The *in vivo* RNA structurome of the malaria parasite

***Plasmodium falciparum,* a protozoan with an A/T-rich**

transcriptome

Dumetz, F[1↑±], Enright, AJ[1↑], Zhao, J[2], Kwok CK[2-3*], Merrick, CJ[1*]

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Pathology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 1QP, UK

[2] Department of Chemistry and State Key Laboratory of Marine Pollution, City

University of Hong Kong, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong SAR, China

[3] Shenzhen Research Institute of City University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

[↑] The first 2 authors should be regarded as joint first authors

*To whom correspondence should be addressed

ckkwok42@cityu.edu.hk (CKK)

c.merrick@keele.ac.uk (CJM)

[±] Present address: Institute for Genome Sciences, University of Maryland School of

Medicine, Baltimore, 21201, Maryland, USA

KEYWORDS

Malaria, *Plasmodium falciparum*, RNA, Structurome, NAI, Structure-seq.

ABSTRACT

Plasmodium falciparum, a protozoan parasite and causative agent of human malaria,

has one of the most A/T-biased genomes sequenced to date. This may give the

genome and the transcriptome unusual structural features. Recent progress in

sequencing techniques has made it possible to study the secondary structures of

RNA molecules at the transcriptomic level. Thus, in this study we produced the *in*

vivo RNA structurome of a protozoan parasite with a highly A/U-biased

transcriptome. We showed that it is possible to probe the secondary structures of *P.*

falciparum RNA molecules *in vivo* using two different chemical probes, and obtained

structures for more than half of all transcripts in the transcriptome. These showed

greater stability (lower free energy) than the same structures modelled *in silico,* and

structural features appeared to influence translation efficiency and RNA decay.

Finally, we compared the *P. falciparum* RNA structurome with the predicted RNA

structurome of an A/T-balanced species, *P. knowlesi,* finding a bias towards lower

overall transcript stability and more hairpins and multi-stem loops in *P. falciparum*.

This unusual protozoan RNA structurome will provide a basis for similar studies in

other protozoans and also in other unusual genomes.

INTRODUCTION

RNA molecules, composed of single strands of four different ribonucleotides, do not

adopt a single canonical structure like the double helix of DNA; instead they can fold

into complex secondary structures made of loops, hairpins and bulges (Mathews et

al. 1999). They serve a variety of roles in the cell (Sharp 2009; Cech and Steitz

2014), including structural roles carried out by transfer and ribosomal RNAs (tRNAs,

rRNAs) and protein coding roles for messenger RNAs (mRNAs). These roles are

facilitated by the ability of RNA molecules to adopt, and transition between, highly

specific secondary structures (Wan et al. 2011; Vandivier et al. 2016). Different

secondary structures can impact on the location of the RNA molecules, their

metabolism and stability (Sun et al. 2019), their interaction with RNA binding proteins

(Casas-Vila et al. 2020), their function and their regulation of protein expression. Two

outstanding examples of this are the function-related shape of tRNA (Hasler and

Meister 2016) and the translation expression controlling element, the Riboswitch

(Wachter 2010).

One of the common strategies to investigate RNA structures *in vivo* is

Selective 2′-Hydroxyl Acylation analyzed by Primer Extension (SHAPE) (Wilkinson et

al. 2006). SHAPE uses chemicals that modify the 2' hydroxyl group of flexible

nucleotides, in which the 2' O-adduct will inhibit reverse transcription during cDNA

synthesis (Spitale et al. 2013). The pattern of stalling is then detected on a

sequencing gel, which determines the identity of all unpaired/flexible bases in the

RNA, and hence allows its secondary structure to be inferred. The technicalities of

SHAPE only permit the analysis of one transcript at the time, requiring a high amount

of starting RNA and potentially more than one sequencing gel to analyse larger

transcripts. All these technical limitations rendered impossible the transcriptome-

wide study of RNA structures, which is referred to as a structurome (Westhof and

Romby 2010). However, the advent of Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) and bio-

informatics revolutionised the field of RNA structure and within the past decade,

Structure-seq (Ding et al. 2014), and many other related methods (Kwok et al. 2015;

Zhao et al. 2019; Rouskin et al. 2014), were developed.

To date, only a few *in vivo* structuromes are available. Many viruses have

been studied, probably due to their small number of RNA molecules, such as HIV

(Watts et al. 2009; Tomezsko et al. 2020), DENV and ZIKV (Li et al. 2018; Huber et

al. 2019), influenza (Simon et al. 2019) and more recently SARS-CoV-2

(Manfredonia et al. 2020; Sun et al. 2021; Ziv et al. 2020; Huston et al. 2021; Ling

Yang et al. 2021; Tammy C. T. Lan, Matthew F. Allan, Lauren E. Malsick, Stuti

Khandwala, Sherry S. Y. Nyeo, Yu Sun, Junjie U. Guo, Mark Bathe, Anthony Griffiths

et al. 2021). Regarding eukaryotes, structuromes were established for model

organisms like the plants *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Ding et al. 2014) and *Oryza sativa*

(rice) (Deng et al. 2018), the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Rouskin et al. 2014),

the bacteria *Escherichia coli* (Guo and Bartel 2016) and amongst mammals, mouse

embryonic stem cells (Incarnato et al. 2014; Guo and Bartel 2016) and human cell

lines (Sun et al. 2019; Rouskin et al. 2014; Wu and Bartel 2017; Guo and Bartel

2016). These have revealed fundamental conserved features across the landscape

of RNA structures.

In this paper we have established the *in vivo* structurome of a protozoan,

Plasmodium falciparum. *P. falciparum* is one of the etiological agents of malaria, the

most widely lethal human parasitic disease in the world (WHO 2018). Little is known

about RNA structures in *P. falciparum*, yet the parasites offer many opportunities to

understand the roles of RNA structures in eukaryotic cells. Firstly, the natural life

cycle of the parasite oscillates from a warm-blooded host to an insect vector,

meaning that the same organism is exposed to very different temperatures and

metabolic environments. This allows the study in natural conditions of the effect of

the environment and temperature upon the RNA structurome. Indeed, it has been

shown that heat stress can affect the structuromes of plants (Su et al. 2018) and

bacteria (Righetti et al. 2016; Twittenhoff et al. 2020), which can likewise experience

temperature extremes in nature. Furthermore, one intriguing piece of evidence

concerning rRNAs suggests that temperature-responsive RNA structures are also

important in *Plasmodium* life cycles. *Plasmodium* does not encode rRNAs in

conventional tandem arrays, but rather in several isolated units which are transcribed

independently in either mosquito stages (S-type) or mammalian stages (A-type)

(Waters et al. 1989; Gunderson et al. 1987). rRNA transcription apparently switches

in response to differential temperature and nutrient availability in the two hosts (Fang

and McCutchan 2002; Fang et al. 2004). The two types of rRNA were predicted,

based on their sequences, to have different structures (John Rogers et al. 1996) and

they do perform differently when complemented into *S. cerevisiae* (Velichutina et al.

1998), so there is clear potential for them to influence translation in insects versus

humans. Thus, *Plasmodium* may have evolved variant RNA structures as a key

element in its life cycle transitions.

Secondly, while all the previously cited organisms have a more balanced ratio

of A/T and G/C in their genomes, *P. falciparum* is 80.6% A/T-rich (Gardner et al.

2002): one of the most biased genome compositions ever to be sequenced. This

offers a critical point of view when studying genome evolution, and it may well lead to

unusual RNA structures.

This RNA structurome of *P. falciparum* sets out intends to investigate the

relationship between RNA shapes and genome composition, as well as transcription

efficiency, in the asexual erythrocytic cycle of this important human parasite.

