

Oral vaccination using microdevices to deliver α -GalCer adjuvanted vaccine afford mucosal immunity

Carlsen, Philip H R; Kjeldsen, Rolf Bech; Pedersen, Gabriel K; Christensen, Dennis; Nielsen, Line Hagner; Boisen, Anja

Published in: Journal of Controlled Release

Link to article, DOI: 10.1016/j.jconrel.2022.11.015

Publication date: 2023

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Link back to DTU Orbit

Citation (APA):

Carlsen, P. H. R., Kjeldsen, R. B., Pedersen, G. K., Christensen, D., Nielsen, L. H., & Boisen, A. (2023). Oral vaccination using microdevices to deliver α-GalCer adjuvanted vaccine afford mucosal immunity. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 353, 134-146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2022.11.015

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.

- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

¹ Oral vaccination using microdevices to

² deliver α -GalCer adjuvanted vaccine afford

3 mucosal immunity

- 6 ^a Center for Intelligent Drug delivery and sensing Using microcontainers and Nanomechanics (IDUN),
- Department of Health Technology, Technical University of Denmark, Oersteds plads 345C, 2800 Kongens
 Lyngby, Denmark
- 9 ^b Vaccine Adjuvant Research, Department of Infectious Disease Immunology, Statens Serum Institute, 10 Artillerivej 5, 2300 Copenhagen, Denmark
- 11

12 Abstract

13 Oral vaccination has in the recent years gained a lot of attraction, mainly due to optimized patient 14 compliance and logistics. However, the development of oral vaccines, especially oral subunit vaccines is challenging. Micro technology can be utilized to overcome some of these challenges, by facilitating 15 protection and effective delivery of the vaccine components in the gastrointestinal tract (GI tract). One 16 17 such technology is Microcontainers (MCs), which can be realized to be mucoadhesive and to target specific regions of the GI tract via oral delivery. Here, we test MCs, for oral delivery of the C. Trachomatis vaccine 18 19 candidate CTH522, in combination with effective mucosal adjuvants. The adjuvants alpha-20 galactosylceramide (α -GalCer), C-di-GMP and cholera toxin B were compared *in vivo*, to identify the most 21 prominent adjuvant for formulation with CTH522. Formulations were administered both purely oral and 22 as boosters following a subcutaneous (s.c.) prime with CTH522 in combination with the CAF®01 adjuvant. 23 CTH522 formulated with α -GalCer showed to be the most efficient combination for the oral vaccine, based on the immunological analysis. Lyophilized formulation of CTH522 and α -GalCer was loaded into MCs and 24 25 these were subsequently coated with Eudragit L100-55 and evaluated in vivo in mice for the ability of MCs 26 to mediate intestinal vaccine delivery and increase immunogenicity of the vaccine. Mice receiving oral 27 prime and boosters did show a significantly enhanced mucosal immune responses compared to naive 28 mice. This indicates the MCs are indeed capable of delivering the vaccine formulation intact and able to 29 stimulate the immune cells. Mice orally boosted with MCs following a s.c. prime with CAF01, 30 demonstrated improved systemic and local Th17 responses, along with increased local IFN-y and IgA levels 31 compared to both the s.c. prime alone and the homologous oral prime-boost immunization. However, 32 due to the relatively weak observed effect of the MC delivery on the immune responses, it was 33 hypothesized that the MCs are proportionally too large for the GI tract of mice, and thus cleared before an effective immune response can be induced. To investigate this, MCs were loaded with BaSO₄, and orally 34 administered to mice. Analysis with X-ray and CT showed a transit time of approximately 1-1.5 h from the 35 36 stomach to the cecum, corresponding to the standard transit time in mice, and an extremely narrow 37 absorption window. This indicates that mice is not a suitable animal model for evaluation of MCs. These 38 data should be taken into consideration in future in vivo trials with this and similar technologies, where 39 larger animals might be a necessity for proof-of-concept studies.

Philip H. R. Carlsen^{a,1}, Rolf Bech Kjeldsen^a, Gabriel K. Pedersen^b, Dennis Christensen^b, Line Hagner Nielsen^a,
 Anja Boisen^a

^{42 &}lt;sup>1</sup> Corresponding author.

⁴³ Email address: phrc@dtu.dk (Philip Hassing Ronøe Carlsen)

44 Keywords:

- 45 Oral vaccination
- 46 Microcontainers
- 47 Adjuvants
- 48 CAF01
- 49 Th17
- 50 Lyophilization

51 1. Introduction

52 In the recent years, requirements for vaccines targeting mucosal pathogens such as influenza- and corona 53 viruses, have gained a high amount of interest, as these pathogens constitute a continual global threat [1]. 54 This is not only the case with respiratory diseases, but also other pathogens like those causing sexual 55 transmitted diseases (STDs) which likewise gain entry through the mucosa. One example is the gram-56 negative bacteria Chlamydia Trachomatis one of the most common sexually transmitted bacterial diseases 57 with 129 million infected people annually [2]. Untreated or repeated bacterial infection with C. 58 Trachomatis can lead to pelvic inflammatory disease ultimately causing tubal factor infertility and ectopic 59 pregnancy. Recently it has become clear that following treatment for a chlamydial genital infection, 60 woman cured of genital infection, often get re-infected due to autoinoculation from the lower 61 gastrointestinal (GI) tract, because chlamydia has the ability to reside in the GI tract for long periods of 62 time in the absence of clinical disease [3]–[5]. Therefore, a vaccine against infection with C. trachomatis 63 could potentially benefit from inducing genital and intestinal mucosal- in addition to systemic immunity.

64

65 Nearly all modern vaccine research is based on subunit vaccines, due to ease of modification and high safety. These advantages, however, result in reduced immunogenicity, creating the essential need for the 66 67 vaccines to be formulated with adjuvants. Today, a substantial amount of adjuvants exits, and their 68 individual function varies according to the type and intended purpose, but also on factors such as, mode 69 of administration and antigen formulation [4],[5]. A lead vaccine candidate against C. Trachomatis is the 70 protein based subunit antigen CTH522, which requires co-delivery with an effective adjuvant that supports 71 mucosal immunity [8]. The liposomal adjuvant CAF01 has showed promise in this regard, being able to 72 stimulate Th1 and Th17 cells, needed for effective mucosal protection [9],[10]. In a recent clinical phase 1 73 trial, the CTH522 vaccine was evaluated by intramuscular injection in combination with CAF01, followed 74 by intranasal administration with CTH522 alone. Here, the CAF01 adjuvanted CTH522 achieved a 75 promising immunogenicity profile, generating neutralizing systemic and genital IgG and IgA antibodies [8]. 76 Currently, the only subunit antigen in a licensed mucosal vaccine is the Cholera Toxin B (CTB), which has 77 frequently been investigated as an adjuvant. CTB have been known to induce mucosal immune stimulation 78 via various routes of administrations, such as intranasal, sublingual and oral [1],[8]. However, the 79 immunomodulating effect of CTB is questioned by the presence of residual cholera toxin or LPS in CTB 80 preparations, making it a challenge to separate adjuvanticity from toxicity [1]. Some recent studies have 81 deemed highly purified CTB as an inducer of immune tolerance, rather than a promoter of mucosal 82 immune responses when administered orally or intranasally [12]. Another mucosal adjuvant candidate is 83 Cyclic-di-GMP (c-di-GMP), a ligand of the STING pathway. Intranasal administered c-di-GMP has on several 84 occasions been shown to develop protection in the respiratory tract, primarily observed to induce high 85 Th1 and Th17 stimulation. Two studies using c-di-GMP as an adjuvant in an influenza vaccine, recorded 86 high stimulation of Th1 IFN-genes and enhanced Th17 cytokine production, as a feat of activating STING 87 [13], [14]. Madhun et al. also investigated c-di-GMP as an intramuscular adjuvant, which interestingly 88 showed no enhancement of the immune response, compared to administration with only the antigen. 89 Furthermore, the glycolipid α -Galactosylceramide (α -GalCer), an activator of invariant Natural Killer T 90 (iNKT) cells, have mostly been used in cancer immunotherapy [15]. However, α -GalCer has been 91 reevaluated as a promising adjuvant of the mucosal immune system, especially following oral 92 administration. In recent studies, whole-cell killed Helicobacter Pylori and enterotoxigenic Escherichia coli 93 vaccines adjuvanted with α -GalCer, demonstrated induction of intestinal IgA and Th1 cell immunity, along 94 with serum IgG responses following oral administration [13], [14]. 95

