3D Reconstruction of Dinoflagellate Chromosomes from Hi-C Data Challenges the Cholesteric Liquid Crystal Hypothesis

Authors: Lucas Philipp[1], Georgi K. Marinov[2], Stephen Todd[3,4], Stephanie C. Weber[1,5,*]

Affiliation: [1]Quantitative Life Sciences Program, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, [2]Department of Genetics, Stanford University, Palo Alto, USA, [3]Department of Computing, Goldsmiths, University of London, London, United Kingdom, [4]London Geometry Ltd., London, United Kingdom, [5]Departments of Biology and Physics, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: steph.weber@mcgill.ca

ORCID IDs:

Lucas Philipp: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6454-4275

Georgi K. Marinov: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1822-7273

Stephen Todd: N/A

Stephanie C. Weber: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7297-2875

Keywords

dinoflagellate | chromosome conformation capture | transcription | topologically associating domain | cholesteric liquid crystal

Abstract

Dinoflagellates have permanently condensed chromosomes that are often described as liquid crystalline. Specifically, a Cholesteric Liquid Crystal (CLC) model was proposed in which DNA is organized into parallel fibers within stacked discs, such that the fiber orientation rotates by a constant angle between adjacent discs. Extrachromosomal loops extending from the discs were hypothesized to be more accessible and thus to contain transcriptionally active genes. Although the CLC model

captures some features of dinoflagellate chromosome structure, its validity has not been rigorously

tested against modern genomic data. Here, we use chromatin conformation capture (Hi-C) data to

simulate 3D conformations of chromosome scaffolds for three dinoflagellate species: *Fugacium*

kawagutii, *Symbiodinium microadriaticum*, and *Breviolum minutum*. Consensus and population-based

modeling generate diverse polymer conformations with moderate orientational and nematic order.

However, we find no evidence of cholesteric discs. Moreover, contact probability curves from

empirical Hi-C data are inconsistent with the CLC model. Nevertheless, we show that introducing

locus-specific boundaries into the CLC model can produce simulated Hi-C contact maps with

topologically associating domains (TADs), which are observed in experimental Hi-C contact maps for

these species. Finally, by mapping RNA-seq data onto our simulated conformations, we show that

actively transcribed genes are present throughout entire chromosomes, and not exclusively on

extrachromosomal loops or at the surface. Our results challenge the long-standing CLC model and

suggest that dinoflagellate chromosomes are organized into condensed but non-crystalline structures

that do not impede transcription.

Introduction

Dinoflagellates are a diverse group of unicellular algae whose chromosomes remain highly

condensed throughout the cell cycle [1]. How this unusual chromosome structure impacts gene

expression is a long-standing question, since compact chromatin domains typically exclude RNA

polymerase [2, 3] and suppress transcription [4] in other eukaryotes. The leading hypothesis to

explain both the unique structure of dinoflagellate chromosomes and its consequences for

transcription is the cholesteric liquid crystal (CLC) model. Originally proposed over fifty years ago,

the CLC model posits that DNA is packaged into a series of flat discs that stack to form the long axis

of the chromosome [5]. Within each disc, chromatin fibers are arranged parallel to a director that

rotates by a constant angle between discs [6-9]. The CLC geometry is consistent with banding

patterns observed in 2D transmission electron micrographs [5, 6]. In addition, extrachromosomal

loops, described previously as 3D protrusions from the chromosome core, were hypothesized to

connect both adjacent and non-adjacent discs and to contain transcriptionally-active genes, due to

their presumed greater accessibility compared to the condensed chromosome core [5-8, 10-15].

However, the validity of the CLC model and its predictions for the spatial organization of

transcription have not been rigorously tested against modern genomic data.

Chromosome conformation capture (Hi-C) is an experimental sequencing technique that

measures which regions of primary DNA sequence contact each other in three-dimensional space. Hi-

C analysis of several dinoflagellate species [16-18] revealed topologically associating domains

(TADs), regions of primary sequence that interact with each other at much higher probabilities than

with other chromosomal regions. These "dinoTADs" correlate with another common feature of

dinoflagellate genomes, tandem arrays of co-oriented genes [19-22]. Indeed, the insulation boundaries

that separate dinoTADs occur at locations where two oppositely-oriented gene arrays converge [16,

17]. Moreover, these boundaries are disrupted by transcription inhibitors, suggesting that active

transcription may contribute to dinoTAD formation. Nevertheless, it remains unclear whether

dinoTADs correspond to cholesteric discs and whether the CLC model is consistent with Hi-C data

more generally [23].

Various computational methods have been developed to reconstruct 3D polymer conformations

from Hi-C data [24, 25]. In the consensus modelling approach, all Hi-C-derived constraints are

applied to a single conformation and contact probability is inversely related to spatial distance

between a particular pair of monomers [25-29]. By contrast, in population-based modelling, contacts

are distributed across many individual conformations in a population [30-32]. In this case, contact

probability corresponds to the fraction of conformations in which a particular monomer pair is

constrained to be in close proximity. Consensus modelling is fast and efficient, and therefore suitable

for surveying hundreds of genomic regions across multiple species. Population-based modelling is

computationally more expensive, but explicitly considers conformational heterogeneity which may

result in polymer conformations that more closely reflect those found in individual cells [33, 34].

In this article, we use previously published Hi-C data [16-18] and both consensus [26] and

population-based [32] modeling tools to simulate 3D conformations of chromosome scaffolds from

three dinoflagellate species: *Fugacium kawagutii* (formerly known as *Symbiodinium kawagutii* [35]),

Symbiodinium microadriaticum and *Breviolum minutum*. Surprisingly, our results indicate that

dinoflagellate chromosomes are not organized into a stack of cholesteric discs as predicted by the

CLC model. Rather, they contain multiple compact domains, and exhibit more orientational and

nematic order than expected by chance, but less than CLCs. By mapping RNA-seq reads [36-38] onto

our simulated polymer conformations, we find that active genes are located throughout chromosomes

and not solely at their surfaces. This distribution suggests that although dinoflagellate chromosomes

are highly condensed, they remain accessible to RNA polymerase. Our findings clarify important

aspects of dinoflagellate chromosome structure and resolve a long-standing question as to how this

structure relates to transcriptional activity.

Results

87
The CLC model does not produce TADs

The CLC model consists of a stack of cholesteric discs (Fig. 1 A) [5-9]. Within each disc, the

chromatin fiber weaves back and forth in a parallel fashion. The director, along which the fiber is

oriented, rotates by a constant angle, θ, between adjacent discs, thereby defining the cholesteric pitch.

To compare the CLC model to empirical Hi-C data [16-18], we generated a population of 10^6 CLC

structures to approximate the number of cells sequenced in a typical bulk Hi-C experiment [39]

(Methods). We assumed that discs were arranged consecutively in the stack, in the same order as in

primary sequence (Fig. 1 A). To introduce conformational heterogeneity, we randomly incorporated

extrachromosomal loops that extend outward from the stack of discs and re-enter either the same disc

(intra-disc loops) or an adjacent disc (inter-disc loops) (Fig. 1 B). The length of each

extrachromosomal loop was drawn from an exponential distribution. The variable positions and

lengths of extrachromosomal loops resulted in variable locations of cholesteric discs along the

primary sequence of individual CLC structures in the population (Supplementary Fig. S1 A).

We simulated a Hi-C contact map from our population of CLC structures and found a grid-like

pattern, with stripes of high contact probability that are parallel to each other and perpendicular to the

central diagonal (Fig. 1 C). The number and spacing of stripes are determined by the number and

diameter of cholesteric discs in the input structures (Supplementary Fig. S1 B, S2 A, B). The grid-like

pattern is robust to changes in CLC model parameters, such as the percentage of total sequence in

extrachromosomal loops, the cholesteric pitch, and the tapering of disc diameter at the top and bottom

of the stack (Supplementary Fig. S2 C, D, E). However, variation of the number of cholesteric discs

per structure within the same population results in a blurring of the stripes (Supplementary Fig. S2 F).

The simulated Hi-C contact maps from CLC populations (Fig. 1 C, Supplementary Fig. S2) are

qualitatively different from empirical Hi-C contact maps from the dinoflagellates *F. kawagutii* and *S.*

microadriaticum [16-18] (Fig. 1 F, top right triangles). The most striking difference is the lack of

TADs. Indeed, quantitative TAD metrics such as the insulation score [40] and directionality index

[31] smoothly oscillate with a constant period for CLCs, while they vary irregularly and abruptly for

dinoflagellate chromosomes (Supplementary Fig. S3). Overall, Hi-C contact maps from the CLC

model are only modestly predictive of experimental data, with Pearson correlation coefficients $r =$

0.62 for *F. kawagutii* and $r = 0.59$ *S. microadriaticum*. These results indicate that the CLC model does

not produce TADs, which are the dominant structural feature of dinoflagellates chromosomes [16-18].

