1

Functional characterization of a "plant-like" HYL1 homolog in the cnidarian *Nematostella vectensis* indicates a conserved involvement in microRNA biogenesis

Abhinandan Mani Tripathi[1,2], Yael Admoni[1,2], Arie Fridrich[1,3], Magda Lewandowska[1,3], Joachim M. Surm[1,3], Reuven Aharoni[1], Yehu Moran[1,4]

[1]Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, Alexander Silberman Institute of Life Sciences, Faculty of Science, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem 9190401, Israel

[2]These authors contributed equally to this work
[3]These authors contributed equally to this work
[4]Corresponding author: yehu.moran@mail.huji.ac.il

Impact statement

Presence of a functional homolog of HYL1 in *Nematostella* vectensis, a basal animal model, indicates divergent evolution of miRNA biogenesis pathway in plants and animals from an ancestral miRNA system

Abstract

While the biogenesis of microRNAs (miRNAs) in both animals and plants depends on the RNase

III Dicer, its partner proteins are considered distinct for each kingdom. Nevertheless, recent discovery of

homologs of Hyponastic Leaves1 (HYL1), a "plant-specific" Dicer partner, in the metazoan phylum

Cnidaria, challenges the view that miRNAs evolved convergently in animals and plants. Here we show

that the HYL1 homolog Hyl1-like a (Hyl1La) is crucial for development and miRNA biogenesis in the

cnidarian model *Nematostella vectensis*. Inhibition of Hyl1La by morpholinos resulted in metamorphosis

arrest in *Nematostella* embryos and a significant reduction in levels of most miRNAs. Further, meta-

analysis of morphants of miRNA biogenesis components, like Dicer1, shows clustering of their miRNA

profiles with Hyl1La morphants. Strikingly, immunoprecipitation of Hyl1La followed by quantitative

PCR revealed that in contrast to the plant HYL1, Hyl1La interacts only with precursor miRNAs and not

with primary miRNAs. This was complemented by an in vitro binding assay of Hyl1La to synthetic

precursor miRNA. Altogether, these results suggest that the last common ancestor of animals and plants

carried a HYL1 homolog that took essential part in miRNA biogenesis and indicate early emergence of

the miRNA system before plants and animals separated.

Introduction

MicroRNAs (miRNAs) are 21-24 nucleotides-long small RNAs that are known to be involved in

post-transcriptional gene regulation and play important roles in both plant and animal development

(Alvarez-Garcia & Miska, 2005; Bråte et al., 2018; Voinnet, 2009). The miRNA is transcribed by RNA

polymerase II into a long primary transcript, which is further processed into a miRNA precursor and

finally chopped into ~22 nucleotide miRNA/miRNA* duplex (Bartel, 2004, 2018; Voinnet, 2009). The

processing of miRNA varies between plants and animals (Moran et al., 2017). In animals, the biogenesis

of miRNAs is compartmentalized as the processing occurs in both the nucleus and cytoplasm. Within the

nucleus, the RNase type III Drosha and its partner Pasha (also called DGCR8) constitute a microprocessor

complex (J. Han et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2009). This complex acts on primary miRNA (pri-miRNA)

transcripts and processes them into precursor miRNA (pre-miRNA). The pre-miRNA is then transported

by Exportin 5 into the cytoplasm where they get further processed into the mature miRNA by the RNase

type III Dicer with the help of other double-stranded RNA binding proteins such as Loquacious (Loqs),

Transactivation response element RNA-binding protein (TRBP) and protein activator of the interferon-

induced protein kinase (PACT) (J. Han et al., 2004; Redfern et al., 2013; Saito et al., 2005).

Contrastingly, in plants both pri-miRNA and pre-miRNA are processed into mature miRNA by a single

RNase type III, called DICER-LIKE1 (DCL1) assisted by its partner the double-stranded RNA binding

motif (DSRM)-containing protein, Hyponastic Leaves1 (HYL1) within the nucleus (M.-H. Han et al.,
2004; Voinnet, 2009). In both plants and animals, the mature miRNA duplex interacts with Argonaute
proteins (AGOs) and forms the RNA-induced silencing complex (RISC) in the cytoplasm. The RISC
complex commences miRNA guided cleavage or translational inhibition of complementary targets genes
(Kim et al., 2009).

The metazoan lineages of Bilateria and its sister group Cnidaria separated more than 600 million
years ago (MYA). While Bilateria include the vast majority of animals, Cnidaria include sea anemones,
corals, hydroids and jellyfish. The phylogenetic position of cnidarians makes them an important
comparative group for inferring animal evolution. In a previous study, we identified different components
of miRNA biogenesis machinery in Cnidaria and observed that most bilaterian components have
cnidarian homologs. However, cnidarians lack homologs of classical bilaterian Dicer protein partners
such as PACT, Loqs or TRBP (Moran et al., 2013). Interestingly two homologs of HYL1 called Hyl1-
Like-a (NveHyl1La) and Hyl1-Like-b (NveHyl1Lb) were identified in the sea anemone *Nematostella*
vectensis (Moran et al., 2013). Apart from this, it was also found that cnidarian miRNAs possess several
interesting features that are common to their counterparts in plants: cnidarian miRNAs and their targets
show perfect complementarity and frequently regulate their targets by messenger RNA (mRNA) cleavage
(Moran et al., 2014). Recently, some other common features with plants were identified in *Nematostella*,
including methylation of miRNAs by HEN1 (Modepalli et al., 2018), a feature rarely found in animals
and the origin of miRNAs from inverted duplication of their target genes (Fridrich et al., 2020), a feature
previously considered specific to plant miRNAs.

In addition to the presence of HYL1 homologs in Cnidaria, homologs are also present in other
non-bilaterian animals such as sponges (*Amphimedon queenslandica*) and in ctenophores (*Mnemiopsis*
leidyi) (Figure 1) (Moran et al., 2013). However, we could not detect HYL1 homologs in Placozoa
(*Trichoplax adhaerens*) (Figure 1A). Additionally, we also could not find any homologs in bilaterian
animals and in unicellular organism like Fungi and Ichthyosporea. However, deep phylogenetic study of
DSRM proteins showed that those of protozoans and fungi are phylogenetically closer to the DSRM
proteins of plants (Dias et al., 2017). These results suggested that the HYL1-like proteins were already
present in the common ancestor of plants and animals and during evolution have been lost in Bilateria and
Ichthyosporea. These sequence-based observations led us to experimentally test the function of a HYL1
homolog of *Nematostella,* which could provide better insight into the evolution and origin of the miRNA
biogenesis pathway. Our results show that Hyl1La is essential for the development of *Nematostella* and
miRNA biogenesis, suggesting a common evolutionary history of miRNA biogenesis in plants and
animals.

Results

Hyl1La plays an essential role in *Nematostella* development

Mutants of miRNA biogenesis pathway components exhibit severe developmental defects in both plants and animals (Alvarez-Garcia & Miska, 2005; Schauer et al., 2002). The HYL1 protein is known to play an essential role in the growth and development of the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* by regulating miRNA biogenesis (Achkar et al., 2018; M.-H. Han et al., 2004). Similarly, in mice, TRBP mutants show multiple developmental abnormities and a reduction in miRNA accumulation (Koscianska et al., 2011; Zhong et al., 1999). The *Hyl1La* gene of *Nematostella* contains 11 exons and 10 introns predicted to code for a protein containing three DSRM domains (Figure 1B and Figure 2A). Unlike its paralog *Hyl1Lb* that is specific to stinging cells and carries additional protein domains, *Hyl1La* expression is ubiquitously distributed throughout *Nematostella* tissues and shares its domain structure with other cnidarian HYL1 homologs (Moran et al., 2013). Thus, we decided to focus our analysis on this gene. To decipher the function of Hyl1La in *Nematostella*, we designed two different splicing morpholinos (Hyl1La SI MO1 and Hyl1La SI MO2) to knockdown by mis-splicing the gene at two different intron-exons junctions. Additionally, the gene was also targeted for inhibition by using a translation-blocking morpholino (Hyl1La TB MO) which binds on the 5′ UTR and sterically blocks translation (Figure 2A). We injected each of the three MOs into *Nematostella* zygotes in parallel with a control morpholino (Control MO) designed to bind to no target in the sea anemone genome. The effect of SI MOs was validated by PCR followed by cloning and sequencing which revealed intron retention in both cases (Figure 2-figure supplement 1-source data1 and Supplementary file 1). All the injected animals were studied until nine days post-fertilization (dpf). We observed that more than 80% of the animals injected with control MO developed normally and metamorphosed into primary polyps. In contrast, the animals injected with any of the three Hyl1La MOs showed developmental abnormalities, where more than 90% of the animals did not settle and metamorphosed into primary polyps until nine days post-fertilization (dpf) (Figure 2B-D and F). The developmental abnormalities observed here were grossly similar to those observed in *Nematostella* morphants of other miRNA processing components such as HEN1, Dicer1, AGO1 and AGO2 knockdown animals (Fridrich et al., 2020; Modepalli et al., 2018) (Figure 2E). These results indicate that Hyl1La plays an essential role in *Nematostella* development, possibly by regulating the processing and expression of miRNAs.