96 Oral delivery of vaccines holds potential in lowering the cost of administration and logistics of vaccine 97 dosing significantly, especially in mass vaccination situations. In addition, oral administration could

98 encourage vaccination for the population due to the high patient compliance [18]. Oral immunization 99 draws its advantage in being able to induce effective secretory IgA antibody and T-cell responses in 100 mucosal tissues in the gastrointestinal (GI) tract, and other local mucosal sites [19]. Oral delivery of subunit 101 vaccines, such as the CTH522 vaccine candidate, is however very sensitive to chemical and enzymatic 102 degradation in the stomach and intestines [18]. Thus, subunit vaccines are in need of innovative oral 103 delivery systems in addition to potent adjuvants. This system should be capable of protecting the vaccine 104 from degradation and facilitate uptake by effective delivery to the intestinal epithelium. The mucosal 105 tissue in the intestines, contains an abundance of immune cells to be utilized, making it a noteworthy 106 target [20]. The concept has been widely studied, and many attempts have been made to facilitate 107 effective oral delivery of vaccines. This includes technologies such as nano- and micro-particular systems 108 such as PEG and PLGA particles, along with permeation enhancers for vaccine formulations such as ionic 109 liquids [21], [22], [23]. Previously, we have tested microcontainers (MCs) as a delivery system of a spray 110 dried vaccine formulation consisting of cubosomes, the adjuvant Quil-A and the model antigen ovalbumin 111 (OVA) [24]. It was observed that the MCs are indeed capable of protecting their content through the GI 112 tract, until intended release in the small intestine of mice by the pH dependent polymeric coating Eudragit 113 L100-55 (EL100-55). Furthermore, it was shown that the humoral response could be slightly improved 114 with oral boosters after a parental prime. However, the MCs ability to deliver an antigen candidate, 115 targeting a mucosal infecting pathogen along with promising mucosal adjuvants, remains to be tested.

116

117 In this study, we investigated the mucosal immune inducing adjuvants, CTB, c-di-GMP and α -GalCer for the purpose of oral vaccination with the C. Trachomatis antigen CTH522, to boost and redirect a 118 subcutaneous (s.c.) prime injection with CTH522 + CAF01 into the intestines. Moreover, a lyophilization 119 120 procedure was developed and optimized for the vaccine formulations to enhance thermal stability. In previous studies, MCs have been coated with poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) or chitosan for drug 121 122 delivery purposes. We here tested their capability to both function as mucosal agents and coatings on 123 MCs, along with the polymer EL100-55, in an *in vivo* comparison study. Findings of the most promising 124 adjuvant along with the most optimal MC coating are combined, and their ability to induce a mucosal 125 immune response against CTH522 via oral administration in mice is evaluated (Fig. 1). The capabilities of 126 the vaccine formulations and micro technology to induce immune responses, were evaluated by analysis 127 of cytokines elicited from T-cells along with IgG and IgA antibodies produced by B-cells.



 $\frac{128}{129}$

130 Fig. 1. Overview of the work flow conducted in this paper. To identify the most effective mucosal adjuvant, an in vivo 131 screening of the adjuvants α -GalCer, c-di-GMP and Cholera Toxin B, formulated with CTH522 was set up (a). 132 Formulations were administered orally with gavage either following an s.c. prime with CAF01 + CTH522 or as oral 133 administration only. To enhance thermal stability of the vaccine formulation, a lyophilization procedure of CTH522 134 was implemented (b). Lyophilized powder was loaded into microcontainers (MCs) and subsequently coated with the 135 polymers Eudragit L100-55 (EL100-55), poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) or chitosan and filled into gelatin capsules 136 for oral immunization to mice, following an s.c. prime with CAF01 + CTH522 (b). Based on the results from these 137 experiments, an experiment with lyophilized CTH522 adjuvanted with α -GalCer, loaded into MCs and coated with 138 EL100-55 was conducted (c). MCs were administered orally either following an s.c. prime with CAF01 + CTH522 or as 139 oral administration only. Created with Biorender.com

140 2. Materials and methods

141 2.1 Materials

142 C-di-GMP was purchased from Invivogen (San Diego, CA, USA), CTB was obtained from Sigma Aldrich (St. 143 Louis, MO, USA) and α -Galactosylceramide was purchased from Avanti lipids (KRN7000, Bermingham, AL, 144 USA). CTH522 and CAF01 were produced in-house as described in[8]. PLGA (low MW 7–17 kDa, 50:50 145 PLA:PGA), trehalose, L-histidine and soybean trypsin inhibitor were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA). Eudragit L100-55 was purchased from Evonik (Darmstadt, Germany). Size M gelatin 146 147 capsules were bought from Torpac (SG Heerlen, The Netherlands). PBS and non-essential amino acids were obtained from Life Technologies (Roskilde Denmark). HEPES buffer, RPMI 1640, L-Glutamine and 148 149 sodium pyruvate was purchased from Invitrogen (Weltham, MA, USA). Fetal calf serum was from Biowest 150 (Nuaillé, France), TMB ready-to-use-substrate was bought from Kem-En-Tec (Taastrup, Denmark), Tween20 was from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany), H_2SO_4 and $BaSO_4$ (precipitated, 99%) was bought from 151 152 VWR International (Radnor, PA, USA). NUNC 96 well Maxisorp plates was obtained from Thermo Scientific (Roskilde, Denmark) and Falcon 100µm nylon cell strainers were bought from Corning (Vordingborg, 153 154 Denmark). HRP rabbit anti-mouse IgG was purchased from AH Diagnostics (Tilst, Denmark), Biotin goat 155 anti-mouse IgA was obtained from Sourthern Biotech (Bermingham, AL, USA) and Streptavidin - HRP 156 conjugate was bought from BD Pharmingen (Lyngby, Denmark). Biotin rat anti-mouse IFN-y and purified 157 rat anti-mouse IFN-y was purchased from BD Pharmingen (Lyngby, Denmark). Biotin anti-mouse IL-17A 158 and purified rat anti-mouse IL-17A was obtained from BioLegend (San Diego, CA, USA). Concavalin A was 159 purchased from GE Healthcare (Marlborough, MA, USA). CB6F1 mice were bought from Envigo 160 (Indianapolis, IN, USA) 161

162 **2.2 Mice**

Male CB6F1 mice were purchased weighing at least 25 g (approx. 12 weeks old) following the minimum oral dosing recommendations from Torpac. Mice were acclimatized 1 week prior to starting experiments. Mice had free access to food and water at all times. All experiments were approved by the Animal Experiments Inspectorate of Denmark, under the license 2020-15-0201-00610 and were conducted in compliance with the Danish laws regulating experiments on animals and the EC Directive 2010/63/EU.

168

169 **2.3 CTH522 formulation with CAF01, C-di-GMP, CTB and α-GalCer**

170 CTH522 (1.4 mg/mL) were thoroughly vortexed with 1 mg/mL CAF01 every 10 min for 30 min prior to 171 immunization. CTB was rehydrated to a concentration of 5 mg/mL and mixed with CTH522 by pipetting. 172 C-di-GMP was similarly rehydrated to a concentration of 5 mg/mL and mixed with CTH522 by pipetting. 173 α -GalCer was mixed, as suggested by Avanti, in 5.7% trehalose, 0.75% L-histidine, and 0.5% Tween 20, 174 making a 5 mg/mL solution. After mixing, the solution was heated at 80 °C and sonicated every 10 min for 175 1 min, until the material was completely dissolved. Dissolved α -GalCer was then mixed with CTH522 and 176 thoroughly vortexed.