Dinoflagellate chromosomes lack cholesteric discs

Next, we computed the 3D conformation(s) of dinoflagellate chromosomes that best reproduce

empirical Hi-C contact probabilities. To mitigate algorithm bias [42], we used both consensus and

population-based modeling approaches. First, we applied the CSynth software package [26], which

incorporates Hi-C contacts as spring-like forces between monomers that serve to constrain their

positions and outputs a single consensus conformation (Methods). After validation (see SI Text), we

used CSynth to simulate conformations for all *F. kawagutii* (Supplementary Fig. S4, Supplementary

Table S1) and *S. microadriaticum* (Supplementary Fig. S5, Supplementary Table S2) chromosome

scaffolds at 5 kb per monomer resolution. Second, we implemented the Integrative Genome Modeling

(IGM) software package [32], which uses maximum likelihood estimation to generate a population of

conformations that is statistically consistent with bulk Hi-C data. We used IGM to simulate a

population of 100 conformations for the first (largest) chromosome scaffold from *F. kawagutii*

(Supplementary Fig. S6) and *S. microadriaticum* (Supplementary Fig. S7), also at 5 kb per monomer

resolution.

In contrast to the CLC model (Fig. 1 A, B), we found that 3D conformations of dinoflagellate

chromosomes lack cholesteric discs (Fig. 1 D, E). Instead, consensus conformations are compact and

ellipsoidal (Fig. 1 D, Supplementary Figs. S4, S5), while population-based conformations can be

elongated or spherical, with multiple compact domains and long extrachromosomal loops (Fig. 1 E,

Supplementary Figs. S6, S7). We observed few extrachromosomal loops in consensus conformations

– 0.63 per chromosome in *F. kawagutii* (Supplementary Fig. S4) and 1.8 per chromosome in *S.*

microadriaticum (Supplementary Fig. S5) – but many more in the population-based conformations –

2.5 per conformation in *F. kawagutii* (Supplementary Fig. S6) and 2.9 per conformation in *S.*

microadriaticum (Supplementary Fig. S7). Extrachromosomal loops were previously reported to be

30-60 kb in length [43], corresponding to 6-12 monomers per loop in our simulations. Therefore, the

apparent sparseness of extrachromosomal loops in our consensus conformations is not due to limited

resolution.

We next simulated Hi-C contact maps from our population-based (IGM) conformations of

chromosome 1 for both species and found squares along the central diagonal, rather than a grid (Fig. 1

F, bottom left triangles). This pattern is consistent with dinoTADs [16-18]. Moreover, quantitative

comparison of these contact maps with the experimental input data showed strong correlation ($r =$

0.91 for *F. kawagutii*, $r = 0.84$ for *S. microadriaticum*) (Fig. 1 F).

Finally, we simulated chromosome conformations for a third dinoflagellate species, *B. minutum*.

While Hi-C data are available [17], they only cover an estimated 39% of the genome, compared to

79% for *F. kawagutii* and 64% for *S. microadriaticum* (Supplementary Table S3). Since *B. minutum*

scaffolds may not correspond to full chromosomes, we selected the 10 largest Hi-C scaffolds for

reconstruction (Supplementary Table S4). Consensus modeling generated spherical conformations

with numerous extrachromosomal loops (5.3 loops per scaffold) (Supplementary Fig. S8 A), in

contrast to the ellipsoidal conformations with few loops seen for *F. kawagutii* and *S. microadriaticum*

(Fig. 1 D, Supplementary Fig. S4, S5). These conformational differences between species may be due

to incomplete scaffolds, rather than true structural differences in *B. minutum* chromosomes.

Interestingly, in this species, population-based modeling generated similar conformations, with

spherical shapes and many extrachromosomal loops (3.7 loops per conformation) (Supplementary

Fig. S8 B). As for the other two species, we found strong correlation ($r = 0.93$) between Hi-C contact

maps simulated from our IGM population and observed for *B. minutum* [17] (Supplementary Fig. S8

C), which both exhibit TAD-like squares rather than CLC-like stripes. Overall, our polymer

simulations suggest that dinoflagellate chromosomes are not organized into stacks of cholesteric

discs.

Locus-specific boundaries can recapitulate TADs in CLCs

In mammalian cells, TADs arise from loop extrusion — which leads to conformational

heterogeneity among cells (and over time) — with locus-specific boundaries [34, 44-46]. To

determine whether the CLC model is compatible with TADs, we grouped cholesteric discs according

to observed dinoTAD sizes [16] and introduced locus-specific boundaries in between groups. The

order of discs was randomly permuted within each group but not between groups (Fig. 2 A). The

simulated Hi-C contact map for CLCs with disc order permuted within groups shows squares of high

contact probability along the central diagonal (Fig. 2 B), which are characteristic of TADs. Indeed, the

insulation score and directionality index vary more irregularly and abruptly than for CLCs with

consecutive disc order (Supplementary Fig. S3). Therefore, the presence of locus-specific boundaries,

together with conformational heterogeneity across the population, can recapitulate TADs in CLCs.

Nevertheless, the correlation with the experimental *S. microadriaticum* contact map is only slightly

better for CLCs with groups of permuted disc order ($r = 0.67$) than for CLCs with consecutive discs (r

$= 0.59$, Fig. 1 C, F).

To visualize dinoTADs in our simulated chromosome conformations, we developed a manual

TAD annotation tool within the CSynth graphical user interface. This tool allows the user to select the

apex of a TAD with a mouse click and then automatically writes the left and right TAD boundary

base-pair coordinates to a text file (Fig. 2 C, Methods). As with the rest of CSynth, this tool runs in a

web browser and does not require any software installation [26]. Moreover, it can be used to annotate

TADs in hundreds of chromosomes in less than a few hours. These TAD annotations can be used to

visualize multiple TADs in distinct colors on the same 3D conformation (Fig. 2 D, Methods). Our

manual TAD annotation tool has many advantages over existing automatic TAD annotators, which

can be sensitive to parameter choice, involve lengthy computation times, require installation, or may

not support integrated visualization of their output [47].

We used this new tool to annotate dinoTADs in Hi-C datasets [16-18]. A majority of the genome

— 84% in *F. kawagutii* and 71% in *S. microadriaticum*, comparable to other eukaryotes [48, 49] — is

organized into dinoTADs, which are located throughout our CSynth conformations but not in a

regular arrangement or stack (Fig. 2 D). Similarly, dinoTADs in IGM conformations are not groups of

cholesteric discs and exhibit diverse shapes depending on the conformation (Fig. 2 E). Therefore,

although the CLC model can be made consistent with TADs, our 3D polymer conformations suggest

that dinoTADs are not groups of cholesteric discs.

Dinoflagellate contact probability curves are inconsistent with CLC model predictions

Contact probability curves are often used to describe chromosome organizational features [50].

This metric quantifies how frequently any two DNA loci, separated by a fixed amount of primary

sequence, make contact in 3D space. Mathematically, contact probability can be written as

$P(s = |i - j| \times 5 \text{ kb}) \propto \sum_{|i-j| \times 5 \text{ kb} = s} \frac{CP_{ij}}{L-s} \propto s^{\gamma}$ where $\sum_{|i-j| \times 5 \text{ kb} = s} CP_{ij}$ is the sum of Hi-C

contact probabilities for all monomer pairs (i, j) separated by $s = |i - j| \times 5$ kb, L is the chromosome

length, and γ is the contact probability decay exponent. The exact proportionality depends on the Hi-

C normalization procedure. The decay exponent can be compared across species and to predictions

from various models [50]. One such model is the equilibrium globule, constructed by first performing

a 3D random walk within the confines of a sphere, and then turning on excluded volume interactions

and thermally equilibrating the polymer. This procedure generates a knotted, space-filling polymer

conformation [50]. Equilibrium globules have a decay exponent of $\gamma = -1.5$, while human interphase

chromosomes have a decay exponent of $\gamma = -1$ [50].

