Title: Replication stress increases de novo CNVs across the malaria parasite genome

Short title: Stress-induced de novo CNVs

Authors: Noah Brown[1], Aleksander Luniewski[1], Xuanxuan Yu[2,3], Michelle Warthan[1], Shiwei Liu[1,4], Julia

Zulawinska[1], Syed Ahmad[1], Nadia Prasad[1], Molly Congdon[5], Webster Santos[5], Feifei Xiao[2], Jennifer L

Guler[1*]

Affiliations:

[1]University of Virginia, Department of Biology, Charlottesville, VA, USA

[2]University of Florida, Department of Biostatistics, College of Public Health and Health Professions,

Gainesville, FL, USA

[3]University of Florida, Department of Surgery, College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA

[4]Current affiliation: Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN, USA

[5]Virginia Tech, Department of Chemistry, Blacksburg, VA, USA

*Corresponding Author

Email: jlg5fw@virginia.edu

ABSTRACT

Changes in the copy number of large genomic regions, termed copy number variations (CNVs), contribute

to important phenotypes. CNVs are readily identified using conventional approaches when present in a

large fraction of the cell population. However, CNVs in only a few genomes are often overlooked but

important; if beneficial, a de novo CNV that arises in a single genome can expand during selection to create

a population of cells with novel characteristics. While single cell methods for studying de novo CNVs are

increasing, we continue to lack information about CNV dynamics in rapidly evolving microbial populations.

Here, we investigated de novo CNVs in the genome of the *Plasmodium* parasite that causes human

malaria. The highly AT-rich *P. falciparum* genome readily accumulates CNVs that facilitate rapid

adaptation. We employed low-input genomics and specialized computational tools to evaluate the impact

of sub-lethal stress on the de novo CNV rate. We observed a significant increase in genome-wide de novo

CNVs following treatment with an antimalarial compound that inhibits replication. De novo CNVs

encompassed genes from various cellular pathways participating in human infection. This snapshot of CNV

dynamics emphasizes the connection between replication stress, DNA repair, and CNV generation in this

important microbial pathogen.

INTRODUCTION

Changes in the copy number of large genomic regions, termed copy number variations (CNVs), are a

source of phenotypic diversity for many organisms (as reviewed in (1-3)), including rapidly evolving

microbes such as bacteria, yeast, and viruses (4-6). CNVs also contribute to many diseases from cancer to

blood, metabolic, neurological, and infectious diseases (7-19). Increased access to genome sequencing

has facilitated the identification of these important genomic rearrangements, especially following

selection. CNVs that are identified using standard "bulk" analysis approaches (e.g. read coverage

methods) are present in a large fraction of the cell population (>50% (2)). However, those in a minority of

genomes, or even a few genomes, are "averaged" away during analysis steps. This artifact limits our ability

to assess how CNVs arise and contribute to the genomic diversity of individual cells within a population.

In order to observe a genome's evolutionary potential in the absence of selection, we require approaches

specifically designed to detect CNVs that are not present in a predecessor "parental" genome. Due to their

rare and novel nature, these events are termed "de novo" CNVs (3,20-24). Early experimental progress

detecting de novo CNVs involved cloning individual cells, which takes time, is prone to contamination, and

prevents detection of detrimental CNVs (20-22). Misalignment of short-reads to reference genomes (i.e.

discordant or split reads) can also indicate the presence of de novo CNVs, but false positives are common

if matched normal samples are not available (reviewed in (25)). Recent single cell-based methods have

successfully assessed de novo CNVs during experimental evolution, disease progression, and tissue

development (as reviewed in (25-29)). While the reach of single cell analysis is expanding, we continue to

lack information about de novo CNVs in microbes and their dynamics in evolving pathogen populations.

The *Plasmodium* parasite that causes malaria readily accumulates kb-sized CNVs in its genome (30-33).

This protozoan propagates within the mosquito vector and then the human host, where it infects the liver

and cyclically invades red blood cells (erythrocytic cycle, **Fig. 1A**). CNVs impact parasite survival, allowing

evasion of clinical detection (34), expansion of beneficial gene families (35), invasion of new host cells

(36), and development of antimalarial resistance (37-39). We are specifically interested in the genetic

diversity of one species of malaria, *P. falciparum*, since this may explain its rapid adaptation to new drugs

and host environments (40). Due to its relatively small, AT-rich genome (23 Mb, 19.4% GC (41)), low-input

genomics is challenging in this single cell protozoan. However, we previously optimized a single cell

genomics approach for erythrocytic stage *P. falciparum* parasites and recently developed novel

computational tools to evaluate de novo CNVs in challenging genomes (42-44).

Here, we combined these advancements and made additional improvements to directly investigate de

novo CNV formation in the *P. falciparum* genome. Since various types of cellular stress can induce genetic

change (reviewed in (2,45-47)), we also evaluated the impacts of sub-lethal stress on de novo CNV

development. Using a low-input genomics pipeline, we observed that replication stress increased the

number of de novo CNVs across the parasite genome. This finding provides key evidence for adaptive

amplification in an important pathogen that has evolved strategies to encourage CNV formation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Parasite Lines, Compounds, and Treatments

We acquired *Dd2* (MRA-156) and *FCR3* (MRA-731) parasite lines from Bei Resources (ATCC, Manassas,

VA). In this study, we were interested in detecting sub-clonal levels of genomic diversity that occur

naturally in cell culture (i.e. untreated conditions); therefore, we did not re-clone parasite lines prior to

treatment. For low-input genomics, we grew parasites in complete RPMI 1640 with HEPES (Thermo Fisher

Scientific, Waltham, MA) supplemented 0.5% Albumax II Lipid-Rich BSA (MilliporeSigma, Burlington, MA)

and 50 mg/L hypoxanthine (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and donor A+ human erythrocytes (BioIVT,

Hicksville, NY). We grew all cultures at 3% hematocrit at 37°C and individually flushed flasks with 5%

oxygen, 5% carbon dioxide, and 90% nitrogen gas. We diluted cultures with uninfected erythrocytes and

changed the culture medium every other day to keep parasitemia below 2% during maintenance. We

confirmed that all cultures were negative for mycoplasma contamination approximately monthly using a

LookOut Mycoplasma PCR detection kit (MilliporeSigma). We synthesized DSM1 as in previous studies

(48,49) and purchased aphidicolin (MilliporeSigma).

Pilot assessments of DSM1 treatment

We conducted multiple independent pilot assessments comparing DSM1 treatment with a replication

inhibitor, aphidicolin (see general scheme in **Fig. S1A**). We first acquired high ring-stage cultures (>60%)

by synchronizing mixed cultures of parasites twice with 5% sorbitol, ~48hrs apart. For these pilot

assessments, we used sorbitol synchronization to increase the level of ring stage in the cultures. We chose

this approach instead of magnetic purification or Percoll gradients in order to limit the time parasites were

outside of culture conditions. We then applied 1μM DSM1, solvent control (dimethylsulfoxide, DMSO), or

4.4μM aphidicolin to ring-dominant parasite populations for 12hrs. Following treatment, we washed

parasites with sterile 1x phosphate-buffered saline (PBS, Thermo Fisher Scientific), returned them to

complete RPMI, and allowed parasites to recover for >36hrs, depending on the experiment (detailed in

Fig. S1B-E). We tracked parasitemia and parasite viability on an Accuri C6 flow cytometer (BD Biosciences,

Franklin Lakes, NJ) as previously performed (42,48,50). At various time points (start at 0h, post-treatment

at 12h, or during recovery, **Fig. S1**), we stained parasites with 1x SYBR Green (Thermo Fisher Scientific,

stains the parasite nucleus) to assess the proportion of infected erythrocytes (parasitemia) and stage of

the parasite development cycle; we also stained parasites with 10nM MitoProbe DiIC1 (5) (Thermo Fisher

Scientific, stains active parasite mitochondria) to indicate the proportion of the parasites that were viable

after recovery. All pilot experiments were assessed from multiple flasks (>2, **Fig. S1**).

DSM1 treatment for low input genomics

For parasite treatment for low-input genomics, we synchronized parasites (as above), applied 1μM DSM1

or the DMSO control for 12hrs in duplicate flasks, and allowed recovery for 28-31hrs (**Fig. S2A**). We

staggered sample sorting in order to limit the impact on parasite health by removal from culture

conditions and allowed parasites to reinvade to produce rings. We removed treatments and tracked

parasite number and health as described above (**Fig. S2B-G**). Following reinvasion, we harvested viable 1n

ring stage parasites for low-input genomics using flow sorting (details below)*.

Parasite Flow Sorting for Low-input Genomics

Cell sorter calibration & accuracy assessments. We calibrated the flow sorter (SH800, Sony Biotechnology,

San Jose, CA) using the manufacturer's calibration beads. We accounted for overlaps in the

excitation/emission wavelengths using the integrated compensation panel matrix calculation in the SH800

software according to the manufacturer's procedure. We also manually calibrated the droplet sorting to

the nearest 0.2mm, as recommended by the manufacturer, using the 96-well plate setting (Armadillo

high- performance 96-well plate, Thermo Fisher Scientific). We evaluated SH800 sorting accuracy prior to

low-input harvest using a colorimetric assay as previously described (51). Briefly, we mixed SYBR

Green+/MitoProbe+ parasites (see staining details in *Parasite lines, Compounds, & Treatments*) with

horseradish peroxidase enzyme (Thermo Fisher Scientific) at a final concentration of 2.5mg/ml. We then

sorted parasites into a 96-well plate filled with TMB-ELIZA substrate (Thermo Fisher Scientific) using the

single cell (3 drops) instrument setting, in triplicate plates (**Fig. S3A & B**). Formation of a color in the well

(blue, green, or yellow) indicates the successful sorting of the enzyme, and therefore parasites, into the

well with the substrate. This assessment allowed us to evaluate the accuracy of SH800 sorting (through

the evaluation of success for 1- versus 2-cell wells, **Fig. S3C**), the consistency of sorting (through the

evaluation of replicates), and the best plate positions for sorting (through the evaluation of performance

in different plate rows/columns). Based on these evaluations, we proceeded with isolating 2- and 10-cells

per well and avoided sorting into the top 2 rows and the first and last column of the 96-well plate (**Fig.**

S3D).

Parasite isolation & storage. We stained parasites with SYBR Green and MitoProbe DiIC1 (5) in complete

RPMI as above (see staining details in *Parasite Lines, Compounds, & Treatments*), gassed the tubes with

5% CO_2, 5% O_2, 90% N, and placed sample on ice to ensure viability prior to flow sorting of viable , ring-

stage parasites (SH800, Sony Biotechnology Inc., San Jose, CA). We used a final concentration of 1×10^7

parasites/ml diluted in sterile 1x PBS (Thermo Fisher Scientific) as input for sorting at the "single-cell

setting" (3 drop) into a 96-well plate (Armadillo high performance 96-well plate, Thermo Fisher Scientific)

with each well containing 2.375µl of cell lysis buffer (0.025M Tris Ph8.8 (Roche Diagnostics, Indianapolis,

IN), 0.01M NaCl (MilliporeSigma), 0.01M KCl (MilliporeSigma), 0.01M $(NH_4)_2SO_4$ (Thermo Fisher Scientific),

0.001M EDTA (Promega, Madison, WI), and 10% Triton X-100 (MilliporeSigma)). We gated viable 1n ring-

stage parasites (**Fig. S4**) and sorted into wells containing cell lysis buffer with an approximate sorting time

of 15 min. After sorting, we centrifuged for 30 seconds in a plate centrifuge (MPS1000, Labnet

International, Madison, NJ). We immediately overlaid samples with one drop (approx. 25µl) of light

mineral oil (BioReagent grade for molecular biology, Millipore Sigma) and sealed the plates with

Microamp® Clear Adhesive Film (Applied Biosystems, Waltham, MA) before storage at -80°C until whole

genome amplification. All samples were isolated on the same day and stored frozen for ~1 month before

amplification (*FCR3*: 33 days, treated *Dd2*: 35 days, and untreated *Dd2*: 40 days).

MALBAC Whole Genome Amplification for Low-input Genomics

We handled each plate separately in order to limit cross-contamination during amplification steps. First,

we thawed each plate containing sorted parasites (see *Parasite Isolation & Storage*) and added 1mg/ml

Proteinase K in sterile 1x PBS (Thermo Fisher Scientific) to a final volume of 2.5µl per well. We heated the

plate in a PCR cycler (C1000, Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA) at 50°C for 3hrs, followed by 75°C for 20

min and 80°C for 5 min for proteinase k digestion. We amplified parasite genomes using the Multiple

Annealing and Looping Based Amplification Cycles (MALBAC) method essentially as previously described

((42), Version 1) with some modifications (Version 2, **Fig. S5**). In summary, 1) we modified the pre-

amplification random primer by adding 5 additional degenerate bases with 20% GC-content to increase

annealing to AT-rich genome sequences (5'GTGAGTGATGGTTGAGGTAGTGTGGAG<u>NNNNNNNNNNN</u>TTT 3');

2) we performed 19 of the 21 total linear cycles with the *Bsu* DNA Polymerase (Large Fragment, New

England Biosciences), which has a lower optimal reaction temperature (37°C) to improve the amplification

on AT-rich sequences (52); 3) we lowered the extension temperature from 40/50°C to 37°C during the

linear amplification cycles that used the *Bsu* enzyme (see full cycling parameters in **Fig. S5** and impacts of

these changes in **Table S1**); and 4) we integrated robotic pipetting (Mosquito LV, SPT Labtech, Melbourn,

UK) to increase the throughput of our assays (from 23 samples in Version 1 to 90 samples in the current

Version 2) and limit contamination potential.

Overall, we performed 21 total linear cycles (19 cycles with *Bsu* polymerase and 2 cycles with *Bst*

polymerase, New England Biolabs, Ipswitch, MA) and 17 total exponential amplification cycles using

Herculase II Fusion DNA polymerase (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA). During amplification steps,

we employed standard steps to limit contamination (42). For automated pipetting of the enzyme solution

during linear cycles, tips were changed after each round of pipetting. Post-amplification, we purified

amplified DNA with Zymo DNA Clean & Concentrator-5columns (Zymo Research, Irvine, CA) according to

the protocol and ran 2µl of all samples on 1% agarose gels to check for the presence of DNA (generally, if

>30ng/µl, samples could be visualized with a size range of 100 to >1500bp).

Assessments of Amplification Success for Low-input Genomics

DNA quantification. We quantified the MALBAC-amplified DNA using a Qubit fluorimeter (Qubit 1X dsDNA

High Sensitivity Assay Kit, Thermo Fisher Scientific) (**Fig. S6**).

Droplet Digital PCR. To confirm the presence of parasite DNA in MALBAC-amplified samples, we

performed droplet digital PCR (ddPCR) as described previously using the QX2000 droplet generator, C1000

thermocycler, and QX2000 droplet reader (Bio-Rad Laboratories) (48,53) (**Fig. S7**). We used duplex assays

to evaluate two parasite genomic loci concurrently (*pfmdr1:* Forward- TGCCCACAGAATTGCATCTA;

Reverse- ACCCTGATCGAAATGGAACCT; Probe - TCGTGTGTTCCATGTGACTG; *pfhsp70:* Forward-

TGCTGTCATTACCGTTCCAG;   Reverse   -   AGATGCTGGTACAATTGCAGGA;   Probe   -

AGCAGCTGCAGTAGGTTCATT (Integrated DNA technologies, Newark, NJ). The reaction master mix

contained 600nm of forward and reverse primers, 50nm probes, 10µl of ddPCR Supermix for Probes (2x,

Bio-Rad Laboratories), 3µl of nuclease-free water (QIAGEN), and 1.5ng (5µl) of template DNA per assay

(total of 20µl). We used the following cycling conditions for PCR amplification: 10 min at 95°C initial

denaturation step, 1 min at 95°C second denaturation step, and 2 min at 58°C annealing and extension

step (ramp rate of 1°C per second), the second denaturation step and the annealing/extension step

repeated 60 times, and then 10 min at 98°C to halt the reaction (53). In addition to running amplified

samples to assess amplification success, we ran ddPCR with bulk genomic DNA as a positive control, no

template controls (water replaced DNA), and material from "no cell" wells to assess cross-well

contamination. We considered the samples positive for parasite DNA if there were more than 50 total

positive droplets in target-positive clusters. For comparisons to DNA amounts (**Fig. S6**), we plotted total

nanograms against total positive droplets (from both *pfmdr1* and *pfhsp70* loci) and performed a simple

linear regression in PRISM (GraphPad, La Jolla, CA).

High Resolution Melting Assay. To assess potential contamination between MALBAC-amplified samples,

we performed asymmetric PCR amplification of the *pfdhps* locus followed by high-resolution melting

(HRM) as described previously (54,55) (**Fig. S8**). The *pfdhps* locus at codon 613 is distinct in *Dd2* and *FCR3*

parasite lines (*Dd2*: Ser-613 and *FCR3*: Ala-613, (56)). Each 20µL reaction contained 8µl of the 2.5x

LightScanner Master mix (BioFire™ Defense, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA), 1/10µM of forward/reverse

primers and 8µM probes targeting the *pfdhps* gene position 613: Forward -

CTCTTACAAAATATACATGTATATGATGAGTATCCACTT; Reverse-

CATGTAATTTTTGTTGTGTATTTATTACAACATTTTGA; Probe - AAGATTTATTGCCCATTGCATGA/3SpC3,

(Integrated DNA technologies), 7µl of nuclease free water, and 3µl of DNA (~0.05ng total). We used the

following cycling conditions for PCR amplification with the Rotor-Gene Q instrument with a 72-well rotor

(QIAGEN): 95°C for 5 min, 45 cycles of 95°C for 10s, 55°C for 30s, and 72°C for 10s, followed by a pre-melt

at 55°C for 90s, and a HRM ramp from 65°C to 90°C, with an increase of 0.1°C every 2s. We plotted the

change in fluorescence versus temperature (dF/T) using Rotor-Gene Q software (version 2.3.5, build 1;

QIAGEN) and compared HRM peaks of amplified samples to bulk genomic DNA and plasmid controls.