177 **2.4 Lyophilization of vaccine formulation**

- 178 CTH522 alone or adjuvanted with α -GalCer were lyophilized in a Christ Delta 2-24 LSCplus freeze-dryer
- 179 (Christ, Osterode am Harz, Germany) with the program depicted in Table 1. Antigen and adjuvants were
- 180 lyophilized in a 10% trehalose + 10 mM Tris-base formulation.
- 181
- **Table 1.** The parameters for the program used to lyophilize the CTH522 + α -GalCer vaccine formulation.
- 182

Phase	Freeze	Primary Drying	Primary Drying	Primary Drying	Secondary Drying	Secondary Drying
Time	3:00 h	0:15 h	0:15 h	36:00 h	5:00 h	10:00 h
Temp.	-42 °C	-42 °C	-30 °C	-30 °C	20 °C	20 °C
Vacuum	-	0.120 mbar	0.120 mbar	0.120 mbar	0.120 mbar	0.120 mbar

183

184 **2.5 SDS-gel of hydrated vaccine formulation**

Gel electrophoresis was performed in a Mini-PROTEAN Tetra system (Bio Rad, Hercules, CA, USA) with a 185 186 Mini-PROTEAN TGX Precast 12 well gel (Bio Rad, Hercules, CA, USA). For the denatured proteins, 2 µg of 187 rehydrated lyophilized CTH522, and 2 µg non-lyophilized CTH522 were formulated with sample buffer 188 Tris/Glycerol, Bromphenol Blue) + SDS and DTT in a 1:1 ratio and loaded on the gel. For the native proteins 2 μ g of rehydrated lyophilized CTH522, and 2 μ g non-lyophilized CTH522 were formulated with sample 189 190 buffer ÷ SDS and DTT in a 1:1 ratio and loaded on the gel. The gel was run at 300 V for 16 min using Power 191 Pac 300 (Bio Rad, Hercules, CA, USA). The gel was removed and washed with deionized water and then 192 emerged in Bio-Safe Coomassie G250 Stain (Bio Rad, Hercules, CA, USA) for 60 min, followed by wash with 193 dionized water for 2x30 min.

194

2.6 Fabrication, drug loading, polymeric coating and capsule filling of microcontainers

196 MCs were fabricated with the negative epoxy photoresist SU-8 by a two-step photolithography process as 197 described previously [25]. The MCs were produced on top of a titanium |gold (Ti|Au) coated silicon wafer 198 to allow easy removal from the wafer. The wafer was then cut into 12.8 by 12.8 mm² chips containing 25 199 by 25 arrays of MCs using a dicing saw (DISCO, München, Germany). MCs on chips were loaded with 200 vaccine formulation powder of CTH522 + α -GalCer using an embossing method as described previously 201 [26]. A shadow mask was used to cover the gaps between the MCs, thus, filling the MCs without filling the 202 space between them with powder. The average powder load in the MCs was estimated by weighing 10 203 chips before and after loading and calculating the average of 1 microcontainer. After loading, the MCs were 204 sealed with either EL100–55, PLGA or chitosan through a spray coating process, using an ExactaCoat spray 205 coater (Sono Tek, Milton, Canada) equipped with an ultrasonic nozzle actuated at 120 kHz (Accumist, Sono 206 Tek, Milton, Canada). Acetic acid containing 0.5%(w/w) chitosan (low molecular weight, 75-85% 207 deacetylated) was sprayed with the spray coating parameters for chitosan depicted in Table 2. 208 Dichloromethane (DCM) containing 0.5% (w/w) PLGA (7-17 kDa, 50:50 PLA:PGA) was sprayed with the spray 209 coating parameters for PLGA depicted in Table 2. Isopropanol containing 1% (w/v) EL100-55 and 5% (w/w 210 in relation to EL100–55) dibutyl sebacate was sprayed with the spray coating parameters for EL100-55

211 depicted in Table 2.

Table 2. Spray coating parameters used for the coating of the polymers chitosan, PLGA and EL100-55 on microcontainers (MCs).

214

	Feed flow	Generator power	Air pressure	Temperature	Nozzel distance to MCs	Speed	Passages
Chitosan	0.1 mL/min	1.3 W	0.030 kPa	50 °C	7.5 cm	25 mm/s	110
PLGA	0.1 mL/min	2.2 W	0.030 kPa	Room temp.	5 cm	10 mm/s	55
EL100-55	0.1 mL/min	2.2 W	0.028 kPa	35 ℃	5 cm	10 mm/s	25

215

After the coating procedure, MCs were directly removed from the chips using a scalpel. MCs were filled into size M gelatin capsules using a size M funnel (Torpac, SG Heerlen, The Netherlands). The amount of MCs in the capsules were determined by weighing the capsules before and after filling. Based on the filling

of 10 capsules, a size M capsule could contain 82 ± 3.7 MCs.

220

221 **2.7** Microcontainer coating characterization and release study

Microcontainer chips were placed in acid baths subsequent to loading with lyophilized CTH522 formulation and coated with chitosan, PLGA or EL100-55. Chips was submerged in 36.6 °C 2 mM pH 4.7 maleic acid for 60 min and visualized with a table top scanning electron microscope (SEM) (Hitachi TM3030plus, Tokyo, Japan), using 15 kV acceleration voltage at 40× and 50× magnification. Chips were then submerged in 36.6 °C 10 mM pH 6.6 maleic acid for 30 min and 60 min, and visualized after each time point with SEM using the same settings as described above.

228

229 **2.8** *In vivo* studies

230 Four *in vivo* studies were conducted in this paper (Table 3, supporting information). Mice were immunized

according to Table 3, and dosed either s.c. or orally with gavage or MCs. MCs were administered in size M

232 gelatin capsules. Mice were euthanized and harvested on day 56.

Table 3. Scheme of the setup for the four *in vivo* studies conducted in this paper, depicting formulation, dosage amount and administration form on the immunization days of the individual groups in each of the studies. Coating of microcontainers (MCs) is included for the groups, which were administered orally with them. Prime immunization is set at day 0, first booster immunization was set at day 21 and second booster immunization was set at day 42. Naive groups were not dosed with anything.

238

<i>In vivo</i> study nr.	Group nr.	Prime (day 0)	1. Booster (day 21)	2. Booster (day 42)	MC coating
1	1	Naive	-	-	-
	2	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	-	-	-
	3.	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg c- di-GMP (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg c-di-GMP (oral gavage)	-
	4	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α- GalCer (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α-GalCer (oral gavage)	-
	5	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg CTB (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg CTB (oral gavage)	-
	6	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg c- di-GMP (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg c- di-GMP (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg c-di-GMP (oral gavage)	-
	7	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α- GalCer (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α- GalCer (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α-GalCer (oral gavage)	-
	8	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg CTB (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg CTB (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg CTB (oral gavage)	-
2	1	Naive	-	-	-
	2	Lyophilized 5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg α-GalCer (s.c.)	Lyophilized 5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg α-GalCer (s.c.)	-	-
	3	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg α- GalCer (s.c.)	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg α- GalCer (s.c.)	-	-
3	1	Naive	-	-	-
	2	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	-	-	-
	3	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	10 μg CTH522 (oral MCs)	10 μg CTH522 (oral MCs)	EL100-55
	4	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	10 μg CTH522 (oral MCs)	10 μg CTH522 (oral MCs)	PLGA
	5	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	10 µg CTH522 (oral MCs)	10 μg CTH522 (oral MCs)	Chitosan
4	1	Naive	-	-	-
	2	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	-	-	-
	3	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	10 μ g CTH522 + 10 μ g α -GalCer (oral gavage)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α-GalCer (oral gavage)	-
	4	5 μg CTH522 + 5 μg CAF01 (s.c.)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α- GalCer (oral MCs)	10 μ g CTH522 + 10 μ g α -GalCer (oral MCs)	EL100-55
	5	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α- GalCer (oral MCs)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α- GalCer (oral MCs)	10 μg CTH522 + 10 μg α-GalCer (oral MCs)	EL100-55

240 **2.9 Sample and organ preparation for ELISA analysis**

241 Whole blood was separated by centrifugation at 10.000 G for 10 min. Serum was removed and stored in 96 well plates. Fecal pellets were collected in cold feces buffer (PBS + 0.1 mg/mL Soybean trypsin inhibitor 242 243 + 1% w/v BSA + 25 mM EDTA + 50% v/v glycerol + 1mM PMSF). Pellets were then broken to form a 244 suspension and incubated for 4 h on ice. Solids were separated from liquid by centrifugation for 10 min at 245 15.500 G at 4 °C. Supernatants were transferred to microfuge tubes, and blocked over night with PBS + 1% (w/v) BSA. Isolated spleens and PPs were filtered through a cell strainer, suspended in RPMI media 246 247 without FBS and centrifuged for 5 min at 1800 rpm. Then resuspended in 1mL using complete RPMI (cRPMI) (supplemented with HEPES, penicillin-streptomycin, sodium pyruvate, l-glutamine and non-248 249 essential amino acids) with 10% FBS (v/v) and counted on a NucleoCounter NC-200 (Chemometec, Allerød, 250 Denmark). Cell cultures were seeded (2×10^5 /well) and stimulated with the CTH522 (1.4 µg/mL); media 251 cRPMI (as negative control) and concavalin A (1 μ g/mL) (as positive control). The supernatants were 252 harvested after 72 h incubation and stored at -20 °C.

