



Competition, cooperation and immune selection for plasmodium falciparum malaria

David Gurarie, PhD

Case western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH 44106

dxg5@case.edu

Parasite-immune interactions

- Driving forces of parasite evolution and selection:
 - Parasite-immune interactions + transmission environment
- Implications: vaccine design, prediction, control mitigation
- Examples:
 - Respiratory pathogens (Covid I 9, flu, RSV...): evolution, predictability ??
 - Effect of vaccination
 - Malaria (A. Reed 2008): "Can imperfect vaccine drive evolution of 'virulence'?

Evidence for clone interaction via cross-reactive serology



Disordered initial state

Organized 'dominance structure'

- Cross-reactive samples: parasite (clones) serum (Ab)
- Transition: acute -> post-infection status

Dominance network structure

C. O. Buckee et al. Malaria parasite population structure

Proc. R. Soc. B (2009) 276, 477-485 doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.1122

Modeling work (snapshot)

Evolution of virulence by imperfect vaccine

• Mackinnon et al, Vaccine, 2008

Strain-selection theory: *immunity* shaping parasite population structure in host communities

- Gupta, S., et al. Science 280, (1998)
- Gupta, S. et al. Nat. Med. 2, 437–442 (1996)
- Severins, M. et al, JRSI (2011)
- Buckee, C. O., et al, PNAS 108, (2011).
- He, Q. et al, Nature Com, (2018)

Key concepts

Population-based

ABM

- P genetic makeup
- P-immune interaction, cross-reactivity CR
- Fitness traits: V-T-P (virulence-transmissibility-persistence)

Interplay between **V-T-P** and their trade-off can drive evolution of virulence



Can these conceptual ideas be tested with detailed models of host-parasite0immune biology ?

Malaria biology: life-cycle, immune evasion



- Human: merozoite cycle (2 days) subject to immune control
- Mosquito: gametocyte uptake, mating and gene crossover
- Immune evasion via AV (antigenic variation)
- iRBC express Pf variable surface antigens (VSA) encoded by 50-60 var-genes
- Each cycle has single expressed Var, can switch on the next cycle
- <u>Vars</u> stimulate specific Abs that clear clones with expressed Var
- Vascular sequestration and severe malaria due to Vars



Multiple P. waves arising from VSA expression

ABM modeling highlights

- Genetically structured Pf: clone = collection of Vars
- Host agent state
 - Target RBC, infected iRBC (w. expressed vars), gametocytes (all cell populations/[µL]):
 - Immunity
 - Innate: febrile threshold for cumulative iRBC-load
 - Adaptive:Var-specific Abs
 - Processes:
 - RBC: invasion/depletion/production
 - iRBC: merozoite replication, AV-switch, gametocyte production
 - Immunity: stimulation/clearing of (expressed) clones, immune loss
- Transmission: mosquito uptake/ inoculation (EIR), crossover

Genetically structured parasite (Pf)





• 6 clones:





CR immune network for 6 clones



• Crossover (mosquito):



In-host dynamics

In-host state for infecting clones {A,B,...}

Components	RBC	iRBC	Gametocytes	IE (Abs)
Variables	х	$<\mid A \rightarrow \{ y_{A1} \text{, } y_{A2} \text{, } \dots \} \text{, } B \rightarrow \{ y_{B1} \text{, } y_{B2} \text{, } \dots \} \text{, } \dots \mid >$	$\{\textbf{G}_{A}\textbf{,}\textbf{G}_{B}\textbf{,}\boldsymbol{\ldots}\}$	$\{u_1, u_2, \ldots\}$
input/output		inoculae	uptake	



Typical infection history of a single 8-var clone

60

60

TP

40

80

80

{4,3,9,7,10,5,6,8}



Comparison with Malaria-Therapy data



Mixed infections: 4-clone case



Downstream CR





Individual-TP outcomes

	Equally fit		
	"single-clone TP"	"4-mix TP"	
1	40.1	36.7	
2	41.1	38.6	
3	41.5	21.2	- Competition ?
4	42.4	47.6	Cooperation ?
			-

