Broad-spectrum immune suppression encoded in self-amplifying RNA enables non-cytotoxic, non-immunostimulatory, reversible transgene expression

Tony K.Y Lim,[1],* Anne Ritoux,[1] Luke W. Paine,[1] Larissa Ferguson,[2] Tawab Abdul,[1]
and Ewan St. John Smith[1],**
[1]Department of Pharmacology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
[2]MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology, Cambridge, UK
*Correspondence: tony.ky.lim@gmail.com
**Correspondence: es336@cam.ac.uk
7

ABSTRACT

Self-amplifying RNA (saRNA) has the potential to provide durable, non-integrative transgene expression
for transient gene therapy. However, its auto-replicative nature mimics viral infection, triggering innate
immune responses that shutdown cap-dependent translation, degrade cellular mRNA, induce cell death,
and release cytokines. In non-immunotherapy applications, this immune activation is undesirable as it
limits transgene expression, depletes transfected cells, and damages surrounding tissues, undermining
therapeutic outcomes. Moreover, the use of exogenous immune suppressants to mitigate these effects
often increases treatment complexity and the risk of unintended systemic side effects. To address these
challenges, we developed a strategy to encode broad-spectrum innate immune suppression directly
within saRNA. This approach leverages cap-independent translation to bypass saRNA-triggered
translation shutdown, enabling the expression of multiple inhibitors targeting diverse double-stranded
RNA-sensing and inflammatory signaling pathways. In mouse primary fibroblast-like synoviocytes—a
model relevant to inflammatory joint diseases—this strategy eliminates the need for external immune
inhibitors, reduces cytotoxicity and antiviral cytokine secretion, and enables sustained transgene
expression that is reversible with a small-molecule antiviral. These findings support the development of
saRNA therapeutics that offer durable, non-integrative, controllable transgene expression without
persistent immune activation or reliance on exogenous immune suppressants.
25

26 **GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT**

ETOC SYNOPSIS

Targeting diverse double-stranded RNA sensing and inflammatory pathways with cap-independently expressed proteins cis-encoded within self-amplifying RNA enables non-cytotoxic, non-immunostimulatory, and reversible transgene expression in mouse primary fibroblast-like synoviocytes.

INTRODUCTION

Self-amplifying RNA (saRNA) is a promising platform for transient gene therapy due to its ability to encode large therapeutic payloads and achieve sustained, non-integrative protein expression.[1] Upon cellular internalization, saRNA utilizes host machinery to synthesize an RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp), which drives replication of the saRNA genome.[2] This process involves the production of a negative-strand RNA intermediate that serves as a template for both genomic and subgenomic RNA synthesis.[3] Subgenomic RNA, encoding the gene of interest, is transcribed in excess of the genomic RNA, leading to robust and sustained protein expression.[4]

However, the self-replication of saRNA also generates double-stranded RNA (dsRNA) intermediates, formed both during the synthesis of negative-strand RNA and during the transcription of positive-strand RNA from the negative-strand template.[3] These dsRNA intermediates are potent activators of cytosolic pattern recognition receptors, triggering innate immune responses.[5,6] This recognition results in suppression of cap-dependent translation,[7–10] degradation of cellular mRNA,[6,11] induction of programmed cell death,[6,10,12–16] and release of cytokines and chemokines characteristic of viral infection[9,17,18]. While this innate immune stimulation can enhance the efficacy of immunotherapy applications such as vaccines and cancer therapy,[19] excessive stimulation can undermine potency by reducing antigen expression,[17] necessitating strategies to reduce the immunostimulatory effects of saRNA.[20] In non-immunotherapy applications, sustained activation of innate immune pathways is particularly problematic, as it limits transgene expression, depletes transfected cells, and induces inflammation. While exogenous immunosuppressants can mitigate these effects and restore transgene expression,[9,21–23] they add complexity to treatment regimens and increase the risk of unintended side effects.

Strategies to mitigate saRNA-mediated innate immune responses have included the incorporation of modified nucleotides[24], removal of dsRNA contaminants,[9,25] and co-delivery of non-replicating mRNA encoding viral innate immune inhibiting proteins.[22,26,27] While these approaches can reduce initial innate immune responses to saRNA transfection, they fall short in addressing the continuous immune activation triggered by dsRNA intermediates that arise during saRNA replication.[2] Sequence evolution of the RdRp replicon shows some promise in reducing these responses, but even engineered replicons still induce significant innate immune activation.[6,28] Another strategy involves encoding a viral immune inhibitor within the saRNA construct using a 2A self-cleaving peptide, which improves protein expression in vitro but does not significantly reduce cytokine responses, despite reductions in NF-κB and IRF3 activation.[19]

Building on these insights, we developed a fully saRNA-based approach to mitigate ongoing saRNA-induced innate immune responses. Our strategy incorporates several key innovations. First, innate immune inhibitory proteins are expressed via cap-independent translation, bypassing the cap-dependent translation shutdown commonly triggered by saRNA. Cap-dependent translation requires the presence of a 5′ cap structure on mRNA, which recruits translation initiation factors and ribosomes.[29] By contrast, cap-independent translation uses alternative mechanisms—such as internal ribosome entry sites (IRES)—to recruit ribosomes directly to the mRNA, enabling translation even when cap-dependent pathways are inhibited.[30] Second, by simultaneously targeting multiple dsRNA-sensing and inflammatory signaling pathways, our method provides a more comprehensive suppression of innate immune responses than single target approaches. Third, encoding innate immune inhibitors directly within the saRNA ensures continuous protection against persistent innate immune activation caused by dsRNA intermediates during saRNA replication, eliminating the need for exogenous immunosuppressants.

We evaluated this approach in mouse primary fibroblast-like synoviocytes (FLS), a key cell type in the pathology of inflammatory joint diseases.[31,32] To facilitate this evaluation, we developed a novel microplate assay for straightforward, longitudinal monitoring of saRNA translation control and cytotoxicity in live cells. Our results demonstrate that this strategy effectively reduces saRNA-induced cytotoxicity and cytokine production while enabling sustained cap-dependent transgene expression, which can be

reversed with a small-molecule antiviral. These results pave the way for saRNA-based therapies that offer
durable, controllable transgene expression with minimal innate immune activation, achieving this without
reliance on exogenous immunosuppressants.

RESULTS

Development of a microplate assay for longitudinal monitoring of translational control and cell
number

Since saRNA can induce cap-dependent translation shutdown and cell death, we developed a microplate
assay to simultaneously monitor cap-independent translation, cap-dependent translation, and cell number
over time. In this assay, primary mouse FLS (Fig. S1) were plated in 6-well plates and transfected with
saRNA constructs that used the Venezuelan equine encephalitis virus (VEEV) RdRp to self-replicate.
These constructs featured a dual-fluorescence design, with EGFP expressed through
encephalomyocarditis virus (EMCV) IRES-mediated, cap-independent translation, and mScarlet3
expressed through subgenomic cap-dependent translation. This dual-reporter system enabled
assessment of the effects of saRNA on translational control (Fig. 1a). Spectral overlap between EGFP
and mScarlet3 was corrected using linear unmixing (Figs. S2a-c).

To monitor cell number, FLS were stained with BioTracker NIR680, a lipophilic carbocyanine membrane
dye that enables long-term fluorescent labeling of cells.[33] Carbocyanine dyes like BioTracker are weakly
fluorescent in aqueous solution but exhibit high fluorescence when integrated into lipid bilayers.
Consequently, mock transfection with Lipofectamine MessengerMAX—a lipid transfection agent—
enhanced BioTracker fluorescence compared to non-transfected cells, likely due to an interaction with the
lipid components of Lipofectamine (Figs. S3a, S3b). Despite this interaction, BioTracker remains effective
for indicating cell number, as treatment of mock transfected cells with the apoptosis inducer
staurosporine[34] reduced BioTracker fluorescence (Figs. S3a, S3b). The BioTracker results were
consistent with those obtained using the viability dye calcein AM (Figs. S3c, S3d), with the added
advantages of eliminating the need for additional staining and wash steps and avoiding spectral overlap
with red and green fluorescent proteins. This assay allows for seamless longitudinal monitoring of cap-
independent translation, cap-dependent translation, and cell number using microplate readers or imagers.

Design of saRNA constructs for inhibiting multiple dsRNA sensing pathways

Cells detect cytosolic dsRNA through several sensing pathways, including RIG-I,[35] melanoma
differentiation-associated protein 5 (MDA-5),[36] protein kinase R (PKR),[37] and the oligoadenylate synthase
(OAS)/RNase L pathway.[38] To broadly inhibit these pathways, we designed an saRNA construct, referred
to as 'E3', that utilizes EMCV IRES cap-independent translation to express the vaccinia virus E3 protein
(Fig. 1a). E3 protein is a pleiotropic inhibitor that binds and sequesters dsRNA, effectively blocking
multiple dsRNA sensing pathways.[39]

Given the key roles of PKR in cap-dependent translation shutdown and OAS/RNase L in cellular mRNA
degradation in response to dsRNA, we sought to further inhibit these pathways in a second construct.
This construct includes Toscana virus NSs, a ubiquitin ligase that promotes PKR degradation,[40] and
Theiler's virus L*, which inhibits RNase L.[41] To enable co-expression of these three proteins—E3, NSs,
and L*—we incorporated 2A "self-cleaving" peptide sequences between the proteins, allowing the
polyprotein to be cleaved into separate proteins during translation. As prior experiments showed that
using multiple identical 2A peptides can reduce protein expression,[42] we selected non-identical 2A
peptides for this construct. This construct, named 'E3-NSs-L*', is expected to provide a more
comprehensive inhibition of dsRNA-sensing pathways than the E3 construct.

Finally, as a control, we designed a 'native saRNA' construct that expresses a blue fluorescent protein
(moxBFP) as a visual marker of IRES functionality in place of inhibitors of dsRNA-sensing pathways.
Importantly, moxBFP expression did not overlap spectrally with the EGFP or mScarlet3 channels (Figs.
S2a-c).

Fig. 1. Differential effects of moderate and strong dsRNA-sensing pathway inhibition on saRNA
transgene expression and cell loss

a, Schematic of the native saRNA, E3, and E3-NSs-L* constructs designed to inhibit dsRNA-sensing pathways and report saRNA transgene expression. The native saRNA construct lacks dsRNA-sensing inhibitors. The E3 construct expresses vaccinia virus E3, a pleiotropic inhibitor of dsRNA sensing, expected to provide moderate inhibition. The E3-NSs-L* construct expresses vaccinia virus E3, and additionally includes Toscana virus NSs and Theiler's virus L*, which target the PKR and OAS/RNase L pathways, expected to provide strong inhibition. EGFP is expressed via an IRES to report cap-independent translation, while a subgenomic promoter (depicted with an angled arrow) enables transcription of an RNA transcript that expresses mScarlet3 via cap-dependent translation. saRNA constructs were transfected into primary mouse FLS, which were labeled with BioTracker to monitor cell number.

b, Representative images of EGFP (green) and mScarlet3 (red) expression in FLS transfected with native saRNA, E3, or E3-NSs-L* over 3 weeks. Scale bar = 5 mm.

c, Representative images of FLS transfected with the same constructs, showing BioTracker intensity over time. Scale bar = 5 mm.

d, Quantification of EGFP fluorescence over time (n = 11). The E3 construct provided the greatest EGFP expression, while the E3-NSs-L* construct showed intermediate levels. Statistical significance of treatment effects at each time point compared to mock transfection was determined by two-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser correction and Dunnett's multiple comparisons test.

e, Quantification of mScarlet3 fluorescence over time (n = 11). The E3 construct provided the greatest mScarlet3 expression, while the E3-NSs-L* showed intermediate levels. Statistical significance of treatment effects at each time point compared to mock transfection was determined by two-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser correction and Dunnett's multiple comparisons test.

f, Quantification of BioTracker fluorescence over time (n = 11). The native saRNA and E3 constructs reduced BioTracker fluorescence, indicating cell loss. Statistical significance of treatment effects at each time point compared to mock transfection was determined by two-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser correction and Dunnett's multiple comparisons test.

g, AUC analysis of BioTracker fluorescence data shown in (f), summarizing cumulative effects over the time course (n = 11). Increasing dsRNA-sensing pathway inhibition prevents saRNA-induced reductions in integrated BioTracker signal. Statistical analysis was performed using one-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser correction and Tukey's multiple comparisons test to compare all groups. Mock transfection data is also presented in Fig. S5a.

h, Representative images of FLS stained with the cell number normalization dye, CellTag 700. Columns represent cells plated from the same biological replicate, while rows show different treatments. Scale bar = 2.5 mm.

i, Quantification of mock transfection normalized CellTag signal (n = 24). Increasing dsRNA-sensing pathway inhibition mitigates saRNA-induced reductions in CellTag signal. Statistical analysis was performed using one-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser correction and Holm-Šídák's multiple comparisons test to compare all groups. Assays were performed 2 days post-transfection. Data in this panel were pooled from in-cell western assays, incorporating data presented in Figs. 3 and 6 as well as additional data not shown elsewhere.

For all statistical reporting, *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001 and ****P < 0.0001. Data are presented as mean ± SEM.

For panels (d-f): Data were normalized to starting cell number, indicated by BioTracker intensity on day 0, prior to transfection. The mock transfection control data is also presented in Figs. 5c-e.

Acronyms: saRNA, self-amplifying RNA; dsRNA, double-stranded RNA; nsP, Venezuelan equine encephalitis virus non-structural protein; IRES, encephalomyocarditis virus internal ribosome entry site; moxBFP, monomeric oxidizing environment-optimized blue fluorescent protein; E3, Vaccinia virus E3 protein; NSs, Toscana virus non-structural NSs protein; L*, Theiler's murine encephalomyelitis virus L* protein; T2A, Thosea asigna virus 2A peptide; P2A, porcine teschovirus-1 2A peptide; PKR, protein kinase R; OAS, oligoadenylate synthase; AUC, area under the curve.

Moderate dsRNA-sensing pathway inhibition enables high transgene expression at the cost of cell loss, while strong inhibition preserves cell number at lower expression levels

Following transfection of saRNA constructs, we monitored BioTracker, EGFP, and mScarlet3 fluorescence over 3 weeks (Figs. 1b, 1c). Inhibiting dsRNA-sensing pathways with viral proteins

significantly enhanced saRNA transgene expression (Figs. 1d, 1e). Interestingly, the E3 construct
produced the highest levels of EGFP and mScarlet3 expression, surpassing both native saRNA and the
E3-NSs-L* construct. Native saRNA yielded low levels of transgene expression, while E3-NSs-L* showed
intermediate expression.

Achieving durable transgene expression depends equally on preserving cell viability and maximizing
transgene expression, as constructs that induce cell death undermine the goal of sustained transgene
expression. Transfection of FLS with native saRNA caused both immediate and long-term reductions in
cell number, as indicated by BioTracker intensity (Fig. 1f). While the E3 construct initially maintained cell
number, BioTracker signals gradually diminished over time. In contrast, the E3-NSs-L* construct provided
sustained protection against the decline in cell number. To quantify the cumulative effects of different
saRNA constructs on cell number over the experimental time course, we performed area under the curve
(AUC) analysis, demonstrating that E3-NSs-L* significantly protected against a decline in cell number
compared to the E3 construct (Fig. 1g). These findings were further supported by experiments using
CellTag, a cell number normalization stain (Fig. 1h), which revealed that increasing dsRNA-sensing
pathway inhibition protects against cell loss (Fig. 1i). Together, these results suggest that while the E3
construct effectively enhances saRNA transgene expression, it is associated with greater cell loss,
underscoring the advantage of the E3-NSs-L* construct for applications requiring sustained, non-cytotoxic
gene expression.

