28 October 2025

Independent evolution of holocentric chromosomes in an early branching

apicomplexan parasite

Running title: Holocentricity in *Cryptosporidium*

Abigail Kimball[1#], Wanyi Huang[1#], Rui Xu[1,a], Melanie Key[1], Lisa Funkhouser-Jones[1,b], and L.

David Sibley[1*]

[#] Contributed equally

Department of Molecular Microbiology, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis,

MO 63110, USA

Present addresses:

[a] State Key Laboratory for Animal Disease Control and Prevention, South China Agricultural

University, Guangzhou 510642, China

[b] Department of Microbial Pathogenesis & Immunology, Naresh K. Vashisht School of

Medicine, Texas A&M University, Bryan, TX 77807, USA

*Address correspondence to Dr. L. David Sibley, Department of Molecular Microbiology,

Washington University School of Medicine, 660 S. Euclid, CB 8230 St. Louis MO 63110. E-

mail address: sibley@wustl.edu

Keywords: apicomplexan, mitosis, centromeres, holocentric, *Cryptosporidium*

ABSTRACT (150 limit)

During its asexual cycle, *Cryptosporidium parvum* (*C. parvum*) amplifies through three rounds

of nuclear division before undergoing cytokinesis to form infectious merozoites. However,

chromosome organization and segregation during nuclear division remain unstudied. Here, we

visualized H3-histones, including the centromeric histone H3 (CENH3), telomeres, and

centrosomes during mitosis. Nuclear division was accompanied by centriole duplication and

elongated microtubules that spanned synchronously dividing nuclei. Surprisingly, *C. parvum*

centromeres detected by CENH3 showed diffuse staining throughout nuclear division, that

overlapped with telomeres at the apical nuclear end. Analysis of centromeres based on CENH3

capture and DNA sequencing revealed numerous distinct binding sites scattered across all eight

chromosomes, including both coding regions and intergenic regions, that were typified by GA

rich repeat sequences. The unique holocentric chromosome structure of *C. parvum* is unlike the

single regional centromeres found in related apicomplexans, suggesting it arose independently

from other known examples in plants, insects and worms.

INTRODUCTION

Cryptosporidium parvum (C. parvum), an obligate intracellular parasite, remains a serious

global health and agricultural threat [1-4]. Transmission occurs through the ingestion of

infectious oocysts and causes severe diarrheal illness in infants, young animals, and

immunocompromised adults [5-7]. Once ingested, sporozoites exit the oocyst, invade host cells,

and undergo three rounds of mitotic division within a single shared cytoplasm (the process of

merogony), followed by cytokinesis to produce eight identical merozoites. Newly formed

merozoites are released into the lumen, where they invade new host cells, and repeat the

invasion-egress cycle three times before transitioning to the sexual phase of the life cycle [8, 9].

Despite its significance as a global health problem, and the novelty of apicomplexan cellular

division processes, *C. parvum* mitosis remains largely uncharacterized, with our current

understanding limited to basic microscopy studies [8, 10-15].

To divide rapidly, apicomplexans have evolved mechanisms to streamline mitotic division.

Firstly, apicomplexans maintain their chromosomes in an uncondensed state, eliminating the

time-consuming steps of chromatin condensation and relaxation and allowing transcription to

resume quickly after division [16, 17]. This adaptation necessitates strict nuclear organization

during mitosis, where centromeres are typically maintained on the apical end of the nucleus

attached to the centrosome and telomeres persistently cluster at the basal end of the nuclear

periphery [18-20]. Additionally, apicomplexans maintain their nuclear envelope throughout

mitosis, minimizing the energy and time required for breakdown and reformation [17, 21]. A

consequence of this closed mitosis is restricted access of spindle fibers to chromosomes,

necessitating alternative segregation mechanisms. Rather than centrosomes orchestrating

microtubule organization from the cytoplasm, apicomplexan centrosome-like structures (spindle

pole bodies, microtubule-organizing centers) are embedded within the nuclear envelope and

serve as spindle assembly hubs that elongate the microtubules so they can attach to the

centromeres and ultimately coordinate chromosome movement during division [22-29]. Nuclear

pores are essential for nucleocytoplasmic transport through the intact envelope and directly

support the process of spindle assembly [30, 31]. Electron microscopy studies suggest that *C.*

parvum undergoes schizogony, with multiple rounds of nuclear replication preceding a

cytoplasmic division, followed by the egress of daughter parasites from the host cell. However, it

remains unclear whether *C. parvum* replicates its nuclei asynchronously, like *Plasmodium*, or

follows a more synchronized division like *Toxoplasma* [17, 32].

During mitosis and meiosis, centromeres function to orchestrate chromosome segregation

by serving as sites for microtubule anchoring to assure faithful separation at metaphase [33].

Centromeres have variable architecture in different organisms consisting of point centromeres

(small 250 bp single site per chromosome) in yeast [34], regional centromeres (gene poor islands

of heterochromatin ranging from several to hundreds of kb) in *T. gondii* and *P. falciparum* [26,

27, 35], and holocentric chromosomes (multiple centromere sites along the chromosome) found

in multiple species of plants, insects and worms [36-38]. Although centromere function is

essential and highly conserved across eukaryotes, centromeric DNA sequences and size are

subject to rapid evolution [39-41]. Variation in centromere architecture affects nuclear

organization, karyotype changes, and ultimately drives speciation [42, 43].

The nuclear structures, chromosome features, and mitotic mechanisms, including the role of

centromeres, have not been examined previously in *C. parvum*. Here, we delineate the

fundamental biology of *C. parvum* mitosis, revealing significant deviations from previously

assumed mechanisms. Using high-resolution imaging we examined nuclear division during the

first round of merogony, leveraging multiple transgenic parasite strains and mitosis-specific

antibodies. Additionally, we used Cleavage Under Targets and Nuclease Release (CUT&RUN)

[44] to identify the location of the centromeres based on CENH3 and patterns of centromere-

associated histone modifications in *C. parvum* and the related parasite *Toxoplasma gondii* (*T.*

gondii). In contrast to the monocentric centromeric structure of *T. gondii*, we found that *C.*

parvum has a dispersed centromeric chromosome structure with CENH3 binding sites scattered

across multiple small regions on all 8 chromosomes, resulting in diffuse CENH3 centromere

staining throughout mitosis. Overall, these results suggest that *C. parvum* employs a divergent

mitotic mechanism compared to other well-studied apicomplexans and has independently

evolved holocentric centromeres.

RESULTS

Characterization of centromeric histone H3 (CENH3) and histone H3 candidates in C.

parvum

The genome annotation of *C. parvum* contains two genes encoding Histone H3 *cgd3_2540* and

cgd4_3220 (referred to here as H3.1 and H3.2, respectively) and a third gene *cgd4_2030*

annotated as a centromere-specific Histone H3 variant (CENH3). To validate these annotations,

we performed multiple BLASTP analyses using the protein products of each of these three *C.*

parvum genes to identify top hits in the following groups: 1) Apicomplexa (excluding all

Cryptosporidium species), 2) all eukaryotic organisms (excluding all Apicomplexa), 3) *Homo*

sapiens, and 4) *Saccharomyces cerevisiae.* Collectively, these analyses provide strong support

for cgd4_2030 as the CENH3 ortholog in *C. parvum* (**Table 1**). To examine the relationship

between the protein sequences for the *C. parvum* genes of interest and the top hits of BLASTP

analyses, a phylogenetic tree was generated (**Fig 1A**). We found that *cgd3_2540* (H3.1) and

cgd4_3220 (H3.2) closely cluster with histone H3 sequences from other organisms, whereas

cgd4_2030 (CENH3) clustered with other centromeric histone H3 proteins. We then directly

compared the amino acid sequences of H3.1 and H3.2 with a global sequence alignment and

found that the two sequences were highly similar (99.26%), but less similar compared to the

CENH3 (65.10% and 64.43%, respectively) (**Table 2 and Fig 1B**).

Table 1: The results of BLASTP analyses using the *C. parvum* centromeric histone H3-like protein (*cgd4_2030*), histone H3-like

proteins (*cgd3_2540* and *cgd4_3220).*

*

Query	Top hits in Apicomplexa*	E value	Top hits in all Eukaryotes#	E value	Top hits in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*	E value	Top hits in *Homo sapiens*	E value
cgd4_2030	histone H3-like centromeric protein CSE4 [*C. cionae*]	5e-46	centromeric DNA-binding histone H3-like protein cse4 [*N. ribis*]	3e-39	Chain A, Cse4	2e-30	Chain A, Histone H3.1, Histone H3-like centromeric protein A, Histone H3.1	5e-39
cgd3_2540	histone H3 [*C. cionae*]	2e-86	histone H3-like [*P. hypophthalmus*]	3e-86	histone H3	4e-81	histone H3.2	1e-88
cgd4_3220	histone H3 [*C. cionae*]	2e-90	histone H3-like [*P. hypophthalmus*]	2e-87	histone H3	2e-81	histone H3.2	1e-89

118   *C.*

119   *parvum* proteins were compared against all organisms in the Apicomplexa phylum (except for *Cryptosporidium* spp.),

120   # *C. parvum* proteins were compared against all organisms (except for Apicomplexa)

123 **Table 2:** The identity and similarity results from multiple global sequence alignments between

124 H3.1, H3.2, and CENH3 proteins using a BLOSUM62 scoring matrix.

Cp H3.1 and *Cp* H3.2	*Cp* CENH3 and *Cp* H3.1	*Cp* CENH3 and *Cp* H3.2
	Identity: 46.31% Similarity: 65.10% Gaps: 14.09%	
Identity: 97.78% Similarity: 99.26% Gaps: 0.00%		Identity: 46.31% Similarity: 64.43% Gaps: 14.09%

To further explore the distribution of H3.1 and H3.2 H3 variants, we generated two

transgenic lines of parasites that replaced the dispensable thymidine kinase (*tk*) gene with a

second copy of *cgd3_2540* (referred to as H3.1-3HA) or *cgd4_3220* (referred to as H3.2-3HA)

fused with a triple hemagglutinin (3HA) epitope tag using CRISPR/Cas9 (**Fig 1C, S1 A-B Fig,**

Table S1). Transgenic parasites were used to infect a human adenocarcinoma cell line (HCT-8)

monolayer, cultures were fixed at 18 hours post-infection (hpi) during merogony, stained, and

the localization of the 3HA tag was observed by immunofluorescence (IFA) high-resolution

confocal laser scanning microscopy equipped with Airyscan detection (LSCM-A). We found that

H3.1-3HA (**Fig 1D**) and H3.2-3HA (**Fig 1E**) had a diffuse staining pattern, which was expected

based on histone H3 staining in other apicomplexan parasites [27, 45, 46]

The staining pattern of C. parvum centromeric histone H3 (CENH3) is distinct.