RESULTS

Assessment of NAI and DMS as RNA structure probing chemicals for *P.*

***falciparum* inside the erythrocyte host cell.**

We conducted *in vivo* structure-seq on *Plasmodium falciparum*: an organism with a

>80% AT-rich genome, and one that lives entirely inside another host cell. It was

necessary first to test and optimise the parameters for *in vivo* RNA probing in this

unusual organism. We used two different probing agents with different nucleotide

reactivity: NAI (2-methylnicotinic acid imidazolide) and DMS (dimethyl sulfate). NAI

reacts with all four unpaired nucleotides while DMS selectively reacts with unpaired

adenosine and cytosine. Neither of these chemicals had been used in *P. falciparum*

before. In order to check if the chemicals could penetrate inside the parasite inside

the host erythrocyte, we exposed an asynchronous culture of *P. falciparum* to NAI or

DMS. After RNA extraction we performed a primer extension with a Cy5-conjugated

primer targeting the 5.8S rRNA transcript. When a nucleotide has been modified by

one of the chemicals, meaning that the nucleotide is unpaired, the reverse

transcriptase will stall one nucleotide beforehand, stopping the elongation reaction

(Fig. 1A). This can be seen on a denaturing polyacrylamide sequencing gel (Fig. 1B,

Supplemental Fig. 1). Reading the sequence confirmed that it was identical to the

PF3D7_0531800 gene sequence available on PlasmoDB (Aurrecoechea et al.

2009). In NAI and DMS probed parasites, base reactivity was seen with all four

nucleotides after NAI-probing, and with only adenosine and cytosine after DMS-

probing. (Modification of adenosine and cytosine was not, however, identical at all

positions with DMS and NAI, because these chemical probes react with different

moieties of the RNA nucleotides, and with different efficiencies.) This indicated that

both chemicals could penetrate into *P. falciparum*, and our probing strategy could

investigate the RNA structures in *P. falciparum*.

To prepare the structurome, we then extracted the total RNA from two

independent asynchronous parasite cultures treated with NAI, DMS, or DMSO only,

as in figure 1, and used poly(T) magnetic beads to enrich poly(A) RNA. The enriched

poly(A) fraction represented 2-3.4% of the total RNA, which is commensurate with

the literature for eukaryotic cells (Westermann et al. 2012). The enriched fractions

were then used to generate NGS libraries (Fig. 2A). The sequencing outputs were

processed using *StructureFold2* and *RNAStructure* for experimental reactivity

constrained folding (Ritchey et al. 2017) to determine the secondary structure of the

RNA molecules. Each replicate for each chemical treatment was analysed

separately. After preliminary analysis, because the distribution of structure

differences between replicates was marginal and the correlation between replicates

and pooled samples was good (Supplemental Fig. 2), reads from both replicates

were merged for subsequent analysis. To ensure structure calls of a high quality,

mappings were filtered such that there were no more than 3 mismatches/indels from

the reference and the first 5' base was matching. Coverage filtering also required

transcripts with complete coverage between samples (i.e. meeting the

StructureFold2 default filtering threshold of an average coverage >1.0 per nucleotide

throughout the transcript (Supplemental Fig. 3). Structural information was more

comprehensive (and agreement between replicates was also better), for the NAI-

probed datasets because all four unpaired nucleotides were detected. Subsequent

analysis was therefore focused on the NAI dataset as the primary *in vivo*

structurome.

Structure of the NAI-probed dataset

After filtering for low-coverage genes, the NAI structurome covered 51.23% of the

total transcriptome of *P. falciparum* (2699 transcripts detected out of 5268 total). We

first looked at the representation of the various families of RNA molecules. Within our

dataset 95.5% of the transcripts were protein coding transcripts, 1.27%

corresponded to mitochondrial transcripts (1.16% mitochondrial rRNA, 0.11%

mitochondrial mRNA) and 0.94% were uncharacterised non-protein coding

transcripts. Other types of non-coding RNA were also detected, 1.31% of snoRNA,

0.19% of snRNA and 0.34% of tRNA (Fig. 2B). Within the protein coding transcripts,

nine were encoded in the apicoplast, a subcellular organelle that is unique to

apicomplexans and represents a relic chloroplast (Supplemental table 1).

As well as the different families of transcripts, we detected 114 transcripts with

splice variants (Supplemental table 2). However, since we used a short-read

technology to sequence the library, it was impossible to associate all the reads within

a variant transcript to one variant. Nevertheless, this overall analysis indicates that

our *in vivo* chemical probing, RNA extraction and polyA selection were robust

because all the different RNA families in *P. falciparum* were detected, with a strong

bias towards mRNAs, and if a long-read sequencing technique had been used, even

the detection of transcript variants would likely have been possible.

Some RNA families have their function dictated by their structure. This is

especially the case of tRNA. Within our dataset 9 tRNAs were identified. Using

RNAStructure we were able to call their structures and 5 were similar to canonical

eukaryotic tRNA molecules. Those tRNAs were for glutamic acid (PF3D7_0411600,

PF3D7_0527700), methionine (PF3D7_1339100), asparagine (PF3D7_0714700),

alanine (PF3D7_0620800) and proline (PF3D7_1339200) (Fig. 2C). In the other 3

tRNAs, for valine (PF3D7_0312600), serine (PF3D7_0410100) and leucine

(PF3D7_0620900), the lowest-free-energy structures predicted by *RNAStructure*

were not canonical (Supplemental Fig. 4). For some but not all of these, alternative

folding with less favourable energy produced canonical structures, albeit less

compatible with the data defining free/flexible bases (e.g. Supplemental Fig. 4A). It

is theoretically possible that dynamic structural variants of some tRNAs exist *in vivo*,

although it is unclear why some tRNAs would differ from others in the dataset.

Importantly, however, tRNA structure is also dependent on nucleotide base

modification such as m^2A, m^2G, pseudouridine, etc. [46]. Those modifications have

not been assessed in this study, but it is possible that they would influence the

apparently-noncanonical tRNA structures.

In general, opportunities to 'verify' the structurome were limited because of

the lack of *Plasmodium* RNA structures obtained independently, by orthogonal

experimental methods. The canonical structural model of a blood-stage *P.*

falciparum rRNA is available from the Comparative RNA Web (CRW) site and this

was used to map base reactivities obtained *in vivo* (Supplemental Fig. 5). The result

demonstrates visually the A/C reactivity of DMS versus the all-base reactivity of NAI,

and makes it clear that many bases modelled as unpaired are nevertheless not

highly reactive *in vivo*. Other factors such as protein binding and base modification

probably affect their reactivity, emphasising the over-simplification imposed by *in*

silico modelling and the extra level of information obtained by *in vivo* structural

probing.

Divergence between *in vivo* RNA structures and structures modelled *in silico*

Using the *RNAStructure* algorithm, RNA structures can be predicted from primary

sequence alone, or they can be predicted with the addition of base-pairing

information gained experimentally. We generated both types of structure,

transcriptome-wide, taking only the lowest-free-energy structure in all cases where

the algorithm generated several alternatives. This was simply because, in the

absence of other constraints, the lowest-free-energy structure is the most likely to

form.

225   Firstly, we sought to discover how much these two types of structures would

differ in *P. falciparum*, i.e. how much new information was gained by performing the

in vivo structurome? We calculated the ratio of bases that differed (i.e. that were

paired versus unpaired) between each *in-silico*-predicted and probing-informed

structure, and termed this ratio the 'divergence'. Most of the non-protein coding

transcripts had relatively low divergence, meaning that they were minimally informed

by probing (Table 2). This was expected for highly conserved, stereotypical

structures like rRNAs and tRNAs – although the divergence for mitochondrial rRNAs,

which are encoded in a highly fragmentary fashion in the *P. falciparum* mitochondrial

genome*,* was notably greater than for nuclear-encoded rRNAs. By contrast, the

divergence of protein coding transcripts was much higher: a median of 0.7067 for the

nuclear-encoded mRNAs and 0.8117 for mitochondrial mRNAs (Table 2).

Table 2: Distribution of 'divergence' normalised by transcript length between base

pairing determined by Structure-seq and *in silico.*

	Protein coding	mito_m RNA	Uncharacterized non protein coding	snoRNA	tRNA	rRNA	snRNA	mito_ rRNA
# transcript	2549	3	25	35	9	8	5	36
Median	0.7067	0.8117	0.5260	0.4414	0.1667	0.2204	0.4630	0.5439
Minimum	0.04408	0.7480	0.07407	0.07500	0.0556	0.0202	0.1880	0.000
25% Percentile	0.5995	0.7480	0.3428	0.2639	0.0972	0.0616	0.1916	0.3471
75% Percentile	0.7874	0.8880	0.6914	0.6341	0.6001	0.3529	0.5636	0.7446

| Maximum | 1.033 | 0.8880 | 0.9083 | 0.9176 | 0.7317 | 0.4706 | 0.6566 | 1.050 |

Data are categorised by family of RNA.