254 **2.10 ELISA**

253

255 For the IgG antibody ELISA, 96 well plates were coated with CTH522 and then blocked with 2% w/v BSA in 256 PBS. Sera were diluted 1:100 and 3-fold diluted across well plates. Samples were then incubated for 2 h 257 with HRP-conjugated IgG anti-mouse monoclonal antibody. For IgA antibody ELISA, wells were coated with 258 CTH522 and then blocked with 2% skim milk in PBS. Fecal supernatants or sera were loaded on well plates 259 and titrated in a 2-fold dilution across the plates and detection was done using biotin conjugated anti-260 mouse IgA (Southern Biotech) for 1 h followed by streptavidin-HRP (BD Biosciences) for 30 min. IgG and IgA were color developed using TMB. Development was stopped with 0.2M H₂SO₄ after 10 min and 261 262 absorbance was measured at 450 nm (correction at 570/620 nm) using a Polarstar Omega Microplate 263 Reader (BMG Labtech). The absorbance values were plotted as a function of the reciprocal dilution of 264 serum samples. Antibody titers were determined as the highest serum dilution corresponding to a cut-off 265 of \geq 0.2 OD450 (supporting information). For the cytokine ELISA, 96 well plates were coated with purified 266 anti-mouse IFN-y or IL-17A in PBS at 4°C overnight. Free binding sites were blocked with 1% BSA. Spleen 267 and PP culture supernatants were tested in triplicates, and detection was done by biotin-labeled rat anti-268 mouse IFN-y or IL-17A. Samples were then incubated for 30 min with Streptavidin HRP. Color was 269 developed and measured as described above. Standards of IFN-y and IL-17A were used to determine the amount of cytokine in the samples. 270

271

272 2.11 CT-scanning and X-ray imaging of mice

To study the transit time of MCs in mice, MCs were loaded with the contrast agent BaSO₄ and coated with 273 274 PLGA as described in 2.8. MCs were given to mice orally in size M gelatin capsules. Mice were anesthetized 275 at time points 0.5 h, 1 h, 1.5 h and 2 h. Mice were frozen and then visualized with 3D visualizations made 276 by CT scanning (Nikon XT H 225, Nikon Metrology, Tokyo, Japan). X-rays were generated using a voltage 277 of 70 kV and a power of 30 W (current of 0.43 mA). The 3D visualizations were created from single planar 278 scans using 1572 projections with 2 frames per projection and an exposure time of 0.5 s. Within the final 279 scan time of approximately 27 min, the frozen mice did not seem to thaw. The voxel size, which 280 corresponds to the spatial resolution, was kept constant at 114.41 µm by having the same distance 281 between the x-ray probe and the sample for all scans even though the size of the frozen mice varied 282 slightly. The following reconstruction was made in the software provided with the CT scanner system (CT 283 Pro 3D, Nikon Metrology, Tokyo, Japan) using a Feldkamp, Davis and Kress filtered back-projection 284 algorithm [27]. As a final step, a 3D visualization and analysis software (Avizo, Thermo Fisher Scientific 285 Inc., Waltham, MA, USA) was used for the CT scan data to be processed and investigated. Subsequently, 286 the GI tract were isolated from the mice for further analysis with X-ray imaging. Planar X-ray imaging of MCs loaded with BaSO₄ in the removed GI tracts was carried out, using a CT scanner, to obtain quantitative 287

information about their location. The distance between the x-ray probe and the samples was adjusted to
 get a magnification of 4 and X-rays were generated using a voltage of 70 kV and a power of 30 W (current
 of 0.43 mA). Image acquisition with 8 frames and an exposure time of 1 s was used for the planar X-ray
 images and a background signal for shading correction. The shading corrections and subsequent manually
 counting of the MCs loaded with BaSO₄ throughout the entire GI tracts were made using an image
 processing software (ImageJ, U. S. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA).

294

295 **2.12 Statistics**

GraphPad Prism 9 software (San Diego, CA, USA) was used for data handling, analysis, and graphic
 representation. Statistical analysis was performed using the Kruskal–Wallis test followed by a post-hoc
 Dunn's multiple comparison test, where p-values below 5% were considered significant. Data is

- 299 presented as mean ± standard error of the mean (SEM).
- 300301 3 Results and discussion

302 **3.1 Screening of mucosal adjuvants for formulation with CTH522 and oral administration**

303 Adjuvants are necessary to induce a proper and efficient immune response against infectious pathogens, 304 especially in regard to subunit type antigens. However, studies have shown that the function of an 305 adjuvant can vary depending on how it is administrated and which kind of antigen is included [7], [28]. In 306 this study, the adjuvants were thus tested according to how well they performed being administered orally 307 in formulation with CTH522. CTH522 was formulated with c-di-GMP, α-GalCer or CTB and dosed orally to 308 mice, either receiving oral prime and boosters, or as boosters following a subcutaneous (s.c.) prime with 309 CTH522 adjuvanted with CAF01 (Fig. 2). In order to evaluate the ability of the oral administered adjuvant 310 formulations to enhance immune responses, a naive group and a group receiving only s.c. prime of CTH522 311 and CAF01 were included as controls. The IgG specific antibodies in the serum, along with the cytokines 312 elicited in the spleen, were measured as representatives of the systemic response (Fig. 2a, 2b, 2e). A trend 313 towards higher levels of IFN-y and IL-17A, indicators of Th1 and Th17 induction, was seen in all groups 314 receiving oral gavage boosters compared to the s.c. priming group (Fig. 2a, 2b). Notably, α - GalCer did 315 achieve higher levels of cytokine secretion compared to the other adjuvants, although not significantly. 316 Low to inconsistent levels of IFN-y and IL-17A comparable to the naive mice, were measured in the groups 317 receiving oral prime and boosters. The CTH522 IgG specific titers, showed no significant difference 318 between the s.c. group and the oral boosted groups (Fig. 2e), suggesting the measured IgG response is 319 developed on account of the s.c. prime injection. Further evidence of this was seen in titers elicited by the 320 oral dosed groups, which, like the cytokine analysis of these groups, were comparable to the naive mice. 321 Cytokine levels in Peyer's Patches (PPs) along with CTH522 specific IgA antibody titers in feces were 322 analyzed in order to represent the local mucosal immune response elicited in the intestine (Fig. 2c, 2d, 323 2f). Here, the same pattern in cytokine levels was observed as in the systemic response analysis. Mice 324 receiving s.c. prime and oral boosters showed increased secretion of IFN-y and IL-17A in PPs compared to 325 the s.c. group, however not significantly (Fig. 2c, 2d). α-GalCer excelled slightly in stimulation of Th17 cells 326 in the PPs compared to the other adjuvants. A change was however seen in the oral primed and boosted 327 groups, where α -GalCer did achieve significantly higher levels of IFN-y compared to the naive group (p < 328 0.0286, Fig 2c). Measured CTH522 specific IgA titers in fecal pellets showed no difference between the s.c. 329 primed groups, suggesting that the response is an effect of the CAF01 injection (Fig. 2f). However, all groups 330 receiving oral prime and boosters generated significantly higher IgA titers compared to the naive mice (p 331 = 0.0346, Fig. 2f), indicating the adjuvants are capable of eliciting local IgA response when administered 332 orally and in formulation with CTH522. The results observed in this study, points towards α -GalCer, as the 333 most prominent adjuvant for formulation and oral administration with CTH522. A reason for this could 334 be that being a glycolipid, α -GalCer is more stable and less prone to

immediate degradation by the low pH in the stomach. α -GalCer have also before shown to boost immunogenicity of HIV antigens peptide by simple oral immunization[29].



