Human ribosome interactions reframe neomycin toxicity

Meng Wu[1,#], Lingfan Zhu[1,#], Xinyi Zhang[1,#], Changfeng Jia[1,#], Keqin Wu[1,#], Chuansen Yi[1], Shuangli Sun[1], Zhe Zhang[1], Lei Guo[2], Xuben Hou[3,*], Alexey Amunts[4,5,*], Wenfei Li[1,2,*]

[1] School of Basic Medical Sciences, Cheeloo College of Medicine, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, China.

[2] Children's Hospital Affiliated to Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, China

[3] Department of Medicinal Chemistry, Shandong Key Laboratory of Druggability Optimization and Evaluation for Lead Compounds, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Cheeloo College of Medicine, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, China.

[4] University of Münster, Schlossplatz 8, 48143 Münster, Germany

[5] Department of Structural Biochemistry, Max Planck Institute of Molecular Physiology, Otto-Hahn-Str. 11, 44227 Dortmund, Germany

[#] Equal contribution

[*] Correspondence to: wenfeili@sdu.edu.cn; alexey.amunts@gmail.com

Abstract

Aminoglycosides like neomycin are widely used but clinically limited due to toxicity, traditionally attributed to mitoribosome inhibition. Here, we demonstrate that this assumption requires re-evaluation by comparing neomycin's interactions with human ribosomes *in vitro* and in cells. While cryo-EM and biochemical assays reveal strong *in vitro* binding to both mitoribosomes and cytosolic ribosomes, especially at conserved regions such as the helix 44 (h44) decoding center despite sequence divergence, and H69. Cellular analyses show minimal impact on global translation, reduced occupancy on cytosolic ribosomes, and a complete absence of neomycin on mitoribosomes. These discrepancies suggest limited mitochondrial permeability rather than direct mitoribosome inhibition underlies neomycin's toxicity. Our findings redefine the mechanistic basis of aminoglycosides side effects and call for a reassessment of their cellular targets.

Introduction

Precise control of protein synthesis is fundamental to cellular life, and its disruption is a common target for antibiotics[1–4]. Although aminoglycosides are highly effective against bacteria, their systemic clinical use is constrained by significant oto- and nephrotoxicity in patients[5,6]. While selectivity of aminoglycosides for bacterial ribosomes is often attributed to structural variations within h44 decoding site compared to their eukaryotic counterparts[7,8], the structural similarity between bacterial and mitochondrial translation apparatus suggests a potential for off-target effects may underlie the observed human toxicities[9–15]. Aminoglycosides have been reported to interact with eukaryotic ribosomes, influencing translation fidelity or inducing premature termination codon readthrough[16–20]. Derivatives of aminoglycosides could further enhance specificity to eukaryotic ribosome for therapeutic purposes, such as leishmania targeting[21] or nonsense mutation suppression for genetic diseases[22].

Neomycin is a 4,5-linked aminoglycoside antibiotic[16,23] that inhibits bacterial translation primarily by binding to the decoding A site[24,25]. This involves binding to h44 of the small subunit (SSU) and H69 of the large subunit (LSU), thereby causing codon misreading and translation inhibition[3,24,26–28]. Molecular dynamics simulations of the decoding site showed that the catalytic activity also depends on rRNA A-site dynamics[29]. Despite the assumption that mitochondrial translation is the primary site of aminoglycoside toxicity, neomycin has also been shown to disrupt mitochondrial lipid metabolism, and promote pathological interactions with lipid droplets, leading to oxidative stress and impaired fatty acid utilization[30]. Thus, the understanding of neomycin's impact for guiding the development of safer therapeutic strategies warrants critical re-evaluation. A detailed investigation of neomycin's interaction with both human mitochondrial and cytosolic ribosomes is crucial for a complete picture of its cellular impact and for guiding the development of safer therapeutic strategies.

Previous studies successfully used addition of antibiotics streptomycin[31] and quinupristin/dalfopristin[32] directly to the cell culture to define their structures in the mitoribosome-bound form. In this study, we systematically investigate neomycin's action on mitoribosomes and cytosolic ribosomes from HEK (human embryonic kidney) 293-

derived cells. We determined the cryo-EM structures of human mitoribosomes and

cytosolic ribosomes bound to neomycin *in vitro*, then analyzed native ribosomes isolated

from drug-treated cells to assess neomycin's occupancy *in vivo.* Our results reveal

striking discrepancies between *in vitro* and *in vivo* drug behavior, including limited

engagement and selective loss of binding at key functional sites, such as h44, in the

cellular environment. These findings challenge the conventional views of neomycin's

mitochondrial toxicity and indicate that additional factors, including cellular bioavailability

barriers, redox-dependent binding plasticity, and ribosomal dynamics should be taken

into account when considering therapeutic strategies.

Results

Distinct neomycin-binding landscape on human mitoribosome

To investigate the molecular basis of neomycin's interaction with human mitoribosomes,

we performed cryo-EM on mitoribosomes rapidly isolated from HEK293F cells[33] and

incubated with 50 μM neomycin. This yielded six maps with average resolutions ranging

from 2.9−3.3 Å. These states were designated as "non-rotated A/A-P/P", "non-rotated

A/A-P/P-E/E", "partially rotated A/A-P/P-E/E", "partially rotated hybrid A/P-P/E", "rotated

empty", "rotated hybrid A/P-P/E" (**Supplementary Fig. 1, Supplementary Table 1**). The

map quality allowed us to consistently identify cofactors, including polyamines and Fe-S

clusters, associated with rRNA and proteins, in agreement with previous reports[15,31]

(**Supplementary Fig. 1c-d**). Neomycin is composed of four linked monosaccharide rings

(I-IV), including a central 2-deoxystreptamine (ring II) and three amino-modified sugars

(**Fig. 1a**). Across the six states, we identified nine distinct densities corresponding to

neomycin molecules: three on the mitochondrial small ribosomal subunit (mtSSU) (Neo1-

3) and six on the mitochondrial large ribosomal subunit (mtLSU) (Neo4-9) (**Fig. 1b**,

Supplementary Table 2).

Specifically, Neo1 displayed well-defined density for all four rings (I-IV) and bound to h44

adjacent to the A-tRNA binding site within the decoding center (**Fig. 1c, Supplementary**

Fig. 2, Supplementary Fig. 3a and d). This binding effectively blocks proper pairing of

tRNA with mRNA, consistent with observations in bacterial ribosomes[24,25]
(**Supplementary Fig. 3a**). Neo1 establishes potential hydrogen bonds with several
nucleotides from the mtSSU including G1489, U1490, C1491, A1555, A1557, A1558,
G1559 and U1560 (**Fig. 1c, Supplementary Fig. 2d**). Notably, ring I of Neo1 forms stable
π-π stacking with the nucleobase C1556 (**Fig. 1c, Supplementary Fig. 2d**). Furthermore,
two conserved nucleotides, A1447 and A1558 (equivalent to A1492/A1493 in bacteria),
are observed to flip out of h44 (**Fig. 1c**), a characteristic of sampling the codon-anticodon
interaction that facilitates near cognate tRNA incorporation of incorrect amino acid during
protein synthesis[34–36].

