RESEARCH ARTICLE

Purification of mitochondria from skeletal muscle tissue for transcriptomic analyses reveals
localisation of nuclear-encoded non-coding RNAs

Authors:

Jessica Silver[1] and Adam J. Trewin[1,6] (co-first authors), Stella Loke[2], Larry Croft[2], Mark Ziemann[3,7],
Megan Soria[3], Hayley Dillon[1,4], Søren Nielsen[5], Séverine Lamon[1], Glenn. D. Wadley[1]

Affiliations:

[1]Institute for Physical Activity and Nutrition, School of Exercise and Nutrition Sciences, Deakin
University, Geelong, Victoria, Australia.

[2]Genomics Centre, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria,
Australia.

[3]School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria, Australia.

[4]Human Integrated Physiology and Sports Cardiology Laboratory, Baker Heart and Diabetes Institute,
Melbourne, Australia.

[5]The Centre of Inflammation and Metabolism and the Centre for Physical Activity Research,
Rigshospitalet, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.

[6]Department of Anatomy and Physiology, University of Melbourne, Australia.

[7]Burnet Institute, Melbourne, Australia

Corresponding author:

Prof. Glenn Wadley

Deakin University

Institute for Physical Activity and Nutrition,

School of Exercise and Nutrition Sciences,

Australia

3125

Email: glenn.wadley@deakin.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Mitochondria are central to cellular function, particularly in metabolically active tissues such as skeletal

muscle. Nuclear-encoded RNAs typically localise within the nucleus and cytosol but a small population

may also translocate to subcellular compartments such as mitochondria. We aimed to investigate the

nuclear-encoded RNAs that localise within the mitochondria of skeletal muscle cells and tissue. Intact

mitochondria were isolated via immunoprecipitation (IP) followed by enzymatic treatments (RNase-A

and proteinase-K) optimised to remove transcripts located exterior to mitochondria, making it amenable

for high-throughput transcriptomic sequencing. Small-RNA sequencing libraries were successfully

constructed from as little as 1.8 ng mitochondrial RNA input. Small-RNA sequencing of mitochondria

from rat myoblasts revealed the enrichment of over 200 miRNAs. Whole-transcriptome RNA

sequencing of enzymatically-purified mitochondria isolated by IP from skeletal muscle tissue showed

a striking similarity in the degree of purity compared to mitoplast preparations which lack an outer

mitochondrial membrane. In summary, we describe a novel, powerful sequencing approach applicable

to animal and human tissues and cells that can facilitate the discovery of nuclear-encoded RNA

transcripts localised within skeletal muscle mitochondria.

INTRODUCTION

Mitochondria are subcellular organelles essential for numerous cellular processes including energy metabolism, signalling, ion and redox homeostasis as well as regulation of apoptosis (Spinelli and Haigis, 2018). Mitochondria are comprised of proteins encoded by both the nuclear and mitochondrial genomes, but nuclear-encoded RNAs are not usually localised within mitochondria. A small number of specific nuclear-encoded non-coding RNAs (ncRNAs), such as microRNAs (miRNAs) (Barrey et al., 2011, Sripada et al., 2012, Das et al., 2012) and possibly long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs) (Noh et al., 2016) can however be imported into mitochondria (Silver et al., 2018). This may occur via the polynucleotide phosphorylase (Wang et al., 2010) and other putative transport mechanisms (reviewed in Silver et al., 2018). Because ncRNAs have the ability to regulate various transcriptional and translational processes relating to mitochondrial function, it is of interest to determine which of these may localise within mitochondria in order to understand the nature of their potential regulatory actions.

Investigations into mitochondria-localised nuclear-encoded RNAs have been constrained, first, by the technical challenges of obtaining pure mitochondrial preparations free of confounding RNAs peripheral to isolated mitochondria and, second, by the significantly lower RNA yields from subcellular fractions when compared to whole tissue homogenates. Early studies providing evidence for the localisation of ncRNAs within mitochondria stem from micro-array analysis and were routinely validated by single qPCR assays or *in situ* hybridisation (Barrey et al., 2011, Sripada et al., 2012, Das et al., 2012). However, the overall population of ncRNAs that localise within mitochondria and their regulatory actions, particularly within metabolically active tissues remains largely unknown.

Skeletal muscle constitutes ~40% of human body mass and plays a central role in whole body metabolism (Zurlo et al., 1990). To meet these dynamic bioenergetic demands, skeletal muscle is densely populated with mitochondria (Russell et al., 2014). Thus, gaining a greater understanding of the RNA profile within muscle mitochondria may yield important insights into the cellular biology and aetiology of diverse metabolic diseases characterised by mitochondrial dysfunction, such as diabetes mellitus and chronic myopathies (Silver et al., 2018). Here, we report a method for isolating and optimising the enzymatic purification of mitochondria from rodent muscle cells or tissues. We provide direct evidence for the purity of this mitochondrial fraction, making it amenable for downstream high-throughput analyses. We also describe methods for small-RNA and whole transcriptome sequencing of mitochondria isolated from cultured myoblasts as well as skeletal muscle tissue samples from animals and humans.

RESULTS

Protease purification of isolated mitochondria from myoblasts

We first isolated mitochondria from cultured L6 rat myoblasts using an antibody against an outer mitochondrial membrane protein (TOMM22) conjugated to magnetic beads allowing for precipitation of intact isolated mitochondria (Figure 1). Immunoblot of the post-precipitation mitochondrial fraction revealed that a small amount of α-tubulin and Lamin B1 (used as protein markers of the cytosol and nucleus, respectively) were present in the isolated mitochondria fraction (Figure 2, lane 1). A portion of the isolated mitochondria was incubated with the serine protease, proteinase-K, to digest proteins not located within the mitochondrial intermembrane space (IMS) or matrix compartments. This led to depletion of α-tubulin and Lamin B1, in addition to a marker of the outer mitochondrial membrane (TOMM20), while intermembrane space (cytochrome-*c*) and matrix protein markers (citrate synthase) were protected from digestion (Figure 2, lane 2). All proteins probed were susceptible to proteinase-K when mitochondrial membranes were dissolved in the presence of the detergent triton-X (Figure 2, lane 3). Together, this demonstrates that mitochondrial isolation by TOMM22-immunoprecipitation followed by enzymatic treatment yields a purified, intact mitochondrial fraction suitable for downstream protein analyses. Based on this, we hypothesised that an analogous approach utilising a ribonuclease could be used to remove RNA located outside of isolated mitochondria.

Ribonuclease purification of isolated mitochondria from myoblasts

Next, mitochondria isolated from L6 rat myoblasts were exposed to a range of concentrations of RNase-A, an endonuclease that cleaves phosphodiester bonds after pyrimidine residues in the RNA molecule (Witzel, 1963). RNase-A-treated isolated mitochondria were assessed by RT-qPCR for abundance of mtDNA-encoded mRNA (*Mt-co3*) localised exclusively within the mitochondrial matrix compartment, and a nuclear-encoded mRNA (*Cox4i1*) that localises outside mitochondria (Suissa and Schatz, 1982). We found that *Mt-co3* was protected from degradation at RNase concentrations up to at least 100 µg/mL, whereas partial *Cox4i1* degradation occurred at 10 µg/mL and was mostly degraded at 100 µg/mL (Figure 3). In the presence of detergent to disrupt mitochondrial membranes, 1 µg/mL RNase-A was sufficient to digest all *Cox4i1* and *Mt-co3*, as well as an exogenous mRNA spike-in control (Figure 3). This suggests that a certain proportion of cytosolic *Cox4i1* is protected from digestion at lower RNase-A concentrations, potentially as a result of being bound to ribosomes at the outer mitochondrial membrane (Gold et al., 2017). Taken together, these data suggest that TOMM22-IP mitochondrial isolation followed by RNase-A treatment is suitable for downstream mitochondrial RNA analyses provided the RNase-A concentration is sufficient to remove transcripts not located within the mitochondrial membranes.