Fig. 2. Levels of secreted IFN-γ and IL-17A measured in spleen (a, b) and Peyer's Patches (c, d). CTH522 specific serum
 IgG and fecal IgA antibody titers (e, f). Mice, except the naive and CAF01(s.c.) group, were immunized 3 times in a
 prime-booster-booster regime, with either a sub cutaneous (s.c.) prime injection followed by oral boosters with
 gavage or oral prime followed by oral boosters with gavage. Immunizations were given at day 0, 21 and 42. Data are
 shown from individual mice and bars represent mean ± SEM (n = 4). * p < 0.05.

345

337 338 339

346 **3.2 Lyophilization procedure for the CTH522 + \alpha-GalCer formulation.**

347 Since vaccine formulations are often thermally labile, lyophilization is frequently used to stabilize vaccine 348 for distribution and storage [30]. This is especially of advantage in places where cold chain management 349 is difficult. During the lyophilization process, solvent is removed, and replaced by a stabilizing substance 350 which also functions as a lyoprotectant[30]. The method is complex and requires optimization of both process parameters and buffers, to achieve optimal drying of the formulation and no loss of 351 352 immunogenicity in the case of vaccines[31]. The lyophilization program described in 2.4 was used with 353 various excipients at different ratios, and evaluated by the consistency and visual appearance in reference 354 to [32] (Table 4). 10%(w/v) Trehalose + 10 mM Tris were deemed the most prominent excipient and 355 additive, achieving the best dried state post-lyophilization.

356 **Table 4.** Buffer formulations for optimization of lyophilization procedure. Post-lyophilization visual attributes were referenced to

357 [32] and the consistency score were based on the ease of loading the powder into microcontainers-

358

Antigen	Adjuvant	Stabilizer	Buffer	Visual attribute of sample	Consistency score
CTH522	α-GalCer	5% Trehalose	10 mM Tris	Uniform	+
(10 µg)	(10 μg)		10 mM Tris + 2% Glycerol	Meltback	-
			PBS	Cracked	+
		10% Trehalose	10 mM Tris	Uniform	+++
			10 mM Tris + 2%Glycerol	Meltback	-
			PBS	Uniform	+
		15% Trehalose	10 mM Tris	Uniform	++
			10 mM Tris + 2%Glycerol	Meltback	-
			PBS	Uniform	++
		10% Sucrose	10 mM Tris	Uniform	++
			PBS	Cracked	+
		10% Lysine	10 mM Tris	Collapse	-
			PBS	Collapse	-
		10% Mannitol	10 mM Tris	Cracked	+
			10 mM Tris + 2% Glycerol	Meltback	-

360

361 Lyophilized CTH522 was then rehydrated and analyzed by SDS-PAGE to determine that no degradation 362 was happening as a result of the lyophilization or rehydration process (Fig. 3a). To investigate if the 363 lyophilization caused any loss of immunogenicity to the antigen, the formulation was evaluated in an in 364 vivo study. Lyophilized CTH522 + α -GalCer was rehydrated and given s.c. to mice in a prime-booster regime 365 (Fig. 3b, 3c, 3d). As controls, a naive group was included along with a group receiving the same formulation 366 but non-lyophilized. From the study, it was evident that no loss of immunogenicity was seen, as no 367 difference was observed between the lyophilized group and non-lyophilized group on any of the measured 368 antibody or cytokine responses. The developed lyophilization process and optimized buffer formulation 369 are thus capable to effectively lyophilize CTH522 while in formulation with α -GalCer, without causing 370 damage to the antigen and successfully retain the immunogenicity. Antigens and adjuvants are usually 371 not lyophilized while in formulation, as it can have implications on the process [33]. The developed 372 protocol could potentially be used for other such formulations in future studies. It should be noted that 373 optimization of the procedure would be necessary in any case, and the presented protocol would likely 374 be most effective for antigens of related conformation. For example, could it be assumed that DNA, RNA 375 and more complex antigens will not be compatible with the developed lyophilization protocol in this study.



376

Fig. 3. SDS-gel of rehydrated lyophilized CTH522 + SDS (row 1), non-lyophilized CTH522 + SDS (row 2), rehydrated
 lyophilized CTH522 ÷ SDS (row 3) and non-lyophilized CTH522 ÷ SDS (row 4) (a). CTH522 specific serum IgG antibody
 titers (b). Levels of secreted IFN-γ and IL-17A measured in spleen (c, d). Mice, except the naive group, were
 immunized subcutaneously 2 times in a prime-booster regime at day 0 and 21. Data are shown from individual mice
 and bars represent mean ± SEM (n = 6).

382

383 **3.3 Fabrication, loading and coating of microcontainers**

384 MCs were fabricated with an outer diameter of $313.4 \pm 1.7 \mu$ m and height of $289.4 \pm 5.3 \mu$ m, and with an 385 inner diameter of $262.5 \pm 0.9 \mu$ m and height of $235.8 \pm 4.4 \mu$ m. MCs were loaded with 3.1 ± 0.6 386 µg/microcontainer of powder and then sealed with either chitosan, PLGA or EL100–55 lids. The average 387 thickness of the lid coating was measured by contact profilometry to be $27.3 \pm 2.1 \mu$ m for chitosan, 28.7 388 $\pm 4.5 \mu$ m for PLGA and 25.7 $\pm 1.5 \mu$ m for EL100–55.

389

PLGA and chitosan have both been documented to have adjuvant properties and are widely used for
 mucosal delivery of antigens and active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs), often as particle carriers [13],

392 [34], [35]. Here, it was investigated if coatings with PLGA or Chitosan on MCs could benefit the delivery of 393 the CTH522 antigen. Additionally, the pH-dependent EL100-55 coating was also included. This polymer has the ability to stay solid at pH 4.7, corresponding to the pH in the stomach of mice, and dissolve at pH 394 395 6.6 corresponding to the pH in the small intestine of mice [36], [37]. These properties can be used to 396 protect the content in the stomach and effectively target the small intestine for the release [24]. This was 397 compared to naive mice and a group only receiving a s.c. prime to distinguish the oral response as in 3.1 398 (Fig. 4). Additionally, the local immune response in the intestine was also investigated for all three 399 coatings, which have not been done before. Systemically no difference in response was seen (Fig. 4a, 4b, 400 4e), however, CTH522 specific IgA antibody levels measured in feces from MCs coated with EL100-55 were 401 significantly increased (p = 0.0488, Fig. 4f). This suggests that the EL100-55 coating can be used for 402 effective delivery of CTH522 with MCs, and that no improvement is gained from coatings with PLGA and 403 chitosan.





407 Fig. 4. Levels of secreted IFN-γ and IL-17A measured in spleen (a, b) and Peyer's Patches (c, d). CTH522 specific serum
 408 IgG and fecal IgA antibody titers (e, f). Mice, except the naive and CAF01(s.c.) group, were immunized 3 times in a
 409 prime-booster regime, with either a sub cutaneous (s.c.) prime injection followed by oral boosters with

- gavage or oral prime followed by oral boosters with gavage. Immunizations were given at day 0, 21 and 42. Data are
 shown from individual mice and bars represent mean ± SEM (n = 6). * p < 0.05.
- 412