To determine the decay exponent expected from the CLC model, we calculated the contact

probability curve for a population of CLC structures following the methods outlined in [51]. For

intermediate genomic separations, s between 10^4 and 10^6 bp, $P(s)$ is very shallow with a decay

exponent of $\gamma \approx -0.2$ (Fig. 3 A). This exponent is robust across a range of CLC parameters

(Supplementary Fig. S2), reflecting the high degree of compaction in this polymer model. At larger

genomic separations, $s > 10^6$ bp, the curve decays more rapidly, consistent with the linear stacking

of cholesteric discs [16]. Furthermore, contact probability curves for CLCs with consecutive disc

order have two prominent local maxima at genomic separations corresponding to intra-disc ($\sim 10^5$

bp) and inter-disc ($\sim 10^6$ bp) contacts (vertical dashed lines: Fig. 3 A, Supplementary Fig. S2). CLCs

with permuted disc order within groups exhibit the same very shallow decay exponent of $\gamma \approx -0.2$

as CLCs with consecutive disc order (Fig. 3 A). However, the second peak corresponding to inter-disc

contacts vanishes. This is expected as discs that are adjacent in primary sequence are no longer

adjacent in 3D space and therefore do not regularly contact each other.

Next, we calculated contact probability curves for *F. kawagutii* and *B. minutum*, as was done

previously for *S. microadriaticum* [16], using the cooltools package [52]. We selected the largest 75

chromosome scaffolds for each species (Supplementary Tables S1, S2, S4), as they likely represent

completely assembled chromosomes, and excluded shorter scaffolds from our analysis. $P(s)$ curves

for dinoflagellate chromosome scaffolds are smooth, with a decay exponent of $\gamma \approx -0.5$ (Fig. 3 B-

D). Contact probability curves from simulated IGM conformations produce the same $\gamma \approx -0.5$ decay

exponent (Fig. 3 B-D). This power-law scaling is steeper than what we observed for the CLC model

(Fig. 3 A, Supplementary Fig. S2), even when groups of permuted discs produce TADs in the CLC

contact map (Fig. 2 B), suggesting that dinoflagellate chromosomes are less condensed than CLCs.

Moreover, the experimental and IGM contact probability curves have no peaks at intermediate

genomic separations, as would be expected for cholesteric discs. Overall, we find no evidence of

cholesteric organization in the contact probability curves of dinoflagellate chromosome scaffolds.

Although the CLC model can be made consistent with TADs, these discrepancies indicate that a

stacked organization of cholesteric discs is fundamentally incompatible with dinoflagellate Hi-C data.

Dinoflagellate chromosomes exhibit moderate orientational and nematic order

Despite their apparent lack of cholesteric discs, we next sought to quantify the degree of order in

our simulated chromosome conformations. We first quantified the orientational order within our

consensus and population-based conformations by calculating the orientational order parameter

(OOP) [53] and its Fourier transform. The OOP can be defined as $OOP(|i - j| \times 5 \text{ kb}) = <\vec{r}_i \cdot \vec{r}_j>$,

where $\vec{r}_i$ is the unit tangent vector to the ith monomer, and the brackets $<\cdot>$ denote the average dot

product over all possible pairs of monomers (i, j) separated by $s = |i - j| \times 5$ kb. For helical

organization, the OOP is a sinusoid as a function of primary sequence separation and its Fourier

transform is a narrow peak corresponding to the period of the helix (Fig. 4 A). For a particular

genomic separation s, an OOP of 1 indicates perfect parallel alignment, an OOP of -1 indicates

perfect anti-parallel alignment, and an OOP of 0 indicates random orientation or no alignment.

Intermediate positive/negative OOP values indicate partial alignment/antialignment.

We compared the OOPs of CLCs as a positive control; equilibrium globules as a negative

control; and simulated conformations of dinoflagellate chromosome scaffolds (Fig. 4 B,

Supplementary Fig. 8 D). The OOP of CLCs with consecutive disc order exhibits a damped

oscillation (Fig. 4 B, Row i). Two peaks are present in its Fourier transform: one peak corresponds to

orientational ordering between adjacent cholesteric discs ($\sim 10^{-6}$/bp), and the other corresponds to

orientational ordering within a cholesteric disc ($\sim 10^{-5}$/bp). The peak locations depend on the

average number of monomers in a cholesteric disc, and not on the percentage of sequence in

extrachromosomal loops, as expected (Supplementary Fig. S9). The OOP of CLCs with permuted disc

order within groups also has a damped oscillation (Fig. 4 B, Row ii) but lacks the peak corresponding

to inter-disc orientational alignment. This is expected because permutation of disc order results in

discs that are adjacent in primary sequence but not in 3D space having directors that differ by random

multiples of θ (Fig. 1 A).

Equilibrium globules are confined 3D random walks with no orientational order. We calculated

the OOP of equilibrium globules using simulated data from [50]. As expected, the OOP

monotonically decays at short genomic separations and plateaus to zero. There are no peaks in its

Fourier transform, consistent with its lack of any periodic structure (Fig. 4 B, Row iii).

In contrast, the OOPs for consensus conformations of *F. kawagutii, S. microadriaticum* and *B.*

breviolum chromosomes lack both the oscillatory signature of the CLC model and the monotonic

decay of the equilibrium globule. Instead, they exhibit a negative peak at $\sim 10^4$ bp (Fig. 4 B, Rows iv

& v, Supplementary Fig. S8 D), indicating partial anti-parallel orientation at this length scale. Since

this corresponds to the average length of gene arrays, these peaks suggest that gene arrays may fold in

an anti-parallel orientation in dinoflagellate chromosomes. Interestingly, we detect no orientational

order on the scale of dinoTADs ($\sim 10^6$ bp), likely due to their structural heterogeneity (Fig. 2 D, E).

Fourier transforms of OOP curves for population-based conformations have smaller peaks at $\sim$

10^{-5}/bp (Fig. 4 B, Rows vi & vii, Supplementary Fig. S8 D), indicating less orientational order in

IGM conformations compared to CSynth conformations.

Ordering of the chromosome could also occur independently of primary sequence separation and

instead depend on the 3D spatial proximity of DNA loci. To measure this, we calculated the local

nematic order parameter (NOP) at two different length scales following the methods outlined in [54].

A NOP of 1 indicates that all tangent vectors within a voxel are co-aligned in either a parallel or

antiparallel orientation. A NOP of 0 indicates that tangent vectors within a voxel are randomly

oriented with no directional correlation. Across all polymer conformations, the NOP decreases as

voxel size increases because tangent vectors are averaged over a larger volume (Fig. 4 C). For CLCs,

NOP also decreases as the number of discs increases because more discs with directors that are

oriented differently are located within the same voxel (Fig. 4 C). For equilibrium globules, we found a

negligible degree of nematic ordering, as expected (Fig. 4 C). Finally, we observe a moderate degree

of nematic ordering in dinoflagellate chromosome conformations, intermediate between that of CLCs

and equilibrium globules (Fig. 4 C, Supplementary Fig. S8 E). Altogether, both OOP and NOP

metrics indicate that dinoflagellate chromosomes, simulated by either modeling approach, are more

ordered than equilibrium globules, but less ordered than CLCs.

Active genes occur throughout dinoflagellate chromosomes

Finally, we visualized the 3D spatial distribution of active genes in dinoflagellate chromosomes

by mapping RNA-seq reads [36-38] to the genome assembly, and in turn, onto their corresponding 3D

locations as predicted by CSynth and IGM. We defined a cylindrical coordinate system where the

cylindrical axis is the chromosome's long axis and the radial axis is all perpendicular directions from

the cylindrical axis to the chromosome's surface (Fig. 5 A). The CLC model — with or without locus-

specific boundaries — is cylindrical in shape and predicts that active transcription occurs on

extrachromosomal loops, which are located at the chromosome surface, as opposed to the core, which

is hypothesized to be inaccessible to RNA polymerases [5-8, 10-15, 55-58]. Thus, we would expect to

see the highest expression levels at the surface and low or no expression in the core (Fig. 5 A).