 Small RNA sequencing on purified isolated mitochondria from myoblasts reveals mitochondria

localised miRNAs

We next aimed to optimize a protocol to perform transcriptomic analysis of the small RNAs (sRNA)

contained within isolated mitochondria from L6 rat myoblasts. We first prepared sRNA libraries from

120 ng and 60 ng mitochondrial RNA with 0.5X adapter dilutions (NEBNext 3′ and 5' SR Adaptors,

and RT primer for Ilumina), in line with the standard manufacturer protocol (NEBNext Multiplex Small

RNA Library Prep Set (New England Biolabs). The standard protocol produced large amounts of

adapter-dimer and was not sufficient to ligate adapters to the target miRNAs within the sample

(Supplementary Figure 1 A, B). We next decreased the amount of the 3' and 5' adapters to investigate

if a lower molar ratio improved miRNA ligation efficiency. Both the modified-0.3X (Supplementary

Figure 1C) and modified-0.1X (data not shown) approaches produced quantifiable amounts of the target

miRNA library when prepared from 60 ng mitochondrial RNA, although the total cDNA yield was

approximately 7-fold higher from the modified-0.3X when compared to modified-0.1X protocol. Both

modified approaches did decrease, but not prevent, adapter-dimer formation.

While 60 ng mitochondrial RNA is below the recommended library RNA input (>100 ng, NEBiolabs,

Inc.), mitochondrial RNA yield from cell and tissue samples is often considerably below this threshold.

Thus, it was necessary to investigate if the modified-0.3X and modified-0.1X approach could similarly

produce the target miRNA library when prepared from much lower amounts of mitochondrial RNA.

The modified-0.3X (Supplementary Figure 1 C, D) and modified-0.1X (data not shown) approaches

both produced the target library when prepared from >1.8 ng (range 1.8-60 ng) mitochondria RNA.

Total cDNA yields were, on average, 4.3-fold higher ($p<0.05$) when using the modified-0.3X protocol

compared to the modified-0.1X. The presence of adapter-dimer dominated each library, regardless of

the mitochondrial RNA input amount used. To combat this, all uniquely indexed libraries were

combined in an equimolar pool and run across two lanes of a TBE polyacrylamide gel. The gel fragment

corresponding to the miRNA region was manually excised, extracted from the gel and then sequenced.

There were no differences in total RNA-seq reads ($p=0.79$) and total mapped miRNA reads ($p=0.19$)

between the modified-0.3X and modified-0.1X protocols (Figure 4A). Over 200 miRNAs were detected

across all but the lowest (1.8 ng, modified-0.1X) mitochondrial RNA inputs (Figure 4B). The number

of miRNAs detected appeared to plateau when libraries were prepared from 15-60 ng mitochondrial

RNA (Figure 4B) and suggests that RNA inputs of at least 15 ng are sufficient to detect most miRNAs

within a sample. Ultimately, either modified approach is suitable for the construction of miRNA

libraries. However, the significantly higher library yields make the modified-0.3X approach amenable

to library pooling, gel excision, and subsequent sequencing.

We next investigated the relative abundance of miRNAs sequenced from serial dilutions of

mitochondrial RNA input (1.8-30 ng), when compared to the highest mitochondria RNA input (60 ng).

Most miRNAs detected were common between libraries prepared from 60 ng mitochondria RNA and the lower mitochondria RNA inputs (Figure 4C-E). Further to this, the relative abundance of miRNAs was comparable between libraries prepared from the two highest RNA inputs (60 vs 30 ng; Figure 4E). A small number of miRNA species were over- (8 miRNAs) and under-represented (5 miRNAs) within libraries prepared from the highest RNA input (60 ng) when compared to lowest RNA input (1.8 ng; Figure 4C). MiRNAs detected in the highest, but not lowest, RNA input displayed low expression levels within the 60 ng sample, and together constituted a small proportion (1069 rpm) of total reads. Interestingly, the skeletal muscle-enriched miR-1, miR-133a, miR-133b and miR-16 and miR-486, predicted to have roles in the regulation of mitochondrial function (Nielsen et al., 2010, Russell et al., 2013), were detected at higher mitochondria RNA inputs (60 and 30 ng), but not lower inputs (1.8-15 ng; Figure 4). In contrast, the let-7 family as well as the skeletal muscle-enriched miR-206 were highly abundant in all samples, and together constituted 63±8% of all mapped miRNA reads. Importantly, the relative distribution of miRNAs within each sample provides adequate representation across serial dilutions of mitochondrial RNA, making it possible to accurately investigate differential miRNA expression across unique cell and tissue samples with variable mitochondrial RNA yields.

Together, these data suggest that careful optimization is required when preparing sRNA libraries from low amounts of RNA from purified mitochondria. To minimize adapter-dimer presence in sRNA libraries, gel excision and purification of the target miRNA fraction is recommended. Importantly, our data demonstrate that RNA-seq results were comparable across serial dilutions of mitochondrial RNA input, suggesting that low mitochondria RNA input does not limit the number nor the relative distribution of miRNA species that can be detected.

<u>The transcriptomic profile of enzymatically treated isolated mitochondria from rat skeletal muscle tissue reveals a similar degree of purity as mitoplasts.</u>

Next, we applied the purification strategies described thus far to study the transcriptome of mitochondria isolated from muscle tissue samples. From a pooled homogenate of rat skeletal muscle tissue, we compared mitochondria isolated with our IP+enzymatic treatment method against mitochondria isolated using a traditional differential centrifugation method. At the protein level, mitochondria isolated by immunoprecipitation had no detectable ribosomal marker proteins and very little abundance of peroxisome, golgi apparatus or endoplasmic reticulum marker proteins, which contrasted with mitochondria obtained via the differential centrifugation method (Supplementary Figure 2A&B). Next, to confirm the lack of co-purifying contaminants on the outer mitochondrial membrane, we compared our IP isolated+enzymatic treated mitochondria with mitoplasts (i.e. mitochondria whose OMM is removed or disrupted but with an IMM and matrix that remains intact). We generated mitoplasts and confirmed that they were devoid of outer mitochondrial membrane (OMM) proteins such as TOMM20 and inner mitochondrial membrane (IMM) and inter membrane

space (IMS) proteins such as mitofilin and AIF without the loss of mitochondrial matrix proteins such as citrate synthase (Supplementary Figure 2C).