413 The reason for this was further investigated, by visually tracking the release of the vaccine formulation 414 from the MCs. Chips with MCs were coated with EL100-55 (Fig. 5a), PLGA (supporting information) or 415 chitosan (supporting information) subsequent to vaccine loading, and emerged in maleic acid of pH 4.7 416 and 6.6 at 36.6 °C simulating stomach and intestinal conditions of mice, in the same manner as previously 417 presented [24]. After 60 min in pH 4.7, lids of EL100-55 (Fig. 5b) and PLGA were still intact, however the 418 majority of the chitosan lids had disappeared along with the content of the containers. A property of 419 chitosan is a swelling behavioral trait, which can be utilized to achieve a slow sustained release if correctly 420 engineered [38], [39]. The coating formulation used in this experiment does however, not seem to be 421 compatible with the MCs and has probably detached itself upon swelling. This is most likely the reason 422 why no effect was seen in the immunological analysis, due to an early release of the vaccine formulation 423 in the stomach, rendering it ineffective. After 60 min, the MC chips were moved to pH 6.6 for 2x30 min. It 424 is evident that the EL100-55 gradually disappears along with the content of the MCs (Fig. 5c, 5d). PLGA 425 does still appear to be intact at these conditions, indicating that no release of vaccine occurs, making it 426 the probable cause to why no effect was observed in the immunological analysis. PLGA has numerous 427 times been employed as a particular delivery vehicle, and does seem to have adjuvant effects when used 428 in this format, due to the particle morphology [34], [40]. As a coating however, this trait is obviously not 429 exploited, and the PLGA formulation used in this study does not seem very well suited for the purpose of 430 proximal intestinal release. However, it has been reported that PLGA can be tailored for colon-directed 431 release, by modifying the lactic and glycolic ratios in combination with pH degradable polymers [41]. A 432 PLGA formulation optimized for the purposes of this study could then most likely be manufactured. From 433 another perspective, a colon targeting PLGA formulation, could be useful for vaccine-related purposes to 434 stimulate local responses against colonic infecting pathogens. In this study, the immunological analysis 435 and subsequent troubleshooting of the release of CTH522 formulation from MCs, revealed EL100-55 as 436 the most proficient coating, for the purpose of oral vaccine delivery with MCs. A significant higher IgA 437 response was observed in fecal samples from this group, most likely due to intended release of CTH522 in 438 the intestine.



439

Fig. 5. SEM images showing dry microcontainers (MCs) on a chip loaded with CTH522 + α -GalCer coated with EL100-55 (a). MCs were soaked in 36.6°C 2mM maleic acid at pH 4.7 simulating the environment of the mouse stomach and imaged after 60 min (b). MCs were then transferred to 36.6°C 10mM maleic acid at pH 6.6 simulating the environment of the mouse intestine and imaged after 30 min (c) and 60 min (d).

3.4 Immunological analysis of oral delivery of CTH552 + α-GalCer with microcontainers coated with
 EL100-55.

447 Based on the results obtained from the screening of adjuvants and MC coatings, CTH522 was formulated 448 with α -GalCer and dosed in MCs with EL100-55 lids, both as oral prime and boosters and as oral boosters 449 following an s.c. prime with CTH522 + CAF01 (Fig. 6). Increased systemic IL-17 levels were observed in the 450 groups receiving oral boosters with either MCs or gavage, compared to the group only receiving a s.c. 451 prime indicating that the response is stimulated by the oral boosters, although not significantly enhanced 452 (Fig. 6b). Furthermore, the IL-17 cytokine levels were slightly higher in the group boosted with MCs 453 compared to the gavage group. The local immune response in PPs and IgA levels in feces, also showed a 454 trend towards enhanced levels in the MC group compared to the s.c. and oral gavage groups, but not 455 significantly higher (Fig. 6c, 6d, 6f). Davitt et al. demonstrated a significantly enhanced systemic and local 456 response of cholera specific IgA antibodies, along with increased INFy levels in the PPs, from dosing 457 Dukoral adjuvanted with α -GalCer orally [42]. These findings are in line with the trends observed in the local mucosal responses in the present study, however the stimulated responses were not statistically 458 459 enhanced. A likely cause for the different findings is that Dukoral contains a killed whole-cell antigen, thus 460 benefitting from intrinsic adjuvant traits as opposed to CTH522 [43], [44]. An interesting observation from 461 this study is the stimulation of Th17-cells in PPs, which is not seen in the study by Davitt et al. CAF01 is 462 known to induce systemic Th17 responses, that can be pulled into mucosal tissues after local mucosal

463 vaccination. The Th17 responses observed in this study could thus be an example of this prime-pull effect, 464 where the Th17 cells, generated by the s.c. prime injection, are migrating to the intestinal tissue upon oral 465 boosting [10], [45], [46]. Elevated levels of Th1 and Th17 responses in PPs as well as IgA antibody titers 466 were also observed in the oral MC prime-boost group compared to the naive mice, indicating that the 467 CTH522 + α -GalCer formulation is indeed capable of inducing mucosal immune responses when delivered 468 orally in MCs (p = 0.0436, 0.0273, p = 0.0281, Fig. 6c, 6d, 6f). Albeit the oral MC prime-boost group did not 469 reach the same level of immune induction as the prime-pull groups.



Fig. 6. Levels of secreted IFN-γ and IL-17A measured in spleen (a, b) and Peyer's Patches (c, d). CTH522 specific serum
IgG and fecal IgA antibody titers (e, f). Mice, except the naive and CAF01 (s.c.) group, were immunized 3 times in a
prime-booster-booster regime, with either a subcutaneous (s.c.) prime injection followed by oral boosters with
gavage or microcontainers (MCs). One group received oral prime followed by oral boosters with MCs. Immunizations
were given at day 0, 21 and 42. Data are shown from individual mice and bars represent mean ± SEM (n = 9). * p <
0.05.

478 **3.5 CT-scan and X-ray imaging of microcontainer transit kinetics in mice**

Even though we observed measurable immune responses upon delivery of adjuvanted CTH522 in MCs, levels were lower than expected. It was therefore speculated that the MCs transit is either too fast or that they deliver the vaccine to the wrong intestinal compartment for stimulation of the immune cells to occur. A recent study by *Esterházy et. al.* thus demonstrated that draining lymph nodes in the distal intestine, promoted effector T-helper cells, whereas proximal lymph nodes promoted T_{reg} responses [47]. These findings indicate that release of vaccine in the proximal intestine may not be optimal, whereas the distal intestinal compartment could be highly relevant to target [1], [47].

486

487 X-ray and CT-scanning have before been used to thoroughly investigate transition in rats but never in mice 488 [25]. Combined analysis of these methods showed that the transit time from the stomach to the cecum 489 of MCs in mice was about 1-1.5 h (Fig. 7). This corresponds to the standard transit time of the GI tract in 490 mice, and could be the reason why a higher immune response was not achieved [48]. It is therefore possible 491 that the immunological performance could be enhanced, by tailoring the polymeric lid to release in the 492 distal part of the intestine. The MCs are made of the mucoadhesive material SU-8 and have previously 493 been proved to increase retention of MCs in the intestine of rats [25], [49]. This effect was thus expected 494 to be utilized in mice as well for the purpose of oral vaccine delivery. However, the data from rats taken 495 together with the observed results in this study, indicate that the proportional size of the MCs to mice is 496 too large, and the MCs are effected by peristaltic movements and moved regardless of being 497 mucoadhesive. A solution could be to change the animal model to one proportionally larger and with a 498 longer transit time, such as rabbits or pigs. This would additionally improve the scalability, and give vital 499 information on the MCs kinetics in an environment genetically and metabolically closer to that of 500 humans[50]. Ideally, a process should be put in place, designed to first get indication of promising 501 formulation candidates in smaller animal models, which then should continue to testing with the 502 microdevices in larger animals. Methods to employ to get indications of the formulations potential, could 503 be intra-intestinal infusion, in combination with an intestinal closed-loop model, where the infused 504 material is prohibited from transit through the intestine [51], [52]. This would in theory evaluate the MCs 505 ability to deliver the vaccine to immune cells of the distal part of the intestine, should it be retained long 506 enough in addition to vaccine formulations immunological capabilities when properly delivered. To 507 further optimize the MC technology for oral delivery of vaccines, the retention time in the intestine should 508 most likely be prolonged. Furthermore, the targeting of immunogenic sites, such as the M-cells in PPs, 509 could greatly benefit the technology to enhance interaction with the immune-cells and the achieved 510 response.



<u>512</u>

Fig. 7. CT-scan of mouse 2 h post-administration with BaSO₄ loaded microcontainers (MCs). X-ray of isolated GI tract of mouse 1.5 h post-administration with BaSO₄ loaded MCs with indication of stomach (blue), proximal small intestine (red), distal small intestine (green), cecum (purple) and colon (orange) (b). Graph showing amount of BaSO4-loaded MCs found in each section of the isolated GI tracts for each time point of euthanasia (c). The counts were found combining CT-scan and planar X-ray imaging and are here plotted as single points, with lines linking each point (n = 3).