Since structure and function in non-protein coding transcripts, like tRNAs, are

deeply intertwined, we then sought any relationship between folding complexity and

biological function. Using the 'divergence' as a metric, we split the protein coding

transcripts into 3 tiers: minimal value to 25th percentile, 25th to 75th percentile and

75th percentile to the highest value (Table 2), The list of transcripts was then

submitted for gene ontology enrichment and using Revigo (Supek et al. 2011) we

obtained broad families of GO terms and networks of terms belonging to a similar

biological pathway. In tier 1, with the lowest 'divergence', we observed an

enrichment of 25 terms, with the strongest enrichment in terms related to ribosomal

functions. This was expected, since ribosomal RNA structures are highly conserved

and are likely to be predicted accurately *in silico* with little alteration in *P. falciparum*.

Other terms such as 'macromolecular complex" were strongly enriched in tier 1, but

they were not part of any network (Fig 3A, Supplemental table 3-1). Twenty-one

terms were found in tier 2. Two terms were strongly enriched: 'translation' and

'cellular amide metabolism'; however, these stand alone. Two networks could be

created: a large one around 'protein' and 'protein regulation' (composed only of lowly

enriched words) and a second network restricted to two terms around RNA splicing

(Fig 3B, Supplemental table 3-2). In tier 3, with the lowest level of identity between *in*

vivo structures and *in silico* predictions, only 11 terms were enriched and 3 networks

were made, the largest composed of 7 terms strongly enriched around different kinds

of metabolism and the others around transport and complex molecule biosynthesis

(Fig 3C, Supplemental table 3-3).

264   Secondly, we assessed the value of performing Structure-seq instead of just

265 *in silico* prediction for modelling the shape of RNA molecules. We used ViennaFold

266 on the *P. falciparum* transcriptome to fold the structures with or without reactivity

267 data. We first aligned the dot/bracket sequences obtained from *in silico* folding with

268 the Structure-seq-determined sequence of the U2 snRNA (PF3D7_1137000). It

269 showed a difference in the pairing of 74 nucleotides out of 198, meaning a 37.4%

270 discrepancy in the structure determined *in silico* compared to *in vivo* (Fig. 4A).

271 Structurally, the difference between the two transcripts is significant and only 3 loops

272 are common to both structures (Fig. 4B). More interestingly, an RNA-appropriate

273 measurement of Minimum Free Energy, MFEden (Trotta 2014), revealed that the

274 Structure-seq U2 snRNA structure had a lower MFEden (-24.76 versus 15.50).

275 Extending this to the whole dataset, we observed a similar effect in each RNA

276 category (Table 3). Thus, structures called from Structure-seq are more likely to form

277 and are more stable than the ones predicted only using an *in silico* prediction.

279 Table 3: MFEden average for every type of RNA molecule.

	protein coding	mito_ mRNA	uncharacterised non protein coding	snoRNA	tRNA	rRNA	snRNA	mito_ rRNA
Structure-seq	-20.5	-27.0	-29.8	-29.6	-63	-31.1	-37.9	-25
in silico	14.1	10.3	10.7	10.2	-8.8	3.2	10.7	2.7

280 All MFEden values per transcript are in Supplemental table 4.

Effect of A/T bias in the structurome of *P. falciparum* by comparison with an A/T-balanced *Plasmodium* species

The *Plasmodium* genus offers the possibility to compare very different genome compositions. *P. falciparum* is ~80% A/T rich while *P. knowlesi*, a macaque *Plasmodium* species which also infects humans, is 62.5% A/T rich (Pain et al. 2008). In order to assess whether genome base composition could affect the structurome, we compared the *in silico* folding of *P. falciparum* and *P. knowlesi* structuromes. Firstly, we assessed the stability of the two predicted structuromes by comparing the average free energy (MFEden (Trotta 2014)) of all folded structures: *P. falciparum* had a significantly higher MFEden than *P. knowlesi* (respectively 14.03 and 7.1, t-test *p*-value <0.0001). Secondly, we looked at the occurrence of various structures by comparing the length-normalised number of nucleotides participating in a structure (e.g. a hairpin or bulge) in each *P. falciparum* transcript with their *P. knowlesi* orthologs. The structurome of *P. falciparum* had significantly more nucleotides involved in hairpins and multi-stem loops than the structurome of *P. knowlesi* (t-test, *p*-value <0.0001), whereas *P. knowlesi* had significantly more nucleotides involved in stems and bulges (t-test, *p*-value <0.0001) (Supplemental table 5).

RNA structures affect translation efficiency in a stage specific manner

Figure 2 shows that various families of RNAs display very conserved structures that are related to their particular functions. This is clearly true for structural RNAs (tRNAs, rRNAs, etc.), but it may also be true for mRNAs, whose main function is to be translated into proteins. The stability of the transcript and the efficiency of its translation could both be affected by mRNA structure. Therefore, if mRNA structures

307 can vary with varying cellular conditions, transcript and protein abundance may both

308 vary accordingly.

309  We first explored the concept that transcript abundance could vary with

310 cellular conditions due to changes in mRNA structure. For this, we used published

311 microarray and transcriptomic datasets from *P. falciparum* under physiological

312 stresses like hyperoxia (Torrentino-Madamet et al. 2011), or drug exposure like

313 chloroquine treatment (Untaroiu et al. 2019). These datasets reveal which transcripts

314 are upregulated and downregulated in each condition. We compared the most

315 differentially expressed genes in each condition with the structurome dataset, to see

316 if they were particularly structured or unstructured. Neither the overall degree of

317 'divergence' nor the representation of diverse structures (the proportion of hairpins,

318 loops, etc), correlated with differential expression under stress (data not shown).

319  Secondly, we looked at the effect of RNA structures on translation efficiency

320 (TE). To establish the translation efficiency for each transcript in our dataset, we

321 extracted from previously published work (Caro et al. 2014) the average level of

322 ribosome attachment per transcript, determined by Ribo-seq. We obtained TE for the

323 transcriptome of rings, early and late trophozoites and schizonts. Applying a linear

324 regression model, we compared TE with transcript structuredness ('NAI ratio', i.e. the

325 ratio of paired to unpaired bases) and also the proportion of different motifs such as

326 stems, hairpins, multi-loop stems and bulges (Fig. 5). We observed no correlation

327 between the transcript-length-normalised 'structuredness' and TE in any of the four

328 stages (Fig. 5A). Therefore, there was no overall relationship between the proportion

329 of paired bases in a transcript and the efficiency of its translation. However, breaking

330 down the different possible structures (Fig. 5B-E) we observed a positive correlation

331 of TE with the presence of stems and a negative correlation between TE and

hairpins, multi-loop stems and bulges. The correlations were only seen in the more

mature parasite stages, late trophozoites and schizonts.

RNA decay is mediated by the same structures across the cell cycle

The final critical part of an RNA molecule's life inside the cell is its rate of decay.

Following a similar reasoning as for translation efficiency, we extracted RNA decay

values from data published by Painter *et al.* (Painter et al. 2018) and tested for any

correlation between RNA decay and RNA secondary structures in the different cell

cycle stages (rings, early and late trophozoites and schizonts). For this, we applied a

linear regression model to compare RNA decay (the higher the value, the less stable

the molecule is) to the number of different structures per transcript. We observed no

correlation between RNA decay and RNA secondary structures involving high

amounts of base pairing: stems and hairpins (Fig. 6A, B). However, when

nucleotides were more exposed, as in bulges and multi-stem loops (Fig. 6C, D) we

observed correlations between RNA decay and the presence of those structures in

all stages (except for multi-stem loops in ring-stage) (Fig. 6C).

DISCUSSION

In this study, we produced the SHAPE-seq-determined structurome of a parasitic

protozoan, *P. falciparum.* This had never previously been performed for any

protozoan parasite, although a second study, appearing after the submission of this

manuscript, has also now described an *in vivo P. falciparum* structurome (Qi et al.

2021). This study covered only 23-35% of the transcriptome (in trophozoites and

rings respectively), compared to >51% here, and had approximately 35% fewer

reads per sample with markedly lower mappability of reads. Our study therefore

remains the most comprehensive structurome in *P. falciparum* to date. A third study,

equally recently published, mapped duplex RNA regions by RNA-seq after

degradation of ssRNA (Alvarez et al. 2021); however this does not produce data

directly comparable to an NAI-probed *in vivo* structurome.