Bulk DNA Extraction for Short-Read Sequencing

We extracted bulk DNA for short-read sequencing as previously performed (42). Briefly, we lysed

erythrocytes with 1.5% saponin and washed the parasite pellet 3 times with 1x PBS (Thermo Fisher

Scientific), before resuspension in a buffered solution (150mM NaCl (MilliporeSigma), 10mM EDTA

(Promega Corporation, Madison, WI), and 50mM Tris pH7.5 (Roche Diagnostics)) to a total volume of

500µl. We then lysed the parasites with 10% sarkosyl (MilliporeSigma) and 20mg/ml proteainase K

(Thermo   Fisher   Scientific)   at   37°C   overnight   before   DNA   purification   using   standard

phenol/chloroform/isoamyl alcohol extraction and chloroform washing steps (2 times each, (42)). Finally,

we precipitated DNA using 100% ethanol with 100mM of sodium acetate overnight in DNA-lo bind tubes

(Eppendorf, Enfield, CT) and then washed twice with 70% ethanol before resuspension in 50µl nuclease

free water (QIAGEN). We stored bulk genomic DNA at -20°C until sequencing library preparation.

Low-input Genomics Sample Selection & Short-Read Sequencing

Low-input sample selection. We selected 16 low-input samples from the *FCR3* plate, 36 samples from the

untreated *Dd2* plate, and 38 samples from the treated *Dd2* plate for short-read Illumina sequencing. We

based our selection on the quantity of the MALBAC amplified DNA and presence of parasite DNA using

ddPCR (**Figs. S6 & S7**). In summary, the majority of *FCR3* and untreated *Dd2* samples yielded quantifiable

parasite DNA following MALBAC amplification (53/60 *FCR3* samples and 60/60 untreated *Dd2* samples);

in these conditions, we chose samples randomly to proceed with sequencing (indicated in **Fig. S6**). For

treated *Dd2* samples, we chose samples for sequencing if they had adequate DNA quantity (>10ng total,

30 samples, **Fig. S6**) or had ddPCR results showing the presence of parasite DNA (an additional 8 samples).

Short-read sequencing. Before short-read sequencing, we sheared bulk samples and low-input samples

using Covaris M220 Focused Ultrasonicator for 150s and 130s, respectively, to generate fragment sizes of

~350bp as evaluated by an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer using the High Sensitivity DNA kit (Agilent, Santa

Clara). We adjusted the volume of sheared samples with nuclease-free water up to 50µl. For samples with

>100ng (**Table S2**, including bulk and MALBAC amplified samples), we diluted them to 1.2-2ng/µl; for

samples <100ng, we proceeded with no dilution. We used NEBNext Ultra II kit (Illumina Inc., San Diego,

CA) to prepare libraries for sequencing with 3 cycles of PCR amplification, as performed previously (42).

We quantified the resulting libraries using NEBNext Library Quant Kit (Illumina Inc.) before sequencing on

the Illumina Nextseq 550 using 150 bp paired-end cycles.

Short-Read Sequence Processing & Analysis

Read processing and alignment. We performed short-read quality control steps as described previously

(40,42). Briefly, we reordered and removed singletons and subsequently interleaved paired reads using

BBMap, filtered for high-quality reads (>Q30), trimmed the MALBAC common sequence, PhiX, and

Illumina adapters from the remaining reads with the BBDuk tool within BBMap, and aligned reads to the

pf3D7-62_v3 reference genome using the Speedseq genome aligner (57). We removed reads that mapped

to VAR regions from bam files according to previously defined genomic coordinates (58). We filtered out

reads with low mapping quality (mapq<30) and duplicated reads using SAMtools (59). We calculated the

percentage of reads that map to the *P. falciparum* genome by dividing the number of mapq>30 mapped

reads by the number of total unaligned reads (mapped reads/total reads). We employed Qualimap to

report mean coverage and standard deviation across the genome (60). Using non-overlapping 20kb size

bins, we calculated the coefficient of variation of read coverage by dividing the standard deviation of

coverage within a bin by the mean across a sample and multiplying by 100 (61,62) (R version 4.4.2). Short-

read data is available at NCBI Sequence Reads Archives under project PRJNA1201106.

BLAST-based evaluation of read composition. We blasted reads from low-input genomics samples

essentially as previously described (42). We also performed an additional BLAST analysis to understand

read composition. We randomly downsampled and extracted 5,000 reads from either 1) all aligned reads

(mapq>1) or 2) unmapped reads (mapq>30, **Fig. S9**). To ensure that BLAST alignments consisted of high-

quality reads, we manually filtered out low complexity (%N>50) and short sequences (length < 100bp).

We used these reads as input for a custom pipeline, where we blasted reads against a database consisting

of common genomes downloaded from NCBI (i.e., human, mouse, mycoplasma, bacterial genera, etc).

For the BLAST step, we employed a Conda installable BLASTN v2.16.0+ for analyzing the reads (63). In

order to count as a hit, the sequence must have 90% of its bases aligned and have an e-value of <e-20.

The pipeline is designed to return the top 10 blast hits with these criteria, and either call the most

significant hit (lowest e-value), or if alignments from the *Plasmodium* genus were present in the result

(but not the most significant hit), call the most significant *Plasmodium* hit. We included this step to

account for possible mismatching due to the abundance of highly repetitive sequences in the *Plasmodium*

genome. We also used a custom script to quantify the abundance of hits based on the genus related to

each hit's accession number. If the pipeline identified a hit, but the genus was not represented in the

custom database, the hit was called 'unknown'. The code for the pipeline, including construction of the

database, is available at https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.29885879.

Single nucleotide polymorphism analysis. We performed SNP genotyping and analysis as previously (42),

based on the MalariaGen *P. falciparum* Community Project V6.0 pipeline (64-67) using the *pf3D7-62_v3*

reference genome (**Fig. S10**). Briefly, we applied GATK's Base Quality Score Recalibration using default

settings. We detected potential SNPs using GATK's HaplotypeCaller and subsequently genotyped the SNPs

using CombineGVCFs and GenotypeGVCFs. We employed GATK's VariantRecalibrator using previously

validated SNP datasets (68) and applied GATK's ApplyRecalibration to assign VQSLOD scores (67). We

filtered the resulting SNPs for those with VQSLOD > 6 and for a GT quality metric >20 to ensure high-

quality variant calling. We only selected variants flagged as Bi-allelic to simplify the analysis. For SNP

Principal Component Analysis (PCA), we merged experiment-wide SNP data (described above) into a single

file. Then we merged the VCF into a large matrix and converted the genomic data into numeric

information using the 'vcfr' package in R (Version 4.2.3) (https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vcfR). We

excluded individual SNPs if >25% of the samples lacked a call in this position or if all calls were the same

for each sample in that position). We scaled the remaining SNPs around the origin using the 'scale' R

function. We then calculated the principal components using the 'prcomp' R function and scored the

dataset using the 'scores' function from the 'vegan' R package (https://CRAN.R-

project.org/package=vegan).

Copy Number Variation Analysis

CNV calling in bulk samples. We performed CNV detection for bulk samples similar to as previously

described (40,42). Briefly, we called CNVs independently using two methods, CNVnator (read depth based

calling, (69)) and LUMPY (split and discordant read based calling, (70)). To Identify CNVs called in both

methods, we used SVCROWS to define overlapping CNV regions relative to their size (43). Briefly,

SVCROWS uses a reciprocal-overlap-based approach (i.e. two CNVs must be overlapping each other at, or

greater than, a defined threshold) to determine if two CNVs are close enough in their genomic position to

be called the same. The program utilizes adaptive thresholds for overlap based on the sizes of the CNVs

being compared, ensuring that we account for shifts in CNV position, particularly in regions of high

variance. For known CNV calls, we used the following SVCROWS input parameters: ExpandRORegion =

FALSE, BPfactor = TRUE, DefaultSizes = FALSE, xs = 3000, xl = 10,000, y1s = 300, y1l = 1000, y2s = 50% and

y2l = 80%; based on the average size of a *P. falciparum* gene (~2.3kb) and intergenic region (~2kb). Similar

to our previous study (42), we identified 3 known CNVs that were called by both LUMPY and CNVnator

methods in the core genome of bulk samples (untreated and treated). We determined known CNV

boundaries using SVCROWS: *pfmdr1* (*Pf3D7_05_v3*, 888001-970000, 82kb), *pf11-1* (*Pf3D7_10_v3*,

1521345-1541576, 20kb), and *pf332* (*Pf3D7_11_v3*, 1950201-1962400, 12kb).

Downsampling. For CNV analysis that assessed downsampled data, we first converted the processed bam

files back into FASTQ files using SAMtools and then used the reformat.sh option of BBtools to select 1.3M

reads from each FASTQ (represented the fewest number of reads from a sample that passed quality

filtering from the final dataset). We then realigned files to the reference genome (*pf3D7-62_v3*).

CNV calling in 2-cell samples. We employed two methods for CNV detection in the core genome of low-

input samples; LUMPY is a split/discordant read strategy with high sensitivity (70), and HapCNV is a read

coverage-based strategy designed for haploid genomes (44). We ran LUMPY as part of Speedseq with

default parameters as previously described (40). We filtered resulting structural variants to include only

duplications (DUP, >1 copy of a region) and deletions (DEL, one less copy of region than the reference).

We then filtered those calls for those GQ > 20 to ensure high-fidelity calls. In HapCNV, we used a quality

control and bias correction procedure to exclude bins of poor quality and remove bias introduced by GC

content and mappability variation. We then constructed a pseudo-reference for each *Dd2* low-input

sample using within-*Dd2* information, which enabled control of background noise while preserving CNV

signals after normalization. Finally, we used a circular binary segmentation algorithm (CBS, (71)) to detect

copy number change points followed by a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM, (72)) for CNV identification.

For statistics, we used PRISM (GraphPad, La Jolla, CA), using unpaired parametric T-tests with Welch's

correction. We calculated standard error in Microsoft Excel.

Defining CNV regions/determination of "rarity" in CNV calling. Small differences in sequence quality

surrounding a read can lead to shifted breakpoint determination for biologically identical CNVs, which is

especially true for low-input genomics datasets (28). To account for this, we used SVCROWS to determine

whether two CNV signals were the same within and between samples (see *CNV calling in bulk samples* for

input parameters (43)). We assigned the categorizations of "rare" and "common" by assessing the CNV

region frequency within datasets as performed in other studies (44,73). "Rare" CNVs were defined as

occurring in <10% of the samples within a treatment group; "common" CNVs were defined as occurring

in ≥10% of samples within a treatment group; "known" CNVs were defined by CNVs called in bulk samples

(see above, *CNV calling in bulk samples*).

High-confidence CNV region identification. To identify "high-confidence" CNV regions called by both

HapCNV and LUMPY methods, we compared the 'consensus list' generated by SVCROWS (43) for each

detection method by combining them into a single input file. Because there is a large disparity of average

CNV region lengths between the two methods (HapCNV = ~40kb, LUMPY = ~4.3kb), we relaxed the

stringency of the SVCROWS parameters for this analysis. Our input parameters to generate the "high-

confidence" list were as follows: $xs = 3000$, $xl = 6000$, $y1s = 500$, $y1l = 1500$, $y2s = 30\%$ and $y2l = 60\%$. We

defined high-confidence CNV regions as those that had >1 match from both HapCNV and LUMPY that was

the same type (i.e. either duplication or deletion or mixed). For Venn diagram generation, we calculated

overlaps using SVCROWS "Scavenge" mode (43), input parameters: ExpandRORegion = FALSE, BPfactor =

TRUE, DefaultSizes = FALSE, $xs = 3000$, $xl = 6000$, $y1s = 500$, $y1l = 1500$, $y2s = 30\%$ and $y2l = 60\%$). We

systematically compared lists for each overlap comparison, and if regions had at least one match in an

opposing dataset, we considered it a match. We used the *draw.quad.venn* function in the

"VennDiagram**"** R package (R 4.2.1) to generate the diagram.

Breakpoint analysis of high-confidence CNV regions. We assessed features of breakpoints flanking high-

confidence CNVs as performed previously (40). Briefly, we used the CNV breakpoint coordinates either

set by LUMPY or HapCNV to extract a 2000bp window around the 5' or 3' CNV end (±1000bp from the

breakpoint). Although Huckaby et al. solely used LUMPY to determine breakpoints (40), we employed CNV

boundary information from both CNV callers (LUMPY and HAPCNV) merged using the Expand-RO function

in SVCROWS to construct the conserved CNV region ((43), see parameters in *High-confidence CNV region*

identification). In this analysis, breakpoints are called using either and/or both HapCNV and LUMPY

boundaries on either end, which captures variance but can limit accuracy. For this reason, we only

identified breakpoints of high-confidence CNVs, which are conserved between CNV-callers. With these

defined breakpoints, we then used Vienna 2.1.9 folding prediction software with Mathews 2004 DNA

folding parameters, wherein G-quadruplexes, GU pairing, and lonely base pairs were disallowed to predict

stable structures in that region based on Gibbs free energy estimates in sliding 50bp windows. We called

stable hairpins by determining local minima of Gibbs free energy across the 2000bp region using the same

50bp windows. We reported the position of the stable structure closest to the breakpoint using the

threshold of -5.8kCal/mol, which we previously reported as the cutoff for stable secondary structure

formation in this genome. If no stable hairpins could be determined within 2kb around the breakpoint,

we recorded that breakpoint as "unresolved". We also calculated the GC content of the breakpoints from

the 100bp window surrounding the stable hairpin, whether this position was genic or intergenic, and the

size of the resulting CNV as the distance between the two breakpoints.

Gene Ontology enrichment and protein class identification from high-confidence CNV regions. We used

the online Gene Ontology Resource (geneontology.org) to perform GO enrichment analysis using the

PANTHER Classification System (74,75). Since a large portion of the *P. falciparum* genome remains

unannotated (PlasmoDB, ~30%) and the majority of molecular functions remain unclassified (92.8%), we

used the Panther Protein class assessment (version 19.0, only 55.9% remained unclassified) with default

statistics (Fisher's test with FDR adjusted p value of <0.05 for significance, which is recommended for small

counts and overlaps between classes). We used the web tool to represent protein classes on pie charts.

Clinical importance of high-confidence CNV regions. We assessed the clinical importance of genes within

high-confidence CNVs by first collecting gene IDs from high-confidence duplications and deletions. To

generate this gene list, we used SVCROWS "Hunt" mode ((43), input parameters: BPfactor = TRUE,

DefaultSizes = FALSE, xs = 3000, xl = 6000, y1s = 300, y1l = 600, y2s = 30, y2l = 60), which takes a

secondary input list of known genes (Pf3D7_62_v3, Plasmodb.org) and overlaps CNVs to the gene list

using a size-weighted scale. We then performed a literature search to identify genes within the list that

are essential for erythrocytic stage, mosquito stage (including gametocyte, gamete, ookinete, sporozoite

formation), or liver stage *P. falciparum* or *P. berghei* development. We also included genes that produced

known parasite antigens important for immune recognition/vaccine escape or contributed to clinical drug

resistance. We noted the Mutagenesis Index Score (MIS) for each gene, which estimates essentiality in

erythrocytic stage parasites (76), from the PlasmoDB database (77). To assess overlap of high-confidence

CNVs with a large catalogue of *P. falciparum* CNVs from clinical isolates, we collected the gene list from

high-frequency CNVs (>1%, >300bp) identified in clinical isolates (Supplementary Table 3 from (38))

and manually reformatted the list to match SVCROWS input style guidelines (43). We then assessed

how often these genes overlapped with our high-confidence gene list using the SVCROWS "Hunt"

mode described above.

RESULTS

Refined low-input genomics pipeline increased efficiency and accuracy

We developed a robust pipeline for assessing the frequency of de novo CNVs in the *P. falciparum* genome. We adapted our single cell genomics method to improve parasite isolation and whole genome amplification steps over our previous study (42). In this modified protocol, we used fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS) to isolate viable, 1n parasites to improve efficiency and modified aspects of our whole genome amplification method to improve coverage (**Table S1**, **Fig. S5**). We also sorted low-cell populations to increase accuracy (e.g. 2-cells per well, **Fig. S3**), and added quality control PCR-based steps that confirmed our samples were of high quality prior to short-read sequencing (**Fig. S7 & S8**). The resulting low-input genomics pipeline consisted of basic steps including parasite isolation using flow sorting, whole genome amplification using a modified MALBAC-based approach, quality control confirmation, short-read sequencing, and CNV analysis (**Fig. 1B**).