Inhibiting dsRNA sensing pathways reduces saRNA-induced cytotoxicity and improves cell
viability

saRNA is known to induce programmed cell death,[6,10,12–16] which often leads to cell detachment.[43] Thus
reductions in BioTracker signal following saRNA treatment are likely indicative of this process. However,
since BioTracker is a lipophilic membrane dye, the reduction in signal may not necessarily correlate with
cell viability or cytotoxicity. In addition to long-term cell tracking, lipophilic membrane dyes like BioTracker
are often used to stain extracellular vesicles, which bud off from the plasma membrane.[44] During cellular
stress, increased production of extracellular vesicles[45] could deplete the membrane-associated
BioTracker dye from cells, resulting in a lower detectable signal. Therefore, the observed reduction in
BioTracker signal could reflect enhanced extracellular vesicle production rather than cell death.

To provide more definitive evidence that inhibiting dsRNA-sensing pathways protects against saRNA-
induced cytotoxicity, we conducted a longitudinal assay with annexin V staining over 6 days (Fig. 2a),
followed by calcein AM staining on day 7 (Fig. 2b). Annexin V, a membrane-impermeable protein, binds
to phosphatidylserine, which translocates to the extracellular side of the cell membrane during early
apoptosis, enabling the detection of apoptotic cells with intact membranes.[46] If the membrane is
compromised, annexin V can enter cells and stain intracellular phosphatidylserine, indicating late
apoptosis or necrosis.[47] Calcein AM, a viability dye, accumulates in metabolically active cells with intact
membranes, serving both as a marker of live cell number and an indicator of membrane integrity.[48]

The apoptosis inducing agent staurosporine caused a transient increase in annexin V staining that
decreased after the first day (Fig. 2c), along with a marked reduction in calcein AM fluorescence
compared to mock transfection (Fig. 2d), observations that are consistent with extracellular
phosphatidylserine translocation and/or increased membrane permeability. Similarly, native saRNA
induced a temporary increase in annexin V staining during the first two days post-transfection (Fig. 2c)
accompanied by reduced calcein AM staining (Fig. 2d). Co-expression of E3 prevented the initial increase
in annexin V staining, but elevated it from day 2 onward, and also resulted in significantly reduced calcein
AM intensity (Figs. 2c, 2d). In contrast, E3-NSs-L* had no significant effect on annexin V or calcein AM
staining compared to mock transfection, supporting the idea that broader inhibition of dsRNA-sensing
pathways, achieved by combining E3, NSs and L*, is more effective than E3 alone in preventing saRNA-
induced cell death and preserving cell viability.

Fig. 2. saRNA induces increased phosphatidylserine staining and reduced viability, which is prevented by E3-NSs-L*

a, Representative cropped images of Annexin V-CF800 staining, indicating phosphatidylserine exposure or loss of membrane integrity, performed daily over 6 days using a microplate imager. Scale bar = 1.5 mm.

b, Representative cropped images of calcein AM staining, indicating viability, on day 7 post-treatment. Scale bar = 1.5 mm.

c, Annexin V staining, quantified as the area of positive pixels determined using Li thresholding (n = 6). Staurosporine, native saRNA, and the E3 construct significantly increased annexin V staining, while E3-NSs-L* did not. Data are normalized to the average of the mock transfection group. Statistical significance of treatment effects at each time point compared to mock transfection was determined using two-way RM ANOVA with Bonferroni's multiple comparisons test. Data are presented as mean ± SEM.

d, Calcein AM intensity measured on day 7 post-treatment (n = 6). Native saRNA, and E3 significantly reduced cell viability compared to mock transfection, while E3-NSs-L* did not. Cell viability in the E3-NSs-L* group was significantly higher than the E3 group. All groups differed significantly from staurosporine; these comparisons are omitted from the figure for clarity due to the large number of statistical comparisons. Data are normalized to cell number on day 0 as determined by BioTracker staining before transfection. Statistical significance was determined by one-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser

251 correction and Tukey's multiple comparisons test comparing all groups.
252 saRNA constructs used are shown in Fig. 1a. For all statistical reporting, *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P <
253 0.001 and ****P < 0.0001.

E3 and E3-NSs-L* prevent saRNA-induced eIF2α phosphorylation and differentially regulate eIF2α levels

We next explored how the E3 and E3-NSs-L* constructs influence translational control mechanisms
during saRNA transfection. Eukaryotic initiation factor 2 alpha (eIF2α) is a central regulator of translation
initiation; its phosphorylation serves as a cellular stress response to limit cellular cap-dependent protein
synthesis, freeing ribosomes for cap-independent translation initiation instead.[49] Using in-cell western
assays, we found that native saRNA transfection increased eIF2α phosphorylation, but both E3 and E3-
NSs-L* effectively blocked this phosphorylation (Fig. 3a), consistent with previous reports of E3's
inhibitory effect on eIF2α phosphorylation.[26] Interestingly, E3-NSs-L* also increased total eIF2α levels, an
effect not observed with the E3 construct (Fig. 3b).

E3-NSs-L* counteracts saRNA-induced PKR upregulation

Given that PKR phosphorylates eIF2α upon activation by dsRNA,[7] we next assessed its levels following
saRNA transfection. Consistent with previous reports,[6] native saRNA transfection increased PKR levels
(Fig. 3c). The E3 construct similarly increased PKR levels; however, co-expression of E3-NSs-L*
mitigated this increase, suggesting that E3-NSs-L* effectively counteracts saRNA-induced PKR
upregulation. This is in line with the known role of the Toscana virus NSs protein as a ubiquitin ligase that
targets PKR for degradation.[40]

saRNA reduces eIF4E phosphorylation without altering total eIF4E levels

272 We next examined the impact of saRNA transfection on eIF4E, a key regulator of translation initiation.[50]
273 All constructs reduced eIF4E phosphorylation levels (Fig 3d), while total eIF4E levels remained
274 unchanged (Fig. 3e).

E3-NSs-L* preserves RNA integrity compared to E3

Both the E3 and E3-NSs-L* constructs inhibited saRNA-induced eIF2α phosphorylation (Fig. 3a) and
reduced eIF4E phosphorylation (Fig. 3d). However, E3-NSs-L* also reduced PKR levels (Fig. 3c) and
increased total eIF2α availability for cap-dependent translation (Fig. 3b). Despite these advantages, the
E3-NSs-L* construct unexpectedly produced lower levels of cap-dependent and cap-independent
transgene expression compared to the E3 construct, suggesting that mechanisms beyond eIF2α and
eIF4E-mediated translational control may contribute to the heightened transgene expression observed
with the E3 construct.

When OAS binds dsRNA, it synthesizes 2′-5′-oligoadenylate, which activates RNase L to cleave single-
stranded RNA, leading to cellular mRNA degradation[51] and inhibition of mRNA nuclear export,[52] thereby
massively reducing host protein synthesis.[53] Many RNA viruses, including dengue and Zika, evade
RNase L by localizing their transcripts within viral replication organelles, protecting them from degradation
while allowing continued protein production.[52,54] Similarly, the VEEV-derived saRNA used in this study
replicates within these organelles,[55] likely protecting its transcripts from RNase L activity. Consequently,
RNase L activation by the E3 construct may selectively deplete cytoplasmic host mRNA while sparing
saRNA. This depletion reduces competition for ribosomes, thereby enhancing the translation of saRNA
transcripts. In contrast, the E3-NSs-L* construct encodes Theiler's virus L*, an RNase L inhibitor,[41]
thereby preventing host mRNA degradation and forcing saRNA transcripts to compete directly with
cellular mRNA for ribosomal access.

To test the hypothesis that RNase L activation by the E3 construct cleaves cellular mRNA, capillary gel
electrophoresis was performed on RNA extracted from FLS transfected with the E3 and E3-NSs-L*
constructs. RNA electropherograms were analyzed using the RNA integrity number (RIN) algorithm, an
automated Bayesian learning method for measuring RNA integrity.[56] Cells transfected with E3-NSs-L*
exhibited higher RIN than cells transfected with E3 (Fig. 3f), supporting the idea that RNase L-mediated
reductions in cellular mRNA occur with the E3 construct but not with the E3-NSs-L* construct.

Fig. 3. Translational control alterations induced by saRNA are modulated by dsRNA-sensing pathway inhibitors with differing effects on RNA integrity

301
302

a, Phosphorylated eIF2α levels examined day 2 post-transfection by in-cell western assay (n = 6). Both
E3 and E3-NSs-L* constructs significantly reduced eIF2α phosphorylation. Data are presented as fold-
change relative to mock transfected cells. Statistical significance was determined by one-way RM ANOVA
with Tukey's multiple comparisons test.
b, eIF2α levels examined day 2 post-transfection by in-cell western assay (n = 5). E3-NSs-L* significantly
increased total eIF2α levels compared to native saRNA transfection. Data are presented as fold-change
relative to mock transfected cells. Statistical significance was determined by one-way RM ANOVA with
Tukey's multiple comparisons test.
c, PKR levels examined day 2 post-transfection by in-cell western assay (n = 4). E3-NSs-L* significantly
reduced PKR levels compared to both native saRNA and E3 transfection. Data are presented as fold-
change relative to mock transfected cells. Statistical significance was determined by one-way RM ANOVA
with Tukey's multiple comparisons test.
d, Phosphorylated eIF4E levels examined day 2 post-transfection by in-cell western assay (n = 6). All
saRNA constructs tested significantly reduced eIF4E phosphorylation levels compared to mock
transfection. Statistical significance was determined by one-way RM ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple
comparisons test comparing treatments to mock transfection.
e, eIF4E levels examined day 2 post-transfection by in-cell western assay (n = 6). One-way RM ANOVA
revealed no significant differences between groups (F(3,15) = 1.207, P = 0.3410).
f, RNA integrity of FLS transfected with E3-NSs-L* is significantly higher than that of E3-transfected FLS
(n = 5). RNA integrity was assessed using the RNA Integrity Number (RIN) algorithm, which ranges from

1 to 10, with 10 indicating fully intact RNA. RNA was extracted from FLS 1 day post-transfection. Data are
shown as a Gardner-Altman comparison plot, with the right panel illustrating the mean effect size ± 95%
CI. Statistical significance was assessed using a paired t-test (P = 0.0054).
saRNA constructs used are shown in Fig. 1a. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: *P < 0.05,
**P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001. The mock transfection control data presented in panels (a), (b), (d) and (f) are
also used in Fig. 6.

Design of saRNA constructs for inhibiting multiple inflammatory signaling pathways

Having addressed key saRNA-induced toxicities—including cell death, translation shutdown, and mRNA
degradation—with the E3-NSs-L* construct, we next sought to design new saRNA constructs aimed at
mitigating cytokine production. In these new constructs, E3-NSs-L*-EGFP was expressed via a single
IRES using non-identical 2A peptides (Fig. 4a). On a second IRES, varying amounts of cellular inhibitors
of inflammatory signaling were expressed. The control construct, called 'moxBFP', lacks cellular inhibitors
of inflammatory signaling and instead expresses a blue fluorescent protein.

Given that activation of nuclear factor-κB (NF-κB) is a hallmark of viral infection and a master regulator of
cytokine and chemokine induction,[57,58] we prioritized its inhibition using super repressor inhibitor of κBα
(srIκBα). This dominant active form of IκBα cannot be phosphorylated and thus resists ubiquitination and
degradation, forming a stable cytoplasmic pool of IκBα that prevents NF-κB nuclear translocation and
downstream signaling.[59,60] We generated one construct expressing srIκBα alone (named 'srIκBα') and
another expressing srIκBα in combination with Smad7 and suppressor of cytokine signaling 1 (SOCS1)
using non-identical 2A peptides (named 'srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1'). Smad7 negatively regulates both
transforming growth factor-β (TGF-β) and NF-κB signaling pathways,[61] while SOCS1 inhibits type I, II,
and III interferon (IFN) pathways as well as NF-κB signaling.[62–64]

Inhibiting dsRNA-sensing pathways and inflammatory signaling suppresses saRNA-induced cytokine secretion

Using a bead-based immunoassay on FLS culture supernatants, we observed that native saRNA
transfection induced cytokine responses associated with viral infection (Figs. 4b, S4a-m). Cytokine
secretion was still apparent when dsRNA-sensing pathways were inhibited, although a reduction in tumor
necrosis factor (TNF)-α, IFN-α, and IFN-β levels were observed with E3 expression. Similarly, C-X-C
motif chemokine ligand 10 (CXCL10) levels were reduced with E3-NSs-L* expression. On the other hand,
srIκBα co-expression broadly suppressed cytokine secretion, reducing all measured cytokines to levels
comparable to mock-transfected FLS. The srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 construct did not further reduce
cytokine levels beyond the suppression achieved by srIκBα alone.

Fig. 4. Inhibiting inflammatory signaling reduces saRNA-induced anti-viral cytokine secretion

a, Schematic of the moxBFP, srIκBα, and srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 saRNA constructs designed for
inhibition of inflammatory signaling. These constructs include dsRNA-sensing pathway inhibitors (vaccinia
virus E3, Toscana virus NSs, and Theiler's virus L*). The moxBFP construct, serving as a control, lacks
inflammatory signaling inhibitors. The srIκBα construct co-expresses srIκBα, which blocks the NF-κB
inflammatory signaling pathway and represents moderate inflammatory signaling inhibition. The srIκBα-
Smad7-SOCS1 construct co-expresses srIκBα, Smad7 and SOCS1 to additionally inhibit TGF-β and IFN
pathways, representing strong inflammatory signaling inhibition. The angled arrow denotes the
subgenomic promotor.

b, FLS were transfected with saRNA constructs, and anti-viral cytokines were quantified by bead-based
immunoassay on day 2 post-transfection (n = 6). dsRNA-sensing pathway inhibition and inflammatory
signaling inhibition significantly reduced cytokine secretion induced by saRNA. Cytokine levels were
scaled within each biological replicate, with the highest value set to 100%, and the mean value displayed
in the heatmap. Detailed graphs of individual cytokines are shown in Supplementary Fig. S4. For
statistical analysis, cytokine levels were normalized to pre-transfection cell number (measured using
BioTracker). Statistical significance for each cytokine was assessed using one-way RM ANOVA followed
by Bonferroni's multiple comparisons test against the mock transfection control. A Bonferroni correction
was applied to P values to account for multiple independent hypothesis testing. *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01,
***P < 0.001 and ****P < 0.0001.

Acronyms: nsP, Venezuelan equine encephalitis virus non-structural protein; IRES, encephalomyocarditis
virus internal ribosome entry site; moxBFP, monomeric oxidizing environment-optimized blue fluorescent
protein; E3, Vaccinia virus E3 protein; NSs, Toscana virus non-structural NSs protein; L*, Theiler's murine
encephalomyelitis virus L* protein; T2A, Thosea asigna virus 2A peptide; P2A, porcine teschovirus-1 2A
peptide, E2A, equine rhinitis A virus 2A peptide, srIκBα, super-repressor inhibitor of κBα; smad7, mothers
against decapentaplegic homolog 7; SOCS1, suppressor of cytokine signaling 1; IFN-γ, interferon-γ;
CXCL1, C-X-C motif chemokine ligand 1; TNF-α, tumor necrosis factor-α; MCP-1, monocyte
chemoattractant protein-1; IL-12p70, interleukin-12; CCL5, chemokine ligand 5; IL-1β, interleukin-1β;

383   CXCL10, C-X-C motif chemokine ligand 10; GM-CSF, granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor;
384   IL-10, interleukin-10; IFN-β, interferon-β; IFN-α, interferon-α; IL-6, interleukin-6.

srIκBα reduces cell number, whereas srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 preserves cell number and enhances transgene expression

We then examined the impact of inhibiting inflammatory signaling on cell number and transgene
expression (Figs. 5a, 5b). Interestingly, the srIκBα construct caused both immediate and sustained
reductions in cell number, as quantified by BioTracker signal, whereas the srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1
construct maintained cell number comparable to mock transfection throughout the experiment (Fig. 5c).
AUC analysis of the BioTracker data confirmed that srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 significantly mitigated the
srIκBα-induced reduction in integrated BioTracker signal (Fig. S5a). Additional experiments using CellTag
and calcein AM staining corroborated these findings, showing that srIκBα negatively impacted both cell
number (Fig. S5b) and viability (Fig. S5c), effects that were prevented by co-expression of Smad7 and
SOCS1.