Cumulative probability of mosquito uptake

Collective TP outcomes Single Pair Triplet $\{1, 2\}$ | 32.9 $\{1\} | 36.7 | \{1, 3\} | 16.9 | \{1, 2, 3\} | 13.4 |$ $\{2\}$ 38.6 $\{1, 4\}$ 35.6 $\{1, 2, 4\}$ 31.9 $\{3\} | 21.2 | \{2, 3\} | 17.2 | \{1, 3, 4\} | 16.9 |$ {4} **| 47.6 | {2, 4} | 37.6 | {2, 3, 4} | 17.2** $\{3, 4\}$ 21.2

{i}, {i j}, {i j k)

Complex TP-outcomes of mixed infections not predictable from clonal makeup (CR)

Evolution and selection in host ABM ensembles

Two-level selection: within-host (mixed infections) + **community** transmission

- I. Primary selection: naïve host ensembles
- **II.** Transmission:
 - serial passage in SP-lines
 - Host communities in mosquito environment

Basic questions

- Which clones or teams (cliques) get selected ?
- Role of V-TP phenotypes?
- Role of transmission environment (EIR-intensity, mosquito population/ behavior)
- Control implications

Identify most fit (TP) individual clones and cooperating teams in mixed contests

...}

Possible setup:

- 5-variant clones
- **Clone-pool**: 200 random draws {S_i} from gene-space {...
- Nested mixed contests: quintuplets-> quadruples->... -> doublets

{1, 2, 3, 4} Type # contests $SS = \left\{S_i, S_j\right\}$ double 28490 **1**, 3, 4} {1, 2, 4} {1, 2, 3} 3, 4} triple SSS 49835 quadrup 25000 SSSS {1, 4} {1, 3} ^{1, 2} quintup {2, 4} {2, 3} SSSSS 5000

Contest outputs:

- Individuals- {TP_i}
- couple: {TP_{ij}}
- triplets: {TP_{ijk}}

Statistical analysis : fitness (TP) loss in mixed contests

Single-clone infections: V-TP



- No **V-TP** correlation
- V minor factor in selection



Statistical loss and gain in mixed ensembles



operating c

More evidence of fitness gain in mixed infections

- Expanded 'couple->triple' $(ij) \rightarrow \{(ijk): k = 1, 2, ...\}$ $\begin{bmatrix} TP & ij & ijk \\ \hline single & \{T_i, T_j\} & \{T_i, T_j, T_k\} \\ \hline mixed & T_{ij} & \{T_{ij}, T_{ik}, T_{jk}, T_{jk}\} \end{bmatrix}$
- Can triple co-infection improve survival: $|T_{ij} < T_{ij}|$?
- For most couples (of 200 core) 5-30% expanded triplets improve TP
- Hence 5-30% chance improve survival via increased mixing

Serial passage (SP) in naïve host lines



- Strain mixture $\{S_1, S_2, ...\}$ injected in donor #1
- Transmissible strains (gametocytes) collected on passage day d_P goes to recipient
- Repeated over multiple cycles, with fixed or random d_P (EIR = transmission intensity)
- Clonal makeup collected over multiple passage cycles



Typical SP line for 4strain mixture

Evolution of SP-ensembles with random infusion

- Ensemble of SP-lines with 100-200 transmission cycles (random dP)
- Initialized with 10 best-quantile of primary selection
- Random infusion of the remaining 190 on each SP-cycle







Persistent clones engage closely-linked cooperative cliques derived from CR network



Multiplicity distribution in multiple SP-lines (SP- ensemble of 200)

Conclusions

- Methodology: ABM with genetically structured parasite and detailed in-host biology (targetparasite-immune interactions). Flexible, computationally efficient
- Intrinsic and derived clonal phenotypes: virulence (RBC), TP (transmission potential
- Selection in naïve host ensembles, and SP-transmission lines; fitness (TP) cost of competition
- Key drivers of selection: clonal cross-reactivity, transmission intensity (EIR, SP frequency
- Evidence of cooperative behavior in host ensembles and transmission lines
- Future work:
 - Exploration of cooperating clusters (cliques) in extended multi-clonal genotype spaces
 - Evolution and selection in coupled human-mosquito systems with crossover
 - Implications of cooperative (persistent) cliques for monitoring, control, vaccine strategies
- Reference: D. Gurarie, bioRxiv 539676; doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.1101/539676.2019</u>.