and tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection by RT-PCR on naso-pharyngeal swab. Volunteers positive for either were excluded from proceeding to CHMI.

The CHMI agent (i.e. Sanaria® PfSPZ Challenge (NF54)) in cryovials was thawed by partial submersion of each vial for 30 s in a 37±1°C water bath. Trained study staff prepared, diluted, and dispensed PfSPZ Challenge to clinical staff using the diluents phosphate buffered saline (PBS) and 25% human serum albumin (HSA) as previously described within 30 minutes of thawing[11,13]. Challenge was administered in a volume of 0.5 mL using a needle and syringe by direct venous inoculation (DVI) at the standard dose of 3.200 PfSPZ Challenge. Intradermal (ID) injections were administered in two separate syringes in both left and right arms with each syringe containing 11,250 PfSPZ Challenge in 0.05 mL (i.e. 22,500 in total). The injection sites were covered with a sterile dressing, removed no earlier than 1 hour after inoculation.

Volunteers in the control group were challenged with 22,500 PfSPZ Challenge by ID. R21 vaccinees were randomized to either 22,500 PfSPZ Challenge by ID or to 3,200 PfSPZ Challenge

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ID by DVI. Data from a previous study of unvaccinated volunteers receiving 3,200 PfSPZ Challenge by DVI who residents of the same sub-location in Kilifi North were were included as PfSPZ Challenge DVI controls in this study analysis[13].

Study endpoint criteria following CHMI for treatment and/or malaria diagnosis was as previously described[13] being (1) reaching parasitaemia threshold of 500 parasites/µL and/or presence of important clinical symptoms; and (2) reaching day 22.

Safety assessment

Solicited adverse events were recorded for 7 days after each vaccination, volunteers were assessed within 1 hour of vaccination on the days of vaccination. Volunteers were provided with diary cards, rulers and thermometers and trained on measurement and recording of cutaneous reactions or swelling, and auxiliary temperature. Clinicians telephoned vaccinees daily for 7 days to remind them to record solicited events, and to record and assess unsolicited adverse events. Further in person examination was organized if necessary. Any unsolicited adverse events occurring between 7 and 30 days of each vaccination were recorded based on recall at 4 weeks. Serious adverse events were collected throughout the study. Causality was assessed by clinicians.

Assessment of antibody responses

Plasma samples were separated from whole blood for serology. We conducted ELISAs for levels of anti-NANP antibody and anti-whole schizont antibody (3D7 strain) as previously described[18,21]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

qPCR for parasite detection

Venous blood was collected twice daily from days 8 to 15 after PfSPZ Challenge inoculation and then daily from days 16 to 22 for the detection of the 18 S ribosomal RNA *P. falciparum* gene[22] using qPCR: in triplicates in a TaqMan assay using primers and probes previously described[13]. Non-template water (non-template control, NTC) was used as a negative control and cultured parasites of known quantity used as positive control, with sample parasite quantification undertaken against DNA extracted from known cultured parasite standards using 8 serial dilutions. Standard curves were checked against the WHO external quantified quality control sample.

Parasite genotyping

Parasite genotyping targeted the *ama1* (PF3D7_1133400) gene using amplicon deep sequencing as previously described[23]. Briefly, *ama1* amplicons spanning nucleotides 441–946 were generated from each sample, in duplicate, using primers designed in a previous study[21]. Deep sequencing of the sequencing library was performed on the SpotON FlowCell R10.4.1 (Oxford Nanopore Technologies, catalogue number FLOW-MIN114-1) at the KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Laboratories. Sequence data analysis was performed in SeekDeep version 3.0.1[24], as previously described[21]. *ama1* microhaplotypes with fewer than 250 reads or those detected at less than 5% minor allele frequency were discarded unless the microhaplotype was independently detected in additional samples at >5% frequency.

