

Large-scale mapping of antigenic relationships in Sars-CoV-2

Peter C. Jentsch^{1,4}, Finlay Maguire^{3,5}, and Samira Mubareka^{1,2}

¹*Sunnybrook Research Institute, Toronto, Canada*

²*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*

³*Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada*

⁴*Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada*

⁵*Shared Hospital Laboratory, Toronto, Canada*

October 17, 2022

1 Background

The rapid and widespread adoption of immunization has saved millions of lives in the COVID-19 pandemic. As the world’s population gains immune experience with Sars-CoV-2, either through previous infection or vaccination, antigenic drift has given rise to new variants that exhibit significant immune escape [14]. Similar to the annual reformulation of influenza vaccinations, public health planning has shifted resources towards increasing resilience against the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants. The Moderna and Pfizer mRNA vaccine boosters were updated accordingly to a bivalent version, including both the ancestral spike protein and the spike protein from the BA.1 lineage of the Omicron variant, the first variant to exhibit major immune escape. In the mean time, the BA.4 and BA.5 Omicron sublineages have become widespread, rapidly becoming the majority of COVID-19 cases. Since these sublineages are also antigenically distinct from their BA.1 ancestors [2], development of bivalent mRNA boosters which cover BA.4 and BA.5 quickly followed. The uptake of updated vaccine boosters will undoubtedly reduce the burden of new variants on health systems worldwide, but perhaps we can do better than a reactive approach. The level of genomic surveillance during this pandemic has been unprecedented, and many new methods have been developed to take advantage of the quantity of data collected. Understanding this immune landscape and the dynamics of viral evolution within it will be key to remaining in control of the resulting antigenic arms race.

Mapping antigenic relationships between related pathogens was pioneered with Influenza A [6]. The immune response of an antiserum to a different antigen, antigenic distance, can be quantified as a reduction in concentration of the newly introduced antigen. These relationships can be measured between many

related strains of a pathogen, to create a map of changing immune responses through the evolution of the pathogen. With manifold reduction techniques such as multidimensional scaling, these relationships can often be approximately represented in two or three dimensional cartesian maps, explicitly showing the antigenic drift of the pathogen. This technique was used to map the antigenic evolution of Influenza A, and argue that it can be understood as primarily occurring in only two dimensions [6, 9]. Wilks et al. have developed upon this technique to create an antigenic map of approximately 17 major variants of Sars-CoV-2 from serum neutralization assays, and further argue that a two-dimensional map is an adequate approximation of the landscape [8, 12, 13].

This work on data-driven approximations of antigenic space motivates the development of models that explicitly incorporates data on antigenic relationships obtained from these neutralization assays. The dynamics of related pathogen strains evolving within a shared host population can rapidly become intractable, and therefore researchers have devised models which can manage this complexity. One method is to constrain the possible viral strains to points on a finite one or two dimensional lattice, thereby making the analysis of strain evolution tractable [3]. In two dimensional strain space, cross-immunity of a pathogen is given specified by an arbitrary function of the euclidean distance between strains, and mutation is implemented as discrete diffusion with some fixed speed. To accurately parameterize these models, the map of antigenic space should use as much genomic information as is available. Fortunately, for Sars-CoV-2, the most sequenced biological entity, we have a huge amount of information. With millions of the samples in the global SCV2 tree, our combined knowledge of the antigenic space of SCV2 could be orders of magnitude more detailed. In this manuscript, we describe methods for constructing more detailed antigenic maps using a subset this genomic diversity, and provide some examples of these maps.

2 Methods

To add viral genomes to our map without obtaining explicit antigenic distances via laboratory assays, we need some method of estimating antigenic distances from genomic data. There are two additional sources of information that we use for this interpolation. Deep mutational scanning of the receptor binding domain (RBD) of the Sars-CoV-2 genome has been used to measure the polyclonal antibody binding affinity for a mutation at every nucleotide in the RBD [10]. Using this data, it is possible to approximate the polyclonal binding affinity for an arbitrary given RBD sequence [4]. This algorithm gives the binding affinity for a given RBD is returned by the aforementioned tool as a fraction between zero and one, where a binding affinity of one represents perfect binding and zero represents no binding, or complete antibody escape. While antigenic distance is more complex than just antibody binding affinity to the viral RBD, we include it as one aspect of our antigenic distance approximation.

The second metric we use is the number of SNPs between two genomes, because identical viral genomes should receive very similar immune reactions,

and genomes that have many mutations between them will likely have provoke different immune reactions. However, the degree to which a given SNP will affect the antigenic escape of the mutated virus depends significantly on the location and base of the SNP in the genome. For instance, since the spike protein is the main antigen of the virus, mutations in the spike protein are far more relevant than mutations in other proteins [5]. To that end, we weight SNPs by the frequency with which they independently reoccur within in the global tree [1]. This is done by counting the sites from the global SCV2 tree created with USHER [11], using the software tool matUtils [7].

For each pair of genomes g_i and g_j ($i \neq j$) aligned with the reference, first we find the closest lineages in existing antigenic map to g_i , and g_j , and corresponding points x_i and x_j . Assume the polyclonal binding affinity is given by $B(g)$ (computed by [4]), where g is some viral genome sequence. Further let $g_i^{(k)}$ be the k th nucleotide base in g_i and $\chi(g_i^{(k)}, g_j^{(k)})$ the two argument indicator function given by equation 1.

$$\chi(a, b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a = b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Assume $h^{(k)}$ is a vector containing the number of homoplastic mutations at site k in the global tree. Then we compute the distance between g_i and g_j as given by equation 2.

$$d(g_i, g_j) = \frac{B(g_i) + B(g_j)}{2} + \frac{\sum_k \chi(g_i^{(k)}, g_j^{(k)}) h^{(k)}}{\sum_k h^{(k)}} \quad (2)$$

Computing $d(g_i, g_j)$ for every pair of Sars-CoV-2 genomes g_i and g_j gives a distance matrix between all genomes in the sample. We use multidimensional scaling (MDS) as in [6, 13] to place the genomes in 2 dimensional euclidean space in a way that closely approximates their distances with respect to d .