To visualize *C. parvum* centromeres, we used CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing to add a 3HA tag to

the C-terminus of the centromere-specific histone H3 variant protein (referred to as CENH3-

3HA) (**Fig 2A, S2 A-B Fig, Table S1**). After successfully selecting and amplifying these

transgenic parasites in immunocompromised mice, we infected HCT-8 cells for 22 h and

examined the staining pattern by LSCM-A microscopy. The CENH3 staining pattern observed in

C. parvum was unexpectedly highly diffuse and looked more like the pattern found in the H3.1-

3HA and H3.2-3HA tagged parasites (**Fig 2B-C**). The diffuse pattern of CENH3 staining in *C.*

parvum contrasts sharply with the regional centromeres previously described in *T. gondii* [27,

47]. Hence, we utilized a CENH3-3HA-tagged *T. gondii*, gifted by Dr. Kami Kim, as a staining

control for our experiments. These parasites were used for the infection of HCT-8 cells, fixed at

24 hpi, stained, and examined by high-resolution LSCM-A immunofluorescence (IFA)

microscopy (**Fig 2D-E)**. We found that the staining pattern of the centromeric histone H3 in *T.*

gondii is punctate, similar to what has been found previously in *T. gondii* by other investigators

[27, 47].

Figure 1: Characterization of centromeric histone H3 (CENH3) and histone H3 candidates in *C. parvum* and construction of Histone H3-3HA tagged strains. (A) Phylogenetic relationship of *C. parvum* H3 and centromeric H3 (CENH3) histones and their corresponding top BLASTP hits in other eukaryotes, apicomplexan parasites, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, or *Homo sapiens*. Cyan stars represent annotated histone H3 genes. (B) Protein sequence alignment of H3 (cyan) and CENH3 (black) in *C. parvum*. Amino acids that are identical between at least two sequences are highlighted in grey. (C) Diagram of the targeting constructs designed to replace

the endogenous *tk* locus with a second copy of either of the genes annotated as Histone H3-like

proteins in *C. parvum* (*cgd3_2540* or *cgd4_3220*), a 3HA tag, and a Nluc-P2A-NeoR cassette.

(D) Immunofluorescence staining of transgenic H3.1-3HA or (E) H3.2-3HA parasites. HCT-8

cells were infected with transgenic oocysts, fixed at 18 hpi, and stained with rat anti-HA and

VVL-Biotin, followed by secondary antibodies Alexa Fluor 488 goat anti-rat IgG and Alexa

Fluor 647 Streptavidin. Hoechst was used for nuclear staining. Images were acquired as Z-stacks

using a Zeiss LSM-880 Laser Scanning Confocal microscope equipped with Airyscan (LSCM-

A) and are presented with orthogonal views. Scale bars, 1 μm.

Mitosis is synchronous in C. parvum and centromeres remain diffuse.

A vital step in mitosis is centrosome duplication, and previous studies in apicomplexans have

shown that it can be traced using antibodies that recognize the centrin 1 protein [27, 48]. A single

point adjacent to the nucleus occurs in non-replicating cells, while two centrin 1 positive points

per nucleus indicates the parasite is undergoing replication [27, 48]. In *Plasmodium*, during

schizogony, asynchronous duplications of centriolar plaques, structural equivalents of

centrosomes, have been observed across multiple nuclei within a single cytoplasm [28]. We

sought to identify centrosomes in *C. parvum* and determine whether its mitosis occurs

asynchronously, like *Plasmodium.* To identify parasites undergoing early mitosis, we infected

HCT-8 cells with excysted wild type *C. parvum* sporozoites, washed off uninvaded sporozoites

at 2 h, fixed the cultures at various timepoints between 6.5-8.5 hpi, and stained with Hoechst and

an anti-centrin-1 antibody. We found that, unlike *Plasmodium*, *C. parvum* appears to undergo

synchronized mitosis, as all nuclei within a dividing meront consistently exhibited two centrin-1

positive points per nucleus (**Fig 2F**). To determine if the diffuse centromere staining pattern

persisted during active mitosis in *C. parvum*, we infected cultures with CENH3-3HA parasites

and repeated the experiment previously described. We found that nuclei undergoing mitosis also

displayed a diffuse CENH3-3HA staining pattern by LSCM-A (**Fig 2G**). Despite

troubleshooting, we could not identify a signal in various CENH3-tagged lines using

ultrastructure expansion or immuno-electron microscopy, which may be due to the low

abundance of CENH3 and difficulty preserving the epitope.

Figure 2. The staining pattern of *C. parvum* centromeric histone H3 (CENH3) is distinct

from *Toxoplasma* and remains diffuse during mitosis. (A) Diagram of the targeting construct

designed to add a 3HA tag and Nluc-P2A-Neo^R cassette to the C-terminus of the *C. parvum*

CENH3 (*cgd4_2030*). (B) HCT-8 cells were infected with CENH3-3HA *C. parvum* parasites,

fixed at 22 hpi, and stained with rat anti-HA and VVL-Biotin, followed by secondary antibodies

Alexa Fluor 488 goat anti-rat IgG and Alexa Fluor 647 Streptavidin followed by Hoechst

staining. Images were acquired as Z-stacks using LSCM-A and are presented with orthogonal

views. Scale bars, 1 μm. (C) Cartoon depiction corresponding to the microscopy image in panel

(B). In *Cryptosporidium*, a late-stage meront contains eight nuclei that have recently completed

cytokinesis to form mature merozoites. The CENH3-3HA signal within each nucleus displays a

diffuse staining pattern in *C. parvum*. (D) HCT-8 cells were infected with CENH3-3HA *T.*

gondii parasites, fixed at 24 hours post-infection (hpi), and stained with rat anti-HA and rabbit

anti-aldolase (ALD) to visualize the cytosol, followed by secondary antibodies Alexa Fluor 488

goat anti-rat IgG and Alexa Fluor 568 anti-rabbit IgG. Hoechst was used for nuclear staining.

Images were acquired as Z-stacks using LSCM-A and are presented with orthogonal views.

Scale bars, 1 μm. (E) Cartoon depiction corresponding to the microscopy image in panel (D). In

T. gondii tachyzoites, the CENH3-3HA signal within each nucleus displays a discrete staining

pattern. (F) HCT-8 cells were infected with excysted *C. parvum* sporozoites for 2 h, then washed

twice to remove extracellular parasites. Cultures were fixed at 30 min increments between 6-9

hpi to identify the first (trophozoites with one nucleus), second (early meronts with 2 nuclei), and

third (mid-stage meronts with 4 nuclei) mitotic divisions during the first round of merogony by

widefield microscopy. Scale bars, 1 μm. (G) Cultures were infected with CENH3-3HA *C.*

parvum sporozoites for 2 h, washed, and fixed at 6.5 hpi to capture the first round of mitosis.

Cultures were stained with rat anti-HA, rabbit anti-centrin-1, and VVL-Biotin, followed by

secondary antibodies Alexa Fluor 488 goat anti-rat IgG, Alexa Fluor 568 goat anti-mouse IgG,

and Alexa Fluor 647 Streptavidin, and lastly Hoechst. Parasites undergoing mitosis were

identified by having two centrin-1 points per nucleus, whereas parasites in interphase had only

one centrin-1 point. Images were acquired as Z-stacks using LSCM-A and are presented with

orthogonal views. Scale bars, 1 μm.

The telomere (G-strand binding protein, GBP) staining pattern is apical in C. parvum.

G-quadruplex structures readily form at repetitive telomeric sequences and require G-quadruplex

binding proteins (GBPs) for stabilization (**Fig 3A**). A previous study identified *cgd1_3530* as the

GBP in *C. parvum* and determined the specific sequence necessary for *Cp*GBP binding

(GGTTA) [49]. Using AlphaFold and ChimeraX, we modeled the G-quadruplex structure

formed by this repetitive sequence and visualized how the *Cp*GBP protein interacts with and

stabilizes it. (**Fig 3B**). To identify the location of *C. parvum* telomeres relative to the

centromeres, we engineered transgenic parasites to express a 3HA tag at the gene encoding the

C-terminus of the G-quadruplex binding protein (referred to as GBP-3HA) (**Fig 3C, S2 A-B Fig,**

Table S1). Previous studies in *Plasmodium* have found that the telomeres are consistently found

on the opposite pole to the centromeres [50-52]. Since the centromeres were located at the apical

end of the nuclei in meronts, we expected that *C. parvum* telomeres would be at the basal end.

However, LSCM-A microscopy on infected HCT-8 monolayers (24 hpi) revealed that the

telomeres were also located at the apical side of the nucleus (**Fig 3D**).

The telomere (GBP) and centromere (CENH3) staining patterns overlap in C. parvum.

To confirm that *C. parvum* centromeres and telomeres had overlapping nuclear locations, we

generated an additional line of transgenic parasites that replaced the dispensable thymidine

kinase (*tk*) gene with a second copy of an N-terminally 3HA tagged CENH3 and GBP C-

terminally tagged with 3Ty via CRISPR/Cas9, with an intervening P2A split peptide to facilitate

co-expression of separate proteins (referred to as 3HA-CENH3-GBP-Ty) (**Fig 3E, S1C-D Fig,**

Table S1). HCT-8 cultures were infected with 3HA-CENH3-GBP-Ty parasites, fixed at 6.5 hpi,

and examined by LSCM-A microscopy after staining. We confirmed that 3HA-CENH3 and

GBP-3Ty staining overlapped completely on the apical end of the nucleus (visualized by

Hoechst) (**Fig 3F)**.