The Neo2 molecule, situated in a pocket formed by h1 and h44, displayed well-identified
density for all four rings (**Fig. 1d, Supplementary Fig. 3c-d**). It establishes potential
hydrogen bonds with the nucleobase of C1481 and sugar-phosphate backbone of U656,
G657, G658 and G899 from the mtSSU (**Fig. 1d**). Similarly, the Neo3 molecule binds to
h28 near the P-tRNA, stabilized by hydrogen bonds with nucleotides from the mtSSU
(specifically, the phosphate group of G1469 and A1470; and the nucleobases from G1472,
C1473, G1474, G1178, U1180 and C1182) (**Fig. 1e, Supplementary Fig. 3c-d**). Neo4
binds to the terminal hairpin of H69 with a relatively less well-identified density (**Fig. 1f,**
Supplementary Fig. 3d). It is stabilized by nucleotides from both the mtSSU (G1079
U1081 and G1582) and mtLSU (C2583 and U2586) (**Fig. 1f, Supplementary Fig. 2e,**
Supplementary Fig. 3b-c). H69 is recognized as another critical binding pocket for
aminoglycosides. Consistent with previous bacterial structural data[24,25], Neo1 and Neo4
represent conserved neomycin binding sites in human mitoribosomes, located within the
h44 and H69 regions, respectively (**Supplementary Fig. 3a-b**).

Fig. 1| Structural analysis of neomycin binding to mitoribosome *in vitro*. a Chemical structure of neomycin. **b** Overall structure of the neomycin-bound mitoribosome in non-rotated state comprising the mtSSU (yellow), mtLSU (blue), mRNA (red), A-site tRNA (magenta) and P-site tRNA (green). rRNA helices h44 and H69 are shown in cartoon in gold and blue, respectively. **c** Close-up view of Neo1 occupying the conserved pocket formed by h44. **d** Close-up view of Neo2 binding pocket formed by residues from h1 and h44. **e** Close-up view of Neo3 binding pocket in h28. **f** Close-up view of Neo4 binding pocket formed by H69 and stabilized by nucleotides from both H69 and the mtSSU. Key interacting nucleotides are represented as sticks (oxygen in red, nitrogen in blue).

The engagement of neomycin, particularly at h44 and H69, was found to be dependent on the rotational state of the mitoribosome (**Supplementary Table 2**). Specifically, Neo1 binds to h44, exhibited well-defined density for all four of its rings across various non-rotated and partially rotated states (**Supplementary Table 2, Supplementary Fig. 3d**). However, it was notably absent in the functional rotated state containing A/P and P/E tRNAs (**Supplementary Table 2**). This suggests that neomycin binding to h44

preferentially stabilizes non-rotated or partially rotated conformations, thereby preventing
the mitoribosome from fully entering the functional rotated state. This observation aligns
with findings in bacterial systems, where neomycin binding to h44 is known to restrict
subunit rotation and maintain a non-rotated state, providing a structural basis for its
inhibitory mechanism[24,27].

For H69, discernible densities for rings I to III of neomycin were observed in both rotated
and non-rotated states only when tRNAs occupied the A and P sites (**Fig. 1f,**
Supplementary Table 2, Supplementary Fig. 3d). Intriguingly, H69 binding was absent
in partially rotated states (**Supplementary Table 2**). This indicates that H69 binding is
contingent upon specific tRNA occupancy and ribosomal conformation, favoring either
the non-rotated or fully rotated states with engaged tRNAs. Collectively, this
conformational state-dependent binding of neomycin to both h44 and H69 on the
mitoribosome suggests a dynamic interplay between drug association and the ribosome's
structural landscape, paralleling similar mechanisms observed in bacterial ribosomes.

Structural analysis reveals canonical and novel neomycin-binding sites on the
human cytosolic ribosome

To understand the impact of neomycin on human cellular translation and its potential
toxicity, we assessed its interaction with human cytosolic ribosomes (**Supplementary Fig.**
4, Supplementary Table 3). While previous studies have indicated sequence differences
in the critical h44 region of human ribosomes compared to their bacterial counterparts
(**Supplementary Fig. 2a-c**), potentially affecting aminoglycoside binding[3,24,26–28], our *in*
vitro translation (IVT) assays revealed that neomycin significantly inhibits cytosolic
ribosomes activity, with a half-maximal inhibitory concentration (IC_{50}) of approximately 50
µM (**Fig. 2a**). This finding suggests that neomycin can effectively target human cytosolic
ribosomes and inhibit its translation.

Fig. 2| Structural analysis of neomycin binding to cytosolic ribosomes *in vitro*. a Luciferase reporter assays of cytosolic ribosomes in response to neomycin at different concentrations of 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50 and 100 µM (data are presented as mean ± s.d., n = 3 independent experiments). **b** Overall structure of neomycin-bound cytosolic ribosomes in rotated state comprising the SSU (yellow), LSU (blue), mRNA (red), A/P-site tRNA (magenta) and P/E-site tRNA (green). rRNA helices h44 and H69 are shown in cartoon in gold and blue, respectively. **c** Close-up view of Neo1 bound to h44. **d** Close-up view of Neo11 bound to a novel pocket within h44 in the rotated state. **e** A different conformation of Neo11 bound to in the partially rotated state. **f** A novel pocket accommodating three neomycin molecules (Neo13, Neo14, and Neo18), with G1940 adopting a unique conformation upon neomycin binding (orange: pre-binding conformation, blue: post-binding conformation). **g** Close-up view of Neo19 bound to a pocket formed by H53 and H54 from the LSU. **h** Comparison showing that in the mitoribosome, the Neo19 site is preoccupied by mitochondrial protein mL30 (PDB: 7QI5[15]).

To further elucidate the molecular mechanism of this inhibition and the specific binding
modes of neomycin on the cytosolic ribosome, we subsequently performed cryo-EM
analysis of cytosolic ribosome complexes incubated with 50 µM neomycin (**Fig. 2**,
Supplementary Fig. 4, Supplementary Table 3). Our single-particle analysis yielded
structures of ribosomes in three distinct translational states: a non-rotated state with P/P
and E/E-site tRNA; a partially rotated state with eEF2, SERBP1 and E/E-site tRNA; and
a rotated state with A/P and P/E-site tRNA (**Supplementary Fig. 4a**). Across these maps,
we identified neomycin molecules bound at 17 distinct pockets: three on the small
ribosomal subunit (SSU) (Neo1, Neo10 and Neo11) and fourteen on the large ribosomal
subunit (LSU) (Neo12-Neo25) (**Fig. 2b, Supplementary Table 4, Supplementary Fig.**
5). Notably, the majority of these binding pockets were consistently occupied by neomycin
across the different ribosomal states (**Supplementary Table 4**).

A well-established mechanism for aminoglycoside action in bacteria involves binding to
the decoding center, primarily formed by h44 of the small subunit[3,24,26–28]. We observed
analogous binding in the human cytosolic ribosome despite sequence differences (**Fig. 2,**
Supplementary Fig. 2a-c). Our structures of the neomycin-bound human cytosolic
ribosome revealed Neo1 at the universally conserved aminoglycoside binding pocket
within h44 (**Fig. 2b-c, Supplementary Table 4, Supplementary Fig. 5a-c and h**). While
the overall binding mode is conserved, superimposition of human and bacterial h44
structures indicated slight conformational changes and subtle differences in the precise
neomycin binding pose (**Supplementary Fig. 5a-c**). Neo1 interacts with U1821-U1827
of h44, with A1824 and A1825 (equivalent to A1492/A1493 in bacteria) flipped out from
the helix, consistent with observations in bacteria and mitoribosomes (**Fig. 1c, Fig. 2c**).

