# A human cell-free translation screen identifies the NT-2 mycotoxin as a ribosomal peptidyl transferase inhibitor

Nino Schwaller[1], Dominic Andenmatten[1], Jonas Luginbühl[1,4], Julius Rabl[3], Marc Chambon[5], Jonathan Vesin[5], Gerardo Turcatti[5], Evangelos D. Karousis[1,2,6]

1. Department of Chemistry, Biochemistry and Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Bern, Bern, 3012, Switzerland.
2. Multidisciplinary Center for Infectious Diseases, University of Bern, Bern, 3012, Switzerland.
3. ETH Zurich, Cryo-EM Knowledge Hub, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland.
4. Institute of Cell Biology, University of Bern, Bern, 3012, Switzerland.
5. Biomolecular Screening Facility, EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland
6. Lead contact

**Correspondence:** evangelos.karousis@unibe.ch

## Summary

Translation inhibitors are invaluable for probing ribosome function and therapeutic applications, but systematic discovery in human systems is limited by the lack of scalable, screening-compatible cell-free platforms. Here, we establish a robust high-throughput screening using human lysates that bypasses cellular cytotoxic effects. After screening ~28,000 small molecules, we identified known and novel translation inhibitors, including NT-2, a trichothecene mycotoxin produced by the pathogenic *Fusarium sporotrichioides*. NT-2 suppressed protein synthesis in human cells and yeast lysates, while sparing translation in bacteria and intact yeast cells. Cryo-EM at 1.72 Å revealed NT-2 bound at the peptidyl transferase center of the human 60S ribosome, confirming NT-2 as a eukaryote-specific elongation inhibitor that engages ribosomes in a dormant, SERBP1-bound state. Together, these results expose NT-2 as a previously unrecognized environmental inhibitor of mammalian protein synthesis and demonstrate the power of cell-free translation screening to reveal new inhibitors with unexpected ribosome fates.

## Keywords

Cell-free translation, high-throughput screening, protein synthesis inhibitors, mycotoxin, mRNA translation, NT-2 toxin, ribosome, translation regulation, Fusarium, peptidyl transferase center, SERBP1, dormant ribosomes

## Introduction

Despite the central role of protein synthesis and translational control in disease and therapy, the discovery of new translation inhibitors is challenging. Screenings using living cells have uncovered translation-modulating compounds (1–3) but cell-based screenings are inherently limited by compound uptake, cytotoxicity, and physiological complexity, which can obscure target-specific effects (4, 5). False positives and overlooked candidates remain a persistent problem, highlighting the need for complementary platforms with high mechanistic resolution (6) and they often fail to discriminate between cell growth inhibitors from those acting on specific mRNA translation mechanisms, such as IRES- or RAN-mediated translation (7, 8). While useful, traditional cell-free systems such as rabbit reticulocyte lysate or *E.coli* lysates lack human-specific context, they present tissue-specific artefacts and are labour-intensive to prepare at scale (9–11). Moreover, they are generally incompatible with high-throughput screening formats, some enzymatic assays and do not support physiologically relevant post-translational processes (6, 9, 12).

This gap is particularly evident for natural toxins, where food-borne contaminants can pose serious health hazards. Mycotoxins are pervasive fungal metabolites that contaminate global food production and exert potent bioactivities, often targeting core cellular processes (13, 14). Trichothecenes are toxic fungal metabolites produced by species of the genus *Fusarium* that increasingly contaminate grains due to changing climate and agricultural practices (15). They can cause a broad spectrum of health effects, including gastrointestinal, immunological, neurological, dermal, and reproductive toxicity, with some showing carcinogenic potential in animal models (14, 16). Globally, around one-quarter of crops exceed regulatory thresholds for mycotoxin contamination, and 60–80% contain detectable levels (16). These risks explain the urgent need to characterize, monitor, and mitigate trichothecene contamination in food and feed supplies. Several Trichothecenes can cause eukaryotic translation inhibition (17–20). Although traditionally studied in the context of food safety, their potent effects make them promising candidates for therapeutic development, especially in antiviral (21) and anticancer contexts (22, 23). Yet few fungal metabolites beyond classical trichothecenes have been systematically examined in human systems (16).

