The genomic basis of host and vector specificity in non-pathogenic

trypanosomatids

1.1.　Author names

Guy Oldrieve[1*] (0000-0003-1428-0608), Beatrice Malacart[1], Javier López-Vidal[1],

Keith Matthews[1] (0000-0003-0309-9184)

1.2.　Affiliation

[1.] Institute for Immunology and Infection Research, School of Biological Sciences,

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3FL, UK

1.3.　Corresponding author *

guy.oldrieve@ed.ac.uk

1.4.　Keywords

Trypanosoma theileri, *Trypanosoma melophagium*, non-pathogenic, host and vector

specificity

1.5.　Repositories

T. melophagium DNA and RNA sequencing data, along with the draft genome

assembly and its annotation, can be found under the NCBI BioProject PRJNA786535.

2.   Abstract

The ability of trypanosome parasites to survive and sustain infections is dependent on diverse and intricate immune evasion mechanisms. Pathogenic trypanosomes often have broad host niches that preclude identification of host specific adaptations. In contrast, some non-pathogenic species of the genus *Trypanosoma* have highly specific hosts and vectors. *Trypanosoma theileri*, a non-pathogenic parasite of bovines, has a predicted surface protein architecture that likely aids survival in its mammalian host, distinct from the dominant variant surface glycoprotein coat of pathogenic African trypanosomes. In both species, their surface proteins are encoded by genes which account for ~10% of their genome. A non-pathogenic parasite of sheep, *Trypanosoma melophagium*, is transmitted by the sheep ked and is closely related to *T. theileri*. To explore host and vector specificity between these closely related species, we sequenced the *T. melophagium* genome and transcriptome and an annotated draft genome was assembled. *T. melophagium* was compared to 43 kinetoplastid genomes, including *T. theileri. T. melophagium* and *T. theileri* have an AT biased genome, the greatest bias of publicly available trypanosomatids. This trend may result from selection acting to decrease the genome nucleotide cost. The *T. melophagium* genome is 6.3Mb smaller than *T. theileri* and large families of proteins, characteristic of the predicted surface of *T. theileri,* were found to be absent or greatly reduced in *T. melophagium.* Instead, *T. melophagium* has modestly expanded protein families associated with the avoidance of complement-mediated lysis. The genome of *T. melophagium* contains core genes required for development, glycolysis, RNA interference, and meiotic exchange, each being shared with *T. theileri*. Comparisons between *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri*

provide insight into the specific adaptations of these related trypanosomatids to their

distinct mammalian hosts and arthropod vectors.

3.   Author summary

Non-pathogenic trypanosomes can have narrow host niches, with closely related

trypanosome species expanding into distinct mammalian host and insect vectors. *T.*

theileri, a non-pathogenic trypanosome of bovines, is predicted to have an intricate

cell surface which allows it to evade the immune response of its mammalian host. In

contrast, *T. melophagium* is closely related to *T. theileri* but infects sheep and is

transmitted by the sheep ked rather than tabanid flies that transmit *T. theileri*. Here,

we sequence and assemble the *T. melophagium* genome to identify the genomic

basis of host and vector specificity in these non-pathogenic trypanosomes. We

confirm the two species are closely related, however, *T. melophagium* has a smaller

genome than *T. theileri*. Most of the discrepancy in genome size is due to an

expansion of putative cell surface genes in *T. theileri*. The differential investment in

cell surface proteins could be due to a focus on adaptation to the mammalian host in

T. theileri and the insect host in *T. melophagium*.

4.   Data summary

The genomes, transcriptomes and proteomes used in this study were accessed from

the TriTrypDB repository or NCBI. *T. theileri* genome sequencing data was

downloaded from NCBI SRA (SRR13482812). *T. melophagium* data generated

during this study is available from the NCBI BioProject PRJNA786535.

5.   Introduction

Trypanosomatidae are a family of single celled eukaryotes, characterised by a specialised mitochondrial genome, the kinetoplast. Trypanosomatidae are monoxenous (single host) or dixenous (two host) species. Dixenous trypanosomatids are obligate parasites of a broad diversity of animals and plants whilst monoxenous species are largely restricted to insects (1). However, the taxonomy of trypanosomatids cannot be distilled into these two broad categories, as many monoxenous species opportunistically infect vertebrates (2) and some dixenous species have subsequently reverted to a monoxenous lifecycle (3).

Expansion into vertebrate hosts gave rise to clades of trypanosomatids which represent medical and veterinary threats. Notably, *Trypanosoma cruzi* and *Leishmania* spp. cause important diseases in humans, Chagas disease and Leishmaniasis, respectively. Also, *Trypanosoma brucei* has been subjected to intense molecular and cytological study as two of its subspecies, *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense* and *Trypanosoma brucei rhodesiense*, are causative agents of Human African Trypanosomiases (HAT) (4). In addition to the medical impact of human African trypanosomes, other African trypanosome species such as *T. b. brucei*, *Trypanosoma vivax* and *Trypanosoma congolense* cause morbidity and mortality in livestock, constraining agricultural development (5).

Trypanosomatids diverged from other eukaryotes over a billion years ago (6, 7) and possess unique adaptations at the genome level (8). The *T. brucei* genome comprises 11 megabase chromosomes (9) along with ~5 intermediate chromosomes

and ~100 mini-chromosomes (10, 11). Nuclear DNA is highly compact, and genes

are organised into polycistronic units, the primary transcripts of which are trans-

spliced and polyadenylated to resolve mature mRNA (12, 13). Their distinct

mitochondrial genome, the kinetoplast, consists of mini (14, 15) and maxicircles (16,

17) that rely upon RNA editing to generate functional mRNA (8).

The divergence in trypanosomatid morphology, transmission, and lifecycle

development has facilitated an adaption to a diverse range of hosts and vectors. The

different surface protein environments of *T. brucei*, *T. cruzi* and *Leishmania* spp.

exemplify the variant strategies adopted by these parasites to evade the immune

systems of their hosts and vectors. For example, *T. brucei* is extracellular and

proliferates in the blood and tissue of mammals. Its cell surface is encoded by a very

extensive repertoire of variant surface glycoproteins (VSGs) (10, 18). VSG variation

is essential to sustain long-term infections, during which antigenically distinct VSG

protein types dominate at each peak, facilitating host immune evasion (19, 20). *T.*

cruzi is an intracellular parasite of wild and domestic mammals. The nuclear genome

contains an expanded family of mucin genes that represent up to 6% of the genome

(21) and, along with trans-sialidases (22), these genes enable sustained infections.

Leishmania spp. are intracellular trypanosomatids whose cell surface is covered by a

thick layer of glycoconjugates, including families of major surface proteases (MSPs)

(23).

Studies have largely focused on pathogenic dixenous trypanosomatids, which can

hold broad host niches, capable of infecting multiple mammalian species (24). In

contrast, non-pathogenic dixenous trypanosomes can be highly specific to their host

and vector. These species represent an attractive model to study the basis of host

and vector specificity.

Trypanosoma theileri is a non-pathogenic bovine parasite which has a reported

prevalence of 80% in cattle in the US and Europe when screened via culture-based

methods (25-28). *T. theileri* is transmitted by tabanid flies (29). It can cause lifelong

infections but remains at an extremely low parasitaemia in immunocompetent

animals, indicating the presence of an effective host immune evasion mechanism or

strict self-imposed population control, which prevents overt disease (30, 31).

Experimentally, *T. theileri* can sustain an infection for at least 12 weeks (28) which,

combined with their non-pathogenic nature, has stimulated development of *T. theileri*

as a potential vaccine delivery vehicle (28). The genome of *T. theileri* encodes five

predicted surface protein families. These are four unique protein families, *T. theileri*

putative surface proteins (TTPSPs) and one MSP family (32). Together these genes

represent 9% of the genome of *T. theileri*, comparable to the representation of the

VSG gene family in *T. brucei.* Lastly, the trans-sialidases that characterise *T. cruzi*

were also found to be highly expressed in *T. theileri*. These findings led to the

suggestion of a novel immune evasion mechanism in *T. theileri,* contrasting with the

well-known system in African trypanosomes and distinct from that in *T. cruzi* or

Leishmania (32).