All three constructs produced low levels of EGFP expression (Fig. 5d), which was expected given EGFP's
position as the fourth protein in a quad-cistronic 2A element (Fig. 4a). Previous studies have
demonstrated that protein expression decreases significantly for downstream genes in such
configurations.[42] Notably, while the moxBFP and srIκBα constructs generated intermediate mScarlet3
levels, the srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 construct produced 2- to 5-fold higher mScarlet3 fluorescence
compared to the others (Fig. 5e).

Fig. 5. Differential effects of srIκBα and srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 on cell number and transgene expression.

a, Representative images of BioTracker staining over 3 weeks in FLS transfected with different saRNA
constructs. Scale bar = 5 mm.
b, Representative images of EGFP (green) and mScarlet3 (red) expression over 3 weeks in FLS
transfected with different saRNA constructs. Scale bar = 5 mm.
c, Quantification of BioTracker fluorescence intensity over time (n = 11). srIκBα induces reduction in cell
number, which is prevented by srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1. Statistical significance of treatment effects at each

time point compared to mock transfection was determined by two-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–
Geisser correction and Dunnett's multiple comparisons test.
d, Quantification of EGFP fluorescence intensity over time (n = 11). All constructs showed low levels of
EGFP expression. Statistical significance of treatment effects at each time point compared to mock
transfection was determined by two-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser correction and Dunnett's
multiple comparisons test.
e, Quantification of mScarlet3 fluorescence intensity over time (n = 11). The srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1
produced 2-5 times more mScarlet3 fluorescence than either moxBFP or srIκBα constructs. Statistical
significance of treatment effects at each time point compared to mock transfection was determined by
two-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser correction and Dunnett's multiple comparisons test.
saRNA constructs used are shown in Fig. 4a. For all statistical reporting, *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01,
***P < 0.001 and ****P < 0.0001. Data were normalized to cell number (BioTracker intensity) on day 0,
prior to transfection. The mock transfection control data used in this figure is also presented in Fig. 1.
Data are presented as mean ± SEM.

Smad7 and SOCS1 co-expression prevents srIκBα-induced alterations in translational control

We next explored how srIκBα and srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 modulate translational regulation. Interestingly,
srIκBα expression led to reductions in eIF2α phosphorylation, a change that was prevented by co-
expression of Smad7 and SOCS1 (Fig. 6a). While neither construct affected total eIF2α levels or eIF4E
phosphorylation compared to the moxBFP construct (Figs. 6b, 6c), srIκBα caused a significant reduction
in total eIF4E levels (Fig. 6d). Given the critical role of eIF4E in cap-dependent translation, its depletion
likely contributes to the poor transgene expression observed with srIκBα (Fig. 5e). These effects,
combined with srIκBα-induced declines in cell number and viability (Figs. 5c, S5a-c), highlight the dual
impact of srIκBα on translational machinery and cellular health. Importantly, Smad7 and SOCS1 co-
expression preserved eIF4E levels, counteracting the disruption of cap-dependent translation caused by
srIκBα.

Fig. 6. *srIκBα reduces eIF2α phosphorylation and total eIF4E levels, effects reversed by co-
expression of Smad7 and SOCS1*

In-cell western assays were performed 2 days post-transfection. Data are presented as fold change
relative to mock-transfected cells.
a, Phosphorylation of eIF2α is significantly reduced by srIκBα, and this reduction is reversed by co-
expression of Smad7 and SOCS1 (n = 6). Statistical significance was determined by one-way RM
ANOVA and Holm-Šídák's multiple comparisons test to compare all groups.
b, Total eIF2α levels are not significantly affected by srIκBα or srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 (n = 6). One-way
RM ANOVA revealed no significant differences among groups. F(2,8)=3.683, P=0.0735.
c, Phosphorylation of eIF4E is not significantly affected by srIκBα or srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 (n = 6). One
way RM ANOVA revealed no significant difference among groups. F(2,10)=1.336, P=0.3059.
d, Total eIF4E levels are significantly reduced by srIκBα, an effect reversed by co-expression of Smad7
and SOCS1 (n = 6). Statistical significance was determined by one-way RM ANOVA and Holm-Šídák's
multiple comparisons test to compare all groups.
saRNA constructs are described in Fig. 4a. For all statistical reporting, *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01 and
***P < 0.001. Mock transfection data used for normalization are the same as in Fig. 3.

 Prolonged moxBFP transfection does not activate FLS, while srIκBα reduces basal activation

Fibroblast activation protein-α (FAP-α) is a serine protease expressed on the surface of FLS that
contributes to extracellular matrix degradation and tissue remodeling.[65,66] Its expression is minimal in
normal adult FLS but increases significantly following inflammatory activation, such as in rheumatoid and
osteoarthritis.[67,68] Since viral infections can induce fibroblast activation,[69,70] we hypothesized that
prolonged saRNA transfection might similarly trigger FLS activation. To test this, we measured FAP-α
levels using an in-cell western assay after 11 days of transfection. FLS transfected with moxBFP showed
FAP-α levels comparable to those of mock-transfected cells, whereas srIκBα and srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1
constructs resulted in significantly lower FAP-α levels compared to mock transfection (Figs. 7a, 7b).
These findings indicate that long-term saRNA transfection does not induce FLS activation, as measured
by FAP-α levels, potentially alleviating concerns that saRNA might drive pathological fibroblast
responses.

Fig. 7. Prolonged transfection with *srIκBα or srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1* significantly reduces basal
fibroblast activation factor-α (FAP-α) levels

a, Representative in-cell western images showing FAP-α expression. Columns show different biological
replicates, and rows show different treatments. The montage on the right shows FAP-α signal normalized
to CellTag signal (FAP-α/CellTag).
b, In-cell western assay of FAP-α expression (n = 8). Both srIκBα and srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 significantly
reduce FAP-α levels compared to mock transfection, while moxBFP does not differ significantly from
mock. Statistical significance was determined by one-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser
correction and Dunnett's multiple comparisons test to compare groups to mock transfection. **P<0.01.

Reversibility of srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 transfection using a small-molecule antiviral

The srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 construct, which includes E3-NSs-L*, provides broad suppression of dsRNA
sensing and inflammatory signaling pathways. This construct mitigates saRNA-induced cytokine release
(Figs. 4b, S4a-m) and counters saRNA- and srIκBα-induced reductions in cell viability (Figs. 5c, S5a–c),
enabling sustained cap-dependent transgene expression (Fig. 5e) without inducing fibroblast activation
(Fig. 7b) or causing srIκBα-associated reductions in eIF4E levels (Fig. 6d). Together, these attributes
position the srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 construct as a promising candidate for transient gene therapy
applications.
To further enhance the therapeutic potential of this construct, we investigated whether its transfection
could be reversed. Achieving temporal control of transgene expression would enhance safety and
flexibility in therapeutic contexts. The saRNA constructs in this study rely on the VEEV RdRp for self-
amplification. VEEV is a mosquito-borne alphavirus capable of causing flu-like illness in humans, with the
potential to progress to fatal encephalitis.[71] Due to its pathogenicity, significant efforts have focused on
developing small-molecule inhibitors of VEEV. One such compound is ML336, a potent inhibitor of the
VEEV RdRp.[72]

To test whether ML336 could reverse srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 transfection, ML336 or vehicle was added to
the culture medium one day post-transfection. EGFP and mScarlet3 fluorescence were monitored over 13
days (Fig. 8a), followed by calcein AM staining to assess cell viability (Fig. 8b). ML336 treatment
significantly reduced EGFP and mScarlet3 expression over time (Figs. 8c, 8d), demonstrating its efficacy
in reversing saRNA transfection. While vehicle-treated cultures exhibited lower viability compared to
mock-transfected cells—possibly due to reduced proliferation over the experiment's duration—prolonged
ML336 treatment did not reduce viability relative to mock-transfected controls (Fig. 8e).
498

Fig. 8. ML336 reverses srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 saRNA transfection

a, Representative images of EGFP (green) and mScarlet3 (red) expression over 13 days in FLS
transfected with srIκBα-smad7-SOCS1. Cultures were treated with vehicle or 1 µM ML336, starting 1 day
post-transfection. Scale bar = 5 mm.
b, Representative images of calcein AM staining on day 13 post-transfection. Scale bar = 5 mm.
c, Quantification of EGFP fluorescence intensity in srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1-transfected FLS (n = 6).
Cultures were treated with vehicle or 1 µM ML336 (treatment period indicated by shading). EGFP
fluorescence was significantly lower in ML336-treated cultures compared to vehicle-treated cultures on
day 7. Statistical significance relative to vehicle-treated cells was determined by two-way RM ANOVA with
Greenhouse–Geisser correction and Dunnett's multiple comparisons test. #P<0.05, ###P<0.01.
d, Quantification of mScarlet3 fluorescence intensity in srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1-transfected FLS (n = 6).
Cultures were treated with vehicle or 1 µM ML336 (treatment period indicated by shading). mScarlet3
fluorescence was significantly lower in ML336-treated cultures compared to vehicle-treated cultures
beginning on day 3. Statistical significance relative to vehicle-treated cells was determined by two-way
RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–Geisser correction and Dunnett's multiple comparisons test. #P<0.05,
##P<0.01, ###P<0.001.
e, Quantification of calcein AM staining on day 13 post-transfection, following 12 days of vehicle or
ML336 treatment (n = 6). Cultures treated with ML336 showed no significant difference in calcein AM
signal compared to mock transfection, while vehicle-treated cultures exhibited significantly lower calcein
AM signals compared to both mock-transfected and ML336-treated cultures. Statistical significance was

DISCUSSION

saRNA-induced translation shutdown is thought to be mediated by phosphorylation of eIF2α.[20,26,73] During
saRNA replication, dsRNA replicative intermediates activate PKR, leading to eIF2α phosphorylation and
translation inhibition.[7,26] Our study is consistent with this mechanism and additionally demonstrates that
saRNA induces a reduction in eIF4E phosphorylation, a phenomenon previously observed with alphavirus
replicons, although the underlying mechanism remains unclear.[74,75] Similar to eIF2α phosphorylation,[76] a
reduction in eIF4E phosphorylation decreases global cap-dependent translation initiation,[77] promoting
cap-independent translation.[78] These combined effects—phosphorylation of eIF2α and reduced
phosphorylation of eIF4E—may explain why IRES-driven, cap-independent transgenes often achieve
higher expression compared to those relying on cap-dependent expression when using native saRNA.[21,79]

To counteract saRNA-induced translation shutdown, we designed saRNA constructs that express
inhibitors targeting dsRNA-sensing pathways using IRES-mediated translation. During translation
shutdown, global mRNA translation decreases, freeing ribosomes that would otherwise be used for
translating capped mRNAs, thereby enhancing cap-independent translation.[80] By leveraging this
mechanism, IRES-mediated expression of dsRNA-sensing pathway inhibitors ensures their levels
increase as translation shutdown intensifies. This approach effectively inhibits dsRNA sensing and
alleviates translation shutdown. In contrast, encoding these inhibitors via cap-dependent translation is
expected to be less effective, as translation shutdown would lead to reduced inhibitor expression.

In this study, we used vaccinia virus E3 to prevent saRNA-induced translation shutdown, a role that E3
has previously been used to fulfill.[26,27] E3 achieves this by sequestering dsRNA intermediates from
sensors like PKR[81] and by directly inhibiting PKR activation.[82] These dual actions prevent eIF2α
phosphorylation, alleviating translation inhibition and enhancing transgene expression.[26,27] However, our
findings suggest that this mechanism is incomplete. While E3 prevents saRNA-induced eIF2α
phosphorylation, its ability to enhance transgene expression also depends on RNase L activity. By
alleviating translation inhibition, E3 facilitates unrestrained RdRp production, driving robust saRNA
replication and dsRNA synthesis. This dsRNA activates RNase L, which degrades mRNA[51] and inhibits
nuclear mRNA export.[52] The resulting depletion of cytoplasmic mRNA[53] reduces competition for
ribosomes, enabling enhanced translation of saRNA transcripts. These transcripts are shielded from
RNase L degradation due to their localization within plasma membrane-associated micro-compartments
called spherules.[3] Consistent with this model, inhibiting RNase L with L* in the E3-NSs-L* construct
reduced transgene expression, likely due to restored ribosomal competition from intact host mRNA.

While preventing eIF2α phosphorylation and activating RNase L drive high levels of saRNA transgene
expression, this combination also causes significant cytotoxicity with the E3 construct. This dual-edged
effect potentially makes the E3 construct suited for immunotherapy applications, such as vaccines and
cancer treatments, where robust transgene expression and immunogenic cell death can promote strong
immune responses.[83,84] In contrast, non-immunotherapy applications require strategies that prioritize cell
viability and minimize tissue damage over maximizing transgene expression.

Alphavirus vectors, including the VEEV replicon used in this study, are known to induce cytotoxicity in
mammalian cells.[6,10,12–16] This cytotoxicity arises from dsRNA intermediates, which activate sensors such
as PKR, RIG-I, MDA-5, and OAS,[5,7,26,85] despite partial shielding within spherules.[3,20] Studies in HeLa
cells using microinjected dsRNA show that PKR is essential for cytosolic dsRNA-induced apoptosis, while
RIG-I and MDA-5 are dispensable.[86] Numerous studies further underscore the central role of PKR in
mediating apoptosis in response to dsRNA,[87–89] and have shown that PKR can mediate dsRNA-induced
apoptosis even in the absence of eIF2α phosphorylation.[90] OAS also contributes to dsRNA-induced
apoptosis by producing 2'-5'-oligoadenylates upon binding dsRNA, which activate RNase L, leading to
cleavage of single-stranded RNA.[53] This disrupts cellular translation as cleavage of actively translated
mRNA causes ribosome stalling. Ribosomes encountering truncated 3' ends of mRNAs are unable to
dissociate, resulting in collisions,[91,92] triggering the ribotoxic stress response[93] which can lead to

apoptosis.[91,94] These findings from the literature identify PKR and OAS/RNase L as key contributors to
saRNA-associated cytotoxicity and highlight them as valuable targets for mitigation.

While E3 relieves saRNA-induced eIF2α phosphorylation,[26,27] the E3 construct also compromised RNA
integrity, suggesting activation of the OAS/RNase L pathway. Furthermore, PKR, an IFN-inducible gene,[95]
was upregulated by the E3 construct, potentially allowing partial evasion of E3-mediated inhibition. Thus,
vaccinia virus E3 alone did not fully address the cytotoxic actions of dsRNA replicative intermediates
produced during saRNA replication. To further suppress PKR and OAS/RNase L pathways, we used
Toscana virus NSs[40] and Theiler's virus L*,[41] respectively. While this strategy resulted in lower transgene
expression—likely due to the protective actions of RNase L inhibition on cellular mRNA integrity—it
effectively mitigated the intrinsic mechanisms of saRNA cytotoxicity. However, the inclusion of multiple
viral proteins introduces additional challenges. In vivo, saRNA constructs must contend not only with
intrinsic cytotoxic mechanisms but also with adaptive immune responses leading to extrinsic cytotoxicity.
The co-expression of several viral proteins, along with the VEEV RdRp, significantly increases the
likelihood of viral peptides being presented on major histocompatibility complex class I molecules to
cytotoxic T lymphocytes. This is expected to activate adaptive immune responses, which could culminate
in the elimination of saRNA-transfected cells. Addressing both intrinsic and immune cell-mediated
cytotoxicity will be critical to achieving the long-term viability of saRNA-transfected cells and unlocking the
platform's full therapeutic potential.

