tion of single $Gag_{206-216}$ epitope-specific CTL responses, $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL responses were induced dominantly but $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses were undetectable at week 2. In contrast, $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses were induced dominantly at week 2 in group III. Both groups showed $Gag_{206-216}$-specific and $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses equivalently at week 6. It may be difficult to compare these results with those in group II animals inducing whole Gag antigen-specific CTL and $CD4^+$ T-cell responses before challenge; the group II animals elicited $Gag_{206-216}$-specific and $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses equivalently at week 2. Our results indicate that prophylactic vaccination results in dominant induction of vaccine antigen-specific CTL responses and may delay CTL responses specific for viral antigens other than vaccine antigens (referred to as nonvaccine antigens) after viral exposure.

A significant difference between groups III and IV is the pattern of selection of CTL escape mutation. All group IV animals showed rapid selection of a $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL escape mutation, while most group III animals showed no *gag* mutation at week 5 but selection of the $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL escape mutation later, at week 12. Thus, prophylactic vaccination may affect the patterns of viral genome diversification, possibly accelerating selection of CTL escape mutations. Interestingly, $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL mutations were not detected even at week 12 in group III animals, although a previous study observed not only the $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL escape mutation (GagL216S), but also a $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL escape mutation (GagD244E) in the chronic phase of SIV infection in *90-120-Ia*-positive macaques (9). These results indicate that delayed, naive-derived $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL responses, as well as preceding $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses, exert strong suppressive pressure on SIV replication in group III animals, implying cooperation between vaccine antigen-specific and non-vaccine antigen-specific CTL responses for virus control.

Rapid selection of the $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL escape mutation (GagL216S) in group II and delayed selection of this mutation without a detectable $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL escape mutation (GagD244E) in group III suggest that the virus with GagL216S (SIVmac239Gag216S) replicates more efficiently than the virus with GagD244E (SIVmac239Gag244E) under both $Gag_{206-216}$-specific and $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses. Our previous competition assay did not find a significant difference in viral fitness between these mutant viruses. Possibly, escape of SIVmac239Gag216S from $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL pressure may be more efficient than that of SIVmac239Gag244E from $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL pressure.

Our analysis revealed that the decline of plasma viral loads from week 3 to week 5 in group II+IV with rapid selection of the GagL216S mutation was significantly less than that in group III without the mutation at week 5, possibly reflecting viral escape from suppressive pressure by $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL responses in the former groups around weeks 3 to 5. Even the comparison between groups II and III, both showing dominant $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses at week 2, revealed a significantly sharper decline in the latter ($P = 0.0087$). Thus, our results suggest three patterns of $Gag_{206-216}$-specific and $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL cooperation for virus control after SIVmac239 challenge. First, as observed in group II, dominantly induced $Gag_{206-216}$-specific and $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses both work against wild-type SIV replication around week 2, but then a mutant virus escaping from the former CTL responses is selected, and the responses work against this mutant virus replication. Second, as observed in group III, dominantly induced $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses work against wild-type SIV replication around week 2 and then contribute to virus control, together with delayed, naive-derived $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL responses. Third, as observed in group IV, dominantly induced $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL responses work against wild-type SIV replication around week 2, but then a mutant virus escaping from $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL responses is selected, and delayed, naive-derived $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses instead work against this mutant virus replication. Viral loads at week 3 in group III looked higher than those in group IV, implying that $Gag_{206-216}$-specific CTL responses may exert a stronger suppressive effect on SIV replication in the acute phase than $Gag_{241-249}$-specific CTL responses. However, viral loads at week 5 in group III looked lower than those in group IV, and the comparison between the two groups showed significantly less decline in the latter ($P = 0.0303$). It is speculated that the third pattern observed in group IV is prone to failure in virus control. Indeed, two of five animals in group IV failed to control SIV replication. Even if vaccines are designed to express multiple antigens, of the vaccine-induced CTLs generated, only several epitope-specific cells may recognize the incoming HIV because of viral diversity and host MHC polymorphisms (18), and cooperation of these vaccine antigen-specific and non-vaccine antigen-specific CTL responses would be required for viral control. Thus, our results may imply a rationale of inducing escape-resistant, epitope-specific CTL memory by prophylactic AIDS vaccines.