We then performed RNA-sequencing on four different mitochondrial sample types: *i*) RNase-A treated mitoplasts, *ii*) RNase-A treated IP isolated mitochondria with or *iii*) without proteinase-K enzymatic purification (to evaluate RNAs that may be bound to ribosomes on the OMM or other RNA binding proteins which protect them from RNase-A), and *iv*) RNase-A treated mitochondria isolated via differential centrifugation ("CrudeMito"). Principal component analysis of the transcriptomes of these mitochondrial sample types revealed a separation along the first principal component between crude mitochondria extracts isolated by differential centrifugation ("CrudeMito") compared with mitochondria isolated via IP and treated with RNase-A and with or without proteinase-K treatment (MitoRNase+ProtK and MitoRNase, respectively) or mitoplasts treated with RNase-A ("MitoplastRNase") (Figure 5A). The overlap of the latter three suggests a high overall degree of similarity of the transcriptomic profile between immunoprecipitation-based methods when compared to the crude mitochondrial fraction. For this reason, the crude mitochondrial fraction was excluded from further analysis.

There were no differentially expressed mtDNA-encoded genes (Figure 5B left panel) or nDNA-encoded genes between MitoplastRNase and MitoRNase+ProtK (Figure 5C left panel). In contrast, there were several DE genes (both mtDNA- and nDNA-encoded) between MitoRNase without proK and MitoplastRNase (Figure 5B & 5C middle panel), and also between MitoRNase without proK and MitoRNase+ProtK (Figure 5B & 5C right panel). The same pattern was observed for mtDNA- and nDNA-encoded rRNAs and mitochondrial tRNAs (data not shown). Collectively, these data demonstrate that mitochondria isolated via our method of immunoprecipitation followed by RNase-A and proteinase-K treatments yield a transcriptome of similar purity to that of mitoplasts.

Next, we extracted RNA from IP+purified (RNase + ProtK) mitochondria and RNA from the corresponding whole tissue from the gastrocnemius skeletal muscle of 9-week old rats (Supplementary Figure 3A & B). Whole-transcriptome RNA sequencing (Supplementary Figure 3C - E) revealed that the transcriptomes of these mitochondria had a high degree of purity as indicated firstly by a low relative proportion of nuclear-encoded mRNAs unrelated to mitochondria, such as genes associated with muscle sarcomere function i.e. myosin light (e.g. *Myl1*) and heavy (e.g. *Myh4* and *Myh7*) isoforms, α-actin (*Acta1*) and troponins (e.g. *Tnnc2*, *Tnnt3*; Figure 6A). Secondly, the mitochondrial fraction also contained a low relative abundance of nuclear-encoded OXPHOS genes (including *Cox4i1*), as expected (Figure 6B). Thirdly, there was similar abundance of all mtDNA-encoded OXPHOS mRNA transcripts including *Mt-co3* between the whole tissue and mitochondrial fractions (Figure 6C). This serves as an important internal control as mtDNA transcripts are expected to be present in both isolated mitochondria and whole tissue in similar proportions.

Lastly, we confirmed the suitability of this approach with human muscle tissue biopsy samples. We
isolated and purified mitochondria from these samples and performed analysis via RT-qPCR. This
revealed the absence of *COX4I1,* used as marker of nuclear-encoded mRNA contamination, yet, several
muscle-enriched miRNAs including miR-206 were detected (Supplementary Table 1), which is
consistent with our results in L6 myoblasts.

DISCUSSION

Studies of subcellular fractions using high-throughput analyses requires careful consideration of
purification strategies to avoid confounding effects of contaminants. Here we report an optimised
method for purification of isolated mitochondria for downstream transcriptomic analysis. Revealing the
utility of this approach, we confirmed that miRNAs can be reliably detected in the mitochondria of L6
myoblasts even when libraries are prepared from RNA inputs well below the thresholds often
recommended by manufacturers.

Incubation of isolated mitochondria with RNase-A digests any contaminating extra-mitochondrial RNA
to ensure that only RNA species contained within the mitochondria membranes are identified in
downstream analyses. This is important when investigating transcripts that do not localise in one
subcellular compartment, but instead may be actively transported between compartments in response
to various physiological stimuli. RNase-A protocols differ substantially between studies that have
investigated mitochondrial RNA expression. In previous studies, RNase-A has been used at variable
final concentrations (5-50 µg/mL) (Barrey et al., 2011, Mercer et al., 2011, Zhang et al., 2014, Bandiera
et al., 2011) or has been omitted entirely (Das et al., 2012, Dasgupta et al., 2015, Lung et al., 2006,
Sripada et al., 2012). Here, we demonstrate that RNase-A concentrations of at least 100 µg/mL are
required to digest the majority of nuclear-encoded transcripts (such as *Cox4i1*) in rat myoblasts.
Importantly, this approach is transferable between cell and tissue models and is shown to effectively
degrade potentially contaminating, non-mitochondrial RNA in mitochondria isolated from human
skeletal muscle tissue (Supplementary Table 1).

Investigations into the mitochondrial RNA population are often limited by technical challenges. For
example, the inherently low mitochondrial RNA yields compared to total cellular RNA are well below
the threshold required for commercially available small RNA library preparation protocols. This
challenge may be overcome by combining mitochondria RNA from biological samples into pools that
represent a single 'intervention' or 'clinical' group, and the 'control' group (Jagannathan et al., 2015,
Wang et al., 2017). While this effectively increases the amount of mitochondrial RNA available for
sRNA library preparation, this approach introduces further limitations. First, the use of pooled samples
requires a much larger sample size to achieve the same statistical power (Takele Assefa et al., 2020).
Second, gene expression is highly variable between individuals; taking a pooled sample approach may

mask potential individual variability in miRNA expression (Takele Assefa et al., 2020, Rajkumar et al.,
2015). Our findings illustrate that small RNA libraries can be prepared from individual biological
samples without the need to pool multiple samples, thereby increasing the statistical power available,
especially for human studies with limited sample material and high participant burden.

A modified small RNA library preparation protocol increased ligation efficiency of the 3' and 5'
adapters to miRNAs within mitochondrial samples. However, this modified approach was not able to
prevent adapter-dimer formation entirely. As the adapter-dimer product is approximately 20 bp smaller
than adapter-ligated miRNAs and preferentially binds to the flow cell during RNA-Seq, gel extraction
of the target miRNA region is essential to maximise read counts that map to miRNAs rather than
adapter-dimer (Shore et al., 2016). When used together, the modified-0.3X protocol plus gel extraction
were successful in detecting over 200 miRNAs from L6 mitochondria RNA inputs as low as 1.8 ng.
Importantly, the relative distribution of miRNAs within each sample was reasonably consistent as RNA
input decreased. However, some miRNA species tended to be over-represented at the lowest
mitochondria RNA inputs. This may be because there were less miRNA species detected in the library
prepared from 1.8 ng (207 miRNAs) when compared to 60 ng mitochondria RNA (266 miRNAs).
Overall, there appears to be minimal bias towards over- or under-representing specific miRNA species
at low RNA inputs.