While we found that inhibiting dsRNA-sensing pathways was an effective means to reduce saRNA-
induced cytotoxicity, it was not effective at preventing saRNA-induced cytokine responses. This agrees
with prior reports showing that dsRNA activates NF-κB even in the absence of PKR and RNase L,[96]
suggesting additional mechanisms contribute to NF-κB activation. One such mechanism may involve
eIF4E, a key regulator of translation initiation, whose activity is governed by its phosphorylation status
and serves as a rate-limiting step in cap-dependent protein synthesis.[50] In this study, we found that
saRNA transfection induces a reduction in eIF4E phosphorylation. Reduced eIF4E phosphorylation has
been shown to decrease the levels of the short-lived IκBα protein,[97] an inhibitor of NF-κB that sequesters
it in the cytoplasm and prevents nuclear translocation. Decreased IκBα levels thus allow NF-κB to
translocate to the nucleus, initiating cytokine expression and inflammatory responses. To address this, we
expressed srIκBα using cap-independent translation to produce a stable cytoplasmic pool of IκBα, thereby
preventing NF-κB activity. While this strategy effectively reduced saRNA-induced cytokine responses, it
also resulted in a reduction in cell viability, highlighting a tradeoff between suppressing inflammation and
maintaining cell survival.

The NF-κB pathway is a key regulator of inflammatory cytokine production, making it an important target
for suppressing cytokine responses.[98] However, NF-κB also has pro-survival functions as it promotes the
transcription of anti-apoptotic genes—though its exact effects depend on tissue type and biological
context.[99] In FLS, overexpression of srIκBα reduces inflammatory cytokine production but increases
sensitivity to TNF-α-induced apoptosis,[100,101] consistent with our findings that saRNA encoding srIκBα
lowered both anti-viral cytokine responses and cell viability. This phenomenon is not unique to FLS;
inhibition of NF-κB signaling with srIκBα has also been shown to render liver hepatocytes more
susceptible to pro-apoptotic stimuli.[102] This raises a key safety consideration, as saRNA delivery systems
such as lipid nanoparticles tend to accumulate in the liver.[103] Therefore, when designing saRNA
constructs for sustained, non-immunostimulatory transgene expression in contexts where apoptosis is
undesirable, the use of srIκBα to suppress cytokine responses may require co-expression of anti-
apoptotic proteins to offset the loss of NF-κB-mediated survival signaling.

In this study, we show that co-expressing Smad7 and SOCS1 effectively counteracted srIκBα-induced
cell death in FLS. While we did not assess the individual contributions of each protein, both are known to
have anti-apoptotic properties in certain contexts. Smad7 can inhibit TGF-β-induced apoptosis,[104,105] while
SOCS1 can suppress apoptosis triggered by IFN-α, IFN-β,[106] IFN-γ,[107] and TNF-α.[108–110] These anti-
apoptotic effects likely enable Smad7 and SOCS1 to mitigate srIκBα-induced reductions in FLS cell
viability.

We also found that co-expression of Smad7 and SOCS1 significantly enhanced cap-dependent
transgene expression. Although we did not distinguish the contributions of each protein to this effect, it is
likely mediated by SOCS1. Previous studies have shown that ruxolitinib, a small-molecule inhibitor of

Janus kinase (JAK) 1 and JAK2,[111] increases saRNA transgene expression when added to saRNA
polyplexes.[18] SOCS1 is an endogenous inhibitor of JAK1 and JAK2,[112] therefore, SOCS1 offers a
genetically encoded alternative to the small-molecule approach of ruxolitinib for enhancing saRNA
expression.

Furthermore, this study presents a straightforward method for controlling saRNA activity. ML336, a VEEV
RdRp inhibitor, blocks the synthesis of positive-sense genomic, negative-sense template, and
subgenomic RNAs of VEEV without affecting host cellular RNA transcription.[113] It has an in vitro effective
concentration 50 (EC_{50}) of 0.02-0.04 µM, and a 50 mg/kg dose offers 100% protection in a lethal VEEV
mouse infection model, with no observed toxicity.[114] Thus, ML336 and other RdRp inhibitors could provide
a practical means to deactivate saRNA—either to terminate transgene expression once therapeutic
objectives are met or as a safety measure to reduce the risks associated with prolonged innate immune
suppression and other potential side effects, including adaptive immune responses to the VEEV replicon
or viral innate immune inhibitory proteins.

Preclinical and clinical data show that saRNA vaccines often trigger an intense innate immune response
that can hinder antigen expression.[8,18,26] Additionally, saRNA vaccines can induce significant
inflammation,[115,116] which is increasingly recognized as problematic, as common adverse events include
pain, headache, tenderness, arthralgia, fever, and chills.[117,118] The approaches described in this study,
which reduces the inherent immunostimulatory effects of saRNA replication, could potentially be applied
to future saRNA vaccine designs to improve antigen expression and reduce reactogenicity.

The approach in this study also underscores the versatility of the saRNA platform, which can efficiently
integrate multiple transgenes and genetic elements. Our largest construct included the VEEV RdRP, two
IRES sequences, five 2A peptides, and eight transgenes within a 16.5-kilobase saRNA. This ability to
encode numerous transgenes without apparent size constraints is a notable yet underutilized strength of
the saRNA platform.

Leveraging this capacity for multiple transgenes, we encoded diverse inhibitors of dsRNA-sensing and
inflammatory signaling pathways directly within saRNA achieving durable and reversible transgene
expression with minimal cytotoxicity and immunostimulation. This approach eliminates the need for
exogenous immune suppressants, a common requirement in other studies utilizing saRNA for non-
immunotherapy applications. For instance, therapeutic antibody production, cellular reprogramming, and
retinal cell transfection with saRNA have relied on interferon-α/β receptor-1 blocking antibodies or the
vaccinia virus B18R interferon decoy receptor to suppress innate immune responses and achieve
effective transgene expression.[9,21–23] Similarly, corticosteroids have been used to enhance antigen
expression by reducing saRNA-induced innate immune activation.[25] Here, we demonstrate that encoding
broad-spectrum innate immune suppression directly within the saRNA obviates the need for additional
immune-modulatory treatments, thereby reducing treatment complexity. Moreover, this strategy localizes
immune suppression to transfected cells, which should minimize the risks of off-target effects associated
with systemic immune suppression.

Expressing multiple transgenes may also be a useful strategy for developing novel therapeutics. The NF-
κB, TGF-β, and JAK/signal transducer and activator of transcription (STAT) pathways are central to the
progression of osteoarthritis.[119–121] The srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 saRNA construct provides a novel strategy
to simultaneously target these pathways: srIκBα inhibits NF-κB, Smad7 blocks TGF-β, and SOCS1
suppresses the JAK/STAT pathway. Each of these proteins has been independently studied as a
treatment for osteoarthritis,[122–124] and their combination within a single construct could represent a
synergistic strategy to enhance therapeutic efficacy. While arthritogenic alphaviruses such as
chikungunya virus and Ross river virus can drive inflammatory responses in FLS, including upregulation
of secreted proteolytic molecules such as matrix metalloproteases,[125,126] the lack of FAP-α upregulation in
transfected FLS provides some evidence that saRNA transfection does not trigger comparable
responses. Moreover, the reduction in basal FAP-α levels observed with the srIκBα and srIκBα-Smad7-
SOCS1 constructs raises the possibility that saRNA could serve as a tool for suppressing fibroblast
activation in inflammatory settings. This approach could hold therapeutic potential in arthritis treatment,[127]
warranting further investigation in disease models.

In addition to expressing therapeutic transgenes, saRNA holds potential for inducing therapeutic effects
by modulating translational control. While the strategy outlined in this report mitigated eIF2α

phosphorylation, it was not effective at preventing saRNA-induced reductions in eIF4E phosphorylation.
In vitro directed evolution of the RdRp replicon[6,28,128] may offer a potential solution to this challenge.
Furthermore, we found that srIκBα expression decreased eIF4E levels, consistent with previous
findings.[129] While reducing eIF4E activity through saRNA or srIκBα expression could lower transgene
expression, it may also have therapeutic value, as lower eIF4E activity is associated with decreased pain
sensitivity,[130] inhibition of tumorigenesis[131], improvement of neurodevelopmental social deficits[132], and
increased longevity.[133] We also observed that srIκBα expression reduced phosphorylation of eIF2α, while
the E3-NSs-L* construct reduced PKR levels. Given that eIF2α phosphorylation activates the integrated
stress response, a pathway often driven by PKR in age-related diseases like neurodegeneration,[134]
saRNA may represent a novel approach to modulate stress responses in these conditions.

Our findings introduce a novel, fully saRNA-based strategy to overcome a key limitation of saRNA:
continuous innate immune stimulation. By inhibiting multiple innate immune pathways through proteins
expressed via cap-independent translation, we achieve sustained transgene expression with low
cytotoxicity and minimal antiviral cytokine induction, all without the use of exogenous
immunosuppressants. Building on these in vitro results, the next step will be to evaluate this strategy in
vivo to assess its effectiveness in complex biological environments. If successful, this approach could
expand the therapeutic applications of saRNA to non-immunotherapy contexts, such as protein
replacement therapy, therapeutic antibody production, genome editing, cellular reprogramming, and
immune cell engineering, where prolonged innate immune stimulation is undesirable. Importantly, the
reversibility of this approach offers significant advantages, enabling precise control over transgene
expression and serving as a crucial safety mechanism for future clinical applications.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Experimental Design

This study aimed to develop and evaluate saRNA constructs that modulate innate immune responses,
specifically targeting dsRNA sensing and inflammatory signaling pathways, to reduce saRNA-induced
cytotoxicity, cytokine expression, and achieve sustained transgene expression. To this end, we
engineered saRNA constructs that co-express multiple viral innate immune inhibitors and cellular
inhibitors of inflammatory signaling. The constructs were designed to enable monitoring of cap-dependent
and cap-independent translation using distinct fluorescent proteins.

The experimental approach included cloning the saRNA constructs using molecular biology techniques,
followed by in vitro transcription and transfection into mouse primary FLS. Transfected cells were
analyzed using fluorescence-based microplate assays to assess cell number, cell viability,
phosphatidylserine exposure, and fluorescent protein expression. Further evaluations of translational
control, FLS activation markers, RNA integrity, and cytokine secretion were conducted using in-cell
western assays, capillary electrophoresis, and bead-based immunoassays. Finally, the reversibility of
saRNA transfection was explored using a small-molecule inhibitor targeting the VEEV RdRp.

Plasmid cloning and construct design

The commercially available TagGFP2 E3L Simplicon vector (SCR725, Merck) served as the saRNA
backbone in this study. After removing the TagGFP2-IRES-E3 sequence, various constructs were
generated by combining different elements using restriction digests (FastDigest, Thermo Scientific),
overlap extension PCR (Phusion, Thermo Scientific), and HiFi assembly (NEBuilder, New England
Biolabs).

Genetic elements were sourced as follows: mScarlet3 from pDx_mScarlet3 (a gift from Dorus Gadella
[Addgene plasmid #189754]),[135] IRES-EGFP from pIRES2-EGFP (Clontech), and IRES-E3 and IRES-
PuroR (puromycin resistance) from the original TagGFP2 E3L Simplicon vector.

Custom gene synthesis (GeneArt, Thermo Scientific) was used to produce IRES-moxBFP, IRES-E3-T2A-
NSs-P2A-L*-E2A-mEGFP, and IRES-srIκBα-P2A-Smad7-T2A-SOCS1 sequences. The IRES sequence

was derived from pIRES2-EGFP (Clontech). Other sequences were derived from public databases:
moxBFP (FPbase ID: SSTDU),[136] mEGFP (FPbase ID: QKFJN), E3 (UniProt: P21605-1), NSs (UniProt:
P21699), L* (UniProt: P0DJX4), Smad7 (UniProt: O35253-1), and SOCS1 (UniProt: O35716). srIκBα was
engineered from IκBα (UniProt: Q9Z1E3) by substituting serines 32 and 36 with alanines. All synthesized
sequences were codon-optimized for mouse expression (GenSmart, GenScript).

Plasmids were cloned in DH5α competent *Escherichia coli* (High Efficiency, New England Biolabs) and
purified by maxiprep (PureLink HiPure, Invitrogen). All plasmid sequences were verified using nanopore
whole plasmid sequencing (Plasmidsaurus).

RNA synthesis

Plasmids were linearized using XbaI (FastDigest, Thermo Scientific) at 37°C for 3 hours. The linear
plasmids were purified by phenol-chloroform extraction followed by sodium acetate ethanol precipitation.
Uncapped RNA was synthesized *in vitro* using the T7 RiboMAX Large Scale RNA Production kit
(Promega) at 37°C for 2 hours. After purification by ammonium acetate precipitation, the RNA was
denatured at 65°C for 5 minutes. Cap-1 structures were then generated using the Vaccinia Capping
System in conjunction with mRNA cap 2'-O-methyltransferase (both from New England Biolabs) for 45
minutes at 37°C. Following another ammonium acetate purification, the RNA was treated with Antarctic
phosphatase (New England Biolabs) for 30 minutes at 37°C. After a final ammonium acetate purification
step, the RNA was resuspended in THE RNA Storage Solution (Invitrogen), aliquoted, and stored at -
80°C until use.

Animals

All mice used in this study were 5- to 12-week-old wildtype C57BL/6J mice (Bicester, UK). Both male and
female mice were included, though sex differences in response to saRNA transfection were not analyzed.
Mice were housed in groups of up to five in a temperature-controlled room (21°C), with bedding, a red
shelter, and enrichment materials provided. They were maintained on a 12-hour light/dark cycle, with food
and water available ad libitum. Mice were euthanized by exposure to CO_2 gas in a rising concentration,
and death confirmed by dislocation of the atlanto-occipital joint by applying pressure to the side of the
neck using thumb and forefinger, procedures in line with the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986
Amendment Regulations 2012.

Mouse primary FLS culture

We cultured FLS from mouse knee joints following established protocols,[137] with slight modifications. In
brief, knee joints were exposed by cutting through the overlying skin with dissecting scissors. The patellar
tendon was then grasped near the patella with Dumont tweezers, and spring scissors were used to sever
the patellar tendon along with surrounding tissues. Finally, the patella was excised by cutting the
quadriceps tendon, and excess muscle and tendons were carefully trimmed away.

Both patellae from each animal were collected into a microcentrifuge tube containing ice-cold sterile
phosphate buffered saline (PBS), then transferred to a 24-well tissue culture plate (Costar) with FLS
culture media. The media consisted of DMEM/F-12 (Invitrogen) supplemented with 25% fetal bovine
serum (Sigma), 1X GlutaMAX (Gibco), and 100 µg/ml Primocin (InvivoGen).

The patellae were maintained in a humidified incubator at 37°C with 5% CO2, with media changes every
1-2 days. FLS outgrowth was observed, and after approximately 10 days, when cells reached 70%
confluency, the patellae were transferred to new wells for further FLS collection. Cells attached to the
original wells were passaged using 0.1% trypsin-EDTA (Sigma) into a single well of a 6-well plate
(Costar). Cells were later expanded into T25 flasks (BioLite, Thermo Scientific or CELLSTAR, Greiner
Bio-One) and passaged upon reaching confluency. After the second passage, Versene solution (Gibco)
was used for cell dissociation.

FLS were used between passages 3 and 8. In most experiments, cells from the same animal were
divided and plated onto 6-well or 24-well plates, allowing for parallel manipulations with matched
conditions. Occasionally, when cell number was low, cells from different animals were pooled before
division. Once plated for experiments, media was changed every 2-3 days.

Immunocytochemistry and confocal microscopy

Cells were plated on poly-D-lysine-coated glass-bottom 35 mm dishes (P35GC-1.5-14-C, MatTek) and
fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde for 10 minutes at room temperature without permeabilization. After
fixation, cells were washed twice with PBS, followed by blocking with 10% normal goat serum in PBS for
1 hour at room temperature.