415
Figure 1. Low-input genomics approach for analysis of malaria parasite genomes under stress. **A**. *P. falciparum* erythrocytic
cycle including approximate timing (h) and genome number (n). Cycle length is 44h total for the *Dd2* parasite line (78,79). Ring
stage parasites have a single genome, replication begins at trophozoite stage, and schizonts develop with 10-20 individual
parasites within a single erythrocyte. **B**. Overview of low-input genomics procedures. Early erythrocytic stage *P. falciparum*
parasites grown in vitro were treated with an antimalarial compound (DSM1) or the solvent control (dimethylsulfoxide, DMSO)
followed by recovery and reinvasion to produce a new round of ring stage parasites (see details in panel C). Parasite-infected
erythrocytes were isolated using flow sorting (10-cell control or 2-cell samples) and genomes were amplified using a modified
MALBAC-based whole genome amplification approach. Quality control steps involved DNA quantification to assess amplification
success, droplet digital PCR to assess parasite genome amplification, and PCR-high resolution melting to assess sample cross-
contamination. After Illumina short-read sequencing, reads were filtered, trimmed and used as input for copy number variation
analysis using two approaches, HapCNV and LUMPY. **C**. Timeline of parasite treatment and recovery. For all experiments (pilot
and low-input genomics), parasites were synchronized to enrich for rings before short-term treatment was applied. Parasite
growth and viability were tracked from start, to post-treatment, to post-recovery, and harvest. The recovery period allowed for
completion of the erythrocytic cycle and reinvasion to produce rings before harvest for low-input genomics (see more details on
pilot treatments in **Fig. S1A** and low-input genomics in **Fig. S2A**). *, cumulative time from start (0h). **treatment led to a decrease
in parasitemia and delay in ring progression and therefore staging is approximate. Aphi, aphidicolin. **D**. Mean growth rate of
parasite lines and treatments for low-input genomics experiment: *FCR3* (yellow circles), untreated *Dd2* (black circles), and treated
Dd2 parasites (red circles). Fold change in % parasitemia was calculated by dividing the ending parasitemia from the starting
parasitemia for the period being measured. Cumulative timing is as follows: start (0h), post treat (12h), pre-harvest (38h), harvest
(+40-43h). N=2. Cumulative parasitemia and ring percentage shown in **Fig. S2B**; raw flow cytometry plots tracking viability and
parasitemia shown in **Fig. S2C-G**. **E**. Recovery time for parasite lines and treatments: *FCR3* (yellow), untreated *Dd2* (black), and
DSM1-treated *Dd2* parasites (red). Recovery is defined as the period just after treatment until harvest for down-stream
processing. **F**. FACS plots at parasite isolation step for DSM1-treated *Dd2* samples. MitoProbe DiIC1 (5) (stains viable parasites)

vs SYBR Green (stains parasite genome) indicates the proportion of erythrocytes (heat map of density) that contain viable ring
stage parasites (blue circle: 0.38% ring stage parasitemia). Plots for other parasite lines are depicted in **Fig. S4**.
441

Replication stress followed by a recovery period led to isolation of viable parasites

To explore the impact of antimalarial stress on de novo CNV generation, we treated the parasites with a

compound that targets *Plasmodium* dihydroorotate dehydrogenase (DSM1, (80)). The application of

DSM1 for an extended period kills parasites (>48hrs at 10x the EC_{50}, (81)). However, we found that when

applied to ring-stage parasites for a short period of time (see general timeline in **Fig. 1C**), DSM1 stalls

parasite progression through the life cycle in a reproducible and reversible manner (**Fig. S1B, C & E**); this

effect was similar to parasite treatment with the replication inhibitor, aphidicolin ((82,83), **Fig. S1D & E**).

While aphidicolin stalls replication through inhibition of B-family DNA polymerases (83,84), DSM1 likely

impacts replication through depletion of pyrimidine pools as is observed for other forms of dNTP

depletion (85,86). For this reason, we now refer to DSM1 treatment as "replication stress".

For the low-input genomics harvest, we applied DSM1 to ring-stage parasites for 12h (**Fig. 1C & S2A**).

Similar to our pilot experiments (**Fig. S1B, C & E**), we observed that DSM1-treated parasites exhibited a

slightly decreased growth rate and altered stage progression compared to untreated parasites (**Figs. 1D**

& S2B-G). We harvested viable parasites after a recovery period (an additional ~30hrs, **Fig. 1E**, or ~42

hours from the treatment start, **Fig. 1C**), where we allowed parasites to complete an additional round of

replication and erythrocyte invasion to produce those that have a single, haploid genome (ring stage, **Fig.**

S2E, G).

As a control for cross-sample contamination between isolation wells, we isolated untreated parasites with

different genetic backgrounds (*FCR3* vs *Dd2*, **Table 1, Fig. 1D & E**). Prior to isolation of low-cell populations,

we confirmed that *FCR3*, untreated *Dd2*, and DSM1-treated *Dd2* parasites were at a similar life cycle stage

and viability (**Table 1**); we saved a portion of these samples for parasite population sequencing (i.e. bulk

samples). We then proceeded to isolate small populations of viable, ring stage parasites using FACS (**Fig.**

S4) for whole genome amplification and sequencing.

Table 1: Parasite density, staging, and health at isolation for low-input genomics.

Line/Treatment*	Mean % Parasitemia$^\$$	Mean % Rings**	Mean % Viability$^@$
Untreated *FCR3*^	0.6%	90%	91%
Untreated *Dd2*^	0.8%	87%$^\&$	94%
DSM1-treated *Dd2*	0.6%	77%$^\&$	95%

*Treatment conditions: 1µM DSM1 (~10x EC$_{50}$) for 12hrs prior to 31hrs of recovery. Untreated samples were incubated with
DMSO as a solvent control for 12hrs and allowed to recover for 28-30hrs (**Fig. 1E**). $^\$$Parasitemia was determined by calculating
the number of infected erythrocytes (SYBR Green+) compared to uninfected erythrocytes (SYBR Green-) (**Fig. S2C-G**). **Mean %
Rings value was collected from "post-recovery" plots in **Fig. S2E/G** (R1 SYBR green plots). $^@$Viability of parasites was determined
by measuring the mitochondrial membrane potential (Mitoprobe+) and calculating % of total SYBR Green-based parasitemia
(plots presented in **Fig. S2E, S2G,** and **Fig. S4**). ^*FCR3* (Africa) and *Dd2* (Southeast Asia) parasite lines are from distinct geographic
origins (87,88). $^\&$The initial % rings were 91.8% for both untreated and treated conditions (**Fig. S2C**).

Quality assessments showed effective isolation and amplification of low-input samples

We sorted ring-stage low-cell populations from each parasite group into 60 wells of a 96-well plate (*FCR3*,

untreated *Dd2,* and treated *Dd2*), including 6 wells with 10-cells and 56 wells with 2-cells. Ten-cell wells

served as positive controls for the whole genome amplification step and 2-cell wells provided the optimal

balance between sorting accuracy (**Fig. S3**) and de novo CNV detection. Zero cells were sorted into the

top 2 rows of the plate ("no-cell" wells). After parasite lysis and applying *Pf*MALBAC version-2 whole

genome amplification (**Fig. S5**), we assessed amplification success using three approaches. First, we

measured the resulting DNA quantity across 80% of the amplified wells (**Fig. S6**). On average, MALBAC

amplification in wells that contained sorted parasites yielded ~120ng of total DNA per reaction, with a

~10% increase in DNA for 10- vs 2-cell samples (mean of 127ng versus 116ng total, respectively). We did

not detect position-based bias across plates or appreciable amplification from no-cell wells, but we

observed that treated *Dd2* wells had ~3-fold lower levels of amplification than other samples (mean of

51ng versus 151ng total, respectively). Of note, there was little difference in mean amplified DNA amounts

between the two untreated sample groups (*FCR3* at 146ng and untreated *Dd2* at 152ng).

Second, we performed droplet digital PCR (ddPCR) for parasite-specific genes on approximately one-third

of wells to confirm the amplification of the parasite genome. DdPCR for *pfmdr1* and *pfhsp70* displayed

that wells with measurable DNA contained amplified parasite DNA (**Fig. S6** and **S7**). Additionally, we

confirmed that 2-cell wells with very low total DNA amounts (**Fig. S6**) were positive for parasite genomes

while "no-cell" wells did not show evidence of parasite material (**Fig. S7A-C**). We observed a significant

correlation between total DNA and positive ddPCR droplet counts (black dotted line, p value of 0.0004)

but also identified some samples where DNA quantity was low (<50ng) when measured using Qubit but

parasite-specific signal was high (red points, all treated *Dd2*, **Fig. S7D**). This observation indicated that

DNA quantification is not the best way to measure amplification success; target-based methods like ddPCR

are more helpful to estimate the quantity of amplified material.

Finally, we employed high-resolution melting analysis to profile a drug resistance marker that differs

between *FCR3* and *Dd2* parasites (56). By assessing the *pfdhps* SNP profile of amplified genomes and

comparing it to the parental profile in ~10% of samples, we confirmed that there was no evidence of cross-

sample contamination during the preparation and amplification steps (**Fig. S8**). Therefore, we proceeded

to sequence the amplified bulk and low-input samples (**Table S2**).

Coverage deviation and SNP profiles exhibited expected trends in low-input samples

We sequenced 3 bulk samples and 90 low-input samples using Illumina short-read sequencing (**Table 2**

and **S3**). Overall, sequencing proceeded well as indicated by coverage and coverage deviation of the bulk

samples, as well as an equivalent mean mapping quality across all samples (**Table 2**). Because we noticed

that treated *Dd2* wells had lower levels of DNA following amplification (**Fig. S6**), we sequenced higher

amounts of material for this condition; this choice impacted mean coverage levels where treated *Dd2*

samples had ~4-times higher coverage than untreated *Dd2* samples (**Table 2**). As expected, based on

previous studies (42), coverage deviation was ~3-fold higher in low-input samples when compared to bulk

samples, reflecting the bias of the whole genome amplification step to over- or under-amplify specific

genomic regions.

The percentage of high-quality reads that mapped to the *P. falciparum* genome was high across all

samples (mean of 67% of all reads). To identify any contaminating reads, we also blasted a subset of high-

quality reads (%N <50, length >100bp, and read q score >30) from each sample to a database of genomes

from other organisms. While the majority yielded matches to the *P. falciparum* genome (97.5%), a very

small number of high-quality reads matched sequences from different organisms (**Fig. S9**). Together, this

information shows efficient amplification of the parasite genome and little contribution of environmental

contamination during sample preparation. We removed five low-input samples from further analysis

based on low coverage levels; on average, excluded samples had ~7-times lower coverage than other low-

input samples (**Table S3**). Of the remaining samples, 18 were 10-cell samples and 57 were 2-cell samples.

Although mean coverage was ~2-fold higher for 2-cell samples due to the higher coverage of treated low-

input samples, the mean normalized deviation was similar between 10- and 2-cell samples (3.5 and 3.1,

respectively).

To once again check for cross-sample contamination, we tracked SNPs in the low-input samples compared

to bulk samples. Despite some variation due to the non-clonal nature of parasite lines (see *Materials and*

Methods), low-input SNP profiles were similar to their corresponding bulk sample as compared using PCA

(**Fig. S10A**). After normalizing total SNPs to mapped reads, we detected a lower rate of SNPs in treated

samples compared to untreated counterparts (p value of 0.0001, **Fig. S10B**). While we did not detect a

correlation between normalized total SNPs and amplification quality (**Fig. S10C**, R_2: untreated *Dd2*, 0.01;

treated *Dd2,* 0.01), we did observe a positive correlation between SNP number and coverage depth in

treated versus untreated *Dd2* samples (**Fig. S10D**, R_2: untreated *Dd2*, 0.66; treated *Dd2,* 0.27). This latter

finding indicates that the difference in SNP numbers between sample groups is likely due to varying

sensitivity at different levels of read coverage (89,90).

Table 2: Sequencing Summary for low-input samples and paired bulk samples

		No. of samples **	Mean no. mapped reads per sample	Mean coverage per sample	Mean Coefficient of Variation (CV#)	Mean mapping quality
Bulk	Untreated *FCR3*	1	9,966,137	54.9	59.5	58.2
Low-input	Untreated *FCR3*	16	2,694,209	13.7	105.1	58.2
Bulk	Untreated *Dd2*	1	5,735,107	33.6	33.3	58.5
Low-input	Untreated *Dd2*	33	2,579,674	13.2	82.6	58.3
Bulk	Treated *Dd2*	1	72,380,215	416.3	35.2	58.5
Low-input	Treated *Dd2**	36	9,936,903	53.7	86.5	58.4

539 *Four times more material was loaded on the flow cell for the treated samples than the untreated samples due to lower initial
540 amplification yields (**Fig. S6**).
541 **Excludes samples that were removed due to low coverage. For low-input samples, analysis includes both 10- and 2-cell samples.
542 #CV is the coefficient of variation of normalized read abundance as in (42)
543

Experimental and computational advances improved known CNV calls across low-input samples

For the current study, we employed two different CNV calling methods in low-input samples. HapCNV is

a novel read coverage-based CNV calling method specifically designed for low-cell data from haploid

genomes (44). In contrast to traditional methods that arbitrarily select reference samples for CNV data

normalization, HapCNV constructs a genomic location (or bin)-based pseudo-reference as a comparison

baseline. This step systematically alleviates amplification bias for the identification of de novo CNVs. On

the other hand, LUMPY is an established CNV calling method that exhibits high sensitivity due to the

incorporation of multiple CNV signals (i.e. split and discordant reads) generated from short-read

sequencing. It is particularly well-suited for detecting low-frequency variants; however, as for many CNV

callers, high sensitivity leads to higher false positives (70,91,92).

Using these two distinct CNV calling methods, combined with a recently developed CNV counting

approach (SVCROWS (43)), we evaluated the presence of known CNVs in our 2-cell samples (**Fig. 2A & B**).

The identification of known CNVs (i.e. those identified in the bulk sample, see *Materials and Methods*)

within low-input samples displays the utility of the specific CNV calling methods for different size CNVs in

specific genome locations. In our previous study, we identified 2 of the 3 known CNVs in ~10% of single

cell genomes (42). In the current study, we identified the *pfmdr1* amplicon in 100% of 2-cell samples using

HapCNV (57/57) and 79% of samples using LUMPY (45/57). We did not identify the *pf11-1* amplicon in any

2-cell samples using HapCNV (0/57) but detected this locus in 75% of samples using LUMPY (43/57).

Finally, we identified *pf332* CNVs in 46% of 2-cell samples using HapCNV (26/57) and 100% of samples

using LUMPY (57/57). Although our two studies used different CNV calling methods and are not directly

comparable, the overall improvement in the detection of known CNVs in the current study is likely due to

advances in both the whole genome amplification method to limit amplification bias (**Table S1**) and

recently developed analysis approaches. When we evaluated the detection of three known CNVs

specifically in *Dd2* low-input samples, we observed a somewhat higher rate of known CNV detection by

either method in treated samples (**Fig. 2B**, HapCNV: mean of 1.2 out of 3 total CNVs for untreated and 1.7

for treated samples (increase of 42%), LUMPY: mean of 2.1 out of 3 total CNVs for untreated and 2.9 for

treated samples (increase of 38%, **Table S4**).

De novo CNVs in low-input samples consisted of rare and common CNVs

We next sought to quantify de novo CNVs in low-input samples. We defined de novo CNVs as those that

are not present in the bulk sample and categorized them based on their frequency in low cell samples. As

defined in other studies (44,73), "common" CNVs were present in a larger number of genomes (≥10% of

the same sample type, i.e. untreated or treated), and "rare" CNVs were those that occurred in a small

proportion of samples (<10% of the sample type) (**Fig. 2A**). Overall, LUMPY detected more total de novo

CNVs than HapCNV across all samples (~12-fold), and the proportion of rare versus common CNVs varied

depending on the method (18% vs 82% for HapCNV, 61% vs 39% for LUMPY, respectively, **Table S4**).

Additionally, de novo CNVs were more often identified as duplications than deletions for both CNV calling

methods (**Fig. 2C**).

To understand the nature of common and rare CNVs, we also assessed how often their locations

overlapped across the two sample types (untreated and treated, **Fig. S11**). This analysis is useful for

tracking common/rare category utility and relevance. For utility, this step acts as a sanity check since, by

definition, we do not expect rare CNV locations to overlap as often as common CNVs. For relevance, de

novo CNVs with conserved locations across sample types are less likely to represent true CNVs newly

arising in a genome. As expected, we identified common CNVs with conserved locations between

untreated and treated samples (22% for HapCNV and 52% for LUMPY, **Fig. S11A**). The lower rate of

overlapping calls across samples for HapCNV is likely due to the bin-based normalization strategy to

remove amplification artifacts (44). Conversely, we found that rare CNVs were predominantly called in

unique genome locations (94% for HapCNV and 97% for LUMPY, **Fig. S11A**), supporting their novel nature.

This pattern was consistent when we randomly downsampled all sequencing data to the lowest read

coverage prior to CNV calling (1.3 million reads, **Fig. S11B**). This comparison not only highlights the

suitability of the common and rare categories but also the difference between the CNV calling methods.

Based on these observations, we assessed common and rare CNVs using both methods to capture the

broadest view of stress effects on CNV generation.

Genome-wide de novo CNVs increased following replication stress

When we compared de novo CNVs in genomes with and without replication stress, we found that results

were consistent regardless of the CNV calling method (**Fig. 2**). While the proportion of duplication and

deletions somewhat changed with treatment (p value of 0.02 for decreased duplications in treated

samples for LUMPY, **Fig. 2C**), we identified large differences in numbers de novo CNVs between treated

and untreated 2-cell samples (p value of 0.0002 for HapCNV and <0.0001 for LUMPY, **Fig. 2D**). This pattern

was consistent when we downsampled all sequencing data (p value of 0.001 for HapCNV and <0.0001 for

LUMPY, **Fig. S12A & B**), indicating that the difference in de novo CNV counts between treatments was not

due to read coverage. When we assessed common and rare CNV categories, we once again observed

highly significant differences between treated and untreated 2-cell samples in common CNVs using both

methods (common: p value 0.0004 for HapCNV and <0.0001 for LUMPY, **Fig. 2E;** rare: p value of 0.008 for

HapCNV and <0.0001 for LUMPY, **Fig. 2F**).