Of note, the skeletal muscle-enriched miR-1, miR-133a and miR-133b were detected at high (30 and
60 ng) but not low (1.8-15 ng) mitochondrial RNA inputs. MiR-1 and miR-133a have previously been
observed in mitochondria isolated from human skeletal and rodent cardiac muscle cells *in vitro* (Barrey
et al., 2011, Jagannathan et al., 2015, Zhang et al., 2014). MiR-1 enhances the transcription of the
mitochondrial-encoded *Mt-co1, Mt-nd1* and *Mt-cytb*, among others (Zhang et al., 2014), while miR-
133a inhibits the transcription of nuclear-encoded genes including *Ppargc1a* and *Tfam* (Nie et al.,
2016), both of which are upstream regulators of mitochondrial biogenesis. The use of proliferating L6
myocytes in this study, compared with primary human myocytes (Barrey et al., 2011) and rat neonatal
cardiomyocytes (Zhang et al., 2014) used previously, may partially account for the differences in
miRNA species detected. Although L6 cells have reportedly higher rates of aerobic metabolism when
compared to C2C12 cells and primary human myocytes, cell culture models are more dependent upon
anaerobic glycolysis (Abdelmoez et al., 2020). Thus, mitochondrial abundance and function in various
cell culture models may differ to those observed with *in vivo* models. This study was primarily designed
to optimise the sRNA-Seq library preparation protocol rather than investigate the physiological
relevance of specific miRNAs. Future *in vivo* studies are now required to profile mitochondrial miRNAs
and their roles in tissues that have high bioenergetic requirements such as skeletal and cardiac muscle.

Finally, having a reliable method to discover nuclear-encoded RNAs within mitochondria in response
to physiological stimuli will allow for future studies into RNA import and/or regulation at the

subcellular level. For instance, non-coding RNAs such as lncRNAs can have important regulatory roles (Wadley et al., 2019), mediating cellular processes by modulating the expression of genes, stability of transcripts and/or function of proteins (Long et al., 2017), including those that directly determine mitochondrial function. However, only a relatively small fraction (~5-10%) of all identified lncRNAs have been functionally characterized (Gao et al., 2020). Therefore, understanding the subcellular distribution may also open new avenues of investigation into how they are imported into the mitochondrial compartment, what are their putative binding target(s) and whether they modulate expression levels of mtDNA encoded genes and/or function of mitochondrial proteins. This will be key to understanding the potential effects on mitochondrial parameters such as oxidative phosphorylation, ROS production, mitochondrial biogenesis, dynamics or mitophagy.

In summary, we report a method for obtaining a highly pure fraction of mitochondria from cultured myoblasts and skeletal muscle tissue and optimised approach for high throughput transcriptomic sequencing on this subcellular fraction. Given the increasing interest in RNA-mediated regulation of cellular function in health and disease, future investigations are warranted to better understand the potential biological and physiological significance of the mitochondrial localisation of nuclear-encoded RNAs.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cell culture

L6 rat myoblast cells were obtained from a commercial vendor (ATCC Cat# CRL-1458, RRID: CVCL_0385). Cells were cultured at 37°C with 5% CO_2 in a humidified incubator in media consisting of Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM; Gibco #11995-065) supplemented with 10% v/v FBS (Gibco #A3161001), 100 U/ml penicillin and 100 μg/ml streptomycin (Gibco #15140-122). Cells were grown in 150 mm dishes to ~90% confluence then washed with sterile PBS and detached (Gibco TrypLE Express #LTS12604021). Cells used for all experiments were ≤9 passages from stock and tested negative for mycoplasma contamination (Agilent MycoSensor QPCR Assay Kit, 302107).

Myoblast mitochondrial isolation

Mitochondria were isolated from L6 myoblasts via immunoprecipitation (Miltenyi Biotek #130-096-946). Briefly, ~5x10⁶ cells (suspended in a small volume of PBS after detachment) were transferred to 1 mL ice-cold lysis buffer on ice, then mechanically homogenised with 20 passes in a 7 mL glass dounce homogeniser (#357542, Wheaton, NJ). Wash buffer (9 mL) was added to the lysate and transferred to a falcon tube. Anti-TOMM22 antibody conjugated magnetic beads (50 μL) were added to the 10 mL lysate and incubated with gentle inversion for 1 hour at 4°C. Lysate was passed through a pre-separation filter then flowed through a column mounted on a magnetic rack. Mitochondria were washed 3 times

prior to elution. Mitochondria were pelleted via centrifugation at 13,000 x g for 2 minutes at 4℃. Supernatant was then removed and the mitochondrial pellet resuspended in storage buffer to be used for subsequent enzymatic purification steps described below.

<u>Enzymatic purification of myoblast mitochondria</u>

Protease treatment: To remove proteins not localised within intact mitochondria, aliquots of isolated mitochondria (1 µg total protein each) were incubated in a 50 µL reaction with or without triton-x (1% v/v) and with or without proteinase K (Qiagen #19131, final concentration 20 µg/mL) for 15 minutes at room temperature. Phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (20 mM) was added to inhibit proteinase-K. Samples were then stored at -20℃ until immunoblot analysis.

RNase treatment: To remove RNA not localised within intact mitochondria, in a 50 µL reaction, aliquots of isolated mitochondria (1 µg total protein each) first had 100 ng mRNA spike-in control added (StemMACS eGFP mRNA #130-101-114, Miltenyi Biotec), and were then incubated with or without triton-x (1% v/v) and with or without Rnase-A (Qiagen #19101, final concentration range 1-1000 µg/mL) and incubated on ice for 30 minutes. Trizol reagent was then added to simultaneously inactivate Rnase activity, lyse mitochondria and preserve RNA. Samples were then stored in Trizol at -20℃ until RNA isolation.

<u>Immunoblot analysis</u>

Mitochondrial samples were resuspended in RIPA buffer (Millipore #20-188) containing protease inhibitors (Sigma #P8340). Protein concentration was determined by BCA assay (Pierce #23225). Samples were mixed with reducing loading buffer (4x Laemmli sample buffer with 10% 2-mercaptoethanol). Samples were loaded into a 4-15% gel (Bio-Rad #5678085) in addition to molecular weight marker (Bio-Rad #161-0373), which were then separated by electrophoresis. The stain-free gel was UV-activated for 1 minute and imaged for total protein (BioRad Chemi Doc XR+, Hercules, CA, USA) with ImageLab software (BioRad Image Lab v6). Protein was then transferred to a methanol soaked polyvinylidene difluoride (PVDF) membrane (Millipore Immobilon FL 0.45 µm #IPFL00010). The membrane was then PBS washed, then blocked for 1 hour (Li-Cor Intercept PBS blocking buffer). The membrane was then incubated with primary antibody in blocking buffer + 0.2% v/v Tween-20 overnight at 4℃. Primary antibodies used were: anti-TOMM20 (Abcam #ab186735; 1:1000), anti-Cytochrome-c (Abcam #ab133504; 1:1000), anti-Citrate Synthase (Cell Signaling Technology #14309; 1:1000), anti-α-Tubulin (Cell Signaling Technology #3873; 1:1000), anti-mitofilin (Abcam #ab110329; 1:1000), anti-AIF (Cell Signaling Technology #4642, 1:500), (anti-catalase (Abcam #ab1877, 1:500), anti-S6 RPL (Cell Signaling Technology #2217, 1:1000), anti-GM130 (BD Transduction Laboratories #610822, 1:1000), anti-SERCA1 (Cell Signaling Technology #4219, 1:1000), and anti-Lamin B1 (Cell Signaling Technology #12586; 1:1000). Membranes were then washed with PBST and incubated with

secondary antibodies (Cell Signaling Technology) anti-rabbit or anti-mouse IgG Dylight® 680 nm (Cell Signaling Technology #5366S, #5470S) or 800 nm (Cell Signaling Technology #5151S or #5257S) at 1:10,000 in blocking buffer containing 0.2% Tween-20 and 0.01% SDS for 1 hour at room temperature. Fluorescent signal was then digitally acquired (Licor Odyssey® Infrared Imaging System, Lincoln, NE, USA).