Cells were then incubated overnight at 4°C in blocking buffer, either without primary antibody (no primary
control) or with cadherin-11 (extracellular) rabbit polyclonal antibody (1:200, DF3523, Affinity
Biosciences). After three washes with PBS, cells were incubated for 1 hour at room temperature in
blocking buffer with 1 µg/ml Hoechst 33342, BioTracker NIR680 (1:2000, Merck), and goat anti-rabbit
Alexa Fluor 488 secondary antibody (1:500, Invitrogen).

After four additional PBS washes, cells were imaged in PBS using a Leica Stellaris 5 confocal microscope
equipped with a 40X oil immersion objective. Tile-scanned images were stitched using Las X microscopy
software (Leica) to generate high-resolution panoramic images.

BioTracker staining

BioTracker NIR680 was diluted 1:2000 in unsupplemented DMEM/F-12. T25 flasks containing FLS were
washed once with HBSS (with calcium and magnesium, Gibco), then incubated with the diluted dye for 30
minutes at 37°C. After incubation, the flasks were washed three times with FLS media, with each wash
lasting 10 minutes at 37°C. The FLS were then dissociated using Versene and plated onto 6- or 24-well
plates.

FLS transfection

For transfection in 6-well plates, the medium was removed and replaced with 1 ml of Opti-MEM I (Gibco).
In a microcentrifuge tube, 500 ng of saRNA was diluted in 200 µl of Opti-MEM I. In a separate tube, 3 µl
of Lipofectamine MessengerMAX (Invitrogen) was diluted in 100 µl of Opti-MEM I. After gently mixing, the
complexes were incubated at room temperature for 5 minutes, then added dropwise to the cells. The cells
were incubated with the complexes for 2 hours at 37°C, after which the media was removed and replaced
with fresh FLS media. For transfection in 24-well plates, all volumes and amounts of saRNA were
reduced fivefold.

Microplate imaging

Unless otherwise specified, black glass-bottom 6-well plates (P06-1.5H-N, Cellvis) were used for
microplate imaging. Prior to imaging, the FLS media was replaced with Live Cell Imaging Solution
(Invitrogen). Imaging was performed using the Odyssey M laser scanner (LI-COR), using LI-COR
acquisition software with a plate offset of +1.45 mm and 100 µm resolution.

EGFP, mScarlet3, and BioTracker NIR680 were imaged using the 488, 520, and 700 channels,
respectively. Spectral cross-excitation between EGFP and mScarlet3 in the 488 and 520 channels was
corrected through linear unmixing analysis, as described below. Fluorescence intensity was quantified in
ImageJ by measuring the integrated density within equal-area regions of interest for each well.
Fluorescence values (EGFP, mScarlet3, and BioTracker) were normalized by the day 0 BioTracker signal
measured before transfection to account for variations in starting cell number.

Linear unmixing analysis

saRNA constructs encoding individual fluorescent proteins (moxBFP, EGFP, or mScarlet3) were
designed to assess cross-excitation among the fluorescent proteins used in this study. tSA201 cells
(96121229, ECACC) were seeded in black glass-bottom 6-well plates coated with poly-D-lysine (Sigma)
and transfected with the saRNA constructs. Cells were imaged the following day using an Odyssey M
laser scanner, with fluorescence captured through the 488 and 520 channels. Expression of moxBFP was
undetectable in both the 488 and 520 channels, and therefore it was excluded from further analysis.
Bleed-through of EGFP into the 520 channel and mScarlet3 into the 488 channel was quantified using
ImageJ, with cross-excitation determined to be 11.32% and 0.94%, respectively. The emission signals
were assumed to be linearly proportional to the sum of the intensities of each fluorophore, and the
unmixed EGFP and mScarlet3 signals were calculated using Python.

Annexin V assay

FLS were stained with BioTracker NIR680 and plated on black glass-bottom 24-well plates (Sensoplate,
Greiner Bio-One). Cells were transfected with saRNA or treated with 0.5 µM staurosporine (Cayman
Chemical) as a positive control.

Annexin V-CF800 conjugate (Biotium) was diluted to 250 ng/ml in Live Cell Imaging Solution (Invitrogen).
On each day of the assay, wells were washed with Live Cell Imaging Solution and replaced with diluted
Annexin V-CF800 solution. Plates were incubated at 37°C for 15 minutes. Following incubation, plates
were washed 3 times with Live Cell Imaging Solution before imaging the 700 and 800 channels with an
Odyssey M imager set to +1.45 mm image offset and 100 µm resolution.

Image analysis was performed using ImageJ. To correct for unidirectional spectral bleed-through of
BioTracker NIR680 into the 800-channel, subtractive compensation was applied by dividing the 700-
channel image by a factor of 800 and then subtracting it from the 800-channel image. Due to the
presence of a small number of high-intensity speckles in the 800-channel image, area rather than
fluorescence intensity was quantified. The display range of the 800-channel image was set between 0.25
and 2.5 and the image was thresholded using the method of Li.[138] The area of thresholded pixels within
each well was then quantified and adjusted based on the BioTracker signal before transfection to account
for variations in cell number. Data was then normalized to the average of the mock transfection condition.

Calcein AM staining

Calcein AM (Invitrogen) staining was performed according to the manufacturer's protocol. Briefly, cells
were washed with HBSS and incubated with 2 µM calcein AM (diluted in HBSS) at 37°C for 30 minutes.
Following three washes, cells were imaged in Live Cell Imaging Solution, and the 488-channel image was
captured using an Odyssey M imager.

Although calcein AM and EGFP share overlapping spectra, calcein AM fluorescence was typically much
higher than EGFP, making EGFP's contribution to the measured Calcein AM signal negligible in most
cases. However, when the E3 construct was used, EGFP expression was sufficient to interfere with the
signal. To address this, in experiments that included use of the E3 construct, a 488-channel image was
captured prior to calcein AM application and subtracted from the post-application image to accurately
measure calcein AM fluorescence.

Fluorescence intensity was quantified using ImageJ. In experiments where BioTracker was used,
fluorescence values were corrected by the pre-transfection BioTracker signal to account for differences in
starting cell number.

In-cell western assay

Cells were plated on black, glass-bottom 24-well plates. Alongside mock and saRNA transfections, one
well was reserved for background subtraction, which received no treatment. Unless specified otherwise,
experiments were conducted 2 days post-transfection. Cells were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde for 10

minutes at room temperature, followed by two washes with tris-buffered saline (TBS). Permeabilization
was then performed using 0.1% Triton X-100 in TBS for 10 minutes, followed by two additional TBS
washes. After permeabilization, cells were blocked with Intercept TBS Blocking Buffer (LI-COR) for 1 hour
at room temperature with gentle agitation.

Primary antibodies were diluted in Intercept Blocking Buffer and incubated with the cells overnight at 4°C.
The background subtraction well was incubated with blocking buffer alone, without primary antibodies.
The following primary antibodies were used: Phospho-eIF2α (Ser51) (D9G8) XP rabbit monoclonal
(1:200, #3398, Cell Signaling Technology), eIF2α (L57A5) mouse monoclonal (1:200, #2103, Cell
Signaling Technology), PKR rabbit polyclonal (1:500, #18244-1-AP, Proteintech), Phospho-eIF4E (S209)
rabbit monoclonal (1:200, #ab76256, Abcam), eIF4E mouse monoclonal (5D11) (1:200, #MA1-089,
Invitrogen), and fibroblast activation protein (73.3) mouse monoclonal (20 μg/ml, #BE0374, InVivoMAb).
Except for the fibroblast activation protein antibody, which was conjugated to DyLight 800 using the
manufacturer's DyLight Antibody Labeling Kit (#53062, Thermo Scientific), all primary antibodies were
unconjugated.

After washing the wells three times with TBS, cells were incubated for 1 hour at room temperature with
the appropriate secondary antibodies or normalization stain, with gentle agitation. The secondary
antibodies used were goat anti-mouse IRDye 800CW (1:800), donkey anti-rabbit IRDye 800CW (1:800),
donkey anti-mouse IRDye 680RD (1:800), and CellTag 700 (1:500), all from LI-COR. The background
subtraction well received secondary antibody but no CellTag. Following four additional washes with TBS,
the plate was inverted and gently tapped on absorbent paper to remove excess liquid. The plate was then
imaged using the Odyssey M imager with LI-COR Acquisition software using a plate offset of +1.45 and
100 μm resolution. Signal quantification was carried out using Empiria Studio software (LI-COR).

RNA integrity analysis

FLS were plated in 6-well plates and transfected with either saRNA or subjected to mock transfection.
After 26-30 hours, cells were harvested by scraping in 350 μl RLT buffer (QIAGEN) supplemented with 10
μl/ml β-mercaptoethanol (Sigma). Cell lysates were homogenized using QIAshredder columns (QIAGEN),
and total RNA was extracted using the RNeasy Mini Kit (QIAGEN) according to the manufacturer's
instructions. RNA quantity and quality were initially assessed using a N60 nanophotometer (Implen).
Samples were aliquoted and stored at -80°C until further analysis. For detailed quality assessment,
samples were transported on dry ice and analyzed using the RNA Pico Kit on the 2100 Bioanalyzer
system (Agilent), performed by Cambridge Genomic Services. RNA Integrity Number (RIN) values were
determined for each sample, and the differences in RIN between saRNA-transfected and mock-
transfected conditions were calculated.

Bead-based immunoassay

FLS were stained with BioTracker and seeded onto 6-well plates. After transfection, the saRNA-
lipofectamine complexes were replaced with 2 ml of fresh FLS media. Two days later, supernatants were
collected and stored at -80°C until analysis. On the day of analysis, the supernatant was thawed on ice,
and levels of 13 innate immune-related cytokines (IFN-γ, CXCL1, TNF-α, MCP-1, IL-12p70, CCL5, IL-1β,
CXCL10, GM-CSF, IL-10, IFN-β, IFN-α, and IL-6) were measured using the LEGENDplex Mouse Anti-
Virus Response Panel (740621, BioLegend) following the manufacturer's protocol. Samples were run in
duplicate. A custom 3D-printed PETG vacuum manifold (designed with Fusion 360) was used for vacuum
filtration, and beads were analyzed using a CytoPLEX LX flow cytometer (Beckman Coulter). Data
analysis was performed with the LEGENDplex Qognit Data Analysis Suite (BioLegend). To account for
differences in cell number between wells, cytokine levels were corrected based on the BioTracker signal
before transfection.

ML336 experiments

ML336 (Cayman Chemical) was dissolved in DMSO (Sigma) at a stock concentration of 10 mM, and
aliquots were stored at -20°C. For treatments, ML336 was added to cell cultures at a final concentration
of 1 µM, while vehicle control cultures received 0.01% DMSO.

Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were conducted using GraphPad Prism 9, with specific tests detailed in the
corresponding figure legends. All statistical tests were two-sided tests.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

913 The code for the unmixing analysis is available at https://github.com/lariferg/spectral_unmixing.

914 The 3D printed vacuum manifold compatible with the LEGENDplex assay has been deposited in the NIH
915 3D print exchange (3DPX-021388).

916 All data needed to evaluate the conclusions in the paper are present in the paper, the Supplementary
917 Materials, and the Figshare repository http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.27091972.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Cambridge Advanced Imaging Centre, the flow cytometry facility
from the School of the Biological Sciences, and Cambridge Genomic Services for their support &
assistance in this work. The authors would like to thank Dr. Paul Miller for providing the pDx_mScarlet3
plasmid and Dr. Alex Cloake for providing the pIRES2-EGFP plasmid used in this study. T.K.L.
acknowledges support from a Horizon Europe Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions European Postdoctoral
Fellowship (UKRI Guarantee) [EP/X023117/1]. A.R. and L.W.P. disclose support from AstraZeneca PhD
studentships [G115018 and G113502, respectively]. L.F. discloses support from funding provided by the
MRC Postdoctoral Training Scheme. E.St.J.S. acknowledges funding from the UKRI and Versus Arthritis
[MR/W002426/1] as part of the ADVANTAGE visceral pain consortium through the Advanced Pain
Discovery Platform (APDP) and the Wellcome Trust [225856/Z/22/Z].

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization, T.K.L. and E.St.J.S
Formal analysis: T.K.L., E.St.J.S.
Funding acquisition: E.St.J.S., T.K.L.
Investigation: T.K.L., A.R., L.W.P.
Methodology: T.K.L., T.A.
Resources: E.St.J.S., T.K.L.
Software: L.F.
Supervision: E.St.J.S., T.K.L.
Visualisation: T.K.L., E.St.J.S.
Writing—original draft: T.K.L.
Writing—reviewing & editing: E.St.J.S., L.F.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

945 Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

KEYWORDS

948 Self-amplifying RNA, alphavirus vectors, RNA replicons, fibroblast-like synoviocytes, double-stranded
949 RNA sensors, nuclear factor kappa B, viral innate immune antagonists, RNA vaccines, RNA therapeutics

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

953 During the preparation of this work, the authors used OpenAI's ChatGPT to enhance clarity and flow of
954 the writing. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full
955 responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCES

1. Frolov, I., Hoffman, T.A., Prágai, B.M., Dryga, S.A., Huang, H.V., Schlesinger, S., and Rice, C.M. (1996).
Alphavirus-based expression vectors: strategies and applications. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *93*,
11371–11377.

2. Bloom, K., van den Berg, F., and Arbuthnot, P. (2021). Self-amplifying RNA vaccines for infectious
diseases. Gene Ther *28*, 117–129. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41434-020-00204-y.

3. Pietilä, M.K., Hellström, K., and Ahola, T. (2017). Alphavirus polymerase and RNA replication. Virus
Research *234*, 44–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virusres.2017.01.007.

4. Maruggi, G., Zhang, C., Li, J., Ulmer, J.B., and Yu, D. (2019). mRNA as a Transformative Technology
for Vaccine Development to Control Infectious Diseases. Mol Ther *27*, 757–772.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymthe.2019.01.020.

5. Akhrymuk, I., Frolov, I., and Frolova, E.I. (2016). Both RIG-I and MDA5 detect alphavirus replication
in concentration-dependent mode. Virology *487*, 230–241.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2015.09.023.

6. Gong, Y., Yong, D., Liu, G., Xu, J., Ding, J., and Jia, W. (2024). A Novel Self-Amplifying mRNA with
Decreased Cytotoxicity and Enhanced Protein Expression by Macrodomain Mutations. Advanced
Science *n/a*, 2402936. https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202402936.

7. Gorchakov, R., Frolova, E., Williams, B.R.G., Rice, C.M., and Frolov, I. (2004). PKR-Dependent and -
Independent Mechanisms Are Involved in Translational Shutoff during Sindbis Virus Infection.
Journal of Virology *78*, 8455–8467. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.78.16.8455-8467.2004.

8. Dominguez, F., Palchevska, O., Frolova, E.I., and Frolov, I. (2023). Alphavirus-based replicons
demonstrate different interactions with host cells and can be optimized to increase protein
expression. Journal of Virology *97*, e01225-23. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.01225-23.

9. Vanluchene, H., Gillon, O., Peynshaert, K., De Smedt, S.C., Sanders, N., Raemdonck, K., and Remaut,
K. (2024). Less is more: Self-amplifying mRNA becomes self-killing upon dose escalation in immune-
competent retinal cells. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics *196*, 114204.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpb.2024.114204.

10. Frolov, I., and Schlesinger, S. (1994). Comparison of the effects of Sindbis virus and Sindbis virus
replicons on host cell protein synthesis and cytopathogenicity in BHK cells. J Virol *68*, 1721–1727.
https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.68.3.1721-1727.1994.

11. Terenzi, F., deVeer, M.J., Ying, H., Restifo, N.P., Williams, B.R., and Silverman, R.H. (1999). The
antiviral enzymes PKR and RNase L suppress gene expression from viral and non-viral based vectors.
Nucleic Acids Res *27*, 4369–4375. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/27.22.4369.