Trypanosoma melophagium is another non-pathogenic trypanosome of the

subgenus *megatrypanum*, transmitted between sheep via the sheep ked. This

flightless insect vector has been eradicated from much of its original geographic

distribution due to widespread pesticide use. However, where the sheep ked

persists, it often carries *T. melophagium* (33, 34)*.* In a study of organic sheep farms,

T. melophagium was found to be present in 86% of keds, however, blood smears

from sheep on the same farms did not detect trypanosomes (34). Other surveys via

blood culture found 7.8% of sheep to be infected with *T. melophagium* (35). It has

historically been argued that *T. melophagium* is a monoxenous parasite of the sheep

ked and that the mammalian host is obsolete for transmission (36-38). However,

extensive studies demonstrated a mammalian host is required (39). Experimental

infections of sheep with *T. melophagium* suggested the longest infection lasts three

months and there is no lasting immunity as sheep can be reinfected with *T.*

melophagium after several months of isolation (33, 39, 40)

Molecular markers place *T. melophagium* as a close relative to *T. theileri* (34). SSU

rRNA is ~98% similar between *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* isolates (33).

Presumably the divergence of *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* is associated with their

discrete host niches (33, 34). Nonetheless, *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* undergo a

similar transmission cycle where metacyclic forms are produced in the insect hindgut

and the infective forms are then believed to be transmitted to their mammalian host

via the mouth, by ingestion of insect faeces or the whole insect body. Trypanosomes

then invade their mammalian hosts and proliferate in the blood, before being taken

up as a bloodmeal by their insect vector (29, 39).

A notable contrast in the biology of these parasites is the divergence in the life

history of their vectors. Sheep keds, which transmit *T. melophagium*, spend their

entire life attached to either the skin or wool and hair of sheep. Both male and female

keds feed on their mammalian host (41). Tabanids, which transmit *T. theileri*, breed

and lay their eggs in soil, water, or trees. The larvae and pupae stages live on

vegetation and soil. Only female adults feed on mammalian blood, which is essential

for egg production. Although adult tabanids show considerable adaptation to blood

feeding, they also feed on the sugars of plants (42).

Here we derive the *T. melophagium* genome and compare its features with *T. theileri*

to provide insight into the biological specificity exhibited by each parasite in the

context of their close phylogenetic relationship.

6.1. Methods

Trypanosome culture, DNA/RNA extraction and sequencing

T. melophagium was isolated from sheep blood collected on the island of St Kilda, Scotland (Kindly provided by Professor Josephine Pemberton, University of Edinburgh). Whole blood was collected into heparinized vacutainers and used within 2 days. 1 ml of blood was diluted with 5 volumes of a 50% mix of HMI9 supplemented with 20% FBS and MDBK conditioned medium. All cultures were kept at 37°C and were examined microscopically every 3 days for 6 weeks. After propagation of *T. melophagium* by culturing of the blood sample, the specimens were transferred and co-cultured with fibroblast-like primary cells as feeder cells, isolated from the same blood sample. Due to the short lifespan of these primary cultured cells, *T. melophagium* was subsequently co-cultivated with MDBK cells and then progressively adapted to axenic conditions with a 50% mix of HMI9 and MDBK conditioned medium.

DNA was extracted from cultured *T. melophagium* using a MagAttract high molecular weight DNA kit, following the manufacturer's instructions (Qiagen) and cleaned via ethanol precipitation. The DNA was sequenced with Oxford Nanopore Technology's (ONT) MinION (R9.4.1), following the Nanopore Rapid Sequencing protocol. Base-calling was performed in high accuracy mode using Guppy (available at https://community.nanoporetech.com/) which produced 1.059 gigabases (Gb) of data. PycoQC was used to visualise the data (43). The same DNA was sequenced with BGI's DNBseq (4.201Gb, 150 base pair (bp) reads). RNA was extracted with the RNeasy mini kit (Qiagen) including a DNAse step, following the manufacturer's

instructions and sequenced with BGI's DNBseq (5.019Gb, 100bp reads). Raw DNA

and RNA DNBseq reads were trimmed with Trimmomatic (44).

T. theileri sequencing data was downloaded from NCBI. 170bp genomic

(SRR13482812) were used.

T. melophagium genome assembly and annotation

Jellyfish and GenomeScope were used to provide a k-mer based estimate of the

genome size and heterozygosity using the short DNA reads described above (45,

46).

Nanopore long reads were assembled using Wtdbg2 (47). For the polishing steps,

BWA-MEM (48) was used to align short reads and Minimap2 (49) was used to align

ONT reads. ONT reads were aligned to the Wtdbg2 draft assembly and three

iterations of Racon (50) followed by one round of Medaka (available at

https://github.com/nanoporetech/medaka) were performed. DNBseq reads were

mapped to the Medaka polished assembly, and two iterations of Racon were

performed. Short and long reads were aligned to the Racon polished assembly to

complete two final iterations of polishing with Pilon (51). At each stage of polishing,

the draft genome was assessed using scaffold_stats.pl (available at

https://github.com/sujaikumar/assemblage) and BUSCO (52).

Both sets of reads were mapped to the draft assembly. Each contig was subjected to

a DIAMOND blastx search against the InterProScan database (53, 54). The resulting

alignments and DIAMOND hits were visualised with BlobTools (55). Two contigs

were outliers in comparison to the rest of the assembly at under 100x coverage and

consisting of only 3,975 and 1,892 base pairs (Fig. S2a). These contigs were

removed from the assembly. BUSCO and BlobTools were re-run on this trimmed

assembly to assess the final assembly's completeness and coverage

(Supplementary Fig. S2b).

Repeat sequences in the genome were identified and soft-masked using

RepeatModeler2 and RepeatMasker (56). BRAKER2 was used to annotate the soft-

masked genome in ETP mode. The OrthoDB v10 protozoa database was utilised for

protein hints (57) with the addition of the *T. theileri* proteome and RNAseq evidence

(53, 58-68). BRAKER2 produced the protein and transcript files utilised in the

following analysis. The *T. melophagium* proteome was functionally annotated using

InterProScan (54) using the Pfam and SignalP databases (69, 70). Genome

conservation of collinearity was compared using D-Genies (71).

Publicly available genomes, transcriptomes and proteomes were accessed from

TriTrypDB (72) along with the *Phytomonas* EM1 assembly which was accessed from

NCBI (73). The quality of the proteomes were assessed using BUSCO; only isolates

which had > 85% complete proteomes were included, which left 43 isolates along

with *T. melophagium*. A list of all the isolates used in this study can be found in the

Supplementary File S1. The assembly statistics of the 44 genomes were assessed

using scaffold_stats (available at https://github.com/sujaikumar/assemblage).

The genomes from each of these trypanosomatid isolates were screened for transfer

RNA genes using tRNAscan-SE (74). The outputs of these results were used to infer

the strength of selection acting on translational efficiency and nucleotide cost for

each isolate, along with the background mutation bias, using CodonMuSe (75, 76).

Each isolate was assessed using 1) every CDS, 2) single copy universal orthologs

(identified in the orthologous protein clustering steps below) (n=992) and 3) single

copy universal orthologs which are essential for every stage of the *T. brucei* life cycle

(n=158). The last list of genes were identified by screening the universal single copy

orthologs for genes which had a significant reduction in transcript levels in every

library of an RNAi phenotype screen (>1.5 log fold decrease) (77).

Orthology inference

Orthologous proteins from 44 trypanosomatid proteomes were identified with

OrthoFinder (78) and protein clusters were summarised with KinFin (79), using

InterProScan annotations based on the Pfam and signalP databases (54, 69, 70). A

minimal cut-off threshold was not applied to the orthogroup annotation. The

orthogroup annotation summary can be found in Supplementary File S2. A species

tree was produced by STAG and STRIDE, as part of the OrthoFinder analysis (80,

81) which was visualised with iTOL (82). STRIDE identified *Bodo saltans* as the best

root for the consensus species tree.

To confirm the absence of VSGs in *T. melophagium*, all CDS sequences labelled as

'VSG' in the *T. brucei* TREU927/4 reference genome were downloaded from

TriTrypDB. A blastn search was performed with the *T. melophagium* genome as the

database using a loose cut-off (e-value = 1e-5). A similar search was performed to

confirm the reduced TTPSP counts in *T. melophagium*. For this, the *T. theileri*

transcripts were used to query a database made from the *T. melophagium*

transcripts (e-value = 1e-25).

The cell surface orthogroups in this study were annotated with the orthogroups from

Kelly *et al*. 2017 (32) based on the orthogroup membership of genes in the two

analyses. Unless stated otherwise, all of the figures in this study were plotted in R

(83) using ggplot2 (84) and ggrepel (85).

The full list of tools used in this study, and the options used to run those tools, can

be found in Table S1.