Statistical analysis

The intent-to-treat (ITT) cohort included volunteers receiving one or more vaccines. The according-to-protocol (ATP) cohort included all evaluable volunteers meeting eligibility criteria

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

and complied with study procedures. Safety is reported ITT, immunogenicity is reported ATP and efficacy in CHMI is reported ITT for the cohort undergoing CHMI. Safety data were tabulated descriptively, immunogenicity was described by geometric means with 95% confidence intervals. CHMI data were reported by description of quantitative PCR over time, then by frequency of outcome categories (as previously defined in Kapulu et al 2021[13]) according to vaccine group.

Results

135 volunteers were screened for eligibility, and 56 were randomized and vaccinated between July 2022 and February 2023. All completed scheduled vaccinations, and the first cohort (i.e. n=28) were eligible for CHMI. Three did not proceed to CHMI due to SARS-CoV-2 positive results (n=2) and increase in liver enzymes (ALT, n=1), so that 25 completed CHMI (Fig. 1). Volunteers were PCR negative for malaria parasites prior to CHMI enrollment, and with a predominance of young male volunteers (Table 1).

Adverse events following vaccination and following CHMI

Following vaccination, local solicited adverse events were detected in 0 to 4.2% of volunteers and general adverse events included headache, fatigue, and malaise in 0 to 8.3% of vaccinations, depending on vaccination group (Supplementary Table S1). No event was reported as severe and four events were reported as moderate, with a median and maximum duration of 4.5 and 5 days, respectively. During CHMI, there were no immediate or early adverse events, but after day 7 fever, headache and associated malaise were common (Supplementary Table S2). Six (6) events were reported to be moderate and none to be severe. All events resolved on follow up.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abnormal blood tests, primarily transient elevations in liver enzymes and/or low white blood counts were identified in several volunteers but were evenly distributed by vaccination group, were not clinically significant, and resolved on follow up (Supplementary Table S3). During CHMI there were clinically insignificant, transient abnormalities of liver enzymes and platelet counts (Supplementary Table S4).

Antibody responses

Following the vaccination course, anti-NANP antibodies rose from baseline levels of just under 10 ELISA Units (EU) to above 1000 EU in the R21-vaccinated volunteers but remained below 10 among the control group (Supplementary Fig S1). Volunteers had evidence of past exposure to malaria as evidenced by pre-vaccination IgG antibodies against schizont extract (Supplementary Fig S2), where historic controls had higher titres than the newly recruited cohort (geometric means of 1,244,000 EU (95%CI 693,000-2,235,000) vs 394,000 EU (95%CI 258,000-602,000), respectively, p=0.0009).

CHMI outcome

CHMI was conducted 28 days after the last vaccination. All eight unvaccinated control volunteers became PCR positive for malaria parasites during CHMI with PfSPZ Challenge by ID, with observed typical parasite growth curves on quantitative PCR. Seven of these volunteers met criteria for diagnosis during CHMI (treated profile), whilst one volunteer did not reach the parasitaemia threshold for diagnosis (untreated PCR positive profile) (Fig. 2, panel a, Table 2). Parasites were genotyped for AMA1, confirming the challenge parasite strain (NF54) in all cases (Supplementary Table S5).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Historical unvaccinated control volunteers who had previously undergone CHMI with PfSPZ Challenge by DVI showed similar growth rates, with 31 of 34 volunteers showing typical growth curves on quantitative PCR and meeting treatment criteria, 2 of 34 being PCR negative and 1 of 34 being PCR positive but not meeting treatment criteria (Fig. 2, panel c, Table 2).

In contrast, none of the 12 volunteers vaccinated with R21 met criteria for diagnosis following CHMI with PfSPZ Challenge by ID. Three out of the nine volunteers were briefly positive by PCR for malaria parasites but with no evidence of parasite growth hence protected but not sterilely protected (Fig. 2, panel b, Table 2). However, when the 5 volunteers vaccinated with R21 underwent CHMI with PfSPZ Challenge by DVI sporozoites, all 5 showed typical growth curves of parasites, and met diagnosis criteria (Fig. 2, panel d, Table 2).