To determine whether transcription levels correlate with proximity to the surface, we used this

coordinate system to calculate the average gene expression throughout *F. kawagutii* and *S.*

microadriaticum chromosome conformations, controlling for variation in DNA density across voxels

(Fig. 5 B-C, Methods). In contrast to the CLC model's prediction, we observe active genes throughout

dinoflagellate chromosomes modeled using both CSynth (Fig. 5 B) and IGM (Fig. 5 C). Transcription

heatmaps of population-based conformations have more diffuse peripheral boundaries compared to

consensus conformations, consistent with their more variable shapes and numerous extrachromosomal

loops (Fig. 1 E, Supplementary Figs. S6, S7). Interestingly, we find somewhat increased transcription

levels away from the center of the cylindrical axis for *S. microadriaticum* chromosomes (Fig. 5 B-C,

blue). Telomeres are also preferentially located away from the center of the cylindrical axis

(Supplementary Fig. S10), which is consistent with the previous observation that *S. microadriaticum*

chromosomes have higher gene density at their telomeres [16]. Overall, we find no correlation

between gene expression and radial position in dinoflagellate chromosomes, indicating that active

transcription is not restricted to extrachromosomal loops.

Discussion

We have systematically and quantitatively compared genomic data for three species of

dinoflagellates to predictions of the CLC model. Unexpectedly, our results challenge the long-

standing hypothesis that dinoflagellate chromosomes are organized into CLCs. First, empirical Hi-C

contact maps have TADs [16-18] instead of a grid-like pattern that we show is characteristic of

cholesteric discs (Fig. 1). Second, the scaling of contact probability curves for dinoflagellate

chromosome scaffolds are inconsistent with CLCs (Fig. 3). Third, our polymer simulations predict 3D

conformations that are less compact and less ordered than CLCs (Fig. 4). Finally, we find active genes

located throughout these 3D conformations, rather than on the surface, as expected for CLCs (Fig. 5).

The CLC model was proposed to explain the unique structure of dinoflagellate chromosomes [5-

9]. It successfully predicted a highly compact twisted chromosome, with significant nematic order,

and became the accepted view [5-15, 64-66]. However, our systematic analysis of reconstructed

chromosome conformations – as well as experimental data [16-18] – reveals several important

disagreements between dinoflagellate chromosomes and the CLC model. Therefore, we conclude that

dinoflagellate chromosomes (at least in these three species) are not cholesteric liquid crystals.

Different computational modeling approaches can generate different outputs from the same input

data, creating uncertainties for interpretation [46]. To mitigate this risk, and to enhance the robustness

of our conclusions, we used two different software packages to reconstruct dinoflagellate

chromosomes. While both CSynth and IGM produce 3D polymer conformations that disagree with

the CLC hypothesis, their predictions differ in some notable ways. For example, the ellipsoidal shape

of CSynth conformations is reminiscent of dinoflagellate chromosomes observed by transmission

electron microscopy [1, 5-8, 13, 59-63], while IGM conformations sometimes adopt dumbbells and

other elongated or irregular shapes (Supplementary Figs. S6, S7) that are less common in the

microscopy literature [1]. Nevertheless, IGM conformations give rise to simulated Hi-C contact maps

(Fig. 1F) and contact probability curves (Fig. 3) that are highly consistent with empirical data [16-18].

Interestingly, CSynth can reproduce CLC-like conformations while IGM cannot (SI text,

Supplementary Fig. S15). Overall, our work highlights both the strengths and limitations of these

computational models. Finally, IGM is capable of simultaneously integrating Hi-C data together with

data from orthogonal experimental methods including fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH), DNA

Adenine Methyltransferase Identification (Dam ID), and single-cell split-pool recognition of

interactions by tag extension (SPRITE) [32]. While such data types are not yet available for

dinoflagellates, optimizing these methods and applying them to these organisms should be a priority

for future research.

The 3D conformations produced by CSynth and IGM are static. However, chromosomes are

highly dynamic in living cells [46]. Analysis of temporal variation in chromosome structure requires

Hi-C data from a synchronized population of cells sampled at different time points throughout the cell

cycle [67, 68]. Comparison of Hi-C contact maps of *S. microadriaticum* cultures enriched for either

flagellated mastigote cells (G1/S) or immobile coccoid cells (G2/M) showed no apparent differences,

indicating that this species' chromosomes are permanently condensed and undergo minimal

rearrangements during the cell cycle [16]. Nevertheless, our study does not rule out the possibility of

dynamic rearrangement of extrachromosomal loops to the chromosome exterior where they are

hypothesized to be more transcriptionally accessible [69]. If this were the case, then the expression of

nearly all genes would need to be regulated via this mechanism as nearly all chromosomal regions are

transcriptionally active (Fig. 5 B, C). Alternatively, the dense core of dinoflagellate chromosomes

may not exclude the transcriptional machinery after all. Indeed, recent Assay for Transposase-

Accessible Chromatin using sequencing (ATAC-seq) data on *B. minutum* indicate that while overall

accessibility is low, it is more uniform than in other eukaryotic genomes, consistent with the lack of

nucleosome-based chromatin [70]. Tn5 transposase (53.3 kD) is much smaller than RNA Polymerase

II (Pol II, 514 kD), so it is possible that Tn5 can access regions from which Pol II is excluded.

However, bacterial RNA polymerase (457 kD) is able to penetrate the highly condensed nucleoid in

stationary-phase *E. coli* cells [71], which has also been described as liquid crystalline [72]. Together,

these findings suggest that dinoflagellate chromosomes are broadly accessible, and could explain why

active genes are located throughout the chromosome rather than preferentially at the surface (Fig. 5).

In addition to the CLC model, many other models for dinoflagellate chromosome organization

have been proposed. One model consists of two independent helices coiled around each other [73].

Another model consists of a toroidal chromosome twisted into a double helix, with rounded hairpin

loops at the chromosome ends rather than exposed telomeres [74]. A third model proposes that

dinoflagellate chromosomes are polytene, i.e. they undergo many rounds of complete and/or partial

replication without segregation, maintaining close alignment of sister chromatids [75]. A fourth model

consists of a hierarchical helix with six degrees of hierarchy [76, 77]. A fifth model consists of a

helical condensed core, with abundant extrachromosomal loops [78].

Our 3D conformations of dinoflagellate chromosomes are not consistent with any of these

models. They do not consist of multiple interwoven helices, are not twisted toroids, are not helices of

helices, and do not contain abundant extrachromosomal loops. Furthermore, dinoflagellate Hi-C

contact maps do not contain an X-shape pattern that is characteristic of circular chromosomes [79], do

not have variable contact probability along the main diagonal as is the case for chromosomes with

polytene bands [80], and lack significant trans-chromosomal contacts that would be expected from

interwoven helices involving multiple chromosomes [16-18].

In addition to dinoflagellates, condensed, twisted, and ordered interphase chromosome structures

have been observed in at least three other biological contexts: mosquito chromosomes [81], cricket

sperm chromosomes [54], and bacterial nucleoids [82]. The latter two examples are particularly

interesting because, like dinoflagellates, they also lack nucleosomes. Indeed, dinoflagellate viral

nuclear protein (DVNPs) and histone-like proteins (HLPs) replace histones [56, 57, 83] as the

dominant DNA-binding protein in dinoflagellates. Histones are replaced by SNBPs (sperm-specific

nuclear basic proteins) in sperm cells [54] and bacteria use a variety of nucleoid-associated proteins,

including HU (heat unstable) proteins [84], to package their DNA. Together, these examples suggest

that highly condensed, ordered chromosome structures may be more common in the absence of

histones.

Beyond DNA structure, the CLC model also makes functional predictions, including that active

genes are located on the chromosome surface in extrachromosomal loops and not in the condensed

chromosome core [5-8, 10-15, 55-58]. These predictions are mainly based on radiolabeling studies,

which show incorporation of ^{3}H-adenine or ^{3}H-uridine at the nucleolus [10, 11, 55], but not

overlapping with condensed chromosomes. Our results, which leverage recent RNA-seq datasets,

suggest that transcription is spatially ubiquitous. We find active genes throughout dinoflagellate

chromosomes and not exclusively at the chromosome surface (Fig. 5 B, C). Our findings are

consistent with other modern genomic assays such as ATAC-seq, which indicate that dinoflagellate

genomes are uniformly accessible to transposases [70]. Moreover, transcription still occurs in highly

condensed human mitotic chromosomes [4]. Thus, dinoflagellate chromosomes are likely accessible

to RNA polymerase and condensation is not the primary mechanism for regulation of gene

expression. Rather, dinoflagellate genes can be actively transcribed regardless of their chromosomal

location.