Figure 2. Low cell genomics displays an increase in de novo CNVs following replication stress. Number of CNVs from untreated (U-*Dd2*) and treated (T-*Dd2*) 2-cell samples from two CNV analysis methods: HapCNV and LUMPY. Statistics for all plots use an unpaired T-test with two tailed Welch's correction (****:p value <0.0001; ***: <0.001; **: <0.01; *:<0.05; no stars: not significant). Analyses include all reads. Line at mean value for each dataset. **A**. Depiction of CNV categories used in the analysis. Known CNVs (orange) are detected in bulk samples and present in all low cell samples. De novo CNVs are not present in bulk samples are considered common (green, >10%) or rare (teal, <10%) depending on their frequency across the 2-cell samples. **B**. Detection of three known CNVs in 2-cell samples. Known CNVs were identified in *Dd2* bulk sequence (either *pfmdr1, pf11-1, or pf332*). 0: no known CNVs were detected in 2-cell sample; 1/2/3: one/two/or three known CNVs were detected in 2-cell sample (see **Table S4** for sample counts). **C.** Proportion of total CNVs detected as duplications (Dup) or deletions (Del) in untreated (U) or treated (T) 2-cell *Dd2* samples (p values: 0.02 for Dup and 0.03 for Del from LUMPY). **D**. Detection of de novo CNVs (common and rare combined) from all reads (p values: 0.0002 for HapCNV, <0.0001 for LUMPY). **E**. Detection of common CNVs from all reads (p values: 0.0004 for HapCNV, <0.0001 for LUMPY). **F**. Detection of rare CNVs from all reads (p values: 0.008 for HapCNV, <0.0001 for LUMPY). **G**. Proportion of total CNVs detected as rare and common from all reads; pie charts show the mean but statistics are calculated using all data points from the rare CNV category (p values: 0.003 for HapCNV, 0.009 for LUMPY). Pie chart size does not represent total de novo CNV numbers (~12x higher for LUMPY, **Table S4**). **H**. Mean fold change between rare and common CNVs detected by HapCNV and LUMPY in untreated and treated *Dd2* 2-cell samples (see **Table 3**).

When we compared the proportion of de novo CNVs relative to total CNVs per sample, rare CNVs were significantly increased over common CNVs (p value of 0.003 for HapCNV and 0.009 for LUMPY, **Fig. 2G**).

This difference persisted regardless of downsampling (p value of 0.02 for HapCNV and 0.004 for LUMPY,

Fig. S12B & C) and is in line with our assessment above that rare CNVs sit in unique genome locations and

are more likely to be novel in nature (**Fig. S11**). Overall, we detected a ~2-3-fold increase of de novo CNVs

in treated samples, regardless of the CNV calling method (**Table 3**). Once again, rare CNVs displayed the

largest increase following treatment (~3-4-fold, **Table 3, Fig. 2H**).

Table 3. Mean CNV counts per 2-cell sample using two analysis methods.

CNV detection method$^\$$	Condition (2-cell only)	Rare CNVs per sample (SE)*	Common CNVs per sample (SE)*	Combined de novo CNVs per sample (SE)^
HapCNV	treated *Dd2*	7 (1.9)	23 (2.1)	15 (3.3)
	untreated *Dd2*	1.7 (0.4)	15 (0.8)	8 (1.0)
	fold change	**4.4**	**1.6**	**1.9**
LUMPY	treated *Dd2*	297 (25)	163 (11)	230 (35)
	untreated *Dd2*	99 (6.5)	68 (3.1)	84 (9.3)
	fold change	**3.0**	**2.4**	**2.7**

638 *Includes both duplications and deletions. Values are calculated by taking the mean of CNV counts per sample within each
639 category. ^De novo CNV counts combined the subcategories of rare (<10% of samples) and common CNVs (>10% of samples,
640 absent in bulk). $^\$$CNV analysis performed using all reads (downsampled data presented in **Fig. S12**).
641

High-confidence de novo CNVs across the genome share consistent breakpoint characteristics

When we compared overlaps between the HapCNV and LUMPY (**Fig. 3A**), we detected a set of CNV regions

that was consistent within sample groups (5 for untreated and 38 for treated, **Table S5**). The frequency of

these "high-confidence" CNV regions also displayed an increase following replication stress (with knowns

excluded, ~12-fold increase in treated samples, **Fig. 3B**). Overall, high-confidence CNV regions

represented both duplications and deletions (**Fig. 3B**) and were located on the majority of chromosomes

(12 of 14, **Fig. 3C**). Of note, approximately half of these regions were identified as "rare" by both CNV

calling methods across treated samples (17/36, 47%; **Table S5**), indicating that novel CNVs were

stimulated in parasite genomes under stress.

651
Figure 3: High-confidence CNVs are located across the genome and represent diverse protein classes. A. Comparison of CNV
calls showing the number of CNV regions consistent across the two CNV calling methods. High-confidence CNV regions in
untreated samples (U-*Dd2*, in yellow text); high-confidence CNV regions in treated samples (T-*Dd2*, in white text). Central number
(grey): CNV regions consistent across all samples and calling methods (includes 2 known CNVs and 2 de novo CNVs, **Table S5**). **B**.
Summary of number of high-confidence (HC) CNV regions in untreated (U-*Dd2*) and treated (T-*Dd2*) samples including duplication
(Dup), deletion (Del), and mixed calls (sub-regions were called as duplications and deletions across a single CNV region by the
same CNV calling method, i.e. HapCNV or LUMPY). **C**. Chromosomal location of high-confidence CNV regions identified by both
HapCNV and LUMPY methods (green) from untreated (black) and treated (red) parasites. Only core regions of the genome are
included in the representation; subtelomeric regions as defined by Otto, et al. were omitted. Each CNV region was increased in
length by a factor of 2 to facilitate visualization relative to the rest of the genome. *, de novo high-confidence CNV regions
identified in both untreated and treated samples. **D**. Panther classification system v19 protein class comparison. Top chart:
protein classes from all annotated *P. falciparum* genes. Bottom charts: protein classes represented by high-confidence CNV
regions in untreated (U-*Dd2*) and treated (T-*Dd2*) samples. UC: unclassified proteins (green). Other colors are randomly assigned
by the program to represent diverse protein classes.
666

We also identified the proposed boundaries for the start and end of high-confidence CNV regions (termed

"breakpoints") and assessed their properties. Although CNV calling methods vary in their ability to

precisely call CNV breakpoints (93), we were interested in whether these sequences shared characteristics

with *P. falciparum* those identified using conventional methods (i.e. high AT content and nearby stable

DNA secondary structures, (40)).). Overall, we found that features of breakpoints from high-confidence

CNVs (12 for untreated and 66 for treated conditions, **Table S6**) were consistent with what was previously

reported. Most breakpoints (>75%) had nearby stable secondary structures predicted to form hairpins

with an average free energy of folding of -7 to -8 kcal/mol (depending on the treatment, **Table S6**). Most

of these regions were situated in intergenic areas of the genome (56% for untreated and 75% for treated).

The breakpoint regions also exhibited a higher AT-content compared to the genomic average (85-86%,

Table S6, versus 80.6% genome-wide (41)). Based on breakpoint positions, we estimated the size of the

high-confidence CNV regions; in general, this list represented relatively large regions (>4kb) that had the

potential to cover multiple genes (maximum of 115kb, average of 23kb, **Table S6**).

High-confidence de novo CNVs represented diverse cellular pathways with potential clinical benefits

When we searched for genes that are covered by these regions, we identified 26 genes (across 3 de novo

CNV regions) and 198 genes (across 37 de novo CNV regions) in untreated and treated *Dd2* samples,

respectively (**Table S5**). Genes encompassed by the CNV regions represented diverse protein classes (**Fig.**

3D) and no gene ontology (GO) categories were significantly enriched in this list of genes (using an FDR

adjusted p value of 0.05, **Table S7**). Along with the distribution across the genome (**Fig. 3C**), the lack of GO

term enrichment emphasizes the random nature of the de novo CNVs and the absence of selection during

sample preparation.

High-confidence CNV regions encompassed genes that were previously reported as important for clinical

malaria infections (**Table 4**). Several genes play essential roles in transmission of the parasite from the

human blood to the mosquito and back. We identified CNV regions that included genes for two TRAP-

related proteins, CTRP and S6, which are important for infection of the mosquito midgut and salivary

glands, respectively (94,95). Additionally, CNV regions encompassed two PHIST genes (Pfg14-744 and 748)

that are important for early gametocyte development (96,97). We detected CNV regions covering 3 genes

important for liver stage development including two genetically-attenuated vaccine candidates, UIS3 and

SLARP (98-101); the latter of which achieved equivalent protection levels to whole sporozoite vaccines

(PfSPZ-GA1, (102,103)). Two CNV regions carried genes important for replication of the erythrocytic stage

(SEA1 and eif4A) and another two for virulence and antigen expression (PTP6 and SURFIN 14.1). One CNV

region encompassed an aminophospholipid transporter previously identified as important for artemisinin

resistance in a GWAS study (104). Finally, some of the genes from high confidence CNV regions were

shown to be essential in the erythrocytic stage transposon mutagenesis screen (Pfg14-744, Pfg14-748,

eif4A, and PTP6), indicating their multiple important roles across the parasite developmental cycle.

Table 4. High-confidence CNV regions with clinical importance.

Gene ID	DUP/DEL	Chrom.	Product description	Clinical importance	Citation
PF3D7_0315200	DUP	3	circumsporozoite- and TRAP-related protein (CTRP)	transmission	(94)
PF3D7_0315600	DUP	3	male development protein (MD3)	transmission	(105)
PF3D7_1403800	DUP	14	nuclear formin-like protein MISFIT	transmission	(106)
PF3D7_1442600	DUP	14	TRAP-like protein (S6)	transmission	(95)
PF3D7_1477700*	DEL	14	Plasmodium exported protein, PHISTa (Pfg14-748)	transmission**	(96,97)
PF3D7_1477300*	DEL	14	Plasmodium exported protein, PHIST (Pfg14-744)	transmission**	(96,97)
PF3D7_1474900	DEL	14	trailer hitch homolog (CITH)	transmission^	(107)
PF3D7_1223700	DEL	12	vacuolar iron transporter (VIT)	liver stage ^	(108)
PF3D7_1147000	DEL	11	sporozoite and liver stage asparagine-rich protein (SLARP)	liver stage	(99,100)
PF3D7_1302200	DEL	13	upregulated in infectious sporozoites 3 (UIS3)	liver stage	(98,101)
PF3D7_1021800	DUP	10	schizont egress antigen-1 (SEA1)	erythrocytic stage replication***	(109)
PF3D7_1468700*	DEL	14	eukaryotic initiation factor 4A (eif4A, PfH45)	erythrocytic stage replication	(110,111)
PF3D7_1302000*	DEL	13	EMP1-trafficking protein (PTP6)	virulence	(112)
PF3D7_1477600	DEL	14	surface-associated interspersed protein 14.1 (SURFIN 14.1)	antigen#	(113)
PF3D7_1468600	DEL	14	aminophospholipid transporter/flippase	drug resistance^^	(104)

705   *Essential in erythrocytic stage parasites based on MIS score <0.3 ((76), as reported in PlasmdDB (77)).
706   **While essential in erythrocytic parasites, these genes are expressed during early gametocytogenesis and categorized as
707   impactful for transmission to mosquitos.

715
716

As a final analysis, we evaluated whether genes from high-confidence CNV regions specifically from our

treated samples have been detected in parasites from clinical infections. We performed this analysis by

searching the largest catalogue of clinically relevant CNVs to date; this list of high-frequency CNVs was

previously called using genomes from 2855 parasite isolates from 21 malaria-endemic countries and

represented genes from larger (>300bp), high-quality, core genome variants (38). Assuming ~5000 genes

in the core *P. falciparum* genome (58), we found that genes from the two lists were ~2-times more likely

to overlap than by chance (chi-square odds ratio of 2.5, Fisher's exact p value <0.0001 for HapCNV-treated

CNV list and 1.6, 0.03 for LUMPY-treated CNV list). Therefore, stress-induced de novo CNVs have the

potential to be beneficial in the clinical environment.

726
727

DISCUSSION

Low-input genomics for studying de novo CNVs

Non-parental or "de novo" CNVs are not detected when analyzing a population of parasites predominantly

because their signal (e.g. extra reads that align to that region or reads that span breakpoints) is negated

by the overwhelming signal from normal copy number at that genome location. For this reason,

assessments of fewer cells are necessary to investigate de novo CNV generation. While de novo CNVs

have been previously tracked using flow cytometry of single yeast genomes (23), this sensitive approach

provides a limited view of CNV dynamics by focusing on few specific loci that express fluorescent

reporters. Inferring gene copy number through single cell transcriptomics can identify Mb-sized structural

changes across genomes from heterogeneous tumor samples (117-120) but this approach is not

applicable for smaller sized de novo CNVs. Single-cell genomics, where individual genomes are isolated

and amplified to a level that can be sequenced, has been used to directly quantify de novo CNV rates in

brain tissue, cancer cells, and *Leishmania* parasites (121-128). Early single-cell genomics studies of *P.*

falciparum have been promising but so far have had limited success with CNV identification (42,129,130).

Here, we optimized a low-input analysis pipeline and successfully isolated, amplified, and sequenced *P.*

falciparum samples for CNV analysis. With experimental and computational improvements, we were able

to increase our rate of parental, or "known", CNV calling over our prior study (42). Importantly, we

detected de novo CNVs across the parasite genome and replication stress significantly increased their rate

of formation. By analyzing ~45 low-input samples per condition, we are limited to observing a subset of

the population. However, this study is one of few that have directly assessed de novo CNVs in microbes

and our findings demonstrate that replication stress readily drives the rapid generation of de novo CNVs

in an important pathogen. Below, we cover the rationale behind our experimental/analysis choices and

integrate our findings into an overarching model of *P. falciparum* adaptation.

Application of stress without evidence of selection to explore CNV dynamics

To evaluate the impact of replication stress on de novo CNV generation, we applied treatment to parasites

just prior to replication. We observed replication stall and then resume post-treatment, which provided

evidence that we successfully applied sub-lethal stress (**Figs. 1D**, **S1**, and **S2**). Following this step, we

allowed the parasites to complete replication and reinvade new erythrocytes; we reasoned that this

"recovery phase" enabled the repair of the resulting DNA damage, which is likely to be replication-

dependent (reviewed in (1,131). Additionally, reinvasion facilitated the isolation of haploid parasite

genomes (1n, **Fig. 1A**), encouraging the detection of de novo CNVs due to limited contrasting signal (26).

Because of the reinvasion step, which involves an expansion in parasite number (~3-fold, **Fig. 1D**), there

was potential to select for beneficial DNA changes across the population of parasites. However, we did

not detect evidence of strong selection from SNP profiles (**Fig. S10A**) or high-confidence CNV regions (**Fig.**

3, **Table S5**). Specifically, we did not observe an enrichment of CNVs that encompassed the *pfdhodh* gene,

which contributes directly to DSM1 resistance (132), or genes from DNA-related pathways (**Table S7**).

While studies of numerous microbes observe CNVs arise under strong selective conditions like nutrient

starvation or drug treatment (as for *Saccharomyces* yeast: (5,133,134), *Salmonella* bacteria: reviewed in

(135), as well as *Plasmodium*: (132,136-142)), we now show that mild, transient conditions can stimulate

CNVs that have the potential to increase parasite survival.

Relative comparison using multiple CNV calling methods to appreciate the impact of stress

De novo CNV estimates using single cell methods from yeast, neurons, and human cancer cells vary greatly

and are difficult to standardize due to the use of different experimental techniques and CNV calling

methods (23,24,143). For these reasons, we are not attempting to compare the rate of *P. falciparum* CNV

formation from this study to those from other organisms. Additionally, this lack of standardization in the

field led us to use two distinct CNV calling methods in our analysis. Due to the strengths and weaknesses

of HapCNV and LUMPY, we observed differences in both known (**Fig. 2B**) and de novo CNV (**Table S4**)

calling using the two methods. LUMPY identifies reads that cover breakpoint regions to sensitively detect

CNVs (70); because we are counting regions with few reads as support, both sensitivity and the number

of false positives are high in this analysis. High known calling rates along with high numbers of de novo

CNVs in our studies exemplified this feature of LUMPY. On the other hand, HapCNV uses a genome-specific

pseudo-reference for normalization, which removes repeated patterns of over-and under-amplification

((44) and *Materials and Methods*); because we require read coverage to span 3 consecutive 1kb bins,

small CNVs in lower coverage genomic neighborhoods are excluded in HapCNV analysis. This limited the

detection of smaller known amplicons (*pf11-1* and *pf332*), led to fewer de novo CNV calls using this

method, and likely contributed to the larger size of high-confidence CNVs (**Table S6**). Given the high

abundance of small CNVs (<300bp) in the parasite genome (38,144), HapCNV is likely underestimating the

impact of small CNVs in our study.