Firstly, we demonstrated that it is possible to use probing chemicals on the

parasite within the host erythrocyte, meaning that the chemicals can get through the

host cell membrane, the parasitophorous vacuole and the parasite membrane. The

fact that we could also detect mitochondrial and apicoplast transcripts shows that the

chemicals also passed through the inner organellar membranes. Thus, we obtained

in vivo structures for about half the transcripts in the transcriptome, including

structural and noncoding RNAs as well as mRNAs. Most of the structural RNAs had

stereotypical structures, although a subset of tRNAs did not model stereotypically –

an interesting observation that merits further investigation. Amongst mRNAs, the *in*

vivo structures tended to have lower free energy, making them more likely to form,

than the equivalent structures predicted *in silico*, thus demonstrating the value of the

experimental approach. Highly conserved RNAs such as ribosomal RNAs tended to

be predicted well, whereas classes of genes whose structures were poorly predicted

in silico included genes involved in metabolism, biosynthesis of complex molecules,

and transport. These genes may have become particularly divergent in *P. falciparum*

due to its parasitic intracellular lifestyle.

We also took advantage of the striking disparities in genome composition in

the *Plasmodium* genus to see if the extreme base composition of the *P. falciparum*

transcriptome might have an impact on the different structures formed, by comparing

the predicted structurome of *P. knowlesi* with that of *P. falciparum*. We observed that

in *P. falciparum* transcripts were more prone to form structures like hairpins and

multi-stem loops, whereas a more balanced genome like *P. knowlesi* gave rise to

orthologous transcripts with more stems. Overall, *P. falciparum* transcripts were

predicted to fold with higher free energy than their orthologs in *P. knowlesi*,

suggesting that an A/U-biased transcriptome is less stable. However, this might be

mitigated by *in vivo* factors, since we also found that overall the *P. falciparum in vivo*

structurome had lower free energy than was predicted *in silico*. It would be

interesting in future to perform an *in vivo* structurome of *P. knowlesi* and see whether

in vivo transcripts tend towards greater stability in this species as well.

To examine how the RNA structurome might influence parasite biology, we

looked at the impacts of the different structures on translation efficiency and RNA

decay. We showed that RNA structures had no impact on translation efficiency in

rings and early trophozoites, two stages of the erythrocytic cycle that are

translationally less active (Caro et al. 2014; Bunnik et al. 2016). On the contrary, late

trophozoites and schizonts are more translationally active and negative correlations

between translation efficiency and complex structures like hairpins, multi-loop stem

and bulges were observed. Recently, we studied a particularly stable RNA structure

in *P. falciparum*, the RNA G-quadruplex, and demonstrated that it likewise had a

negative impact on translation (Dumetz et al. 2021). We also observed a positive

correlation between translation efficiency and a simpler RNA structure, stems. This is

consistent with the idea that stem structures can facilitate ribosome attachment,

whereas other complex structures can inhibit it (Kramer and Gregory 2018).

The correlations described above were not detected in either of the parallel *P.*

falciparum 'structurome' studies. A study comparing duplex RNA regions with

translation efficiency failed to observe any clear correlations (Alvarez et al. 2021),

probably because it did not distinguish the subtleties of different types of RNA

secondary structure: this highlights the power of the structurome approach taken

here. Meanwhile, the comparable study by Wang and co-workers (Qi et al. 2021)

reported that the least-structured transcripts had the highest abundance, but since

abundance was derived only from a snapshot RNA-seq measurement, it was not

possible to attribute this specifically to transcript half-life, decay rate, etc. as

individual factors that might be affected by RNA structure. Our study examined two

such factors individually – translation efficiency and also RNA decay rate – and

therefore generated different insights.

There was a negative correlation between structures and RNA decay, so we

can hypothesise that RNA structures influence protein expression on at least two

levels: the rate of translation and the degree of transcript stability. Similar effects

were previously demonstrated in human cell lines, and furthermore RNA base

modifications were also found to be important, impacting protein expression by

changing the functional half-life of transcripts (Mauger et al. 2019). This latter area

has been little explored in *P. falciparum* as yet, but a recent study of base

modification in *P. falciparum* likewise implicated RNA base modification in protein

expression (Baumgarten et al. 2019).

This study focuses on RNA structure in the erythrocytic life cycle of

Plasmodium parasites. Two more parts of the full life cycle remain to be studied in

future: the liver stage and the sexual cycle which happens in the host vector, a

mosquito. The liver stages are particularly interesting because two human-infective

Plasmodium species, *P. vivax* and *P. ovale*, can make hypnozoites – a dormant form

that can stay inside the liver of infected people for months and then reactivate to

cause disease (White and Imwong 2012). Currently the biology of hypnozoites

remains complicated to investigate. However, translational repression may be key to

long-term dormancy, so the RNA structurome of hypnozoites could be intriguing. A

more accessible stage, the gametocyte, also shows dormancy (albeit a dormancy

that lasts days rather than months), and female gametocytes are known to

translationally repress hundreds of transcripts (Guerreiro et al. 2014). Once in the

mosquito midgut, the translational repression is lifted, and we can hypothesise that

the change of temperature between a warm-blooded host and a non-

thermoregulatory insect would impact RNA structures, playing a role in lifting the

repression.

Within the mosquito, the sexual life cycle encompasses four different life

stages for which no RNA structures are known. This step of the life cycle is crucially

important in completion of the transmission chain and also in generating genetic

diversity (Arez et al. 2003). Recent progress in single cell RNA sequencing give us

the opportunity to look at the transcriptome of single parasites at all life cycle stages,

including those in the host vector (Bogale et al. 2021). In parallel, novel RNA

structure determination techniques, like SHAPE-MaP-seq associated with the latest

algorithms like DRACO, would make the determination of single cell RNA structures

possible (Morandi et al. 2021). Other technological breakthroughs like SMRT-seq

(Single Molecule, Real Time) associated with SHAPE-MaP would allow access to

transcriptional variant structures (Mays et al. 2019), which were not possible to

analyse in this study, and this could shed new light on post-transcriptional regulation

in *Plasmodium*. Finally, the key roles of RNA-binding proteins in determining RNA

structures *in vivo* have yet to be examined. Broadly, Wang and co-workers found

that de-proteinised RNAs that had been refolded *in vitro* were less structured, and/or

protein-bound, than the same RNAs *in vivo*, which is not unexpected (Qi et al. 2021).

However, more specific future experiments could potentially knock out single RNA

binding proteins and then compare the resultant RNA structures *in vivo*. This would

shed more detailed light on the determinants of the *P. falciparum* RNA structurome.

Overall, this work paves the way to decipher another level of complexity in the

molecular biology of *Plasmodium* parasites.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Parasite culture

Plasmodium falciparum 3D7, obtained from the Malaria Research and Reference

Reagent Resource Center (MR4), was cultured in O+ human erythrocytes at 4%

haematocrit in RPMI 1640 supplemented with 0.25 % albumax (Invitrogen), 5% heat-

inactivated human serum and 0.25% sodium bicarbonate in gassed chambers at 1%

O_2, 3% CO_2, and 96% N_2 (Trager and Jensen 1976). Parasite count was assessed

on thin blood smears stained with Hemacolor (Merck).

RNA structure probing and poly(A) enrichment

An asynchronous culture was grown up to 1.2×10^{10} parasites as previously

described (Trager and Jensen 1976). Erythrocytes were pelleted and then incubated

for 30 minutes either with 10 mM DMS (dimethyl sulfate, Sigma) in ethanol or 20 mM

NAI (2-methylnicotinic acid imidazolide) in anhydrous DMSO, at 37°C, agitated at

200 rpm, in the same gas mixture described above. The NAI was prepared as

previously described (Kwok et al. 2013). The reaction was stopped with 40 mM

dithiothreitol (DTT). Parasites were extracted by erythrocyte lysis using 1v of 0.2%

saponin in PBS and then washed 3 times in ice-cold PBS. RNA was extracted using

Qiagen RNeasy plus mini kit (Qiagen) following manufacturer's instructions and then

submitted to DNase treatment for 15 minutes (Qiagen). The total RNA recovered

was split into samples of 5 μg each and enriched in poly(A) transcripts using

NEBNext Poly(A) mRNA magnetic isolation module (NEB) according to

manufacturer's instructions.