Figure 3: The telomere (G-strand binding protein, GBP) staining pattern is apical in *C.

***parvum* and overlaps with the centromere (CENH3) staining pattern.** (A) The 3' overhang

single-stranded DNA at the end of telomeres contains repetitive sequences $(GGTTTA)_n$ in *C.*

parvum that form G-quadruplex structures. (B) The G-quadruplex binding protein (GBP) is

essential for forming and stabilizing these structures. The sequence of *Cp*GBP and its binding

motif has been previously determined and the protein structure is modeled by Alphafold and

ChimeraX [49]. (C) Diagram of the targeting construct designed to add a 3HA tag and Nluc-

P2A-Neo^R cassette to the C-terminus of the G-quadruplex binding proteins gene *(GBP,*

cgd1_3530) (D) HCT-8 cells were infected with GBP-3HA parasites, fixed at 6.5 hpi to capture

early meronts (2 nuclei), and stained with rat anti-HA and VVL-Biotin, followed by secondary

antibodies Alexa Fluor 488 goat anti-rat IgG and Alexa Fluor 647 Streptavidin. Hoechst was

used for nuclear staining. Images were acquired as Z-stacks using LSCM-A and are presented

with orthogonal views and the scale bar is 1 µm. (E) Diagram of the targeting construct designed

to replace the endogenous *tk* locus with a second copy of CENH3 N-terminally tagged with 3HA

and GBP with a C-terminal 3xTy tag separated with a P2A split peptide. (F)

Immunofluorescence staining of transgenic 3HA-CENH3-GBP-3Ty parasites. HCT-8 cells were

infected with transgenic oocysts, fixed at 6.5 hpi to capture early meronts (2 nuclei), and stained

with rat anti-HA, mouse anti-Ty, and VVL-Biotin followed by a secondary antibody stain

containing Alexa Fluor 488 goat anti-rat IgG, Alexa Fluor 568 goat-anti mouse, and Alexa Fluor

647 Streptavidin. Hoechst was used for nuclear staining. Images were acquired as Z-stacks using

LSCM-A and are presented with orthogonal views. Scale bars, 1 µm.

Detection of mitotically active DNA, microtubules, and the nuclear pore proteins in C. parvum

The phosphorylation of histone H3 (specifically at serine 10 and serine 28) is a highly conserved

mechanism for initiating chromosome condensation in preparation for mitosis [53]. Antibodies

recognizing the phosphorylated version of H3 at serine 10 are commonly used in other systems

to determine which cells are currently undergoing mitosis from late interphase through telophase

[54]. Even though apicomplexan parasites are known not to condense their chromosomes, *C.*

parvum meronts frequently stained positive for the phosphorylated histone H3 (PH3) antibody

(**Fig 4A**). Furthermore, PH3 positive parasites also contained nuclei with duplicated centrin-1

positive centrosomes, suggesting that it provides a marker of mitotic parasites. We visualized

nuclear pores in *C. parvum* with an antibody that recognizes NUP116 in *Plasmodium falciparum*

(P. falciparum) and found that it reliably stained the parasite nucleus in a punctate pattern that

was concentrated primarily peripherally in the nucleus (**Fig 4B**). Among apicomplexan parasites,

mitosis has primarily been studied in *T. gondii* and *P. falciparum* [16, 17, 27, 55]. These studies

demonstrate that once centrosomes duplicate, and the nuclear envelope forms a tunnel-like

structure, organizing spindle microtubules within it. As the tunnel progressively perforates,

spindle microtubules access the centromere, attaching to mediate chromosome movement [32].

This process was visualized in *C. parvum* by staining with antibodies that recognize the centrin-1

and alpha tubulin (**Fig 4C-D**). We frequently observed two conformations of centrin-1 tubulin

structures that may correlate with early (**Fig 4C**) and late mitotic phases (**Fig 4D**). Early in

mitosis, the microtubules are relatively short and form a straight line (**Fig 4C, E**). Later, they are

accompanied by a wider nucleus, have elongated, and form a "v" shape, suggesting they have

attached to the chromosomes and are mediating their movement before budding (**Fig 4D, F**).

Figure 4: Mitotically active DNA, microtubules, and the nuclear pore proteins as visualized

by antibody staining in *C. parvum*. (A) HCT-8 cells were infected with wild type parasites,

fixed at 18 hpi, and stained with rabbit anti-phosphorylated Histone H3 (PH3) followed by an

Alexa Fluor 568 goat anti-rabbit IgG antibody. DNA was stained with Hoechst and a mid-stage

meront with 4 nuclei is shown. (B) Parasites were prepared identically to panel A, but were

stained with an antibody that recognizes a subunit of the nuclear pore in *Plasmodium falciparum*

(NUP116) followed by an Alexa Fluor 568 goat anti-rabbit IgG antibody and Hoechst. A late-

stage meronts with 8 nuclei is shown. (C, D) HCT-8 cells were infected with wild type parasites,

fixed at 6.5 hpi to capture early meronts (2 nuclei), and stained with rabbit anti-centrin-1, mouse

anti-tubulin, and VVL-Biotin, followed by the secondary antibodies Alexa Fluor 488 goat anti-

mouse IgG, Alexa Fluor 568 goat anti-rabbit IgG, Alexa Fluor 647 Streptavidin, and Hoechst.

The nucleus in the first meront (C) is likely an example of early mitosis, whereas the second

meront (D) is likely an example of a later phase of the mitotic process. Images were acquired as

Z-stacks using LSCM-A and are presented with orthogonal views. Scale bars, 1 μm. (E) A

cartoon representation of the mitotic structures visualized in (C). The pink circles represent

centrin, which is localized to the intact nuclear envelope. Yellow microtubules originate from the

centriole-equivalent structures and attach to the uncondensed chromosomes visualized by

Hoechst. (F) A cartoon representation of the mitotic structures visualized in (D). Later in mitosis,

the microtubules (yellow) become more prominent and the centriole-equivalent structures (pink)

move away from one another, indicating active segregation and preparation for cytokinesis.

Composition of centromeres in C. parvum and T. gondii

Centromeres are defined by the deposition of CENH3-containing nucleosomes [27, 56]. Given

the diffuse staining of CENH3, we wanted to further characterize the centromere by identifying

DNA sites bound by this protein. Therefore, we adopted protocols for CUT&RUN to identify

centromeres based on CENH3 binding based on capture with anti-HA antibody in *C. parvum*

[44]. To ensure sufficient HA binding, we developed a CENH3 line tagged with spaghetti

monster (referred to as CENH3-smHA) that contains 10 HA epitope repeats for these

experiments and validated identical staining patterns to CENH3-3HA *C. parvum* (**S2 A-C Fig,**

Table S1). To validate our experimental strategy, we first applied CUT&RUN to *T. gondii*,

whose centromeres have previously been defined by ChIP-seq [27]. Our CUT&RUN data

closely matched earlier findings, with CENH3 enrichment observed at discrete chromosomal loci

corresponding to the previously described centromeres (**Fig 5A, S3A-C Fig**). We also detected

the positive correlation of CENH3 with H3K9me3 and inverse correlation with H3K4me3

reported in earlier ChIP-chip analyses (**Fig 5A, S3A-B Fig**). Based on these signals, we

implemented a stepwise strategy to identify centromeric regions. Valleys in H3K4me3,

consisting of 20 kb windows, sized to match reported centromere lengths (16 kb ± 3.4 kb)[27],

combined with co-enrichment of H3K9me3 with CENH3-smHA were used as criteria for

identifying centromere regions (**S3D Fig**). Applying these rules, we identified a single

centromere in each of the 13 chromosomes of *T. gondii* (**S3E Fig**), with Chr VIIb identified as

part of Chr VIII [57](**S3C Fig**).

We next applied CUT&RUN to *C. parvum*. Initial experiments using a 120-minute MNase

digestion failed to generate usable data, as both sequencing depth and genome coverage were

low compared to negative controls (**S1 Dataset**). Since CENH3 nucleosomes can be

hypersensitive to MNase digestion, as reported previously in *Caenorhabditis elegans* (*C.*

elegans) [56], we tested digestion times of 5, 30, and 60 min. The 30 min digestion yielded the

best coverage and sequencing depth, and these conditions were used for following analyses (**S1**

Dataset, S4A Fig). Unlike *T. gondii*, read mapping profiles for CENH3 in *C. parvum* showed

signals broadly distributed along chromosomes (**Fig 5B**). To locate centromeric regions in *C.*

parvum, we first attempted the *T. gondii* stepwise strategy, but no valid windows were detected.

As the CENH3 distribution resembled that of the holocentric nematode *C. elegans*, we adjusted

thresholds accordingly by restricting the peaks analysis to 400 bp windows (**S4B Fig**). We

identified 423 CENH3-enriched regions distributed across all chromosomes. Heatmaps and

aggregate signal profiles showed that these windows displayed features of CENH3 enrichment

correlated with H3K9me3 deposition and H3K4me3 depletion, suggesting that they represent

centromere-associated chromatin (**S4C-D Fig**). Importantly, these signals were largely absent in

wild type parasites stained with HA antibody as a control, supporting their authenticity (**S4C-D**

Fig). To further refine localization, we excluded windows overlapping with WT-HA signals,

reducing the dataset to 347 high-confidence centromeric windows (**S4B,E Fig**). Taken together,

these results indicate that *C. parvum* possesses many small CENH3 binding sites dispersed

across eight chromosomes, in contrast to the monocentric nature of *T. gondii*.

We further investigated characteristics of *C. parvum* centromeres. In contrast to *T. gondii*,

where centromeres are typically located within large intergenic regions [27], no extended

intergenic regions were observed in *C. parvum* due to the tight compaction of the genome.