NT-2 (15-deacetyl-neosolaniol) is a type-A trichothecene mycotoxin first isolated from *Fusarium sporotrichioides* (15, 24, 25). NT-2 carries an epoxide moiety at C12–13, a feature essential for trichothecene bioactivity, but its unique substitution pattern, including multiple hydroxyl groups, chemically distinguishes it from the previously studied T-2 and HT-2 toxins (14).

Here, we establish the first high-throughput cell-free translation screening (CFTS) using human lysates, fully compatible with 384-well formats. Screening 28,000 compounds revealed NT-2, a previously uncharacterized trichothecene mycotoxin from *Fusarium*, as a potent inhibitor of eukaryotic translation. Cryo-EM at 1.72 Å placed NT-2 in the peptidyl transferase center and showed that inhibition engages ribosomes in a dormant state. Together, these findings reveal an overlooked environmental threat to human translation and demonstrate the power of CFTS to uncover both new inhibitors and unexpected ribosome fates.

## Results

### Development of a human-based Cell-Free Translation Screening Platform

To overcome the limitations of living cells in high-throughput discovery, we established a massively parallel cell-free translation screening based on human dual-centrifugation lysates (12, 26, 27). Cytoplasmically enriched extracts preserve key human translation features and provide sufficient material for thousands of reactions (26). As illustrated in Fig. 1A, the workflow involves lysate preparation, the addition of reporter mRNAs and compounds in 384-well plates, and automated luminescence readout, enabling compatibility with large-scale screening.

Translation of capped and polyadenylated Renilla luciferase mRNA provides a quantitative readout for protein synthesis, and pre-spotted compounds reduce well-to-well variation. To maximize throughput without compromising fidelity, we optimized several parameters. Low reaction volumes (5 µL per well) retain signal intensity, lysate-mRNA mixes can be frozen and thawed with a minor reduction in activity (Fig. 1B), and luminescent signals remain stable within the time window of 20 minutes required to process more than 10 plates in parallel. (Fig. 1C). Assay quality was benchmarked with cycloheximide, yielding a Z′ factor of 0.82, reflecting a dynamic range exceeding three orders of magnitude and a clear separation between uninhibited and fully inhibited reactions (28) (Fig. 1D). These performance metrics establish CFTS as a robust and human-specific platform for scalable discovery of translation inhibitors.




**Figure 1 – CFTS platform development and optimization (A)** CFTS workflow. Dual centrifugation-produced HeLa S3 lysates are combined with *Renilla* luciferase reporter mRNAs and dispensed into 384-well plates preloaded with compounds. Translation was quantified by luminescence. **(B)** Luminescence output from reactions performed at 5 µL and 10 µL volumes using freshly assembled or pre-frozen reaction mixes. **(C)** Luminescence signal stability over 90 minutes following substrate addition. **(D)** Z' factor assessment with DMSO (vehicle) or cycloheximide (CHX, positive control) with mean ± 3SD shown as dotted lines. For B and C, data are presented as mean values of three biological replicates (sets of translation reactions) averaged after three measurements ± SD.

## Identification of active compounds across chemically diverse libraries

We performed the high-throughput CFTS to evaluate 27,763 small molecules from six mechanistically and chemically diverse libraries for their ability to modulate human translation. Compounds were tested at a final concentration of 10 µM, and those with a hit score above 0.6 were classified as primary active hits. The hit score was calculated from the luminescence

signal relative to uninhibited (DMSO) and fully inhibited (CHX) controls, where a value of 1 corresponds to complete inhibition equivalent to CHX and 0 corresponds to no inhibition (DMSO).

The Prestwick Library (Fig. 2A), made up of 1280 FDA/EMA/PMDA-approved drugs with noted bioactivity and the kinases inhibitor collection (275 compounds), yielded 17 active compounds out of the 1,555 molecules, including several known translation inhibitors. In the Repurposing Library (Fig. 2B), which contains molecules that have reached clinical or preclinical development, 25 actives were identified from 4,477 compounds, with puromycin among the top hits, serving as a positive internal control. The Protein–Protein Interaction (PPI) Library (Fig. 2C),, which contains compounds that interfere with known protein-protein interactions, showed the highest apparent hit rate, with 277 actives among 2,156 compounds screened. Seven scored above 0.9, likely indicating enrichment of molecules targeting interaction surfaces essential for ribosome assembly or factor recruitment. To select the most active compounds, we applied a stringent cut-off of 0.7, reducing the primary hits to 90.