Ultimately, the value of our study is in the relative comparison of treated and untreated samples. During

sample preparation, we acknowledge that the apparent 3-fold difference in amplification efficiencies

between untreated and treated sample groups (**Fig. S6**) could compromise this comparison. In order to

prevent cross-contamination, 2-cell samples were sorted into different plates and consequently, they

were amplified separately. Although separated by just a few days (see *Materials and Methods*), alterations

in reagent performance from batch to batch could contribute to differences in amplification efficiency.

Additionally, we speculate that there may have been a general under-quantification of the treated *Dd2*

plate; we increased the amount of each sample sequenced by 4-fold to compensate for low DNA amounts

and ended up achieving ~4-fold higher coverage levels for treated samples (**Table 2**). This under-

quantification is supported by our ddPCR assays, where samples with small amounts of quantified DNA

still yielded abundant PCR positive droplets (**Fig. S7D**), indicating adequate *P. falciparum* genome

amplification for this round. Because sequencing quality was similar between sample groups (**Table 2**, CV

and mapping quality), downsampled data showed a consistent result with analyses using all data (**Figs. 2**,

S11, and **S12**), and treatment had a consistent impact on CNV categories using two distinct CNV calling

programs (**Table 3** & **Fig. S12B**), we are confident that coverage differences are not dramatically impacting

our overall conclusions.

During our analysis, we assumed that false positive CNVs occur at a similar rate across both treated and

untreated groups (within each CNV caller and coverage level), which allowed us to confidently assess the

impact of stress despite some experimental variation. Variations in known and de novo CNV calling

described above emphasize that no CNV calling method is perfect and combining them can improve

confidence in results (42,145-147). Therefore, we investigated de novo CNV patterns using the two

individual methods (**Figs. 2**, **S11**, & **S12**) as well as those that overlapped between HapCNV and LUMPY

(**Fig. 3**, **Table S5**). Importantly, these "high-confidence" CNVs reflected increases after stress previously

detected using the individual tools, albeit at a greater level (~3- versus 12-fold increase). Additionally, we

speculate that newly arising CNVs would have distinct locations across samples; thus, the rare nature and

unique locations of high-confidence CNVs emphasized their potential to be novel (**Table S5**).

De novo CNV categories highlighting existing and novel genome variation

During our investigations, we identified two types of de novo CNVs; those detected in one or a few

genomes (rare, <10%) and those detected in more than a few (common, >10%). While others have used

these CNV categories (73), there is no precedence for them in the context of *Plasmodium* biology (i.e. a

haploid parasite with asynchronous replication and schizogeny (148)). However, we propose that tracking

these categories helps us to understand the biological relevance of de novo CNVs in our analysis.

Based on their frequency, common CNVs are either artifacts of low-input procedures/CNV analysis or

represent minor variants that preexisted in the population or arose early in the replication cycle. For the

former, bias during the whole genome amplification step (i.e. the repeated pattern of over/under-

amplification that occurs in a reproducible pattern across the parasite genome (42)) and PCR during library

construction have the potential to skew gene copy number and increase the false positive rate (149,150).

However, we chose experimental and computational methods designed to limit the contribution of

amplification bias. First, MALBAC amplification itself limits the over-amplification of certain genomic

regions by avoiding exponential amplification at the earliest steps (149) and we used limited PCR cycles

during library preparation (3 cycles, (42)). These efforts are most clearly shown through the reduction in

CV following MALBAC optimization in both of our studies (by ~39% after modifying the amplification

primer (42) and by 43% after switching to the *Bsu* polymerase, **Table S1**). Second, LUMPY is not dependent

on read coverage and HapCNV specifically addresses amplification artifacts by removing repeated signal

present in all samples (44,70). Overall, we detected few CNVs with conserved genomic locations across

low-input samples, which provides evidence that our methods limit the effect of amplification bias on the

results; we only identified two high-confidence CNV regions that had conserved locations across multiple

Dd2 and *FCR3* 2-cell samples (**Fig. 3C**, **Table S5**). In the future, amplification-free methods (151), or

visualization of single long-reads (49,152), may offer advantages in distinguishing amplification bias from

minor variants and de novo CNVs.

Rare CNVs, on the other hand, represent either random noise or true signal from novel CNVs arising in the

genome. We assert that most noise is removed through normalization procedures, especially with

HapCNV, and the impact of remaining false positives are minimized by the relative comparison of our

studies (see above). We identified the majority of rare CNVs in unique genome locations across sample

types, providing evidence that they are not a result of amplification bias where the same CNVs are

repeatedly detected in each sample. Additionally, the greater impact of stress on rare CNVs than common

CNVs (**Table 3** and **Figs. 2F, 2G**) supports their replication dependence. The random nature of de novo

CNVs, as well as the capacity to encompass any gene across the genome, ensures that CNVs can alter all

aspects of parasite biology in response to the host environment. Further, our finding that stress-induced

de novo CNVs tended to exhibit altered copy number in clinical isolates combined with the high frequency

of unique CNVs in previous genome-wide CNV studies (32,38), directly illustrate the expansive

evolutionary potential of this pathogen.

Adaptations that encourage de novo CNV formation

The current model of CNV formation in asexual erythrocytic *P. falciparum* parasites is that AT-rich

sequences form hairpins, disrupt replication, and eventually lead to double-strand breaks that are

repaired by error-prone pathways (40). The evolution of CNVs in this organism is especially interesting

because of its unique genome architecture and alternative repertoire of CNV-generating repair pathways

(41,153). Although they arise at many locations across the genome ((30,31,38), **Fig. 3C**), *P. falciparum*

CNVs that contribute to adaptation are commonly gene duplications with a relatively simple structure.

Many impactful duplications form in tandem head-to-tail orientation ((40,132,142,154), **Fig. 4A**), which is

likely due to a limited repertoire of DNA repair pathways; *P. falciparum* lacks the canonical

nonhomologous end-joining (NHEJ) pathway that is a major contributor to CNV formation in other

organisms (1,153). Instead, parasites use pathways that employ varying lengths of sequencing homology

(i.e. homologous recombination, or HR, and microhomology-mediated repair, **Fig. 4B**). This repair

repertoire, along with an especially high AT-content genome that facilitates CNV formation (40,132), and

a lack of cell cycle checkpoints that control replication forks during times of stress (reviewed in (155)),

likely represent adaptations that assist haploid *P. falciparum* parasites in accumulating CNVs across their

genome (**Fig. 4A**). One major question that remains is whether these same processes are active in other

rapidly replicating parasite stages such as oocysts in the mosquito midgut or schizonts in the human liver.

Figure 4: Potential connection between replication stress, DNA repair, and CNV generation in the malaria genome. **A**.
Adaptations that encourage CNV formation in the *P. falciparum* genome (underlined, (40)). **B**. Proposed model of how replication
stress can impact DNA repair pathways based on prior studies (HR, homologous recombination; NHEJ, non-homologous end-

joining; MMEJ, microhomology-mediated end joining; MMBIR, microhomology-mediated break-induced repair; DSB, double-
strand breaks). Model is suggested based on studies showing 1) stress can lead to reduction of RAD51 and increased DSBs reduced
HR activity (156,157), 2) stress can trigger pathways that use microhomology sequences for DNA repair (158,159), and 3) *P.*
falciparum uses microhomologous sequences to generate CNVs (40). **C.** Potential benefits of a diverse parasite population for
evolutionary potential. Stress elevates the frequency of de novo CNVs across the population, which leads to more rapid evolution
of beneficial CNVs (blue cells).

Updating the model of P. falciparum genome adaptation

In conjunction with previous studies in other organisms, our findings in *P. falciparum* support the

connection between replication stress, DNA repair, and CNV generation (**Fig. 4B**). Studies from bacteria

to cancer cells have shown that stress can either alter levels of proteins essential for HR-based repair or

increase the frequency of DNA breaks (159). In cancer cells, hypoxic stress causes a decrease in HR activity

(156) and this may lead to an increased reliance on alternative error-prone pathways to repair DNA

damage (160). In bacteria (158,161), starvation drives initial amplification steps at microhomologous

sequences. The nature, degree, and timing of applied stress likely matter because some studies also show

the dose-dependent induction of HR proteins under some conditions (162). Studying these processes in

P. falciparum under various conditions will be particularly important due to the lack of NHEJ repair (see

Adaptations that encourage de novo CNV formation); when NHEJ is deficient in cancer cells, DNA repair

becomes more error-prone and contributes to CNV formation (163,164).

Prior to the current study, the predominant evidence connecting DNA repair and CNV generation in *P.*

falciparum was the detection of microhomology-mediated pathway signatures in CNV breakpoints (40).

Microhomology-mediated pathways require less homology and therefore, are more likely to interact with

diverse sequences up- and downstream of a DNA break to generate various length CNVs. Our current

observation of stress-induced de novo CNV formation (**Table 3** and **Fig. 2H**) further supports this model.

We originally set out to understand how sub-lethal antimalarial treatment impacts CNV generation

because this is a condition that the parasite encounters during clinical infection (165). However, because

this compound targets pyrimidine biosynthesis and its impacts mirror aphidicolin treatment (**Fig. S1**), we

speculate that the effects we observed are likely due to replication inhibition. Our result is consistent with

studies on diverse organisms, like humans, mice, and flies, where replication stress leads to CNV formation

(20-22,166,167). Interestingly, the degree of de novo CNV stimulation is also consistent across these

studies; we detected a ~3-fold increase in *P. falciparum* de novo CNVs (**Table 3**) compared to a ~3-5-fold

increase in mammalian de novo CNVs (20-22). Compared to this work, our study highlights that despite

the smaller genome and divergent biology of *Plasmodium*, as well as the use of different experimental

approaches, there are likely conserved processes that increase genetic diversity under stress. Future

studies will address gaps in knowledge including assessment of conditions that stimulate the *P. falciparum*

adaptive amplification response, the timing of this response, and the requirement and regulation of

specific mechanistic players.

Support for adaptive amplification in microbial populations

The experimental evolution approach to evaluate the impact of selective conditions on microbial

populations across relatively long time scales has provided many insights that include the important role

of gene amplification in genomic diversity (e.g. (5,134)). In bacteria, the term "adaptive amplification" was

established to describe how environmental conditions can induce genetic change to help cells adapt to

stress (161). De novo CNVs have been directly investigated in bacteria and *Leishmania* parasites using

single read assessments and single-cell isolation, respectively (128,152); to our knowledge, prior studies

have not assessed the effect of non-selective short-term conditions on de novo CNV rates in microbes. By

continuing to improve genome amplification and CNV detection methods, we anticipate that future

studies of genome dynamics will lead to new insight on how stress stimulates microbial evolution.

Already, studies from a variety or organisms are showing that an increased rate of CNV formation can

have an impact on a population of organisms; if beneficial under specific conditions, a CNV that arises in

a single genome can expand during selection into a larger population of cells with novel characteristics

(135,168). This rapid expansion is exemplified when minor bacterial populations with higher gene copy

numbers confer "heteroresistance" during clinical antibiotic selection (152,169-171). In another example,

higher levels of intra-tumor heterogeneity in gene copy number predict a poorer cancer prognosis

(127,172,173).

For *Plasmodium*, even with a change in the copy number of a single region per parasite, the genomic

diversity within a single infected human is expansive due to the sheer numbers of parasites (estimated to

reach 10^8 parasites when symptomatic and $>10^{11}$ in severe *P. falciparum* infection (174)). This diversity

can provide an obvious advantage as a heterogeneous population prepares asexual parasites to respond

to diverse stressors (**Fig. 4C**). While our current studies point to a role of adaptive amplification in *P.*

falciparum, we do note a low level of de novo CNVs across the parasite genome under normal conditions

(**Fig. 2D** and **S12A**). Since some antimalarials act rapidly (81), some level of de novo CNVs already present

in a few parasites across the population would increase the chances of survival during drug treatment. It

is also important to understand how parasites respond to stressful environments during infection,

including changes in nutrient composition in different hosts, drug treatment during symptomatic

infection, or attack from the human immune system. While the current study focused on one antimalarial

compound, it will be important for future studies to evaluate the impact of other sources of stress on *P.*

falciparum CNV formation. For example, hypoxia stimulates CNV formation in cancer cells (156) and a

proteotoxic drug stimulates genetic change in yeast (175). As a eukaryotic microbe, *P. falciparum* occupies

special niche that can be exploited as a model to study eukaryotic mechanisms of stress-induced genome

dynamics.

Clinical implications & future questions

P. falciparum causes the majority of malaria deaths worldwide and readily acquires antimalarial resistance

(176,177). Resistance-conferring CNVs that encompass multiple genes have been identified in clinical

infections (30,38,178-182). While a gene from one of our high-confidence CNVs may contribute to

artemisinin resistance, we also identified genes that participate in many processes important for malaria

transmission and infection (**Table 4**). This observation combined with the diverse genome location and

protein classes represented (**Fig. 3**) illustrates the enormous adaptive potential of the *P. falciparum*

genome.

Despite their direct contributions to various phenotypes, CNVs may also facilitate the acquisition of point

mutations in haploid *P. falciparum*; strong evidence for the close relationship comes from the observation

of point mutations *within* amplifications selected in vitro (137,139,142,183,184). Once de novo CNVs form

during replication of the asexual erythrocytic stage (**Fig. 4**), meiotic recombination during the sexual phase

in the mosquito can streamline beneficial CNVs to balance fitness costs (68). Given the importance of

CNVs in *P. falciparum* adaptation, it is not surprising that this organism has evolved strategies to

encourage CNV formation (as described in *Adaptations that encourage de novo CNV formation*).

Additionally, parasites from specific regions of the world may have an increased propensity to develop

drug resistance (185). Evaluating whether the CNV rate correlates with the parasite background will help

to define the evolutionary potential of this successful pathogen.

Antimalarial therapies and vaccines targeting the *Plasmodium* parasite are in danger due to drug

resistance and access challenges (186,187). A strategy to impede genome evolution may be required to

control malaria infections. "Evolution-proof" therapies have been explored in response to antibiotic and

anticancer resistance (reviewed in (188,189)). Of particular note is a recent study targeting NHEJ repair to

prevent resistance in melanoma cell lines (190). While antimalarial combination therapies were originally

suggested to limit recrudescence following artemisinin-based drug treatment (191), the parasite has

gained CNV-based strategies to overcome partner drugs ((181,182) and reviewed in (192)). Therefore,

identifying and targeting unique aspects of *Plasmodium* biology that facilitate CNV formation (e.g. DNA

repair, AT-dependent mechanisms, or replication control) may limit parasite evolution and increase

treatment efficacy.

Data Availability

The source code for the BLAST pipeline and SVCROWS can be accessed at https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.29885879 and https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.29099801.v1.

Short read data is available at NCBI Sequence Reads Archives under project PRJNA1201106.

Supplementary Data are available at *NAR* Online

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. John Campbell for the use of the Mosquito LV instrument and assay reagents for the colorimetric assessment of the SH800. We would also like to thank Dr. Ali Guler for statistical consultation and Dr. Heidi Seears from the University of Virginia Department of Biology Genomics Core Facility for sequencing assistance. We also thank the Vector and Eukaryotic Pathogen Genomics Database Resource (VEuPathDB) and specifically PlasmoDB (https://plasmodb.org) for hosting data used in some aspects of this study.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (1R01AI150856 to J.L.G.); and the National Science Foundation (NRT-ROL 2021791 to N.J.B.).

References

1. Hastings, P.J., Lupski, J.R., Rosenberg, S.M. and Ira, G. (2009) Mechanisms of change in gene copy number. *Nat Rev Genet*, **10**, 551-564.
2. Lauer, S. and Gresham, D. (2019) An evolving view of copy number variants. *Curr Genet*.
3. Pos, O., Radvanszky, J., Buglyo, G., Pos, Z., Rusnakova, D., Nagy, B. and Szemes, T. (2021) DNA copy number variation: Main characteristics, evolutionary significance, and pathological aspects. *Biomed J*, **44**, 548-559.
4. Roth, J.R. (2011) The joys and terrors of fast adaptation: new findings elucidate antibiotic resistance and natural selection. *Mol Microbiol*, **79**, 279-282.