RNA isolation and quality control

Myoblast mitochondria samples stored in Trizol were thawed on ice and centrifuged at 10,000 x g for 10 min at 4℃. An aliquot of the supernatant was then used for RNA purification with on-column DNase-I treatment (Direct-Zol RNA Microprep R2060, Zymo Research). RNA concentration and purity was determined by spectrophotometry (NanoDrop 1000, Thermo Fisher Scientific) while RNA fragment size distribution was assessed by gel electrophoresis (Tapestation HS-RNA, Agilent Technologies).

Reverse transcription and quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR)

Equal volumes of isolated RNA from the RNase-treated mitochondria samples (to account for differences in total RNA yield between samples due to RNase treatment) were reverse transcribed to first-strand cDNA in a 20 µL reaction along with no-template and no-RTase controls (Applied Biosystems High Capacity RT kit #4368814). Quantitative PCR was performed in triplicate (Agilent AriaMX G8830A) on 4 ng of cDNA in a 10 µL reaction consisting of SYBR green master mix (Applied Biosystems #4367659) with 0.3 µM forward and reverse primers (Table 1).

Table 1. List of RT qPCR primers

Target	Forward (5' -3')	Reverse (5' -3')	Accession ID
Mt-co3	GACGGAATTTACGGCTCAACAT	AATTAGGAAAGTTGAGCCAATAATTACG	>NC_001665.2 Rattus norvegicus strain BN/SsNHsdMCW mitochondrion, complete genome
Cox4i1	GTGCTGATCTGGGAGAAGAGCTA	GGTTGACCTTCATGTCCAGCAT	>NM_017202.1 Rattus norvegicus cytochrome c oxidase subunit 4i1 (*Cox4i1*), mRNA; nuclear gene for mitochondrial product
eGFP	ACTTCTTCAAGTCCGCCATG	AGCTCGATGCGGTTCACCAG	>XM_013480425.1 Eimeria maxima Green fluorescent protein, related partial mRNA

Thermal conditions used for qPCR were 10 min at 95℃ (activation) then 40 cycles of 15 s at 95℃ (denature) and 60 s at 55-60℃ (anneal/extend). A dissociation curve was performed to confirm the

amplification of a single product. Quantification cycle (C_q) thresholds were calculated using software

(Agilent Aria v1.5).

<u>Myoblast small RNA sequencing and bioinformatics</u>

Total RNA isolated from individual (*n*=7) L6 mitochondria samples was pooled into a single tube, from

which serial dilutions ranging from 0.3-20 ng/μL were prepared. cDNA libraries were then prepared

using a range of mitochondrial RNA inputs (final input range 1.8-120 ng) using the NEBNext Multiplex

Small RNA Library Prep Set (New England Biolabs). To investigate the efficiency of small RNA library

preparation across a range of mitochondrial RNA inputs, libraries were prepared either according to the

manufacturer's recommendations for low RNA inputs (NEBNext 3´ and 5' SR Adaptors, and RT primer

for Ilumina diluted 0.5X, 15 PCR cycles) or with modifications (NEBNext 3´ and 5' SR Adaptors, and

RT primer for Ilumina diluted 0.3X or 0.1X, 20 PCR cycles). cDNA concentration was determined by

fluorometric quantitation (Qubit 1xdsDNA, Thermo Fisher Scientific) while cDNA fragment size

distribution was assessed by gel electrophoresis (Tapestation HS-D1000, Agilent Technologies).

An equimolar pool of all uniquely indexed small RNA libraries was prepared. Twenty-five μL of the

equimolar pool was loaded across two lanes on a 6% Novex TBE polyacrylamide gel (Thermo Fischer

Scientific), with 5 μL Quick-Load pBR322 DNA-MspI Molecular Marker (New England Biolabs Inc.)

in a separate lane. The buffer dam was filled with 600 mL 1X TBE running buffer and the gel run at

120V for 1h. The gel was then incubated with 50 mL 1X TBE spiked with 1X SYBR Gold Nucleic

Acid Gel Stain (Thermo Fischer Scientific), before being visualised on a Safe Imager 2.0 Blue-Light

Transilluminator (Invitrogen) following exposure to UV-Blue (470 nm) light. Fragments corresponding

to the 130-160 bp region were manually excised, before suspended and then crushed in 250 μL gel

elution buffer (New England Biolabs Inc.). To increase the recovery of low concentrations of small

nucleic acids, cDNA was precipitated overnight at -20°C with 0.3 M sodium acetate (pH 5.5), 4X

volumes of 100% ethanol and 1 μL linear acrylamide carrier. Following overnight precipitation, the

solution was centrifuged at 16,000x*g* for 60 minutes to pellet the cDNA fragment. The cDNA pellet

was washed twice with 80% ethanol and resuspend in 12 μL TE buffer. Fragment size distribution of

the gel-extracted cDNA pool was assessed by gel electrophoresis (Tapestation HS-D1000, Agilent

Technologies).

RNA sequencing was performed by the Deakin University Genomics Core on the Illumina MiniSeq

platform. A 1.3 pM loading pool was prepared with 20% Phi-X spike-in and was sequenced on a single-

end 75 bp run. Sequenced reads underwent quality checks with FastQC before the adapter and reads

<20nt were trimmed. Small RNAs, including miRNAs, are not well sequenced in the rat genome but

are conserved between rat and mouse species. Reads were mapped to known mature mouse miRNAs

accessible from miRbase v22.0. Raw read counts were normalised by the size of each individual library.
Counts were visualised using GraphPad Prism (v7).

<u>Rodent study ethical approval and procedures</u>

All experimental procedures were approved by the Deakin University Animal Ethics Committee (G02-
2019). All animals were housed and treated in accordance with standards set by Deakin University's
Animal Welfare Committee, which complies with the ethical and governing principles outlined in the
Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes. Wistar Kyoto male rats were
obtained from the Animal Resource Centre, Perth, Western Australia. Rats were housed in pairs and
maintained with a 12-hour light/dark cycle, constant temperature of $21 \pm 2°C$, and humidity levels
between 40 and 70%. Rats had *ad libitum* access to standard chow diet and tap water. At 9-weeks of
age, animals were humanely killed following dissection of the heart under heavy anaesthesia using 5%
isoflurane gas. The gastrocnemius muscle was rapidly excised then the inner red portion was dissected.
A portion of this was snap frozen in liquid nitrogen for subsequent whole muscle RNA analyses, and a
separate ~ 100 mg piece was taken for mitochondrial isolation.

<u>Rat muscle tissue mitochondrial isolation</u>

Tissue was immediately placed in 1 mL ice-cold lysis buffer containing 5 µl/ml protease inhibitors
(Sigma #P8340) and minced using fine scissors before mechanical homogenisation with an ice-cold
Teflon-tipped glass dounce homogeniser (10 passes with rotation at 350 rpm). Intact mitochondria were
then isolated using the magnetic-bead immunoprecipitation method as described above for L6
myoblasts except with the following RNase treatment conditions: RNase-A 340 µg/mL in a reaction
with ~20 µg total mitochondrial protein performed for 1 hour at 37°C, after which 5 µL proteinase-K
(stock concentration 600 mAU/mL) was then added to inactivate RNase activity (Barrey et al., 2011).
Each tube was briefly inverted before the mitochondria solutions were then centrifuged at 8000 x g for
10 min at 4°C. The supernatant was aspirated and the pellet was washed twice with 100 µL ice-cold
storage buffer. The RNase-treated mitochondrial pellet was resuspended in 100 uL storage buffer then
frozen at -80°C until RNA extraction.