Intriguingly, we also identified a second neomycin molecule (Neo11) bound to a novel,
distinct pocket located centrally on h44, away from the canonical A-site tRNA binding
region (**Fig. 2d-e, Supplementary Fig. 5h**). The conformation of Neo11 within this pocket
exhibited significant differences between the partially rotated and rotated states (**Fig. 2d-**
e). Specifically, in the rotated ribosome, ring I of Neo11 directly interacts with G437 from
the SSU via a hydrogen bond, while ring IV forms hydrogen bonds with h44 residues,
including G1726, G1727 and A1806 (**Fig. 2d**). In contrast, in the partially rotated state
(characterized by an approximate 5° rotation of the SSU relative to the one from the

rotated state), this pocket undergoes a spatial displacement of approximately 3 Å.
Meanwhile, Neo11 undergoes a 180° flip with its ring I approaching the A1806 direction
(**Fig. 2e**). This conformational rearrangement leads to entirely distinct interactions
between Neo11 and h44: ring I forms a hydrogen bond with C1807, ring II interacts with
U1730 and G1805 (proximal of A1806), and ring IV engages with the phosphate group of
G1726 and G1727 (**Fig. 2e, Supplementary Fig. 5h**). These latter interactions, where
nucleobases stabilize neomycin, occur specifically in the rotated state. These dynamic
binding characteristics suggest a potential link between the novel Neo11 binding site and
ribosome dynamics. Notably, unlike in bacterial ribosomes and mitoribosomes where H69
is a conserved aminoglycoside pocket, no neomycin binding was observed to H69 of the
human cytosolic ribosome, likely due to sequence differences in human H69 causing a
relatively smaller pocket and potential steric clash (**Supplementary Fig. 5d**).

Beyond these h44-proximal sites, we identified a large, previously uncharacterized pocket
formed by helices H89 and H72 of the LSU rRNA and a conserved rRNA loop (C1928-
C2053) (**Fig. 2f**). This pocket simultaneously accommodates three neomycin molecules
(Neo13, Neo14, and Neo18) (**Fig. 2f, Supplementary Fig. 5h**). Upon neomycin binding
within this pocket, we observed a distinct conformational change in nucleotide G1940
(**Fig. 2f**). This specific conformational alteration of G1940 was consistently present across
all structural classes of neomycin-bound ribosomes. Analyzing the identified binding
pockets revealed significant differences compared to those observed in mitoribosomes,
with the exception of the universally conserved Neo1 site (**Supplementary Tables 2 and
4**). Several neomycin-binding pockets appeared to be specific to the human cytosolic
ribosome, occupying regions that correspond to different ribosomal proteins in the
bacterial ribosome or mitoribosome (**Fig. 2g-h, Supplementary Fig. 5e-g**). For example,
Neo19 binds to a pocket formed by LSU nucleotides, a pocket that is absent in
mitoribosomes as it is occupied by the mL30 protein (**Fig. 2g-h**). These differences
highlight the distinct structural landscapes of various ribosomes. Collectively, these
multiple binding interactions, particularly at the h44 decoding center, provide a structural
rationale for the neomycin-induced inhibition of cytosolic translation observed in our IVT
assays (**Fig. 2**).

Absence of neomycin binding to mitoribosomes in cells

While our cryo-EM data analysis revealed multiple binding of neomycin to both mitoribosomes and cytosolic ribosomes *in vitro* (**Figs. 1 and 2**), its effects on cellular translation were mild. Cell viability assays (CCK8) indicated limited cytotoxicity upon short-term neomycin exposure with an IC_{50} of approximately 1.2 mM after prolonged (72 h) treatment (**Fig. 3a**). Consistent with this, L-azidohomoalanine (L-AHA) labeling assay (a method for detecting newly synthesized nascent chains)[37–39] showed no significant change of global mitochondrial translation (**Fig. 3b**).

Fig. 3| *In vivo* effects and structural dynamics of neomycin on human mitoribosomes. **a** Cell viability of HEK293T cells measured by the CCK-8 assay after treatment with increasing concentrations of neomycin for 3 h, 24 h, and 72 h, respectively (data are presented as mean ± s.d., n = 3 independent experiments). **b** *De novo* mitochondrial nascent protein synthesis measured via L-AHA labeling. **c** Overall cryo-EM structure of native mitoribosome with different tRNAs and cofactors. Coloring is consistent with previous figures. **d** MD simulations depicting the temperature-dependent binding stability of neomycin molecules (Neo1, Neo2, and Neo3) within the mtSSU, illustrating the relative movement of the neomycin molecules within their binding pocket. The changes in distance between the ligand mass center and the binding pocket mass center (defined as the centroid of residues within 3 Å of the ligand in initial cryo-EM structure) during molecular dynamics simulations at temperatures ranging from 90 K to 310 K. **e** Calculated linear interaction energy for neomycin within the mtSSU.

To investigate this discrepancy between *in vitro* potency and *in vivo* cellular effects, we conducted comprehensive structural, biochemical and computational analysis of the native ribosome (**Supplementary Figs. 6-10**). We isolated the native translation complexes from the kidney-derived HEK293F cells treated with 1 mM neomycin. This concentration, while higher than typical plasma levels (up to ~0.13 mM), is clinically relevant as neomycin accumulates to millimolar concentrations in the kidney—a primary site of its toxicity[40,41]. As previously shown[31,42,43] this approach implies that the antimicrobial would have to be imported into mitochondria, preserving more native states. Mitoribosomes were then isolated and subjected to a cryo-EM analysis (**Supplementary Fig. 6, Supplementary Table 5**).

The cryo-EM analysis of mitoribosomes from treated cells yielded six distinct translational states characterized by varying SSU rotations and associated translation factors (**Fig. 3c, Supplementary Fig. 6**). Consistent with our biochemical data showing limited cellular toxicity and effect on mitochondrial translation upon neomycin treatment (**Fig. 3a-b**), our structural analysis revealed a striking absence of bound neomycin molecules on human mitoribosomes isolated from these treated cells (**Fig. 3c, Supplementary Table 2**). This indicates that under the cellular conditions, neomycin does not stably associate with or

significantly inhibit human mitoribosomes *in vivo*.

At physiological temperatures, biomolecules can access a broader range of
conformations, and the rates of conformational switching are generally faster than at
lower temperatures[44]. Although rapid cooling during cryo-EM sample preparation can
kinetically trap molecules in states representative of the room-temperature ensemble[3,44].
It remains crucial to assess if the binding pocket for neomycin adopts a non-binding-
competent conformation specifically at physiological cellular temperatures *in vivo*. To
investigate this, we performed all-atom explicit-solvent molecular dynamics (MD)
simulations of the mtSSU with bound neomycin, focusing on the decoding center (**Fig.
3d-e, Supplementary Fig. 9**). Molecular dynamics (MD) simulations were initiated from
the cryo-EM structure and performed across a range of temperatures up to physiological
conditions. For each temperature, five independent replicates were conducted,
accumulating a total simulation time of 0.5 μs. As anticipated, the fluctuation of the
antibiotic's binding pockets and its atomic positions, quantified by root mean square
deviation (RMSD) analysis, increased with rising temperature (**Supplementary Fig. 9a-
c**). Despite these thermal fluctuations, the neomycin molecules remained stably
associated with their binding sites within the mitoribosome (**Fig. 3d**). The consistent
association of neomycin with its mitoribosomal binding sites even at physiological
temperatures effectively rules out temperature-driven conformational changes as the sole
reason for its observed absence *in vitro*. Furthermore, comparative analysis of the MD
trajectories revealed enhanced binding stability of neomycin at the Neo1 site relative to
Neo2 and Neo3, evidenced by lower ligand RMSD values and reduced calculated linear
interaction energy (**Fig. 3e**)**.**