6.2. Results

T. melophagium genome assembly

An initial assessment of the *T. melophagium* genome, via k-mer counting, predicted

that it was smaller than that of *T. theileri* (22.3 Mb and 27.6 Mb, respectively), this

variation being observed in its repeat and unique sequence (Table 1). Notably, both

genomes are predicted to have extremely low heterozygosity (0.30 and 0.41 for *T.*

melophagium and *T. theileri,* respectively) in comparison to other *Trypanosoma*

isolates (86). Large gene families, such as the TTPSPs, only account for ~10% of

the *T. theileri* genome and so are predicted to have a minor effect in the

heterozygosity calculation. The k-mer counting prediction was similar in size to the

final assembly (Table 1). The *T. melophagium* assembly consisted of 64 contigs in

comparison to 253 for *T. theileri*. BUSCO assessments suggest both assemblies are

100% complete, although *T. theileri* is slightly fragmented (Table 1).

Table 1: Genome assessment. The assemblies used in this assessment represent

the final draft of the *T. melophagium* assembly produced during this study and the *T.*

theileri assembly available from TriTrypDB (32, 72). The k-mer spectra plots

associated with the first section of the table are found in Fig. S1.

	T. melophagium	*T. theileri* (32)
k-mer based genome survey		
Heterozygosity (%)	0.30	0.41
Genome / repeat / unique length (Mbp)	22.28 / 4.16 / 18.13	27.62 / 7.97 / 19.65
Genome assembly statistics (for scaffolds longer than 200 bp)		
Number of contigs	64	253
Span (Mbp)	23.3	29.6
Min / Max / Mean (bp)	5,186 / 1,230,212 / 364,120	791 / 1,635,300 / 117,005
N50	505,851	517,122
GC (%)	41.2	40.1
Genome BUSCO assessment		
Complete/ Single copy/ Duplicated/ Fragmented	100 / 100 / 0 / 0	99.2 / 99.2 / 0 / 0.8
Annotation		
Number of genes	10,057	11,312
Annotation BUSCO assessment		

Complete/ Single copy/ Duplicated/ Fragmented	100 / 100 / 0 / 0	99.2 / 99.2 / 0 / 0.8

The *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri* genomes were aligned to highlight the

conservation of collinearity. The conservation is more similar to the conservation

between the species *T. brucei* TREU927/4 *and T. congolense* IL3000 2019 than

between isolates of the same species, *T. brucei* TREU927/4 and *T. brucei* Lister 427

(Fig. 1 & Fig. S3). The *T. melophagium* genome was annotated with 10,057 proteins,

in comparison to 11,312 in *T. theileri* (Fig. 2c & Table 1) (32).

Trypanosomatid genomes, proteomes and transcriptomes were downloaded from

TriTrypDB (72). Proteome completeness was assessed with BUSCO. Those above

85% complete were retained, leaving 44 isolates from 9 genus (Supplementary File

S1). *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* have some of the smallest genomes in this study

group and have the lowest GC content (40.1% and 41.2%, respectively), contrasting

with the trypanosomatid mean of 48.4% (Fig. 2a).

Environmental temperature, generation time, neutral drift, gene splicing, tRNAs,

translational accuracy/efficiency and protein folding have all been hypothesised to

cause codon bias. However, codon bias can be influenced by nutrient availability

(76). Species with low nitrogen availability, such as the plant trypanosomatid,

Phytomonas, have an AT rich genome, potentially to mitigate the lack of nitrogen in

their plant hosts (76). Selection acting on genome nucleotide cost (Sc) is in

competition with selection acting to alter the translational efficiency of the genome

(St) (75, 76). Based on universal single copy orthologues, selection pressure acting

on the translational efficiency is minimal for both *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium*. In

contrast, they show the greatest predicted selection pressure acting to reduce the

nucleotide cost of any trypanosomatid genome. The AT biased content can be

interpreted as a remodelling of the *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* genomes to

reduce the cost of the genome (Fig. 2 a & b). This pattern held true when every CDS

was compared (Fig. S4 a & b) and in universal single copy orthologs which are

essential for every life cycle stage of *T. brucei* (Fig. S4 c & d).

347 **Figure 1:** Synteny of the *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri* genome sequences

348 highlights conservation and identity between the two species. The legend refers to

349 the percentage identity between the sequences.

Figure 2: (a) GC content across the whole genome and GC content bias in the CDS of trypanosomatid universal single copy orthologues (n=992). GC content (GC) > 0 = GC content bias. GC < 0 = AT content bias. (b) Selection acting on translational efficiency (St) and selection acting on nucleotide cost (Sc) in trypanosomatid universal single copy orthologues. Sc > 0 = Selection acting to increase codon nucleotide cost. Sc < 0 = Selection is acting to decrease codon nucleotide cost. St > 0 = Selection is acting to increase codon translational efficiency. St < 0 = Selection acting to decrease codon translational efficiency. (c) Counts of annotated protein sequences of publicly available trypanosomatids compared by genome size.

Orthologous protein clustering and phylogenetic inference

Orthologous clustering identified genes that descended from a gene in the last

common ancestor of the 44 trypanosomatid proteomes used in this study (Fig. 2,

Supplementary File S1). From the 44 proteomes, 18,274 orthogroups were identified

(96.5% of the proteins used in this study were included in one of these orthogroups),

992 orthogroups were single copy and contained all isolates.

A species tree was generated as part of the orthologous protein clustering. Using

genetic markers, previous studies have noted the similarity between *T. melophagium*

and *T. theileri* (33, 34). Based on 2,312 gene trees, *T. theileri* is the closest isolate to

T. melophagium and groups with the stercorarian trypanosomes, which include *T.*

cruzi, *Trypanosoma grayi* and *Trypanosoma rangeli,* rather than with salivarian

trypanosomes such as *T. brucei* (Fig. 3). *T. grayi* is the closest isolate to the *T.*

melophagium and *T. theileri* clade and is closer in size to the genome span of *T.*

melophagium than to *T. theileri* (Fig. 2c). *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri* do seem to

be closely related species with relatively short branch lengths (0.093 and 0.088

substitutions per site, respectively). In comparison, *T. congolense* is more divergent

from *T. brucei* (0.249) whilst the isolates within *T. brucei* (*T. brucei brucei* Lister

427:0.0009, *T. brucei evansi* STIB805: 0.003, *T. brucei brucei* TREU927/4: 0.003

and *T. brucei gambiense* DAL972:0.004) show less divergence than seen between

T. theileri and *T. melophagium*.

T. theileri has a greater number of species-specific orthogroups than *T.*

melophagium and 12.9% of its genes are assigned to one of these orthogroups,

while *T. melophagium* has only 2.7% of its genes in a species specific orthogroup

(Table 2). Terminal branch length is correlated with specific orthogroup counts,

which could account for the discrepancy. However, *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri*

are each other's most recent common ancestor and have been evolving at a roughly

similar rate since this time, with similar terminal branch lengths (Fig. 3). To visualise

these differences, the number of genes in each orthogroup was compared between

T. melophagium and *T. theileri*. Orthogroups associated with host interaction protein

families were highlighted based on their identification as a putative cell surface

protein by Kelly *et al*. 2017 (32). Many of the *T. theileri* species specific orthogroups

expansions belong to a cell surface family (Fig. 4a).

Table 2: Orthologous protein clustering statistics of *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri*.

The full species-specific clustering summary can be found in Supplementary File S3.

	T. melophagium	*T. theileri*
Number of genes	10,057	11,312
Genes in orthogroups (%)	97.3	97.4
Orthogroups containing species (%)	43.9	44.2
Number of species-specific orthogroups	76	121
Genes in species-specific orthogroups (%)	2.7	12.9
Comparatively expanded orthogroups	787	563

Figure 3: Species consensus tree based on 2,312 species trees created by STAG and STRIDE, OrthoFinder. The support values are represented by circles. Support values correlate to the proportion of times that the bipartition is seen in each of the individual trees used to create the consensus tree. The scale represents substitutions per site.

Figure 4: (a) Orthogroup and (b) host interaction orthogroup size comparison

between *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri*. Each dot represents the numbers of genes

found in each orthogroup for both species. The orthogroups have been annotated

with their designation as either a putative cell surface protein family or 'other' (32).

Interaction with the mammalian host and predicted cell surface proteins

Firstly, and as expected, *T. melophagium* was found to lack any genes in

orthogroups which contained VSGs, characteristic of African trypanosomes

(Supplementary File S4). To validate this, a blast search was performed using a

relaxed cut off (1e-5) using the *T. melophagium* genome as the database and *T.*

brucei TREU927/4 VSGs as the query. No hits were identified.