Surprisingly, the majority of *C. parvum* CENH3-associated windows were located within gene

coding regions rather than being restricted to intergenic regions (**S2 DataSet2**). To determine

whether centromeric regions were also present within intergenic regions of *C. parvum*, we

applied a stepwise identification strategy using a slightly relaxed read depth threshold (**S4F Fig**).

We identified 58 centromeric regions distributed within intergenic regions across all

chromosomes (**Fig. 5C, S3 DataSet**). Heatmaps and aggregate signal profiles for CNEH3 as well

as chromatin marks also supported that they represent centromere-associated chromatin (**Fig.**

5D,E). These results suggest that CENH3 binding in *C. parvum* is broadly distributed throughout

the chromosomes, including both with in coding regions and intergenic regions. To assess

sequence properties of *C. parvum* centromeric windows, motif analysis of *C. parvum*

centromeric windows was performed using MEME, revealing two GA-rich motifs enriched at

CENH3-associated sites (**Fig 5F**). Notable, these GA repeats are also found in other regions of

the genome that were not identified in the CENH3 capture studies.

Figure 5. Genome-wide distribution of CENH3 in *Toxoplasma gondii* and *Cryptosporidium*

parvum. (A) Genome browser view of *T. gondii* chromosome Ia showing CUT&RUN signals for

CENH3-HA (HA antibody), H3K9me3, and H3K4me3. CENH3 signal enrichment positively

correlates with H3K9me3 and inversely with H3K4me3. Peaks of CENH3 enrichment are

indicated (red arrows). (B) Genome browser view of *C. parvum* chromosome I, showing

CUT&RUN signals for CENH3-HA *C. parvum* captured with HA antibody and wild type *C.*

parvum captured with HA antibody (referred to as WT-HA), H3K9me3, and H3K4me3

(captured with antibodies). (C) Chromosomal distribution of the 58 CENH3-enriched windows

in intergenic regions of *C. parvum* chromosomes (Chr#). Numbers below each chromosome

indicate the number of windows. (D) Heatmaps of CUT&RUN signals for the groups shown in

(B) within a 400 bp window around all 58 CENH3-enriched windows . Each row represents an

individual centromeric site, ranked by signal intensity. (E) Average signal profiles for CENH3-

HA (green), WT-HA (gray), H3K9me3 (orange), and H3K4me3 (teal) across the 400 bp window

around CENH3 sites. (F) Circos plot of CENH3-associated motifs. From inner to outer rings:

chromosomes, locations of 347 CENH3-enriched windows found in coding regions (black), and

locations of 58 CENH3-enriched windows found in intergenic regions (black). Representative

sequence logos for motif 1 and motif 2 are shown.

DISCUSSION

Despite rapid asexual proliferation being required for parasite expansion, the molecular

mechanisms that underlie *C. parvum* mitosis have remained unexplored. To investigate this

process, we examined nuclear division using markers to track multiple rounds of mitosis during

merogony. Nuclear division in *C. parvum* occurs synchronously as shown by staining with

phospho-H3 and centrin-1, which provide markers for mitotically active chromatin and

duplicating centrosomes, respectively. Surprisingly, both CENH3, a marker for centromeres, and

GBP, a marker for telomeres, were diffusely localized across the apical half of the nucleus.

Moreover, these diffuse apical patterns persisted throughout mitosis, as shown by tracking

nuclear division through stages visualized with centrin-1 and microtubules. To explore the

molecular nature of centromeres, we performed CUT&RUN sequencing of transgenic parasites

expressing epitope-tagged CENH3. Although discrete monocentric peaks were detected in the

related parasite *T. gondii*, CENH3 binding sites were diffusely scattered across ~ >400 sites in

the *C. parvum* genome. Overall, these findings indicate that *C. parvum* has evolved an alternative

chromosome structure compared to other apicomplexan parasites, differences that may have

significant functional consequences for chromosome stability and meiotic recombination.

Following entry of sporozoites (or merozoites) into the host cell, the parasite undergoes

merogony, consisting of 3 rounds of nuclear division prior to cytokinesis to generate infectious

merozoites. By tracking nuclear division with phospho-H3, to detect mitotically active nuclei,

and centrin-1 to monitor dividing centrosomes, we observed that all nuclei found in a common

cytoplasm shared the same centrin-1 staining pattern (whether dividing or not), indicating that

nuclei divide synchronously. This pattern differs from *Plasmodium* schizogony, where nuclei are

observed at different mitotic stages within a single schizont [28]. In *Plasmodium*, nuclear pores

are important for cell division as they facilitate the transport of mitotic molecules through the

intact nuclear envelope and associate with the centriolar plaques [31, 58]. Although we did not

examine the dynamics of nuclear pores during division, they appear as peripheral puncta in

mature meronts and may serve a similar function in *C. parvum*. Staining with alpha-tubulin

allowed us to visualize *C. parvum* microtubules during mitosis, particularly at early stages where

it spanned dividing nuclei, likely representing extra-nuclear spindles involved in chromosome

separation. By monitoring the duplication of the centrosomes, distance between the centrin-1

foci, length of microtubules, and elongation of the nucleus we generated a pseudo timeline for

early, mid, and late merogony. These findings provide an important foundation for studies of the

dynamics of centromere staining described below.

Unexpectedly, we found a diffuse nuclear CENH3-3HA staining pattern rather than the

punctate pattern observed in other apicomplexan parasites [27, 29, 35]. We also confirmed that

the diffuse CENH3 staining pattern did not deviate when the method of tagging was altered (e.g.

GFP, mNeon, and smHA), when the location of the tag was swapped (C vs N-terminally tagged),

or when a tagged second copy of the gene was inserted into a neutral locus of the genome. We

also developed epitope-tagged lines of telomere-binding protein GBP, similar to studies in

Eimeria and *Plasmodium* [59, 60]. Unlike in other apicomplexans, GBP also showed an apical

location in *C. parvum*, overlapping closely with CENH3 [18-20, 50]. We further confirmed that

the telomeres and centromeres occupied a similar nuclear location using a parasite strain in

which CENH3 and GBP proteins were simultaneously expressed as tagged second copies. This

pattern contrasts sharply with other apicomplexans where telomers are localized to the opposite

pole of the nucleus from centromeres [50-52]. We sought to determine if centromeres remained

diffuse throughout mitosis by simultaneously visualizing the centriole-equivalent structures and

centromeres by staining CENH3-3HA with anti-HA and centrin-1 antibodies. We confirmed that

in *C. parvum,* the diffuse centromere staining pattern does not change throughout mitosis, which

further contrasts with the highly focal nature of centromeres in *T. gondii* and *P. falciparum* [26,

27].

Given the highly unusual staining patterns of CENH3 in *C. parvum*, we decided to

investigate CENH3 binding sites on DNA using CUT&RUN sequencing. For comparison, we

also performed CUT&RUN studies on CENH3 in the related parasite *T. gondii* and compared

them to previous studies that used ChIPSeq to define centromeres [27]. In *T. gondii*, CUT&RUN

sequencing identified highly similar CENH3 binding sites to those reported previously by

ChIPSeq [27] with a single predominant peak on each chromosome, including newly defined

peaks on chromosome IV, that had not been identified previously. Centromeres in *T. gondii*

consist of gene-poor regions of ~15 kb that are not defined by any particular sequence or repeats

but instead are positively correlated with H3K9me3 and inversely correlated with H3K4me3,

typical chromatin patterns expected for centromeric regions [18, 27]. Under similar conditions,

CUT&RUN experiments for CENH3 binding sites in *C. parvum* failed to identify similar

singular dominant peaks on each chromosome. Instead, CENH3 binding sites were

hypersensitive to MNase digestion, with the signal being the highest at a 30- min incubation

time, similar to that observed in ChIP-seq studies of the holocentric nematode *Caenorhabditis*

elegans (*C. elegans*) [56]. Under optimal digestive conditions, we found that the CENH3 signal

in *C. parvum* was broadly distributed along chromosomes, with ~ 350 distinct sites in coding

regions and another ~ 60 sites within intergenic regions scattered across 8 chromosomes.

Interestingly, like *T. gondii*, *C. parvum* CENH3 peaks also correlated with H3K9me3 signal and

were found in areas lacking H3K4me3, consistent with a centromere-associated chromatin

pattern. The distribution of CENH3 binding sites in *C. parvum* is similar to that described in *C.*

elegans as polycentric, implying that CENH3 binds to distinct sites rather than diffusely across

the entire chromosome [56].

Collectively, our findings are consistent with *C. parvum* containing holocentric centromeres

based on the following criteria: Firstly, the staining pattern of CENH3 diffusely stains the apical

half of the nucleus under nondividing conditions, in contrast to the focal staining of CENH3 in *T.*

gondii [18, 27] and *P. falciparum* [26]. Secondly, the diffuse pattern of CENH3 staining remains

throughout mitosis, suggesting centromeres do not coalesce into a single regional center. Thirdly,

CENH3 binding sites as defined by CUT&RUN resemble the dispersed pattern of low-intensity

peaks seen in *C. elegans*, which has well-characterized holocentric chromosomes. Finally, the

CENH3 binding sites show evidence of simple GA nucleotide repeats, a feature also seen in *C.*

*elegan*s [56]. In both cases, the GA repeats are also found in other regions of the respective

genomes, so this feature alone is not sufficient to mediate CENH3 binding. One unusual feature

of the CENH3 binding sites in *C. parvum* is that they extend into coding regions, which is not an

expected feature of centromeres. The dispersed polycentric pattern of CENH3 binding sites in *C.*

elegans is also unusual in that these regions are concentrated in High Occupancy Targets (HOT)

sites for permissive binding of transcription factors [56]. In *C. elegans*, the CENH3 and HOT

sites appear to serve a dual purpose: in replicating cells they bind CENH3, while they recruit

transcription factors when CENH3 is lost during exit from the cell cycle in differentiated muscle

cells [56]. By analogy, transcriptional silencing during mitosis in *C. parvum* may allow CENH3

binding in coding regions to facilitate chromosome segregation, with displacement during the

rest of the cell cycle when transcription is active. Alternatively, the CENH3 binding sites in

intergenic regions may function as the primary centromere localizing signal for formation of

kinetochores.