12. Li, Y., Su, Z., Zhao, W., Zhang, X., Momin, N., Zhang, C., Wittrup, K.D., Dong, Y., Irvine, D.J., and
Weiss, R. (2020). Multifunctional oncolytic nanoparticles deliver self-replicating IL-12 RNA to
eliminate established tumors and prime systemic immunity. Nat Cancer *1*, 882–893.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s43018-020-0095-6.

13. Venticinque, L., and Meruelo, D. (2010). Sindbis viral vector induced apoptosis requires translational
inhibition and signaling through Mcl-1 and Bak. Mol Cancer *9*, 37. https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-
4598-9-37.

14. Mastrangelo, A.J., Hardwick, J.M., Bex, F., and Betenbaugh, M.J. (2000). Part I. Bcl-2 and Bcl-x(L)
limit apoptosis upon infection with alphavirus vectors. Biotechnol Bioeng *67*, 544–554.

15. Frolov, I., Agapov, E., Thomas A Hoffman, J., Prágai, B.M., Lippa, M., Schlesinger, S., and Rice, C.M.
(1999). Selection of RNA Replicons Capable of Persistent Noncytopathic Replication in Mammalian
Cells. Journal of Virology *73*, 3854. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.73.5.3854-3865.1999.

16. Lundstrom, K., Abenavoli, A., Malgaroli, A., and Ehrengruber, M.U. (2003). Novel semliki forest virus
vectors with reduced cytotoxicity and temperature sensitivity for long-term enhancement of
transgene expression. Molecular Therapy *7*, 202–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1525-
0016(02)00056-4.

17. Pepini, T., Pulichino, A.-M., Carsillo, T., Carlson, A.L., Sari-Sarraf, F., Ramsauer, K., Debasitis, J.C.,
Maruggi, G., Otten, G.R., Geall, A.J., et al. (2017). Induction of an IFN-Mediated Antiviral Response
by a Self-Amplifying RNA Vaccine: Implications for Vaccine Design. The Journal of Immunology *198*,
4012–4024. https://doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.1601877.

18. Blakney, A.K., McKay, P.F., Bouton, C.R., Hu, K., Samnuan, K., and Shattock, R.J. (2021). Innate
Inhibiting Proteins Enhance Expression and Immunogenicity of Self-Amplifying RNA. Mol Ther *29*,
1174–1185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymthe.2020.11.011.

19. Blakney, A.K., Ip, S., and Geall, A.J. (2021). An Update on Self-Amplifying mRNA Vaccine
Development. Vaccines (Basel) *9*, 97. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9020097.

20. Minnaert, A.-K., Vanluchene, H., Verbeke, R., Lentacker, I., De Smedt, S.C., Raemdonck, K., Sanders,
N.N., and Remaut, K. (2021). Strategies for controlling the innate immune activity of conventional
and self-amplifying mRNA therapeutics: Getting the message across. Adv Drug Deliv Rev *176*,
113900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2021.113900.

21. Erasmus, J.H., Archer, J., Fuerte-Stone, J., Khandhar, A.P., Voigt, E., Granger, B., Bombardi, R.G.,
Govero, J., Tan, Q., Durnell, L.A., et al. (2020). Intramuscular Delivery of Replicon RNA Encoding

ZIKV-117 Human Monoclonal Antibody Protects against Zika Virus Infection. Molecular Therapy
Methods & Clinical Development *18*, 402–414. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omtm.2020.06.011.

22. Yoshioka, N., Gros, E., Li, H.-R., Kumar, S., Deacon, D.C., Maron, C., Muotri, A.R., Chi, N.C., Fu, X.-D.,
Yu, B.D., et al. (2013). Efficient Generation of Human iPS Cells by a Synthetic Self-Replicative RNA.
Cell Stem Cell *13*, 10.1016/j.stem.2013.06.001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2013.06.001.

23. Kim, Y.G., Baltabekova, A.Z., Zhiyenbay, E.E., Aksambayeva, A.S., Shagyrova, Z.S., Khannanov, R.,
Ramanculov, E.M., and Shustov, A.V. (2017). Recombinant Vaccinia virus-coded interferon inhibitor
B18R: Expression, refolding and a use in a mammalian expression system with a RNA-vector. PLOS
ONE *12*, e0189308. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189308.

24. McGee, J.E., Kirsch, J.R., Kenney, D., Cerbo, F., Chavez, E.C., Shih, T.-Y., Douam, F., Wong, W.W., and
Grinstaff, M.W. (2024). Complete substitution with modified nucleotides in self-amplifying RNA
suppresses the interferon response and increases potency. Nat Biotechnol, 1–7.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-024-02306-z.

25. Zhong, Z., McCafferty, S., Opsomer, L., Wang, H., Huysmans, H., De Temmerman, J., Lienenklaus, S.,
Portela Catani, J.P., Combes, F., and Sanders, N.N. (2021). Corticosteroids and cellulose purification
improve, respectively, the in vivo translation and vaccination efficacy of sa-mRNAs. Molecular
Therapy *29*, 1370–1381. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymthe.2021.01.023.

26. Beissert, T., Koste, L., Perkovic, M., Walzer, K.C., Erbar, S., Selmi, A., Diken, M., Kreiter, S., Türeci, Ö.,
and Sahin, U. (2017). Improvement of In Vivo Expression of Genes Delivered by Self-Amplifying RNA
Using Vaccinia Virus Immune Evasion Proteins. Hum Gene Ther *28*, 1138–1146.
https://doi.org/10.1089/hum.2017.121.

27. Xue, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhong, Y., Du, S., Hou, X., Li, W., Li, H., Wang, S., Wang, C., Yan, J., et al. (2024).
LNP-RNA-engineered adipose stem cells for accelerated diabetic wound healing. Nat Commun *15*,
739. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-45094-5.

28. Li, Y., Teague, B., Zhang, Y., Su, Z., Porter, E., Dobosh, B., Wagner, T., Irvine, D.J., and Weiss, R.
(2019). In vitro evolution of enhanced RNA replicons for immunotherapy. Sci Rep *9*, 6932.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-43422-0.

29. Merrick, W.C. (2004). Cap-dependent and cap-independent translation in eukaryotic systems. Gene
332, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gene.2004.02.051.

30. Yang, Y., and Wang, Z. (2019). IRES-mediated cap-independent translation, a path leading to hidden
proteome. Journal of Molecular Cell Biology *11*, 911–919. https://doi.org/10.1093/jmcb/mjz091.

31. Maglaviceanu, A., Wu, B., and Kapoor, M. (2021). Fibroblast-like synoviocytes: Role in synovial
fibrosis associated with osteoarthritis. Wound Repair and Regeneration *29*, 642–649.
https://doi.org/10.1111/wrr.12939.

32. Mousavi, M.J., Karami, J., Aslani, S., Tahmasebi, M.N., Vaziri, A.S., Jamshidi, A., Farhadi, E., and
Mahmoudi, M. (2021). Transformation of fibroblast-like synoviocytes in rheumatoid arthritis; from a
friend to foe. Autoimmun Highlights *12*, 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13317-020-00145-x.

33. Honig, M.G., and Hume, R.I. (1986). Fluorescent carbocyanine dyes allow living neurons of identified
origin to be studied in long-term cultures. J Cell Biol *103*, 171–187.
https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.103.1.171.

34. Bertrand, R., Solary, E., O'Connor, P., Kohn, K.W., and Pommier, Y. (1994). Induction of a Common
Pathway of Apoptosis by Staurosporine. Experimental Cell Research *211*, 314–321.
https://doi.org/10.1006/excr.1994.1093.

35. Rehwinkel, J., and Gack, M.U. (2020). RIG-I-like receptors: their regulation and roles in RNA sensing.
Nat Rev Immunol *20*, 537–551. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-020-0288-3.

36. Junior, A.G.D., Sampaio, N.G., and Rehwinkel, J. (2019). A Balancing Act: MDA5 in Antiviral Immunity
and Autoinflammation. Trends in Microbiology *27*, 75–85.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2018.08.007.

37. Gal-Ben-Ari, S., Barrera, I., Ehrlich, M., and Rosenblum, K. (2019). PKR: A Kinase to Remember.
Front. Mol. Neurosci. *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnmol.2018.00480.

38. Silverman, R.H. (2007). Viral Encounters with 2',5'-Oligoadenylate Synthetase and RNase L during
the Interferon Antiviral Response. Journal of Virology *81*, 12720–12729.
https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.01471-07.

39. Szczerba, M., Subramanian, S., Trainor, K., McCaughan, M., Kibler, K.V., and Jacobs, B.L. (2022).
Small Hero with Great Powers: Vaccinia Virus E3 Protein and Evasion of the Type I IFN Response.
Biomedicines *10*, 235. https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines10020235.

40. Kalveram, B., and Ikegami, T. (2013). Toscana Virus NSs Protein Promotes Degradation of Double-
Stranded RNA-Dependent Protein Kinase. J Virol *87*, 3710–3718. https://doi.org/10.1128/JVI.02506-
12.

41. Drappier, M., Jha, B.K., Stone, S., Elliott, R., Zhang, R., Vertommen, D., Weiss, S.R., Silverman, R.H.,
and Michiels, T. (2018). A novel mechanism of RNase L inhibition: Theiler's virus L* protein prevents
2-5A from binding to RNase L. PLoS Pathog *14*, e1006989.
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1006989.

42. Liu, Z., Chen, O., Wall, J.B.J., Zheng, M., Zhou, Y., Wang, L., Ruth Vaseghi, H., Qian, L., and Liu, J.
(2017). Systematic comparison of 2A peptides for cloning multi-genes in a polycistronic vector. Sci
Rep *7*, 2193. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-02460-2.

43. Costigan, A., Hollville, E., and Martin, S.J. (2023). Discriminating Between Apoptosis, Necrosis,
Necroptosis, and Ferroptosis by Microscopy and Flow Cytometry. Current Protocols *3*, e951.
https://doi.org/10.1002/cpz1.951.

44. Liu, Q., Huang, J., Xia, J., Liang, Y., and Li, G. (2022). Tracking tools of extracellular vesicles for
biomedical research. Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol. *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2022.943712.

45. Chiaradia, E., Tancini, B., Emiliani, C., Delo, F., Pellegrino, R.M., Tognoloni, A., Urbanelli, L., and
Buratta, S. (2021). Extracellular Vesicles under Oxidative Stress Conditions: Biological Properties and
Physiological Roles. Cells *10*, 1763. https://doi.org/10.3390/cells10071763.

46. van Genderen, H., Kenis, H., Lux, P., Ungeth, L., Maassen, C., Deckers, N., Narula, J., Hofstra, L., and
Reutelingsperger, C. (2006). In vitro measurement of cell death with the annexin A5 affinity assay.
Nat Protoc *1*, 363–367. https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2006.55.

47. Crowley, L.C., Marfell, B.J., Scott, A.P., and Waterhouse, N.J. (2016). Quantitation of Apoptosis and
Necrosis by Annexin V Binding, Propidium Iodide Uptake, and Flow Cytometry. Cold Spring Harb
Protoc *2016*. https://doi.org/10.1101/pdb.prot087288.

48. Chan, L.L., Wilkinson, A.R., Paradis, B.D., and Lai, N. (2012). Rapid Image-based Cytometry for
Comparison of Fluorescent Viability Staining Methods. J Fluoresc *22*, 1301–1311.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10895-012-1072-y.

49. Baird, T.D., and Wek, R.C. (2012). Eukaryotic Initiation Factor 2 Phosphorylation and Translational
Control in Metabolism. Advances in Nutrition *3*, 307. https://doi.org/10.3945/an.112.002113.

50. Mars, J.-C., Culjkovic-Kraljacic, B., and Borden, K.L.B. (2024). eIF4E orchestrates mRNA processing,
RNA export and translation to modify specific protein production. Nucleus *15*, 2360196.
https://doi.org/10.1080/19491034.2024.2360196.

51. Burke, J.M., Moon, S.L., Matheny, T., and Parker, R. (2019). RNase L Reprograms Translation by
Widespread mRNA Turnover Escaped by Antiviral mRNAs. Molecular Cell *75*, 1203-1217.e5.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2019.07.029.

52. Burke, J.M., Gilchrist, A.R., Sawyer, S.L., and Parker, R. (2021). RNase L limits host and viral protein
synthesis via inhibition of mRNA export. Science Advances *7*, eabh2479.
https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abh2479.

53. Donovan, J., Rath, S., Kolet-Mandrikov, D., and Korennykh, A. (2017). Rapid RNase L-driven arrest of
protein synthesis in the dsRNA response without degradation of translation machinery. RNA *23*,
1660–1671. https://doi.org/10.1261/rna.062000.117.

54. Whelan, J.N., Li, Y., Silverman, R.H., and Weiss, S.R. (2019). Zika Virus Production Is Resistant to
RNase L Antiviral Activity. J Virol *93*, e00313-19. https://doi.org/10.1128/JVI.00313-19.

55. Paul, D., and Bartenschlager, R. (2013). Architecture and biogenesis of plus-strand RNA virus
replication factories. World J Virol *2*, 32–48. https://doi.org/10.5501/wjv.v2.i2.32.

56. Schroeder, A., Mueller, O., Stocker, S., Salowsky, R., Leiber, M., Gassmann, M., Lightfoot, S., Menzel,
W., Granzow, M., and Ragg, T. (2006). The RIN: an RNA integrity number for assigning integrity
values to RNA measurements. BMC Molecular Biology *7*, 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2199-7-3.

57. Santoro, M.G., Rossi, A., and Amici, C. (2003). NF-κB and virus infection: who controls whom. The
EMBO Journal *22*, 2552–2560. https://doi.org/10.1093/emboj/cdg267.

58. Mitchell, J.P., and Carmody, R.J. (2018). Chapter Two - NF-κB and the Transcriptional Control of
Inflammation. In International Review of Cell and Molecular Biology Transcriptional Gene Regulation
in Health and Disease., F. Loos, ed. (Academic Press), pp. 41–84.
https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.ircmb.2017.07.007.

59. Lee, Y.-R., Kweon, S.-H., Kwon, K.-B., Park, J.-W., Yoon, T.-R., and Park, B.-H. (2009). Inhibition of IL-
1β-mediated inflammatory responses by the IκBα super-repressor in human fibroblast-like
synoviocytes. Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications *378*, 90–94.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2008.11.002.

60. Brown, K., Gerstberger, S., Carlson, L., Franzoso, G., and Siebenlist, U. (1995). Control of IκB-α
Proteolysis by Site-Specific, Signal-Induced Phosphorylation. Science *267*, 1485–1488.
https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7878466.

61. Yan, X., Liu, Z., and Chen, Y. (2009). Regulation of TGF-β signaling by Smad7. Acta Biochimica et
Biophysica Sinica *41*, 263–272. https://doi.org/10.1093/abbs/gmp018.

62. Sobah, M.L., Liongue, C., and Ward, A.C. (2021). SOCS Proteins in Immunity, Inflammatory Diseases,
and Immune-Related Cancer. Front Med (Lausanne) *8*, 727987.
https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2021.727987.

63. Dimitriou, I.D., Clemenza, L., Scotter, A.J., Chen, G., Guerra, F.M., and Rottapel, R. (2008). Putting
out the fire: coordinated suppression of the innate and adaptive immune systems by SOCS1 and
SOCS3 proteins. Immunological Reviews *224*, 265–283. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-
065X.2008.00659.x.

64. Blumer, T., Coto-Llerena, M., Duong, F.H.T., and Heim, M.H. (2017). SOCS1 is an inducible negative
regulator of interferon λ (IFN-λ)-induced gene expression in vivo. J Biol Chem *292*, 17928–17938.
https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M117.788877.

65. Bauer, S., Jendro, M.C., Wadle, A., Kleber, S., Stenner, F., Dinser, R., Reich, A., Faccin, E., Gödde, S.,
Dinges, H., et al. (2006). Fibroblast activation protein is expressed by rheumatoid myofibroblast-like
synoviocytes. Arthritis Res Ther *8*, R171. https://doi.org/10.1186/ar2080.