<u>Rat muscle tissue and isolated mitochondria RNA extraction</u>

For RNA extraction from gastrocnemius whole muscle tissue, ~15 mg frozen tissue was placed in a
liquid nitrogen pre-chilled cyrotube with a 5 mm stainless steel bead. The tissue was then mechanically
disrupted (2 cycles at 4m/s for 10 s, MP Biomedical FastPrep). Tri-reagent (600 uL) was added, then
RNA extracted (Zymo DirectZol RNA Miniprep #R2050). For RNA extraction from isolated

mitochondria from the respective red portion of gastrocnemius muscle, frozen samples were thawed in the presence of 5 volumes of TRI-reagent (Qiagen), pipette mixed thoroughly then centrifuged at 16,000 x g for 1 min. RNA extraction was then performed with on-column DNase I treatment (Zymo Research DirectZol RNA Microprep #2060). Extracted RNA was tested for purity on Nanodrop, concentration with Qubit HS RNA assay (Thermo Fisher) then RNA integrity number (RIN) was determined using a Tapestation (Agilent) with High Sensitivity RNA reagents. All RINs from whole tissue RNA were ≥7.0.

Rat muscle tissue and isolated mitochondria total RNA sequencing

Total RNA from whole-tissue (50 ng) and isolated mitochondria (10 ng) were converted to cDNA libraries (Zymo-Seq RiboFree Total RNA #R300, Zymo Research). Briefly, ribosomal RNA was depleted, then remaining transcripts were fragmented and converted to cDNA using random priming. After second strand synthesis, the ends of the cDNA were enzymatically repaired and Illumina-compatible sequencing adaptors were ligated. Library size (TapeStation, Agilent) and concentration (Qubit) was assessed prior to sequencing. RNA sequencing was performed by the Deakin University Genomics Core on the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 platform. Reads underwent adapter trimming and quality check with Skewer then mapped to the rat genome (Ensembl version 99) with STAR aligner v2.7.2a. STAR generated read counts were collated in R version 4.0.3 (R Development Core Team, 2010). Normalised counts were visualised using GraphPad Prism (v7). Analysis of differential expression was performed using Voom/Limma in Degust v 4.1.5 (Powell, 2019). Transcripts with a false discovery rate (FDR) <0.05 were considered differentially expressed.

Rat muscle tissue mitoplast preparation and RNA sequencing

All experimental procedures were approved by the Deakin University Animal Ethics Committee (G01-2023) and housed and treated in accordance with standards set by Deakin University's Animal Welfare Committee, which complies with the ethical and governing principles outlined in the Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes. A 14 week old male Wistar Kyoto rat was obtained from the Animal Resource Centre, Perth, Western Australia and humanely killed following dissection of the heart under heavy anaesthesia using 5% isoflurane gas. The hindlimb muscles were rapidly excised and cut into 200 mg pieces. Each piece was immediately placed in 1 mL ice-cold lysis buffer containing 5ul/ml protease inhibitors (Sigma #P8340), minced using fine scissors and incubated on ice for 30 min. Samples were then mechanically homogenised with an ice-cold Teflon-tipped glass dounce homogeniser (10 passes with rotation at 350 rpm) and the homogenate was pooled. To compare different isolation methods, intact mitochondria were then isolated from separate aliquots of the same homogenate using either the magnetic-bead immunoprecipitation method described above, or a differential centrifugation method.

To obtain mitochondria by differential centrifugation, tissue homogenate was spun at 800 × g for 10

min at 4°C and the pellet was discarded. The supernatant was then spun at 16,000 × g for 30 min at 4°C

and the pellet resuspended in 1 mL of isolation buffer containing 1mM PMSF and then spun at 10,000

× g for 10 mins at 4°C. The mitochondrial pellets were washed twice in 1 mL ice-cold storage buffer.

The mitochondrial pellets were then pooled and resuspended a small volume of storage buffer.

To generate mitoplasts, intact mitochondria (40 μg) obtained from the magnetic-bead

immunoprecipitation method were incubated in 0.06% digitonin on ice for 30 min, followed by 30 min

incubation on ice with proteinase-K (final concentration 20 μg/mL). The samples were then incubated

on ice for 10 min in PMSF (final concentration 10 mM) to inhibit proteinase-K. The mitoplast pellets

were then washed once in 0.75 mL storage buffer containing 5 mM PMSF and then once in 0.75 mL

storage buffer without PMSF. Each time the pellets were spun at 13,000 × g for 2 min at 4°C and the

supernatants discarded. Finally, the mitoplast pellets were resuspended in 40 μL storage buffer.

The following 4 different treatments were conducted in triplicate on 40 μg of protein from mitochondria

or mitoplasts that were obtained from the hindlimb muscle of a single animal. All four treatments

included 120 μg/mL RNase-A (cat# 19101, Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) incubation for 30 min on ice.

1. MitoProK: Mitochondria from magnetic-bead IP, +RNase-A (followed by 20 μg/mL proteinase-K)

2. MitoRNase: Mitochondria from magnetic-bead IP, +RNase-A (no proteinase-K)

3. MitoplastRNase: Mitoplasts, +RNase-A (no proteinase-K)

4. CrudeMito: Mitochondria from differential centrifugation, +RNase-A (no proteinase-K)

After RNase-A incubation, either proteinase-K (final concentration 20 μg/mL) or a similar volume of

buffer was added to the respective treatment groups and incubated on ice for 30 min. Each tube was

then centrifuged at 13,000 × g for 2 min at 4°C. The supernatant was aspirated and the pellet was washed

once with 500 μL and then once with 200 μL ice-cold storage buffer. The mitochondrial pellets were

resuspended in 400 μL Tri-reagent and frozen at -80°C until RNA extraction.

For RNA extraction, frozen samples were thawed and then pipette mixed thoroughly to disrupt the

pellets and then centrifuged at 13,000 x g for 10 min. RNA extraction was then performed with on-

column DNase I treatment (Zymo Research DirectZol RNA Microprep #2060) and eluted in 12 μL

nuclease free water. RNA yield was determined using a Tapestation (Agilent) with High Sensitivity

RNA reagents. Mitochondria from magnetic-bead IP yielded ~1.5 ng RNA per μg of protein, whereas

mitochondria from differential centrifugation yielded ~0.2 ng RNA per μg of protein.

Total RNA extracted from mitochondria from differential centrifugation (6.3 ng), mitochondria and

mitoplasts isolated from magnetic-bead IP (40 ng) methods were converted to cDNA libraries (Zymo-

Seq RiboFree Total RNA #R300, Zymo Research) then underwent whole transcriptome RNA

sequencing as described above.