In summary, this study showed dominant induction of vaccine antigen-specific CTL responses and delay in non-vaccine antigen-specific CTL responses in the acute phase of SIV infection, clearly describing the impact of prophylactic vaccination on CTL immunodominance and cooperation after virus exposure. Our results indicate that the patterns of cooperation of vaccine antigen-specific and non-vaccine antigen-specific CTL responses affect virus control and selection of CTL escape mutations. These findings provide great insights into antigen design in the development of a CTL-inducing AIDS vaccine.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by grants-in-aid from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology; grants-in-aid from the Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare; and a grant from the Takeda Science Foundation, Japan.

We thank F. Ono, K. Oto, K. Komatsuzaki, M. Hamano, Y. Emoto, H. Akari, and Y. Yasutomi for their assistance in animal experiments.

REFERENCES

1. **Altfeld M, et al.** 2003. Influence of HLA-B57 on clinical presentation and viral control during acute HIV-1 infection. AIDS 17:2581–2591.
2. **Berger CT, et al.** 2011. High functional avidity CTL responses to HLA-B-restricted Gag-derived epitopes associate with relative HIV control. J. Virol. 85:9334–9345.
3. **Borrow P, Lewicki H, Hahn BH, Shaw GM, Oldstone MB.** 1994. Virus-specific CD8 cytotoxic T-lymphocyte activity associated with control of viremia in primary human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. J. Virol. 68:6103–6110.
4. **Goulder PJ, Watkins DI.** 2004. HIV and SIV CTL escape: implications for vaccine design. Nat. Rev. Immunol. 4:630–640.
5. **Goulder PJ, Watkins DI.** 2008. Impact of MHC class I diversity on immune control of immunodeficiency virus replication. Nat. Rev. Immunol. 8:619–630.
6. **Hansen SG, et al.** 2009. Effector memory T cell responses are associated