Reduced engagement of neomycin with human cytosolic ribosomes *in vivo*

Despite strong *in vitro* inhibition of cytosolic ribosomes and observed binding to the key
h44 site in *in vitro* incubated structures (**Fig. 2**), neomycin treatment did not markedly
inhibit nanoluciferase expression in cells, even at high concentrations (**Fig. 4a,
Supplementary Fig. 8a and c**). This suggests a limited overall effect on cellular
translation. Although L-AHA labeling assay showed no significant change of global

cytosolic translation, we did observe an increase in stop codon readthrough in a reporter cell line upon neomycin treatment (**Fig. 4b-c, Supplementary Fig. 8b**). This suggests that neomycin can influence cytosolic translation fidelity, even with minimal overall inhibition. To further understand neomycin's cellular effect on cytosolic translation, we isolated cytosolic ribosomes from the same batch of neomycin-treated cells used for mitoribosome analysis. Our analysis revealed ribosomes in four different states, with the rotated state being the most prevalent (**Supplementary Fig. 7, Supplementary Table 5**). We detected 15 neomycin molecules bound to the ribosomes, occupying some of the same pockets identified in our *in vitro* incubation experiments (**Supplementary Table 4**). Notably, densities for some sites such as Neo21 and Neo19 were diminished or absent in the cellular samples compared to the *in vitro* incubated ribosomes (**Supplementary Table 4**). Strikingly, the Neo1 site within the canonical h44 decoding center, a key binding site *in vitro*, was completely devoid of neomycin in the cellular dataset (**Supplementary Table 4, Fig. 4d**). This absence occurred despite no significant conformational changes in the h44 pocket or novel post-translational modifications in the decoding center (**Supplementary Fig. 8e**). We performed temperature-dependent MD simulations on the SSU was conducted for the SSU with its bound neomycin molecules, including Neo1. Although the neomycin molecules and their binding pocket displayed conformational change with increasing temperatures (**Supplementary Fig 9d-f**), their binding relative to their pockets remained stable with minor RMSD during simulations (**Fig. 4e**), excluding temperature-driven conformational changes as the sole cause for its *in vitro* absence. Additionally, neomycin binding at Neo1 site exhibited significantly stronger affinity than at Neo10 or Neo11 from the SSU, evidenced by much lower interaction energies (**Fig. 4f**), indicating that the lack of h44 bound neomycin is not due to weak binding affinity.

Our *in vivo* structural findings, particularly the reduced occupancy on cytosolic ribosomes (**Supplementary Table 4**), suggest that the cellular environment critically modulates neomycin's interactions, contrasting with direct incubation experiments. Given that prior research has highlighted the protective effect of GSH against neomycin toxicity[45,46], we examined the role of the cellular redox state. To test this, we performed *in vitro* and *in vivo* translation assays using both oxidizing and reducing agents, but found no significant change in neomycin's inhibitory action (**Fig. 4g-h, Supplementary Fig. 8d**). This

suggests that the redox state is not the primary factor responsible for the restricted binding at the h44 site or the observed *in vivo* translational effects (**Supplementary Table 4**). Moreover, at higher concentrations (3 mM) and prolonged exposure, neomycin binding became restricted to only two pockets (**Supplementary Tables 4-5, Supplementary Fig. 10**), suggesting that cellular mechanisms, such as drug efflux, may actively limit neomycin's interaction with its targets.

Fig. 4| *In vivo* effects and structural analysis of neomycin with human cytosolic ribosomes. a *In vivo* translation assays using the NLuc cell line at various time points following treatment with different concentrations of neomycin (data are presented as mean ± s.d., n = 3 independent experiments). **b** *De novo* nascent protein synthesis measured via L-AHA labeling. **c** Quantification of cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) nonsense allele readthrough in cultured HEK293T cells treated with increasing concentrations of neomycin for 24 h and 48 h (data are presented as mean ± s.d., n = 3 independent experiments). **d** Overall cryo-EM structure of native cytosolic ribosomes with different tRNAs and cofactors. Coloring is consistent with previous figures. **e** MD simulations depicting the temperature-dependent binding stability of neomycin molecules (Neo1, Neo10, and Neo11) within the SSU, illustrating the relative movement of the neomycin molecules within their binding pocket. The changes in distance between the ligand's center of mass and the binding pocket's center of mass (defined as the centroid of residues within 3 Å of the ligand in initial cryo-EM structure) during molecular dynamics simulations at temperatures ranging from 90 K to 310 K. **f** Calculated linear interaction energy for neomycin within the SSU. **g** *In vitro* translation assays with luciferase reporters were performed in the presence of 0.02 mM neomycin under varying redox conditions. The redox conditions are mimicked by adding different concentrations of H_2O_2 and TCEP. The vehicle group presents the condition with no additional redox agents (data are presented as mean ± s.d., n = 3 independent experiments). **h** Cell viability of HEK293T cells measured by the CCK-8 assay after treatment with increasing concentrations of neomycin in the presence or absence of H_2O_2 (data are presented as mean ± s.d., n = 3 independent experiments). **i** *In vivo* translation assays with luciferase reporters in response to different concentrations of neomycin in a 0.3 mM H_2O_2 environment (data are presented as mean ± s.d., n = 3 independent experiments).

Discussion

This study provides insights into neomycin's interaction with human ribosomes by uncovering the differences between its *in vitro* binding properties and in-cell behavior. We show that neomycin's activity is modulated by the cellular environment, which can

diminish or prevent its engagement with key ribosomal targets. Our findings highlight a

clear divergence between *in vitro* and *in vivo* neomycin-ribosome interactions. *In vitro*,

neomycin robustly binds conserved sites on both mitoribosomes and cytosolic ribosomes,

including the bacterial-like decoding center at h44 (**Figs. 1-2, Supplementary Tables 2**

and 4). Crucially, however, in cells neomycin fails to occupy these sites, most notably

h44 in cytosolic ribosomes, and is undetectable on mitoribosomes (**Figs. 3-4**,

Supplementary Table 2). These observations correlate with minimal inhibition of global

translation, suggesting intracellular factors, such as limited mitochondrial permeability

and redox balance may restrict neomycin's effective access.

Based on our findings, we re-evaluated several hypotheses for this striking *in vivo / in*

vitro divergence. While the cellular redox state was a possible candidate given prior

research on neomycin toxicity[45,46], our translation assays showed that the reducing

agents TCEP or GSH had only a minimal effect on neomycin's inhibitory action (**Fig. 4**,

Supplementary Fig. 8). This suggests that the redox environment is not the primary

mechanism responsible for neomycin's lack of binding at the key h44 site. Instead, we

propose that other robust cellular mechanisms, such as drug efflux, are critically involved.