Although our results indicate that chromosome conformation does not influence gene expression in dinoflagellates, transcription may contribute to chromosome organization. For example, we observe orientational order at length scales corresponding to gene arrays (Fig. 4 B). The negative peak in the OOP curve for dinoflagellate chromosomes is similar to that observed in model human chromosomes perturbed by extensible force dipoles that represent transcriptional activity [85]. Thus, transcription of co-oriented genes in divergent gene arrays may result in an anti-parallel arrangement. Transcription has also been implicated in dinoTAD formation. Indeed, the boundaries of dinoTADs in *S. microadriaticum* [16] and *B. minutum* [17] correspond to positions at which oppositely-oriented gene arrays converge and are sensitive to transcriptional inhibitors. We mapped RNA-seq reads [36-38] onto the *F. kawagutii* genome assembly and also found that dinoTAD boundaries occur between convergent gene arrays (Supplementary Fig. S11), consistent with these previous studies [16, 17].

Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) has been used frequently to generate 2D cross-sectional images of dinoflagellate chromosomes [1, 5-8, 13, 59-63]. To date, no study has imaged dinoflagellate chromatin fiber orientation in 3D. Instead, interpretation of the banding patterns observed in 2D cross-sectional images has relied on mathematically projecting 3D CLC models onto a 2D imaging plane [5]. The limitation of 2D data makes it difficult to extrapolate ordering observed in a single plane to volumes within a whole chromosome, and to track the contours of individual chromatin fibers as a function of primary sequence. For example, dinoflagellate chromosomes that produce banding patterns in TEM cross-sections, which are typically attributed to CLC organization, appear helical when viewed after a whole-mounting procedure [86]. In addition, a recent TEM study [62] found that while oblique and longitudinal sections of *Prorocentrum minimum* chromosomes agree qualitatively with CLC model predictions, chromatin fibers were not parallel within transverse sections — an observation that is inconsistent with cholesteric discs. The advantage of our Hi-C-

based polymer modeling approach is that the entire dinoflagellate chromosome is modeled in 3D with

the added context of primary sequence information.

Overall, this work advances our understanding of dinoflagellate chromosome organization in 3D,

providing evidence that dinoflagellate chromosomes are not cholesteric liquid crystals. Future work

should focus on 3D imaging and chromatin fiber tracing within dinoflagellate chromosomes, as well

as 3D imaging of nascent RNA and transcription [87].

Methods

Hi-C data pre-processing

Hi-C-assisted genome assemblies and contact probabilities were accessed from the Gene

Expression Omnibus (GEO) with accession numbers: GSE152150 [16] and GSE153950 [17], or from

the Sequence Read Archive (SRA) with accession numbers: SRR25948349, SRR25948348 [88], and

further processed following [18].

F. kawagutii Hi-C contact maps were converted from .hic format to .cool format using the

hic2cool python package https://github.com/4dn-dcic/hic2cool.

When un-ligated and self-ligated Hi-C artifacts are abundant, Hi-C normalization can greatly

reduce off-diagonal contact probabilities [89]. This results in weak CSynth Hi-C-based attraction

forces and slow equilibration. Un-ligated and self-ligated Hi-C artifacts do not contain information

about the 3D organization of the chromosome; they are short range contacts that map entirely within a

single Hi-C bin (main diagonal), or across one Hi-C bin boundary (1st off-diagonal) [16]. To

accelerate CSynth conformation equilibration, the ratio of average main diagonal contact probabilities

$\overline{CP}_{i,j=i}$ to average off-diagonal contact probabilities $\overline{CP}_{i,j \geq i+2}$ was set to 100 by dividing all main

diagonal contact probabilities by $\frac{\overline{CP}_{i,j=i}}{\overline{CP}_{i,j \geq i+2}}/100$, and the ratio of average 1st off-diagonal contact

probabilities $\overline{CP}_{i,j=i+1}$ to average off-diagonal contact probabilities $\overline{CP}_{i,j \geq i+2}$ was set to 10 by dividing

all 1st off-diagonal contact probabilities by $\frac{\overline{CP}_{i,j=i+1}}{\overline{CP}_{i,j\geq i+2}}$ /10. These modifications were chosen such that

after normalization, CSynth Hi-C attraction forces remained high enough to allow conformation

equilibration within minutes. Main diagonal and 1st off-diagonal contact probabilities were excluded

for all contact probability curve calculations.

Individual Hi-C contact files for each chromosome were then normalized by Iterative Correction

and Eigenvector decomposition (ICE) [89] and written to a text file in a CSynth compatible format via

the cooler python package [90].

Generating 3D chromosome conformations with CSynth

CSynth was accessed online at: https://csynth.github.io/csynth/csynth.html. The maximum

number of monomers supported by our system's GPU was determined by typing the command

gl.getParameter(gl.MAX_TEXTURE_SIZE) into the console of the web browser's developer tools.

The following optimized parameters (SI Text) were used:

• Spring power: 0. This sets the relative importance of long and short distance effects.

• Contact force: 60. This sets the magnitude of attraction between Hi-C contacts.

• Push-apart power: -4. This sets the exponent for a global repulsive force between monomers

that decays with distance. This exponent is analogous and has a similar value to the

empirically derived exponent relating Hi-C contact probability and mean spatial distance

determined by FISH in human IMR90 cells on chromosome 21 [91, 92].

After equilibration, the xyz coordinates of all monomers were saved to a text file. A picture of the

equilibrated structure was saved separately.

Simulating CLC structures

3D polymer models of CLCs were generated using a custom MATLAB script. Polymer length

(20 Mb, 4000 monomers) was chosen to match the largest *S. microadriaticum* and *F. kawagutii* Hi-C

scaffolds. Cholesteric discs were made by placing monomers on a square grid inside a circle of a

chosen diameter. Monomers were connected in primary sequence by "weaving" the polymer

backbone back and forth, parallel to a rotating director. The number and length of extrachromosomal

loops were randomized while maintaining the total amount of sequence in loops at a user-defined

fraction. After specifying the fraction of total monomers in extrachromosomal loops, and the fraction

of loop monomers in inter-disc loops (1 minus the fraction of loop monomers in intra-disc loops), the

remaining monomers were divided by the number of cholesteric discs minus 1 to give the mean inter-

disc loop length. Inter-disc loop lengths were then drawn from an exponential distribution with a

parameter determined by the mean inter-disc loop length. This was done to make loop starts/stops as

uniformly distributed in monomer space as possible. Intra-disc extrachromosomal loop lengths were

drawn from an analogous exponential distribution.

The primary sequence order of discs was either consecutive from top to bottom of the stack or

permuted within groups but not across locus-specific boundaries which separate groups adjacent in

primary sequence. In the case of CLCs with permuted disc order, inter-disc extrachromosomal loops

were assigned to connect disc pairs according to that disc pair's spatial distance separation rank

because adjacent discs in primary sequence located further away in 3D space require longer loops to

connect them.

Simulating Hi-C contact maps

For CLCs and Csynth, Hi-C contacts were simulated using $CP_{ij} \propto \frac{1}{(D_{ij})^4}$ [91, 92] where CP_{ij}

represents the Hi-C contact probability for genomic loci pair (i, j), and D_{ij} represents the Euclidean

distance between these two monomers. For population level Hi-C contact maps, the contact

probability for each single-conformation Hi-C contact map was averaged per pixel (i, j) across all

conformations.

For IGM, Hi-C contact maps were simulated as previously described in [32].

Quantitative TAD metrics

We used the FanC python package [93] to calculate insulation score [40] and directionality index

[41] using a Hi-C bin size of 5 kb and a window size of 100 kb.

Equilibrium globule structures

Equilibrium globule structures were downloaded from GEO using the accession number:

GSE18199 [50].

Analyzing spatial organization of transcription

RNA-seq data from asynchronous cell populations were accessed via the SRA using the

following accession numbers: for *S. microadriaticum*, SRR3337493 [36]; for *F. kawagutii*,

SRR9417753, SRR9417755, SRR9417756, SRR1300302, SRR1300303, SRR1300304, and

SRR1300305 [37, 38].

Alignment to the genome assembly was performed following the methods outlined in [17].

Calculating normalized gene expression

The largest 75 chromosome scaffolds, likely representing complete or near-complete

chromosome assemblies, for each dinoflagellate species were scaled isotropically to the same size,

with each chromosome long axis aligned horizontally. Using a cylindrical coordinate system, the total

number of RNA-seq reads were counted in each voxel, integrated azimuthally, and divided by the

cylindrical Jacobian which controls for variation in amount of DNA per voxel.