with protection of rhesus monkeys from mucosal simian immunodeficiency virus challenge. Nat. Med. 15:293–299.
7. Julg B, et al. 2010. Enhanced anti-HIV functional activity associated with Gag-specific CD8 T-cell responses. J. Virol. 84:5540–5549.
8. Kaslow RA, et al. 1996. Influence of combinations of human major histocompatibility complex genes on the course of HIV-1 infection. Nat. Med. 2:405–411.
9. Kawada M, et al. 2006. Involvement of multiple epitope-specific cytotoxic T-lymphocyte responses in vaccine-based control of simian immunodeficiency virus replication in rhesus macaques. J. Virol. 80:1949–1958.
10. Kawada M, et al. 2008. Gag-specific cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-based control of primary simian immunodeficiency virus replication in a vaccine trial. J. Virol. 82:10199–10206.
11. Kestler HW III, et al. 1991. Importance of the nef gene for maintenance of high virus loads and for development of AIDS. Cell 65:651–662.
12. Kiepiela P, et al. 2007. CD8+ T-cell responses to different HIV proteins have discordant associations with viral load. Nat. Med. 13:46–53.
13. Koup RA, et al. 1994. Temporal association of cellular immune responses with the initial control of viremia in primary human immunodeficiency virus type 1 syndrome. J. Virol. 68:4650–4655.
14. Leslie A, et al. 2010. Additive contribution of HLA class I alleles in the immune control of HIV-1 infection. J. Virol. 84:9879–9888.
15. Letvin NL, et al. 2006. Preserved CD4+ central memory T cells and survival in vaccinated SIV-challenged monkeys. Science 312:1530–1533.
16. Li F, et al. 2011. Mapping HIV-1 vaccine induced T-cell responses: bias towards less-conserved regions and potential impact on vaccine efficacy in the Step study. PLoS One 6:e20479.
17. Liu J, et al. 2009. Immune control of an SIV challenge by a T-cell-based vaccine in rhesus monkeys. Nature 457:87–91.
18. Liu Y, McNevin JP, Holte S, McElrath MJ, Mullins JI. 2011. Dynamics of viral evolution and CTL responses in HIV-1 infection. PLoS One 6:e15639.
19. Loffredo JT, et al. 2008. Patterns of CD8 immunodominance may influence the ability of Mamu-B*08-positive macaques to naturally control simian immunodeficiency virus SIVmac239 replication. J. Virol. 82:1723–1738.
20. Matano T, Kano M, Nakamura H, Takeda A, Nagai Y. 2001. Rapid appearance of secondary immune responses and protection from acute CD4 depletion after a highly pathogenic immunodeficiency virus challenge in macaques vaccinated with a DNA prime/Sendai virus vector boost regimen. J. Virol. 75:11891–11896.
21. Matano T, et al. 2004. Cytotoxic T lymphocyte-based control of simian immunodeficiency virus replication in a preclinical AIDS vaccine trial. J. Exp. Med. 199:1709–1718.
22. Matano T, et al. 1998. Administration of an anti-CD8 monoclonal antibody interferes with the clearance of chimeric simian/human immunodeficiency virus during primary infections of rhesus macaques. J. Virol. 72:164–169.
23. Migueles SA, et al. 2000. HLA B*5701 is highly associated with restriction of virus replication in a subgroup of HIV-infected long term nonprogressors. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 97:2709–2714.
24. Miura T, et al. 2009. HLA-B57/B*5801 human immunodeficiency virus type 1 elite controllers select for rare gag variants associated with reduced viral replication capacity and strong cytotoxic T-lymphocyte [corrected] recognition. J. Virol. 83:2743–2755.
25. Mothé BR, et al. 2003. Expression of the major histocompatibility complex class I molecule Mamu-A*01 is associated with control of simian immunodeficiency virus SIVmac239 replication. J. Virol. 77:2736–2740.
26. Naruse TK, et al. 2010. Diversity of MHC class I genes in Burmese-origin rhesus macaques. Immunogenetics 62:601–611.
27. Ndhlovu ZM, et al. 2011. Mosaic HIV-1 Gag antigens can be processed and presented to human HIV-specific CD8+ T cells. J. Immunol. 186:6914–6924.
28. Schmitz JE, et al. 1999. Control of viremia in simian immunodeficiency virus infection by CD8+ lymphocytes. Science 283:857–860.
29. Shibata R, et al. 1997. Infection and pathogenicity of chimeric simian-human immunodeficiency viruses in macaques: determinants of high virus loads and CD4 cell killing. J. Infect. Dis. 176:362–373.
30. Streeck H, et al. 2009. Human immunodeficiency virus type 1-specific CD8+ T-cell responses during primary infection are major determinants of the viral set point and loss of CD4+ T cells. J. Virol. 83:7641–7648.
31. Tang J, et al. 2002. Favorable and unfavorable HLA class I alleles and haplotypes in Zambians predominantly infected with clade C human immunodeficiency virus type 1. J. Virol. 76:8276–8284.
32. Tsukamoto T, et al. 2009. Impact of cytotoxic-T-lymphocyte memory induction without virus-specific CD4+ T-cell help on control of a simian immunodeficiency virus challenge in rhesus macaques. J. Virol. 83:9339–9346.
33. Turnbull EL, et al. 2009. Kinetics of expansion of epitope-specific T cell responses during primary HIV-1 infection. J. Immunol. 182:7131–7145.
34. Wang YE, et al. 2009. Protective HLA class I alleles that restrict acute-phase CD8+ T-cell responses are associated with viral escape mutations located in highly conserved regions of human immunodeficiency virus type 1. J. Virol. 83:1845–1855.
35. Wilson NA, et al. 2006. Vaccine-induced cellular immune responses reduce plasma viral concentrations after repeated low-dose challenge with pathogenic simian immunodeficiency virus SIVmac239. J. Virol. 80:5875–5885.
36. Yant LJ, et al. 2006. The high-frequency major histocompatibility complex class I allele Mamu-B*17 is associated with control of simian immunodeficiency virus SIVmac239 replication. J. Virol. 80:5074–5077.