5.   Payen, C., Di Rienzi, S.C., Ong, G.T., Pogachar, J.L., Sanchez, J.C., Sunshine, A.B., Raghuraman,
M.K., Brewer, B.J. and Dunham, M.J. (2014) The dynamics of diverse segmental amplifications in
populations of Saccharomyces cerevisiae adapting to strong selection. *G3 (Bethesda)*, **4**, 399-
409.
6.   Elde, N.C., Child, S.J., Eickbush, M.T., Kitzman, J.O., Rogers, K.S., Shendure, J., Geballe, A.P. and
Malik, H.S. (2012) Poxviruses deploy genomic accordions to adapt rapidly against host antiviral
defenses. *Cell*, **150**, 831-841.
7.   Leary, R.J., Lin, J.C., Cummins, J., Boca, S., Wood, L.D., Parsons, D.W., Jones, S., Sjoblom, T., Park,
B.H., Parsons, R. *et al.* (2008) Integrated analysis of homozygous deletions, focal amplifications,
and sequence alterations in breast and colorectal cancers. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, **105**, 16224-
16229.
8.   Beroukhim, R., Mermel, C.H., Porter, D., Wei, G., Raychaudhuri, S., Donovan, J., Barretina, J.,
Boehm, J.S., Dobson, J., Urashima, M. *et al.* (2010) The landscape of somatic copy-number
alteration across human cancers. *Nature*, **463**, 899-905.
9.   Zhang, L., Yuan, Y., Lu, K.H. and Zhang, L. (2016) Identification of recurrent focal copy number
variations and their putative targeted driver genes in ovarian cancer. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **17**,
222.
10.   Peng, H., Lu, L., Zhou, Z., Liu, J., Zhang, D., Nan, K., Zhao, X., Li, F., Tian, L., Dong, H. *et al.* (2019)
CNV Detection from Circulating Tumor DNA in Late Stage Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Patients.
Genes (Basel), **10**, 926.
11.   Gonzalez, E., Kulkarni, H., Bolivar, H., Mangano, A., Sanchez, R., Catano, G., Nibbs, R.J.,
Freedman, B.I., Quinones, M.P., Bamshad, M.J. *et al.* (2005) The influence of CCL3L1 gene-
containing segmental duplications on HIV-1/AIDS susceptibility. *Science*, **307**, 1434-1440.
12.   Sebat, J., Lakshmi, B., Malhotra, D., Troge, J., Lese-Martin, C., Walsh, T., Yamrom, B., Yoon, S.,
Krasnitz, A., Kendall, J. *et al.* (2007) Strong association of de novo copy number mutations with
autism. *Science*, **316**, 445-449.
13.   Glessner, J.T., Bradfield, J.P., Wang, K., Takahashi, N., Zhang, H., Sleiman, P.M., Mentch, F.D.,
Kim, C.E., Hou, C., Thomas, K.A. *et al.* (2010) A genome-wide study reveals copy number variants
exclusive to childhood obesity cases. *Am J Hum Genet*, **87**, 661-666.
14.   Olsson, L.M. and Holmdahl, R. (2012) Copy number variation in autoimmunity--importance
hidden in complexity? *Eur J Immunol*, **42**, 1969-1976.
15.   Butchbach, M.E. (2016) Copy Number Variations in the Survival Motor Neuron Genes:
Implications for Spinal Muscular Atrophy and Other Neurodegenerative Diseases. *Front Mol
Biosci*, **3**, 7.
16.   Sekar, A., Bialas, A.R., de Rivera, H., Davis, A., Hammond, T.R., Kamitaki, N., Tooley, K.,
Presumey, J., Baum, M., Van Doren, V. *et al.* (2016) Schizophrenia risk from complex variation of
complement component 4. *Nature*, **530**, 177-183.
17.   Zekavat, S.M., Ruotsalainen, S., Handsaker, R.E., Alver, M., Bloom, J., Poterba, T., Seed, C., Ernst,
J., Chaffin, M., Engreitz, J. *et al.* (2018) Deep coverage whole genome sequences and plasma
lipoprotein(a) in individuals of European and African ancestries. *Nat Commun*, **9**, 2606.
18.   Farashi, S. and Harteveld, C.L. (2018) Molecular basis of alpha-thalassemia. *Blood Cells Mol Dis*,
70, 43-53.
19.   Wisniowiecka-Kowalnik, B. and Nowakowska, B.A. (2019) Genetics and epigenetics of autism
spectrum disorder-current evidence in the field. *J Appl Genet*, **60**, 37-47.
20.   Arlt, M.F., Mulle, J.G., Schaibley, V.M., Ragland, R.L., Durkin, S.G., Warren, S.T. and Glover, T.W.
(2009) Replication stress induces genome-wide copy number changes in human cells that
resemble polymorphic and pathogenic variants. *Am J Hum Genet*, **84**, 339-350.

21.   Arlt, M.F., Ozdemir, A.C., Birkeland, S.R., Wilson, T.E. and Glover, T.W. (2011) Hydroxyurea
induces de novo copy number variants in human cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, **108**, 17360-
17365.
22.   Arlt, M.F., Rajendran, S., Birkeland, S.R., Wilson, T.E. and Glover, T.W. (2012) De novo CNV
formation in mouse embryonic stem cells occurs in the absence of Xrcc4-dependent
nonhomologous end joining. *PLoS Genet*, **8**, e1002981.
23.   Lauer, S., Avecilla, G., Spealman, P., Sethia, G., Brandt, N., Levy, S.F. and Gresham, D. (2018)
Single-cell copy number variant detection reveals the dynamics and diversity of adaptation. *PLoS*
Biol, **16**, e3000069.
24.   Oketch, D.J.A., Giulietti, M. and Piva, F. (2023) Copy Number Variations in Pancreatic Cancer:
From Biological Significance to Clinical Utility. *Int J Mol Sci*, **25**, 391.
25.   Yi, D., Nam, J.W. and Jeong, H. (2023) Toward the functional interpretation of somatic structural
variations: bulk- and single-cell approaches. *Brief Bioinform*, **24**, 297.
26.   Macaulay, I.C. and Voet, T. (2014) Single cell genomics: advances and future perspectives. *PLoS*
Genet, **10**, e1004126.
27.   Wang, Y. and Navin, N.E. (2015) Advances and applications of single-cell sequencing
technologies. *Mol Cell*, **58**, 598-609.
28.   Gawad, C., Koh, W. and Quake, S.R. (2016) Single-cell genome sequencing: current state of the
science. *Nat Rev Genet*, **17**, 175-188.
29.   Wang, X., Chen, H. and Zhang, N.R. (2018) DNA copy number profiling using single-cell
sequencing. *Brief Bioinform*, **19**, 731-736.
30.   Kidgell, C., Volkman, S.K., Daily, J., Borevitz, J.O., Plouffe, D., Zhou, Y., Johnson, J.R., Le Roch, K.,
Sarr, O., Ndir, O. *et al.* (2006) A systematic map of genetic variation in Plasmodium falciparum.
PLoS Pathog, **2**, e57.
31.   Ribacke, U., Mok, B.W., Wirta, V., Normark, J., Lundeberg, J., Kironde, F., Egwang, T.G., Nilsson,
P. and Wahlgren, M. (2007) Genome wide gene amplifications and deletions in Plasmodium
falciparum. *Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology*, **155**, 33-44.
32.   Cheeseman, I., Gomez-Escobar, N., Carret, C., Ivens, A., Stewart, L., Tetteh, K. and Conway, D.
(2009) Gene copy number variation throughout the Plasmodium falciparum genome. *BMC*
Genomics, **10**, 353.
33.   Bopp, S.E., Manary, M.J., Bright, A.T., Johnston, G.L., Dharia, N.V., Luna, F.L., McCormack, S.,
Plouffe, D., McNamara, C.W., Walker, J.R. *et al.* (2013) Mitotic evolution of Plasmodium
falciparum shows a stable core genome but recombination in antigen families. *PLoS Genet*, **9**,
e1003293.
34.   Gendrot, M., Fawaz, R., Dormoi, J., Madamet, M. and Pradines, B. (2019) Genetic diversity and
deletion of Plasmodium falciparum histidine-rich protein 2 and 3: a threat to diagnosis of P.
falciparum malaria. *Clin Microbiol Infect*, **25**, 580-585.
35.   Matesanz, F., Tellez, M. and Alcina, A. (2003) The Plasmodium falciparum fatty acyl-CoA
synthetase family (PfACS) and differential stage-specific expression in infected erythrocytes. *Mol*
Biochem Parasitol, **126**, 109-112.
36.   Dankwa, S., Lim, C., Bei, A.K., Jiang, R.H., Abshire, J.R., Patel, S.D., Goldberg, J.M., Moreno, Y.,
Kono, M., Niles, J.C. *et al.* (2016) Ancient human sialic acid variant restricts an emerging zoonotic
malaria parasite. *Nat Commun*, **7**, 11187.
37.   Price, R.N., Uhlemann, A.-C., Brockman, A., McGready, R., Ashley, E., Phaipun, L., Patel, R., Laing,
K., Looareesuwan, S., White, N.J. *et al.* (2004) Mefloquine resistance in Plasmodium falciparum
and increased pfmdr1 gene copy number. *The Lancet*, **364**, 438-447.

38. Ravenhall, M., Benavente, E.D., Sutherland, C.J., Baker, D.A., Campino, S. and Clark, T.G. (2019)
An analysis of large structural variation in global Plasmodium falciparum isolates identifies a
novel duplication of the chloroquine resistance associated gene. *Sci Rep*, **9**, 8287.
39. Heinberg, A., Siu, E., Stern, C., Lawrence, E.A., Ferdig, M.T., Deitsch, K.W. and Kirkman, L.A.
(2013) Direct evidence for the adaptive role of copy number variation on antifolate susceptibility
in Plasmodium falciparum. *Mol Microbiol*, **88**, 702-712.
40. Huckaby, A.C., Granum, C.S., Carey, M.A., Szlachta, K., Al-Barghouthi, B., Wang, Y.H. and Guler,
J.L. (2019) Complex DNA structures trigger copy number variation across the Plasmodium
falciparum genome. *Nucleic acids research*, **47**, 1615-1627.
41. Gardner, M.J., Hall, N., Fung, E., White, O., Berriman, M., Hyman, R.W., Carlton, J.M., Pain, A.,
Nelson, K.E., Bowman, S. *et al.* (2002) Genome sequence of the human malaria parasite
Plasmodium falciparum. *Nature*, **419**, 498-511.
42. Liu, S., Huckaby, A.C., Brown, A.C., Moore, C.C., Burbulis, I., McConnell, M.J. and Guler, J.L.
(2021) Single-cell sequencing of the small and AT-skewed genome of malaria parasites. *Genome
Med*, **13**, 75.
43. Brown, N., Danis, C., Ahmedjanova, V. and Guler, J.L. (2025) SVCROWS: A User-Defined Tool for
Interpreting Significant Structural Variants in Heterogeneous Datasets. *bioRxiv*.
44. Yu, X., Qin, F., Liu, S., Brown, N.J., Lu, Q., Cai, G., Guler, J.L. and Xiao, F. (2025) HapCNV: A
Comprehensive Framework for CNV Detection in Low-input DNA Sequencing Data. *bioRxiv*.
45. Galhardo, R.S., Hastings, P.J. and Rosenberg, S.M. (2007) Mutation as a stress response and the
regulation of evolvability. *Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol*, **42**, 399-435.
46. Arlt, M.F., Wilson, T.E. and Glover, T.W. (2012) Replication stress and mechanisms of CNV
formation. *Curr Opin Genet Dev*, **22**, 204-210.
47. Glover, T.W., Wilson, T.E. and Arlt, M.F. (2017) Fragile sites in cancer: more than meets the eye.
Nat Rev Cancer, **17**, 489-501.
48. McDaniels, J.M., Huckaby, A.C., Carter, S.A., Lingeman, S., Francis, A., Congdon, M., Santos, W.,
Rathod, P.K. and Guler, J.L. (2021) Extrachromosomal DNA amplicons in antimalarial-resistant
Plasmodium falciparum. *Mol Microbiol*, **115**, 574-590.
49. Liu, S., Zulawinska, J., Ebel, E.R., Luniewski, A., Danis, C., Simpson, M.L., Kim, J., Ene, N.,
Braukmann, T.W.A., Congdon, M. *et al.* (2025) Direct long-read visualization reveals hidden
variation in GCH1 gene copy number and precise expansion steps. *BMC Genomics*, **26**, 671.
50. Brown, A.C., Moore, C.C. and Guler, J.L. (2020) Cholesterol-dependent enrichment of
understudied erythrocytic stages of human Plasmodium parasites. *Sci Rep*, **10**, 4591.
51. Rodrigues, O.R. and Monard, S. (2016) A rapid method to verify single-cell deposition setup for
cell sorters. *Cytometry A*, **89**, 594-600.
52. Nam, D., Kim, S., Kim, J.H., Lee, S., Kim, D., Son, J., Kim, D., Cha, B.S., Lee, E.S. and Park, K.S.
(2023) Low-Temperature Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification Operating at Physiological
Temperature. *Biosensors (Basel)*, **13**.
53. Brown, N., da Silva, C., Webb, C., Matias, D., Dias, B., Cancio, B., Silva, M., Viegas, R., Salvador,
C., Chivale, N. *et al.* (2024) Antimalarial resistance risk in Mozambique detected by a novel
quadruplex droplet digital PCR assay. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*, **68**, e0034624.
54. Daniels, R., Ndiaye, D., Wall, M., McKinney, J., Sene, P.D., Sabeti, P.C., Volkman, S.K., Mboup, S.
and Wirth, D.F. (2012) Rapid, field-deployable method for genotyping and discovery of single-
nucleotide polymorphisms associated with drug resistance in Plasmodium falciparum.
Antimicrob Agents Chemother, **56**, 2976-2986.
55. Kassaza, K., Long, A.C., McDaniels, J.M., Andre, M., Fredrickson, W., Nyehangane, D., Orikiriza,
P., Operario, D.J., Bazira, J., Mwanga-Amumpaire, J.A. *et al.* (2021) Surveillance of Plasmodium

falciparum pfcrt haplotypes in southwestern uganda by high-resolution melt analysis. *Malar J*,
20, 114.
56.   Alker, A.P., Mwapasa, V. and Meshnick, S.R. (2004) Rapid real-time PCR genotyping of mutations
associated with sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine resistance in Plasmodium falciparum. *Antimicrob*
Agents Chemother, **48**, 2924-2929.
57.   Chiang, C., Layer, R.M., Faust, G.G., Lindberg, M.R., Rose, D.B., Garrison, E.P., Marth, G.T.,
Quinlan, A.R. and Hall, I.M. (2015) SpeedSeq: ultra-fast personal genome analysis and
interpretation. *Nature methods*, **12**, 966-968.
58.   Otto, T.D., Bohme, U., Sanders, M., Reid, A., Bruske, E.I., Duffy, C.W., Bull, P.C., Pearson, R.D.,
Abdi, A., Dimonte, S. *et al.* (2018) Long read assemblies of geographically dispersed Plasmodium
falciparum isolates reveal highly structured subtelomeres. *Wellcome Open Res*, **3**, 52.
59.   Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis, G.,
Durbin, R. and Genome Project Data Processing, S. (2009) The Sequence Alignment/Map format
and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*, **25**, 2078-2079.
60.   Garcia-Alcalde, F., Okonechnikov, K., Carbonell, J., Cruz, L.M., Gotz, S., Tarazona, S., Dopazo, J.,
Meyer, T.F. and Conesa, A. (2012) Qualimap: evaluating next-generation sequencing alignment
data. *Bioinformatics*, **28**, 2678-2679.
61.   Huang, L., Ma, F., Chapman, A., Lu, S. and Xie, X.S. (2015) Single-Cell Whole-Genome
Amplification and Sequencing: Methodology and Applications. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet*,
16, 79-102.
62.   Chen, C., Xing, D., Tan, L., Li, H., Zhou, G., Huang, L. and Xie, X.S. (2017) Single-cell whole-
genome analyses by Linear Amplification via Transposon Insertion (LIANTI). *Science*, **356**, 189-
194.
63.   Altschul, S.F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E.W. and Lipman, D.J. (1990) Basic local alignment
search tool. *J Mol Biol*, **215**, 403-410.
64.   McKenna, A., Hanna, M., Banks, E., Sivachenko, A., Cibulskis, K., Kernytsky, A., Garimella, K.,
Altshuler, D., Gabriel, S., Daly, M. *et al.* (2010) The Genome Analysis Toolkit: a MapReduce
framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Genome Res*, **20**, 1297-1303.
65.   DePristo, M.A., Banks, E., Poplin, R., Garimella, K.V., Maguire, J.R., Hartl, C., Philippakis, A.A., del
Angel, G., Rivas, M.A., Hanna, M. *et al.* (2011) A framework for variation discovery and
genotyping using next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Nat Genet*, **43**, 491-498.
66.   Van der Auwera, G.A., Carneiro, M.O., Hartl, C., Poplin, R., Del Angel, G., Levy-Moonshine, A.,
Jordan, T., Shakir, K., Roazen, D., Thibault, J. *et al.* (2013) From FastQ data to high confidence
variant calls: the Genome Analysis Toolkit best practices pipeline. *Curr Protoc Bioinformatics*, **43**,
1110.
67.   MalariaGen, Ahouidi, A., Ali, M., Almagro-Garcia, J., Amambua-Ngwa, A., Amaratunga, C.,
Amato, R., Amenga-Etego, L., Andagalu, B., Anderson, T.J.C. *et al.* (2021) An open dataset of
Plasmodium falciparum genome variation in 7,000 worldwide samples. *Wellcome Open Res*, **6**,
42.
68.   Miles, A., Iqbal, Z., Vauterin, P., Pearson, R., Campino, S., Theron, M., Gould, K., Mead, D., Drury,
E., O'Brien, J. *et al.* (2016) Indels, structural variation, and recombination drive genomic diversity
in Plasmodium falciparum. *Genome Res*, **26**, 1288-1299.
69.   Abyzov, A., Urban, A.E., Snyder, M. and Gerstein, M. (2011) CNVnator: an approach to discover,
genotype, and characterize typical and atypical CNVs from family and population genome
sequencing. *Genome Res*, **21**, 974-984.
70.   Layer, R.M., Chiang, C., Quinlan, A.R. and Hall, I.M. (2014) LUMPY: a probabilistic framework for
structural variant discovery. *Genome Biol*, **15**, R84.