Annotating TADs manually with CSynth

After loading a Hi-C contact file into CSynth, the chromosome was hidden and its dynamics

were arrested. Hi-C contacts were displayed on CSynth's matrix viewer. The *matdistfar* parameter

was adjusted until TADs were clearly visible and rotation was set to 1.5 for a more upright matrix

view. To annotate a TAD, the TAD apex was selected using the mouse, and edges then appeared

outlining the TAD boundary. TAD coordinates were saved separately for each TAD using option+Z

(Macintosh) or alt+Z (Windows), and collectively exported in BED file format using shift+option+Z

(Macintosh) or shift+alt+Z (Windows). Finally, TADs were colored in 3D after un-hiding the

chromosome and dragging the .bed file into the CSynth browser window. For a detailed list of

commands, see SI Text.

Data availability

525   Code is available at: https://github.com/lucasphilipp1/3D-Reconstruction-of-Dinoflagellate-

526   Chromosomes-from-Hi-C-Data. *F. kawagutii* Hi-C data, *F. kawagutii* and *S. microadriaticum* CSynth

527   conformations, CLC structures, RNA-seq .bed files, and TAD .bed files, have been deposited to

528   https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14285613.

Supplementary Information Appendix (SI)

530   Supplementary Information accompanying this article including SI Text, Supplementary Figures S1-

531   S15 and Tables S1-S4 can be found here ___________ .

References

1. Bhaud, Y. et al. Morphology and behaviour of dinoflagellate chromosomes during the cell cycle

and mitosis. *J. Cell Sci.* 133, 1231-1239 (2000).

2. Miron, E., et al. Chromatin arranges in chains of mesoscale domains with nanoscale functional

topography independent of cohesin. *Sci. Adv.* 6, eaba8811 (2020).

3. Chen, J. K., et al. Nanoscale analysis of human G1 and metaphase chromatin in situ. *The EMBO*

Journal, *44*(9), 2658-2694 (2025).

4. Palozola, K.C., et al., Mitotic transcription and waves of gene reactivation during mitotic exit.

Science 358, 119-122 (2017).

5. Bouligand, Y., Soyer, M., Puiseux-Dao, S. La structure fibrillaire et l'orientation des chromosomes

chez les dinoflagellés. *Chromosoma* 24, 251-287 (1968).

6. Livolant, F., Bouligand, Y. New observations on the twisted arrangement of dinoflagellate

chromosomes. *Chromosoma* 68, 21-44 (1978).

7. Gautier, A., Michel-Salamin, L., Tosi-Couture, E., McDowall, E., Dubochet, J. Electron

microscopy of the chromosomes of dinoflagellates in situ: confirmation of Bouligand's liquid crystal

hypothesis. *J. Ultrastruct. Mol. Struct. Res.* 97, 10-30 (1986).

8. Rill, R. L., Livolant, F., Aldrich, H.C., Davidson, M. W. Electron microscopy of liquid crystalline

DNA: direct evidence for cholesteric-like organization of DNA in dinoflagellate chromosomes.

Chromosoma 98, 280-286 (1989).

9. Bouligand, Y., Norris, V. Chromosome separation and segregation in dinoflagellates

and bacteria may depend on liquid crystalline states. *Biochimie* 83, 187-192 (2001).

10. Sigee, D. C. Structural DNA and genetically active DNA in dinoflagellate chromosomes.

Biosystems 16, 203-210 (1983).

11. Sigee, D. C. The dinoflagellate chromosome. *Adv. Bot. Res.* 12, 205-264 (1986).

12. Soyer-Gobillard, M. O. The genome of the primitive eukaryote dinoflagellates: organization and

functioning. *Zool. Stud.* 35, 78-84 (1996).

13. Chow, M. H., Yan, K. T., Bennett, M. J., Wong, J. T. Birefringence and DNA condensation of

liquid crystalline chromosomes. *Eukaryot. Cell* 9, 1577-1587 (2010).

14. Wisecaver, J. H, Hackett, J.D. Dinoflagellate genome evolution. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* 65, 369-

387 (2011).

15. Riaz, S., Niaz, Z., Khan, S., Liu, Y., Sui, Z. Detection, characterization and expression dynamics

of histone proteins in the dinoflagellate *Alexandrium pacificum* during growth regulation. *Harmful*

Algae 87, 101630 (2019).

16. Nand, A., et al. Genetic and spatial organization of the unusual chromosomes of the dinoflagellate

Symbiodinium microadriaticum. *Nat. Genet.* 53(5), 618-629 (2021).

17. Marinov, G. K., et al. Transcription-dependent domain-scale three-dimensional organization in the

dinoflagellate *Breviolum minutum*. *Nat. Genet. 53*(5), 613-617 (2021).

18. Marinov, G. K., Kundaje, A., Greenleaf, W. J., Grossman, A. R. Protocol for mapping the three-

dimensional organization of dinoflagellate genomes. *STAR Protoc.* 5, 102941 (2024).

19. Aranda, M. et al., Genomes of coral dinoflagellate symbionts highlight evolutionary adaptations

conducive to a symbiotic lifestyle. *Sci. Reports* 6, 39734 (2016).

20. Stephens, T. G. et al. Genomes of the dinoflagellate *Polarella glacialis* encode tandemly repeated

single-exon genes with adaptive functions. *BMC Biol.* 18, 1-21 (2020).

21. Bachvaroff, T. R., Place, A. R. From stop to start: tandem gene arrangement, copy number and

trans-splicing sites in the dinoflagellate *Amphidinium carterae*. PLoS One 3, e2929 (2008).

22. Beauchemin, M. et al. Dinoflagellate tandem array gene transcripts are highly conserved

and not polycistronic. *PNAS,* 109, 15793-15798 (2012).

23. Lin, S., Song, B., & Morse, D. Spatial organization of dinoflagellate genomes: novel insights and

remaining critical questions. *Journal of Phycology*, *57*(6), 1674-1678 (2021).

24. Oluwadare, O., Highsmith, M., & Cheng, J. An overview of methods for reconstructing 3-D

chromosome and genome structures from Hi-C data. *Biological procedures online*, *21*(1), 7 (2019).

25. Hua, N., Tjong, H., Shin, H., Gong, K., Zhou, X. J., & Alber, F. Producing genome structure

populations with the dynamic and automated PGS software. *Nat. Protoc.*, *13*(5), 915-926 (2018).

26. Todd, S., et al, CSynth: an interactive modelling and visualization tool for 3D chromatin structure.

Bioinformatics 37, 951-955 (2021).

27. Duan, Z., et al. A three-dimensional model of the yeast genome. *Nature*, 465(7296), 363-367

(2010).

28. Lesne, A., Riposo, J., Roger, P., Cournac, A., & Mozziconacci, J. 3D genome reconstruction from

chromosomal contacts. *Nat. Methods*, 11(11), 1141-1143 (2014).

29. Wang, H., Yang, J., Zhang, Y., Qian, J., & Wang, J. Reconstruct high-resolution 3D genome

structures for diverse cell-types using FLAMINGO. *Nat. Commun.*, *13*(1), 2645 (2022).

30. Giorgetti, L., et al. Predictive polymer modeling reveals coupled fluctuations in chromosome

conformation and transcription. *Cell*, *157*(4), 950-963 (2014).

31. Tjong, H., et al. Population-based 3D genome structure analysis reveals driving forces in spatial

genome organization. *PNAS*, *113*(12), E1663-E1672 (2016).

32. Boninsegna, L., et al. (2022). Integrative genome modeling platform reveals essentiality of rare

contact events in 3D genome organizations. *Nat. Methods*, *19*(8), 938-949.

33. Stevens, T. J., et al. 3D structures of individual mammalian genomes studied by single-cell Hi-C.

Nature 544, 59-64 (2017).

34. Bintu, B., et al. Super-resolution chromatin tracing reveals domains and cooperative interactions

in single cells. *Science*, *362*(6413), eaau1783 (2018).

35. LaJeunesse, T. C., et al. Systematic revision of Symbiodiniaceae highlights the antiquity and

diversity of coral endosymbionts. *Curr. Biol.* 28, 2570-2580 (2018).

36. Liew, Y. J., Li, Y., Baumgarten, S., Voolstra, C. R., Aranda, M. Condition-specific RNA editing

in the coral symbiont *Symbiodinium microadriaticum*. *PLoS Genet.* 13, e1006619 (2017).

37. Li, T., et al. RNA-seq profiling of *Fugacium kawagutii* reveals strong responses in metabolic

processes and symbiosis potential to deficiencies of iron and other trace metals. *Sci. Total. Environ.*

705, 135767 (2020).