The Natural Product-Inspired Library (Fig. 2D), comprising 13,431 synthetic analogs of natural product scaffolds, yielded 38 actives, though none exceeded a score of 0.75. The Chemically Diverse Collection Extension (Fig. 2E), representing a broad synthetic scaffold space, yielded 16 hits from 3,518 molecules, including four with scores approaching 1.0. Finally, the Natural Products Library (Fig. 2F), comprising 2,626 plant and microbial extracts, yielded 46 primary hits, several with scores greater than 1.0, illustrating the richness of natural metabolites as translation inhibitors. Overall hit rates varied across libraries, ranging from ~1% in Prestwick and Repurposing to over 10% in the PPI library, highlighting the CFTS capacity to resolve mechanistically diverse modulators across distinct compound classes.

To validate primary hits and assess potency, we performed dose-response assays (30 nM to 100 μM) on 232 top-scoring candidates. Compounds showing reproducible, saturable inhibition curves were classified as confirmed hits, yielding 46 molecules, of which 36 had not previously been linked to translation inhibition (Sup. Table 1). To distinguish genuine translation inhibitors from luciferase-specific artefacts, we measured Rluc protein levels by Western blot. Twelve compounds were classified as false positive luciferase inhibitors because the luminescence decrease was not matched by reduced protein levels and persisted when added after translation had completed (Sup. Fig. 1, Sup. Table 1). Ten established inhibitors, including cycloheximide, puromycin, and T-2 toxin, served as internal benchmarks and confirmed assay fidelity (Sup. Table 2). In addition, five molecules were validated as bona fide translation inhibitors (Sup. Table 1). A Sankey diagram summarizes compound filtering through the entire workflow (Fig. 2G).

Together, these results validate CFTS as a high-resolution, scalable platform that identifies modulators of human translation and reveals broader activity patterns across compound classes.




**Figure 2 - High-throughput identification of translation modulators across chemically diverse libraries. (A-F)** Compounds with hit scores > 0.6 are positive hits marked with red dots, and negative hits with a score < 0.6 with blue triangles. Hit score distributions from six compound libraries screened by CFTS. Prestwick and Repurposing libraries yielded ~1% actives, while the PPI library showed the highest density of actives. The Natural product collection contributed multiple top-scoring hits. Compounds were tested at 10 µM in the primary screen (two measurements per compound). Selected hits were validated in independent duplicate dose-response assays. **(G)** Sankey diagram illustrating the sequential filtering of compounds in a multi-step screening workflow. Node widths are proportional to the number of compounds progressing at each stage.

## Validation of the Mycotoxin NT-2 as a translation inhibitor

Our initial human cell-free translation screen identified the mycotoxin NT-2 (15-Deacetylneosolaniol, CAS 76348-84-0) as a translation modulator with a hit score of 0.73.

Some trichothecenes are well-established ribosome inhibitors (25), yet NT-2 itself remains uncharacterized in this regard. Structurally, NT-2 features a unique combination of substitutions within the trichothecene scaffold, including a C-8 hydroxyl group and a 4β-acetoxy moiety (Fig. 3A), which distinguishes it from better-characterized toxins such as T-2, HT-2, or deoxynivalenol. Secondary validation by dose-response analysis revealed a sigmoidal inhibition curve, with near-complete suppression of protein synthesis at concentrations greater than 30 µM and partial inhibition at lower doses (Fig. 3B). To exclude direct interference with luciferase enzyme activity, we tested NT-2 in a translation assay using a FLAG-tagged RLuc reporter mRNA. Luminescence decreased in a dose-dependent manner, yielding an $IC_{50}$ of 4.1 µM, and this pattern was confirmed by Western blot analysis of FLAG–RLuc protein (Fig. 3C–D). Together, these assays validate NT-2 as a bona fide inhibitor of human protein synthesis.