The geometric mean parasite densities by PCR were similar over time following PfSPZ Challenge by DVI and ID in the control group, and for R21 vaccinees receiving PfSPZ Challenge by DVI (Fig 3). Hence, parasite inoculum and growth rates appear similar among these three groups.

Discussion

We show that vaccination with R21 is protective against PfSPZ Challenge, extending to Kenyan adults observations of protective efficacy by R21 against CHMI delivered by infective mosquito bites in UK adults[25] and observations of protective efficacy by R21 against natural challenge in the field in West and East African children[3,18]. Instead of infectious mosquito bites, we injected PfSPZ Challenge by needle and syringe for CHMI, and we were therefore able to compare protective efficacy against direct venous inoculation versus intradermal inoculation of sporozoites.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

R21 vaccine was immunogenic in our study, consistent with previous studies[17,26], suggesting that the vaccine potency was preserved, and we noted no lapses in GCP standard cold chain monitoring. R21 provided high levels of protective efficacy against PfSPZ Challenge by ID, but there was no evidence of efficacy against PfSPZ Challenge by DVI (i.e. 12 out of 12 volunteers (100%) protected (9 out of 12 sterilely (75%) protected) vs 0 out of 5 protected, respectively, $p<0.001$ by Fisher's). We saw one-off PCR positive signals on a single timepoint among 3 of the 12 volunteers vaccinated with R21 who received PfSPZ Challenge by ID. We have previously seen this in a CHMI study of naturally acquired immunity among volunteers resident at moderate to high transmission intensity, and who had higher levels of anti-malaria-schizont antibody, but not previously at lower transmission intensity[13,21]. One-off PCR positives were not previously noted among residents from lower transmission intensity settings[11,13], and we therefore speculate that R21 was synergistic with host immunity to clear low levels of parasitaemia.

Our data are consistent with animal models suggesting that anti-sporozoite antibodies exert protective efficacy primarily against sporozoites in the skin[7]. Mosquito bites *in vivo* deliver mostly sporozoites by ID, but an inconsistent proportion are delivered directly into a capillary and rapidly move into the venous circulation[27,28]. Anti-PfCSP antibodies correlate with protection against sporozoite infection, but protection appears to be leaky and therefore the correlation is noisy and no distinct antibody threshold has been defined[29]. In the field noise may be introduced by variable exposure[9]. Our demonstration that anti-PfCSP antibodies are ineffective against PfSPZ Challenge by DVI implies that further variation in outcome will be introduced by the occasional injection of sporozoites into capillaries during mosquito bites. Hence, the correlation between anti-PfCSP antibody titres and outcome is limited even in a tightly controlled experimental challenge[30]. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

infrequent injection of sporozoites into capillaries (i.e. one in five mosquito feeds) is consistent with high levels of efficacy achieved with anti-PfCSP antibody induction despite this lack of efficacy against PfSPZ Challenge by DVI[31].

On the other hand, direct venous injection of sporozoites is standard in the mouse model in which anti-CSP antibodies have been repeatedly shown to be protective[32]. In some mouse models, high levels of monoclonal antibodies but not polyclonal antibodies induced by vaccination were protective against venous injection of sporozoites, as was also the case in Saimiri monkeys challenged with vivax sporozoites[33,34]. Taken together, this raises the possibility that very high titres of anti-CSP antibodies in humans might be protective against sporozoites delivered by direct venous injection.