71.   Venkatraman, E.S. and Olshen, A.B. (2007) A faster circular binary segmentation algorithm for
1189   the analysis of array CGH data. *Bioinformatics*, **23**, 657-663.
1190   72.   Xiao, F., Niu, Y., Hao, N., Xu, Y., Jin, Z. and Zhang, H. (2017) modSaRa: a computationally efficient
1191   R package for CNV identification. *Bioinformatics*, **33**, 2384-2385.
1192   73.   Jiang, Y., Wang, R., Urrutia, E., Anastopoulos, I.N., Nathanson, K.L. and Zhang, N.R. (2018)
1193   CODEX2: full-spectrum copy number variation detection by high-throughput DNA sequencing.
1194   *Genome Biol*, **19**, 202.
1195   74.   Mi, H., Ebert, D., Muruganujan, A., Mills, C., Albou, L.P., Mushayamaha, T. and Thomas, P.D.
1196   (2021) PANTHER version 16: a revised family classification, tree-based classification tool,
1197   enhancer regions and extensive API. *Nucleic acids research*, **49**, D394-D403.
1198   75.   Singh, G. and Gupta, D. (2022) In-Silico Functional Annotation of Plasmodium falciparum
1199   Hypothetical Proteins to Identify Novel Drug Targets. *Front Genet*, **13**, 821516.
1200   76.   Zhang, M., Wang, C., Otto, T.D., Oberstaller, J., Liao, X., Adapa, S.R., Udenze, K., Bronner, I.F.,
1201   Casandra, D., Mayho, M. *et al.* (2018) Uncovering the essential genes of the human malaria
1202   parasite Plasmodium falciparum by saturation mutagenesis. *Science*, **360**, eaap7847.
1203   77.   Aurrecoechea, C., Brestelli, J., Brunk, B.P., Dommer, J., Fischer, S., Gajria, B., Gao, X., Gingle, A.,
1204   Grant, G., Harb, O.S. *et al.* (2009) PlasmoDB: a functional genomic database for malaria
1205   parasites. *Nucleic acids research*, **37**, D539-543.
1206   78.   Reilly, H.B., Wang, H., Steuter, J.A., Marx, A.M. and Ferdig, M.T. (2007) Quantitative dissection of
1207   clone-specific growth rates in cultured malaria parasites. *Int J Parasitol*, **37**, 1599-1607.
1208   79.   Reilly Ayala, H.B., Wacker, M.A., Siwo, G. and Ferdig, M.T. (2010) Quantitative trait loci mapping
1209   reveals candidate pathways regulating cell cycle duration in Plasmodium falciparum. *BMC
1210   Genomics*, **11**, 577.
1211   80.   Phillips, M.A., Gujjar, R., Malmquist, N.A., White, J., El Mazouni, F., Baldwin, J. and Rathod, P.K.
1212   (2008) Triazolopyrimidine-Based Dihydroorotate Dehydrogenase Inhibitors with Potent and
1213   Selective Activity against the Malaria Parasite Plasmodium falciparum. *Journal of Medicinal
1214   Chemistry*, **51**, 3649-3653.
1215   81.   Sanz, L.M., Crespo, B., De-Cozar, C., Ding, X.C., Llergo, J.L., Burrows, J.N., Garcia-Bustos, J.F. and
1216   Gamo, F.J. (2012) P. falciparum in vitro killing rates allow to discriminate between different
1217   antimalarial mode-of-action. *PloS one*, **7**, e30949.
1218   82.   Inselburg, J. and Banyal, H.S. (1984) Synthesis of DNA during the asexual cycle of Plasmodium
1219   falciparum in culture. *Mol Biochem Parasitol*, **10**, 79-87.
1220   83.   Inselburg, J. and Banyal, H.S. (1984) Plasmodium falciparum: synchronization of asexual
1221   development with aphidicolin, a DNA synthesis inhibitor. *Exp Parasitol*, **57**, 48-54.
1222   84.   Sugino, A. and Nakayama, K. (1980) DNA polymerase alpha mutants from a Drosophila
1223   melanogaster cell line. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, **77**, 7049-7053.
1224   85.   Petermann, E., Orta, M.L., Issaeva, N., Schultz, N. and Helleday, T. (2010) Hydroxyurea-stalled
1225   replication forks become progressively inactivated and require two different RAD51-mediated
1226   pathways for restart and repair. *Mol Cell*, **37**, 492-502.
1227   86.   Mannava, S., Moparthy, K.C., Wheeler, L.J., Natarajan, V., Zucker, S.N., Fink, E.E., Im, M.,
1228   Flanagan, S., Burhans, W.C., Zeitouni, N.C. *et al.* (2013) Depletion of deoxyribonucleotide pools
1229   is an endogenous source of DNA damage in cells undergoing oncogene-induced senescence. *Am
1230   J Pathol*, **182**, 142-151.
1231   87.   Jensen, J.B. and Trager, W. (1978) Plasmodium falciparum in culture: establishment of additional
1232   strains. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*, **27**, 743-746.
1233   88.   Dolan, S.A., Miller, L.H. and Wellems, T.E. (1990) Evidence for a switching mechanism in the
1234   invasion of erythrocytes by Plasmodium falciparum. *J Clin Invest*, **86**, 618-624.

89.   Tian, S., Yan, H., Neuhauser, C. and Slager, S.L. (2016) An analytical workflow for accurate variant
discovery in highly divergent regions. *BMC Genomics*, **17**, 703.
90.   Sanderson, N.D., Swann, J., Barker, L., Kavanagh, J., Hoosdally, S., Crook, D., GonFast
Investigators, G., Street, T.L. and Eyre, D.W. (2020) High precision Neisseria gonorrhoeae variant
and antimicrobial resistance calling from metagenomic Nanopore sequencing. *Genome Res*, **30**,
1354-1363.
91.   Cameron, D.L., Di Stefano, L. and Papenfuss, A.T. (2019) Comprehensive evaluation and
characterisation of short read general-purpose structural variant calling software. *Nat Commun*,
10, 3240.
92.   Gabrielaite, M., Torp, M.H., Rasmussen, M.S., Andreu-Sanchez, S., Vieira, F.G., Pedersen, C.B.,
Kinalis, S., Madsen, M.B., Kodama, M., Demircan, G.S. *et al.* (2021) A Comparison of Tools for
Copy-Number Variation Detection in Germline Whole Exome and Whole Genome Sequencing
Data. *Cancers (Basel)*, **13**.
93.   Kosugi, S., Momozawa, Y., Liu, X., Terao, C., Kubo, M. and Kamatani, Y. (2019) Comprehensive
evaluation of structural variation detection algorithms for whole genome sequencing. *Genome
Biol*, **20**, 117.
94.   Dessens, J.T., Beetsma, A.L., Dimopoulos, G., Wengelnik, K., Crisanti, A., Kafatos, F.C. and Sinden,
R.E. (1999) CTRP is essential for mosquito infection by malaria ookinetes. *EMBO J*, **18**, 6221-
6227.
95.   Steinbuechel, M. and Matuschewski, K. (2009) Role for the Plasmodium sporozoite-specific
transmembrane protein S6 in parasite motility and efficient malaria transmission. *Cell Microbiol*,
11, 279-288.
96.   Eksi, S., Haile, Y., Furuya, T., Ma, L., Su, X. and Williamson, K.C. (2005) Identification of a
subtelomeric gene family expressed during the asexual-sexual stage transition in Plasmodium
falciparum. *Mol Biochem Parasitol*, **143**, 90-99.
97.   Silvestrini, F., Lasonder, E., Olivieri, A., Camarda, G., van Schaijk, B., Sanchez, M., Younis Younis,
S., Sauerwein, R. and Alano, P. (2010) Protein export marks the early phase of
gametocytogenesis of the human malaria parasite Plasmodium falciparum. *Mol Cell Proteomics*,
9, 1437-1448.
98.   Mueller, A.K., Labaied, M., Kappe, S.H. and Matuschewski, K. (2005) Genetically modified
Plasmodium parasites as a protective experimental malaria vaccine. *Nature*, **433**, 164-167.
99.   Silvie, O., Goetz, K. and Matuschewski, K. (2008) A sporozoite asparagine-rich protein controls
initiation of Plasmodium liver stage development. *PLoS Pathog*, **4**, e1000086.
100. van Schaijk, B.C., Ploemen, I.H., Annoura, T., Vos, M.W., Foquet, L., van Gemert, G.J., Chevalley-
Maurel, S., van de Vegte-Bolmer, M., Sajid, M., Franetich, J.F. *et al.* (2014) A genetically
attenuated malaria vaccine candidate based on P. falciparum b9/slarp gene-deficient
sporozoites. *Elife*, **3**, e03582.
101. Real, E., Rodrigues, L., Cabal, G.G., Enguita, F.J., Mancio-Silva, L., Mello-Vieira, J., Beatty, W.,
Vera, I.M., Zuzarte-Luis, V., Figueira, T.N. *et al.* (2018) Plasmodium UIS3 sequesters host LC3 to
avoid elimination by autophagy in hepatocytes. *Nat Microbiol*, **3**, 17-25.
102. Roestenberg, M., Walk, J., van der Boor, S.C., Langenberg, M.C.C., Hoogerwerf, M.A., Janse, J.J.,
Manurung, M., Yap, X.Z., Garcia, A.F., Koopman, J.P.R. *et al.* (2020) A double-blind, placebo-
controlled phase 1/2a trial of the genetically attenuated malaria vaccine PfSPZ-GA1. *Sci Transl
Med*, **12**, eaaz5629.
103. Franke-Fayard, B., Marin-Mogollon, C., Geurten, F.J.A., Chevalley-Maurel, S., Ramesar, J., Kroeze,
H., Baalbergen, E., Wessels, E., Baron, L., Soulard, V. *et al.* (2022) Creation and preclinical
evaluation of genetically attenuated malaria parasites arresting growth late in the liver. *NPJ
Vaccines*, **7**, 139.

104.   Van Tyne, D., Park, D.J., Schaffner, S.F., Neafsey, D.E., Angelino, E., Cortese, J.F., Barnes, K.G.,
1284   Rosen, D.M., Lukens, A.K., Daniels, R.F. *et al.* (2011) Identification and functional validation of
1285   the novel antimalarial resistance locus PF10_0355 in Plasmodium falciparum. *PLoS Genet*, **7**,
1286   e1001383.
1287   105.   Farrukh, A., Musabyimana, J.P., Distler, U., Mahlich, V.J., Mueller, J., Bick, F., Tenzer, S., Pradel,
1288   G. and Ngwa, C.J. (2024) The Plasmodium falciparum CCCH zinc finger protein MD3 regulates
1289   male gametocytogenesis through its interaction with RNA-binding proteins. *Mol Microbiol*, **121**,
1290   543-564.
1291   106.   Bushell, E.S., Ecker, A., Schlegelmilch, T., Goulding, D., Dougan, G., Sinden, R.E., Christophides,
1292   G.K., Kafatos, F.C. and Vlachou, D. (2009) Paternal effect of the nuclear formin-like protein
1293   MISFIT on Plasmodium development in the mosquito vector. *PLoS Pathog*, **5**, e1000539.
1294   107.   Mair, G.R., Lasonder, E., Garver, L.S., Franke-Fayard, B.M., Carret, C.K., Wiegant, J.C., Dirks, R.W.,
1295   Dimopoulos, G., Janse, C.J. and Waters, A.P. (2010) Universal features of post-transcriptional
1296   gene regulation are critical for Plasmodium zygote development. *PLoS Pathog*, **6**, e1000767.
1297   108.   Slavic, K., Krishna, S., Lahree, A., Bouyer, G., Hanson, K.K., Vera, I., Pittman, J.K., Staines, H.M.
1298   and Mota, M.M. (2016) A vacuolar iron-transporter homologue acts as a detoxifier in
1299   Plasmodium. *Nat Commun*, **7**, 10403.
1300   109.   Perrin, A.J., Bisson, C., Faull, P.A., Renshaw, M.J., Lees, R.A., Fleck, R.A., Saibil, H.R., Snijders,
1301   A.P., Baker, D.A. and Blackman, M.J. (2021) Malaria Parasite Schizont Egress Antigen-1 Plays an
1302   Essential Role in Nuclear Segregation during Schizogony. *mBio*, **12**, e03377-03320.
1303   110.   Pradhan, A., Hussain, E.M. and Tuteja, R. (2008) Characterization of replication fork and
1304   phosphorylation stimulated Plasmodium falciparum helicase 45. *Gene*, **420**, 66-75.
1305   111.   Evans, L., Gowers, D., Firman, K. and Youell, J. (2012) Enhanced purification and characterization
1306   of the PfeIF4A (PfH45) helicase from Plasmodium falciparum using a codon-optimised clone.
1307   *Protein Expr Purif*, **85**, 1-8.
1308   112.   Maier, A.G., Rug, M., O'Neill, M.T., Brown, M., Chakravorty, S., Szestak, T., Chesson, J., Wu, Y.,
1309   Hughes, K., Coppel, R.L. *et al.* (2008) Exported proteins required for virulence and rigidity of
1310   Plasmodium falciparum-infected human erythrocytes. *Cell*, **134**, 48-61.
1311   113.   Ajibola, O., Diop, M.F., Ghansah, A., Amenga-Etego, L., Golassa, L., Apinjoh, T.,
1312   Randrianarivelojosia, M., Maiga-Ascofare, O., Yavo, W., Bouyou-Akotet, M. *et al.* (2021) In silico
1313   characterisation of putative Plasmodium falciparum vaccine candidates in African malaria
1314   populations. *Sci Rep*, **11**, 16215.
1315   114.   Raj, D.K., Nixon, C.P., Nixon, C.E., Dvorin, J.D., DiPetrillo, C.G., Pond-Tor, S., Wu, H.W., Jolly, G.,
1316   Pischel, L., Lu, A. *et al.* (2014) Antibodies to PfSEA-1 block parasite egress from RBCs and protect
1317   against malaria infection. *Science*, **344**, 871-877.
1318   115.   Winter, G., Kawai, S., Haeggstrom, M., Kaneko, O., von Euler, A., Kawazu, S., Palm, D.,
1319   Fernandez, V. and Wahlgren, M. (2005) SURFIN is a polymorphic antigen expressed on
1320   Plasmodium falciparum merozoites and infected erythrocytes. *J Exp Med*, **201**, 1853-1863.
1321   116.   Weiner, J. and Kooij, T.W. (2016) Phylogenetic profiles of all membrane transport proteins of the
1322   malaria parasite highlight new drug targets. *Microb Cell*, **3**, 511-521.
1323   117.   Patel, A.P., Tirosh, I., Trombetta, J.J., Shalek, A.K., Gillespie, S.M., Wakimoto, H., Cahill, D.P.,
1324   Nahed, B.V., Curry, W.T., Martuza, R.L. *et al.* (2014) Single-cell RNA-seq highlights intratumoral
1325   heterogeneity in primary glioblastoma. *Science*, **344**, 1396-1401.
1326   118.   Xu, Q.H., Chen, S.H., Hu, Y.B. and Huang, W. (2021) Single-cell RNA transcriptome reveals the
1327   intra-tumoral heterogeneity and regulators underlying tumor progression in metastatic
1328   pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. *Cell Death Discov*, **7**.

119. Gao, R.L., Bai, S.S., Henderson, Y.C., Lin, Y.Y., Schalck, A., Yan, Y., Kumar, T., Hu, M., Sei, E., Davis, A. *et al.* (2021) Delineating copy number and clonal substructure in human tumors from single-cell transcriptomes. *Nature Biotechnology*, **39**, 599-608.

120. Mahdipour-Shirayeh, A., Erdmann, N., Leung-Hagesteijn, C. and Tiedemann, R.E. (2022) sciCNV: high-throughput paired profiling of transcriptomes and DNA copy number variations at single-cell resolution. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, **23**, bbab413.

121. Navin, N., Kendall, J., Troge, J., Andrews, P., Rodgers, L., McIndoo, J., Cook, K., Stepansky, A., Levy, D., Esposito, D. *et al.* (2011) Tumour evolution inferred by single-cell sequencing. *Nature*, **472**, 90-94.

122. McConnell, M.J., Lindberg, M.R., Brennand, K.J., Piper, J.C., Voet, T., Cowing-Zitron, C., Shumilina, S., Lasken, R.S., Vermeesch, J.R., Hall, I.M. *et al.* (2013) Mosaic copy number variation in human neurons. *Science*, **342**, 632-637.

123. Cai, X., Evrony, G.D., Lehmann, H.S., Elhosary, P.C., Mehta, B.K., Poduri, A. and Walsh, C.A. (2014) Single-cell, genome-wide sequencing identifies clonal somatic copy-number variation in the human brain. *Cell Rep*, **8**, 1280-1289.

124. Francis, J.M., Zhang, C.Z., Maire, C.L., Jung, J., Manzo, V.E., Adalsteinsson, V.A., Homer, H., Haidar, S., Blumenstiel, B., Pedamallu, C.S. *et al.* (2014) EGFR variant heterogeneity in glioblastoma resolved through single-nucleus sequencing. *Cancer Discov*, **4**, 956-971.

125. Eirew, P., Steif, A., Khattra, J., Ha, G., Yap, D., Farahani, H., Gelmon, K., Chia, S., Mar, C., Wan, A. *et al.* (2015) Dynamics of genomic clones in breast cancer patient xenografts at single-cell resolution. *Nature*, **518**, 422-426.

126. Rohrback, S., April, C., Kaper, F., Rivera, R.R., Liu, C.S., Siddoway, B. and Chun, J. (2018) Submegabase copy number variations arise during cerebral cortical neurogenesis as revealed by single-cell whole-genome sequencing. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, **115**, 10804-10809.

127. Baslan, T., Kendall, J., Volyanskyy, K., McNamara, K., Cox, H., D'Italia, S., Ambrosio, F., Riggs, M., Rodgers, L., Leotta, A. *et al.* (2020) Novel insights into breast cancer copy number genetic heterogeneity revealed by single-cell genome sequencing. *Elife*, **9**, e51480.