**Figure 3 - Validation of NT-2 as a translation inhibitor in human cell-free lysates. (A)** Chemical structure of NT-2, represented in Lewis format **(B)** Dose-response curve from secondary assays showing NT-2–mediated inhibition of *Renilla* luciferase translation. Concentration between 30 nM and 100 µM NT-2 were tested and the inhibition score was calculated, where a value of 0 is no inhibition and 1 is a full inhibition equivalent to CHX. Data are means of two biological replicates (dots) ± SD. **(C)** Cell-free translation reactions were performed using FLAG-tagged *Renilla* luciferase mRNA in HeLa S3 lysate with increasing NT-2 concentrations (50 nM to 100 µM). The measured luminescence was normalized to the negative control containing no supplement (CTR). The calculated $IC_{50}$ for NT-2 was 4.1 µM, based on the average of three biological replicates (dots) ± SD. **(D)** Western blot confirmation of NT-2-mediated translation inhibition. Samples from the reactions in (C) were analyzed by SDS-PAGE and immunoblotting for FLAG-tagged *Renilla* luciferase (translation product) and Vinculin (loading control).

**Eukaryote-specific translation inhibition by NT-2**

We next examined NT-2 activity in living cells. Puromycin incorporation assays in HEK293T cells showed potent suppression of translation, with detectable inhibition at 62.5 nM and complete inhibition at 2 μM (Fig. 4A). Quantification of the puromycin signal yielded a dose-response curve with an $IC_{50}$ of 135 nM (Fig. 4B), indicating substantially greater potency in cells than in lysates. This discrepancy suggests that intracellular factors, such as compound uptake or accumulation, may enhance NT-2 activity *in vivo*.

We generated polysome profiles from HEK293T cells treated with 2 μM NT-2 to further investigate the mechanism of translation inhibition . In DMSO-treated cells, prominent polysome and balanced 40S/60S/80S peaks indicated active translation (Fig. 4C). In contrast, NT-2 treatment resulted in a pronounced accumulation of 80S monosomes, accompanied by a striking depletion of polysomes, consistent with global translation inhibition. We tested whether NT-2 indirectly inhibits translation through eIF2α phosphorylation, a central marker of the integrated stress response. No increase in phospho-eIF2α was observed after NT-2 treatment (Fig. 4D), indicating that the repression is not mediated through this signalling route.

To assess phylogenetic specificity, we extended the analysis to prokaryotic and fungal systems. *E. coli* growth was unaffected by NT-2, in contrast to tetracycline-treated controls (Fig. 4E), and NT-2 failed to inhibit protein synthesis in bacterial S30 extracts (Fig. 4F), indicating that NT-2 does not impair prokaryotic ribosomes. In *S. cerevisiae*, NT-2 similarly did not affect cellular growth (Fig. 4G). Consistently, AHA-labelling in living yeast cells showed no reduction of protein synthesis upon NT-2 treatment (Fig. 4H). However, translation assays in yeast lysates revealed concentration-dependent inhibition, with ~70% reduction at 5 μM and complete inhibition at 50 μM (Fig. 4I). These results suggest that NT-2 can inhibit both mammalian and fungal protein synthesis *in vitro*, but its growth-inhibitory effects in intact cells are species-dependent, likely reflecting differences in uptake, efflux, or metabolic modification.




**Figure 4 - NT-2 activity across human, yeast, and bacterial systems. (A)** Puromycin incorporation assay in HEK293T cells treated with increasing NT-2 concentrations, DMSO, or CHX. Equal amounts of cell lysate were loaded into a 4-12% Bis-Tris gel and analysed by Western blot probing with anti-puromycin and anti-GAPDH antibodies. **(B)** Quantification of protein synthesis based on signal intensity in the anti-Puromycin-stained blot (Fig 4A) normalized with GAPDH. The calculated $IC_{50}$ for NT-2 in living cells was 135 nM, based on the average of three biological replicates (dots) ± SD. **(C)** Polysome profiles of NT-2 treated HEK293T cells (2 hours with 2 µM NT-2 or DMEM+/+ medium). **(D)** Western blot analysis of eIF2α and phospho-eIF2α in NT-2–treated cells. HEK293T cells were treated with NT-2 (2 µM) or 0.02% DMSO (CTR) for 2 h. Equal amounts of cell lysate were analysed by Western blot probing with anti-Vinculin, anti-eIF2α and anti-phospho-eIF2α antibodies. An equal amount of HeLa S3 lysate was loaded as a positive control for phosphorylation, as described in (26). **(E)** Growth curve of