<u>Statistical analysis</u>

Small RNA-seq data was analysed by paired t-test. RNase-A dose-response data were tested for
normality of variance and then analysed by one- or two-way ANOVA with Tukey's post hoc test for
multiple comparisons using GraphPad Prism (v7). All data are presented as mean (SD) with significance
accepted at $p<0.05$.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge Gisella Mazzarino and Amandi Gunawardena for their assistance with animal
experiments and tissue collection and Erin Mayne for her assistance with the muscle tissue mitoplast
preparation and RNA sequencing experiments. We acknowledge Sarah Alexander for her assistance
with female participant recruitment. Severine Lamon is supported by an Australian Research Council
Future Fellowship (FT10100278).

Author contributions

Conceptualization: JLS, AJT, SN, S.Lamon, GDW

Conducted experiments: JLS, AJT, GDW, S.Loke

Conducted human studies: JLS, GDW, S.Lamon, HD

Data analysis (bioinformatics): MZ, LC, MS

Data analysis and visualisation: JLS, AJT, MS

Manuscript – original draft: JLS & AJT

Manuscript– review and editing: all authors.

Approved final version of manuscript: all authors.

REFERENCES

ABDELMOEZ, A. M., SARDÓN PUIG, L., SMITH, J. A. B., GABRIEL, B. M., SAVIKJ, M., DOLLET, L., CHIBALIN, A. V., KROOK, A., ZIERATH, J. R. & PILLON, N. J. 2020. Comparative profiling of skeletal muscle models reveals heterogeneity of transcriptome and metabolism. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol,* 318**,** C615-c626.

BANDIERA, S., RUBERG, S., GIRARD, M., CAGNARD, N., HANEIN, S., CHRETIEN, D., MUNNICH, A., LYONNET, S. & HENRION-CAUDE, A. 2011. Nuclear outsourcing of RNA interference components to human mitochondria. *PLoS One,* 6**,** e20746.

BARREY, E., SAINT-AURET, G., BONNAMY, B., DAMAS, D., BOYER, O. & GIDROL, X. 2011. Pre-microRNA and mature microRNA in human mitochondria. *PLoS One,* 6**,** e20220.

DAS, S., FERLITO, M., KENT, O. A., FOX-TALBOT, K., WANG, R., LIU, D., RAGHAVACHARI, N., YANG, Y., WHEELAN, S. J., MURPHY, E. & STEENBERGEN, C. 2012. Nuclear miRNA regulates the mitochondrial genome in the heart. *Circ Res,* 110**,** 1596-603.

DASGUPTA, N., PENG, Y., TAN, Z., CIRAOLO, G., WANG, D. & LI, R. 2015. miRNAs in mtDNA-less cell mitochondria. *Cell Death Discov,* 1**,** 15004.

GAO, F., CAI, Y., KAPRANOV, P. & XU, D. 2020. Reverse-genetics studies of lncRNAs—what we have learnt and paths forward. *Genome Biology,* 21**,** 93.

GOLD, V. A., CHROSCICKI, P., BRAGOSZEWSKI, P. & CHACINSKA, A. 2017. Visualization of cytosolic ribosomes on the surface of mitochondria by electron cryo-tomography. *EMBO Rep,* 18**,** 1786-1800.

JAGANNATHAN, R., THAPA, D., NICHOLS, C. E., SHEPHERD, D. L., STRICKER, J. C., CROSTON, T. L., BASELER, W. A., LEWIS, S. E., MARTINEZ, I. & HOLLANDER, J. M. 2015. Translational Regulation of the Mitochondrial Genome Following Redistribution of Mitochondrial MicroRNA (MitomiR) in the Diabetic Heart. *Circulation. Cardiovascular genetics,* 8**,** 785-802.

LONG, Y., WANG, X., YOUMANS, D. T. & CECH, T. R. 2017. How do lncRNAs regulate transcription? *Science Adv,* 3**,** eaao2110.

LUNG, B., ZEMANN, A., MADEJ, M. J., SCHUELKE, M., TECHRITZ, S., RUF, S., BOCK, R. & HUTTENHOFER, A. 2006. Identification of small non-coding RNAs from mitochondria and chloroplasts. *Nucleic Acids Res,* 34**,** 3842-52.

MERCER, T. R., NEPH, S., DINGER, M. E., CRAWFORD, J., SMITH, M. A., SHEARWOOD, A. M., HAUGEN, E., BRACKEN, C. P., RACKHAM, O., STAMATOYANNOPOULOS, J. A., FILIPOVSKA, A. & MATTICK, J. S. 2011. The human mitochondrial transcriptome. *Cell,* 146**,** 645-58.

NIE, Y., SATO, Y., WANG, C., YUE, F., KUANG, S. & GAVIN, T. P. 2016. Impaired exercise tolerance, mitochondrial biogenesis, and muscle fiber maintenance in miR-133a-deficient mice. *Faseb j,* 30**,** 3745-3758.

NIELSEN, S., SCHEELE, C., YFANTI, C., AKERSTROM, T., NIELSEN, A. R., PEDERSEN, B. K. & LAYE, M. J. 2010. Muscle specific microRNAs are regulated by endurance exercise in human skeletal muscle. *J Physiol,* 588**,** 4029-37.

NOH, J. H., KIM, K. M., ABDELMOHSEN, K., YOON, J.-H., PANDA, A. C., MUNK, R., KIM, J., CURTIS, J., MOAD, C. A. & WOHLER, C. M. 2016. HuR and GRSF1 modulate the nuclear export and mitochondrial localization of the lncRNA RMRP. *Genes Dev,* 30**,** 1224-1239.

POWELL, D. 2019. Degust v4.1.1. Zenodo. doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3501067.

RAJKUMAR, A. P., QVIST, P., LAZARUS, R., LESCAI, F., JU, J., NYEGAARD, M., MORS, O., BØRGLUM, A. D., LI, Q. & CHRISTENSEN, J. H. 2015. Experimental validation of methods for differential gene expression analysis and sample pooling in RNA-seq. *BMC Genomics,* 16**,** 548.

RUSSELL, A. P., FOLETTA, V. C., SNOW, R. J. & WADLEY, G. D. 2014. Skeletal muscle mitochondria: a major player in exercise, health and disease. *Biochim Biophys Acta,* 1840**,** 1276-84.