Visualisation of 5.8S rRNA structure using RT-stalling

RT stalling was performed using a primer targeting the 5.8S rRNA gene

(PF3D7_0531800). Briefly, 1.5 μg of total RNA from DMS, NAI and DMSO-treated

cultures in 5.5 μl nuclease-free water was mixed with 1 μl of 5 μM Pfa_5.8S primer

labelled at the 5' end with Cy5 [Cy5]ATTTTCTGTAGGAGTACCACT (Eurofins

Genomics) in 3 μl of reverse transcription buffer (20 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 4 mM MgCl$_2$, 1

mM DTT, 0.5 mM dNTPs, 150 mM LiCl in final). For the sequencing reactions

(A/G/C/T), an extra 1 μl of 10 mM dideoxynucleoside triphosphate (Roche) was

added to replace 1 μl of nuclease-free water. All samples were heated at 75°C for 3

min, 35°C for 5 min and then held at 50°C. Next, 0.5 μl of Superscript III (200U/μl)

(Thermo Scientific) was added and reverse transcription was performed at 50°C for

15 min, followed by addition of 0.5 μl of 2M NaOH at 95°C for 10 min to degrade the

RNA template. After reverse transcription, 10 μl of 2x formamide orange G dye (94%

deionized formamide, 20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 20 mM EDTA, orange G dye) was added

and heated at 95°C for 3 min before loading into a pre-heated (at 90W for 45 min)

8% denaturing polyacrylamide gel. The gel was run at constant power of 90 W for 90

min after loading 3.2 μl of each sample. Fujifilm FLA 9000 was used to scan the gel.

Library preparation and sequencing details

Random fragmentation of polyA-enriched RNA was performed with 150 ng polyA-

enriched RNA in fragmentation buffer (40 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.2, 100 mM LiCl, 30 mM

MgCl$_2$) at 95°C for 60s to generate average fragment size of ~250 nt, and then

purified with RNA Clean & Concentrator (Zymo Research). 3' dephosphorylation

reactions included 7 µl fragmented sample, 1 µl of 10x PNK buffer (NEB), 1 µl of

rSAP enzyme (NEB) and 1 µl of PNK enzyme (NEB), carried out at 37°C for 30 min.

3' adapter ligation was performed by adding 3' adapter

(5'-/5rApp/NNNNNNAGATCGGAAGAGCACACGTCTG/3SpC3/-3' with 1:5 molar

ratio of RNA to 3' adapter), PEG 8000 (17.5% final) and T4 RNA ligase 2 (NEB) in 1x

T4 RNA ligase buffer at 25°C for 1 h. Excess adapter was digested by adding 1 µl

RecJf (NEB) and 1 µl 5'deadenylase (NEB) at 30°C for 30 min and removed by RNA

Clean & Concentrator (Zymo Research). Reverse transcription reactions including

the ligated RNA above, reverse primer (5'-CAGACGTGTGCTCTTCCGATCT-3' with

1:2.5 molar ratio of RNA to reverse primer), reverse transcription buffer (see RTS

method above) and Superscript III (1U/µl final) (Thermo Scientific) were performed at

75°C for 3 min, 35°C for 5 min, then 50°C for 50 min. In this step, Superscript III

should be added before the 50°C and after reverse transcription, NaOH (0.1 M final)

was added at 95 °C for 10 min for RNA degradation, followed by mixing with 5 µl 1M

Tris-HCl (pH 7.5) before RNA Clean & Concentrator (Zymo Research). The purified

cDNA was then ligated with 5' adapter

(5'/5Phos/AGATCGGAAGAGCGTCGTGTAGCTCTTCCGATCTN10/3SpC3/-3' with

1:20 molar ratio of RNA to 5'adapter) using Quick Ligation Kit (NEB) at 37°C

overnight. Ligated reaction mixture was heated to 95°C for 10 min for inactivation

and mixed with 1 volume of 2x formamide orange G dye before purifying with 10%

denaturing urea-TBE acrylamide gel (Thermo Scientific) at 300V for 20 min. The size

of 100-400 nt was sliced, crushed and soaked in 1x TEN 250 buffer (1x TE pH 7.4,

0.25 M NaCl) with incubation at 80°C for 30 min with 1300 rpm shaking, and then

purified with RNA Clean & Concentrator (Zymo Research). The purified ssDNA was

mixed with forward primer (5'-

AATGATACGGCGACCACCGAGATCTACACTCTTTCCCTACACGACGCTCTTCCG

ATCT-3', 0.5 µM final) and reverse primer with different indexes (5'-

CAAGCAGAAGACGGCATACGAGAT-(6 nt index seq)-

GTGACTGGAGTTCAGACGTGTGCTCTTCCGATCT-3', 0.5 µM final) for PCR

amplification by using KAPA HiFi HotStart ReadyMix (KAPA Biosystems). The PCR

program included 95°C for 3 min, 16 cycles of 3 steps (98°C: 20s, 68°C: 15s, 72°C:

40s), 72°C for 90s, then cooled to 4°C for size selection. PCR samples were

resolved on a 1.8% TAE agarose gel at 120 V for 55 min. The size of 150-400 nt was

cut and recovered by Zymo DNA agarose gel extraction kit (Zymo Research). DNA

libraries were quantified, pooled and sequenced on the Illumina Hiseq System in 150

bp paired-end (PE) configuration. A more detail protocol was described in reference

(Yeung et al. 2019).

Structurome analysis

Forward and reverse reads from each sample were cleaned of adapter sequence

contamination using *reaper* (v15-065) from the *kraken* package (Davis et al. 2013).

Paired reads were then aligned to an indexed reference transcriptome (PlasmoDB-

45_Pfalciparum3D7) using *Bowtie2* (v2.4.2) in paired-end mode and converted to

SAM and sorted BAM files (Langmead et al. 2019). Reverse transcription stops were

assessed using *StructureFold2* for each individual sample (Tack et al. 2018).

Coverage and overlap of RT stop data were then computed along with cross-

replicate coverage and overlap and stop correlation was assessed among all

samples via *StructureFold2*. These data were normalised and structural reactivity

data generated for each transcript with enough supporting data across samples

using *StructureFold2*. These reactivities were supplied to *RNAStructure* for

experimental reactivity constrained folding (Reuter and Mathews 2010). Resulting

structures were then assessed for structural features using *Forgi* from the

ViennaRNA package (Lorenz et al. 2011). Unconstrained folding of every transcript

was also performed using RNAStructure with the same parameters and assessed

similarly to generate a cohort of unconstrained purely *in silico* folded transcripts.

Parameters for the number of reads and mapping efficiency for each library are

shown (Table 1).

Table 1: Sequencing parameters for each NGS library generated in this study.

Sample	Number of Read Pairs	Yield (Gigabases)	Mapped Reads	Mapped Reads (%)
Total-RNA-DMS-3	148,865,508	44.6597	108,912,838	73.1%
Total-RNA-DMSO-3	163,681,632	49.1045	115,215,035	70.3%
Total-RNA-NAI-3	192,424,134	57.7272	144,128,728	74.9%
Total-RNA-DMS-2	166,742,223	50.0227	117,106,285	70.2%
Total-RNA-DMSO-2	186,503,272	55.951	128,887,798	69.1%
Total-RNA-NAI-2	145,601,085	43.6803	108,451,225	74.5%

Functional dataset analysis

Microarray datasets from parasites exposed to hyperoxia were extracted from

(Torrentino-Madamet et al. 2011), and the chloroquine-exposed dataset was

extracted from (Untaroiu et al. 2019). Lists of genes were updated to the current

genome annotation. Ribosome profiling data were obtained from (Caro et al. 2014)

and translational efficiency was calculated as ribosome density per messenger RNA.

The RNA decay dataset was extracted from (Painter et al. 2018) at 10hpi for rings,

24hpi for early trophozoites, 30hpi for late trophozoites and 46hpi for schizonts.

Structural parameters per transcript (numbers of nucleotides involved in stems,

hairpins, multi-stem loop and bulges) were normalized to transcript length before

comparing these structural parameters with the translational efficiency of each gene.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr. Betty Chung from the Cambridge Pathology Department

for her help with the transcription efficiency data processing.

Funding

UK Medical Research Council (grants MR/K000535/1 and MR/L008823/1) to CJM,

Royal Society Kan Tong Po fellowship, Shenzhen Basic Research Project

(JCYJ20180507181642811), Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong SAR,

China Projects CityU 11101519, CityU 11100218, N_CityU110/17, CityU 21302317,

Croucher Foundation Project No. 9509003, 9500030, State Key Laboratory of

Marine Pollution Director Discretionary Fund, City University of Hong Kong projects

6000711, 7005503, 9680261, 9667222 to CKK. The funders had no role in study

design, data collection and interpretation, or the decision to submit the work for

publication.