This is further supported by the observed restricted engagement of neomycin on the

ribosomes at higher neomycin concentrations (**Supplementary Tables 4-5**). Beyond

direct ribosomal inhibition, other potential toxicity mechanisms exist, as exemplified by a

recent finding that neomycin induces toxicity by mediating PGC-1α imbalance of

mitochondria-lipid droplet homeostasis[30]**.**

Expanding on these insights, our observations reveal that neomycin binding is highly

sensitive to the ribosomal state, aligning with the known mechanism by which 4,5-linked

aminoglycosides stabilize the non-rotated state and inhibit translocation[24,27]. Furthermore,

while the binding of neomycin to mitoribosomes and cytosolic ribosomes differs overall,

the fundamental contact modules of neomycin remain conserved. To investigate this in

detail, we quantified the interacting frequency of each neomycin atom across previously

reported bacterial ribosome structures and human ribosome structures (mitoribosome

and cytosolic ribosome) determined in our study. Our analysis revealed that, consistent

with prior bacterial studies, rings I and II of neomycin are the most frequently utilized

moieties for ribosomal interaction[24,27], playing a crucial role in neomycin's binding

(**Supplementary Fig. 9g**). Specifically, these two -NH$_2$ groups from ring II (2-DOS ring,
the core of aminoglycosides) exhibit the highest frequency of interactions across all three
ribosome types, closely followed by the -OH and 6'-NH$_2$ groups from ring I
(**Supplementary Fig. 9g**). The strong binding capabilities of these amino groups stem
from their ability to form hydrogen bonds with phosphate oxygen atoms within the
ribosome's rRNA backbone or with nucleotide hydroxyl groups. Furthermore, their typical
positive charge enables robust electrostatic interactions with the negatively charged
phosphate backbone of the ribosome.

Collectively, our study demonstrates that neomycin-ribosome interactions are not static
but highly sensitive to various factors, such as the ribosomal state and cellular
environment, indicating an additional level of complexity in the ribosome-antibiotic binding
studies. Moreover, our findings challenge the prevailing assumption that mitochondrial
translation inhibition is the primary cause of neomycin toxicity, as neomycin was notably
absent on native mitoribosomes *in vivo*. Instead, toxicity may involve metabolic
disturbances or drug accumulation under pathological conditions. The resilience of
mitoribosomes to neomycin may also arise from an adaptive cellular response, inherent
insensitivity to certain threshold levels, or a limited import into mitochondria. However, the
specific mechanistic processes essential for neomycin binding warrant further
investigation. In the future, the structural studies of native samples will help to better
understand the related pathological dysfunctions.

Methods

Cell lines and cell culture

HEK293T cells were cultured at 37 °C and 5% CO$_2$ in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's
Medium (DMEM, Gibco, C11995500BT) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS,
Excell Bio, FSP500). HEK293F cells were cultured in SMM 293-TII expression medium
(Sino Bio, M293TII) in shake flasks at 37 °C, 5% CO$_2$ and 110 rpm.

Plasmid construction and generation of stable cell lines

Clonal stable cell lines expressing NanoLuciferase (NLuc) or cystic fibrosis
transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) were generated as previously described[47].
The NLuc expression construct was generated by PCR amplification of NLuc-Flag
fragments, subsequently assembled into a linearized vector (originally derived from Jamie
H. D. Cate's laboratory) via Gibson Assembly. For the *CFTR* plasmid, *CFTR-G542X*
(UGA) along with the G542X context (seven codons upstream and downstream) was
fused to NLuc. This recombinant fragment was cloned into the same laboratory-derived
backbone vector using Gibson Assembly. The CFTR-G542X mutant was created through
site-directed mutagenesis of wild-type *CFTR* cDNA templates. The plasmid construct was
subsequently transfected into HEK293T cells and stable transfectants were selected
using 1 µg/ml puromycin for two weeks.

In vivo translation assays

The effect of neomycin on cytosolic translation was evaluated using the NLuc cell lines,
which were exposed to different concentrations of neomycin (0.5, 1, 2 and 3 mM) or
DMEM as a control. Luciferase activity was quantified after 1, 4, and 24 h using microplate
luminometer (BERTHOLD, Centro XS3 LB 960). To access the impact of the redox
environment on neomycin toxicity, 0.3 mM H_2O_2 was co-administered with varying
concentrations of neomycin (0.1, 1, and 3 mM) for 1 h. Additionally, to determine the
readthrough effect of neomycin, the CFTR cell lines were treated with different
concentrations of neomycin (0.5, 1, 2, and 3 mM) for 24 h and 48 h, respectively.

In vitro transcription and translation assays

The DNA template for *in vitro* transcription was PCR-amplified from plasmid pGM_EMCV-
NLuc using primers encoding T7 RNA polymerase promoter and poly-A tail sequences.
The *in vitro* transcription reaction was performed as previously described[47]. mRNA
transcripts were assessed for quality and size by gel electrophoresis, quantified
spectrophotometrically (Implen spectrophotometer, Nanophotometer NP80), diluted to 1
µg/µL, aliquoted, and preserved at -80 °C prior to *in vitro* translation reactions.

HEK293T cells were harvested at ~80% confluency and resuspended in ice-cold lysis

buffer (10 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 10 mM KOAc, 0.5 mM Mg(OAc)$_2$, 5 mM DTT) at a

1:1 (v/v) ratio. The HEK293T cell lysates and IVT reaction systems were prepared as

described previously[48,49]. Neomycin (MCE, HY-17624A) was introduced at different

concentrations as experimental variables in the reaction system at final concentrations of

1 µM, 5 µM, 10 µM, 15 µM, 25 µM, 30 µM, 40 µM, 50 µM and 100 µM. Reactions were

equilibrated at 30 °C for 25 min prior to luciferase activity measurement using a microplate

luminometer (BERTHOLD, Centro XS3 LB 960). Lysates and mRNA aliquots from

identical preparation lots were used for comparative assays within individual experimental

series to control batch variability.

474   Cell counting kit-8 (CCK-8) cell growth assay

The cytotoxicity of neomycin was measured in HEK293T cell lines using the CCK-8 assay.

Approximately 8000 cells per well were seeded in a 96-well plate in DMEM medium

supplemented with 10% FBS. After 24 h of adhesion, the cells were treated with different

concentrations of neomycin dilutions versus DMEM vehicle control. After 72 h of

incubation, culture medium was replaced with fresh DMEM medium supplemented with

CCK-8 (10% v/v reagent: medium ratio) for an additional 2 h of light-protected incubation.

Cellular viability was determined by measuring at 450 nm using a microplate reader. The

half-maximal inhibitory concentration (IC$_{50}$) for neomycin was calculated by fitting the

dose-response curve using GraphPad Prism software. All experiments were performed

in biological triplicates (n = 3).

486   L-AHA labeling of nascent polypeptides

487   L-AHA labeling of mitochondrial-encoded nascent polypeptides was performed as

488   described previously[39]. Briefly, the cells were treated with different concentrations of

489   neomycin and 50 µg/mL cycloheximide (CHX, MCE, HY-12320), which selectively inhibits

490   eukaryotic cytosolic ribosome activity by blocking translational elongation. Fluorescence

491   signals were analyzed using an Amersham Typhoon 5 (Cytiva).

For the cytosolic nascent polypeptide labeling, the procedure mirrored that used for mitochondrial-encoded nascent polypeptides, with cells treated with 50 μg/mL CHX as a positive control. Following the labeling, cells were harvested and resuspended in buffer containing 60 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0, 50 mM NaCl, 2 mM $MgCl_2$, 40 mM KCl, 5% glycerol, 0.1% NP-40 and 1× protease inhibitor and were subsequently homogenized on ice using a glass dounce homogenizer. The resulting cell lysate was cleared by centrifugation at 15,000 ×*g* for 15 min at 4 °C, and the supernatant was transferred to new 1.5 mL tubes. The click reaction and the following protein signal detection were performed as described above. All experiments were performed in triplicate (n = 3 independent experiments).