519 4. Conclusion

520 In this work, we tested MCs ability to orally deliver the C. trachomatis vaccine candidate CTH522 in 521 combination with a mucosal adjuvant. α -GalCer was found to be the most prominent adjuvant to be 522 formulated with CTH522. A procedure to successfully lyophilize the vaccine formulation, without 523 degrading the antigen or losing immunogenicity, was developed. MCs coated with EL100-55 elicited a 524 significantly higher local CTH522 specific IgA response, compared to MCs coated with PLGA and chitosan, 525 deeming EL100-55 the best choice for MC lids. CTH522 + α -GalCer administered in MCs orally following 526 an s.c. prime, showed an increase in the mucosal immune response locally and to a degree systemically, 527 demonstrating a prime-pull effect. Solely oral dosing with MCs also managed to generate significantly 528 enhanced mucosal immune responses compared to naive mice. Some optimization is however needed, as 529 the measured immune responses are relatively low, and not significantly enhanced compared to just 530 receiving an s.c. prime. A possible reason for this could be the fast transit time in mice. CT-scan and X-ray 531 imaging showed that the transit time of MCs delivered orally is only 1-1.5h and that they are not retained 532 despite mucoadhesive traits. This is probably partly due to the proportional size ratio between the MCs 533 and the intestinal tract of mice. In a mouse, the diameter of the intestinal tract is approximate 2mm, and 534 the mucus layer is around 20-25 µm thick. Thus, the microcontainers will not be completely embedded in 535 the mucus layer and will then easily be moved along with consumed food and peristaltic movements. Our 536 results indicate that the mouse is not an optimal animal model, when dealing with oral delivery of devices 537 in the 100 µm range. In future studies with such devices, larger animals may be needed to study the effects 538 of MCs. Assuming the MC technology was implemented as a vaccination solution for humans, the results 539 in this paper suggest that people would need a prime injection, followed by oral MC boosters. The ideal 540 situation would be, that patients could administer capsule themselves making the procedure more 541 compliant and time effective. However, in order to account for the potential humane errors, such as 542 unproper storage of capsules, failing to administer them, etc. it would be more feasible for patients to 543 appear at vaccination centers for administration. In this case it would most likely still be more time 544 efficient than the mass vaccination under COVID-19, with minimal need for medical personal. There is of 545 course a lot of aspects in this, and several methods on how to ensure proper consumption and storage of 546 the capsules by the patients could be discussed.

548 Acknowledgements

549 This work was supported by the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF122) and Villum Fonden

(Grant No. 9301) for Intelligent Drug Delivery and Sensing Using Microcontainers and Nanomechanics(IDUN).

552 The authors would like to thank Nicoline Andersen, Kamal Hadraoui, Maja Egelund and Rasmus Stage for 553 inputs to the lyophilization process. Lasse Højlund Thamdrup for producing the microcontainers and 554 measuring the microcontainer dimensions. Julia Sid Hansen and Rune Fledelius Jensen for help with 555 sample and organ preparation and ELISA measurements.

556

- 557 Conflicts of interest
- 558 The authors have no conflict of interest to declare

References 559 560 [1] R. W. Ward and E. C. Lavelle, "Mucosal vaccines - fortifying the frontiers," Nat. Rev. Immunol., 561 vol. 0123456789. 562 [2] "Sexually transmitted infections (STIs)," 2021. [Online]. Available: https://www.who.int/newsroom/fact-sheets/detail/sexually-transmitted-infections-(stis). [Accessed: 26-Jan-2022]. 563 564 [3] R. G. Rank and L. Yeruva, "Hidden in plain sight: chlamydial gastrointestinal infection and its relevance to persistence in human genital infection," Infect. Immun., vol. 82, no. 4, pp. 1362– 565 566 1371, Apr. 2014. [4] L. Yeruva, N. Spencer, A. K. Bowlin, Y. Wang, and R. G. Rank, "Chlamydial infection of the 567 568 gastrointestinal tract: a reservoir for persistent infection," Pathog. Dis., vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 88–95, 569 Aug. 2013. 570 [5] C. Foschi et al., "Chlamydia trachomatis infection prevalence and serovar distribution in a high-571 density urban area in the north of Italy," J. Med. Microbiol., vol. 65, no. 6, pp. 510–520, 2016. 572 [6] C. Foged, "Subunit vaccines of the future: the need for safe, customized and optimized 573 particulate delivery systems," Ther. Deliv., vol. 2, no. 8, pp. 1057–1077, Aug. 2011. 574 [7] C. M. Janitzek et al., "The immunogenicity of capsid-like particle vaccines in combination with 575 different adjuvants using different routes of administration," Vaccines, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 1–14, 576 2021. 577 [8] S. Abraham *et al.*, "Safety and immunogenicity of the chlamydia vaccine candidate CTH522 578 adjuvanted with CAF01 liposomes or aluminium hydroxide : a first-in-human , randomised , 579 double-blind , placebo-controlled , phase 1 trial," Lancet Infect. Dis., vol. 3099, no. 19, pp. 1–10, 580 2019. 581 [9] G. K. Pedersen, P. Andersen, and D. Christensen, "Immunocorrelates of CAF family adjuvants," 582 Semin. Immunol., vol. 39, no. November, pp. 4–13, 2018. 583 T. Lindenstrøm, J. Woodworth, J. Dietrich, C. Aagaard, P. Andersen, and E. M. Agger, "Vaccine-[10] 584 Induced Th17 Cells Are Maintained Long-Term Postvaccination as a Distinct and Phenotypically 585 Stable Memory Subset," Infect. Immun., vol. 80, no. 10, pp. 3533–3544, 2012. T. Stratmann, "Cholera Toxin Subunit B as Adjuvant—An Accelerator in Protective Immunity and 586 [11] 587 a Break in Autoimmunity," pp. 579–596, 2015. 588 [12] N. Lycke and C. Lebrero-Fernández, "ADP-ribosylating enterotoxins as vaccine adjuvants," Curr. 589 *Opin. Pharmacol.*, vol. 41, pp. 42–51, 2018. 590 [13] S. C. Svindland, G. K. Pedersen, R. D. Pathirana, G. Bredholt, and J. K. Nøstbakken, "A study of Chitosan and c-di-GMP as mucosal adjuvants for intranasal influenza H5N1 vaccine," pp. 1181-591 592 1193, 2012. 593 A. S. Madhun et al., "Intranasal c-di-GMP-adjuvanted plant-derived H5 influenza vaccine induces [14] 594 multifunctional Th1 CD4 + cells and strong mucosal and systemic antibody responses in mice," 595 Vaccine, vol. 29, no. 31, pp. 4973–4982, 2011. 596 [15] S. Nagaraj, C. Ziske, J. Strehl, D. Messmer, and T. Sauerbruch, "Dendritic cells pulsed with alpha-597 galactosylceramide induce anti-tumor immunity against pancreatic cancer in vivo," vol. 18, no. 8, 598 pp. 1279-1283, 2006. 599 [16] S. Longet et al., "An oral alpha-galactosylceramide adjuvanted Helicobacter pylori vaccine 600 induces protective IL-1R- and IL-17R- dependent Th1 responses," npj Vaccines. 601 [17] S. Longet et al., "Thermostability of the coating , antigen and immunostimulator in an adjuvanted oral capsule vaccine formulation," Int. J. Pharm., vol. 534, no. 1–2, pp. 60–70, 2017. 602 603 [18] J. E. V. Ramirez, L. A. Sharpe, N. A. Peppas, and P. Care, "Current state and challenges in 604 developing oral vaccines," pp. 116-131, 2018. 605 [19] M. Van Splunter et al., "Oral cholera vaccination promotes homing of IgA + memory B cells to the