To enable comparison to the *T. theileri* genome analysis, the genes and orthogroups

from this study were annotated with orthogroups from Kelly *et al*. (2017) (32). Across

the entire genome, *T. theileri* is predicted to contain 1,265 more genes than *T.*

melophagium (Table 1). Examination of orthogroups which were associated with a *T.*

theileri putative surface protein (TTPSP) revealed a large expansion in *T. theileri*

(1,251 genes) compared to *T. melophagium* (10 genes) which could equate to much

of the disparity in genome size (Fig. 4). To confirm the difference in TTPSPs, the *T.*

theileri transcripts were subjected to a blastn search against a database consisting of

the *T. melophagium* transcripts (1e-25 cut-off). The *T. melophagium* transcripts were

derived from the genome annotation analysis. Only 9 *T. theileri* TTPSPs aligned to *T.*

melophagium.

TTPSPs were split between four orthogroups in the original *T. theileri* genome

analysis but were split between 66 orthogroups in this analysis (Table 3) (32).

TTPSPs share conserved C terminal GPI addition and N terminal signal sequences

and contain regions of high divergence in the remainder of the sequence. TTPSPs

are highly expressed as a family at the population level and are largely contained

within tandem arrays, highlighting a similarity to the VSGs of *T. brucei* (32).

Excluding *T. melophagium*, TTPSPs are absent from all other kinetoplastid species

analysed (Supplementary File S4) revealing their specific innovation in these related

trypanosomatids.

Following the TTPSPs, the largest expanded gene family in *T. theileri* are the MSPs.

This protein family belongs to the peptidase M8 family of metalloproteinases. MSPs

are likely to have contrasting roles in different life stages but their best understood

function is to bind and cleave members of the complement system. This role

presumably allows for evasion of complement-mediated proteolysis and therefore

assists survival in the insect and mammalian hosts (23). Orthogroups which

annotated as MSPs were expanded in *T. melophagium*, such as OG0008865. *T.*

melophagium also has a species specific orthogroup (OG0009903) consisting of 11

proteins and annotated as leishmanolysin, indicative of cell surface protein families.

Combined, these results suggest that the surface protein environment of *T.*

melophagium and *T. theileri* are distinct and that genes encoding these proteins

account for most of the discrepancy in the genome sizes.

Table 3: Cell surface orthogroup counts from Kelly *et al*. (2017) (32) and this study

along with counts of genes present in each category.

Cell surface category	Annotation	Orthogroup count Kelly *et al* / this study	Gene count *T. theileri* / *T. melophagium*
Conserved	Amastin	1 / 2	7 / 4
Conserved	MASP	1 / 1	1 / 1
Conserved	MSP	1 / 18	229 / 52
Conserved	PSSA-2	1 / 1	5 / 3
Unique	TTPSP1	1 / 42	720 / 1
Unique	TTPSP2	1 / 10	301 / 0
Unique	TTPSP3	1 / 11	157 / 9
Unique	TTPSP4	1 / 3	73 / 0

453 **Clade and species specific orthogroups**

454 *T. grayi*, *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri* contain 42 clade-specific orthogroups

455 including the MSP orthogroups OG0000590 and OG0008095. Both orthogroups

456 were expanded in *T. theileri* in comparison to *T. grayi* and *T. melophagium*. *T.*

457 *melophagium* and *T. theileri* share 81 orthogroups specific to the two species.

458 Twelve of the orthogroups are putative cell surface protein families, including five

459 representatives from TTPSP and seven MSP orthogroups. Of the nine-remaining

460 annotated orthogroups, OG0008096 is the largest and contains trans-sialidsases.

461 The orthogroup is expanded in *T. theileri* (n=17) compared to *T. melophagium* (n=5).

462

463 *T. theileri* has 121 species specific orthogroups. Sixty-four of these were putative

464 host interaction genes (32). Two annotated orthogroups remained, which included a

465 leucine rich repeat family associated with protein binding and (OG0011868) and a

466 calpain cysteine protease family (OG0018204). *T. melophagium* has 76 species

467 specific orthogroups, 68 of these were unannotated. Leishmanolysin families were

468 annotated in three of the remaining orthogroups (OG0009903, OG0013746 and

469 OG0013747). This annotation is associated with cell adhesion, such as MSP

470 families. Other annotated species-specific orthogroups consisted of an actin family

471 (OG0018163) along with several families associated with protein binding, WD

472 domain G-beta repeat (OG0018131) and a leucine rich repeat family (OG0018098).

Modifying enzymes

Trans-sialidases are differentially expanded in *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium*, with

38 and 8 genes, respectively. Of the four orthogroups containing trans-sialidase, two

do not contain proteins from *T. melophagium* (OG0011818 and OG0015016). These

two orthogroups contain proteins from *T. cruzi* and so are likely to have been lost by

T. melophagium and *T. grayi.* In *T. cruzi*, trans-sialidases are involved in host

immune evasion (22).

Invertases are typical of the cell surface of *Leishmania* and is thought to transform

sucrose into hexose in the gut of the vector. The orthogroups (OG0000150 and

OG0000409) that include 20 *T. theileri* invertase genes only have 3 members in *T.*

melophagium and 3 members in *T. grayi.* This expansion might indicate an

adaptation of *T. theileri* to its vector, the tabanid fly, which can feed on sugary flower

nectar (87). In contrast, the *T. melophagium* vector, the sheep ked, exclusively feeds

on mammalian blood. The orthogroups with *T. theileri* invertases contain only one

gene from the plant parasite *Phytomonas* (88, 89), suggesting a different mechanism

for sucrose metabolism in these parasites.

Other putative cell surface modifying molecules*,* such as UDP-galactose/UDP-N-

acetylglucosamine transferases (OG0000001) were expanded in *T. theileri* (n=60)

compared to *T. melophagium* (n=11).

Glycolysis

Transcriptome comparison between *T. brucei* and *T. theileri* revealed differences in

abundance of glycosomal enzyme mRNAs. Particularly, pyruvate orthophosphate

dikinase, phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase and malate dehydrogenase were

found to be >10 fold more abundant in *T. theileri* than in *T. brucei* (32). When

comparing glycolysis-related genes in *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri*, we found that

T. melophagium has expanded the number of genes in three of the orthogroups

associated with glycolytic enzymes. These included pyruvate orthophosphate

dikinase (OG0000570), phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase (OG0000120) and

malate dehydrogenase (OG0000332), whilst *T. melophagium* has a reduced

numbers of genes in the fumarate reductase orthogroup (OG0000078). Orthogroups

associated with peroxisome targeting were found to be in equal numbers

(OG0004108 PEX5 and OG0003998 – PEX7). All other glycolysis-related genes

included in the comparison are present in equal numbers in the two species.

Therefore, it is likely that the glycolysis pathway is conserved in *T. melophagium.*

Life cycle

Extensive studies of *T. brucei* have identified genes which are associated with key

stages of the *T. brucei* life cycle. These studies tracked genes associated with

stumpy formation in the blood stream form (90-93) and regulators of

metacyclogenesis (94). These genes were combined with a list of validated

development associated genes such as the RNA binding proteins RBP6, RBP7,

RBP10 and ZFP2 and ZFP3 along with developmental regulators NRK A, NRK B,

RDK1, RDK2, MAPK2 and phosphatases such as PTP1 and PIP39 (95-102). Most

of the orthogroups containing these genes were represented with a similar number of

genes in each species, indicating the presence of an environmental sensing ability

and developmental competence (Fig. 5). However, there were notable differences.

There is an expansion in the orthogroups containing KRIPP14, which is a

mitochondrial SSU component (90), in *T. theileri*. *T. melophagium* has expanded its

orthogroups containing the kinases NRK (96, 100), NEK and (99) ADKF (90) along

with a dual specificity phosphatase (DsPho) and protein phosphatases 1 (PP1) (90,

103). Both *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* are missing metacaspase (MCA1) which is

associated with the later stages of progression towards metacyclic forms in *T. brucei*

(94) and Hyp12 which upregulates bound mRNAs during development based on

tethering assays in *T. brucei* (90, 103). Puf11, an effector molecule required for

kinetoplast repositioning in epimastigotes (94), is also absent in *T. melophagium*.

Life cycle regulatory genes and genes controlling meiosis SPO11, MND1, HOP1 and

DMC1 were found in *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri* (Fig. 5), suggesting

maintenance of a sexual stage.

Figure 5: Genes associated with development, and related proteins, at various stages throughout the *T. brucei* life cycle. The number of genes in orthogroups associated with developmental regulation have been quantified in *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium*.

RNAi

All 5 core genes that represent the trypanosome RNAi machinery (AGO1, DCL1,

DCL2, RIF4 and RIF5) were present in *T. melophagium*, with an extra gene in the

orthogroup containing DLC2 (Supplementary File S4). This indicates a functional

gene silencing pathway is present in *T. melophagium* matching the prediction in *T.*

theileri.