The limitations to our study include the difficulty in comparing doses of sporozoites by different routes. The dose of 3,200 cryopreserved PfSPZ Challenge was selected for DVI studies following studies showing that 800 PfSPZ Challenge only infected 7 of 9 volunteers and 3,200 PfSPZ infected 100% (9/9) of volunteers[12]. Similarly, 22,500 cryopreserved PfSPZ Challenge were required to ensure consistent infection rates[10,11,35]. The similar infection rates achieved by these doses suggest that these are similar effective inoculums, and this is supported by the similar growth curves seen following CHMI with DVI and ID PfSPZ Challenge given to control volunteers in our study (Fig 3). Furthermore, DVI is not an exact replication of the capillary injection by a mosquito proboscis, and it is possible that the slower flow rates in capillaries compared with veins might result in higher efficacy of anti-PfCSP antibodies. Our study was limited in sample size, although the complete differences in outcome between ID and DVI routes (i.e. 100% vs 0%) mitigates the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

limited statistical power. We relied on historical controls for PfSPZ Challenge by DVI and given the non-contemporaneous recruitment it is unsurprising that prior malaria exposure may have differed (Supplementary Figure S2). However, the outcomes for DVI vs ID PfSPZ Challenge among R21 vaccinees were based on a contemporaneous and randomized comparison, as was the comparison of R21 vaccinees vs control vaccines for PfSPZ Challenge by ID.

We conclude that PfSPZ Challenge by DVI are relatively resistant to neutralization with anti-PfCSP antibodies. This may be because of the existence of additional effector functions which can be recruited in the skin[7,28], because the sporozoite spends more time in the skin and a period of incubation is required for antibody binding to occur, or because invasion of the capillary basement membrane is more readily blocked than invasion of the hepatocytes. Since infective mosquito bites deliver a proportion of sporozoites intravenously, this implies a fixed population of sporozoites that will be non-susceptible to neutralization by anti-PfCSP antibodies and implies that further clinical development plans should build on the efficacy of R21 by adding with candidate blood stage vaccines.

Competing interests

AVSH and KJE are named as co-inventors on patent applications related to R21. KJE was an employee of the University of Oxford at the time of the work and is now an employee of GSK and owns restricted shares in GSK. YA, ERJ, PFB, TLR, BKLS and SLH are salaried, full-time employees of Sanaria, the manufacturer of Sanaria PfSPZ Challenge. All the other authors declare that there are no competing interests or have no additional financial interests.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Author contributions

MCK, PB: Writing – original draft. MCK, HK, MM, and PB: Formal analysis. FO, DK, EK, HK, MM, MSD, DB, JM, ON, HR, SA, MwM, LN, KK, RG, AM, JM, JeM, YA, ERJ, PFB, CN, MoM, JoM, BT, KW, LOO, JW, AL, FRL, RR, TLR, BKLS, SLH, KJE, AVSH, MH: Writing – review and editing.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all the study volunteers who volunteered to participate in the VAC074 study. We are also very grateful to the study teams (clinical, nursing, pharmacy, laboratory, and fieldworkers) that have supported the study, including the collaborating teams at Sanaria and the Data Safety Monitoring Board and Local Safety Monitor. We are grateful to the teams at Novavax, Serum Institute India, and Clinical Biomanufacturing Facility at Oxford University for the vaccines. All VAC074 study team members were notified of the manuscript and reviewed the manuscript. This manuscript is published with permission/approval from KEMRI Director.

Data availability

The datasets presented in this study can be found at the online repository for KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme: Harvard Dataverse https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/TNHS14.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Funding statement

This work was funded as part of the EDCTP2 programme supported by the European Union (grant number RIA2016V-1649-MMVC). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