Hyl1La regulates the miRNA biogenesis

The above observed metamorphosis arrest suggested the possible involvement of Hyl1La in
miRNA biogenesis, as mutants defective in their miRNA biogenesis exhibit abnormal development in
both animals and plants (Achkar et al., 2018; Zhong et al., 1999). HYL1 in *Arabidopsis* interacts with the
stem region of miRNA precursors by using its DSRM domains and works with DCL1 synergistically
(Song et al., 2007; Wu et al., 2007). Although the Dicer homolog alone is capable of processing the
precursor into a mature miRNA, the presence of HYL1 is essential as it enhances the efficiency and in
some cases the accuracy of miRNA biogenesis in plants (Dong et al., 2008; Szarzynska et al., 2009). To
assay the possible role of Hyl1La on miRNA expression in *Nematostella*, we performed small RNA
sequencing of animals, injected with Hyl1La SI MO1 and with control MO. The analysis of read length
distribution showed that the small RNA reads that lied between the size of miRNAs (20-24 nt) were
higher ($P < 0.01$, Student's t-test) in control as compared to knockdown embryos (Figure 3A). Further, we
analyzed the miRNA expression by using miRProf (Stocks et al., 2012) and normalized the miRNA reads
in transcripts per million (TPM) (Supplementary file 2). For the miRNA quantification we used the most
recent *Nematostella* miRNA datasets that were obtained by AGO-immunoprecipitation (Fridrich et al.,
2020). The expression of normalized miRNA reads was compared between control and Hyl1La SI MO1.
About 54% of the total identified miRNAs showed downregulation of more than two-fold in Hyl1La SI
MO1 injected animals as compared to the control (Figure 3B). Further, a significant reduction in overall
miRNA abundance was observed in the knockdown morphants ($P < 0.00001$, Wilcoxon signed-rank test)
(Figure 3C). The expression variation caused by the action of other two morpholinos (Hyl1La SI MO2
and Hyl1La TB) was also assayed by quantitative stem-loop PCR of five miRNAs (Figure 3D and Figure
3-figure supplement 1). Significant downregulation of three miRNAs: miR2022-3p, miR2025-3p and
miR2026-5p was detected in all three MOs (with the exception of miR-2026-5p with SI MO1), which
supported the small RNA sequencing results. In contrast, two miRNAs, miR2027-5p and miR2028-5p
either showed upregulation or were not significantly affected by the Hyl1La knockdown. Previous studies
have also shown that these two miRNAs may respond differently to other miRNAs in HEN1 and Dicer1
knockdown morphants of *Nematostella* (Modepalli et al., 2018). This might be relevant to other miRNAs
that did not show downregulation and suggest differences in their biogenesis. Further, we also checked
for the processing accuracy of all the identified miRNAs by mapping them onto their respective
precursors. The analysis did not reveal any aberrant processing. These results suggest that like its
homolog in plants, Hyl1La in *Nematostella* might be involved in enhancement of Dicer efficiency and is
not involved in size selection.

To further explore the effect Hyl1La knockdown has on the expression of mature miRNAs in
Nematostella, we performed a meta-analysis comparing the effect of knocking down previously

characterized miRNA biogenesis components such as HEN1, Dicer1, AGO1 and AGO2 (Fridrich et al.,

2020; Modepalli et al., 2018) (Figure 2G and supplementary file 3). Using principal component analysis

(PCA), we see that broadly the expression of mature miRNAs following the knockdown of Hyl1La

functions similarly to other characterized miRNA processing components. This is evident with Hyl1La

morphants clustering with all miRNA biogenesis components compared to control, particularly with

HEN1 and Dicer1. We also observe that both AGO1 and AGO2 are the most distant among the miRNA

biogenesis components, which is consistent with their function of loading and therefore affecting a

particular subset of miRNAs (Fridrich et al., 2020), while Hyl1La, HEN1 and Dicer1 affect the majority

of the same miRNA in the same manner.

Next, we explored the effect of Hyl1La MO on other categories of small RNAs (siRNA and

piRNA) reported in *Nematostella* (Modepalli et al., 2018; Praher et al., 2017). The expression of

normalized reads of siRNA and piRNAs were compared between control and Hyl1La MO injected

animals. Significant ($P < 0.00001$, Wilcoxon signed-rank test) down- and up-regulation of siRNAs and

piRNAs, respectively were observed in Hyl1La MO depleted animals (Figure 3-figure supplement 2A-D).

In case of siRNAs the difference was very mild as only 9% (46 out of 469) of siRNAs showed

downregulation of more than two-fold in Hyl1La MO injected animals (Figure 3-figure supplement 2A).

Contrastingly, most of the piRNAs showed upregulation in Hyl1La depleted animals wherein 36% (91

out of 251) of piRNAs showed upregulation of more than two-fold (Figure 3-figure supplement 2C). In

addition, the size distribution of reads shows upregulation ($P < 0.05$, Student's t-test) of sizes that

correspond to piRNAs (28-30 nt) (Figure 3A). Overall small RNA analysis showed that Hyl1La depletion

has strong effect on miRNA expression, while mild and opposite effect on siRNA and piRNA expression,

respectively.

To further support our results obtained with MOs, we attempted to knockdown this gene by using

short-hairpin RNAs (shRNAs), a method previously established in *Nematostella* (Karabulut et al., 2019)

that worked well in our lab for other genes (Lewandowska et al., 2021). We designed three different

shRNAs from three different regions of Hyl1La gene (Hyl1La shRNA1, Hyl1La shRNA2 and Hyl1La

shRNA3) (Figure 4A-C) and injected them into *Nematostella* zygotes. In parallel we also used a control

shRNA with no target in *Nematostella* genome that was previously used as control for similar

experiments (He et al., 2018; Karabulut et al., 2019). To assess the effect of these shRNAs on Hyl1La

expression, we performed qRT-PCR from three days old injected animals. Unexpectedly, we did not find

any difference in Hyl1La expression (Figure 4D). Additionally, we also assessed the phenotype, but we

could not identify any phenotypic difference either. Next, we employed stem-loop PCR to test whether

small RNAs are generated from an injected shRNA and indeed the small RNAs were produced as

expected (Figure 4E). This result indicates that the small RNAs derived from the shRNAs were not able
to down regulate Hyl1La.

Hyl1La interacts with pre-miRNAs but not with pri-miRNAs

The above observed reduction in miRNA expression indicates the possible involvement of
Hyl1La in miRNA biogenesis. Being a DSRM containing protein, it could interact either with pri-
miRNA, pre-miRNA or with both. Hence to test if Hyl1La interacts with pre- and/or pri-miRNA we
conducted an immunoprecipitation (IP) assay by injecting a plasmid carrying a cassette encoding an N-
terminal 3×FLAG-tagged full-length Hyl1La ("FLAG- Hyl1La") followed by a 3′-memOrange2
separated by a P2A self-cleaving peptide (Figure 5A) (Kim et al., 2011; Shaner et al., 2008). The
expression of the FLAG-Hyl1La cassette was confirmed by visualizing the animals under fluorescence
microscope (Figure 5B) and by using anti-FLAG western blot (Figure 5- figure supplement 1A-source
data 1 and 2). Further, RNA immunoprecipitation (RIP) with anti-FLAG antibody was performed (Figure
5C-source data 3 and 4) in three different biological replicates followed by qPCR analysis. Interestingly,
we observed that there was very poor enrichment of pri-miRNA (Ct-values >30, sometimes undetected)
as compared to pre-miRNA (Supplementary file 4 and Figure 5- figure supplement 1 B-C-source data 5
and 6). Due to the very high Ct values measured for pri-miRNA we were not able to compare the levels of
pri-miRNAs bound with IgG and accurately compare them to FLAG-Hyl1La. Interestingly, when we
compared the enrichment of pre-miRNAs, we found that six out of eight were significantly enriched in
FLAG-Hyl1La IP in comparison to IgG, with miR-2023 showing a trend similar to other miRNAs but not
reaching significance (Figure 5D and Figure 5- figure supplement 1-source data 5 and 6). Expectedly,
miR-2029 showed no enrichment in anti-FLAG samples. This miRNA might be processed independently
of Hyl1La since it is also not significantly decreased following Hyl1La and Dicer1 knockdowns
(Modepalli et al., 2018). Taken together, these results showed that Hyl1La interacts with pre-miRNA but
not with pri-miRNA.

Next, we generated libraries from FLAG-Hyl1La immunoprecipitated samples and analyzed the
expression of additional longer (>100 bp) transcripts (Figure 5- figure supplement 4 and supplementary
file 5). We observed no significant enrichment for pri-miRNA, mRNA, non-coding RNA (rRNA,
snoRNA and tRNA) and repetitive elements. These results suggest that Hyl1La specifically binds pre-
miRNAs. To further validate Hyl1La affinity to pre-miRNAs, we tested Hyl1La binding to pre-miRNAs
via in vitro binding assay. We generated synthetic pre-miRNAs based on the pre-miR-2022 backbone
with the mature miRNA sequence changed so it will not target *Nematostella* genes. As a control we used
a shuffled version of the same pre-miRNA that does not create a hairpin secondary structure (Figure 6A-

B). Both pre-miRNAs were labeled with biotin at their 3' end and incubated with protein lysates from FLAG-Hyl1La expressing animals in three biological replicates. Western blot conducted with anti-FLAG antibodies revealed Hyl1La binding the pre-miRNA with significantly higher efficiency than the shuffled sequence (Figure 6C-D – source data 1-6 and supplementary file 6), thus supporting the specific affinity of Hyl1La to miRNA precursors.

Discussion

Altogether the absence of animal-like Dicer partner proteins such as TRBP or PACT and presence of a functional homolog of HYL1 (Hyl1La) in *Nematostella* indicated that a Hyl1-like protein might have been present in the last common ancestor of plants and animals. Apart from *Nematostella*, the presence of HYL1 homologs in additional members of Cnidaria and other non-bilaterian metazoan groups such as sponges (Figure 1A) further strengthens the notion of common ancestry of the miRNA systems of plants and animals. Further, while the cleavage mode of action and nearly-perfect target binding could have evolved convergently in plants and cnidarians (Moran et al., 2014), the involvement in miRNA biogenesis of the Hyl1L in Cnidaria and its plant homolog HYL1 is far less likely to be the result of parallel evolution. This is because the former might be driven by functional constraints or advantage in cleaving miRNA targets whereas the latter would require the independent recruitment of the same protein into the same system. Thus, our results call into question the hypothesis that miRNAs evolved convergently in plants and animals from an ancestral RNAi system (Axtell et al., 2011; Tarver et al., 2012). To the best of our knowledge, our study provides the first demonstration that an elaborate miRNA biogenesis pathway might have existed in the common ancestor of plants and animals. However, it is also important to note that the presence of HYL1-like proteins by itself cannot be considered a definitive hallmark for the existence of miRNAs in non-bilaterian animals or their relatives. For example, a homolog of HYL1 exists in the ctenophore *M. leidyi*, but this species does not produce miRNAs (Figure 1A) (Maxwell et al., 2012). Moreover, several unicellular relatives of animals contain miRNAs, but no homologs of HYL1 (Bråte et al., 2018). Thus, this pathway might demonstrate in various lineages compositional flexibility as well as high loss rates (Reviewed in (Moran et al., 2017). Recently, it was found in *Chlamydomonas* (a unicellular green algae) that DUS16, which is a DSRM protein, and the RNase III DCL3 were efficient enough for miRNA processing (Yamasaki et al., 2016). Further, various fungal groups also exhibit the presence of Dicer and plant-like DSRM proteins and lack animal-like accessory proteins, such as Drosha and Pasha (Dang et al., 2011; Dias et al., 2017). Contrastingly, DCL3 of *Chlamydomonas* exhibits some structural features that are reminiscent of metazoan Drosha (Valli et al., 2016). These observations suggest that the common ancestor of all these groups might have harbored only

a single Dicer/Drosha-like RNase III enzyme assisted by a DSRM protein resembling the ones found in
plants (HYL1-like).