6.3. Discussion

T. melophagium and *T. theileri* are closely related trypanosomes that have distinct hosts and vectors (33, 34). Here, the genome of *T. melophagium* was sequenced and a draft assembly was produced and annotated. The annotated proteome was incorporated into a comparison with *T. theileri,* and other publicly available trypanosomatid proteomes, to determine their phylogenetic relationship and to explore the genomic basis of the host and vector specificity of these non-pathogenic trypanosomatids.

Although the two genomes compared in this analysis are predicted to be complete (Table 1), their assembly and annotation were performed five years apart using different pipelines and technologies. Comparing assemblies obtained using the same sequencing technologies and pipelines would allow for greater confidence in the observed variations in their genome content. This was not possible since many of the assembly tools used are specific for the sequencing technologies whilst there has been substantial development in assembly methods between the two studies. However, based on the convergence of the k-mer counting based prediction with the assembly sizes, along with 100% complete BUSCO scores, we were reassured by the quality of the draft assemblies and the subsequent comparisons of their genome content.

Using k-mer counting based predictions, *T. melophagium* was anticipated to have a smaller genome than *T. theileri*. This held true when the data were assembled (Table 1). The *T. melophagium* genome is more similar in size to *T. grayi*, the closest

relative to *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri,* than to *T. theileri* (Fig. 2 & 3). *T. theileri*

has likely expanded its genome size since speciation occurred. A peculiarity of *T.*

theileri and *T. melophagium* is their highly reduced heterozygosity, in contrast to

African trypanosomes (86). It is possible this reduced heterozygosity is linked to a

founder effect (104). As *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* have utilised specific host

and vector niches, the small population that initially expanded into the niches

possibly underwent a significant population bottleneck, especially as host

domestication caused eradication of wild progenitors and wild relatives, which could

have facilitated a reduction in heterozygosity, induced by genetic drift. Alternatively,

the absence of a sexual cycle could contribute to the reduced heterozygosity.

Although *T. melophagium* and *T. theileri* contain genes required for meiosis, it

doesn't confirm the species undergo sexual reproduction.

Selection appears to be acting to reduce the genome wide nucleotide biosynthesis

cost in both *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* (Fig. 2b) which has remodelled their

genomes toward an AT bias, contrasting all other trypanosomatid genomes analysed

in this study (Fig. 2 a & c). The predicted selection pressure acting to reduce

nucleotide cost is at the expense of translational efficiency (Fig. 2c) and is greater

than the free-living *Bodo saltans*, monoxenous insect parasites such as the early

branching *Paratrypanosoma confusum* and *Phytomonas* EM1. *Phytomonas* has

limited access to nitrogen as it infects nitrogen deficient plants and has been

highlighted as an example where diet can cause selection to reduce the species

genome nucleotide cost, through a reduction in GC content (76). We propose that

the reduction in the selection cost of *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* may be related

to their non-pathogenic nature. By remodelling their genome to an AT bias, they may

have reduced their cost to their host, facilitating reduced pathogenicity.

This clade specific genome remodelling provides an example of the similarity

between *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium*. However, the species have contrasting

hosts, vectors, and genome sizes. Genome annotation and orthology inference

identified candidates for their discrepancy in genome size. When species specific

orthogroups were compared, the greatest contrast was between orthogroups

associated with the putative cell surface, with the largest expansions detected in *T.*

theileri being of TTPSP and MSP surface protein families (Fig. 4)*. Although both

species undergo a cyclical transmission cycle, which includes mammalian and insect

stages, we hypothesise the respective prevalence in their mammalian hosts, and the

contrasting life history of their respective vectors could explain the genome

expansion in *T. theileri*. *T. theileri*, spread by tabanids, are found in over 80% of

livestock (25-28). In comparison, *T. melophagium* exhibits lower detected

prevalence, being rarely identified in its mammalian host via blood smears (34) or

after blood culture (35). Moreover, sheep keds, which transmit *T. melophagium*, are

intimately associated with their mammalian host, spending their entire life either on

the sheep's skin or wool. Here, males and females feed solely on mammalian blood

providing many opportunities for transmission of *T. melophagium* from the sheep to

the sheep ked (39). Therefore, there is potentially less advantage for *T.*

melophagium to invest in mammalian immune evasion mechanisms required to

extend the length of its infection in sheep, since it has many transmission

opportunities. The limited investment in *T. melophagium* is emphasised by their

relatively unsophisticated putative TTPSP repertoire alongside modestly expanded

species-specific MSP families (Fig. 4). Instead, *T. melophagium* could rely on its

ancestral ability to sustain infections in invertebrate hosts which, although able to be

primed to defend against a specific pathogen, rely upon an innate immune response

(105).

In contrast, *T. theileri* has a transient host-vector interaction. Tabanid flies of either

gender survive on plant sugars whilst adult females occasionally feed on mammalian

blood (42). Therefore, potentially *T. theileri* requires extended survival in its

mammalian host to sustain transmission to cattle, compared to the intimate long-

term association of sheep keds with *T. melophagium*. The investment from *T. theileri*

in an expanded surface protein repertoire is likely to support adaptive immune

evasion and prolonged survival in the mammalian stage of its life cycle. Alternatively,

or additionally, differences between the bovine and ovine immune responses could

contribute (106).

Many of the gene families identified in *T. theileri* (32) were further divided into

multiple orthogroups in this study. The discrepancy is likely to be explained by

evolution of the methods utilised by OrthoFinder. At the time of publication of the *T.*

theileri study, OrthoFinder v.1 was available, while our analysis used version v.2.5.

For this reason, we can speculate that the clustering in this study is more refined,

such that the TTPSP families should be divided into smaller protein families.

However, large paralogous orthogroups remain the toughest challenge for

orthogroup clustering software and so the relationships between this set of proteins

will continue to evolve alongside the software (107).

Genes involved in the trypanosome life cycle, cellular quiescence and meiosis were

all detected in *T. melophagium*, suggesting a competent developmental cycle along

with the machinery for sexual recombination. There is an expansion of the *T. theileri*

invertase orthogroup which was not present in *T. melophagium*. This is potentially

associated with the utilisation of sucrose in the tabanid fly's diet. Although the

glycolysis pathway is present in *T. melophagium*, there was an expansion in the

pyruvate orthophosphate dikinase, phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase and malate

dehydrogenase orthogroups. These genes are associated with the branch of the

glycolysis pathway that converts pyruvate to succinate to facilitate the recovery of

NAD^+ (32). This branch of the glycolytic pathway was upregulated in *T. theileri* in

contrast to *T. brucei* (32). Interestingly, the core RNAi genes were detected in *T.*

melophagium, consistent with *T. theileri* but distinct from *T. cruzi* which is also a

stercorarian trypanosome, but which lacks the requisite molecular machinery (108).

In summary, we have found that *T. theileri* and *T. melophagium* are closely related

species which display substantial remodelling of their genomes to facilitate a

reduction in their nucleotide costs, which could reduce the costs they impose on their

hosts. *T. theileri* displays a considerable genome expansion which is associated with

a large repertoire of unique proteins that characterise its cell surface and host

interaction gene repertoire. These genes could facilitate a lifelong infection in its

mammalian host. The comparatively unsophisticated immune evasion repertoire

displayed by *T. melophagium* suggests that the species has emphasised its

adaptation to the insect stage of its lifecycle.

7. Author statements

7.1. Authors and contributions

Guy Oldrieve (GO) 0000-0003-1428-0608

Beatrice Malacart (BM)

Javier López Vidal (JLV)

Keith Matthews (KM) 0000-0003-0309-9184

Contributor Role	Author
Conceptualisation	GO, KM
Methodology	GO, BM
Software	GO
Validation	GO
Formal Analysis	GO, BM
Investigation	GO, BM
Resources	GO, KM, JLV
Data Curation	GO
Writing – Original Draft Preparation	GO, BM
Writing – Review and Editing	GO, KM, BM, JLV
Visualisation	GO, KM, BM
Supervision	KM
Project Administration	GO, KM
Funding	KM

7.2. Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

7.3. Funding information

This research was funded in part by the Wellcome Trust (103740/Z/14/Z and 108905/B/15/Z) and through support from the 'Supporting Evidence Based Interventions' and Bill and Melinda Gates foundation, and a Royal Society GCRF Challenge grant CH160034, both awarded to KM. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

KM was supported by a Wellcome Trust Investigator award grant (103740/Z/14/Z), GO by a Wellcome Trust PhD studentship (108905/B/15/Z), and JLP by a Royal Society GCRF Challenge grant CH160034.