References

1. Noor, A. M. & Alonso, P. L. The message on malaria is clear: progress has stalled. *The Lancet* **399**, 1777 (2022).
2. Björkman, A., Benn, C. S., Aaby, P. & Schapira, A. RTS,S/AS01 malaria vaccine—proven safe and effective? *Lancet Infect Dis* **23**, e318–e322 (2023).
3. Datoo, M. S. *et al.* Safety and efficacy of malaria vaccine candidate R21/Matrix-M in African children: a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet* **403**, 533–544 (2024).
4. World Health Organisation. *World Malaria Report 2023*. https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2023 (2023).
5. Kayentao, K. *et al.* Subcutaneous Administration of a Monoclonal Antibody to Prevent Malaria. *New England Journal of Medicine* **390**, 1549–1559 (2024).
6. Smith, P. G., Rodrigues, L. C. & Fine, P. E. M. Assessment of the Protective Efficacy of Vaccines against Common Diseases Using Case-Control and Cohort Studies. *Int J Epidemiol* **13**, 87–93 (1984).
7. Flores-Garcia, Y. *et al.* Antibody-Mediated Protection against Plasmodium Sporozoites Begins at the Dermal Inoculation Site. *mBio* **9**, (2018).
8. Olotu, A. *et al.* Seven-Year Efficacy of RTS,S/AS01 Malaria Vaccine among Young African Children. *New England Journal of Medicine* **374**, 2519–2529 (2016).
9. Bejon, P. *et al.* Analysis of immunity to febrile malaria in children that distinguishes immunity from lack of exposure. *Infect Immun* **77**, 1917–23 (2009).
10. Roestenberg, M. *et al.* Controlled human malaria infections by intradermal injection of cryopreserved Plasmodium falciparum sporozoites. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **88**, 5–13 (2013).
11. Shekalaghe, S. *et al.* Controlled human malaria infection of Tanzanians by intradermal injection of aseptic, purified, cryopreserved Plasmodium falciparum sporozoites. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **91**, 471–480 (2014).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

12. Mordmuller, B. *et al.* Direct venous inoculation of Plasmodium falciparum sporozoites for controlled human malaria infection: a dose-finding trial in two centres. *Malar J* **14**, 117 (2015).

13. Kapulu, M. C. *et al.* Safety and PCR monitoring in 161 semi-immune Kenyan adults following controlled human malaria infection. *JCI Insight* **6**, (2021).

14. Douglas, A. D. *et al.* Comparison of modeling methods to determine liver-to-blood inocula and parasite multiplication rates during controlled human malaria infection. *J Infect Dis* **208**, 340–345 (2013).

15. Bejon, P. *et al.* Calculation of Liver-to-Blood Inocula, Parasite Growth Rates, and Preerythrocytic Vaccine Efficacy, from Serial Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction Studies of Volunteers Challenged with Malaria Sporozoites. *J Infect Dis* **191**, 619–626 (2005).

16. Snow, R. W. *et al.* The prevalence of Plasmodium falciparum in sub-Saharan Africa since 1900. *Nature* **550**, 515–518 (2017).

17. Venkatraman, N. *et al.* Phase I assessments of first-in-human administration of a novel malaria anti-sporozoite vaccine candidate, R21 in matrix-M adjuvant, in UK and Burkinabe volunteers. *medRxiv* 19009282 (2019) doi:10.1101/19009282.

18. Datoo, M. S. *et al.* Efficacy of a low-dose candidate malaria vaccine, R21 in adjuvant Matrix-M, with seasonal administration to children in Burkina Faso: a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet* **397**, 1809–1818 (2021).

19. Collins, K. A., Snaith, R., Cottingham, M. G., Gilbert, S. C. & Hill, A. V. S. Enhancing protective immunity to malaria with a highly immunogenic virus-like particle vaccine. *Sci Rep* **7**, (2017).

20. Collins, K. A. *et al.* Ultra-low dose immunization and multi-component vaccination strategies enhance protection against malaria in mice. *Sci Rep* **11**, (2021).

21. Kapulu, M. C. *et al.* Controlled human malaria infection (CHMI) outcomes in Kenyan adults is associated with prior history of malaria exposure and anti-schizont antibody response. *BMC Infect Dis* **22**, 1–10 (2022).

22. Ogwang, C. *et al.* Safety and Immunogenicity of Heterologous Prime-Boost Immunisation with Plasmodium falciparum Malaria Candidate Vaccines, ChAd63 ME-TRAP and MVA ME-TRAP, in Healthy Gambian and Kenyan Adults. *PLoS One* **8**, e57726 (2013).