Holocentric chromosomes have been documented in many species, primarily through direct

cytological observation, yet their functional implications and evolutionary origins remain poorly

understood [38, 56, 61, 62]. Current evidence suggests that holocentric chromosomes have

evolved convergently at least 13 times across distantly related taxa in both the plant and animal

kingdoms [37, 38, 62]. Holocentricity has not previously been described in protists, and hence it

likely evolved independently in *C. parvum*. It is also possible that holocentricity is more

widespread among protists but that it has been overlooked due to their small size and failure to

condense chromosomes during division. One proposed advantage of holocentricity is its capacity

to stabilize chromosomal fragments during mitosis, thereby mitigating genetic loss. This trait

may confer a selective benefit to organisms frequently exposed to elevated levels of DNA

damage due to environmental stressors or lifestyle factors [37, 61]. Thus, holocentricity may

impart genome stability under stress encountered in the gastrointestinal system where the

parasite is exposed to toxic bacterial metabolites [63] and host immune responses [64]. Despite

this potential advantage, holocentricity also presents a major challenge for coordinating

chromosome segregation following crossover during meiosis I. Well-characterized holocentric

species have evolved mechanisms to circumvent this issue, such as inverted meiosis or, in the

case of *C. elegans*, the deployment of kinetochore proteins that localize to discrete chromosomal

regions, effectively mimicking monocentric behavior [65]. Whether *C. parvum* uses a similar

mechanism as *C. elegans* to localize kinetochore proteins to discrete sites on the chromosome is

uncertain, but previous work from our laboratory examining crossover rates during *C. parvum*

meiosis revealed a high frequency of crossover events and failed to find evidence for inverted

meiosis, a process used by some holocentric organisms [66].

Limitations and Future Studies

Examination of the nuclear organization of *C. parvum* throughout the cell cycle revealed a

persistently diffuse centromere staining pattern, suggesting a holocentric chromosome structure.

During division, such multiple centromeric sites dispersed along the chromosome are expected to

bind centrosomes and thereby connect to microtubules for chromosome separation. Although we

visualized events consistent with this process in an artificial timeline, future studies using

fluorescent reporters could potentially provide more precise information on the formation of

centrosomes, coordinated assembly of microtubules, and nuclear division in *C. parvum*.

However, obtaining direct cytological data in support of holocentric centromeres and their

behavior during nuclear division will be challenging in this system because chromosomes do not

condense during division. Alternatively, it may be possible to explore the nature of centromeres

by examining the distribution of other conserved centrosome and kinetochore binding proteins

during nuclear division. Such studies could shed further light on chromosome tethering in

nuclear division and provide invaluable insights into unique evolutionary adaptations in *C.*

parvum.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Jennifer Barks for assistance with cell culture, Dr. Wandy L. Beatty, Microbiology

Imaging Facility, Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, for assistance with

microscopy, and Dr. Kami Kim, Univ. South Florida, for providing the *T. gondii* CENH3-HA

line used here. We are grateful for helpful comments from Drs. Daniel E Goldberg, Douglas L.

Chalker, and Tim Schedl, Washington University and Dr. Lihua Xiao, South China Agricultural

University. Genome sequencing was performed by the GTAC Genome core at Washington

University in St Louis. Supported in part by the Graduate Research Fellowship Program,

National Science Foundation (to A.K.) and grant AI175150 from the National Institutes of

Health (to L.D.S.).

Author contributions

AK: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation,

Methodology, Resources, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review &

editing

WH: Data Curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Visualization,

Writing

MK: Investigation, Methodology, Resources

LFJ: Investigation, Methodology, Resources

LDS: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Resources,

Supervision, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Data Sources and Availability:

All materials described here are available from the corresponding author based on MTA.

Sequence for the CUT&RUN analyses have been deposited to the NCBI Bioproject #

PRJNA1330822.

Declarations:

The authors declare that they have no conflicts to disclose.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Animal studies and ethical approval.

Animal studies were approved by the Institutional Animal Studies Committee (School of

Medicine, Washington University in St. Louis). *Ifngr1*^{-/-} mice (003288; Jackson Laboratories),

and NOD scid gamma mice (referred to as NSG) (005557; Jackson Laboratories) were bred in-

house in a specific-pathogen-free animal facility on a 12:12 light-dark cycle. Male and female

mice between 8 and 12 weeks of age were used for sex-matched groups used in crossing

experiments. Mice were co-housed with siblings of the same sex throughout the experiments.

Cell culture.

HCT-8 cells (Human ileocecal adenocarcinoma, ATCC CCL-244) derived from a human

ileocecal carcinoma were cultured in RPMI 1640 ATCC Modification medium supplemented

with 10% fetal bovine serum at 37 °C in a 5% CO_2 incubator. After trypsinization, 450,000 cells

were plated on glass coverslips in 24-well plates and used for experiments. Cells were confirmed

to be mycoplasma-free with the e-Myco plus Mycoplasma PCR detection kit.

Immunofluorescence assays & microscopy. Staining protocols have been previously described

and all antibodies are listed in **Table S2** [67]. Briefly, infected HCT-8 cultures were fixed with

4% formaldehyde 8-24 hours post-infection (hpi), permeabilized with 0.1% Triton X-100,

blocked with 1% bovine serum albumin (BSA), stained with a primary antibody mixture for 1 h

followed by secondary antibodies for 1 h and Hoechst for 20 min. Primary antibodies were

diluted for staining: anti-HA (rat, 1:500), VVL-Biotin (*Vicia Villosa* Lectin, Biotinylated, 1:500),

anti-Aldolase (ALD, rabbit, 1:1000) centrin-1 (mouse, 1:250), anti-Ty (mouse, 1:250), and anti-

PH3 (rabbit, 1:500). All Alexa Fluor secondary antibodies were diluted at 1:1000 and Hoechst

was diluted 1:2000. Coverslips were mounted onto microscope slides with Prolong Glass

Antifade Mountant. Coverslips were visualized using a Zeiss LSM880 laser scanning confocal

microscope equipped with a 63x, 1.4 N.A. Zeiss Plan Apochromat oil objective lens and Airy

scan. Images were acquired with ZEN v2.1, v2.5 software and further analyzed using ImageJ.

CRISPR/Cas9 plasmid construction.

Plasmid construction

Primers used to generate the following plasmids were ordered from IDT and all sequences are found in **Table S3**. SnapGene (v7.1.1) and NEBuilder Assembly Tool (v2.9.0) were used to construct plasmid maps and design primers.

The CENH3-3HA tagging plasmid was generated using the previously described ABC-3HA tagging plasmid [68] by replacing the C-terminal and 3'UTR sequences with equivalent regions from the *Cp*CENH3 gene amplified from *C. parvum* cDNA to generate the tagging plasmid CENH3-3HA-Nluc-P2A-Neo^R.

The 3HA-CENH3- GBP-3Ty tagging plasmid was created via a seven-way Gibson assembly combining a backbone generated from the TK-GFP-Nluc-P2A-Neo^R-TK homology tagging plasmid previously generated in our lab [69] together with the following fragments: 1) The 5' homology region of CENH3 (500 bp), the CENH3 CDS, a portion of the 3' homology region of CENH3 (216 bp) were amplified from the CENH3-3HA tagging plasmid described above. 2) The 3HA-pLinker region was amplified from a TK-3HA-CENH3-Nluc-P2A-Neo^R-TK plasmid (data not shown in this study), 3) the GBP CDS was amplified from *C. parvum* genomic DNA, 4) the pLinker-3Ty sequence was amplified from a tagging plasmid previously generated in our lab [68], and 5) the P2A skip peptide sequence was generated as a gBlock Gene Fragment from Azenta. The U6:sgTK plasmid previously generated in our lab was utilized for all experiments with TK locus replacement repair plasmids [69].

The H3.1-3HA and H3.2-3HA tagging plasmids were generated via Gibson assembly using the 3HA-CENH3-GBP-3Ty plasmid to provide a backbone, the pLinker-3HA region was

amplified from the CENH3-3HA tagging plasmid described above, and the CDS regions for

H3.1 and H3.2 were amplified from *C. parvum* genomic DNA.

The GBP-3HA tagging plasmid was generated using the CENH3-3HA tagging plasmid

described above for the backbone and replacing the C-terminal and 3'UTR sequences with the

GBP CDS sequence amplified from *C. parvum* genomic DNA.

CENH3 and GBP CRISPR/Cas9 plasmids were created via Gibson assembly of the

linearized backbone amplified from the TK CRISPR/Cas9 plasmid (Addgene 122852) and an

oligonucleotide with the sgRNA specific for the CENH3 or GBP gene [69]. The Eukaryotic

Pathogen CRISPR guide RNA/DNA Design tool (http://grna.ctegd.uga.edu) was used to identify

CENH3 and GBP sgRNA sequences.

Amplifying transgenic parasites in mice.

The transfection and amplification of parasites in immunocompromised mice were conducted as

previously described [69-72]. Briefly, 1×10^8 freshly excysted sporozoites were electroporated

with 100 μg of repair plasmid and 66 μg of CRISPR/Cas9 plasmid, then resuspended in 300 μL

of cold DPBS. *Ifngr1*$^{-/-}$ mice were first orally gavaged with an 8% (wt/vol) sodium bicarbonate

solution to neutralize stomach acid, followed by the administration of the electroporated

sporozoites. To facilitate the selection of transgenic parasites, paromomycin (16 g/L) was

provided in the drinking water 24 h post-infection. Fecal pellets were collected at intervals post-

infection for luciferase assays and diagnostic PCR analysis to verify parasite growth and proper

gene insertion. Oocysts were isolated from fecal material using bleach treatment, and 20,000

oocysts per mouse were employed for a subsequent round of amplification in NSG mice.

Luciferase assays for mouse experiments. Fecal samples collected from infected mice were

analyzed with the Promega Nano-Glo luciferase assay kit, as previously described [72]. The

luciferase activity was measured using the BioTek Cytation 3 cell imaging multi-mode reader.