7.4. Ethical approval

Not applicable.

7.5. Consent for publication

Not applicable.

7.6. Acknowledgments

We thank Steven Kelly (University of Oxford) for his comments and insights on the manuscript.

8.   Supplementary material

(a)

Supplementary Figure S1: k-mer spectra of (a) *T. melophagium* and (b) *T. theileri* using a k-mer size of 21. The statistics presented in these images represent the lowest estimate size, the highest estimate was used in Table 1 as these had a greater model fit.

726   (a)

748   **Supplementary Figure S2:** Coverage and blast annotation for (a) the polished

749   assembly and (b) the manually trimmed assembly.

772 **Supplementary Figure S3:** Synteny plot of (a) *T. brucei* TREU927/4 and *T. brucei*

773 Lister 427 and (b) *T. brucei* TREU927/4 *and T. congolense* IL3000 2019 genome

774 sequences. The legend refers to the identity between the sequences.

Supplementary Figure S4: (a) GC content across the whole genome and GC

content bias in a every CDS. (b) Selection acting on translational efficiency (St) and

selection acting on nucleotide cost (Sc). (c) GC content across the whole genome

and GC content bias in CDS of a trypanosomatid universal single copy orthologue

which is essential in every life cycle stage in *T. brucei* (n=158). (d) Selection acting

on translational efficiency (St) and selection acting on nucleotide cost (Sc) in

trypanosomatid universal single copy orthologues which is essential in every life

cycle stage in *T. brucei* (n=158).

784 **Table S1:** Software, including the version and any options used.

Tool	Version	Flag	Available at
Guppy	4.0.15	--flowcell FLO-MIN106 --kit SQK-RAD004	https://community.nanoporetech.com/
Trimmomatic	0.39	SLIDINGWINDOW 4:20 MINLEN 50	https://github.com/timflutre/trimmomatic
GenomeScope	1	Kmer 21 Max kmer cov. 1000	http://qb.cshl.edu/genomescope/
Jellyfish	2.2.10	-C -m 21 -s 1000000000	https://github.com/gmarcais/Jellyfish
Wtdbg2	3	-x ont -g 30m -A -t 10	https://github.com/ruanjue/wtdbg2
Minimap2	2.17-r941	-ax map-ont	https://github.com/lh3/minimap2
Racon	v1.4.13	-m 8 -x -6 -g -8 -w 500	https://github.com/isovic/racon
Medaka	V5	-m r941_min_high_g360	https://github.com/nanoporetech/medaka
BWA-MEM	0.7.17-r1188	N/A	https://github.com/lh3/bwa
Pilon	1.24	--genome --diploid –bam	https://github.com/broadinstitute/pilon

		--bam	
Blast	2.6.0+	blastn -task megablast -outfmt '6 qseqid staxids bitscore std' -max_target_seqs 1 -max_hsps 1 -evalue 1e-25 or 1e-5	ftp://ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/blast/executables/blast+/LATEST/
DIAMOND	2.0.5.143	Blastx --sensitive --max-target-seqs 1 --evalue 1e-25	http://www.diamondsearch.org
BlobTools	1.1.1	-r genus	https://github.com/DRL/blobtools
Scaffold_stats	N/A	N/A	https://github.com/sujaikumar/assemblage
BUSCO	V5	-l euglenozoa_odb10	https://busco.ezlab.org/
RepeatModeler	N/A	-database -LTRStruct -pa 8	http://www.repeatmasker.org/RepeatModeler/
RepeatMasker	N/A	-lib consensi.fa.classified -pa 8 -xsmall -nolow –gff	http://www.repeatmasker.org/RMDownload.html

BRAKER2	2.1.6	--prot_seq --bam --softmasking --etpmode --gff3	https://github.com/Gaius-Augustus/BRAKER
D-Genies	1.2.0	-Minimap2	http://dgenies.toulouse.inra.fr/run
tRNAscan-SE	2.0.9	-E	http://lowelab.ucsc.edu/tRNAscan-SE/
CodonMuse	0.1.0	-f -tscan	https://github.com/easeward/CodonMuSe
OrthoFinder	2.5.2	-S diamond_ultra_sens	https://github.com/davidemms/OrthoFinder
InterProScan	5.52-86.0	--dp --goterms -appl SignalP-EUK-4.1, Pfam -f TSV	https://www.ebi.ac.uk/interpro/
KinFin	1.0.3		https://github.com/DRL/kinfin
R	3.6.1		https://www.r-project.org/
ggplot2	3.3.3		https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/ggplot2/index.html

ggrepel	0.9.1		https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/ggrepel/index.html
dplyr	1.0.5		https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/dplyr/index.html

9.   References

1.   Podlipaev S. The more insect trypanosomatids under study-the more diverse

Trypanosomatidae appears. Int J Parasitol. 2001;31(5-6):648-52.

2.   Kaufer A, Ellis J, Stark D, Barratt J. The evolution of trypanosomatid

taxonomy. Parasit Vectors. 2017;10(1):287.

3.   Schnaufer A, Domingo GJ, Stuart K. Natural and induced dyskinetoplastic

trypanosomatids: how to live without mitochondrial DNA. International Journal for

Parasitology. 2002;32(9):1071-84.

4.   Cayla M, Rojas F, Silvester E, Venter F, Matthews KR. African trypanosomes.

Parasit Vectors. 2019;12(1):190.

5.   Mehlitz D, Molyneux DH. The elimination of Trypanosoma brucei gambiense?

Challenges of reservoir hosts and transmission cycles: Expect the unexpected.

Parasite Epidemiol Control. 2019;6:e00113.

6.   Cavalier-Smith T. Kingdoms Protozoa and Chromista and the eozoan root of

the eukaryotic tree. Biol Lett. 2010;6(3):342-5.

7.   Burki F. The eukaryotic tree of life from a global phylogenomic perspective.

Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2014;6(5):a016147.

8.   Maslov DA, Opperdoes FR, Kostygov AY, Hashimi H, Lukes J, Yurchenko V.

Recent advances in trypanosomatid research: genome organization, expression,

metabolism, taxonomy and evolution. Parasitology. 2019;146(1):1-27.

9.   Melville SE, Leech V, Gerrard CS, Tait A, Blackwell JM. The molecular

karyotype of the megabase chromosomes of Trypanosoma brucei and the

assignment of chromosome markers. Mol Biochem Parasitol. 1998;94(2):155-73.

10.   Wickstead B, Ersfeld K, Gull K. The small chromosomes of Trypanosoma

brucei involved in antigenic variation are constructed around repetitive palindromes.

Genome Res. 2004;14(6):1014-24.

11.   Daniels JP, Gull K, Wickstead B. Cell biology of the trypanosome genome.

Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 2010;74(4):552-69.

12.   Parsons M, Nelson RG, Watkins KP, Agabian N. Trypanosome mRNAs share

a common 5' spliced leader sequence. Cell. 1984;38(1):309-16.

13.   Clayton C. Regulation of gene expression in trypanosomatids: living with

polycistronic transcription. Open Biol. 2019;9(6):190072.

14.   Steinert M. Mitochondria Associated with the Kinetonucleus of Trypanosoma

Mega. J Biophys Biochem Cytol. 1960;8(2):542-6.

15.   Kleisen CMaBP. Sequence heterogeneity of the mini-circles of kinetoplast

DNA of Crithidia luciliae and evidence for the presence of a component more

complex than mini-circle DNA in the kinetoplast network. Biochimica et Biophysica

Acta (BBA) - Nucleic Acids and Protein Synthesis. 1975;407(4):473-8.

16.   Borst P, Fase-Fowler F. The maxi-circle of Trypanosoma brucei kinetoplast

DNA. Biochim Biophys Acta. 1979;565(1):1-12.

17.   Simpson L. Isolation of maxicircle component of kinetoplast DNA from

hemoflagellate protozoa. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1979;76(4):1585-8.

18.   Berriman M, Ghedin E, Hertz-Fowler C, Blandin G, Renauld H, Bartholomeu

DC, *et al.* The genome of the African trypanosome Trypanosoma brucei. Science.

2005;309(5733):416-22.

19.   Borst P. Antigenic variation and allelic exclusion. Cell. 2002;109(1):5-8.

20.   Pays E, Vanhamme L, Perez-Morga D. Antigenic variation in Trypanosoma

brucei: facts, challenges and mysteries. Curr Opin Microbiol. 2004;7(4):369-74.

21.   Buscaglia CA, Campo VA, Frasch AC, Di Noia JM. Trypanosoma cruzi

surface mucins: host-dependent coat diversity. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2006;4(3):229-36.