RUSSELL, A. P., LAMON, S., BOON, H., WADA, S., GULLER, I., BROWN, E. L., CHIBALIN, A. V., ZIERATH,
J. R., SNOW, R. J., STEPTO, N., WADLEY, G. D. & AKIMOTO, T. 2013. Regulation of miRNAs in
human skeletal muscle following acute endurance exercise and short-term endurance
training. *J Physiol,* 591**,** 4637-53.
SHORE, S., HENDERSON, J. M., LEBEDEV, A., SALCEDO, M. P., ZON, G., MCCAFFREY, A. P., PAUL, N. &
HOGREFE, R. I. 2016. Small RNA Library Preparation Method for Next-Generation Sequencing
Using Chemical Modifications to Prevent Adapter Dimer Formation. *PLoS One,* 11**,** e0167009.
SILVER, J., WADLEY, G. & LAMON, S. 2018. Mitochondrial regulation in skeletal muscle: A role for non-
coding RNAs? *Experimental Physiology* 103**,** 1132-1144.
SPINELLI, J. B. & HAIGIS, M. C. 2018. The multifaceted contributions of mitochondria to cellular
metabolism. *Nat Cell Biol,* 20**,** 745-754.
SRIPADA, L., TOMAR, D., PRAJAPATI, P., SINGH, R., SINGH, A. K. & SINGH, R. 2012. Systematic Analysis
of Small RNAs Associated with Human Mitochondria by Deep Sequencing: Detailed Analysis
of Mitochondrial Associated miRNA. *PLoS ONE,* 7**,** e44873.
SUISSA, M. & SCHATZ, G. 1982. Import of proteins into mitochondria. Translatable mRNAs for
imported mitochondrial proteins are present in free as well as mitochondria-bound
cytoplasmic polysomes. *J Biol Chem,* 257**,** 13048-55.
TAKELE ASSEFA, A., VANDESOMPELE, J. & THAS, O. 2020. On the utility of RNA sample pooling to
optimize cost and statistical power in RNA sequencing experiments. *BMC Genomics,* 21**,** 312.
WADLEY, G. D., LAMON, S., ALEXANDER, S. E., MCMULLEN, J. R. & BERNARDO, B. C. 2019. Non-coding
RNAs regulating cardiac muscle mass. *Journal of Applied Physiology,* 127**,** 633-644.
WANG, G., CHEN, H. W., OKTAY, Y., ZHANG, J., ALLEN, E. L., SMITH, G. M., FAN, K. C., HONG, J. S.,
FRENCH, S. W., MCCAFFERY, J. M., LIGHTOWLERS, R. N., MORSE, H. C., 3RD, KOEHLER, C. M.
& TEITELL, M. A. 2010. PNPASE regulates RNA import into mitochondria. *Cell,* 142**,** 456-67.
WANG, X., SONG, C., ZHOU, X., HAN, X., LI, J., WANG, Z., SHANG, H., LIU, Y. & CAO, H. 2017.
Mitochondria Associated MicroRNA Expression Profiling of Heart Failure. *Biomed Res Int,*
2017**,** 4042509.
WITZEL, H. 1963. The Function of the Pyrimidine Base in the Ribonuclease Reaction. *In:* DAVIDSON, J.
N. & COHN, W. E. (eds.) *Progress in Nucleic Acid Research and Molecular Biology.* Academic
Press.
ZHANG, X., ZUO, X., YANG, B., LI, Z., XUE, Y., ZHOU, Y., HUANG, J., ZHAO, X., ZHOU, J., YAN, Y., ZHANG,
H., GUO, P., SUN, H., GUO, L., ZHANG, Y. & FU, X. D. 2014. MicroRNA directly enhances
mitochondrial translation during muscle differentiation. *Cell,* 158**,** 607-19.
ZURLO, F., LARSON, K., BOGARDUS, C. & RAVUSSIN, E. 1990. Skeletal muscle metabolism is a major
determinant of resting energy expenditure. *J Clin Invest,* 86**,** 1423-7.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Overview of TOMM22 immunoprecipitation based method for mitochondrial isolation

Figure 2. Protease treatment of mitochondria isolated from L6 myocytes. Isolated mitochondria

were incubated with or without proteinase-K (20 µg/mL) and detergent (1% triton-X). Mitochondria

(0.2 µg total protein) and whole cell lysate (12 µg total protein) were resolved via SDS-PAGE and

probed for marker proteins of subcellular compartments: TOMM20 (OMM), Cytochrome-c (IMS),

citrate synthase (matrix), α-tubulin (cytosol), lamin B1 (nucleus). Blots are representative of $n=2$

technical replicates from a single mitochondrial isolation preparation.

Figure 3. RNase-A treatment of mitochondria isolated from L6 myocytes. Isolated mitochondria

were incubated with or without RNase-A (1-1000 µg/mL) in the presence or absence of detergent (1%

triton-X). The levels of representative mtDNA (*Mtco3*) and nuclear (*Cox4i1*) encoded genes were then

assessed by RT-qPCR in addition to an exogenous mRNA spike-in control (*eGFP*) added to isolated

mitochondria (but not to the whole cell lysate). Data are mean(SD) for $N=3$ technical replicates from a

single mitochondrial isolation preparation.

Figure 4. Small RNA-Seq on isolated mitochondria from L6 myocytes. A) Small RNA libraries

were prepared from 1.8 to 60 ng mitochondria RNA with modified-0.3X (n=6) or modified-0.1X ($n=4$)

protocols. The total number of reads ($p=0.79$) and total mapped miRNA reads ($p=0.19$) were not

different between protocols. Student's paired t-test, $n=1$ at each RNA input. **B)** Neither mitochondrial

RNA input nor library preparation protocols limit the number of mature miRNAs that can be detected

from mitochondrial RNA. The number of mature miRNA species detected across all mitochondria RNA

inputs was not different ($p=0.60$, student's paired t-test) following modified-0.3X (m-0.3X; $n=6$) and

modified-0.1X (m-0.1X; $n=4$) protocols. Each point represents an independent library prepared from

1.8-60 ng mitochondrial RNA. **C-E)** The relative abundance of miRNAs within each sample is

comparable between small RNA libraries prepared from high, moderate and low mitochondrial RNA

inputs. Venn diagrams depicting unique and shared miRNAs detected from 60 ng mitochondria RNA

when compared to **C)** 1.8 ng, **D)** 7.5 ng and **E)** 30 ng mitochondria RNA, prepared using the modified-

0.3X library preparation approach. The relative distribution of miRNAs detected at each RNA input

was expressed relative to miR-let-7c-2. Differences in the relative distribution of miRNAs between the

highest RNA input and serial RNA dilutions are depicted by grey dots (<5-fold change when compared

to 60ng), red dots (>5-fold change when compared to 60ng) and green dots (>10-fold change when

compared to 60ng). Highly abundant miRNAs across all RNA inputs (including the let-7 family and
mmu-miR-206) are shown in orange dots.

Figure 5. Mitoplasts and enzymatically-treated isolated mitochondria from rat skeletal muscle
tissue have a similar RNA transcriptome. A) PCA plot of RNA-seq whole transcriptome of
mitochondria isolated via IP, RNase-A treated, then treated with proteinase-K ("MitoRnase+ProtK") or
without ("MitoRnase"), mitoplast preparations treated with RNase-A ("MitoplastRnase"), and crude
mitochondria extracts isolated by differential centrifugation treated with RNase-A ("CrudeMito"). Data
are N=3 technical replicates (independent mitochondrial isolation procedures), from the tissue of n=1
animal. Volcano plots of differentially expressed **B)** mtDNA encoded genes, and **C)** nuclear-encoded
genes between the different mitochondrial treatments and mitoplasts, statistical significance accepted
at adjusted p-value (FDR) <0.05 and $\log_2$ fold-change <1.

Figure 6. Purity of enzymatically-treated isolated mitochondria from rat skeletal muscle relative
to respective whole muscle tissue. A) Whole-transcriptome RNA sequencing of isolated mitochondria
and respective whole muscle tissue (rat gastrocnemius) shows that the isolated mitochondria were free
of **D)** highly abundant muscle sarcomere related mRNAs **B)** and nuclear-encoded mRNAs involved in
the mitochondrial electron transport chain, while **C)** mtDNA encoded mitochondrial electron transport
chain genes were present. Each point represents the mean normalised abundance (counts per million,
CPM) of an individual gene from n=6 animals.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.

Figure 4.

A

PC1 vs PC2 by Extraction Method

B (mtDNA)

C (nuclear)

Figure 5.

Figure 6.