Authors' contributions

FD performed experiments, data analysis, made the figures and wrote the

manuscript, AE performed the bioinformatic Structure-seq analysis, JZ performed the

structure probing gel assay and Structure-seq library preparation and sequencing,

and participated in the writing, CKK and CJM conceptualised the paper and wrote

the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Alvarez DR, Ospina A, Barwell T, Zheng B, Dey A, Li C, Basu S, Shi X, Kadri S,

Chakrabarti K. 2021. The RNA structurome in the asexual blood stages of

malaria pathogen plasmodium falciparum. *RNA Biol* **00**: 1–18.

https://doi.org/10.1080/15476286.2021.1926747.

Arez AP, Pinto J, Pålsson K, Snounou G, Jaenson TGT, do Rosário VE. 2003.

Transmission of mixed Plasmodium species and Plasmodium falciparum

genotypes. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **68**: 161–8.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12641406.

Aurrecoechea C, Brestelli J, Brunk BP, Dommer J, Fischer S, Gajria B, Gao X,

Gingle A, Grant G, Harb OS, et al. 2009. PlasmoDB: a functional genomic

database for malaria parasites. *Nucleic Acids Res* **37**: D539–D543.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18957442.

Baumgarten S, Bryant JM, Sinha A, Reyser T, Preiser PR, Dedon PC, Scherf A.

2019. Transcriptome-wide dynamics of extensive m6A mRNA methylation

during Plasmodium falciparum blood-stage development. *Nat Microbiol* **4**: 2246–

2259. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41564-019-0521-7.

Bogale HN, Pascini T V., Kanatani S, Sá JM, Wellems TE, Sinnis P, Vega-Rodríguez

J, Serre D. 2021. Transcriptional heterogeneity and tightly regulated changes in

gene expression during Plasmodium berghei sporozoite development. *Proc Natl*

Acad Sci **118**: e2023438118.

http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.2023438118.

Bunnik EM, Batugedara G, Saraf A, Prudhomme J, Florens L, Le Roch KG. 2016.

The mRNA-bound proteome of the human malaria parasite Plasmodium

falciparum. *Genome Biol* **17**: 1–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13059-016-1014-

0.

Caro F, Ahyong V, Betegon M, DeRisi JL. 2014. Genome-wide regulatory dynamics

of translation in the Plasmodium falciparum asexual blood stages. *Elife* **3**: 1–24.

https://elifesciences.org/articles/04106.

Casas-Vila N, Sayols S, Pérez-Martínez L, Scheibe M, Butter F. 2020. The RNA fold

interactome of evolutionary conserved RNA structures in S. cerevisiae. *Nat*

Commun **11**: 1–12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16555-4.

Cech TR, Steitz JA. 2014. The noncoding RNA revolution-trashing old rules to forge

new ones. *Cell* **157**: 77–94. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.03.008.

Davis MPA, van Dongen S, Abreu-Goodger C, Bartonicek N, Enright AJ. 2013.

Kraken: A set of tools for quality control and analysis of high-throughput

sequence data. *Methods* **63**: 41–49.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ymeth.2013.06.027.

Deng H, Cheema J, Zhang H, Woolfenden H, Norris M, Liu Z, Liu Q, Yang X, Yang

M, Deng X, et al. 2018. Rice In Vivo RNA Structurome Reveals RNA Secondary

Structure Conservation and Divergence in Plants. *Mol Plant* **11**: 607–622.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molp.2018.01.008.

Ding Y, Tang Y, Kwok CK, Zhang Y, Bevilacqua PC, Assmann SM. 2014. In vivo

genome-wide profiling of RNA secondary structure reveals novel regulatory

features. *Nature* **505**: 696–700. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature12756.

Dumetz F, Chow EY, Harris LM, Umar MI, Jensen A, Chung B, Chan TF, Merrick CJ,

Kwok CK. 2021. G-quadruplex RNA motifs influence gene expression in the

malaria parasite Plasmodium falciparum. *Nucleic Acids Research 1*

doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkab1095.

Fang J, McCutchan TF. 2002. Thermoregulation in a parasite's life cycle. *Nature*

418: 742.

Fang J, Zhou H, Rathore D, Sullivan M, Su XZ, McCutchan TF. 2004. Ambient

glucose concentration and gene expression in Plasmodium falciparum. *Mol*

Biochem Parasitol **133**: 125–129.

Gardner MJ, Hall N, Fung E, White O, Berriman M, Hyman RW, Carlton JM, Pain A,

Nelson KE, Bowman S, et al. 2002. Genome sequence of the human malaria

parasite Plasmodium falciparum. *Nature* **419**: 498–511.

Guerreiro A, Deligianni E, Santos JM, Silva PAGC, Louis C, Pain A, Janse CJ,

Franke-Fayard B, Carret CK, Siden-Kiamos I, et al. 2014. Genome-wide RIP-

Chip analysis of translational repressor-bound mRNAs in the Plasmodium

gametocyte. *Genome Biol* **15**: 1–16.

Gunderson JH, Sogin ML, Wollett G, Hollingdale M, de la Cruz VF, Waters AP,

McCutchan TF. 1987. Structurally distinct, stage-specific ribosomes occur in

Plasmodium. *Science* **238**: 933–7.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3672135.

Guo JU, Bartel DP. 2016. RNA G-quadruplexes are globally unfolded in eukaryotic

cells and depleted in bacteria. *Science (80-)* **353**.

Hasler D, Meister G. 2016. From tRNA to miRNA: RNA-folding contributes to correct

entry into noncoding RNA pathways. *FEBS Lett* **590**: 2354–63.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27397696.

Huber RG, Lim XN, Ng WC, Sim AYL, Poh HX, Shen Y, Lim SY, Sundstrom KB, Sun

X, Aw JG, et al. 2019. Structure mapping of dengue and Zika viruses reveals

functional long-range interactions. *Nat Commun* **10**.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09391-8.

Huston NC, Wan H, Strine MS, de Cesaris Araujo Tavares R, Wilen CB, Pyle AM.

2021. Comprehensive in vivo secondary structure of the SARS-CoV-2 genome

reveals novel regulatory motifs and mechanisms. *Mol Cell* **81**: 584-598.e5.

https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S109727652030962X.

Incarnato D, Neri F, Anselmi F, Oliviero S. 2014. Genome-wide profiling of mouse

RNA secondary structures reveals key features of the mammalian

transcriptome. *Genome Biol* **15**: 491.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25323333.

John Rogers M, Gutell RR, Damberger SH, Li J, Mcconkey GA, Waters AP,

McCutchan TF. 1996. Structural features of the large subunit rRNA expressed in

Plasmodium falciparum sporozoites that distinguish it from the asexually

expressed large subunit rRNA. *RNA* **2**: 134–145.

Kramer MC, Gregory BD. 2018. Does RNA secondary structure drive translation or

vice versa? *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **25**: 641–643.

Kwok CK, Ding Y, Tang Y, Assmann SM, Bevilacqua PC. 2013. Determination of in

vivo RNA structure in low-abundance transcripts. *Nat Commun* **4**: 2971.

http://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms3971.

Kwok CK, Tang Y, Assmann SM, Bevilacqua PC. 2015. The RNA structurome:

transcriptome-wide structure probing with next-generation sequencing. *Trends*

Biochem Sci **40**: 221–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tibs.2015.02.005.

Langmead B, Wilks C, Antonescu V, Charles R. 2019. Scaling read aligners to

hundreds of threads on general-purpose processors ed. J. Hancock.

Bioinformatics **35**: 421–432. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30020410.

Li P, Wei Y, Mei M, Tang L, Sun L, Huang W, Zhou J, Zou C, Zhang S, Qin CF, et al.

2018. Integrative Analysis of Zika Virus Genome RNA Structure Reveals Critical

Determinants of Viral Infectivity. *Cell Host Microbe* **24**: 875-886.e5.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2018.10.011.