Isolation of mitochondria and purification of mitoribosomes

Mitochondria isolation was performed as described previously[42]. A final volume of 1L HEK293F cells at a density of 3× 10^6 cells/ml was harvested, washed with Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS) buffer, and resuspended in 60mL mitochondrial isolation buffer (50 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 10 mM KCl, 1.5 mM $MgCl_2$, 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM EGTA, 1 mM DTT, protease inhibitors). Cells were lysed by grinding in a glass dounce homogenizer and lysate was clarified by centrifugation at 1000 ×*g* for 15 min, then 10,000 ×*g* for 15min at 4°C to get the crude mitochondria in the pellet. The resulting pellet was resuspended in 10 mL resuspension buffer (50 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 10 mM KCl, 1.5 mM $MgCl_2$, 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM EGTA, 1 mM DTT, 70 mM sucrose, 210 mM mannitol, and 1× protease inhibitor). Genomic DNA was removed by adding of 100 U RNase-free DNase I and centrifugation at 10,000 ×*g* for 15 min at 4 °C. The crude mitochondria were gently resuspended in 1 mL buffer containing 20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA, 250 mM sucrose and loaded onto sucrose gradients comprising 1.5 mL 60% (w/v), 4 mL 32% (w/v), 1.5 mL 23% (w/v) and 1.5 mL 15% (w/v) sucrose solutions in 20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA. The gradients were centrifuged at 28,000 rpm for 1h at 4 °C using an SW41Ti rotor (Beckman Coulter). The brown band containing mitochondria migrating to the interface of 32% and 60% sucrose was collected.

The fresh isolated mitochondria were resuspended in lysis buffer (25 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 100 mM KCl, 10 mM Mg(OAc)$_2$, 1.7% Triton X-100, 2 mM DTT, 1× protease

inhibitor) at a mitochondria-to-buffer ratio of 1:2 (v/v). The mixture was homogenized with

a glass dounce homogenizer. The lysate was cleared by centrifugation at 30,000 ×*g* for

20 min at 4 °C. The supernatant was then loaded onto the top of sucrose cushion (1 M

sucrose in 20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 100 mM KCl, 20 mM Mg(OAc)$_2$, 1% TX-100, 2

mM DTT) and centrifuged at 339,200 ×*g* for 45 minutes at 4°C using an MLA130 rotor

(Beckman Coulter). The pellet was rinsed and resuspended in Grid buffer (20 mM

HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 100 mM KCl, 10 mM Mg(OAc)$_2$, 0.02% DDM, 1 mM DTT).

Mitoribosomes (280 nM) were incubated with 50 µM neomycin (~178-fold excess) for

30 min at 4 °C prior to the cryo-EM sample preparation (molar ratio of ribosome to

neomycin around 1:170).

Human cytosolic ribosome purification

The human cytosolic ribosome was isolated using a modified protocol adapted from a

previously published paper[50]. HEK293T cells were harvested at ~80% confluency,

centrifuged at 1000 ×*g* for 10 minutes at 4 °C, and washed twice with ice-cold PBS. The

cell pellet was resuspended in an equal volume of lysis buffer (10 mM HEPES-KOH pH

7.5, 10 mM KOAc, 0.5 mM Mg(OAc)$_2$, 5 mM DTT). Following 20 min incubation on ice,

the resuspended cells were mechanically lysed by grinding in a glass homogenizer.

Lysates were centrifuged at 1,000 ×*g* for 10 min to remove cell debris, and cleared by

centrifugation at 10,000 ×*g* for 15 min at 4 °C. The supernatant was then loaded onto a

sucrose cushion (10 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 50 mM KCl, 5mM Mg(OAc)$_2$, 0.02% DDM,

1 mM DTT, 1M sucrose) and centrifuged at 603,000 ×*g* for 45 min at 4 °C in an MLA130

Rotor (Beckman Coulter). The pellets obtained were washed and sequentially

resuspended in Grid buffer (20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 50 mM KCl, 5 mM Mg(OAc)$_2$,

0.02% DDM) and measured using an Implen spectrophotometer. Cytosolic ribosomes

(294 nM) were incubated with 50 µM neomycin (~170-fold excess) for 30 min at 4 °C prior

to the cryo-EM sample preparation (molar ratio of ribosome to neomycin around 1:170).

Isolation of mitoribosome and cytosolic ribosome from neomycin treated cells

HEK293F was scaled up sequentially, by inoculating at 1×10^6 cells/mL and subsequently

splitting at a cell density of 3.0×10^6 cells/mL until achieving 300 mL final culture volume.

Neomycin was added to HEK293F cells to a final concentration of 1 mM for 1 hour prior
to utilization. Native human mitoribosomes purification was performed as described for
the "Isolation of mitochondria and purification of mitoribosomes" part. And no extra
neomycin was added during the purification. The same batch of cells were used for
cytosolic ribosome isolation to make strict comparison, meaning we have native
mitoribosomes and cytosolic ribosomes from the same cells. After cells harvest and lysis,
the supernatant was applied for cytosolic ribosome isolation and the pellet was for crude
mitochondria isolation. The protocol for purification of cytosolic ribosomes is the same as
described in "Human cytosolic ribosome purification". For the high concentration
neomycin treated cells, we treated the cells with 3 mM neomycin for 3 h and then
conducted the cytosolic ribosomes isolation as described.

Cryo-EM grids preparation

The concentrations of the mitoribosomes and cytosolic ribosomes used for cryo-EM grid
preparation were 280 nM and 160 nM, respectively. Approximately, 3.2 µL aliquots were
applied to a plasma-cleaned holey carbon grid (R1.2/1.3, 300 mesh, Quantfoil) for 1 min,
on which a homemade continuous carbon film was precoated. Grids were blotted for 2.5 s
under 100% humidity at 4 °C and plunge-frozen in liquid ethane using Vitrobot Mark IV
(Thermo Fisher Scientific).

Cryo-EM data collection and processing

Cryo-EM micrographs of all samples were collected on a Titan Krios transmission electron
microscope (Thermo Fisher Scientific) operated at 300 kV using a slit width of 20 eV on
a GIF quantum energy filter (Gatan). The micrographs were recorded using a Falcon 4i
direct electron detector at a pixel size of 0.81 Å. A total electron dose of 50 electrons per
Å² was fractionated over 40 frames with a total exposure time of 5.9 s. Data were acquired
using EPU software[50] with a defocus ranging from 1.0 to 2.0 µm.

All datasets were processed using cryoSPARC v.4.2.1[51]. The movie stacks were first
corrected for motion using the patch motion correction tool of cryoSPARC. Contrast
transfer function (CTF) parameters were estimated using the patch CTF estimation tool.
Manual curation was performed to exclude suboptimal micrographs. From the curated

micrographs, particles were initially identified through blob-based template-free picking,

followed by iterative template-based particle picking using averaging projections selected

from 2D classification. The extracted particles underwent multiple rounds of 2D

classification to remove non-ribosomal contaminants and ice artifacts. Particles were then

used for 3D auto-refinement yielding a map for further classification.

Focused 3D classification was carried out using a mask on the SSU to facilitate

conformational sorting, enabling separation of rotated versus non-rotated ribosome states.

Another round of focused 3D classification using a spherical mask on the tRNA binding

sites was performed, separating the particles into different tRNA binding states. H69 and

h44 are key binding sites of aminoglycoside antibiotics. Therefore, a spherical mask of

radius 23 Å was generated for H69 and h44, respectively, for 3D classification to improve

the local resolution. Masks with smoothed edges were generated with the

"relion_mask_create" tool in RELION4.0.0[52]. After one round of CTF refinement, particles

of each class were further processed by focused refinements with different masks applied.