We unexpectedly found that in contrast to plant HYL1 proteins, which interacts with both pri-
and pre-miRNA, Hyl1La in *Nematostella* interacts only with pre-miRNA and not with pri-miRNA
(Figure 5D). Our sequencing data strengthens the specificity of the pre-miRNA binding by showing no
enrichment for additional longer RNA molecules (Figure 5- figure supplement 4A). Further supporting
the specific binding of Hyl1La to pre-miRNAs is the in vitro binding assay to a synthetic pre-miRNA
compared to the shuffled sequence with a different secondary structure (Figure 6D). A plausible
explanation to this finding might be that *Nematostella* already possesses miRNA biogenesis machinery
like the Drosha-Pasha microprocessor (Moran et al., 2013) that is known to interact only with pri-
miRNAs and crop them into the pre-miRNAs (Kim et al., 2009). Another surprising finding in this study
is that we were able to knockdown the Hyl1La by using the morpholino only and not by shRNA
microinjection, despite the processing of the shRNA (Figure 4D-E). A possible explanation for this
contrasting result between MO and shRNA probably lies between the different mode of action of these
two molecules. In contrast to MOs that do not use the cellular machinery, shRNA requires the
miRNA/RNAi machinery for their production as well as in target recognition and inhibition. Thus, our
combined results suggest that Hyl1La might have an additional effect on biogenesis steps that are
downstream to the cleavage by Dicer such as loading of small RNAs into AGO, the protein at the heart of
the RNA-induced silencing complex (RISC) (Hutvagner & Simard, 2008). Under such a condition the
shRNA-derived small RNA would be unable to load onto RISC and hence could not cleave the Hyl1La,
rendering its expression unaffected. Further, in such a scenario after injection with the shRNAs the
system might reach a balance point that is very close to the normal Hyl1La levels. Alternatively, it is
possible that the three shRNAs are ineffective due to lack of accessibility of the three distinct target sites
on the Hyl1La transcript to the RISC loaded with the shRNA derived small RNAs for reasons such as
secondary structure or binding by other proteins that restrict the RISC accessibility. However, we find this
explanation less likely because the three shRNAs target distinct parts of this relatively long transcript.
During small RNA analysis, we expectedly observed a strong reduction in miRNA expression but
in parallel a mild reduction in siRNA expression was also observed in Hyl1La-depleted animals (Figure 3
and Figure 3- figure supplement 2A-B). This might be due to involvement of Hyl1La in siRNA
biogenesis pathway in *Nematostella*. Similar observation was also reported in *Arabidopsis* where different
members of the DRB protein family, which includes HYL1, are known to be involved in biogenesis of
different siRNAs and hinder their expression (Curtin et al., 2008; Raja et al., 2014). For example, a HYL1
(DRB1) mutant of *Arabidopsis* exhibits severe defects in miRNA expression but also has a partial effect

on tasiRNA (a plant-specific category of siRNAs) expression (Tagami et al., 2009). Further, DRB2 and DRB4 were shown to inhibit small RNA expression produced by RNA polymerase IV (Pélissier et al., 2011). In addition to miRNAs and siRNAs an opposite trend in piRNA expression was also observed as most of the piRNAs were up-regulated in Hyl1La-depleted animals (Figure 3A and Figure 3- figure supplement 2C-D). We propose this might be due to the fact that depletion of Hyl1La-dependent miRNAs provided a void in the sequencing libraries that in turn made more reads available for piRNAs.

Finally, here we report that Hyl1La plays an important role in miRNA biogenesis in *Nematostella*, a representative of Cnidaria which is the sister group of Bilateria. However, the functional importance of Hyl1La in *Nematostella* identified here raises another interesting evolutionary question of what led to the replacement of Hyl1La by other DSRM proteins like TRBP, Loqs or PACT in bilaterian animals during evolution (Figure 1A). Interestingly, both Loqs in flies and TRBP in mammals, enable processing of some miRNA precursors into different mature miRNAs and by this significantly increase their variability and targeted sequences (Fukunaga et al., 2012; Lee & Doudna, 2012). Such variability is currently unknown in plants or cnidarians. It is intriguing to consider the possibility that this ability of the bilaterian proteins to increase small RNA variability was advantageous over Hyl1-like proteins and led to the loss of the latter in bilaterian lineages.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Key resources table

Reagent type (species) or resource	Designation	Source or reference	Identifiers
Escherichia coli	Strain DH5α	New England Biolabs	NEB-C2987I
Chemical compound	Trizol	Thermo (Ambion)	15596026
Chemical compound	Tryptone	Merck Millipore	61930505001730
Chemical compound	Yeast extract purified for Microbiology	Merck Millipore	61931105001730
Chemical compound	Agar purified for Microbiology	Merck Millipore	61939005001730

Chemical compound, drug	Ampicillin	ROTH	K029.1
Chemical compound	Dextran Alexa Fluor 488	Thermo (Molecular Probes)	D22910
Chemical compound	Red sea salt	Red sea	
Chemical compound	L-Cysteine	Merck Millipore	1028380100
Commercial Assay or kit	SuperScript III Reverse Transcriptase	Thermo (Invitrogen)	18080044
Commercial Assay or kit	Fast SYBR® Green Master Mix	Thermo (ABI)	AB-4385612
Commercial Assay or kit	Q5® High-Fidelity DNA Polymerase	New England Biolabs	NEB-M0493S
Commercial Assay or kit	AmpliScribe™ T7-Flash™ Transcription Kit	Lucigen	ASF3507
Commercial Assay or kit	Quick-RNA Miniprep	Zymo Research	R1054
Commercial Assay or kit	NucleoSpin Gel and PCR Clean-up	Macherey-Nagel	MAN-740609.50
Commercial Assay or kit	CloneJet cloning kit	Thermo (Fermentas)	K1231
Commercial Assay or kit	NextSeq 500/550 v2 Kits (75 cycles)	Illumina	FC-404-2005
Commercial Assay or kit	NEBNext Multiplex Small RNA Library Prep Set for Illumina (1-12) - 24 rxns	New England Biolabs	NEB-E7300S
Commercial Assay or kit	Pierce RNA 3' End Biotinylation Kit	Thermo Fisher Scientific	20160
Commercial Assay or kit	Ovation® SoLo RNA-seq systems kit	Tecan Genomics	0500-32
Nematostella	Lab strain, Rhode River, MD	Lab strain	

vectensis			
Software, algorithm	miRDeep2	doi:10.1093/nar/gkr688 (2012)	
Software, algorithm	The UEA small RNA Workbench	doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/ bts311	
Software, algorithm	Trimmomatic (v3.4)	doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btu1 70. Epub 2014 Apr 1	
Software, algorithm	STAR (v2.7.9)	doi.org/10.1093/bioinformati cs/bts635	
Software, algorithm	RSEM	doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105- 12-323	
Software, algorithm	shRNA design	doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2019 .01.005	www.invivogen.c om/sirnawizard/in dex
Software, algorithm	Protein Domain Search	pfam.xfam.org/search#tabvie w=t	
Software, algorithm	Homologs search	blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Blast. cgi/Proteins	
Oligonucleotides	PCR Primers	Integrated DNA Technologies	In this paper
Oligonucleotides	DNA template of shRNA	Integrated DNA Technologies	In this paper
modified oligonucleotides	Morpholino	Gene Tools	In this paper
Antibody	Monoclonal mouse anti-FLAG M2 antibody	Sigma-Aldrich	F1804-50UG
Antibody	Total mouse IgG	Sigma-Aldrich	I5381-1MG

Animal culture and microinjection

Nematostella were grown in 16‰ artificial salt water (ASW) at 18 °C in a dark culture room. The

growing animals were fed with freshly hatched *Artemia salina* nauplii three times a week. Induction of

spawning was performed as previously described (Genikhovich & Technau, 2009): the mature male and

female animals were induced to produce eggs and sperm by placing them in an incubator for eight hours

under constant white light and heat (25 °C). After induction, the tanks were further kept at 18 °C (in the

culture room) for two hours to allow the release of egg packages and sperm. Further, the egg packages

were fertilized for 30 min by placing the packages inside the male tanks. The quality of egg packages was

checked under the stereomicroscope and egg packages of round shape and homogenous size were

processed further for dejellying using 3% of L-Cysteine in 16‰ ASW pH 7.2 (titrated with 10 M NaOH).

The selected egg packages were kept in the cysteine solution for 15 min while rotated by hand. The eggs

were washed using 16‰ ASW in tissue culture plates. These clean eggs (zygotes) were further used for

microinjection. For microinjection 1 mM stock solutions of both morpholino and shRNA were prepared

by dissolving them into nuclease-free water. The toxicity of morpholinos as well as shRNA was

optimized by injecting different concentrations into the animals along with the control injected animals.

Concentrations resulting in toxicity of less than 30% of the animals (estimated morphologically in the two

days following the injection) were considered suitable for injection. All morpholinos used in this study

were designed and synthesized by Gene Tools, LLC (USA). The same control morpholino was used in all

experiments.