*E.coli* treated with 8 µM NT-2 toxin, 0.08% DMSO, or tetracycline (translation-inhibition control). **(F)** Cell-free translation reactions with *Renilla* luciferase mRNA in *E.coli* S30 lysate in the presence of no supplement (CTR), 5 µM NT-2, 50 µM NT-2, cycloheximide (CHX, 100 µg/ml), tetracycline (Tet, 10 µg/ml) or without RNA. The measured luminescence was normalized to the control reaction (CTR). Data are presented as mean ± SD values of three biological replicates (sets of translation reactions) averaged after three measurements. **(G)** Growth curves of *S. cerevisiae* treated with 25 µM NT-2, 0.25% DMSO, or 10 µg/ml CHX as a positive control for translation inhibition. **(H)** Yeast cells were incubated with L-AHA to label newly synthesized proteins and treated with 25 µM NT-2 toxin, 0.25% DMSO (CTR), or 50 µg/ml CHX. Mean fluorescence after click chemistry was quantified by flow cytometry; unlabeled cells indicate background signal. **(I)** Cell-free translation reactions with *Renilla* luciferase mRNA in *S. cerevisiae* lysate in the presence of 5 or 50 µM NT-2 or 1 mg/ml puromycin. The measured luminescence was normalized to the control reaction (CTR) which contained no supplement. Data are presented as mean ± SD values of three biological replicates (sets of translation reactions) averaged after three measurements.

## NT-2 is a eukaryotic peptidyl transferase inhibitor

To define the mechanism of NT-2 translation inhibition, we determined the structure of human 80S ribosomes from NT-2–treated HEK293T cells by single-particle cryo-electron microscopy (cryo-EM). As controls, we reconstructed human 80S ribosomes from untreated cells, with or without soaking in NT-2, before vitrification. Density for NT-2 was detected in the reconstructions of human 80S ribosomes from NT-2-treated HEK293T cells, and in ribosomes soaked with NT-2, but not in the untreated 80S controls, indicating that NT-2 binds ribosomes in cells and remains associated during purification (Fig. 5A).

The reconstruction reached a resolution of 1.72 Å, providing near-atomic detail (Fig. 5B-C, Suppl. Fig. 4). The NT-2 density was clearly resolved in the peptidyl transferase center (PTC) of the large subunit, occupying the A-site cleft. The compound showed no evidence of intracellular modification such as de-epoxidation or deacetylation. Binding is mediated by hydrogen bonds and van der Waals contacts (Fig. 5C). Key interactions include hydrogen bonds between the ethyleneoxide group of NT-2 and the C2 ribose hydroxyl group of U4450, between the C-3 hydroxyl group of NT-2 and O-2 of the uracil base U4446, and between the oxane of NT-2 and both, the cytosine base of C4398 and the uracil base of U4446. Additional van der Waals contacts involve the adenine base of A4397. The 4β-acetoxy group forms hydrogen bonds with the guanine base of G3907 and the ribose of A4449.

This binding mode explains the polysome collapse with 80S accumulation observed in cells and is consistent with NT-2 acting as a direct inhibitor of elongation. The lack of activity in bacterial systems is explained by divergence in the prokaryotic PTC, which cannot accommodate NT-2. Together, these structural and biochemical data establish NT-2 as a eukaryote-specific peptidyl transferase inhibitor.