- large intestine and the respiratory tract," *Mucosal Immunol.*, no. February, 2018.
- 607 [20] K. R. James, R. Elmentaite, S. A. Teichmann, and G. L. Hold, "Rede fining intestinal immunity with 608 single-cell transcriptomics," no. July, pp. 1–11, 2021.
- M. Garinot *et al.*, "PEGylated PLGA-based nanoparticles targeting M cells for oral vaccination," *J. Control. Release*, vol. 120, no. 3, pp. 195–204, 2007.
- 611 [22] M. Uddin, D. Basak, R. Hopefl, and B. Minofar, "Potential application of ionic liquids in
 612 pharmaceutical dosage forms for small molecule drug and vaccine delivery system," *J. Pharm.*613 *Pharm. Sci.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 158–176, 2020.
- S. D. Jazayeri, H. X. Lim, K. Shameli, and S. K. Yeap, "Nano and Microparticles as Potential Oral
 Vaccine Carriers and Adjuvants Against Infectious Diseases," vol. 12, no. June, pp. 1–15, 2021.
- 616 [24] C. von Halling Laier *et al.*, "Microcontainers for protection of oral vaccines, in vitro and in vivo 617 evaluation," *J. Control. Release*, vol. 294, no. December 2018, pp. 91–101, 2019.
- 618 [25] R. B. Kjeldsen *et al.*, "X ray Imaging for Gastrointestinal Tracking of Microscale Oral Drug
 619 Delivery Devices," 2021.
- [26] Z. Abid *et al.*, "Powder embossing method for selective loading of polymeric microcontainers
 with drug formulation," *Microelectron. Eng.*, vol. 171, pp. 20–24, 2017.
- 622 [27] L. A. Feldkamp, "Practical cone-beam algorithm Sfrdr I _ f," vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 612–619, 1984.
- [28] V. Jully, F. Mathot, N. Moniotte, V. Préat, and D. Lemoine, "Mechanisms of Antigen Adsorption
 onto an Aluminum-Hydroxide Adjuvant Evaluated by High-Throughput Screening," *J. Pharm. Sci.*,
 vol. 105, no. 6, pp. 1829–1836, 2016.
- A. N. Courtney, P. N. Nehete, B. P. Nehete, P. Thapa, D. Zhou, and K. J. Sastry, "Alphagalactosylceramide is an effective mucosal adjuvant for repeated intranasal or oral delivery of
 HIV peptide antigens," *Vaccine*, vol. 27, no. 25–26, pp. 3335–3341, 2009.
- 629 [30] G. D. J. Adams, "Lyophilization of Vaccines," in *Vaccine Protocols*, A. Robinson, M. J. Hudson, and
 630 M. P. Cranage, Eds. Totowa, NJ: Humana Press, 2003, pp. 223–243.
- 631 [31] F. Jameel *et al.*, "Recommended Best Practices for Lyophilization Validation 2021 Part I :
 632 Process Design and Modeling," pp. 1–18, 2021.
- 633 [32] S. M. Patel *et al.*, "Lyophilized Drug Product Cake Appearance: What Is Acceptable?," *J. Pharm.*634 *Sci.*, vol. 106, no. 7, pp. 1706–1721, 2017.
- [33] M. Y. Chan, T. S. Dutill, and R. M. Kramer, "Lyophilization of Adjuvanted Vaccines: Methods for
 Formulation of a Thermostable Freeze-Dried Product," 2017, pp. 215–226.
- 637 [34] A. L. Silva, P. C. Soema, B. Slütter, F. Ossendorp, and W. Jiskoot, "PLGA particulate delivery
 638 systems for subunit vaccines: Linking particle properties to immunogenicity," *Hum. Vaccines*639 *Immunother.*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 1056–1069, 2016.
- 640 [35] L. M. Spindler *et al.*, "Nano-in-Micro-Particles Consisting of PLGA Nanoparticles Embedded in
 641 Chitosan Microparticles via Spray-Drying Enhances Their Uptake in the Olfactory Mucosa," vol.
 642 12, no. September, pp. 1–19, 2021.
- 643 [36] M. Z. I. Khan, Ž. Prebeg, and N. Kurjaković, "A pH-dependent colon targeted oral drug delivery
 644 system using methacrylic acid copolymers. I. Manipulation of drug release using Eudragit[®] L100645 55 and Eudragit[®] S100 combinations," *J. Control. Release*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 215–222, 1999.
- E. L. McConnell, A. W. Basit, and S. Murdan, "Measurements of rat and mouse gastrointestinal
 pH, fluid and lymphoid tissue, and implications for in-vivo experiments," *J. Pharm. Pharmacol.*,
 vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 63–70, 2010.
- 649[38]K. Kamguyan *et al.*, "Colon-Specific Delivery of Bioactive Agents Using Genipin-Cross-Linked650Chitosan Coated Microcontainers," ACS Appl. Bio Mater., vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 752–762, 2021.
- E. Budianto and A. Amalia, "Swelling behavior and mechanical properties of Chitosan-Poly(N-vinyl-pyrrolidone) hydrogels," *J. Polym. Eng.*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 551–560, Aug. 2020.
- 653 [40] T. Jiang *et al.*, "Biomaterials Targeted oral delivery of BmpB vaccine using porous PLGA

- 654 microparticles coated with M cell homing peptide-coupled chitosan," *Biomaterials*, vol. 35, no. 7, 655 pp. 2365–2373, 2014.
- 656 [41] M. Naeem and M. Kim, "Colon-targeted delivery of cyclosporine A using dual-functional Eudragit 657 • FS30D / PLGA nanoparticles ameliorates murine experimental colitis," pp. 1225–1240, 2018.
- 658 [42] C. J. H. Davitt *et al.*, "Alpha-galactosylceramide enhances mucosal immunity to oral whole-cell 659 cholera vaccines," *Mucosal Immunol.*, no. February, 2019.
- [43] J. Liao, D. R. Smith, J. Brynjarsdóttir, P. I. Watnick, and V. J. DiRita, "A Self-Assembling Whole-Cell
 Vaccine Antigen Presentation Platform," *J. Bacteriol.*, vol. 200, no. 15, pp. e00752-17, 2018.
- 662 [44] A. Concha *et al.*, "Safety and immunogenicity of oral killed whole cell recombinant B subunit
 663 cholera vaccine in Barranquilla, Colombia.," *Bull. Pan Am. Health Organ.*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 312–
 664 321, Dec. 1995.
- 665 [45] D. Christensen, R. Mortensen, I. Rosenkrands, J. Dietrich, and P. Andersen, "Vaccine-induced
 666 Th17 cells are established as resident memory cells in the lung and promote local IgA responses,"
 667 *Mucosal Immunol.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 260–270, 2017.
- [46] D. I. Bernstein *et al.*, "Successful application of prime and pull strategy for a therapeutic HSV vaccine," *npj Vaccines*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 33, Dec. 2019.
- 670[47]D. Esterházy *et al.,* "Compartmentalized gut lymph node drainage dictates adaptive immune671responses," *Nature*, vol. 569, no. 7754, pp. 126–130, 2019.
- 672 [48] P. Padmanabhan, J. Grosse, A. Bakar, A. Asad, G. K. Radda, and X. Golay, "Gastrointestinal transit
 673 measurements in mice with 99m Tc-DTPA-labeled activated charcoal using," pp. 1–8, 2013.
- 674[49]J. F. Christfort *et al.*, "Cubic microcontainers improve in situ colonic mucoadhesion and675absorption of amoxicillin in rats," *Pharmaceutics*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 1–16, 2020.
- 676 [50] C. Thirion-Delalande *et al.*, "Comparative analysis of the oral mucosae from rodents and non677 rodents: Application to the nonclinical evaluation of sublingual immunotherapy products," *PLoS*678 *One*, vol. 12, no. 9, pp. 1–16, 2017.
- 679[51]A. Sadio *et al.*, "A mouse intra-intestinal infusion model and its application to the study of680nanoparticle distribution," *Front. Physiol.*, vol. 7, no. NOV, pp. 1–7, 2016.
- [52] I. Lozoya-Agullo *et al.*, "Closed-Loop Doluisio (Colon, Small Intestine) and Single-Pass Intestinal
 Perfusion (Colon, Jejunum) in Rat—Biophysical Model and Predictions Based on Caco-2," *Pharm. Res.*, vol. 35, no. 1, p. 2, Jan. 2018.