Hyl1La TB MO (Translation Blocking) GGCCGCCATTTCTTAGAGAAGTTCA

Hyl1La SI MO1 (Splicing inhibition) AGAAACAGACTTGTACCTTTTGTA

Hyl1La SI MO2 (Splicing inhibition) CTTGTTGTAGTCTAAGCCTTACCAT

Dicer1 TB MO (Translation Blocking) ATTCCTCTTCGTCACTTGACATCTT

Control MO (Standard control MO) CCTCTTACCTCAGTTACAATTTATA

We found that the optimum concentrations were 300 μM, 900 μM and 450 μM for the Hyl1La

TB, Hyl1La SI MO1 and Hyl1La SI MO2, respectively. Dicer1 TB MO was injected at the concentration

of 805 μM. For all the three shRNAs, 600 ng/μl concertation was found to be suitable. Similar

concentration of control MO was used for microinjection in parallel with Hyl1La MOs. In every shift, we

injected 600 zygotes (300 Control MO and 300 Hyl1La MO) by mixing the injected material with dextran

Alexa Fluor 488 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA) which was used as a fluorescent tracer while injection

was carried under magnification by a TS-100F fluorescent microscope (Nikon, Japan). The injected

zygotes were kept at 22 °C for further growth. The morphology of the animals was observed for up to

nine days after which the number of settled and unsettled animals were counted and documented under SMZ-18 fluorescent stereomicroscope (Nikon). Animals injected with Dicer1 MO were observed and documented after ten days. For RNA extraction microinjected zygotes were flash frozen in liquid nitrogen after three days of growth and stored at -80 °C until RNA extraction. All the MO and shRNA injection experiments were performed in three independent biological replicates with three distinct animals' batches. Dicer1 MO injection was performed in one replicate to repeat an experiment with published results (Modepalli et al., 2018).

Small RNA sequencing and analysis

The RNA was isolated using Trizol (Thermo Fisher Scientific) from three days old animals. Small RNA sequencing was performed for only Hyl1La SI MO1 and control MO injected animals. The small RNA library was prepared using NEBNext Multiplex Small RNA Library Prep Illumina kit (New England Biolabs, USA) with some modifications (Plotnikova et al., 2019). In brief, small RNAs were isolated (18nt-30nt) from 1 µg of total RNA using 15% urea-PAGE (Bio-Rad, USA) followed by overnight precipitation using 0.3% NaCl. The size-selected small RNAs were further precipitated using ice-cold ethanol (2.5× volume) and 1 µl of GlycoBlue (Thermo Fisher Scientific) by centrifugation at $21130 \times g$. The pellet was dissolved in 7.5 µl nuclease-free water and used further for adapter ligation. The ligated products were subjected to 14 cycles of PCR amplification using adapter specific primers. The PCR product was run on 2% agarose gel followed by staining with GelRed (Biotium, USA). The band size between 137nt–149nt was selected and purified using Gel Extraction Kit (Macherey-Nagel, Germany). The quality of the purified product (sRNA-seq libraries) was checked by using TapeStation system (Agilent, USA). The libraries having a dominant peak at the size range of 137nt–149nt were sequenced by NextSeq500 (Illumina) in single-end mode.

The small RNA data was analyzed using miRProf (Stocks et al., 2012) with the following parameters: two mismatches allowed, minimum abundance of 1 for miRNA and 5 for piRNA and siRNA, allowed overhang and not grouping mature and star strands. For miRNA, piRNA and siRNA analysis we mapped the small RNA sequences after adapter removal on the relevant previously reported sets of *Nematostella* small RNAs (Fridrich et al., 2020; Modepalli et al., 2018; Praher et al., 2017). The small RNA expression was normalized in TPM (transcripts per million) by using only the transcripts that mapped on the reference genome. For read length distribution and scattered plot we used the average of expression obtained from the three biological replicates. For mapping onto the genome and miRNA precursor for identification of aberrant processing of miRNA, miRDeep2 (Friedländer et al., 2012) was used.

Meta-analysis was performed to compare the pattern of miRNA expression following the

knockdown of miRNA biogenesis components. Raw reads from small RNA-seq experiments involving

the knockdown of various miRNA biogenesis components (Hyl1La, Dicer1, HEN1, AGO1 and AGO2)

were downloaded from the NCBI Sequence Read Archive (Fridrich et al., 2020; Modepalli et al., 2018).

Raw reads were trimmed using Cutadapt (v3.4)(Martin, 2011) and sequences shorter than 18 nt were

discarded. Filtered reads were mapped to the *Nematostella* genome using Bowtie (v1.3.1)(Langmead et

al., 2009) and miRNA loci quantified using featureCounts (v2.0.0)(Liao et al., 2014) from previously

characterized coordinates. Due to differences in developmental stages and library preparation, reads were

normalized between morphants and their respective control samples. Principle component analysis was

then performed using these normalized values using ggplot2 in R (v4.1.0).

Total RNA sequencing and analysis

To generate total RNA libraries from immunoprecipitated samples, RNA was extracted with 1 ml

Trizol (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and purified following the manufacturer's protocol. To increase the

yield, we added 1 µl of RNA-grade glycogen (Roche, Switzerland) into the isopropanol during the

precipitation step and conducted two rounds of 75% ice-cold ethanol washes. RNA pellets were dissolved

with 8 µl low-EDTA TE buffer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and diluted with 0.1% Tween-20 (Sigma-

Aldrich, USA). The samples were prepared for sequencing using Ovation® SoLo RNA-seq systems kit

(Tecan Genomics, USA) according to the manufacturer's protocol with the exclusion of the AnyDeplete

stage. The samples were amplified for 13, 14 and 16 cycles using uniquely barcoded adaptors provided in

the kit. The quality and size distribution of the produced libraries was checked using TapeStation system

(Agilent, USA). The pooled libraries were run on NextSeq500 (Illumina) in the concentration of 1.1 pM.

Raw reads were processed by Trimmomatic (v3.4), using the following parameters

(HEADCROP:9 LEADING:3 TRAILING:3 SLIDINGWINDOW:4:20 MINLEN:36) (Bolger et al.,

2014). High-quality reads retained were mapped to the *Nematostella* genome (JGI.Nemve1) using STAR

(v2.7.9) (Dobin et al., 2013) and de-duplexed using NuDup (nugentechnologies.github.io/nudup/).

Transcript abundances were estimated to previously characterized coding (Schwaiger et al., 2014) and

noncoding RNA (Fridrich et al., 2020; Modepalli et al., 2018) using RSEM (v1.3) (Li & Dewey, 2011)

and cross-sample normalized using TMM (Robinson & Oshlack, 2010).

Synthesis of shRNA

Potential shRNA precursors for Hyl1La gene were predicted using the shRNA prediction tools

(https://www.invivogen.com/sirnawizard/index.php) (Karabulut et al., 2019). Three precursors from three

different regions were further chosen, all having GC content of more than 35%. Further, we also added to the sequence a T7 promotor and three different mismatches at nucleotide positions 10, 13 and 16 to create bulges in the precursors (Figure 4A-C). All these modified precursors were reverse complemented and synthesized at the DNA level by Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc. (IDT, USA). The DNA templates and reverse primer were mixed (1:1) and denatured at 98 °C for 5 min and cooled to 24 °C. Further, this mixture was mixed with the components of AmpliScribe™ T7-Flash™ Transcription Kit (Lucigen, USA) and incubated for eight hours at room temperature. The in vitro transcribed product was further purified using Quick-RNA Miniprep (Zymo Research, USA). The quality and size of the precursor was checked on agarose gel and its concentration was measured using Qubit RNA BR (Broad Range) Assay Kit with the Qubit Fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The concentration ranged from 1500 ng/µl to 2000 ng/µl.

Reverse transcription-quantitative PCR

For the quantification of Hyl1La transcripts from shRNA injected animals and for checking the splicing inhibition (Hyl1La SI MO injected animals), cDNA was prepared from 500 ng of total RNA using the iScript™ cDNA Synthesis Kit (Bio-Rad). For the quantification of miRNAs and shRNA, we designed the stem-loop primers for five different miRNAs and shRNA (Chen et al., 2005). For cDNA preparation, 100 ng of total RNA was reverse transcribed using the SuperScript™ III Reverse Transcriptase (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The specificity of the miRNA primers was determined by using end point PCR (Varkonyi-Gasic et al., 2007). For this, we used 2 µl of cDNA as template, miRNAs specific forward primer and stem-loop specific reverse primer and run the PCR at 94 °C for 2 min, followed by 35 cycles of 94 °C for 15 s and 60 °C for 1 min. For analyzing differential expression, we ran qRT-PCR with 5sRNA as an internal control. For amplification of pre-miR-2029, pre-miR-2030 ad pre-miR-2035-1 we used 1.5 µl of cDNA. For all the real time experiments, we used Fast SYBR® Green Master Mix (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and samples were run on StepOnePlus Real-Time PCR System (Thermo Fisher Scientific). All the real time experiments were performed in three independent biological replicates and two technical replicates and data was analyzed using $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method (Livak & Schmittgen, 2001). All the primers are listed in Supplementary file7.

Cloning and sequencing of Hyl1La SI MO injected animals

To validate the effect of splicing morpholinos, we designed the primers pairs spanning the introns lying on the boundary of exons. PCR of the Hyl1La was done using Q5® High-Fidelity DNA Polymerase (New England Biolabs). The PCR products were run on the gel and the expected-sized PCR product was purified with a kit. Then the purified PCR products were ligated into the pJet2.1 vector (Thermo Fisher

439 Scientific) and transformed into the *E. coli* DH5α strain (NEB5α, New England Biolabs). The plasmids

440 were purified by a PureLink miniprep kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and outsourced for Sanger

441 sequencing (HyLabs, Israel).