**NT-2 links peptidyl transferase inhibition to ribosome dormancy**

To determine how NT-2 impacts ribosome conformations, we classified cryo-EM particles of purified 80S ribosomes from DMSO-treated cells, NT-2 soaked 80S and 80S from NT-2-treated cells. Under normal conditions, eEF2-bound rotated-2 (R2) intermediates are highly transient and rarely detected in actively translating ribosomes, whereas decoding and the A, P states are strongly represented (29, 30). To determine how NT-2 reshapes ribosome conformations, we analyzed 150,000 particles for each condition, DMSO control, NT-2 treatment in cells, and NT-2 added after purification. Classification by either heterogeneous refinement (Fig. 5D, Sup. Fig. 5B) or focused refinement on the intersubunit space masking A/P/E-site tRNAs and eEF2 (Sup. Fig.5A) assigned ribosomes into four categories: 60S subunits, 80S ribosomes, 80S bound to eEF2 and unclassified. Both workflows converged on the same trend: NT-2 treatment in cells selectively enriches ribosomes engaged with eEF2 in an R2 conformation as described in a previous work (31). In contrast, adding NT-2 to purified ribosomes fails to induce this state and yields distributions indistinguishable from those of the controls. This indicates that the characteristic NT-2 signature, namely ribosomes stalled in an eEF2-bound state, emerges only in the context of active cellular translation and cannot be recapitulated by soaking the compound on 80S.

NT-2 density was present in all ribosome classes and closer inspection of the dominant eEF2 class revealed clear density for both eEF2 and SERBP1 (Fig. 5E). eEF2 normally engages R2 ribosomes to catalyze forward translocation, whereas SERBP1 binds translationally inactive ribosomes and stabilizes stalled ribosome-eEF2 complexes (32). Here, SERBP1 was selectively detected in the NT-2–stalled R2 state, consistent with a role as a stabilizer of stalled eEF2–bound complexes. The simultaneous presence of eEF2 and SERBP1 indicates that NT-2 promotes the stabilization of 80S ribosomes in an inactive state recognized by SERBP1. This configuration is distinct from canonical elongation intermediates upon NT-2 treatment and defines an inactive, SERBP1-locked eEF2-bound ribosome. This state has been observed and associated with dormant 80S in different physiological contexts (30, 32, 33).

Together, our Cryo-EM data link peptidyl transferase inhibition by NT-2 to ribosome dormancy. This fate is only revealed in actively translating cells, emphasizing the importance of analyzing inhibitors in their physiological context.




**Figure 5 – NT-2 binds the ribosomal PTC and inhibits elongation in a SERBP1-stabilized state.** **(A)** Cryo-EM maps of the 60S peptidyl transferase center (PTC) from DMSO-treated ribosomes (left), ribosomes from NT-2–treated cells (middle), and untreated ribosomes soaked with NT-2 (right). Clear NT-2 density (in green) is present only in the NT-2–treated and NT-2–soaked maps. **(B)** Refined atomic model of the human 60S ribosomal subunit with bound NT-2, in proximity to the nascent polypeptide exit tunnel (NPET). Ribosome structure is shown as a surface representation, and NT-2 is shown in stick representation. On the right panel, NT-2 and adjacent nucleotides are shown in stick representation. **(C)** NT-2 at the PTC of ribosomes of NT-2 treated cells. The refined atomic structure of NT-2 and the surrounding nucleotides are shown in stick representation. Experimental Cryo-EM density

is plotted at a contour level of 5.5$\sigma$ and shown as a mesh. **(D)** Heterogeneous refinement–based particle classification of 150,000 ribosomes per condition into different classes. **(E)** Cryo-EM density map of the dominant NT-2–stalled class showing resolved densities for eEF2 (blue), SERBP1 (red), and E-site tRNA (green).

## Discussion

This study establishes a scalable, human-specific cell-free translation screening (CFTS) platform and applies it to identify novel translation modulators. Unlike cell-based assays, which often miss potent inhibitors due to cytotoxicity or poor cellular uptake, CFTS enables direct readout of protein synthesis in human lysates under controlled conditions. Using cytoplasmically enriched extracts prepared by dual centrifugation, we achieved batch consistency, freeze–thaw compatibility, and preservation of human-specific translation features, including cap-dependent initiation, regulatory RNA elements, and poly(A) sensitivity (12, 26). Similar HeLa S3 lysates have previously been shown to recapitulate known and reveal new translation-relevant processes (34–37). These features, together with assay miniaturization and signal stability, position CFTS as a versatile and immediately deployable system for unbiased discovery of translation modulators in a human mechanistic context. By adapting mRNA reporters or lysate cell types (12), the platform can also be extended to interrogate readthrough, frameshifting, and transcript- or cell type–specific regulation.