128. Negreira, G.H., Monsieurs, P., Imamura, H., Maes, I., Kuk, N., Yagoubat, A., Van den Broeck, F., Sterkers, Y., Dujardin, J.C. and Domagalska, M.A. (2022) High throughput single-cell genome sequencing gives insights into the generation and evolution of mosaic aneuploidy in Leishmania donovani. *Nucleic acids research*, **50**, 293-305.

129. Nair, S., Nkhoma, S.C., Serre, D., Zimmerman, P.A., Gorena, K., Daniel, B.J., Nosten, F., Anderson, T.J. and Cheeseman, I.H. (2014) Single-cell genomics for dissection of complex malaria infections. *Genome Res*, **24**, 1028-1038.

130. Trevino, S.G., Nkhoma, S.C., Nair, S., Daniel, B.J., Moncada, K., Khoswe, S., Banda, R.L., Nosten, F. and Cheeseman, I.H. (2017) High-Resolution Single-Cell Sequencing of Malaria Parasites. *Genome Biol Evol*, **9**, 3373-3383.

131. Saxena, S. and Zou, L. (2022) Hallmarks of DNA replication stress. *Mol Cell*, **82**, 2298-2314.

132. Guler, J.L., Freeman, D.L., Ahyong, V., Patrapuvich, R., White, J., Gujjar, R., Phillips, M.A., DeRisi, J. and Rathod, P.K. (2013) Asexual populations of the human malaria parasite, Plasmodium falciparum, use a two-step genomic strategy to acquire accurate, beneficial DNA amplifications. *PLoS Pathog*, **9**, e1003375.

133. Dunham, M.J., Badrane, H., Ferea, T., Adams, J., Brown, P.O., Rosenzweig, F. and Botstein, D. (2002) Characteristic genome rearrangements in experimental evolution of Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, **99**, 16144-16149.

134. Gresham, D., Desai, M.M., Tucker, C.M., Jenq, H.T., Pai, D.A., Ward, A., DeSevo, C.G., Botstein, D. and Dunham, M.J. (2008) The repertoire and dynamics of evolutionary adaptations to controlled nutrient-limited environments in yeast. *PLoS Genet*, **4**, e1000303.

135. Sandegren, L. and Andersson, D.I. (2009) Bacterial gene amplification: implications for the
evolution of antibiotic resistance. *Nat Rev Microbiol*, **7**, 578-588.
136. Dharia, N., Sidhu, A., Cassera, M., Westenberger, S., Bopp, S., Eastman, R., Plouffe, D., Batalov,
S., Park, D., Volkman, S. *et al.* (2009) Use of high-density tiling microarrays to identify mutations
globally and elucidate mechanisms of drug resistance in Plasmodium falciparum. *Genome
Biology*, **10**, R21.
137. Rottmann, M., McNamara, C., Yeung, B.K., Lee, M.C., Zou, B., Russell, B., Seitz, P., Plouffe, D.M.,
Dharia, N.V., Tan, J. *et al.* (2010) Spiroindolones, a potent compound class for the treatment of
malaria. *Science*, **329**, 1175-1180.
138. Ross, L.S., Gamo, F.J., Lafuente-Monasterio, M.J., Singh, O.M., Rowland, P., Wiegand, R.C. and
Wirth, D.F. (2014) In Vitro Resistance Selections for Plasmodium falciparum Dihydroorotate
Dehydrogenase Inhibitors Give Mutants with Multiple Point Mutations in the Drug-binding Site
and Altered Growth. *J Biol Chem*, **289**, 17980-17995.
139. Phillips, M.A., Lotharius, J., Marsh, K., White, J., Dayan, A., White, K.L., Njoroge, J.W., El Mazouni,
F., Lao, Y., Kokkonda, S. *et al.* (2015) A long-duration dihydroorotate dehydrogenase inhibitor
(DSM265) for prevention and treatment of malaria. *Sci Transl Med*, **7**, 296ra111.
140. Cowell, A. and Winzeler, E. (2018) Exploration of the Plasmodium falciparum Resistome and
Druggable Genome Reveals New Mechanisms of Drug Resistance and Antimalarial Targets.
Microbiol Insights, **11**.
141. Rocamora, F., Zhu, L., Liong, K.Y., Dondorp, A., Miotto, O., Mok, S. and Bozdech, Z. (2018)
Oxidative stress and protein damage responses mediate artemisinin resistance in malaria
parasites. *PLoS Pathog*, **14**, e1006930.
142. Luth, M.R., Godinez-Macias, K.P., Chen, D., Okombo, J., Thathy, V., Cheng, X., Daggupati, S.,
Davies, H., Dhingra, S.K., Economy, J.M. *et al.* (2024) Systematic in vitro evolution in Plasmodium
falciparum reveals key determinants of drug resistance. *Science*, **386**, eadk9893.
143. Evrony, G.D., Lee, E., Park, P.J. and Walsh, C.A. (2016) Resolving rates of mutation in the brain
using single-neuron genomics. *Elife*, **5**, e12966.
144. Mills, R.E., Walter, K., Stewart, C., Handsaker, R.E., Chen, K., Alkan, C., Abyzov, A., Yoon, S.C., Ye,
K., Cheetham, R.K. *et al.* (2011) Mapping copy number variation by population-scale genome
sequencing. *Nature*, **470**, 59-65.
145. Zhao, M., Wang, Q., Wang, Q., Jia, P. and Zhao, Z. (2013) Computational tools for copy number
variation (CNV) detection using next-generation sequencing data: features and perspectives.
BMC Bioinformatics, **14 Suppl 11**, S1.
146. Guan, P. and Sung, W.K. (2016) Structural variation detection using next-generation sequencing
data: A comparative technical review. *Methods*, **102**, 36-49.
147. Gabrielaite, M., Torp, M.H., Rasmussen, M.S., Andreu-Sanchez, S., Vieira, F.G., Pedersen, C.B.,
Kinalis, S., Madsen, M.B., Kodama, M., Demircan, G.S. *et al.* (2021) A Comparison of Tools for
Copy-Number Variation Detection in Germline Whole Exome and Whole Genome Sequencing
Data. *Cancers (Basel)*, **13**, 6283.
148. Arnot, D.E., Ronander, E. and Bengtsson, D.C. (2011) The progression of the intra-erythrocytic
cell cycle of Plasmodium falciparum and the role of the centriolar plaques in asynchronous
mitotic division during schizogony. *Int J Parasitol*, **41**, 71-80.
149. Zong, C., Lu, S., Chapman, A.R. and Xie, X.S. (2012) Genome-wide detection of single-nucleotide
and copy-number variations of a single human cell. *Science*, **338**, 1622-1626.
150. Lasken, R.S. (2013) Single-cell sequencing in its prime. *Nat Biotechnol*, **31**, 211-212.
151. Laks, E., McPherson, A., Zahn, H., Lai, D., Steif, A., Brimhall, J., Biele, J., Wang, B., Masud, T., Ting,
J. *et al.* (2019) Clonal Decomposition and DNA Replication States Defined by Scaled Single-Cell
Genome Sequencing. *Cell*, **179**, 1207-1221 e1222.

152. Kupke, J., Brombach, J., Fang, Y., Wolf, S.A., Thrukonda, L., Ghazisaeedi, F., Kuropka, B., Hanke,
D., Semmler, T., Nordholt, N. *et al.* (2025) Heteroresistance in Enterobacter cloacae complex
caused by variation in transient gene amplification events. *NPJ Antimicrob Resist*, **3**, 13.
153. Kirkman, L.A., Lawrence, E.A. and Deitsch, K.W. (2014) Malaria parasites utilize both
homologous recombination and alternative end joining pathways to maintain genome integrity.
Nucleic acids research, **42**, 370-379.
154. Triglia, T., Foote, S.J., Kemp, D.J. and Cowman, A.F. (1991) Amplification of the multidrug
resistance gene pfmdr1 in Plasmodium falciparum has arisen as multiple independent events.
Mol. Cell. Biol., **11**, 5244-5250.
155. Matthews, H., Duffy, C.W. and Merrick, C.J. (2018) Checks and balances? DNA replication and
the cell cycle in Plasmodium. *Parasit Vectors*, **11**, 216.
156. Bindra, R.S., Schaffer, P.J., Meng, A., Woo, J., Maseide, K., Roth, M.E., Lizardi, P., Hedley, D.W.,
Bristow, R.G. and Glazer, P.M. (2004) Down-regulation of Rad51 and decreased homologous
recombination in hypoxic cancer cells. *Mol Cell Biol*, **24**, 8504-8518.
157. Saleh-Gohari, N., Bryant, H.E., Schultz, N., Parker, K.M., Cassel, T.N. and Helleday, T. (2005)
Spontaneous homologous recombination is induced by collapsed replication forks that are
caused by endogenous DNA single-strand breaks. *Mol Cell Biol*, **25**, 7158-7169.
158. Slack, A., Thornton, P.C., Magner, D.B., Rosenberg, S.M. and Hastings, P.J. (2006) On the
mechanism of gene amplification induced under stress in Escherichia coli. *PLoS Genet*, **2**, e48.
159. Hastings, P.J., Ira, G. and Lupski, J.R. (2009) A microhomology-mediated break-induced
replication model for the origin of human copy number variation. *PLoS Genet*, **5**, e1000327.
160. Valerie, K. and Povirk, L.F. (2003) Regulation and mechanisms of mammalian double-strand
break repair. *Oncogene*, **22**, 5792-5812.
161. Hastings, P.J., Bull, H.J., Klump, J.R. and Rosenberg, S.M. (2000) Adaptive amplification: an
inducible chromosomal instability mechanism. *Cell*, **103**, 723-731.
162. Cole, G.M., Schild, D., Lovett, S.T. and Mortimer, R.K. (1987) Regulation of RAD54- and RAD52-
lacZ gene fusions in Saccharomyces cerevisiae in response to DNA damage. *Mol Cell Biol*, **7**,
1078-1084.
163. Raghavan, D., Shipley, W.U., Garnick, M.B., Russell, P.J. and Richie, J.P. (1990) Biology and
management of bladder cancer. *N Engl J Med*, **322**, 1129-1138.
164. Bentley, J., Diggle, C.P., Harnden, P., Knowles, M.A. and Kiltie, A.E. (2004) DNA double strand
break repair in human bladder cancer is error prone and involves microhomology-associated
end-joining. *Nucleic acids research*, **32**, 5249-5259.
165. White, N.J. (2013) Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic considerations in antimalarial dose
optimization. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*, **57**, 5792-5807.
166. Durkin, S.G., Ragland, R.L., Arlt, M.F., Mulle, J.G., Warren, S.T. and Glover, T.W. (2008)
Replication stress induces tumor-like microdeletions in FHIT/FRA3B. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*,
105, 246-251.
167. Chen, L., Zhou, W., Zhang, C., Lupski, J.R., Jin, L. and Zhang, F. (2015) CNV instability associated
with DNA replication dynamics: evidence for replicative mechanisms in CNV mutagenesis. *Hum
Mol Genet*, **24**, 1574-1583.
168. Craven, S.H. and Neidle, E.L. (2007) Double trouble: medical implications of genetic duplication
and amplification in bacteria. *Future Microbiol*, **2**, 309-321.
169. Hjort, K., Nicoloff, H. and Andersson, D.I. (2016) Unstable tandem gene amplification generates
heteroresistance (variation in resistance within a population) to colistin in Salmonella enterica.
Mol Microbiol, **102**, 274-289.
170. Anderson, S.E., Sherman, E.X., Weiss, D.S. and Rather, P.N. (2018) Aminoglycoside
Heteroresistance in Acinetobacter baumannii AB5075. *mSphere*, **3**, e00271-00218.

171. Nicoloff, H., Hjort, K., Levin, B.R. and Andersson, D.I. (2019) The high prevalence of antibiotic heteroresistance in pathogenic bacteria is mainly caused by gene amplification. *Nat Microbiol*, **4**, 504-514.

172. van Dijk, E., van den Bosch, T., Lenos, K.J., El Makrini, K., Nijman, L.E., van Essen, H.F.B., Lansu, N., Boekhout, M., Hageman, J.H., Fitzgerald, R.C. *et al.* (2021) Chromosomal copy number heterogeneity predicts survival rates across cancers. *Nat Commun*, **12**, 3188.

173. Sobral, D., Martins, M., Kaplan, S., Golkaram, M., Salmans, M., Khan, N., Vijayaraghavan, R., Casimiro, S., Fernandes, A., Borralho, P. *et al.* (2022) Genetic and microenvironmental intra-tumor heterogeneity impacts colorectal cancer evolution and metastatic development. *Commun Biol*, **5**, 937.

174. White, N.J. (2017) Malaria parasite clearance. *Malar J*, **16**, 88.

175. Shor, E., Fox, C.A. and Broach, J.R. (2013) The yeast environmental stress response regulates mutagenesis induced by proteotoxic stress. *PLoS Genet*, **9**, e1003680.

176. WHO. (2023) World Malaria Report 2023.

177. Okombo, J. and Fidock, D.A. (2025) Towards next-generation treatment options to combat Plasmodium falciparum malaria. *Nat Rev Microbiol*, **23**, 178-191.

178. Wilson, C., Serrano, A., Wasley, A., Bogenschutz, M., Shankar, A. and Wirth, D. (1989) Amplification of a gene related to mammalian mdr genes in drug-resistant Plasmodium falciparum. *Science*, **244**, 1184-1186.

179. Nair, S., Nash, D., Sudimack, D., Jaidee, A., Barends, M., Uhlemann, A.-C, Krishna, S., Nosten, F. and Anderson, T.J.C. (2007) Recurrent Gene Amplification and Soft Selective Sweeps during Evolution of Multidrug Resistance in Malaria Parasites. *Mol Biol Evol*, **24**, 562-573.

180. Ravenhall, M., Benavente, E.D., Mipando, M., Jensen, A.T., Sutherland, C.J., Roper, C., Sepulveda, N., Kwiatkowski, D.P., Montgomery, J., Phiri, K.S. *et al.* (2016) Characterizing the impact of sustained sulfadoxine/pyrimethamine use upon the Plasmodium falciparum population in Malawi. *Malar J*, **15**, 575.

181. Leroy, D., Macintyre, F., Adoke, Y., Ouoba, S., Barry, A., Mombo-Ngoma, G., Ndong Ngomo, J.M., Varo, R., Dossou, Y., Tshefu, A.K. *et al.* (2019) African isolates show a high proportion of multiple copies of the Plasmodium falciparum plasmepsin-2 gene, a piperaquine resistance marker. *Malar J*, **18**, 126.

182. Bopp, S., Magistrado, P., Wong, W., Schaffner, S.F., Mukherjee, A., Lim, P., Dhorda, M., Amaratunga, C., Woodrow, C.J., Ashley, E.A. *et al.* (2018) Plasmepsin II-III copy number accounts for bimodal piperaquine resistance among Cambodian Plasmodium falciparum. *Nat Commun*, **9**, 1769.

183. Thaithong, S., Ranford-Cartwright, L.C., Siripoon, N., Harnyuttanakorn, P., Kanchanakhan, N.S., Seugorn, A., Rungsihirunrat, K., Cravo, P.V. and Beale, G.H. (2001) Plasmodium falciparum: gene mutations and amplification of dihydrofolate reductase genes in parasites grown in vitro in presence of pyrimethamine. *Exp Parasitol*, **98**, 59-70.

184. Istvan, E.S., Dharia, N.V., Bopp, S.E., Gluzman, I., Winzeler, E.A. and Goldberg, D.E. (2011) Validation of isoleucine utilization targets in Plasmodium falciparum. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, **108**, 1627-1632.

185. Rathod, P.K., McErlean, T. and Lee, P.C. (1997) Variations in frequencies of drug resistance in Plasmodium falciparum. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, **94**, 9389-9393.

186. Olawade, D.B., Wada, O.Z., Ezeagu, C.N., Aderinto, N., Balogun, M.A., Asaolu, F.T. and David-Olawade, A.C. (2024) Malaria vaccination in Africa: A mini-review of challenges and opportunities. *Medicine (Baltimore)*, **103**, e38565.

187. Theodoridis, L. and Carvalho, T.G. (2025) Antimalarial drug resistance and drug discovery: learning from the past to innovate the future. *Int J Parasitol Drugs Drug Resist*, **28**, 100602.

188.   Bell, G. and MacLean, C. (2018) The Search for 'Evolution-Proof' Antibiotics. *Trends Microbiol*,
26, 471-483.
189.   Zhang, L., Ma, J., Liu, L., Li, G., Li, H., Hao, Y., Zhang, X., Ma, X., Chen, Y., Wu, J. *et al.* (2023)
Adaptive therapy: a tumor therapy strategy based on Darwinian evolution theory. *Crit Rev Oncol*
Hematol, **192**, 104192.
190.   Dharanipragada, P., Zhang, X., Liu, S., Lomeli, S.H., Hong, A., Wang, Y., Yang, Z., Lo, K.Z., Vega-
Crespo, A., Ribas, A. *et al.* (2023) Blocking Genomic Instability Prevents Acquired Resistance to
MAPK Inhibitor Therapy in Melanoma. *Cancer Discov*, **13**, 880-909.
191.   Li, G.Q., Arnold, K., Guo, X.B., Jian, H.X. and Fu, L.C. (1984) Randomised comparative study of
mefloquine, qinghaosu, and pyrimethamine-sulfadoxine in patients with falciparum malaria.
Lancet, **2**, 1360-1361.
192.   Siddiqui, F.A., Liang, X. and Cui, L. (2021) Plasmodium falciparum resistance to ACTs: Emergence,
mechanisms, and outlook. *Int J Parasitol Drugs Drug Resist*, **16**, 102-118.
1534