23. Wamae, K. *et al.* Targeted amplicon deep sequencing of ama1 and mdr1 to track within-host P. falciparum diversity throughout treatment in a clinical drug trial. *Wellcome Open Res* **7**, 95 (2024).

24. Hathaway, N. J., Parobek, C. M., Juliano, J. J. & Bailey, J. A. SeekDeep: single-base resolution de novo clustering for amplicon deep sequencing. *Nucleic Acids Res* **46**, e21–e21 (2018).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

25. Abstract Book. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **97**, 1–674 (2017).

26. Sang, S. *et al.* Safety and immunogenicity of varied doses of R21/Matrix-M^{TM} vaccine at three years follow-up: A phase 1b age de-escalation, dose-escalation trial in adults, children, and infants in Kilifi-Kenya. *Wellcome Open Res* **8**, 450 (2023).

27. Amino, R. *et al.* Quantitative imaging of Plasmodium transmission from mosquito to mammal. *Nature Medicine 2006 12:2* **12**, 220–224 (2006).

28. Choumet, V. *et al.* Visualizing Non Infectious and Infectious Anopheles gambiae Blood Feedings in Naive and Saliva-Immunized Mice. *PLoS One* **7**, e50464 (2012).

29. Olotu, A. I., Fegan, G. & Bejon, P. Further Analysis of Correlates of Protection from a Phase 2a Trial of the Falciparum Malaria Vaccines RTS,S/AS01B and RTS,S/AS02A in Malaria-Naive Adults. *J Infect Dis* **201**, 970–971 (2010).

30. Kester, K. E. *et al.* Randomized, double-blind, phase 2a trial of falciparum malaria vaccines RTS,S/AS01B and RTS,S/AS02A in malaria-naive adults: safety, efficacy, and immunologic associates of protection. *J Infect Dis* **200**, 337–346 (2009).

31. Ponnudurai, T., Lensen, A. H. W., Gemert, G. J. A., Bolmer, M. G. & Meuwissen, J. H. T. Feeding behaviour and sporozoite ejection by infected Anopheles stephensi. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* **85**, 175–180 (1991).

32. Sedegah, M., Hedstrom, R., Hobart, P. & Hoffman, S. L. Protection against malaria by immunization with plasmid DNA encoding circumsporozoite protein. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **91**, 9866–9870 (1994).

33. Charoenvit, Y. *et al.* Monoclonal, but not polyclonal, antibodies protect against Plasmodium yoelii sporozoites. *The Journal of Immunology* **146**, 1020–1025 (1991).

34. Charoenvit, Y. *et al.* Inability of malaria vaccine to induce antibodies to a protective epitope within its sequence. *Science* **251**, 668–671 (1991).

35. Bastiaens, G. J. H. *et al.* Safety, immunogenicity, and protective efficacy of intradermal immunization with aseptic, purified, cryopreserved plasmodium falciparum sporozoites in volunteers under chloroquine prophylaxis: A randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* **94**, 663–673 (2016).

Tables

Table 1. Volunteer baseline characteristics based on vaccine enrolment and CHMI group.

	Challenged			Not Challenged			Total (N=56)	Historic Control DVI (n=34)
	R21 ID (n=12)	R21 DVI (n=7)	Control ID (n=9)	R21 ID (n=12)	R21 DVI (n=7)	Control ID (n=9)		
Age in years, mean (SD)	28.17 (6.1)	26.14 (4.1)	30.78 (8.1)	27.42 (6.8)	25.43 (6.0)	26.67 (3.5)	27.58 (6.06)	28 (8)
Female, % (n/N)	83.3% (10/12)	71.4% (5/7)	55.6% (5/9)	83.3% (10/12)	71.4% (5/7)	77.8% (7/9)	75% (42/56)	21% (7/34)
Male, % (n/N)	16.7% (2/12)	28.6% (2/7)	44.4% (4/9)	16.7% (2/12)	28.6% (2/7)	22.2% (2/9)	25% (14/56)	79% (27/34)
BMI, kg/m2, mean (SD)	21.69 (1.7)	19.72 (1.8)	20.55 (1.9)	21.74 (2.4)	20.71 (1.8)	19.79 (1.5)	20.84 (1.98)	31.0(3.5)
qPCR positive*, % (n/N)	0% (0/12)	14.3% (1/7)	0% (0/9)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/7)	0% (0/9)	1.79% (1/56)	0% (0/34)
qPCR** median (min-max)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0.002)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0.02)	0 (0, 0)