The number of relative luminescence units per milligram of feces was obtained by dividing the

average values from two technical replicates by the fecal sample weight.

Quantifying oocyst shedding in mouse experiments. DNA was extracted from fecal pellets

collected from infected mice using the QIAamp PowerFecal DNA kit, following previously

established methods [69, 71, 72]. Quantitative PCR (qPCR) analysis was conducted to determine

the number of oocysts at each time point based on *C. parvum* glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate

dehydrogenase (GAPDH) primers and a standard curve derived from a dilution series (**S2 Table**)

[69]. Genomic DNA (gDNA) amounts were quantified using the QuantStudio 3 real-time PCR

system.

Confirmation of insertions in transgenic parasites by PCR.

To confirm the correct integration of the homology repair template, extracted gDNA from

murine fecal samples and wild type controls were used as the template. PCR amplification was

performed using 1 µL of the extracted gDNA, Q5 Hot Start high-fidelity 2X master mix or

PrimeSTAR GXL premix (TaKaRa), and primers at a final concentration of 500 nM on a Veriti

96-well thermal cycler. All PCR products were resolved on a 1% agarose gel containing GelRed

(1:10,000) and visualized using the ChemiDoc MP imaging system.

Oocyst purification from fecal material and storage.

The *C. parvum* isolate AUCP -1 used for transfections was purified from fecal material collected

from male Holstein calves at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign [73]. All

procedures involving the calves received approval from the Institutional Animal Care and Use

Committee (IACUC). Transgenic oocysts were purified in-house from fecal material collected

from NSG mice, using a saturated sodium chloride solution for oocyst flotation [74]. Post-

purification, oocysts were stored at 4°C in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) for up to three

months following fecal collection.

Structural predictions

The protein structure of the G-quadruplex binding protein (GBP, *cgd1*_3530) was predicted

using Alphafold 3 (www.alphafoldserver.com). Using ChimeraX

(https://www.cgl.ucsf.edu/chimerax/), we modeled how the G-quadruplex structure formed by

the *Cp*GBP repetitive binding sequence (GGTTA) [49] interacts and is stabilized by the CpGBP

protein.

Parasite Preparation and Lysis for CUT&RUN experiments.

The CENH3-3HA line of *T. gondii* [27] was obtained from the laboratory of Dr. Kami Kim at

University of South Florida. *Tg*CENH3-3HA tachyzoites were propagated in human foreskin

fibroblasts and harvested using established protocols [75]. *C. parvum* sporozoites ($4x10^7$) and *T.*

gondii tachyzoites ($1x10^7$) were centrifuged at 2,500 RPM for 5 min, supernatants removed, and

parasites were resuspended in 2 mL of cold parasite lysis buffer (10 mM HEPES pH 7.9, 1.5 mM

MgCl2, 10 mM KCl, 0.65% NP40 (supplemented with IGEPAL) and 0.5 mM PMSF

(supplemented with cOmplete EDTA free protease inhibitor cocktail and sterile distilled H_2O),

incubated for 10 min on ice, and centrifuged at 3,000 RPM for 10 min at 4°C (previously

described in [76, 77]).

CUT&RUN Processing, Library Preparation, Quality Control & Sequencing.

Following lysis treatment, the lysis buffer was removed, and the nuclei pellet was washed

following the CUT&RUN Kit Version 4 protocol (EpiCypher, Inc, Catalog No. 14-1048).

Isolated nuclei were incubated with either 1.0 μg of rat anti-HA antibody, 0.5 μg of rabbit anti-

H3K4me3 positive control antibody, or 0.5 μg of mouse anti-IgG negative control antibody.

Chromatin digestion and release steps were performed according to the EpiCypher protocol, and

5 ng of CUT&RUN enriched DNA was used for library preparation according to the CUT&RUN

Library Prep Kit User Manual Version 1.5 (EpiCypher, Inc, Catalog No. 14-1001). The

concentrations of CUT&RUN library samples were determined via Qubit and quality control

were assessed with an Agilent 4200 TapeStation.

CUT&RUN Analysis & Visualization.

Multiple CUT&RUN runs were preformed to obtain biological replicates of each sample. DNA

products were sequenced on an Illumina NovaSeq 6000 using 150-bp paired-ends at the GTAC

sequencing core at Washington University in St. Louis. Sequence reads obtained from Illumina

were trimmed for adapter sequences and poor sequence quality (phred score < 25 and trimmed

length < 50) using fastp v0.23.4. The trimmed reads were mapped to the reference *C. parvum*

IOWA-CDC genome using BWA-MEM v0.7.17 [78]. Duplicate reads were marked and

removed in the bam files using the MarkDuplicates algorithm of picard v3.1.1

(https://broadinstitute.github.io/picard/) with REMOVE_DUPLICATES=true,

CREATE_INDEX=true, and ASSUME_SORTED=true. Reads with mapping lengths less than

50 bp were further removed from the bam files using SAMtools v1.7

(http://samtools.sourceforge.net/). Genome coverage and sequence depth were estimated using

the mpileup algorithm of SAMtools. The read depth of each locus was normalized by dividing by

the total number of counts for all loci, then scaled by multiplying by the number of loci in the

genome. Input counts were subtracted from negative control counts. Data was visualized by a R

package 'ggplot2' (https://www.rdocumentation.org/packages/ggplot2). Motifs within

centromeric windows were identified using MEME v5.5.8 (https://meme-

suite.org/meme/tools/meme). Chromosomal distributions of intergenic regions, centromeric

windows, and motifs were visualized with Circos plot generated in TBtools-II v2.311

(https://github.com/CJ-Chen/TBtools-II).

REFERENCES:

1. Tyzzer E. An extracellular coccidium, Cryptosporidium muris (gen. et sp. nov.), of the gastric glands of the common mouse. J Med Res. 1910;23:487-509. PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2098948.
2. Greenberg PD, Koch J, Cello JP. Diagnosis of Cryptosporidium parvum in patients with severe diarrhea and AIDS. Dig Dis Sci. 1996;41(11):2286-90.
3. Striepen B. Parasitic infections: Time to tackle cryptosporidiosis. Nature. 2013;503(7475):189-91. PubMed Central PMCID: PMC24236315.
4. Tzipori S, Widmer G. A hundred-year retrospective on cryptosporidiosis. Trends Parasitol. 2008;24(4):184-9. Epub 20080307. doi: 10.1016/j.pt.2008.01.002. PubMed PMID: 18329342; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2716703.
5. Sow SO, Muhsen K, Nasrin D, Blackwelder WC, Wu Y, Farag TH, et al. The Burden of Cryptosporidium Diarrheal Disease among Children < 24 Months of Age in Moderate/High Mortality Regions of Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, Utilizing Data from the Global Enteric Multicenter Study (GEMS). PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2016;10(5):e0004729. Epub 2016/05/25. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004729. PubMed PMID: 27219054; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4878811.
6. Kotloff KL, Nataro JP, Blackwelder WC, Nasrin D, Farag TH, Panchalingam S, et al. Burden and aetiology of diarrhoeal disease in infants and young children in developing countries (the Global Enteric Multicenter Study, GEMS): a prospective, case-control study. Lancet. 2013;382(9888):209-22.
7. Wanyiri JW, Kanyi H, Maina S, Wang DE, Steen A, Ngugi P, et al. Cryptosporidiosis in HIV/AIDS patients in Kenya: clinical features, epidemiology, molecular characterization and antibody responses. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2014;91(2):319-28. Epub 2014/05/29. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.13-0254. PubMed PMID: 24865675; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4125256.
8. Funkhouser-Jones LJ, Ravindran S, Sibley LD. Defining Stage-Specific Activity of Potent New Inhibitors of Cryptosporidium parvum Growth In Vitro. mBio. 2020;11(2). Epub 2020/03/05. doi: 10.1128/mBio.00052-20. PubMed PMID: 32127445; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7064746.
9. English ED, Guerin A, Tandel J, Striepen B. Live imaging of the Cryptosporidium parvum life cycle reveals direct development of male and female gametes from type I meronts. PLoS Biol. 2022;20(4):e3001604. Epub 2022/04/19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3001604. PubMed PMID: 35436284; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9015140.
10. Beyer TV, Svezhova NV, Sidorenko NV, Khokhlov SE. Cryptosporidium parvum (Coccidia, Apicomplexa): Some new ultrastructural observations on its endogenous development. European Journal of Protistology. 2000;36(2):151-9. doi: 10.1016/s0932-4739(00)80034-6.
11. Pohlenz J, Bemrick WJ, Moon HW, Cheville NF. Bovine cryptosporidiosis: a transmission and scanning electron microscopic study of some stages in the life cycle and of the host-parasite relationship. Vet Pathol. 1978;15(3):417-27. Epub 1978/05/01. doi: 10.1177/030098587801500318. PubMed PMID: 98896.
12. Tzipori S, McCartney E, Lawson GH, Rowland AC, Campbell I. Experimental infection of piglets with cryptosporidium. Res Vet Sci. 1981;31(3):358-68. Epub 1981/11/01. PubMed PMID: 7342229.