22.   Nardy AF, Freire-de-Lima CG, Perez AR, Morrot A. Role of Trypanosoma

cruzi Trans-sialidase on the Escape from Host Immune Surveillance. Front Microbiol.

2016;7:348.

23.   Yao C, Donelson JE, Wilson ME. The major surface protease (MSP or GP63)

of Leishmania sp. Biosynthesis, regulation of expression, and function. Mol Biochem

Parasitol. 2003;132(1):1-16.

24.   Funk S, Nishiura H, Heesterbeek H, Edmunds WJ, Checchi F. Identifying

Transmission Cycles at the Human-Animal Interface: The Role of Animal Reservoirs

in Maintaining Gambiense Human African Trypanosomiasis. Plos Computational

Biology. 2013;9(1):e1002855.

25.   Matthews DM, Kingston N, Maki L, Nelms G. Trypanosoma theileri Laveran,

1902, in Wyoming cattle. Am J Vet Res. 1979;40(5):623-9.

26.   Schlafer DH. Trypanosoma theileri: a literature review and report of incidence

in New York cattle. Cornell Vet. 1979;69(4):411-25.

27.   Farrar RG, Klei TR. Prevalence of Trypanosoma theileri in Louisiana cattle. J

Parasitol. 1990;76(5):734-6.

28.   Mott GA, Wilson R, Fernando A, Robinson A, MacGregor P, Kennedy D, *et al*.

Targeting Cattle-Borne Zoonoses and Cattle Pathogens Using a Novel

Trypanosomatid-Based Delivery System. Plos Pathogens. 2011;7(10):e1002340.

29.   Bose R, Heister NC. Development of Trypanosoma (M.) theileri in tabanids. J

Eukaryot Microbiol. 1993;40(6):788-92.

30.   Doherty ML, Windle H, Voorheis HP, Larkin H, Casey M, Clery D, *et al*.

Clinical disease associated with Trypanosoma theileri infection in a calf in Ireland.

Vet Rec. 1993;132(26):653-6.

31.   Seifi HA. Clinical Trypanosomosis Due to Trypanosoma-Theileri in a Cow in

Iran. Tropical Animal Health and Production. 1995;27(2):93-4.

32.   Kelly S, Ivens A, Mott GA, O'Neill E, Emms D, Macleod O, *et al*. An

Alternative Strategy for Trypanosome Survival in the Mammalian Bloodstream

Revealed through Genome and Transcriptome Analysis of the Ubiquitous Bovine

Parasite Trypanosoma (Megatrypanum) theileri. Genome Biology and Evolution.

2017;9(8):2093-109.

33.   Gibson W, Pilkington JG, Pemberton JM. Trypanosoma melophagium from

the sheep ked Melophagus ovinus on the island of St Kilda. Parasitology.

2010;137(12):1799-804.

34.   Martinkovic F, Matanovic K, Rodrigues AC, Garcia HA, Teixeira MM.

Trypanosoma (Megatrypanum) melophagium in the sheep ked Melophagus ovinus

from organic farms in Croatia: phylogenetic inferences support restriction to sheep

and sheep keds and close relationship with trypanosomes from other ruminant

species. J Eukaryot Microbiol. 2012;59(2):134-44.

35.   Serpil. Trypanosoma melophagium in blood cell culture. Ankara Üniversitesi

Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi. 2008;50(1):1-.

36.   Flu. Über die Flagellaten im Darm von Melophagus ovinus. Arch. f.

37.   Porter A. The Structure and Life-history of Crithidia melophagia (Flu), an

Endoparasite of the Sheep Ked, Melophagus ovinus.

38.   Swingle LD. The Relation of Crithidia melophagia to the Sheep's Blood, with

Remarks upon the Controversy between Dr. Porter and Dr. Woodcock. Transactions

of the American Microscopical Society. 1911;30(4):275.

39.   Hoare CA. An Experimental Study of the Sheep-Trypanosome (T.

melophagium Flu, 1908), and its Transmission by the Sheep-Ked (Melophagus

ovinus L.). Parasitology. 1923;15(4):365-424.

40.   Hoare CA. The trypanosomes of mammals. A zoological monograph. The

trypanosomes of mammals A zoological monograph , sciwheel-projects =

Monomorphism. 1972.

41.   Underwood WJaBRaDMLaGRaMSAaSA. Biology and diseases of ruminants

(sheep, goats, and cattle). Laboratory Animal Medicine: Elsevier; 2015. p. 623-94.

42.   Chainey JE. Horse-flies, deer-flies and clegs (Tabanidae). In: Lane RPaCRW,

editor. Medical insects and arachnids. Dordrecht , sciwheel-projects = T-mel vs T-

the: Springer Netherlands; 1993. p. 310-32.

43.   Leger AaLT. pycoQC , interactive quality control for Oxford Nanopore

Sequencing. The Journal of Open Source Software. 2019;4(34):1236.

44.   Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. Bioinformatics. 2014;30(15):2114-20.

45.   Marcais G, Kingsford C. A fast, lock-free approach for efficient parallel

counting of occurrences of k-mers. Bioinformatics. 2011;27(6):764-70.

46.   Vurture GW, Sedlazeck FJ, Nattestad M, Underwood CJ, Fang H, Gurtowski

J, *et al*. GenomeScope: fast reference-free genome profiling from short reads.

Bioinformatics. 2017;33(14):2202-4.

47.   Ruan J, Li H. Fast and accurate long-read assembly with wtdbg2. Nat

Methods. 2020;17(2):155-8.

48.   Li H. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with

BWA - MEM. arXiv , sciwheel-projects = Software. 2013.

49.   Li H. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics.

2018;34(18):3094-100.

50.   Vaser R, Sovic I, Nagarajan N, Sikic M. Fast and accurate de novo genome

assembly from long uncorrected reads. Genome Res. 2017;27(5):737-46.

51.   Walker BJ, Abeel T, Shea T, Priest M, Abouelliel A, Sakthikumar S, *et al*.

Pilon: an integrated tool for comprehensive microbial variant detection and genome

assembly improvement. PLoS One. 2014;9(11):e112963.

52.   Seppey M, Manni M, Zdobnov EM. BUSCO: Assessing Genome Assembly

and Annotation Completeness. Methods Mol Biol. 2019;1962:227-45.

53.   Buchfink B, Xie C, Huson DH. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using

DIAMOND. Nature Methods. 2015;12(1):59-60.

54.   Jones P, Binns D, Chang HY, Fraser M, Li W, McAnulla C, *et al*. InterProScan

5: genome-scale protein function classification. Bioinformatics. 2014;30(9):1236-40.

55.   Laetsch DRaBML. BlobTools : Interrogation of genome assemblies.

F1000Research. 2017;6:1287.

56.   Flynn JM, Hubley R, Goubert C, Rosen J, Clark AG, Feschotte C, *et al*.

RepeatModeler2 for automated genomic discovery of transposable element families.

Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2020;117(17):9451-7.

57.   Kriventseva EV, Kuznetsov D, Tegenfeldt F, Manni M, Dias R, Simao FA, *et*

al. OrthoDB v10: sampling the diversity of animal, plant, fungal, protist, bacterial and

viral genomes for evolutionary and functional annotations of orthologs. Nucleic Acids

Res. 2019;47(D1):D807-D11.

58.   Hoff KJ, Lange S, Lomsadze A, Borodovsky M, Stanke M. BRAKER1:

Unsupervised RNA-Seq-Based Genome Annotation with GeneMark-ET and

AUGUSTUS. Bioinformatics. 2016;32(5):767-9.

59.   Stanke M, Schoffmann O, Morgenstern B, Waack S. Gene prediction in

eukaryotes with a generalized hidden Markov model that uses hints from external

sources. Bmc Bioinformatics. 2006;7:62.

60.   Gotoh O. A space-efficient and accurate method for mapping and aligning

cDNA sequences onto genomic sequence. Nucleic Acids Res. 2008;36(8):2630-8.

61.   Stanke M, Diekhans M, Baertsch R, Haussler D. Using native and syntenically

mapped cDNA alignments to improve de novo gene finding. Bioinformatics.

2008;24(5):637-44.

62.   Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, *et al*. The

Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics. 2009;25(16):2078-9.

63.   Barnett DW, Garrison EK, Quinlan AR, Stromberg MP, Marth GT. BamTools:

a C++ API and toolkit for analyzing and managing BAM files. Bioinformatics.

2011;27(12):1691-2.

64.   Iwata H, Gotoh O. Benchmarking spliced alignment programs including

Spaln2, an extended version of Spaln that incorporates additional species-specific

features. Nucleic Acids Research. 2012;40(20):e161.