Plasmid generation

Two gBlock synthetic DNA fragments (Integrated DNA Technologies) at the lengths of 1.6 kb

and 1.7 kb corresponding to Hyl1La fragments with a 3×FLAG tag and 20 bp overlaps were ordered used

for generating the expression cassette. These fragments were PCR-amplified by Q5® Hot Start High-

Fidelity DNA Polymerase (New England Biolabs), visualized on 1% agarose gel and purified by

NucleoSpin Gel and PCR Clean-up (Macherey-Nagel). Gibson assembly was performed with the

NEBuilder HiFi DNA Assembly Master Mix (New England Biolabs) following the manufacturer's

protocol. The resulting product was further subcloned by restriction digestion with *Asc*I and *Sal*I into a

pER242 vector having a TBP promoter previously proved to drive ubiquitous expression in *Nematostella*

(Admoni et al., 2020), memOrange2, and SV40 polyadenylation signal (Figure 5A). The transformation

was performed in *E. coli* DH5α strain (New England Biolabs). The plasmid was purified by HiSpeed

Plasmid Midi Kit (Qiagen, Germany) and sequenced by the Sanger method (HyLabs, Israel). 100 ng/µl of

purified plasmid was injected into the fertilized *Nematostella* embryo and visualized after two days under

an SMZ18 stereomicroscope equipped with a DS-Qi2 camera (Nikon, Japan).

Hyl1La immunoprecipitation

100 µl of protein G SureBeads™ magnetic beads (Bio-Rad, USA) were washed five times with

1× PBS (Phosphate-buffered saline). 5 µg of monoclonal mouse anti-FLAG M2 antibody (Sigma-Aldrich,

USA) or total mouse IgG (Sigma-Aldrich) were added to the washed beads and incubated overnight at

4°C on a rotating shaker. Three thousand zygotes were injected with the plasmid containing 3×FLAG-

Hyl1La among which ~ 2000 animals survived after two days and were used for protein extraction.

Protein was extracted in lysis buffer with the following composition: 25 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4), 150 mM

KCl, 25 mM EDTA, 0.5% NP-40, 1 mM DTT, Protease inhibitor cOmplete ULTRA tablets (Roche,

Germany) and Protease Inhibitor Cocktail Set III, EDTA-Free (Merck Millipore, USA). Murine RNase

inhibitor (New England Biolabs) was used in RNA processing buffer. The RNase and protease inhibitors

were added fresh just before use. For protein extraction, the frozen animals were mechanically

homogenized in 1 ml lysis buffer and incubated for rotation at 4 °C. After two hours the samples were

centrifuged at $16000 \times g$ for 15 min at 4 ºC and supernatant was collected. Then, 100 µl of protein G

magnetic beads were washed thrice with 1 ml 1×PBS, once with lysis buffer and then mixed with the

protein lysate. The tube volume was maintained to 1.2 ml using the lysis buffer containing RNase

inhibitor and incubated at 4 °C on a rotating shaker (Intelli-Mixer™ ELMI, USA), for one hour. After one

hour, the pre-cleared lysate was collected and added to the antibody-bound beads that were preincubated

with the antibody overnight. These samples were incubated for two hours in rotation at 4 ºC. After

incubation, the beads were collected by using a magnetic stand and washed six times with lysis buffer

containing RNase inhibitor and one time with PBS with RNAse inhibitor. For Western blot 40 µl SDS

sample buffer (New England Biolabs) were added to the beads and heated at 100 °C for 8 min and placed

on ice for 1 min. The samples were then centrifuged for 1 min at $16,000 \times g$ at 4 °C, and the supernatant

was collected.

For RNA extraction, the beads were mixed with 1 ml Trizol (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and

purified following the manufacturer's protocol. We added 1 µl of RNA-grade glycogen (Roche,

Switzerland) into the isopropanol during the precipitation step. The isolated RNA was treated with Turbo

DNAse (Thermo Fisher Scientific) for 30 min at 37 °C, purified with RNA Clean & Concentrator-5 kit

(Zymo Research), eluted in 8 µl and used for cDNA preparation.

484   Primer designing for pre- and pri-miRNA quantification

The pre-miRNA primer pairs were designed from stable stem region of precursors (Figure 5 -

figure supplement 2) as described previously (Schmittgen et al., 2008). The pre-miRNA sequence was

obtained from our recently published data (Fridrich et al., 2020). The primer pairs for pri-miRNA were

designed so they will anneal at least 10 nucleotides away from the pre-miRNA primers (Figure 5 - figure

supplement 3). These probable pri-miRNA sequences flanking the pre-miRNA were obtained from the

Nematostella genome browser (https://simrbase.stowers.org/).

491   Biotin-labeled synthetic pre-miRNA generation

Synthetic pre-miRNA for in vitro binding assay was designed based on miR-2022 backbone, with

the mature and star stands changed to target an mCherry synthetic gene, which is not found in the

Nematostella genome. To generate a control sequence, the original sequence was shuffled and non-

hairpin secondary structure was validated with RNAfold web server (Lorenz et al., 2011). The reverse

complement DNA templates were ordered from Integrated DNA Technologies (USA) and transcribed

using the AmpliScribe™ T7-Flash™ Transcription kit protocol (Lucigen). The DNase treated products

were cleaned with Quick-RNA MiniPrep Kit (Zymo Research), then validated on agarose gel and

concentration was measured with Epoch Microplate Spectrophotometer (BioTek Instruments, Inc., USA).

Next, 790 ng of the products were biotinylated with Pierce RNA 3' End Biotinylation Kit (Thermo Fisher

Scientific). After ligation of 15 h, products were cleaned according to the manufacturer's protocol and

pellets were dissolved with 12.5 µl nuclease-free water. A second cleaning step was conducted with
Quick-RNA MiniPrep Kit (Zymo Research). Products were eluted with 16 µl nuclease-free water and
concentration was measured with NanoDrop (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

In vitro binding assay

In vitro binding assay was performed according to a previously described method (Lewandowska
et al., 2021). In brief, 4000 zygotes were injected with the plasmid containing 3×FLAG-Hyl1La, from
which ~3000 survived after two days. Embryos were flash frozen with liquid nitrogen and stored in -80
°C. Next, animals were mechanically homogenized in the following lysis buffer: 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH
7.4), 150 mM KCl, 0.5% NP-40, 10% glycerol, Protease inhibitor cOmplete ULTRA tablets (Roche,
Switzerland), Protease Inhibitor Cocktail Set III, EDTA-Free (Merck Millipore) and Murine RNase
inhibitor (New England Biolabs). Protease and RNase inhibitors were added fresh just before use. Lysed
animals were incubated and supernatants were collected as described before. Next, the lysate was pre-
cleared as follows: 100 µl of streptavidin magnetic beads (New England Biolabs) were washed in 1 ml of
1×PBS for 3 times and the FLAG-tagged Hyl1La lysate was added to the washed beads. Lysis buffer was
added to make up 1.3 ml and samples were incubated at 4 °C rotation for one hour. After the incubation,
the pre-cleared lysates were collected and mixed with the biotin labeled pre-miRNA or biotin labeled
shuffled pre-miRNA as negative control in the final concentration of 8.23 ng/ml and ATP (New England
Biolabs) in the final concentration of 0.5 mM. Samples were incubated for one hour in rotation at room
temperature. Simultaneously, 100 µl of fresh streptavidin magnetic beads were washed as described
before and blocked with three days old wild-type lysate for one hour at 4 °C. Biotin labeled precursors
containing lysates were added to the blocked beads and incubated for two hours in rotation at 4 °C for
biotin labeled pre-miRNA pull-down. 60 µl was taken from each lysate before addition to the beads as
input sample. After the incubation, the lysates were discarded and the beads were washed 3 times with
500 µl of the following wash buffer: 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4), Protease inhibitor cOmplete ULTRA
tablets, Protease Inhibitor Cocktail Set III, EDTA-Free and Murine RNase inhibitor. Subsequently, 40 µl
of filtered double-distilled water and 20 or 30 µl of Blue Protein Loading Dye (New England Biolabs)
were added to the beads or the inputs, respectively. The samples were heated and centrifuged as described
before and the supernatant was collected for Western blot. Intensities of Western bands were determined
by using the ImageStudio software (Licore, UK). Enrichment of pre-miRNA pull-down compared to
shuffled pre-miRNA pull-down was determined by the ratio of the band to the background intensity.

Quantification and statistical analysis

For phenotypic analysis, we performed Student's t-test between the number of developed and
undeveloped animals. To test differences in size distribution of small RNA sequencing reads, Student's t-
test (paired two-tailed) was performed between control and Hyl1La SI MO1 samples. For statistical
analysis of qRT-PCR data, Student's t-test (one-tailed assuming equal variance) was performed on ΔCt
values between different biological replicates. For in vitro binding assay analysis, Student's t-test (paired
two-tailed) was performed on the ratio of the bands to background intensity. To check overall significant
difference between the miRNA expression levels, Wilcoxon signed-rank test was done. The Student's t-
test was conducted in Microsoft Excel while Wilcoxon signed-rank test was done using socscistatistics
(https://www.socscistatistics.com/tests/signedranks/default.aspx).

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. Michal Bronstein and Mrs. Adi Turjeman of the Centre for Genomic
Technologies (The Hebrew University) for their help with sequencing. This work was supported by
European Research Council Starting Grant 637456 CNIDARIAMICRORNA and European Research
Council Consolidator Grant 863809 AntiViralEvo to YM.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: A.M.T. and Y.M.; Methodology: A.M.T., Y.A. and Y.M.; Validation: A.M.T.;
Software: A.M.T. and A.F.; Formal Analysis: A.M.T., Y.A., J.M.S, A.F. and M.L.; Investigation: A.M.T.,
Y.A., A.F. M.L., J.M.S. and R.A.; Resources: Y.M.; Data Curation: A.M.T., Y.A. and J.M.S. ; Writing –
Original Draft: A.M.T., Y.A., and Y.M.; Writing –Review & Editing: A.F., M.L., J.M.S. and R.A.;
Visualization: A.M.T., Y.A., A.F. and J.M.S.; Supervision: Y.M.; Project Administration: Y.M.; Funding
Acquisition: Y.M.

Additional files

Supplementary file 1 - The MO clones that are showing the intron retention.

Supplementary file 2 - miRNAs and their expression.

Supplementary file 3 - miRNAs and their expression for meta-analysis.

Supplementary file 4 - pre-miRNA and pri-miRNA Ct values.