66. Zhang, H.E., Hamson, E.J., Koczorowska, M.M., Tholen, S., Chowdhury, S., Bailey, C.G., Lay, A.J.,
Twigg, S.M., Lee, Q., Roediger, B., et al. (2019). Identification of Novel Natural Substrates of
Fibroblast Activation Protein-alpha by Differential Degradomics and Proteomics. Mol Cell
Proteomics *18*, 65–85. https://doi.org/10.1074/mcp.RA118.001046.

67. Fan, A., Wu, G., Wang, J., Lu, L., Wang, J., Wei, H., Sun, Y., Xu, Y., Mo, C., Zhang, X., et al. (2023).
Inhibition of fibroblast activation protein ameliorates cartilage matrix degradation and osteoarthritis
progression. Bone Res *11*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41413-022-00243-8.

68. Croft, A.P., Campos, J., Jansen, K., Turner, J.D., Marshall, J., Attar, M., Savary, L., Wehmeyer, C.,
Naylor, A.J., Kemble, S., et al. (2019). Distinct fibroblast subsets drive inflammation and damage in
arthritis. Nature *570*, 246–251. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1263-7.

69. Boyd, D.F., Allen, E.K., Randolph, A.G., Guo, X.J., Weng, Y., Sanders, C.J., Bajracharya, R., Lee, N.K.,
Guy, C.S., Vogel, P., et al. (2020). Exuberant fibroblast activity compromises lung function via
ADAMTS-4. Nature *587*, 466–471. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2877-5.

70. Krausgruber, T., Fortelny, N., Fife-Gernedl, V., Senekowitsch, M., Schuster, L.C., Lercher, A., Nemc,
A., Schmidl, C., Rendeiro, A.F., Bergthaler, A., et al. (2020). Structural cells are key regulators of

organ-specific immune response. Nature *583*, 296–302. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2424-
4.

71. Nagata, L.P., Wong, J.P., Hu, W., and Wu, J.Q. (2013). Vaccines and Therapeutics for the Encephalitic
Alphaviruses. Future Virology *8*, 661–674. https://doi.org/10.2217/fvl.13.42.

72. Chung, D., Schroeder, C.E., Sotsky, J., Yao, T., Roy, S., Smith, R.A., Tower, N.A., Noah, J.W., McKellip,
S., Sosa, M., et al. (2010). ML336: Development of Quinazolinone-Based Inhibitors Against
Venezuelan Equine Encephalitis Virus (VEEV). In Probe Reports from the NIH Molecular Libraries
Program (National Center for Biotechnology Information (US)).

73. Frolova, E.I., Palchevska, O., Dominguez, F., and Frolov, I. Alphavirus-induced transcriptional and
translational shutoffs play major roles in blocking the formation of stress granules. J Virol *97*,
e00979-23. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.00979-23.

74. Berglund, P., Finzi, D., Bennink, J.R., and Yewdell, J.W. (2007). Viral Alteration of Cellular
Translational Machinery Increases Defective Ribosomal Products. Journal of Virology *81*, 7220–
7229. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.00137-07.

75. Fros, J.J., and Pijlman, G.P. (2016). Alphavirus Infection: Host Cell Shut-Off and Inhibition of Antiviral
Responses. Viruses *8*, 166. https://doi.org/10.3390/v8060166.

76. Fernandez, J., Yaman, I., Sarnow, P., Snider, M.D., and Hatzoglou, M. (2002). Regulation of Internal
Ribosomal Entry Site-mediated Translation by Phosphorylation of the Translation Initiation Factor
eIF2α*. Journal of Biological Chemistry *277*, 19198–19205.
https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M201052200.

77. Scheper, G.C., and Proud, C.G. (2002). Does phosphorylation of the cap-binding protein eIF4E play a
role in translation initiation? European Journal of Biochemistry *269*, 5350–5359.
https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1432-1033.2002.03291.x.

78. Dyer, J.R., Michel, S., Lee, W., Castellucci, V.F., Wayne, N.L., and Sossin, W.S. (2003). An activity-
dependent switch to cap-independent translation triggered by eIF4E dephosphorylation. Nat
Neurosci *6*, 219–220. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1018.

79. Chang, C., Music, N., Cheung, M., Rossignol, E., Bedi, S., Patel, H., Safari, M., Lee, C., Otten, G.R.,
Settembre, E.C., et al. (2022). Self-amplifying mRNA bicistronic influenza vaccines raise cross-
reactive immune responses in mice and prevent infection in ferrets. Molecular Therapy Methods &
Clinical Development *27*, 195–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omtm.2022.09.013.

80. Koch, A., Aguilera, L., Morisaki, T., Munsky, B., and Stasevich, T.J. (2020). Quantifying the dynamics
of IRES and cap translation with single-molecule resolution in live cells. Nat Struct Mol Biol *27*,
1095–1104. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41594-020-0504-7.

81. Ho, C.K., and Shuman, S. (1996). Physical and Functional Characterization of the Double-Stranded
RNA Binding Protein Encoded by the Vaccinia Virus E3 Gene. Virology *217*, 272–284.
https://doi.org/10.1006/viro.1996.0114.

82. Dueck, K.J., Hu, Y. (Sandy), Chen, P., Deschambault, Y., Lee, J., Varga, J., and Cao, J. (2015).
Mutational Analysis of Vaccinia Virus E3 Protein: the Biological Functions Do Not Correlate with Its
Biochemical Capacity To Bind Double-Stranded RNA. Journal of Virology *89*, 5382–5394.
https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.03288-14.

83. Leitner, W.W., Hwang, L.N., Bergmann-Leitner, E.S., Finkelstein, S.E., Frank, S., and Restifo, N.P.
(2004). Apoptosis is essential for the increased efficacy of alphaviral replicase-based DNA vaccines.
Vaccine *22*, 1537–1544. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2003.10.013.

84. Wu, Y.-Y., Sun, T.-K., Chen, M.-S., Munir, M., and Liu, H.-J. (2023). Oncolytic viruses-modulated
immunogenic cell death, apoptosis and autophagy linking to virotherapy and cancer immune
response. Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2023.1142172.

85. Li, Y., Banerjee, S., Wang, Y., Goldstein, S.A., Dong, B., Gaughan, C., Silverman, R.H., and Weiss, S.R.
(2016). Activation of RNase L is dependent on OAS3 expression during infection with diverse human
viruses. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *113*, 2241–2246. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1519657113.

86. Zuo, W., Wakimoto, M., Kozaiwa, N., Shirasaka, Y., Oh, S.-W., Fujiwara, S., Miyachi, H., Kogure, A.,
Kato, H., and Fujita, T. (2022). PKR and TLR3 trigger distinct signals that coordinate the induction of
antiviral apoptosis. Cell Death Dis *13*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41419-022-05101-3.

87. Xu, C., Gamil, A.A.A., Munang'andu, H.M., and Evensen, Ø. (2018). Apoptosis Induction by dsRNA-
Dependent Protein Kinase R (PKR) in EPC Cells via Caspase 8 and 9 Pathways. Viruses *10*, 526.
https://doi.org/10.3390/v10100526.

88. Gil, J., and Esteban, M. (2000). The interferon-induced protein kinase (PKR), triggers apoptosis
through FADD-mediated activation of caspase 8 in a manner independent of Fas and TNF-α
receptors. Oncogene *19*, 3665–3674. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.onc.1203710.

89. Zhang, P., and Samuel, C.E. (2007). Protein Kinase PKR Plays a Stimulus- and Virus-Dependent Role
in Apoptotic Death and Virus Multiplication in Human Cells. Journal of Virology *81*, 8192–8200.
https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.00426-07.

90. Roretz, C. von, and Gallouzi, I.-E. (2010). Protein Kinase RNA/FADD/Caspase-8 Pathway Mediates
the Proapoptotic Activity of the RNA-binding Protein Human Antigen R (HuR). The Journal of
Biological Chemistry *285*, 16806. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M109.087320.

91. Xi, J., Snieckute, G., Martínez, J.F., Arendrup, F.S.W., Asthana, A., Gaughan, C., Lund, A.H., Bekker-
Jensen, S., and Silverman, R.H. (2024). Initiation of a ZAKα-dependent ribotoxic stress response by
the innate immunity endoribonuclease RNase L. Cell Reports *43*.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2024.113998.

92. Guydosh, N.R., Kimmig, P., Walter, P., and Green, R. (2017). Regulated Ire1-dependent mRNA decay
requires no-go mRNA degradation to maintain endoplasmic reticulum homeostasis in S. pombe.
eLife *6*, e29216. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.29216.

93. Snieckute, G., Genzor, A.V., Vind, A.C., Ryder, L., Stoneley, M., Chamois, S., Dreos, R., Nordgaard, C.,
Sass, F., Blasius, M., et al. (2022). Ribosome stalling is a signal for metabolic regulation by the

ribotoxic stress response. Cell Metab *34*, 2036-2046.e8.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmet.2022.10.011.

94. Li, G., Xiang, Y., Sabapathy, K., and Silverman, R.H. (2004). An Apoptotic Signaling Pathway in the
Interferon Antiviral Response Mediated by RNase L and c-Jun NH2-terminal Kinase *. Journal of
Biological Chemistry *279*, 1123–1131. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M305893200.

95. Samuel, C.E., Kuhen, K.L., George, C.X., Ortega, L.G., Rende-Fournier, R., and Tanaka, H. (1997). The
PKR protein kinase--an interferon-inducible regulator of cell growth and differentiation. Int J
Hematol *65*, 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0925-5710(96)00544-0.

96. Iordanov, M.S., Wong, J., Bell, J.C., and Magun, B.E. (2001). Activation of NF-κB by Double-Stranded
RNA (dsRNA) in the Absence of Protein Kinase R and RNase L Demonstrates the Existence of Two
Separate dsRNA-Triggered Antiviral Programs. Molecular and Cellular Biology *21*, 61–72.
https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.21.1.61-72.2001.

97. Herdy, B., Jaramillo, M., Svitkin, Y.V., Rosenfeld, A.B., Kobayashi, M., Walsh, D., Alain, T., Sean, P.,
Robichaud, N., Topisirovic, I., et al. (2012). Translational control of the activation of transcription
factor NF-κB and production of type I interferon by phosphorylation of the translation factor eIF4E.
Nat Immunol *13*, 543–550. https://doi.org/10.1038/ni.2291.

98. Liu, T., Zhang, L., Joo, D., and Sun, S.-C. (2017). NF-κB signaling in inflammation. Sig Transduct Target
Ther *2*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/sigtrans.2017.23.

99. Luo, J.-L., Kamata, H., and Karin, M. (2005). IKK/NF-κB signaling: balancing life and death – a new
approach to cancer therapy. Journal of Clinical Investigation *115*, 2625–2632.
https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI26322.

100.   Miagkov, A.V., Kovalenko, D.V., Brown, C.E., Didsbury, J.R., Cogswell, J.P., Stimpson, S.A.,
Baldwin, A.S., and Makarov, S.S. (1998). NF-κB activation provides the potential link between
inflammation and hyperplasia in the arthritic joint. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences
95, 13859–13864. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.95.23.13859.

101.   Zhang, H.G., Huang, N., Liu, D., Bilbao, L., Zhang, X., Yang, P., Zhou, T., Curiel, D.T., and Mountz,
J.D. (2000). Gene therapy that inhibits nuclear translocation of nuclear factor kappaB results in
tumor necrosis factor alpha-induced apoptosis of human synovial fibroblasts. Arthritis Rheum *43*,
1094–1105. https://doi.org/10.1002/1529-0131(200005)43:5<1094::AID-ANR20>3.0.CO;2-V.

102.   Xu, Y., Bialik, S., Jones, B.E., Iimuro, Y., Kitsis, R.N., Srinivasan, A., Brenner, D.A., and Czaja, M.J.
(1998). NF-kappaB inactivation converts a hepatocyte cell line TNF-alpha response from
proliferation to apoptosis. Am J Physiol *275*, C1058-1066.
https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpcell.1998.275.4.C1058.

103.   Sago, C.D., Krupczak, B.R., Lokugamage, M.P., Gan, Z., and Dahlman, J.E. (2019). Cell Subtypes
Within the Liver Microenvironment Differentially Interact with Lipid Nanoparticles. Cellular and
Molecular Bioengineering *12*, 389. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12195-019-00573-4.

104.   Yamamura, Y., Hua, X., Bergelson, S., and Lodish, H.F. (2000). Critical Role of Smads and AP-1
1278   Complex in Transforming Growth Factor-β-dependent Apoptosis. Journal of Biological Chemistry
1279   *275*, 36295–36302. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M006023200.

1280   105.   Patil, S., Wildey, G.M., Brown, T.L., Choy, L., Derynck, R., and Howe, P.H. (2000). Smad7 is
1281   induced by CD40 and protects WEHI 231 B-lymphocytes from transforming growth factor-beta -
1282   induced growth inhibition and apoptosis. J Biol Chem *275*, 38363–38370.
1283   https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M004861200.

1284   106.   Zitzmann, K., Brand, S., De Toni, E.N., Baehs, S., Göke, B., Meinecke, J., Spöttl, G., Meyer,
1285   H.H.H.D., and Auernhammer, C.J. (2007). SOCS1 Silencing Enhances Antitumor Activity of Type I IFNs
1286   by Regulating Apoptosis in Neuroendocrine Tumor Cells. Cancer Research *67*, 5025–5032.
1287   https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-06-2575.

1288   107.   Mann-Chandler, M.N., Kashyap, M., Wright, H.V., Norozian, F., Barnstein, B.O., Gingras, S.,
1289   Parganas, E., and Ryan, J.J. (2005). IFN-γ Induces Apoptosis in Developing Mast Cells1. The Journal of
1290   Immunology *175*, 3000–3005. https://doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.175.5.3000.

1291   108.   Kimura, A., Naka, T., Nagata, S., Kawase, I., and Kishimoto, T. (2004). SOCS-1 suppresses TNF-
1292   alpha-induced apoptosis through the regulation of Jak activation. Int Immunol *16*, 991–999.
1293   https://doi.org/10.1093/intimm/dxh102.

1294   109.   Madonna, S., Scarponi, C., Pallotta, S., Cavani, A., and Albanesi, C. (2012). Anti-apoptotic effects
1295   of suppressor of cytokine signaling 3 and 1 in psoriasis. Cell Death Dis *3*, e334–e334.
1296   https://doi.org/10.1038/cddis.2012.69.

1297   110.   Yan, L., Tang, Q., Shen, D., Peng, S., Zheng, Q., Guo, H., Jiang, M., and Deng, W. (2008). SOCS-1
1298   Inhibits TNF-α-Induced Cardiomyocyte Apoptosis via ERK1/2 Pathway Activation. Inflammation *31*,
1299   180–188. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10753-008-9063-5.

1300   111.   Goker Bagca, B., and Biray Avci, C. (2020). The potential of JAK/STAT pathway inhibition by
1301   ruxolitinib in the treatment of COVID-19. Cytokine & Growth Factor Reviews *54*, 51–61.
1302   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cytogfr.2020.06.013.

1303   112.   Liau, N.P.D., Laktyushin, A., Lucet, I.S., Murphy, J.M., Yao, S., Whitlock, E., Callaghan, K., Nicola,
1304   N.A., Kershaw, N.J., and Babon, J.J. (2018). The molecular basis of JAK/STAT inhibition by SOCS1. Nat
1305   Commun *9*, 1558. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04013-1.

1306   113.   Skidmore, A.M., Adcock, R.S., Jonsson, C.B., Golden, J.E., and Chung, D.-H. (2020). Benzamidine
1307   ML336 inhibits plus and minus strand RNA synthesis of Venezuelan equine encephalitis virus
1308   without affecting host RNA production. Antiviral Research *174*, 104674.
1309   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.antiviral.2019.104674.