Data are presented either as mean (SD), percentage and (n/N), or median and (min-max). *Volunteers were qPCR positive at pre-vaccination with qPCR confirmation of no presence of parasites at C-1. **qPCR density as parasites/μL. n=number of healthy volunteers enrolled to each group. BMI, Body mass index, qPCR quantitative PCR.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Malaria diagnosis outcome by vaccination and challenge group

qPCR Outcome	R21 ID n=12	R21 DVI n=5	Control ID n=8	Historic Control DVI (n=34)	Total N=59
PCR (-), % (n/N)	75% (9/12)	0% (0/5)	0% (0/8)	5.9% (2/34)	18.6% (11/59)
Untreated PCR (+), % (n/N)	25% (3/12)	0% (0/5)	12.5% (1/8)	2.9% (1/34)	8.5% (5/59)
Treated, febrile, % (n/N)	0% (0/12)	100% (5/5)	50.0% (4/8)	55.9% (19/34)	47.5% (28/59)
Treated, nonfebrile, % (n/N)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)	37.5% (3/8)	35.3% (12/34)	25.4% (15/59)

Data are presented percentage and (n/N), PCR (-): PCR negative; PCR (+): PCR positive.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figures and Figure Legends



Fig. 1. Study Flow Diagram. Out of one-hundred and thirty-five volunteers screened, fifty-six volunteers who were eligible and met the enrolment criteria were randomised into one of four groups across two enrolment cohorts 4 weeks apart. Of the 55 excluded volunteers those with abnormal laboratory results, included low haemoglobin levels (<10g/dl for females (n=6)); thrombocytopenia (n=2); and elevated levels of ALTs (n=1). For other exclusions, these included being eligible but: did not turn up for screening results (n=4); not on any method of contraception (n=3); number required attained (n=3); did not meet location of residence criteria (n=2); and did not attend enrolment visit (n=2). Other reasons with frequency of 1 (n=8) were: written informed consent not signed; unstable blood pressure values; positive pregnancy test; abdominal hernia,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

neurofibromatosis, allergy to ibuprofen, failed Test of Understanding (TOU), history of schizophrenia. 7 volunteers had more than one screening failure and these were elevated laboratory values (n=4), abdominal mass (n=1), abnormal ECG (n=1), and substance use (n=1). *A further 24 volunteers were randomized to a vaccine group to receive ChAd63/MVA ME-TRAP in a heterologous prime-boost regimen of 0,8 weeks.



Fig. 2. Malaria diagnosis outcome following CHMI. qPCR results (y axis, log transformed), by time after inoculation (x axis) in panels showing (a) control group, ID challenge (n=8); (b) R21 vaccinated group, ID challenge (n=12); (c) historical control group, DVI challenge (n=34); and (d) R21 vaccinated group, DVI challenge (n=5). Parasitemia was determined by asexual 18S ribosomal RNA gene qPCR done in Kilifi. Blue lines represent individuals who required reached malaria diagnosis criteria. Green lines represent individuals who did not meet criteria for diagnosis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.06.24311495; this version posted August 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

but were qPCR positive. Orange lines represent individuals who were qPCR negative throughout monitoring. Red dots denote individuals who were febrile based on the criteria for diagnosis.



Fig 3. Parasite growth curves following ID and DVI inoculation. Geometric means of log PCR parasite densities following CHMI by group and day being R21 DVI (red line); Control ID (green line); and Historic Control DVI (blue line).