Supplementary file 5 - RNA-seq.

Supplementary file 6 - In vitro binding assay band intensities.

Supplementary file 7 - Primers used in this study.

Source data legends

Figure 2 - Source data1 - Related to Figure 2 - Figure supplement 1 - This data includes the gel image
of aberrant Hyl1La splicing after different morpholinos injections.

Figure 5 - Source data 1 - **Related to Figure 5 - Figure supplement 1A -** Western blot of FLAG-
Hyl1La with anti-FLAG antibody.

Figure 5 - Source data 2 - Related to Figure 5 - Figure supplement 1A - Figure includes the image of
Western Blot Protein Ladder used as a size ruler.

Figure 5 - Source data 3 - Related to Figure 5C - Western blot of FLAG-Hyl1La after
immunoprecipitation.

Figure 5 - Source data 4 - Related to Figure 5C - Figure includes the image of Western Blot Protein
Ladder used as a size ruler.

Figure 5 - Source data 5 - Related to Figure 5 - Figure supplement 1B - Gel image of PCR amplified
pri-miRNA.

Figure 5 - Source data 6 - Related to Figure 5 - Figure supplement 1C - Gel image of PCR amplified
pre-miRNA.

Figure 6 - Source data 1 - **Related to Figure 6C -** Western blot of biotin pull-down with anti-FLAG
antibody – replicate1.

Figure 6 - Source data 2 - **Related to Figure 6C -** Figure includes the image of Western Blot Protein
Ladder used as a size ruler – replicate1.

Figure 6 - Source data 3 - **Related to Figure 6C -** Western blot of biotin pull-down with anti-FLAG
antibody – replicate2.

Figure 6 - Source data 4 - **Related to Figure 6C -** Figure includes the image of Western Blot Protein
Ladder used as a size ruler – replicate2.

Figure 6 - Source data 5 - **Related to Figure 6C -** Western blot of biotin pull-down with anti-FLAG
antibody – replicate3.

Figure 6 - Source data 6 - **Related to Figure 6C -** Figure includes the image of Western Blot Protein
Ladder used as a size ruler – replicate3.

Data availability

The RNA sequencing data were submitted to NCBI-SRA under BioProject ID PRJNA630340.

References

Achkar, N. P., Cho, S. K., Poulsen, C., Arce, A. L., Re, D. A., Giudicatti, A. J., Karayekov, E., Ryu, M. Y., Choi,
S. W., & Harholt, J. (2018). A quick HYL1-dependent reactivation of microRNA production is
required for a proper developmental response after extended periods of light deprivation.
Developmental cell, 46(2), 236-247. e236.

Admoni, Y., Kozlovski, I., Lewandowska, M., & Moran, Y. (2020). TATA Binding Protein (TBP) Promoter
Drives Ubiquitous Expression of Marker Transgene in the Adult Sea Anemone Nematostella
vectensis. *Genes, 11*(9), 1081.

Alvarez-Garcia, I., & Miska, E. A. (2005). MicroRNA functions in animal development and human disease.
Development, 132(21), 4653-4662.

Axtell, M. J., Westholm, J. O., & Lai, E. C. (2011). Vive la différence: biogenesis and evolution of
microRNAs in plants and animals. *Genome biology, 12*(4), 1-13.

Bartel, D. P. (2004). MicroRNAs: genomics, biogenesis, mechanism, and function. *Cell, 116*(2), 281-297.

Bartel, D. P. (2018). Metazoan micrornas. *Cell, 173*(1), 20-51.

Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M., & Usadel, B. (2014). Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence
data. *Bioinformatics, 30*(15), 2114-2120.

Bråte, J., Neumann, R. S., Fromm, B., Haraldsen, A. A., Tarver, J. E., Suga, H., Donoghue, P. C., Peterson,
K. J., Ruiz-Trillo, I., & Grini, P. E. (2018). Unicellular origin of the animal microRNA machinery.
Current Biology, 28(20), 3288-3295. e3285.

Chen, C., Ridzon, D. A., Broomer, A. J., Zhou, Z., Lee, D. H., Nguyen, J. T., Barbisin, M., Xu, N. L.,
Mahuvakar, V. R., & Andersen, M. R. (2005). Real-time quantification of microRNAs by stem–
loop RT–PCR. *Nucleic acids research, 33*(20), e179-e179.

Curtin, S. J., Watson, J. M., Smith, N. A., Eamens, A. L., Blanchard, C. L., & Waterhouse, P. M. (2008). The
roles of plant dsRNA-binding proteins in RNAi-like pathways. *FEBS letters, 582*(18), 2753-2760.

Dang, Y., Yang, Q., Xue, Z., & Liu, Y. (2011). RNA interference in fungi: pathways, functions, and
applications. *Eukaryotic cell, 10*(9), 1148-1155.

Dias, R., Manny, A., Kolaczkowski, O., & Kolaczkowski, B. (2017). Convergence of domain architecture,
structure, and ligand affinity in animal and plant RNA-binding proteins. *Molecular biology and
evolution, 34*(6), 1429-1444.

Dobin, A., Davis, C. A., Schlesinger, F., Drenkow, J., Zaleski, C., Jha, S., Batut, P., Chaisson, M., & Gingeras,
T. R. (2013). STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics, 29*(1), 15-21.

Dong, Z., Han, M.-H., & Fedoroff, N. (2008). The RNA-binding proteins HYL1 and SE promote accurate in
vitro processing of pri-miRNA by DCL1. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,*
105(29), 9970-9975.

Fridrich, A., Modepalli, V., Lewandowska, M., Aharoni, R., & Moran, Y. (2020). Unravelling the
developmental and functional significance of an ancient Argonaute duplication. *Nature*
communications, 11(1), 1-12.

Friedländer, M. R., Mackowiak, S. D., Li, N., Chen, W., & Rajewsky, N. (2012). miRDeep2 accurately
identifies known and hundreds of novel microRNA genes in seven animal clades. *Nucleic acids*
research, 40(1), 37-52.

Fukunaga, R., Han, B. W., Hung, J.-H., Xu, J., Weng, Z., & Zamore, P. D. (2012). Dicer partner proteins
tune the length of mature miRNAs in flies and mammals. *Cell, 151*(3), 533-546.

Genikhovich, G., & Technau, U. (2009). Induction of spawning in the starlet sea anemone Nematostella
vectensis, in vitro fertilization of gametes, and dejellying of zygotes. *Cold Spring Harbor*
Protocols, 2009(9), pdb. prot5281.

Han, J., Lee, Y., Yeom, K.-H., Kim, Y.-K., Jin, H., & Kim, V. N. (2004). The Drosha-DGCR8 complex in
primary microRNA processing. *Genes & development, 18*(24), 3016-3027.

Han, M.-H., Goud, S., Song, L., & Fedoroff, N. (2004). The Arabidopsis double-stranded RNA-binding
protein HYL1 plays a role in microRNA-mediated gene regulation. *Proceedings of the National*
Academy of Sciences, 101(4), 1093-1098.

He, S., Del Viso, F., Chen, C.-Y., Ikmi, A., Kroesen, A. E., & Gibson, M. C. (2018). An axial Hox code
controls tissue segmentation and body patterning in Nematostella vectensis. *Science, 361*(6409),
1377-1380.

Hutvagner, G., & Simard, M. J. (2008). Argonaute proteins: key players in RNA silencing. *Nature reviews*
Molecular cell biology, 9(1), 22-32.

Karabulut, A., He, S., Chen, C.-Y., McKinney, S. A., & Gibson, M. C. (2019). Electroporation of short
hairpin RNAs for rapid and efficient gene knockdown in the starlet sea anemone, Nematostella
vectensis. *Developmental biology, 448*(1), 7-15.

Kim, J. H., Lee, S.-R., Li, L.-H., Park, H.-J., Park, J.-H., Lee, K. Y., Kim, M.-K., Shin, B. A., & Choi, S.-Y. (2011).
High cleavage efficiency of a 2A peptide derived from porcine teschovirus-1 in human cell lines,
zebrafish and mice. *PloS one, 6*(4), e18556.

Kim, V. N., Han, J., & Siomi, M. C. (2009). Biogenesis of small RNAs in animals. *Nature reviews Molecular*
cell biology, 10(2), 126-139.

Koscianska, E., Starega-Roslan, J., & Krzyzosiak, W. J. (2011). The role of Dicer protein partners in the
processing of microRNA precursors. *PloS one, 6*(12).

Langmead, B., Trapnell, C., Pop, M., & Salzberg, S. L. (2009). Ultrafast and memory-efficient alignment of
short DNA sequences to the human genome. *Genome biology, 10*(3), 1-10.

Lee, H. Y., & Doudna, J. A. (2012). TRBP alters human precursor microRNA processing in vitro. *Rna,*
18(11).

Lewandowska, M., Sharoni, T., Admoni, Y., Aharoni, R., & Moran, Y. (2021). Functional characterization
of the cnidarian antiviral immune response reveals ancestral complexity. *Molecular biology and*
evolution, 38(10), 4546-4561.

Li, B., & Dewey, C. N. (2011). RSEM: accurate transcript quantification from RNA-Seq data with or
without a reference genome. *BMC bioinformatics, 12*(1), 1-16.

Liao, Y., Smyth, G. K., & Shi, W. (2014). featureCounts: an efficient general purpose program for
assigning sequence reads to genomic features. *Bioinformatics, 30*(7), 923-930.

Livak, K. J., & Schmittgen, T. D. (2001). Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time
quantitative PCR and the 2− ΔΔCT method. *methods, 25*(4), 402-408.

Lorenz, R., Bernhart, S. H., Höner zu Siederdissen, C., Tafer, H., Flamm, C., Stadler, P. F., & Hofacker, I. L.
(2011). ViennaRNA Package 2.0. *Algorithms for molecular biology, 6*(1), 1-14.

Martin, M. (2011). Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads.
EMBnet. journal, 17(1), 10-12.

Maxwell, E. K., Ryan, J. F., Schnitzler, C. E., Browne, W. E., & Baxevanis, A. D. (2012). MicroRNAs and
essential components of the microRNA processing machinery are not encoded in the genome of
the ctenophore Mnemiopsis leidyi. *BMC genomics, 13*(1), 1-11.