38. Keeling, P. J. et al. The marine microbial eukaryote transcriptome sequencing project (MMETSP):

illuminating the functional diversity of eukaryotic life in the oceans through transcriptome

sequencing. *PLoS Biol.* 12, e1001889 (2014).

39. Belton, J. M., et al. Hi–C: a comprehensive technique to capture the conformation of

genomes. *Methods*, *58*(3), 268-276 (2012).

40. Crane, E., et al. Condensin-driven remodelling of X chromosome topology during dosage

compensation. *Nature*, *523*(7559), 240-244 (2015).

41. Dixon, J. R., et al. Topological domains in mammalian genomes identified by analysis of

chromatin interactions. *Nature*, *485*(7398), 376-380 (2012).

42. Kubica, J., Korsak, S., Banecki, K. H., Schirman, D., Yadavalli, A. D., & Plewczynski, D. The

challenge of chromatin model comparison and validation: A project from the first international 4D

Nucleome Hackathon. *PLOS Computational Biology*, *21*(8), e1013358 (2025).

43. Yen, C. S., Steele, R. E., Rae, P. M. M. Chromatin structure in a dinoflagellate as revealed by

electron microscopy of DNA cross-linked in vivo with trimethylpsoralen. *J. Cell Biol.* 79, 120a

(1978).

44. Sanborn, A. L., et al. Chromatin extrusion explains key features of loop and domain formation in

wild-type and engineered genomes. *PNAS, 112*(47), E6456-E6465 (2015).

45. Fudenberg, G., et al. Formation of chromosomal domains by loop extrusion. *Cell reports*, *15*(9),

2038-2049 (2016).

46. Sabaté, T., et al. Uniform dynamics of cohesin-mediated loop extrusion in living human cells. *Nat.*

Genet., 1-13 (2025).

47. Xu, J., et al. A comprehensive benchmarking with interpretation and operational guidance for the

hierarchy of topologically associating domains. *Nat. Commun.* 15, 4376 (2024).

48. An, L., et al. OnTAD: hierarchical domain structure reveals the divergence of activity among

TADs and boundaries. *Genome Biol.*, 20, 1-16 (2019).

49. Szabo, Q., Bantignies, F., & Cavalli, G. Principles of genome folding into topologically

associating domains. *Sci. Adv.*, 5(4), eaaw1668 (2019).

50. Lieberman-Aiden, E. et al. Comprehensive mapping of long-range interactions reveals folding

principles of the human genome. *Science* 326, 289-293 (2009).

51. Naumova, N., et al. Organization of the mitotic chromosome. *Science* 342, 948-953 (2013).

52. Open2C, et al. Cooltools: enabling high-resolution Hi-C analysis in Python. *PLOS Comput. Biol.*

20, e1012067 (2024).

53. Zhang, B., Wolynes, P. G., Topology, structures, and energy landscapes of human chromosomes.

PNAS, 112, 6062-6067 (2015).

54. Orsi, G. A., et al. Biophysical ordering transitions underlie genome 3D re-organization during

cricket spermiogenesis. *Nat. Commun.* 14, 4187 (2023).

55. Babillot, C. Étude de l'incorporation d'uridine-^{3}H dans le noyau chez *l'Amphidinium carteri*,

dinoflagellé. C. R. Acad. Sci. (Paris) 271, 828-831 (1970).

56. Sala-Rovira, M. et al. Molecular cloning and immunolocalization of two variants of the major

basic nuclear protein (HCc) from the histone-less eukaryote *Crypthecodinium cohnii* (Pyrrhophyta).

Chromosoma 100, 510-518 (1991).

57. Géraud, M. L., Sala-Rovira, M., Herzog, M., Soyer-Gobillard, M. O. Immunocytochemical

localization of the DNA-binding protein HCc during the cell cycle of the histone-less dinoflagellate

protoctista *Crypthecodinium cohnii B. Biol. Cell* 71, 123-134 (1991).

58. Anderson, D. M., Grabber, A., Herzog, M. Separation of coding sequences from structural DNA

in the dinoflagellate *Crypthecodinium cohnii*. *Mol. Mar. Biol. Biotechno*l. 1, 89-96 (1992).

59. Allen, J., Roberts, T. M., Loeblich, A. R., Klotz, L. C. Characterization of the DNA from the

dinoflagellate *Crypthecodinium cohnii* and implications for nuclear organization. *Cell* 6, 161-169

(1975).

60. Udy, J. W., Hinde, R., Vesk, M. Chromosomes and DNA in Symbiodinium from Australian hosts.

J. Phycol. 29, 314-320 (1993).

61. Weynberg, K. D., et al. Prevalent and persistent viral infection in cultures of the coral algal

endosymbiont Symbiodinium. *Coral Reefs* 36, 773-784 (2017).

62. Sergey, G., Mariia, B., Yana, M., Eugene, S., Sergei, S. Ultrastructural organization of the

chromatin elements in chromosomes of the dinoflagellate *Prorocentrum minimum*. *Protistology* 12,

163-172 (2018).

63. Sunesen, I. et al. Morphological and molecular characterization of *Heterocapsa claromecoensis*

sp. nov. (Peridiniales, Dinophyceae) from Buenos Aires coastal waters (Argentina). *Eur. J. Phycol.*

55, 490-506 (2020).

64. Kalvelage, J., & Rabus, R. Multifaceted dinoflagellates and the marine model Prorocentrum

cordatum. *Microbial Physiology*, *34*(1), 197-242 (2024).

65. Li, C., et al. Characterization of the enzyme for 5-hydroxymethyluridine production and its role in

silencing transposable elements in dinoflagellates. *PNAS*, *121*(46), e2400906121 (2024).

66. Wang, D. Z., et al. 100 Dinoflagellate Genome Project. *The Innovation*. 0(0), 101120 (2025).

67. Gibcus, J. H., et al. A pathway for mitotic chromosome formation. *Science*, *359*(6376), eaao6135

(2018).

68. Contessoto, V. G., et al. Energy landscape analysis of the development of the chromosome

structure across the cell cycle. *PNAS*, *122*(12), e2425225122 (2025).

69. Chan, Y. H., Wong, J. T. Concentration-dependent organization of DNA by the dinoflagellate

histone-like protein HCc3. *Nucleic acids res.*, *35*(8), 2573-2583 (2007).

70. Marinov, G. K. et al. Genome-wide distribution of 5-hydroxymethyluracil and chromatin

accessibility in the *Breviolum minutum* genome. *Genome Biol.* 25, 115 (2024).

71. Janissen, R., et al. Global DNA compaction in stationary-phase bacteria does not affect

transcription. *Cell*, *174*(5), 1188-1199 (2018).

72. Frenkiel-Krispin, D., et al. Regulated phase transitions of bacterial chromatin: a non-enzymatic

pathway for generic DNA protection. *EMBO J.*, 20, 1184-1191 (2001).

73. Spector, D., Vasconcelos, A., Triemer, R. DNA duplication and chromosome structure in the

dinoflagellates. *Protoplasma* 105, 185-194 (1981).

74. Oakley, B. R., Dodge, J. D. Evidence for a double-helically coiled toroidal chromonema in the

dinoflagellate chromosome. *Chromosoma* 70, 277-291 (1979).

75. Haapala, O., Soyer, M. O. Structure of dinoflagellate chromosomes. *Nat. New Biol.* 244, 195-197

(1973).

76. Herzog, M., Soyer, M. The native structure of dinoflagellate chromosomes and their stabilization

by Ca2+ and Mg2+ cations. *Eur. J. Cell Biol.* 30, 33-41 (1983).

77. Dodge, J. D. The chromosomes of dinoflagellates. *Int. Rev. Cytol.* 94, pp. 5-19 (1985).

78. Wong, J. T. Y., Architectural organization of dinoflagellate liquid crystalline chromosomes.

Microorganisms 7, 27 (2019).

79. Le, T. B., Imakaev, M. V., Mirny, L. A., Laub, M. T. High-resolution mapping of the spatial

organization of a bacterial chromosome. *Science* 342, 731-734 (2013).

80. Eagen, K. P., Hartl, T. A., Kornberg, R. D. Stable chromosome condensation revealed by

chromosome conformation capture. *Cell* 163, 934-946 (2015).

81. Contessoto, V. G., et al. Interphase chromosomes of the Aedes aegypti mosquito are liquid

crystalline and can sense mechanical cues. *Nat. Commun.* 14, 1-12 (2023).