All reported map resolutions were determined by the FSC = 0.143 cutoff criterion.

Model building and refinement

In general, the structures of cytosolic ribosomes (PDB: 8QOI[53]) and mitoribosome (PDB:

7QI5 and 7QI6[15]) were used for rigid body docking into the cryo-EM density map using

UCSF ChimeraX v1.8[54]. The docked coordinates were realigned to match map orientation

and saved as models for manual building and adjustment in Coot v0.9.8.1[55]. The

neomycin ligand was fetched from the Coot ligand library using the three-letter code: NMY

and manually positioned according to the density maps. Conformational changes induced

by neomycin binding were also manually adjusted. And the unknown continuous density

was analyzed using CryFold[56] to predict the sequence and three-dimensional structure,

which was subsequently added into the model. Final models were further subjected to

refinement with Phenix.real_space_refine v1.13_2998[57,58]. The figures were prepared

with ChimeraX v1.8[54]. Figures were compiled using Adobe Illustrator.

Computational methods

mtSSU molecular dynamics (MD) simulations were performed using the AMBER package.

The system comprised ribosomal proteins, rRNA, and three neomycin molecules (Neo1,

Neo2, Neo3) solvated in an orthorhombic TIP3P water box extending 12 Å beyond the

solute. The ff19SB force field was applied to proteins, OL3 to RNA, and GAFF2

parameters with AM1-BCC charges to ligands. After energy minimization and stepwise

heating, production runs were conducted at 90 K, 280 K, 290 K, 300 K, and 310 K under

NPT conditions using a 2-fs timestep with SHAKE constraints. Five independent 100-ns

replicates per temperature were acquired. Binding free energies were calculated via the

linear interaction energy method using the *cpptraj* module in Ambertools. And the MD of

the SSU of the cytosolic ribosome with three neomycin molecules (Neo1, Neo10, and

Neo11) were performed as described for the mtSSU.

Neomycin Occupancy Estimation

Neomycin occupancy was estimated for both the mitoribosomes and cytosolic ribosomes

using OccuPy (v0.1.9)[59], following the software's documentation for compositional

heterogeneity analysis. Briefly, we processed the input cryo-EM maps through a local

filtering approach to generate local resolution maps. These maps were subsequently

used to modify the original density maps by applying an amplification power and a final

output low-pass filter. The final neomycin occupancy was visualized by coloring the

original density maps according to the modified output maps in ChimeraX v1.8[54]. This

process effectively highlighted the regions of neomycin binding across both ribosome

types.

Reporting summary

Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting

Summary linked to this paper.

Data availability

671   **Acknowledgements**

We thank Zhengkun Xie from the Center of Advanced Analysis & Gene Sequencing of Zhengzhou University for technical support, Jamie Doudna Cate and Jingdong Cheng for helpful discussions. This work was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (32171291 and 32371351 to W.L., 82302100 to M.W.), National Key Research and Development Program of China (2022YFA0807100 to W.L., 2023YFC2308900 to M.W.), Nature Science Foundation of Shandong Province (ZR2021QC002 to W.L.) the Shandong Excellent Young Scientists Fund Program (2022HWYQ-025), Taishan Scholars Program (tsqnz20221104), Cutting Edge Development Fund of Advanced Medical Research Institute (GYY2023QY01) and the Cheeloo Youth Program of Shandong University to W.L., European Research Council (805230) to A.A..

Contributions

X.Z., L.Z., C.J. and M.W. performed the sample preparation, acquired cryo-EM data, and carried out image processing and structure refinement. L.Z., C.J., W.M. and W.L. did the model building and structural analysis. X.Z., L.Z. and K.W. conducted biochemistry and cell-based experiments. X.H. performed the MD experiment. L.Z., W.L., C.J., W.M. and A.A. prepared the figures. W.L. and A.A. wrote the initial draft of the paper. All authors analyzed the data and edited the paper.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Kohanski, M. A., Dwyer, D. J. & Collins, J. J. How antibiotics kill bacteria: from targets to networks. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **8**, 423–435 (2010).
2. Lin, J., Zhou, D., Steitz, T. A., Polikanov, Y. S. & Gagnon, M. G. Ribosome-targeting antibiotics: Modes of action, mechanisms of resistance, and implications for drug design. *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* **87**, 451–478 (2018).
3. Paternoga, H. *et al.* Structural conservation of antibiotic interaction with ribosomes. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **30**, 1380–1392 (2023).

4. Wilson, D. N. Ribosome-targeting antibiotics and mechanisms of bacterial resistance.
Nat. Rev. Microbiol. **12**, 35–48 (2014).

5. Becker, B. & Cooper, M. A. Aminoglycoside antibiotics in the 21st century. *ACS Chem.*
Biol. **8**, 105–115 (2013).

6. Zaher, H. S. & Green, R. Fidelity at the molecular level: lessons from protein synthesis.
Cell **136**, 746–762 (2009).

7. Recht, M. I., Douthwaite, S. & Puglisi, J. D. Basis for prokaryotic specificity of action
of aminoglycoside antibiotics. *EMBO J.* **18**, 3133–3138 (1999).

8. Moazed, D. & Noller, H. F. Interaction of antibiotics with functional sites in 16S
ribosomal RNA. *Nature* **327**, 389–394 (1987).

9. Prezant, T. R. *et al.* Mitochondrial ribosomal RNA mutation associated with both
antibiotic-induced and non-syndromic deafness. *Nat. Genet.* **4**, 289–294 (1993).

10. Böttger, E. C., Springer, B., Prammananan, T., Kidan, Y. & Sander, P. Structural
basis for selectivity and toxicity of ribosomal antibiotics. *EMBO Rep.* **2**, 318–323
(2001).

11. Hobbie, S. N. *et al.* Genetic analysis of interactions with eukaryotic rRNA identify the
mitoribosome as target in aminoglycoside ototoxicity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*
105, 20888–20893 (2008).

12. Guan, M.-X. Mitochondrial 12S rRNA mutations associated with aminoglycoside
ototoxicity. *Mitochondrion* **11**, 237–245 (2011).

13. Matt, T. *et al.* Dissociation of antibacterial activity and aminoglycoside ototoxicity in
the 4-monosubstituted 2-deoxystreptamine apramycin. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*
A. **109**, 10984–10989 (2012).

14. Amunts, A., Brown, A., Toots, J., Scheres, S. H. W. & Ramakrishnan, V. Ribosome.
The structure of the human mitochondrial ribosome. *Science* **348**, 95–98 (2015).

15. Singh, V. *et al.* Mitoribosome structure with cofactors and modifications reveals
mechanism of ligand binding and interactions with L1 stalk. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 4272
(2024).

16. Fosso, M. Y., Li, Y. & Garneau-Tsodikova, S. New trends in aminoglycosides use.
Medchemcomm **5**, 1075–1091 (2014).

17. Prokhorova, I. *et al.* Aminoglycoside interactions and impacts on the eukaryotic
ribosome. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **114**, E10899–E10908 (2017).

18. Palmer, E., Wilhelm, J. M. & Sherman, F. Phenotypic suppression of nonsense
mutants in yeast by aminoglycoside antibiotics. *Nature* **277**, 148–150 (1979).

19. Manuvakhova, M., Keeling, K. & Bedwell, D. M. Aminoglycoside antibiotics mediate
context-dependent suppression of termination codons in a mammalian translation
system. *RNA* **6**, 1044–1055 (2000).