Ling Yang S, DeFalco L, Anderson DE, Zhang Y, Aw AJ, Lim Y, Xin Ni L, Yee Tan K,

Zhang T, Chawla T, et al. 2021. Comprehensive mapping of SARS-CoV-2

interactions in vivo reveals 1 functional virus-host interactions 2 3. *bioRxiv*

2021.01.17.427000. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.17.427000.

Lorenz R, Bernhart SH, Höner Zu Siederdissen C, Tafer H, Flamm C, Stadler PF,

Hofacker IL. 2011. ViennaRNA Package 2.0. *Algorithms Mol Biol* **6**: 26.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22115189.

Manfredonia I, Nithin C, Ponce-Salvatierra A, Ghosh P, Wirecki TK, Marinus T,

Ogando NS, Snijder EJ, van Hemert MJ, Bujnicki JM, et al. 2020. Genome-wide

mapping of SARS-CoV-2 RNA structures identifies therapeutically-relevant

elements. *Nucleic Acids Res* 1–17. https://academic.oup.com/nar/advance-

article/doi/10.1093/nar/gkaa1053/5961787.

Mathews DH, Sabina J, Zuker M, Turner DH. 1999. Expanded sequence

dependence of thermodynamic parameters improves prediction of RNA

secondary structure. *J Mol Biol* **288**: 911–40.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10329189.

Mauger DM, Cabral BJ, Presnyak V, Su S V., Reid DW, Goodman B, Link K,

Khatwani N, Reynders J, Moore MJ, et al. 2019. mRNA structure regulates

protein expression through changes in functional half-life. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U*

S A **116**: 24075–24083.

http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.1908052116.

Mays AD, Schmidt M, Graham G, Tseng E, Baybayan P, Sebra R, Sanda M,

Mazarati JB, Riegel A, Wellstein A. 2019. Single-molecule real-time (SMRT) full-

length RNA-sequencing reveals novel and distinct mRNA isoforms in human

bone marrow cell subpopulations. *Genes (Basel)* **10**: 1–17.

Morandi E, Manfredonia I, Simon LM, Anselmi F, van Hemert MJ, Oliviero S,

Incarnato D. 2021. Genome-scale deconvolution of RNA structure ensembles.

Nat Methods **18**: 249–252. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33619392.

Pain A, Böhme U, Berry AE, Mungall K, Finn RD, Jackson AP, Mourier T, Mistry J,

Pasini EM, Aslett MA, et al. 2008. The genome of the simian and human malaria

parasite Plasmodium knowlesi. *Nature* **455**: 799–803.

Painter HJ, Chung NC, Sebastian A, Albert I, Storey JD, Llinás M. 2018. Genome-

wide real-time in vivo transcriptional dynamics during Plasmodium falciparum

blood-stage development. *Nat Commun* **9**: 2656.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04966-3.

Qi Y, Zhang Y, Zheng G, Chen B, Zhang M, Li J, Peng T, Huang J, Wang X. 2021. In

Vivo and In Vitro Genome-Wide Profiling of RNA Secondary Structures Reveals

Key Regulatory Features in Plasmodium falciparum. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol*

11: 1–13. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fcimb.2021.673966/full.

Reuter JS, Mathews DH. 2010. RNAstructure: software for RNA secondary structure

prediction and analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics* **11**: 129.

https://bmcbioinformatics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2105-11-

129.

Righetti F, Nuss AM, Twittenhoff C, Beele S, Urban K, Will S, Bernhart SH, Stadler

PF, Dersch P, Narberhaus F. 2016. Temperature-responsive in vitro RNA

structurome of Yersinia pseudotuberculosis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **113**:

7237–7242.

Ritchey LE, Su Z, Tang Y, Tack DC, Assmann SM, Bevilacqua PC. 2017. Structure-

seq2: sensitive and accurate genome-wide profiling of RNA structure in vivo.

Nucleic Acids Res **45**: e135.

Rouskin S, Zubradt M, Washietl S, Kellis M, Weissman JS. 2014. Genome-wide

probing of RNA structure reveals active unfolding of mRNA structures in vivo.

Nature **505**: 701–705. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature12894.

Sharp PA. 2009. The Centrality of RNA. *Cell* **136**: 577–580.

Simon LM, Morandi E, Luganini A, Gribaudo G, Martinez-Sobrido L, Turner DH,

Oliviero S, Incarnato D. 2019. In vivo analysis of influenza A mRNA secondary

structures identifies critical regulatory motifs. *Nucleic Acids Res* **47**: 7003–7017.

Spitale RC, Crisalli P, Flynn RA, Torre EA, Kool ET, Chang HY. 2013. RNA SHAPE

analysis in living cells. *Nat Chem Biol* **9**: 18–20.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23178934.

Su Z, Tang Y, Ritchey LE, Tack DC, Zhu M, Bevilacqua PC, Assmann SM. 2018.

Genome-wide RNA structurome reprogramming by acute heat shock globally

regulates mRNA abundance. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **115**: 12170–12175.

Sun L, Fazal FM, Li P, Broughton JP, Lee B, Tang L, Huang W, Kool ET, Chang HY,

Zhang QC. 2019. RNA structure maps across mammalian cellular

compartments. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **26**: 322–330.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41594-019-0200-7.

Sun L, Li P, Ju X, Rao J, Huang W, Ren L, Zhang S, Xiong T, Xu K, Zhou X, et al.

2021. In vivo structural characterization of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA genome

identifies host proteins vulnerable to repurposed drugs. *Cell* **184**: 1865-

1883.e20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2021.02.008.

Supek F, Bošnjak M, Škunca N, Šmuc T. 2011. REVIGO Summarizes and

Visualizes Long Lists of Gene Ontology Terms ed. C. Gibas. *PLoS One* **6**:

e21800. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21789182.

Tack DC, Tang Y, Ritchey LE, Assmann SM, Bevilacqua PC. 2018. StructureFold2:

Bringing chemical probing data into the computational fold of RNA structural

analysis. *Methods* **143**: 12–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymeth.2018.01.018.

Tammy C. T. Lan, Matthew F. Allan, Lauren E. Malsick, Stuti Khandwala, Sherry S.

Y. Nyeo, Yu Sun, Junjie U. Guo, Mark Bathe, Anthony Griffiths SR, Lan TCT,

Allan MF, Malsick LE, Khandwala S, Nyeo SSY, Sun Y, Guo JU, Bathe M,

Griffiths A, et al. 2021. Insights into the secondary structural ensembles of the

full SARS-CoV-2 RNA genome in infected cells. *bioRxiv* 2020.06.29.178343.

http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2021/02/19/2020.06.29.178343.abstract.

Tomezsko PJ, Corbin VDA, Gupta P, Swaminathan H, Glasgow M, Persad S,

Edwards MD, Mcintosh L, Papenfuss AT, Emery A, et al. 2020. Determination of

RNA structural diversity and its role in HIV-1 RNA splicing. *Nature* **582**: 438–

442. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2253-5.

Torrentino-Madamet M, Alméras L, Desplans J, Priol Y Le, Belghazi M, Pophillat M,

Fourquet P, Jammes Y, Parzy D. 2011. Global response of Plasmodium

falciparum to hyperoxia: A combined transcriptomic and proteomic approach.

Malar J **10**: 1–15.

Trager W, Jensen JB. 1976. Human malaria parasites in continuous culture. *Science*

193: 673–5. http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/science.781840.

Trotta E. 2014. On the normalization of the minimum free energy of RNAs by

sequence length. *PLoS One* **9**.

Twittenhoff C, Brandenburg VB, Righetti F, Nuss AM, Mosig A, Dersch P,

Narberhaus F. 2020. Lead-seq: Transcriptome-wide structure probing in vivo

using lead(II) ions. *Nucleic Acids Res* **48**: E71–E71.

Untaroiu AM, Carey MA, Guler JL, Papin JA. 2019. Leveraging the effects of

chloroquine on resistant malaria parasites for combination therapies. *BMC*

Bioinformatics **20**: 1–9.

Vandivier LE, Anderson SJ, Foley SW, Gregory BD. 2016. The Conservation and

Function of RNA Secondary Structure in Plants. *Annu Rev Plant Biol* **67**: 463–

488.

Velichutina I V., Rogers MJ, McCutchan TF, Liebman SW. 1998. Chimeric rRNAs

containing the GTPase centers of the developmentally regulated ribosomal

rRNAs of Plasmodium falciparum are functionally distinct. *RNA* **4**: 594–602.