82. Yee, B., et al. Electron tomography of the nucleoid of *Gemmata obscuriglobus* reveals complex

liquid crystalline cholesteric structure. *Front. Microbiol.* 3, 326 (2012).

83. Gornik, S. G. et al. Loss of nucleosomal DNA condensation coincides with appearance of a novel

nuclear protein in dinoflagellates. *Curr. Biol.* 22, 2303-2312 (2012).

84. Yee, B., Sagulenko, E., Fuerst, J. A. Making heads or tails of the HU proteins in the

planctomycete *Gemmata obscuriglobus*. *Microbiology* 157, 2012-2021 (2011).

85. Saintillan, D., Shelley, M. J., Zidovska, A. Extensile motor activity drives coherent motions in a

model of interphase chromatin. *PNAS,* 115, 11442-11447 (2018).

86. Costas, E., Goyanes, V. J. Ultrastructure and division behaviour of dinoflagellate chromosomes.

Chromosom. (Berl) 95, 435-441 (1987).

87. Le, P., Ahmed, N., Yeo, G. W. Illuminating RNA biology through imaging. *Nat. Cell Biol.* 24,

815-824 (2022).

88. Li, T., et al. Genome improvement and core gene set refinement of *Fugacium kawagutii*.

Microorganisms 8, 102 (2020).

89. Imakaev, M. et al. Iterative correction of Hi-C data reveals hallmarks of chromosome

organization*. Nat. Methods* 9, 999-1003 (2012).

90. Abdennur, N., Mirny, L. A. Cooler: scalable storage for Hi-C data and other genomically labeled

arrays. Bioinformatics 36, 311-316 (2020).

91. Su, J. H., Zheng, P, Kinrot, S. S., Bintu, B., Zhuang, X. Genome-scale imaging of the 3D

organization and transcriptional activity of chromatin. *Cell* 182, 1641-1659 (2020).

92. Wang, S., et al. Spatial organization of chromatin domains and compartments in single

chromosomes. *Science* 353, 598-602 (2016).

93. Kruse, K., Hug, C. B., & Vaquerizas, J. M. FAN-C: a feature-rich framework for the analysis and

visualisation of chromosome conformation capture data. *Genome biology*, *21*(1), 303 (2020).

Acknowledgements

729   We would like to thank Audrey Baguette for helpful discussions regarding Hi-C data pre-processing.

730   L.P. was supported by a Canadian Graduate Scholarship – Master's and a Canadian Graduate

731   Scholarship – Doctoral from the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada. The

732   work was funded by the New Frontiers in Research Fund (NFRFE-2019-00189 to S.C.W.). This

733   research was undertaken, in part, thanks to funding from the Canada Research Chairs Program.

Author contributions

735   L.P. and S.C.W. designed the research, wrote the paper, and obtained funding; G.K.M. improved the

736   *F. kawagutii* genome assembly using raw Hi-C reads, assembled *F. kawagutii* contact maps, and

737   aligned RNA-seq reads to the genome; S.T. added data visualization and manual TAD annotation

738   functionalities to CSynth; L.P. performed all other research aspects.

Competing interest statement

740   The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Figure 1. Dinoflagellate chromosomes lack cholesteric discs. A) The Cholesteric Liquid Crystal (CLC) model. The polymer aligns with a director (black arrows), which rotates by a constant angle θ between cholesteric discs. Discs are arranged in a consecutive order. B) CLCs are simulated by adding extrachromosomal loops to the stack of discs. Loops are positioned randomly and have exponentially distributed lengths. Intra-disc loops start and end within the same disc (green) and inter-disc loops connect vertically adjacent discs (red). C) Simulated Hi-C contact map for a population of 10^6 simulated CLC structures. D) CSynth conformations at 5 kb per monomer resolution of chromosome scaffold 1 from *Fugacium kawagutii* (Hi-C data: [18, 88]) and *Symbiodinium microadriaticum* (Hi-C data: [16]). Color indicates primary sequence. For the complete set of consensus conformations of dinoflagellate chromosome scaffolds, see Supplementary Figs. S4, S5. E) IGM conformations at 5 kb per monomer resolution from a population of 100 total conformations of the same chromosomes as in D. For a complete set of population-based conformations, see Supplementary Figs. S6, S7. F) Empirical Hi-C contact maps of representative dinoflagellate chromosomes (data: [16, 18, 88], upper right triangles) and simulated Hi-C contact maps from IGM populations (lower left triangles). Pearson correlation coefficients: $r = 0.91$ for *F. kawagutii*, $r = 0.84$ for *S. microadriaticum*.

763
Figure 2. Locus-specific boundaries can recapitulate TADs in CLCs. A) Discs are grouped according
to observed TAD size [16]. Insulating boundaries are added in between each group. Within each
group, the primary sequence order of discs is permuted in the sub-stack across structures in the
population. B) Simulated Hi-C contact map for CLCs with disc order permuted within groups. C)
Manual annotation of TADs in CSynth generates a text file of boundary coordinates (inset). TADs can
be visualized as distinct colors on the Hi-C contact map (bottom triangle) and in the 3D polymer
conformation. D) TADs visualized using CSynth for *F. kawagutii* chr1 (top) and *S. microadriaticum*
chr1 (bottom) at 5 kb per monomer resolution. E) TADs visualized in IGM conformations (3 of 100
total) of the same chromosomes.

773
Figure 3. Contact probability curves for dinoflagellate chromosome scaffolds are inconsistent with CLC
model predictions. A) Contact probability curve for a population of 10^6 CLC structures with either
consecutive disc order or disc order permuted within groups. The genomic separations corresponding to
twice the mean cholesteric disc diameter and mean for two cholesteric discs are indicated by vertical
dotted lines. Black dashed line represents a power law relationship with an exponent $\gamma \approx -0.5$. Red
dashed line represents a power law with exponent $\gamma \approx -0.2$. Contact probability curves for the 75
largest chromosome scaffolds for B) *F. kawagutii* (Hi-C data: [18]); C) *S. microadriaticum* (Hi-C data:
[16]); D) *Breviolum minutum* (Hi-C data: [17]). Each curve corresponds to an individual chromosome
scaffold. Orange lines correspond to contact probability curves for a population of 100 IGM
conformations for chromosome 1.

784
Figure 4. Dinoflagellate chromosomes exhibit moderate orientational and nematic order. A)
Orientational order parameter (OOP) and its Fourier transform for a simple helix. Tangent vectors $\vec{r}_i$
and $\vec{r}_j$ (red arrows) at monomers i and j, located a primary sequence separation s (purple) apart. B)
Left: OOP. Right: Fourier transform of OOP. Each curve corresponds to one of 75
structures/conformations. Row i: CLCs with consecutive disc order. Row ii: CLCs with disc order
permuted within groups. Dashed lines: reciprocal of the average amount of sequence in two
cholesteric discs, reciprocal of the amount of sequence in twice the average disc diameter. Row iii:
Equilibrium globules (data: [50]). Row iv: *F. kawagutii*, CSynth. Row v: *S. microadriaticum*, CSynth.
Each curve corresponds to a consensus conformation of one of the 75 largest chromosomes. Row vi:
F. kawagutii, IGM. Row vii: *S. microadriaticum*, IGM. Each curve corresponds to one conformation
from a population of 100 total conformations of chromosome 1. The mean gene array size (±1
standard deviation) and the mean TAD size are indicated. C) Left: Example CSynth conformation of a
dinoflagellate chromosome (black) with tangent vectors (red arrows). Small (edge length = 16.7% chr
long axis) and large (edge length = 25% chr long axis) voxels (red boxes) are blown-up as insets and
used to estimate short and long range orientational order, respectively. Right: Local nematic order
parameter is calculated for all tangent vectors within every voxel and across 75
structures/conformations.

803
Figure 5. Active genes occur throughout dinoflagellate chromosomes. A) Cylindrical coordinate
system with cylindrical axis aligned with the chromosome long axis. The outward radial axis is
perpendicular to the cylindrical axis. The CLC model predicts that active genes are near the
chromosome surface on extrachromosomal loops, and not in the condensed core. B) Normalized gene
expression (data: [36-38]) as a function of distance to core (relative radial position) and position along
long axis (relative cylindrical position) of consensus conformations for *F. kawagutti* (green) and *S.*
microadriaticum (blue). C) Normalized gene expression of population-based conformations of
chromosome 1 for each species using the same cylindrical coordinate system.