20. Keeling, K. M., Xue, X., Gunn, G. & Bedwell, D. M. Therapeutics based on stop codon
readthrough. *Annu. Rev. Genomics Hum. Genet.* **15**, 371–394 (2014).

21. Shalev, M. *et al.* Structural basis for selective targeting of leishmanial ribosomes:
aminoglycoside derivatives as promising therapeutics. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **43**, 8601–
8613 (2015).

22. Sabbavarapu, N. M. *et al.* Design of novel aminoglycoside derivatives with enhanced
suppression of diseases-causing nonsense mutations. *ACS Med. Chem. Lett.* **7**,
418–423 (2016).

23. Benveniste, R. & Davies, J. Structure-activity relationships among the

aminoglycoside antibiotics: role of hydroxyl and amino groups. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **4**, 402–409 (1973).

24. Wang, L. *et al.* Allosteric control of the ribosome by small-molecule antibiotics. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **19**, 957–963 (2012).

25. Wallis, M. G., von Ahsen, U., Schroeder, R. & Famulok, M. A novel RNA motif for neomycin recognition. *Chem. Biol.* **2**, 543–552 (1995).

26. Borovinskaya, M. A. *et al.* Structural basis for aminoglycoside inhibition of bacterial ribosome recycling. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **14**, 727–732 (2007).

27. Wasserman, M. R. *et al.* Chemically related 4,5-linked aminoglycoside antibiotics drive subunit rotation in opposite directions. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 7896 (2015).

28. Fourmy, D., Recht, M. I., Blanchard, S. C. & Puglisi, J. D. Structure of the A site of Escherichia coli 16S ribosomal RNA complexed with an aminoglycoside antibiotic. *Science* **274**, 1367–1371 (1996).

29. Smolkin, B. *et al.* Towards catalytic antibiotics: Redesign of aminoglycosides to catalytically disable bacterial ribosomes. *Chembiochem* **20**, 247–259 (2019).

30. Chen, B. *et al.* PGC-1α-mediated imbalance of mitochondria-lipid droplet homeostasis in neomycin-induced ototoxicity and nephrotoxicity. *Acta Pharm. Sin. B.* **14**, 4413–4430 (2024).

31. Itoh, Y. *et al.* Structure of the mitoribosomal small subunit with streptomycin reveals Fe-S clusters and physiological molecules. *Elife* **11**, (2022).

32. Sighel, D. *et al.* Inhibition of mitochondrial translation suppresses glioblastoma stem cell growth. *Cell Rep.* **35**, 109024 (2021).

33. Aibara, S., Andréll, J., Singh, V. & Amunts, A. Rapid isolation of the mitoribosome from HEK cells. *J. Vis. Exp.* (2018) doi:10.3791/57877.

34. Carter, A. P. *et al.* Functional insights from the structure of the 30S ribosomal subunit and its interactions with antibiotics. *Nature* **407**, 340–348 (2000).

35. Holm, M. *et al.* mRNA decoding in human is kinetically and structurally distinct from bacteria. *Nature* **617**, 200–207 (2023).

36. Ogle, J. M. *et al.* Recognition of cognate transfer RNA by the 30S ribosomal subunit. *Science* **292**, 897–902 (2001).

37. An, H., Ordureau, A., Körner, M., Paulo, J. A. & Harper, J. W. Systematic quantitative analysis of ribosome inventory during nutrient stress. *Nature* **583**, 303–309 (2020).

38. Yousefi, R. *et al.* Monitoring mitochondrial translation in living cells. *EMBO Rep.* **22**, e51635 (2021).

39. Li, X. *et al.* Structural basis for differential inhibition of eukaryotic ribosomes by tigecycline. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 5481 (2024).

40. Rosenberg, C. R., Fang, X. & Allison, K. R. Potentiating aminoglycoside antibiotics to reduce their toxic side effects. *PLoS One* **15**, e0237948 (2020).

41. Le, T. A. *et al.* Aminoglycoside-related nephrotoxicity and ototoxicity in clinical practice: A review of pathophysiological mechanism and treatment options. *Adv. Ther.* **40**, 1357–1365 (2023).

42. Aibara, S., Singh, V., Modelska, A. & Amunts, A. Structural basis of mitochondrial translation. *Elife* **9**, (2020).

43. Itoh, Y. *et al.* Mechanism of membrane-tethered mitochondrial protein synthesis. *Science* **371**, 846–849 (2021).

44. Bock, L. V. & Grubmüller, H. Effects of cryo-EM cooling on structural ensembles. *Nat.*

795   *Commun.* **13**, 1709 (2022).

45. Hammill, T. L. & Campbell, K. C. Protection for medication-induced hearing loss: the state of the science. *Int. J. Audiol.* **57**, S67–S75 (2018).

46. Garetz, S. L., Altschuler, R. A. & Schacht, J. Attenuation of gentamicin ototoxicity by glutathione in the guinea pig in vivo. *Hear. Res.* **77**, 81–87 (1994).

47. Li, W., Chang, S. T.-L., Ward, F. R. & Cate, J. H. D. Selective inhibition of human translation termination by a drug-like compound. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 4941 (2020).

48. Li, W. *et al.* Structural basis for selective stalling of human ribosome nascent chain complexes by a drug-like molecule. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **26**, 501–509 (2019).

49. Lintner, N. G. *et al.* Selective stalling of human translation through small-molecule engagement of the ribosome nascent chain. *PLoS Biol.* **15**, e2001882 (2017).

50. Thompson, R. F., Iadanza, M. G., Hesketh, E. L., Rawson, S. & Ranson, N. A. Collection, pre-processing and on-the-fly analysis of data for high-resolution, single-particle cryo-electron microscopy. *Nat. Protoc.* **14**, 100–118 (2019).

51. Punjani, A., Rubinstein, J. L., Fleet, D. J. & Brubaker, M. A. cryoSPARC: algorithms for rapid unsupervised cryo-EM structure determination. *Nat. Methods* **14**, 290–296 (2017).

52. Kimanius, D., Dong, L., Sharov, G., Nakane, T. & Scheres, S. H. W. New tools for automated cryo-EM single-particle analysis in RELION-4.0. *Biochem. J.* **478**, 4169–4185 (2021).

53. Holvec, S. *et al.* The structure of the human 80S ribosome at 1.9 Å resolution reveals the molecular role of chemical modifications and ions in RNA. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **31**, 1251–1264 (2024).

54. Goddard, T. D. *et al.* UCSF ChimeraX: Meeting modern challenges in visualization and analysis. *Protein Sci.* **27**, 14–25 (2018).

55. Emsley, P., Lohkamp, B., Scott, W. G. & Cowtan, K. Features and development of coot. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **66**, 486–501 (2010).

56. Su, B., Huang, K., Peng, Z., Amunts, A. & Yang, J. Improved automated model building for cryo-EM maps using CryFold. *bioRxiv* (2024) doi:10.1101/2024.11.13.623164.

57. Afonine, P. V. *et al.* Real-space refinement in PHENIX for cryo-EM and crystallography. *Acta Crystallogr. D Struct. Biol.* **74**, 531–544 (2018).

58. Liebschner, D. *et al.* Macromolecular structure determination using X-rays, neutrons and electrons: recent developments in Phenix. *Acta Crystallogr. D Struct. Biol.* **75**, 861–877 (2019).

59. Forsberg, B. O., Shah, P. N. M. & Burt, A. A robust normalized local filter to estimate compositional heterogeneity directly from cryo-EM maps. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 5802 (2023).