13. Current WL, Reese NC. A comparison of endogenous development of three isolates of
Cryptosporidium in suckling mice. J Protozool. 1986;33(1):98-108. Epub 1986/02/01.
PubMed PMID: 3959014.
14. Keithly JS, Langreth SG, Buttle KF, Mannella CA. Electron tomographic and ultrastructural
analysis of the Cryptosporidium parvum relict mitochondrion, its associated membranes,
and organelles. J Eukaryot Microbiol. 2005;52(2):132-40. Epub 2005/04/09. doi:
10.1111/j.1550-7408.2005.04-3317.x. PubMed PMID: 15817118.
15. Wilke G. Development of an in vitro Culture System for Cryptosporidium parvum. Theses
and Dissertations: Washington University in St. Louis; 2020.
16. White MW, Suvorova ES. Apicomplexa Cell Cycles: Something Old, Borrowed, Lost, and
New. Trends Parasitol. 2018;34(9):759-71. Epub 20180802. doi:
10.1016/j.pt.2018.07.006. PubMed PMID: 30078701; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC6157590.
17. Striepen B, Jordan CN, Reiff S, van Dooren GG. Building the perfect parasite: cell division
in apicomplexa. PLoS Pathog. 2007;3(6):e78. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.0030078.
PubMed PMID: 17604449; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1904476.
18. Gissot M, Walker R, Delhaye S, Huot L, Hot D, Tomavo S. Toxoplasma gondii
chromodomain protein 1 binds to heterochromatin and colocalises with centromeres and
telomeres at the nuclear periphery. PLoS One. 2012;7(3):e32671. Epub 20120309. doi:
10.1371/journal.pone.0032671. PubMed PMID: 22427862; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC3302879.
19. Duraisingh MT, Voss TS, Marty AJ, Duffy MF, Good RT, Thompson JK, et al.
Heterochromatin silencing and locus repositioning linked to regulation of virulence genes
in Plasmodium falciparum. Cell. 2005;121(1):13-24. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2005.01.036.
PubMed PMID: 15820675.
20. del Cacho E, Pages M, Gallego M, Barbero JL, Monteagudo L, Sanchez-Acedo C. Meiotic
chromosome pairing and bouquet formation during Eimeria tenella sporulation. Int J
Parasitol. 2010;40(4):453-62. Epub 20091029. doi: 10.1016/j.ijpara.2009.09.008.
PubMed PMID: 19837073.
21. Dey G, Culley S, Curran S, Schmidt U, Henriques R, Kukulski W, et al. Closed mitosis
requires local disassembly of the nuclear envelope. Nature. 2020;585(7823):119-23.
Epub 20200826. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2648-3. PubMed PMID: 32848252; PubMed
Central PMCID: PMCPMC7610560.
22. Matthews H, Duffy CW, Merrick CJ. Checks and balances? DNA replication and the cell
cycle in Plasmodium. Parasit Vectors. 2018;11(1):216. Epub 20180327. doi:
10.1186/s13071-018-2800-1. PubMed PMID: 29587837; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC5872521.
23. Rout MP, Obado SO, Schenkman S, Field MC. Specialising the parasite nucleus: Pores,
lamins, chromatin, and diversity. PLoS Pathog. 2017;13(3):e1006170. Epub 20170302.
doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1006170. PubMed PMID: 28253370; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC5333908.
24. Suvorova ES, Francia M, Striepen B, White MW. A novel bipartite centrosome coordinates
the apicomplexan cell cycle. PLoS Biol. 2015;13(3):e1002093. Epub 20150303. doi:
10.1371/journal.pbio.1002093. PubMed PMID: 25734885; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC4348508.

25. Chen CT, Kelly M, Leon J, Nwagbara B, Ebbert P, Ferguson DJ, et al. Compartmentalized
Toxoplasma EB1 bundles spindle microtubules to secure accurate chromosome
segregation. Mol Biol Cell. 2015;26(25):4562-76. Epub 20151014. doi:
10.1091/mbc.E15-06-0437. PubMed PMID: 26466679; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC4678015.
26. Hoeijmakers WA, Flueck C, Francoijs KJ, Smits AH, Wetzel J, Volz JC, et al. Plasmodium
falciparum centromeres display a unique epigenetic makeup and cluster prior to and
during schizogony. Cell Microbiol. 2012;14(9):1391-401. Epub 20120515. doi:
10.1111/j.1462-5822.2012.01803.x. PubMed PMID: 22507744.
27. Brooks CF, Francia ME, Gissot M, Croken MM, Kim K, Striepen B. Toxoplasma gondii
sequesters centromeres to a specific nuclear region throughout the cell cycle. Proc Natl
Acad Sci U S A. 2011;108(9):3767-72. Epub 20110214. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1006741108.
PubMed PMID: 21321216; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3048097.
28. Arnot DE, Ronander E, Bengtsson DC. The progression of the intra-erythrocytic cell cycle of
Plasmodium falciparum and the role of the centriolar plaques in asynchronous mitotic
division during schizogony. Int J Parasitol. 2011;41(1):71-80. Epub 20100917. doi:
10.1016/j.ijpara.2010.07.012. PubMed PMID: 20816844.
29. Iwanaga S, Khan SM, Kaneko I, Christodoulou Z, Newbold C, Yuda M, et al. Functional
identification of the Plasmodium centromere and generation of a Plasmodium artificial
chromosome. Cell Host Microbe. 2010;7(3):245-55. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2010.02.010.
PubMed PMID: 20227667; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2996609.
30. Absalon S. A dynamic barrier: remodeling of the nuclear envelope during closed mitosis in
malaria parasites. mSphere. 2025;10(7):e0099924. Epub 20250609. doi:
10.1128/msphere.00999-24. PubMed PMID: 40488521; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC12306155.
31. Weiner A, Dahan-Pasternak N, Shimoni E, Shinder V, von Huth P, Elbaum M, et al. 3D
nuclear architecture reveals coupled cell cycle dynamics of chromatin and nuclear pores
in the malaria parasite Plasmodium falciparum. Cell Microbiol. 2011;13(7):967-77. Epub
20110428. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-5822.2011.01592.x. PubMed PMID: 21501361.
32. Francia ME, Striepen B. Cell division in apicomplexan parasites. Nat Rev Microbiol.
2014;12(2):125-36. Epub 20140102. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro3184. PubMed PMID:
24384598.
33. Kursel LE, Malik HS. Centromeres. Curr Biol. 2016;26(12):R487-R90. doi:
10.1016/j.cub.2016.05.031. PubMed PMID: 27326706.
34. Hegemann JH, Fleig UN. The centromere of budding yeast. Bioessays. 1993;15(7):451-60.
doi: 10.1002/bies.950150704. PubMed PMID: 8379948.
35. Kelly JM, McRobert L, Baker DA. Evidence on the chromosomal location of centromeric
DNA in Plasmodium falciparum from etoposide-mediated topoisomerase-II cleavage.
Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2006;103(17):6706-11. Epub 20060414. doi:
10.1073/pnas.0510363103. PubMed PMID: 16617116; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC1458945.
36. Viera A, Page J, Rufas JS. Inverted meiosis: the true bugs as a model to study. Genome Dyn.
2009;5:137-56. doi: 10.1159/000166639. PubMed PMID: 18948713.
37. Mandrioli M, Manicardi GC. Holocentric chromosomes. PLoS Genet. 2020;16(7):e1008918.
Epub 20200730. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1008918. PubMed PMID: 32730246;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7392213.

38. Marques A, Drinnenberg IA. Same but different: Centromere regulations in holocentric
insects and plants. Curr Opin Cell Biol. 2025;93:102484. Epub 20250220. doi:
10.1016/j.ceb.2025.102484. PubMed PMID: 39983583.
39. Bensasson D. Evidence for a high mutation rate at rapidly evolving yeast centromeres. BMC
Evol Biol. 2011;11:211. Epub 20110718. doi: 10.1186/1471-2148-11-211. PubMed
PMID: 21767380; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3155921.
40. Csink AK, Henikoff S. Something from nothing: the evolution and utility of satellite repeats.
Trends Genet. 1998;14(5):200-4. doi: 10.1016/s0168-9525(98)01444-9. PubMed PMID:
9613205.
41. Talbert PB, Henikoff S. Centromeres drive and take a break. Chromosome Res.
2025;33(1):17. Epub 20250804. doi: 10.1007/s10577-025-09777-z. PubMed PMID:
40759764; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC12321929.
42. Henikoff S, Ahmad K, Malik HS. The centromere paradox: stable inheritance with rapidly
evolving DNA. Science. 2001;293(5532):1098-102. doi: 10.1126/science.1062939.
PubMed PMID: 11498581.
43. Talbert PB, Henikoff S. What makes a centromere? Exp Cell Res. 2020;389(2):111895. Epub
20200206. doi: 10.1016/j.yexcr.2020.111895. PubMed PMID: 32035948.
44. Skene PJ, Henikoff S. An efficient targeted nuclease strategy for high-resolution mapping of
DNA binding sites. Elife. 2017;6. Epub 20170116. doi: 10.7554/eLife.21856. PubMed
PMID: 28079019; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5310842.
45. Herrera-Solorio AM, Vembar SS, MacPherson CR, Lozano-Amado D, Meza GR,
Xoconostle-Cazares B, et al. Clipped histone H3 is integrated into nucleosomes of DNA
replication genes in the human malaria parasite Plasmodium falciparum. EMBO Rep.
2019;20(4). Epub 20190304. doi: 10.15252/embr.201846331. PubMed PMID: 30833341;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6446197.
46. Verma G, Surolia N. Plasmodium falciparum CENH3 is able to functionally complement
Cse4p and its, C-terminus is essential for centromere function. Mol Biochem Parasitol.
2013;192(1-2):21-9. Epub 20131206. doi: 10.1016/j.molbiopara.2013.11.002. PubMed
PMID: 24316361.
47. Naumov A, Kratzer S, Ting LM, Kim K, Suvorova ES, White MW. The Toxoplasma
Centrocone Houses Cell Cycle Regulatory Factors. mBio. 2017;8(4). Epub 20170822.
doi: 10.1128/mBio.00579-17. PubMed PMID: 28830940; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC5565962.
48. Mahajan B, Selvapandiyan A, Gerald NJ, Majam V, Zheng H, Wickramarachchi T, et al.
Centrins, cell cycle regulation proteins in human malaria parasite Plasmodium
falciparum. J Biol Chem. 2008;283(46):31871-83. Epub 20080808. doi:
10.1074/jbc.M800028200. PubMed PMID: 18693242.
49. Liu C, Wang L, Lancto CA, Abrahamsen MS. Characterization of a Cryptosporidium parvum
protein that binds single-stranded G-strand telomeric DNA. Mol Biochem Parasitol.
2009;165(2):132-41. Epub 20090204. doi: 10.1016/j.molbiopara.2009.01.013. PubMed
PMID: 19428660.
50. Ay F, Bunnik EM, Varoquaux N, Bol SM, Prudhomme J, Vert JP, et al. Three-dimensional
modeling of the P. falciparum genome during the erythrocytic cycle reveals a strong
connection between genome architecture and gene expression. Genome Res.
2014;24(6):974-88. Epub 20140326. doi: 10.1101/gr.169417.113. PubMed PMID:
24671853; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4032861.