65.   Lomsadze A, Burns PD, Borodovsky M. Integration of mapped RNA-Seq

reads into automatic training of eukaryotic gene finding algorithm. Nucleic Acids

Research. 2014;42(15):e119.

66.   Hoff KJ, Lomsadze A, Borodovsky M, Stanke M. Whole-Genome Annotation

with BRAKER. Methods Mol Biol. 2019;1962:65-95.

67.   Bruna T, Lomsadze A, Borodovsky M. GeneMark-EP+: eukaryotic gene

prediction with self-training in the space of genes and proteins. NAR Genom

Bioinform. 2020;2(2):lqaa026.

68.   Bruna T, Hoff KJ, Lomsadze A, Stanke M, Borodovsky M. BRAKER2:

automatic eukaryotic genome annotation with GeneMark-EP+ and AUGUSTUS

supported by a protein database. NAR Genom Bioinform. 2021;3(1):lqaa108.

69.   Nielsen H. Predicting Secretory Proteins with SignalP. Methods Mol Biol.

2017;1611:59-73.

70.   Mistry J, Chuguransky S, Williams L, Qureshi M, Salazar GA, Sonnhammer

ELL, *et al*. Pfam: The protein families database in 2021. Nucleic Acids Res.

2021;49(D1):D412-D9.

71.   Cabanettes F, Klopp C. D-GENIES: dot plot large genomes in an interactive,

efficient and simple way. PeerJ. 2018;6:e4958.

72.   Aslett M, Aurrecoechea C, Berriman M, Brestelli J, Brunk BP, Carrington M, *et*

al. TriTrypDB: a functional genomic resource for the Trypanosomatidae. Nucleic

Acids Research. 2010;38:D457-D62.

73.   Leinonen R, Sugawara H, Shumway M, International Nucleotide Sequence

Database C. The sequence read archive. Nucleic Acids Res. 2011;39(Database

issue):D19-21.

74.   Chan PP, Lin BY, Mak AJ, Lowe TM. tRNAscan-SE 2.0: improved detection

and functional classification of transfer RNA genes. Nucleic Acids Research.

2021;49(16):9077-96.

75.   Seward EA, Kelly S. Selection-driven cost-efficiency optimization of

transcripts modulates gene evolutionary rate in bacteria. Genome Biology. 2018;19.

76. Seward EA, Kelly S. Dietary nitrogen alters codon bias and genome

composition in parasitic microorganisms. Genome Biology. 2016;17.

77. Alsford S, Turner DJ, Obado SO, Sanchez-Flores A, Glover L, Berriman M, *et*

al. High-throughput phenotyping using parallel sequencing of RNA interference

targets in the African trypanosome. Genome Research. 2011;21(6):915-24.

78. Emms DM, Kelly S. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for

comparative genomics. Genome Biol. 2019;20(1):238.

79. Laetsch DR, Blaxter ML. KinFin: Software for Taxon-Aware Analysis of

Clustered Protein Sequences. G3 (Bethesda). 2017;7(10):3349-57.

80. Emms DM, Kelly S. STRIDE: Species Tree Root Inference from Gene

Duplication Events. Mol Biol Evol. 2017;34(12):3267-78.

81. Emms DaKS. STAG : Species Tree Inference from All Genes. BioRxiv. 2018.

82. Letunic I, Bork P. Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL): an online tool for

phylogenetic tree display and annotation. Bioinformatics. 2007;23(1):127-8.

83. Team RC. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R

Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2019.

84. Wickham H. ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis. 2016.

85. Slowikowski K. ggrepel: Automatically Position Non-Overlapping Text Labels

with'ggplot2'. R package version 08 0 ed. 2018.

86. Oldrieve G, Verney M, Jaron KS, Hebert L, Matthews KR. Monomorphic

Trypanozoon: towards reconciling phylogeny and pathologies. Microb Genom.

2021;7(8).

87. Kniepert FW. Blood-feeding and nectar-feeding in adult tabanidae (Diptera).

Oecologia. 1980;46(1):125-9.

88.   Sanchez-Moreno M, Lasztity D, Coppens I, Opperdoes FR. Characterization

of carbohydrate metabolism and demonstration of glycosomes in a Phytomonas sp.

isolated from Euphorbia characias. Mol Biochem Parasitol. 1992;54(2):185-99.

89.   Jaskowska E, Butler C, Preston G, Kelly S. Phytomonas: trypanosomatids

adapted to plant environments. PLoS Pathog. 2015;11(1):e1004484.

90.   Mony BM, MacGregor P, Ivens A, Rojas F, Cowton A, Young J, *et al*.

Genome-wide dissection of the quorum sensing signalling pathway in Trypanosoma

brucei. Nature. 2014;505(7485):681-5.

91.   Cayla M, McDonald L, MacGregor P, Matthews K. An atypical DYRK kinase

connects quorum-sensing with posttranscriptional gene regulation in Trypanosoma

brucei. Elife. 2020;9.

92.   Ling AS, Trotter JR, Hendriks EF. A zinc finger protein, TbZC3H20, stabilizes

two developmentally regulated mRNAs in trypanosomes. J Biol Chem.

2011;286(23):20152-62.

93.   Liu B, Kamanyi Marucha K, Clayton C. The zinc finger proteins ZC3H20 and

ZC3H21 stabilise mRNAs encoding membrane proteins and mitochondrial proteins

in insect-form Trypanosoma brucei. Mol Microbiol. 2020;113(2):430-51.

94.   Toh JY, Nkouawa A, Sanchez SR, Shi H, Kolev NG, Tschudi C. Identification

of positive and negative regulators in the stepwise developmental progression

towards infectivity in Trypanosoma brucei. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):5755.

95.   Szoor B, Ruberto I, Burchmore R, Matthews KR. A novel phosphatase

cascade regulates differentiation in Trypanosoma brucei via a glycosomal signaling

pathway. Genes Dev. 2010;24(12):1306-16.

96.   Domingo-Sananes MR, Szoor B, Ferguson MA, Urbaniak MD, Matthews KR.

Molecular control of irreversible bistability during trypanosome developmental

commitment. J Cell Biol. 2015;211(2):455-68.

97.   Szoor B, Wilson J, McElhinney H, Tabernero L, Matthews KR. Protein

tyrosine phosphatase TbPTP1: A molecular switch controlling life cycle differentiation

in trypanosomes. J Cell Biol. 2006;175(2):293-303.

98.   Walrad P, Paterou A, Acosta-Serrano A, Matthews KR. Differential

trypanosome surface coat regulation by a CCCH protein that co-associates with

procyclin mRNA cis-elements. PLoS Pathog. 2009;5(2):e1000317.

99.   Gale M, Jr., Parsons M. A Trypanosoma brucei gene family encoding protein

kinases with catalytic domains structurally related to Nek1 and NIMA. Mol Biochem

Parasitol. 1993;59(1):111-21.

100.   Gale M, Jr., Carter V, Parsons M. Translational control mediates the

developmental regulation of the Trypanosoma brucei Nrk protein kinase. J Biol

Chem. 1994;269(50):31659-65.

101.   Jones NG, Thomas EB, Brown E, Dickens NJ, Hammarton TC, Mottram JC.

Regulators of Trypanosoma brucei cell cycle progression and differentiation

identified using a kinome-wide RNAi screen. PLoS Pathog. 2014;10(1):e1003886.

102.   Muller IB, Domenicali-Pfister D, Roditi I, Vassella E. Stage-specific

requirement of a mitogen-activated protein kinase by Trypanosoma brucei. Mol Biol

Cell. 2002;13(11):3787-99.

103.   Mony BM, Matthews KR. Assembling the components of the quorum sensing

pathway in African trypanosomes. Mol Microbiol. 2015;96(2):220-32.

104.   Pool JE, Nielsen R. Population size changes reshape genomic patterns of

diversity. Evolution. 2007;61(12):3001-6.

105.   Cooper D, Eleftherianos I. Memory and Specificity in the Insect Immune

System: Current Perspectives and Future Challenges. Front Immunol. 2017;8:539.

106.   Wang F, Ekiert DC, Ahmad I, Yu W, Zhang Y, Bazirgan O, *et al*. Reshaping

antibody diversity. Cell. 2013;153(6):1379-93.

107.   Emms DM, Kelly S. Benchmarking Orthogroup Inference Accuracy: Revisiting

Orthobench. Genome Biology and Evolution. 2020;12(12):2258-66.

108.   Ullu E, Tschudi C, Chakraborty T. RNA interference in protozoan parasites.

Cellular Microbiology. 2004;6(6):509-19.

1058