Modepalli, V., Fridrich, A., Agron, M., & Moran, Y. (2018). The methyltransferase HEN1 is required in
Nematostella vectensis for microRNA and piRNA stability as well as larval metamorphosis. *PLoS*
genetics, 14(8), e1007590.

Moran, Y., Agron, M., Praher, D., & Technau, U. (2017). The evolutionary origin of plant and animal
microRNAs. *Nature ecology & evolution, 1*(3), 1-8.

Moran, Y., Fredman, D., Praher, D., Li, X. Z., Wee, L. M., Rentzsch, F., Zamore, P. D., Technau, U., & Seitz,
H. (2014). Cnidarian microRNAs frequently regulate targets by cleavage. *Genome research,*
24(4), 651-663.

Moran, Y., Praher, D., Fredman, D., & Technau, U. (2013). The evolution of microRNA pathway protein
components in Cnidaria. *Molecular biology and evolution, 30*(12), 2541-2552.

Pélissier, T., Clavel, M., Chaparro, C., Pouch-Pélissier, M.-N., Vaucheret, H., & Deragon, J.-M. (2011).
Double-stranded RNA binding proteins DRB2 and DRB4 have an antagonistic impact on
polymerase IV-dependent siRNA levels in Arabidopsis. *Rna, 17*(8), 1502-1510.

Praher, D., Zimmermann, B., Genikhovich, G., Columbus-Shenkar, Y., Modepalli, V., Aharoni, R., Moran,
Y., & Technau, U. (2017). Characterization of the piRNA pathway during development of the sea
anemone Nematostella vectensis. *RNA biology, 14*(12), 1727-1741.

Raja, P., Jackel, J. N., Li, S., Heard, I. M., & Bisaro, D. M. (2014). Arabidopsis double-stranded RNA binding
protein DRB3 participates in methylation-mediated defense against geminiviruses. *Journal of*
virology, 88(5), 2611-2622.

Redfern, A. D., Colley, S. M., Beveridge, D. J., Ikeda, N., Epis, M. R., Li, X., Foulds, C. E., Stuart, L. M.,
Barker, A., & Russell, V. J. (2013). RNA-induced silencing complex (RISC) Proteins PACT, TRBP,
and Dicer are SRA binding nuclear receptor coregulators. *Proceedings of the National Academy*
of Sciences, 110(16), 6536-6541.

Robinson, M. D., & Oshlack, A. (2010). A scaling normalization method for differential expression
analysis of RNA-seq data. *Genome biology, 11*(3), 1-9.

Saito, K., Ishizuka, A., Siomi, H., & Siomi, M. C. (2005). Processing of pre-microRNAs by the Dicer-1–
Loquacious complex in Drosophila cells. *PLoS biology, 3*(7).

Schauer, S. E., Jacobsen, S. E., Meinke, D. W., & Ray, A. (2002). DICER-LIKE1: blind men and elephants in
Arabidopsis development. *Trends in plant science, 7*(11), 487-491.

Schmittgen, T. D., Lee, E. J., Jiang, J., Sarkar, A., Yang, L., Elton, T. S., & Chen, C. (2008). Real-time PCR
quantification of precursor and mature microRNA. *methods, 44*(1), 31-38.

Schwaiger, M., Schönauer, A., Rendeiro, A. F., Pribitzer, C., Schauer, A., Gilles, A. F., Schinko, J. B., Renfer,
E., Fredman, D., & Technau, U. (2014). Evolutionary conservation of the eumetazoan gene
regulatory landscape. *Genome research, 24*(4), 639-650.

758
759 Shaner, N. C., Lin, M. Z., McKeown, M. R., Steinbach, P. A., Hazelwood, K. L., Davidson, M. W., & Tsien, R.
760   Y. (2008). Improving the photostability of bright monomeric orange and red fluorescent
761   proteins. *Nature methods, 5*(6), 545.

762
763 Song, L., Han, M.-H., Lesicka, J., & Fedoroff, N. (2007). Arabidopsis primary microRNA processing
764   proteins HYL1 and DCL1 define a nuclear body distinct from the Cajal body. *Proceedings of the*
765   *National Academy of Sciences, 104*(13), 5437-5442.

766
767 Stocks, M. B., Moxon, S., Mapleson, D., Woolfenden, H. C., Mohorianu, I., Folkes, L., Schwach, F.,
768   Dalmay, T., & Moulton, V. (2012). The UEA sRNA workbench: a suite of tools for analysing and
769   visualizing next generation sequencing microRNA and small RNA datasets. *Bioinformatics,*
770   *28*(15), 2059-2061.

771
772 Szarzynska, B., Sobkowiak, L., Pant, B. D., Balazadeh, S., Scheible, W.-R., Mueller-Roeber, B.,
773   Jarmolowski, A., & Szweykowska-Kulinska, Z. (2009). Gene structures and processing of
774   Arabidopsis thaliana HYL1-dependent pri-miRNAs. *Nucleic acids research, 37*(9), 3083-3093.

775
776 Tagami, Y., Motose, H., & Watanabe, Y. (2009). A dominant mutation in DCL1 suppresses the hyl1
777   mutant phenotype by promoting the processing of miRNA. *Rna, 15*(3), 450-458.

778
779 Tarver, J. E., Donoghue, P. C., & Peterson, K. J. (2012). Do miRNAs have a deep evolutionary history?
780   *Bioessays, 34*(10), 857-866.

781
782 Valli, A. A., Santos, B. A., Hnatova, S., Bassett, A. R., Molnar, A., Chung, B. Y., & Baulcombe, D. C. (2016).
783   Most microRNAs in the single-cell alga Chlamydomonas reinhardtii are produced by Dicer-like 3-
784   mediated cleavage of introns and untranslated regions of coding RNAs. *Genome research, 26*(4),
785   519-529.

786
787 Varkonyi-Gasic, E., Wu, R., Wood, M., Walton, E. F., & Hellens, R. P. (2007). Protocol: a highly sensitive
788   RT-PCR method for detection and quantification of microRNAs. *Plant methods, 3*(1), 12.

789
790 Voinnet, O. (2009). Origin, biogenesis, and activity of plant microRNAs. *Cell, 136*(4), 669-687.

791
792 Wu, F., Yu, L., Cao, W., Mao, Y., Liu, Z., & He, Y. (2007). The N-terminal double-stranded RNA binding
793   domains of Arabidopsis HYPONASTIC LEAVES1 are sufficient for pre-microRNA processing. *The*
794   *Plant Cell, 19*(3), 914-925.

795
796 Yamasaki, T., Onishi, M., Kim, E.-J., Cerutti, H., & Ohama, T. (2016). RNA-binding protein DUS16 plays an
797 essential role in primary miRNA processing in the unicellular alga Chlamydomonas reinhardtii.
798 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113*(38), 10720-10725.

799
800 Zhong, J., Peters, A. H., Lee, K., & Braun, R. E. (1999). A double-stranded RNA binding protein required
801 for activation of repressed messages in mammalian germ cells. *Nature genetics, 22*(2), 171-174.

Figure 1. Schematic representation of a phylogenetic tree of Eukaryotes at the phylum level

(A) Phylogenetic tree representing the presence (green circles) and absence (open circles) of miRNAs, Dicer and Dicer interacting proteins in different plant and animal phyla. The names of representatives of different phyla are given in brackets. The names of Dicer interacting proteins are given near the green circles.

(B) Domain structure of different Dicer interacting proteins predicted by using the Pfam (https://pfam.xfam.org/). NCBI gene ID is shown in brackets.

Figure 2. Developmental defects in different morphants of Hyl1La

(A) Schematic representation of the Hyl1La gene showing the intron-exon junction as defined by comparing the transcript (NCBI Accession KF192067.1) to the *Nematostella vectensis* genome. The positions targeted by different morpholinos used in the study are shown by red symbols. The black arrows represent the position of primers designed for the validation of splicing morpholino.

(B-D) Images of 9 dpf animals showing similar developmental defects in different morphants.

(E) Images of 10 dpf Dicer1 morphants showing similar developmental defects to Hyl1La morphants.

Scale bars are 500 μm.

(F) Bar chart representing percentage of developed and undeveloped animals for each of the morphants.

More than 80% of Hyl1La depleted animals did not develop into the primary polyp stage after 9 dpf. Data

was taken in triplicates, in each n=200, ***P<0.001 (Student's t-test).

(G) Principal component analysis (PCA) plot of the miRNA expression following the knockdown of

miRNA biogenesis components: Hyl1La, HEN1, Dicer2, AGO1 and AGO2. Morphants are in blue and

control in orange, different symbols represent different miRNA biogenesis components and their

respective controls from the same experiment.

Figure 2 - figure supplement 1. Gel image showing aberrant splicing of Hyl1La. cDNAs were amplified by using two different primer sets for different morpholinos (Hy1La SI MO1 and Hyl1La SI MO2). The control morpholino lane showed the band of spliced Hyl1La while the Hyl1La SI morpholino lane showed the band of size equivalent for intron retention. The genomic DNA was amplified by using the same primer pairs to check the size and primer efficiency (Figure 2 – source data 1).

Figure 3. Hyl1La morphants show reduced expression of miRNAs

(A) Average read length distribution of small RNA reads after adapter removal.

(B) Scatter plot representing normalized read counts of miRNAs in control and treated animals. Each dot represents the average expression of an individual miRNA. The miRNAs showing a depletion greater than two-fold are indicated in green. The axes are scaled to Log_{10} of normalized read counts. The data represents the mean of three independent biological replicates.

(C) Box plot showing the average of abundance of miRNA read counts in Hyl1La SI MO1 and control MO. A significant reduction of miRNA read counts is noted in Hyl1La SI MO1, (P < 0.0001, Wilcoxon signed-rank test). The data represents the mean of three independent biological replicates ± SD.