The dataset we use for this is the set of public genomes made available by the NCBI (CITE). To avoid sampling bias we take only the genomes sequenced as a result of random sampling, for a total of 1,895,794 unique Sars-CoV-2 genomes. However, we only consider the SNPs in the RBD, plus top X most frequent SNPs with respect to h , because the weight assigned to other SNPs is mostly negligible. This simplification reduces the total number of unique genomes to Y, which is much more tractable for processing with commonly available MDS software packages.

References

- [1] Stephen W Attwood, Sarah C Hill, David M Aanensen, Thomas R Connor, and Oliver G Pybus. Phylogenetic and phylodynamic approaches to understanding and combating the early sars-cov-2 pandemic. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, pages 1–16, 2022.

- [2] Yunlong Cao, Ayijiang Yisimayi, Fanchong Jian, Weiliang Song, Tianhe Xiao, Lei Wang, Shuo Du, Jing Wang, Qianqian Li, Xiaosu Chen, et al. Ba. 2.12. 1, ba. 4 and ba. 5 escape antibodies elicited by omicron infection. *Nature*, 608(7923):593–602, 2022.
- [3] J. R. Gog and B. T. Grenfell. Dynamics and selection of many-strain pathogens. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(26):17209–17214, December 2002.
- [4] Allison J Greaney, Tyler N Starr, and Jesse D Bloom. An antibody-escape estimator for mutations to the sars-cov-2 receptor-binding domain. *Virus evolution*, 8(1):veac021, 2022.
- [5] William T Harvey, Alessandro M Carabelli, Ben Jackson, Ravindra K Gupta, Emma C Thomson, Ewan M Harrison, Catherine Ludden, Richard Reeve, Andrew Rambaut, Sharon J Peacock, et al. Sars-cov-2 variants, spike mutations and immune escape. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 19(7):409–424, 2021.
- [6] Alan Lapedes and Robert Farber. The Geometry of Shape Space: Application to Influenza. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 212(1):57–69, September 2001.
- [7] Jakob McBroome, Bryan Thornlow, Angie S Hinrichs, Nicola De Maio, Nick Goldman, David Haussler, Russell Corbett-Detig, and Yatish Turakhia. matutils: Tools to interpret and manipulate mutation annotated trees. *bioRxiv*, 2021.
- [8] Nathaniel L. Miller, Thomas Clark, Rahul Raman, and Ram Sasisekharan. An Antigenic Space Framework for Understanding Antibody Escape of SARS-CoV-2 Variants. *Viruses*, 13(10):2009, October 2021.
- [9] Derek J. Smith, Alan S. Lapedes, Jan C. de Jong, Theo M. Bestebroer, Guus F. Rimmelzwaan, Albert D. M. E. Osterhaus, and Ron A. M. Fouchier. Mapping the Antigenic and Genetic Evolution of Influenza Virus. *Science*, 305(5682):371–376, July 2004.
- [10] Tyler N Starr, Allison J Greaney, Sarah K Hilton, Daniel Ellis, Katharine HD Crawford, Adam S Dingens, Mary Jane Navarro, John E Bowen, M Alejandra Tortorici, Alexandra C Walls, et al. Deep mutational scanning of sars-cov-2 receptor binding domain reveals constraints on folding and ace2 binding. *Cell*, 182(5):1295–1310, 2020.
- [11] Yatish Turakhia, Bryan Thornlow, Angie S Hinrichs, Nicola De Maio, Landen Gozashti, Robert Lanfear, David Haussler, and Russell Corbett-Detig. Ultrafast sample placement on existing trees (usher) enables real-time phylogenetics for the sars-cov-2 pandemic. *Nature Genetics*, 53(6):809–816, 2021.

- [12] Karlijn van der Straten, Denise Guerra, Marit van Gils, Ilja Bontjer, Tom G Caniels, Hugo D van Willigen, Elke Wynberg, Meliawati Poniman, Judith A Burger, Joey H Bouhuijs, et al. Mapping the antigenic diversification of sars-cov-2. *medRxiv*, 2022.
- [13] Samuel H. Wilks, Barbara Mühlemann, Xiaoying Shen, Sina Türeli, Eric B. LeGresley, Antonia Netzl, Miguela A. Caniza, Jesus N. Chacaltana-Huarcaya, Xiaoju Daniell, Michael B. Datto, Thomas N. Denny, Christian Drosten, Ron A. M. Fouchier, Patricia J. Garcia, Peter J. Halfmann, Agatha Jassem, Terry C. Jones, Yoshihiro Kawaoka, Florian Krammer, Charlene McDanal, Rolando Pajon, Viviana Simon, Melissa Stockwell, Haili Tang, Harm van Bakel, Richard Webby, David C. Montefiori, and Derek J. Smith. Mapping SARS-CoV-2 antigenic relationships and serological responses. Preprint, Immunology, January 2022.
- [14] Jonathan W. Yewdell. Antigenic drift: Understanding COVID-19. *Immunity*, 54(12):2681–2687, December 2021.