1310   114.   Schroeder, C.E., Yao, T., Sotsky, J., Smith, R.A., Roy, S., Chu, Y.-K., Guo, H., Tower, N.A., Noah,
1311   J.W., McKellip, S., et al. (2014). Development of (E)-2-((1,4-Dimethylpiperazin-2-ylidene)amino)-5-
1312   nitro-N-phenylbenzamide, ML336: Novel 2-Amidinophenylbenzamides as Potent Inhibitors of
1313   Venezuelan Equine Encephalitis Virus. J. Med. Chem. *57*, 8608–8621.
1314   https://doi.org/10.1021/jm501203v.

115.   Tregoning, J.S., Stirling, D.C., Wang, Z., Flight, K.E., Brown, J.C., Blakney, A.K., McKay, P.F.,
Cunliffe, R.F., Murugaiah, V., Fox, C.B., et al. (2023). Formulation, inflammation, and RNA sensing
impact the immunogenicity of self-amplifying RNA vaccines. Molecular Therapy Nucleic Acids *31*,
29–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omtn.2022.11.024.

116.   Bathula, N.V., Friesen, J.J., Casmil, I.C., Wayne, C.J., Liao, S., Soriano, S.K.V., Ho, C.H., Strumpel,
A., and Blakney, A.K. (2024). Delivery vehicle and route of administration influences self-amplifying
RNA biodistribution, expression kinetics, and reactogenicity. Journal of Controlled Release *374*, 28–
38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2024.07.078.

117.   Oda, Y., Kumagai, Y., Kanai, M., Iwama, Y., Okura, I., Minamida, T., Yagi, Y., Kurosawa, T.,
Greener, B., Zhang, Y., et al. (2024). Immunogenicity and safety of a booster dose of a self-
amplifying RNA COVID-19 vaccine (ARCT-154) versus BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine: a double-
blind, multicentre, randomised, controlled, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. The Lancet Infectious
Diseases *24*, 351–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00650-3.

118.   Saraf, A., Gurjar, R., Kaviraj, S., Kulkarni, A., Kumar, D., Kulkarni, R., Virkar, R., Krishnan, J., Yadav,
A., Baranwal, E., et al. (2024). An Omicron-specific, self-amplifying mRNA booster vaccine for COVID-
19: a phase 2/3 randomized trial. Nat Med *30*, 1363–1372. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-024-
02955-2.

119.   Roman-Blas, J.A., and Jimenez, S.A. (2006). NF-κB as a potential therapeutic target in
osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis. Osteoarthritis and Cartilage *14*, 839–848.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2006.04.008.

120.   Shen, J., Li, S., and Chen, D. (2014). TGF-β signaling and the development of osteoarthritis. Bone
Res *2*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1038/boneres.2014.2.

121.   Zhou, Q., Ren, Q., Jiao, L., Huang, J., Yi, J., Chen, J., Lai, J., Ji, G., and Zheng, T. (2022). The
potential roles of JAK/STAT signaling in the progression of osteoarthritis. Front. Endocrinol. *13*.
https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2022.1069057.

122.   Blackwell, N.M., Sembi, P., Newson, J.S., Lawrence, T., Gilroy, D.W., and Kabouridis, P.S. (2004).
Reduced infiltration and increased apoptosis of leukocytes at sites of inflammation by systemic
administration of a membrane-permeable IκBα repressor. Arthritis & Rheumatism *50*, 2675–2684.
https://doi.org/10.1002/art.20467.

123.   Chen, S.-Y., Shiau, A.-L., Wu, C.-L., and Wang, C.-R. (2016). Intraarticular overexpression of
Smad7 ameliorates experimental arthritis. Sci Rep *6*, 35163. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep35163.

124.   Ha, Y.-J., Choi, Y.S., Kang, E.H., Shin, K., Kim, T.K., Song, Y.W., and Lee, Y.J. (2016). SOCS1
suppresses IL-1β-induced C/EBPβ expression via transcriptional regulation in human chondrocytes.
Exp Mol Med *48*, e241–e241. https://doi.org/10.1038/emm.2016.47.

125.   Freppel, W., Lim, E.X.Y., Rudd, P.A., and Herrero, L.J. (2024). Synoviocytes assist in modulating
the effect of Ross River virus infection in micromass-cultured primary human chondrocytes. J Med
Microbiol *73*, 001859. https://doi.org/10.1099/jmm.0.001859.

126.   Legros, V., Belarbi, E., Jeannin, P., Kümmerer, B., Hardy, D., Desprès, P., Gessain, A., Roques, P.,
1353   Ceccaldi, P.-E., and Choumet, V. (2024). A recombinant CHIKV-NLuc virus identifies chondrocytes as
1354   target of Chikungunya virus in a immunocompetent mouse model. Preprint at bioRxiv,
1355   https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.594924 https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.594924.

1356   127.   Wäldele, S., Koers-Wunrau, C., Beckmann, D., Korb-Pap, A., Wehmeyer, C., Pap, T., and Dankbar,
1357   B. (2015). Deficiency of fibroblast activation protein alpha ameliorates cartilage destruction in
1358   inflammatory destructive arthritis. Arthritis Res Ther *17*, 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13075-015-
1359   0524-6.

1360   128.   Petrakova, O., Volkova, E., Gorchakov, R., Paessler, S., Kinney, R.M., and Frolov, I. (2005).
1361   Noncytopathic Replication of Venezuelan Equine Encephalitis Virus and Eastern Equine Encephalitis
1362   Virus Replicons in Mammalian Cells. J Virol *79*, 7597–7608. https://doi.org/10.1128/JVI.79.12.7597-
1363   7608.2005.

1364   129.   Hariri, F., Arguello, M., Volpon, L., Culjkovic-Kraljacic, B., Nielsen, T.H., Hiscott, J., Mann, K.K.,
1365   and Borden, K.L.B. (2013). The eukaryotic translation initiation factor eIF4E is a direct transcriptional
1366   target of NF-κB and is aberrantly regulated in acute myeloid leukemia. Leukemia *27*, 2047–2055.
1367   https://doi.org/10.1038/leu.2013.73.

1368   130.   Uttam, S., Wong, C., Price, T.J., and Khoutorsky, A. (2018). eIF4E-Dependent Translational
1369   Control: A Central Mechanism for Regulation of Pain Plasticity. Front Genet *9*, 470.
1370   https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2018.00470.

1371   131.   Siddiqui, N., and Sonenberg, N. (2015). Signalling to eIF4E in cancer. Biochemical Society
1372   Transactions *43*, 763–772. https://doi.org/10.1042/BST20150126.

1373   132.   Gkogkas, C.G., Khoutorsky, A., Ran, I., Rampakakis, E., Nevarko, T., Weatherill, D.B., Vasuta, C.,
1374   Yee, S., Truitt, M., Dallaire, P., et al. (2013). Autism-related deficits via dysregulated eIF4E-
1375   dependent translational control. Nature *493*, 371–377. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11628.

1376   133.   Syntichaki, P., Troulinaki, K., and Tavernarakis, N. (2007). eIF4E function in somatic cells
1377   modulates ageing in Caenorhabditis elegans. Nature *445*, 922–926.
1378   https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05603.

1379   134.   Costa-Mattioli, M., and Walter, P. (2020). The integrated stress response: From mechanism to
1380   disease. Science *368*, eaat5314. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat5314.

1381   135.   Gadella, T.W.J., van Weeren, L., Stouthamer, J., Hink, M.A., Wolters, A.H.G., Giepmans, B.N.G.,
1382   Aumonier, S., Dupuy, J., and Royant, A. (2023). mScarlet3: a brilliant and fast-maturing red
1383   fluorescent protein. Nat Methods *20*, 541–545. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-023-01809-y.

1384   136.   Costantini, L.M., Baloban, M., Markwardt, M.L., Rizzo, M.A., Guo, F., Verkhusha, V.V., and Snapp,
1385   E.L. (2015). A palette of fluorescent proteins optimized for diverse cellular environments. Nat
1386   Commun *6*, 7670. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8670.

1387   137.   Chakrabarti, S., Hore, Z., Pattison, L.A., Lalnunhlimi, S., Bhebhe, C.N., Callejo, G., Bulmer, D.C.,
1388   Taams, L.S., Denk, F., and Smith, E.S.J. (2020). Sensitization of knee-innervating sensory neurons by

1389   tumor necrosis factor-α-activated fibroblast-like synoviocytes: an in vitro, coculture model of
1390   inflammatory pain. Pain *161*, 2129–2141. https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001890.

1391   138.   Li, C.H., and Lee, C.K. (1993). Minimum cross entropy thresholding. Pattern Recognition *26*, 617–
1392   625. https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-3203(93)90115-D.

1393

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Document S1. Figures S1–S5

Fig. S1. Cadherin-11, a marker of fibroblast-like synoviocytes (FLS), stains cells isolated from mouse knee explants
Representative microscopy images of FLS isolated from mouse knee explants, stained with cadherin-11 (CDH11), an FLS marker. From left to right, columns show nuclear staining (Hoechst 33342, cyan), lipophilic membrane dye labeling (Biotracker NIR680, magenta), and Alexa 488 anti-rabbit secondary immunostaining (yellow), followed by a merged image. The top row shows cells treated with rabbit anti-CDH11 primary antibody, confirming CDH11 expression in isolated cells. The bottom row presents a no primary antibody control, showing no signal in the 488 channel. Scale bar = 200 μm.

1407
Fig. S2. Linear unmixing corrects spectral overlap of EGFP and mScarlet3 fluorescent signals
imaged using the Odyssey M laser scanner
Schematic of the saRNA constructs used for linear unmixing, each expressing a different fluorescent
protein: moxBFP, EGFP, and mScarlet3. These constructs were transfected into tSA201 cells.
b, Representative imaging results showing fluorescence in the 488 and 520 channels, 1 day after
transfection. moxBFP-transfected cells were not detected in either channel. EGFP was primarily detected
in the 488 channel, with 11.32% bleedthrough into the 520 channel. mScarlet3 was primary detected in
the 520 channel, with 0.94% bleedthrough into the 488 channel. Background signal was determined from
mock transfected cells.
c, Corrected images using linear unmixing to negate spectral bleedthrough from mScarlet3 and EGFP
signals. Scale bars = 5 mm.

1419
Fig. S3. BioTracker fluorescence indicates cell number following staurosporine-induced
apoptosis, despite an increase after mock transfection
Validation of BioTracker fluorescence as a marker for cell number in the presence of apoptotic stimuli.
a, Representative images of FLS stained with BioTracker under three conditions: no transfection control,
mock transfection, and mock transfection with 1 μM staurosporine. BioTracker fluorescence intensity
increases after mock transfection but decreases following staurosporine treatment, indicating cell loss.
Scale bar = 5 mm.
b, Quantification of BioTracker fluorescence over time for the three conditions (n = 3). Statistical
significance was determined by two-way RM ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparisons test comparing
groups to the no treatment control.
c, Representative images of the same FLS stained with Calcein AM. Unlike BioTracker, Calcein AM
fluorescence does not increase after mock transfection but decreases after staurosporine treatment,
reflecting apoptotic cell death. Scale bar = 5 mm.
d, Quantification of BioTracker fluorescence over time for the three conditions (n = 3). Fluorescence
decreases following staurosporine treatment, consistent with findings in (a, b). Statistical significance was
determined by two-way RM ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparisons test comparing groups to the no
treatment control.
For all statistical reporting, **P < 0.01 and ***P < 0.001. Data are presented as mean ± SEM.

1438

Fig. S4. Inhibition of dsRNA-sensing pathways and inflammatory signaling reduces saRNA-induced anti-viral cytokine secretion

Cytokines were collected from FLS 2 days post-transfection, quantified by bead-based immunoassay, and normalized by cell number using the BioTracker signal on day 0 (n = 6). Statistical significance for each cytokine was assessed using one-way RM ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's multiple comparisons test against the mock transfection control. A Bonferroni correction was applied to P values to account for multiple independent hypothesis testing. *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001 and ****P < 0.0001. Data are presented as mean ± SEM.

a-m, Native saRNA induces anti-viral cytokine secretion. E3 reduces TNF-α (c), IFN-α (i), and IFN-β (j), secretion. E3-NSs-L* reduces CXCL10 secretion (f). srIκBα appears to reduce secretion of all cytokines tested. srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 does not reduce cytokine secretion more than srIκBα.

n, The BioTracker signal from day 0, used for normalizing differences in starting cell number, is shown.

Acronyms: IFN-γ, interferon-γ; CXCL1, C-X-C motif chemokine ligand 1; TNF-α, tumor necrosis factor-α; MCP-1, monocyte chemoattractant protein-1; IL-12p70, interleukin-12; CCL5, chemokine ligand 5; IL-1β, interleukin-1β; CXCL10, C-X-C motif chemokine ligand 10; GM-CSF, granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor; IL-10, interleukin-10; IFN-β, interferon-β; IFN-α, interferon-α; IL-6, interleukin-6.

1455
Fig. S5. srIκBα reduces cell number and viability, while srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 preserves both
a, AUC analysis of BioTracker fluorescence data shown in Fig. 5c, summarizing cumulative effects over
the time course (n = 11). srIκBα induces reductions in integrated BioTracker signal, which is prevented by
srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1. Statistical analysis was performed using one-way RM ANOVA with Greenhouse–
Geisser correction and Tukey's multiple comparisons test to compare all groups. Mock transfection data
is also presented in Fig. 1g.
b, Quantification of mock transfection normalized CellTag signal (n = 20). The srIκBα construct reduces
cell number, whereas this reduction is prevented by the srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 construct. Data were
normalized to mock transfection. Statistical significance was determined by one-way RM ANOVA with
Greenhouse–Geisser correction, and Tukey's multiple comparisons test. Data in this panel were pooled
from in-cell western assays performed on day 2 post-transfection, incorporating data presented in Figs. 3
and 6 as well as additional data not shown elsewhere. ***P < 0.001.
c, Calcein AM staining performed 3 days post-transfection (n = 4). The srIκBα-Smad7-SOCS1 construct
protects against reductions in cell viability induced by srIκBα. Data were normalized to the moxBFP
construct. Statistical significance was determined by a paired t test. *P<0.05.
Data are presented as mean ± SEM. saRNA constructs used are shown in Fig. 4a.

a

Annexin V

Day 1 Day 2 Day 3 Day 4 Day 5 Day 6

Mock Transfection

0.5 µM staurosporine

Native saRNA

E3

E3-NSs-L*

Intensity

b

Calcein AM

Day 7

Mock Transfection

0.5 µM staurosporine

Native saRNA

E3

E3-NSs-L*

b

Annexin V (normalized area)

Days post-treatment

- Mock Transfection
- 0.5 µM Staurosporine
- Native saRNA
- E3
- E3-NSs-L*

d

Calcein AM Fluorescence (AU) (normalized to day 0 BioTracker)

Mock Transfection   0.5 µM Staurosporine   Native saRNA   E3   E3-NSs-L*

a

	Day 1	Day 3	Day 5	Day 7	Day 9	Day 11	Day 13
Mock Transfection							
Vehicle control							
1 µM ML336							

b

Calcein AM
Day 13

Mock Transfection

Vehicle control

1 µM ML336

c

- Mock Transfection
- Vehicle
- 1 µM ML336

EGFP Fluorescence (AU)
(normalized to day 0 BioTracker)

Days post transfection

d

- Mock Transfection
- Vehicle
- 1 µM ML336

mScarlet3 Fluorescence (AU)
(normalized to day 0 BioTracker)

Days post transfection

e

Calcein AM Fluorescence (AU)
(normalized to day 0 BioTracker)

** ***

Mock Transfection   Vehicle   1 µM ML336

| Hoechst 33342 | BioTracker NIR680 | Anti-rabbit secondary | Merge |

+ CDH11 antibody

No primary control

200 μm

a

b Before linear unmixing:

c After linear unmixing:

Intensity