51. Bunnik EM, Cook KB, Varoquaux N, Batugedara G, Prudhomme J, Cort A, et al. Changes in
genome organization of parasite-specific gene families during the Plasmodium
transmission stages. Nat Commun. 2018;9(1):1910. Epub 20180515. doi:
10.1038/s41467-018-04295-5. PubMed PMID: 29765020; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC5954139.
52. Hollin T, Le Roch KG. From Genes to Transcripts, a Tightly Regulated Journey in
Plasmodium. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2020;10:618454. Epub 20201217. doi:
10.3389/fcimb.2020.618454. PubMed PMID: 33425787; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC7793691.
53. McIntosh JR. Mitosis. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2016;8(9). Epub 20160901. doi:
10.1101/cshperspect.a023218. PubMed PMID: 27587616; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC5008068.
54. Perez-Cadahia B, Drobic B, Davie JR. H3 phosphorylation: dual role in mitosis and
interphase. Biochem Cell Biol. 2009;87(5):695-709. doi: 10.1139/O09-053. PubMed
PMID: 19898522.
55. Gerald N, Mahajan B, Kumar S. Mitosis in the human malaria parasite Plasmodium
falciparum. Eukaryot Cell. 2011;10(4):474-82. Epub 20110211. doi: 10.1128/EC.00314-
10. PubMed PMID: 21317311; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3127633.
56. Steiner FA, Henikoff S. Holocentromeres are dispersed point centromeres localized at
transcription factor hotspots. Elife. 2014;3:e02025. Epub 20140101. doi:
10.7554/eLife.02025. PubMed PMID: 24714495; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC3975580.
57. Xia J, Venkat A, Bainbridge RE, Reese ML, Le Roch KG, Ay F, et al. Third-generation
sequencing revises the molecular karyotype for Toxoplasma gondii and identifies
emerging copy number variants in sexual recombinants. Genome Res. 2021;31(5):834-
51. Epub 20210427. doi: 10.1101/gr.262816.120. PubMed PMID: 33906962; PubMed
Central PMCID: PMCPMC8092015.
58. Blauwkamp J, Ambekar SV, Hussain T, Mair GR, Beck JR, Absalon S. Nuclear pore
complexes undergo Nup221 exchange during blood-stage asexual replication of parasites.
Msphere. 2024;9(12). doi: 10.1128/msphere.00750-24. PubMed PMID:
WOS:001352594000001.
59. Edwards-Smallbone J, Jensen AL, Roberts LE, Totanes FIG, Hart SR, Merrick CJ.
Plasmodium falciparum GBP2 Is a Telomere-Associated Protein That Binds to G-
Quadruplex DNA and RNA. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2022;12:782537. Epub
20220222. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2022.782537. PubMed PMID: 35273922; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMCPMC8902816.
60. Zhao N, Gong P, Li Z, Cheng B, Li J, Yang Z, et al. Identification of a telomeric DNA-
binding protein in Eimeria tenella. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2014;451(4):599-
602. Epub 20140813. doi: 10.1016/j.bbrc.2014.08.030. PubMed PMID: 25128826.
61. Melters DP, Paliulis LV, Korf IF, Chan SW. Holocentric chromosomes: convergent
evolution, meiotic adaptations, and genomic analysis. Chromosome Res. 2012;20(5):579-
93. doi: 10.1007/s10577-012-9292-1. PubMed PMID: 22766638.
62. Lucek K, Augustijnen H, Escudero M. A holocentric twist to chromosomal speciation?
Trends Ecol Evol. 2022;37(8):655-62. Epub 20220426. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2022.04.002.
PubMed PMID: 35484024.

63. Funkhouser-Jones LJ, Xu R, Wilke G, Fu Y, Schriefer LA, Makimaa H, et al. Microbiota-
produced indole metabolites disrupt mitochondrial function and inhibit Cryptosporidium
parvum growth. Cell Rep. 2023;42(7):112680. Epub 2023/06/29. doi:
10.1016/j.celrep.2023.112680. PubMed PMID: 37384526.
64. Pardy RD, Wallbank BA, Striepen B, Hunter CA. Immunity to Cryptosporidium: insights
into principles of enteric responses to infection. Nat Rev Immunol. 2024;24(2):142-55.
Epub 20230911. doi: 10.1038/s41577-023-00932-3. PubMed PMID: 37697084.
65. Martinez-Perez E, Schvarzstein M, Barroso C, Lightfoot J, Dernburg AF, Villeneuve AM.
Crossovers trigger a remodeling of meiotic chromosome axis composition that is linked
to two-step loss of sister chromatid cohesion. Genes Dev. 2008;22(20):2886-901. doi:
10.1101/gad.1694108. PubMed PMID: 18923085; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC2569886.
66. Kimball A, Funkhouser-Jones L, Huang W, Xu R, Witola WH, Sibley LD. Mendelian
segregation and high recombination rates facilitate genetic analyses in Cryptosporidium
parvum. PLoS Genet. 2024;20(6):e1011162. Epub 20240617. doi:
10.1371/journal.pgen.1011162. PubMed PMID: 38885280; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC11213348.
67. Wilke G, Ravindran S, Funkhouser-Jones L, Barks J, Wang Q, VanDussen KL, et al.
Monoclonal antibodies to intracellular stages of *Cryptosporidium parvum* define life
cycle progression in vitro. Msphere. 2018;3(3):e00124-18. Epub 2018/06/01. doi:
10.1128/mSphere.00124-18. PubMed PMID: 29848759; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC5976880.
68. Xu R, Beatty WL, Greigert V, Witola WH, Sibley LD. Multiple pathways for glucose
phosphate transport and utilization support growth of Cryptosporidium parvum. Nat
Commun. 2024;15(1):380. Epub 20240109. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-44696-3. PubMed
PMID: 38191884; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10774378.
69. Wilke G, Funkhouser-Jones L, Wang Y, Ravindran S, Wang Q, Beatty WL, et al. Forward
genetics in *Cryptosporidium* enabled by complete in vitro development in stem cell-
derived intestinal epithlium. Cell Host Microbe. 2019;doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3331307.
70. Xu R, Beatty WL, Greigert V, Witola WH, Sibley LD. Multiple pathways for glucose
phosphate transport and utilization support growth of Cryptosporidium parvum. bioRxiv.
2023. Epub 2023/07/10. doi: 10.1101/2023.06.27.546703. PubMed PMID: 37425855;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10327089.
71. Akey ME, Xu R, Ravindran S, Funkhouser-Jones L, Sibley LD. Apical Secretory
Glycoprotein Complex Contributes to Cell Attachment and Entry by Cryptosporidium
parvum. mBio. 2023;14(1):e0306422. Epub 2023/02/02. doi: 10.1128/mbio.03064-22.
PubMed PMID: 36722968; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9973360.
72. Xu R, Feng Y, Xiao L, Sibley LD. Insulinase-like Protease 1 Contributes to Macrogamont
Formation in Cryptosporidium parvum. mBio. 2021;12(2). Epub 2021/03/11. doi:
10.1128/mBio.03405-20. PubMed PMID: 33688009; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC8092296.
73. Kuhlenschmidt TB, Rutaganira FU, Long S, Tang K, Shokat KM, Kuhlenschmidt MS, et al.
Inhibition of Calcium-Dependent Protein Kinase 1 (CDPK1) In Vitro by
Pyrazolopyrimidine Derivatives Does Not Correlate with Sensitivity of Cryptosporidium
parvum Growth in Cell Culture. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2015;60(1):570-9.

74. Current WL. Techniques and laboratory maintenance of *Cryptosporidium*. In: Dubey JP,
966   Speer CA, Fayer R, editors. Cryptosporidiosis of Man and Animals. Boca Raton, FL:
967   CRC Press; 1990. p. 44-77.
968   75. Mehta S, Sibley LD. Actin depolymerizing factor controls actin turnover and gliding motility
969   in Toxoplasma gondii. Mol Biol Cell. 2011;22(8):1290-9. Epub 20110223. doi:
970   10.1091/mbc.E10-12-0939. PubMed PMID: 21346192; PubMed Central PMCID:
971   PMCPMC3078074.
972   76. Behnke MS, Radke JB, Smith AT, Sullivan WJ, Jr., White MW. The transcription of
973   bradyzoite genes in Toxoplasma gondii is controlled by autonomous promoter elements.
974   Mol Microbiol. 2008;68(6):1502-18. Epub 20080421. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
975   2958.2008.06249.x. PubMed PMID: 18433450; PubMed Central PMCID:
976   PMCPMC2440561.
977   77. Waldman BS, Schwarz D, Wadsworth MH, 2nd, Saeij JP, Shalek AK, Lourido S.
978   Identification of a Master Regulator of Differentiation in Toxoplasma. Cell.
979   2020;180(2):359-72 e16. Epub 20200116. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2019.12.013. PubMed
980   PMID: 31955846; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6978799.
981   78. Huang W, Tang K, Chen C, Arrowood MJ, Chen M, Guo Y, et al. Sequence introgression
982   from exogenous lineages underlies genomic and biological differences among
983   Cryptosporidium parvum IOWA lines. Water Res. 2024;254:121333. Epub 20240217.
984   doi: 10.1016/j.watres.2024.121333. PubMed PMID: 38402753; PubMed Central PMCID:
985   PMCPMC10994760.
986

Supporting Information

S1 Table. Transgenic *Cryptosporidium* strains used in this study.

S2 Table. Key Resources used in the experiments.

S3 Table. Oligonucleotides and plasmids used in this study.

S1 Dataset Information of sequencing samples from the Cut&Run and summary statistics of the

data.

S2 Dataset Genomic location of the CENH3 sites within coding regions.

S3 Dataset Genomic location of the CENH3 sites within intergenic regions.