(D) Bar plot showing the expression of miR-2022, miR-2025, miR-2026, miR-2027 and miR-2028 as quantified using stem-loop PCR in translation blocking (TB) and control morpholino. The data represents the mean of three independent biological replicates ± SD. ***P< 0.001, ** P ≤ 0.01. * P ≤ 0.05, (Student's t-test), n.s (not significant).

Figure 3 - figure supplement 1. Effect of Hyl1La depletion on miRNA expression.

The expression of miR-2022, miR-2025, miR-2026, miR-2027 and miR-2028 was checked by using the stem-loop PCR between the Hyl1La SI MO1 vs. Control MO and Hyl1La SI MO2 vs. Control MO. The data represents the mean of four independent biological replicates ± SD. ***$P<0.001$, ** $P \leq 0.01$. * $P \leq 0.05$, (Student's t-test), n.s (not significant).

Figure 3 - figure supplement 2. Effect of Hyl1La depletion on siRNA and piRNA expression.

(A) Box plot showing the average of abundance of siRNA read counts in Hyl1La SI MO1 and control MO. A significant slight reduction of siRNA read counts is noted in Hyl1La SI MO1, ($P < 0.00001$, Wilcoxon signed-rank test). The data represents the mean of three independent biological replicates ± SD.

(B) Scatter plot representing normalized read counts of siRNAs in control and treated animals. Each dot represents the average expression of an individual siRNA. The siRNAs showing a depletion greater than two-fold are indicated in green. The axes are scaled to Log_{10} of normalized read counts. The data represents the mean of three independent biological replicates.

(C) Box plot showing the average of abundance of piRNA read counts in Hyl1La SI MO1 and control MO. A significant upregulation of piRNA read counts is noted in Hyl1La SI MO1, ($P < 0.00001$, Wilcoxon signed-rank test). The data represents the mean of three independent biological replicates ± SD.

(D) Scatter plot representing normalized read counts of piRNAs in control and treated animals. Each dot represents the average expression of an individual piRNA. The piRNAs showing an upregulation greater than two-fold are indicated in green. The axes are scaled to Log_{10} of normalized read counts. The data represents the mean of three independent biological replicates.

Figure 4. Structure of shRNA precursors and their effect on Hyl1La expression

(A-C) Structure of different shRNAs designed from different positions of Hyl1La gene along with GC content and their position are shown. In the shRNA sequence, the red color shows the nucleotides edited for mismatch and blue color represents loop region. The red colored nucleotides on precursor's structure indicate the small RNA derived from the shRNAs.

(D) Real time quantification of Hyl1La from animals injected with different shRNAs relative to control. The data represents the mean of three independent biological replicates ± SD.

(E) Quantification of small RNAs produced from Hyl1La shRNA1. The quantification was performed by using stem-loop qRT-PCR.

Figure 5. RNA Immunoprecipitation (RIP) and qRT-PCR

(A) Schematic representation of the FLAG-Hyl1La construct with a TBP promoter, a self-cleaving P2A sequence, a memOrange2 gene and the polyadenylation signal SV40.

(B) The plasmid-injected and uninjected embryos were visualized under a florescence microscope after two days. The injected embryos were showing the expression of memOrange2 (right side).

(C) Immunoprecipitation of 3×FLAG-Hyl1La with mouse anti-FLAG antibody or whole mouse IgG by using Protein G Magnetic Beads. The input and IP samples were subjected to Western blot with mouse anti-FLAG antibody. The red arrow (110 kDa) indicates the 3×FLAG-Hyl1La (Figure 5 - source data 3 and 4).

(D) pre-miRNA expression of eight different miRNAs were measured using the qRT-PCR. The Y-axis represents the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ values of three independent biological replicates. ***P<0.001, **P ≤ 0.01. *P ≤ 0.05, (Student's t-test).

**Figure 5 - figure supplement 1. RNA Immunoprecipitation (RIP) and PCR (Related to Figure 5B-
D)**

(A) Western blot of 3×FLAG-Hyl1La with mouse anti-FLAG antibody. (Figure 5 - source data 1 and 2)
Gel image showing RT-PCR amplified (B) pri-miRNA (primary miRNA) and (C) pre-miRNA (precursor
miRNA) transcripts. The pri- and pre-miRNA were amplified with their specific primers from RNA
isolated from samples immunoprecipitated with mouse anti-FLAG antibody (Hyl1La IP)/whole mouse
IgG (IgG IP). The red arrow indicates the expected product size. Ubiquitin was taken as control
housekeeping gene (HKG). (Figure 5 - source data 5 and 6)

943 **Figure 5 - figure supplement 2. Position of primers on pre-miRNA**

944 The secondary structure of miRNA precursors used in this study for identification of functional
945 interaction with Hyl1La. The green arrow indicates the primer positions used for pre-miRNA
946 quantification. The blue box represents position of miRNA/miRNA* duplex.

>nve-mir-2022
AGCGTGGGGATGCAGACAGATAATCTCGGGATGAGTTCGCCTGAATGATCAAGATGAGTTC
GCCTGAAAGTCGGGATGAGATCGCCTGAGAGTCGGGATAAGATCGCCTGAAAGTCGGGATA
AATCAACTGTCAAGTGGTTGTCATTTGCTAGTTGCTTTTGTCCCGCCTTTTCTGCGAATTGAT
CACGTGATGTGACGTCATCACTGCCCAATTACAAATGCTGCAATATATTGAGGTACGTAAAC
GTTAGATGTTGCGCATATACCTCATACG

>nve-mir-2023
GACTAGCTCAGTGGATCGACTAATTGGGGAATGGGCTATAGAAGACGACGATTACTATCAA
AATAGCTCAGTGGGCCAAGTACTGGAGACCAGACGAGAAGAGTTGCGTGACATACCTGTGT
CTGCCACCTGTATTTCTATCACGTCAGATGAAAGAAGTACAAGTGGTAGGGAAGGGTGTGTC
GATTGACAATGGCGGCTTATCAAGACACGACCAATGTTGTAAGGGAGGAGGTAGATATACA
AGAATGCAGCAGAAATAGTTTACAAGCTTCGAGGTAAGGGAGGGAGTA

>nve-mir-2024a

CAAGAGCGATCGAGCACACGTGAGTCAGAATATTGCTTATGTTCTATAAGTATTCCTGGTAA
TTTTGAGGAGGCGATGTAACTCTACCAACAAGTGCTACTGCTTCAAAATATCGGTGTTGGGT
AAAAGGTCACATTT**TACACAGTACCGATATTGTGA**AGCACGTTTGCTTAGGAACTAGGATA
CAACGAGGAGGCAAATTAAAGCTACCAACAAGCGCTGTAACTCCACACGAAGACAGGTAAC
GAGAGAAATCAAGCCCG

>nve-mir-2025
GTAAAAGCATGTATGTGTTTTAACGCTAGTGCAGTAGCAAAACTACAACCGGGAGTGGAGA
CCCAAAAGGCGTTCATGTCGACACAGCAAGAATATGATCAACAATTAGGCCACATACAAAG
CTTTCGATGGCTAGAAAATCCTTAGTGATTTTTTAGCCCGCGGAAGTTGTGTTGCCTGGCCAA
TATTACCATTAGGGTGAAGGCAATGATCAAGACGAGGTTGTACTGGAAGACGCGAAGGCTG
TTTATTTATATTACAGTATAAGGGTAAGAAACATCGGTTACTTTGAAGG

>nve-mir-2027
CCTTGGAATCTCTCAGCTTCAAGAGCAGCAGCAAGCCCCTAGTAATTGATGTATTCAGTTTG
TTTTCAAACAAGATAGAGCTGCACACCTCAGATCTTTCAATCCGAGAGCCTTAAGGCTT**GCT
TGTTGGT**AATTTTGCAT**C**TGTTGCACATGCGATTTTACCAAAATGCAATTCTTATGGTTCAG
TGATCAGGAACCCAATAACTGCAGCACAGTTGTCTGATATCGGTGCATGAAACTGATAGTCA
CTACAGTTTTTAAATTCATCTAATATAATAACTTCCAAGGGCTTATTT

Figure 5 - figure supplement 3. Position of pre- and pri-miRNA primers on probable sequence of pri-miRNA

The probable sequence of pri-miRNA taken from the *Nematostella* genome browser (https://simrbase.stowers.org/). The underlined sequences represent the pre-miRNA. The sequences with purple and green color represents primer position for pri- and pre-miRNA, respectively.

Figure 5 - figure supplement 4. RNA-seq of RNA Immunoprecipitation (RIP)

(A) Immunoprecipitation RNA sequencing of FLAG-Hyl1La. Read-counts mapped to the *Nematostella* genome were log2 and trimmed mean of m (TMM) normalized. A combination of coding (mRNA), non-coding RNA (rRNA, snoRNA, tRNA) and repetitive elements were quantified for both FLAG-Hyl1La and IgG. Error bars correspond to standard deviation among replicates (n=4). All comparisons were not significant (Student's t-test).

(B) Representation of size distribution of libraries generated from RIP samples, validated with TapeStation system (Agilent, USA).

A

Synthetic pre-miRNA

GCCCTGACGCTGAAACCTATGGTTGTCATATGTTTCAGGTTCAGGGCGA

B

Shuffled synthetic pre-miRNA

GCGGAGACTCCAGTTCGTCGCGAGGGCTTCATTAACTTAGAAGTTTCTG

C

D

Figure 6 – In vitro binding assay

(A) The sequence and secondary structure of biotin-labeled synthetic pre-miRNA used for in vitro binding assay.

(B) The sequence and secondary structure of biotin-labeled shuffled synthetic pre-miRNA used as negative control for in vitro binding assay.

(C) Pull-down of biotin labeled synthetic pre-miRNA and shuffled pre-miRNA negative control using streptavidin magnetic beads. The pull-down samples were subjected to Western blot with mouse anti-FLAG antibody (Figure 6 – source data 1-6).

(D) Relative intensity of Western blot bands with mouse anti-FLAG antibody, showing pull-down of biotin labeled synthetic pre-miRNA and shuffled pre-miRNA negative control. Error bars correspond to standard deviation among replicates (n=3). **$P \leq 0.01$ (Student's t-test).

1011

1012

1013

1014