Wachter A. 2010. Riboswitch-mediated control of gene expression in eukaryotes.

RNA Biol **7**.

Wan Y, Kertesz M, Spitale RC, Segal E, Chang HY. 2011. Understanding the

transcriptome through RNA structure. *Nat Rev Genet* **12**: 641–655.

Waters AP, Syin C, McCutchan TF. 1989. Developmental regulation of stage-specific

ribosome populations in Plasmodium. *Nature* **342**: 438–40.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2586613.

Watts JM, Dang KK, Gorelick RJ, Leonard CW, Bess JW, Swanstrom R, Burch CL,

Weeks KM. 2009. Architecture and secondary structure of an entire HIV-1 RNA

genome. *Nature* **460**: 711–6. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature08237.

Westermann AJ, Gorski SA, Vogel J. 2012. Dual RNA-seq of pathogen and host. *Nat*

Rev Microbiol **10**: 618–630. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22890146.

Westhof E, Romby P. 2010. The RNA structurome: high-throughput probing. *Nat*

Methods **7**: 965–967. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nmeth1210-965.

White NJ, Imwong M. 2012. Relapse. In *Advances in Parasitology*, pp. 113–150.

WHO. 2018. *World malaria report 2018*.

https://www.who.int/malaria/publications/world-malaria-report-2018/en/.

Wilkinson KA, Merino EJ, Weeks KM. 2006. Selective 2'-hydroxyl acylation analyzed

by primer extension (SHAPE): quantitative RNA structure analysis at single

nucleotide resolution. *Nat Protoc* **1**: 1610–6.

http://www.nature.com/articles/nprot.2006.249.

Wu X, Bartel DP. 2017. Widespread Influence of 3′-End Structures on Mammalian

mRNA Processing and Stability. *Cell* **169**: 905-917.e11.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2017.04.036.

Yeung PY, Zhao J, Chow EYC, Mou X, Hong HQ, Chen L, Chan TF, Kwok CK.

2019. Systematic evaluation and optimization of the experimental steps in RNA

G-quadruplex structure sequencing. *Sci Rep* **9**: 1–12.

Zhao J, Qian X, Yeung PY, Zhang QC, Kwok CK. 2019. Mapping In Vivo RNA

Structures and Interactions. *Trends Biochem Sci* **44**: 555–556.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibs.2019.01.012.

Ziv O, Price J, Shalamova L, Kamenova T, Goodfellow I, Weber F, Miska EA. 2020.

The Short- and Long-Range RNA-RNA Interactome of SARS-CoV-2. *Mol Cell*

80: 1067-1077.e5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2020.11.004.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: *In vivo* probing of RNA structures in *P. falciparum*

(A) Schematic of RNA structure probing. An asynchronous parasite culture was split

into two, one exposed to NAI (+NAI) and the other exposed to DMSO as control (-

NAI). Reverse transcription (RT) was performed using a 5'-Cy5 conjugated primer

(dark red star) specific for the 5.8S rRNA of *P. falciparum* (in green). During RT,

nucleotides that have been modified by NAI in the +NAI samples (red dots) will stall

the reverse transcription, interrupting the elongation process (black line). Finally,

elongation cDNA products are resolved on a PAGE gel. **(B)** Sequencing gel showing

the 5.8S rRNA gene of *P. falciparum.* Lanes 1 to 4 are sequencing lanes where one

of the four nucleotides in the reaction mix has been switched with the

dideoxynucleotide, provoking RT-termination. Lanes 5 and 6 represent respectively

DMS and NAI modifications on 5.8S rRNA.

Figure 2: RNA structurome of *P. falciparum* using Structure-seq

(A) Schematic showing the Structure-seq pipeline. An asynchronous parasite culture

was split into two, one exposed to NAI (+NAI) and the other exposed to DMSO as

control (-NAI). Polyadenylated-enriched RNA fractions were then used to prepare the

sequencing libraries in parallel. Fragmentation was performed to generate an

average length (~250 nt) of RNA for sequencing followed by 3' dephosphorylation,

which replaces the 2'3' cyclic phosphate group with a 3'-OH group for 3' adapter

ligation. Then a 3' adapter (black line) was ligated to the 3'-OH group of

dephosphorylated RNA. Next, RT of RNA molecules (orange line) was carried out

using a designed reverse primer (dark blue line) at the 5' end. During RT,

nucleotides that had been modified by NAI in the +NAI samples (red dots) would stall

the reverse transcription, interrupting the elongation process (pink line). Later, a 5'

adaptor (light blue line) was added by ssDNA ligation at the 3' end of the newly

synthesised cDNA strand (pink line). Finally, forward primers (brown+light blue line)

and reverse primers (dark blue+red+green line) with different indexes were added by

PCR for NGS and bioinformatic analysis. Reads were aligned to the PF3D7

reference genome and subsequently analysed with *StructureFold2* to determine the

structural reactivity sequence (transcribed as a dot/bracket sequence denoting

paired/unpaired nucleotides), and with *RNAStructure* to predict the folding. **(B)**

Representation of the diversity of the dataset regarding RNA families. **(C)** Structure-

seq derived structures of glutamic acid (PF3D7_0411600), methionine

(PF3D7_1339100), asparagine (PF3D7_0714700), alanine (PF3D7_0620800) and

proline (PF3D7_1339200) tRNAs, all of which are similar to canonical tRNA

structures.

Figure 3: GO terms enrichment networks for protein coding transcripts, tier 1

to 3.

All networks represent the GO enrichment provided by REVIGO for **(A)** tier 1, **(B)** tier

2 and **(C)** tier 3. The brighter the red, the more enriched the term is. Detailed values

are available in Supplemental table 3.

Figure 4: Difference in U2 snRNA structure determined by Structure-seq

versus *in silico* prediction

(A) U2 snRNA (PF3D7_1137000) reactivity sequence alignment, comparing *in vitro*

probing using NAI and *in silico* prediction using the same constraint parameters. The

first line shows the nucleotide sequence, the second line shows the *in silico*

predicted dot/bracket sequence and the third line, the Structure-seq dot/bracket

sequence extracted from reactivity measurement. A dot shows a nucleotide not

paired with any other nucleotide. An open bracket shows a nucleotide paired with

another and starting a structural motif, while a closed bracket shows a nucleotide

paired with another but finishing a structural motif. Red-highlighted dot or bracket

indicates a change of pairing between the NAI and *in silico* predicted structural

sequence. A green-highlighted bracket indicates a change in motif orientation

between the NAI and *in silico* predicted structural sequence. Boxes with roman

numerals indicate the conserved structures between the two shapes. **(B)** U2 snRNA

structure predicted *in silico* from RNA sequence alone, on the left, and with the

addition of reactivity data on the right. The red and green colouring have the same

meaning as in (A).

Figure 5: Impact of various RNA motifs on transcription efficiency across the

life cycle of *P. falciparum*

The columns represent the different erythrocytic life stages of *P. falciparum* and the

rows represent the correlation between transcription efficiency and **(A)** the transcript

structuredness normalised by the transcript length, **(B)** the number of stems, **(C)** the

number of hairpins, **(D)** the number of multi-stem loops and **(E)** the number of

bulges. Statistically significant positive correlations have a *p*-value framed in green

and statistically significant negative correlations have a *p*-value framed in red.

Figure 6: Correlation between RNA secondary structures and RNA decay

across the life cycle of *P. falciparum*

The columns represent the different erythrocytic life stages of *P. falciparum* and the

rows represent the correlation between RNA decay and **(A)** the number of stems, **(B)**

the number of hairpins, **(C)** the number of multi-stem loops and **(D)** the number of

bulges. Statistically significant negative correlations have a *p*-value framed in red.

A

5'
3'
A
U

In vivo probing

● + NAI   – NAI (control)

Poly(A) RNA enrichment

Fragmentation

3' dephosphorylation

3' adapter ligation

Reverse transcription

5' adapter ligation

PCR

NGS and bioinformatic analysis

Structural reactivity sequence: ..(((((....))))).

Transcript folding:

B

Total=2669

Total=120

protein coding (95.47%)   others (4.53%)

uncharacterised non protein coding (0.94%)
snoRNA (1.31%)   mito_rRNA (1.16%)
rRNA (0.45%)   tRNA (0.34%)
snRNA (0.19%)   mito_mRNA (0.11%)

C

Glutamic acid   Methionine   Asparagine

Alanine   Proline