The screen recovered both established inhibitors, including cycloheximide, puromycin, and the T-2 toxin (38–40), and a chemically diverse set of novel hits. Among these, the trichothecene NT-2 stood out as a previously uncharacterized translation modulator. First described in structural studies of Fusarium-derived mycotoxins, NT-2 exhibits an uncommon hydroxylation pattern and a 4β-acetoxy substitution, which is present in only a subset of related trichothecenes (40). As a sesquiterpenoid, NT-2 belongs to a natural product class related to ribotoxic and immunotoxic activities (15, 24, 40). Our data now reveal NT-2 as a natural compound that can directly and specifically inhibit eukaryotic ribosomes, confirming its cellular relevance and highlighting underestimated risks related to cereal contamination by species of the *Fusarium* genus (16).

The cross-kingdom profile of NT-2 highlights how physiology and ribosome evolution dictate inhibitor sensitivity. In mammalian cells, NT-2 inhibition was stronger than in lysates, consistent with enhanced uptake or potentiation by endogenous pathways, a phenomenon noted for other translation inhibitors (41). Conversely, NT-2 showed no detectable effect on *E. coli* growth or S30 extracts, confirming that it does not impair prokaryotic protein synthesis. This strict eukaryotic specificity implies sparing of bacterial communities such as the gut microbiota, a crucial point for toxicology and therapeutic considerations (42, 43). In *S.*

*cerevisiae*, NT-2 inhibited translation in lysates but not in living cells, with no impact on the yeast growth, likely due to limited intracellular access across the multilayered yeast cell wall (44–46). Once the barrier is bypassed, NT-2 displays potency comparable to that of other trichothecenes (14), consistent with a conserved eukaryotic ribosomal target such as the PTC. This divergence between *in vitro* and *in vivo* activity suggests that NT-2 is more relevant toxicologically for animal and human hosts than for suppressing fungal competitors (13, 14, 16).

At sub-2 Å resolutions, chemical modifications and solvent interactions can be directly visualized (47, 48). Our 1.72 Å cryo-EM map of NT-2 bound to the human 60S ribosomal subunit achieves such interpretability, unambiguously placing the inhibitor in the PTC A-site cleft. This structural information explains the polysome collapse with 80S accumulation observed *in vivo*, consistent with elongation arrest at the PTC, and the absence of eIF2α phosphorylation, indicating a direct rather than stress-mediated mechanism. The lack of inhibition in bacterial systems agrees with structural differences in the prokaryotic PTC, which lacks rRNA features contacted by NT-2 in the human ribosome (49–51).

NT-2 is a member of the trichothecenes, a large group of toxins that share a core structure but differ in the substituents at positions 3, 4, 7, 8, and 15 (Fig. 3A) and vary in extent and mechanism of toxicity. Comparison of our structure of the human 80S with NT-2 and the structure of T-2 bound to the yeast ribosome (52) shows that both toxins occupy the same site in the conserved eukaryotic PTC and establish similar rRNA contacts. Larger substituents in position 3 (e.g. OAc in calonectrin) would clash with the bases of G4393 and U4446, while shorter substituents in position 4 (e.g. H in calonectrin) would abolish hydrogen bonding contacts with G3907 and A4449. Hydroxyl groups at positions 8 and 15 of NT-2 do not contact the ribosome, while the 4-Methylpent-4-enoic acid substituent of T-2 projects into the nascent protein tunnel (Fig. 5B). Thus, large substituents at positions 8 and 15 are tolerated but dispensable for binding, whereas modifications at position 3 or 4 critically influence ribosome engagement.

The accumulation of R2–eEF2 particles only in ribosomes from NT-2–treated cells, and not *in vitro*–treated ribosomes, highlights the need to study inhibitors in their physiological context. eEF2 normally binds transiently to rotated ribosomes to promote translocation (29, 30). The additional presence of SERBP1 indicates that these stalled complexes enter a dormant state: SERBP1 occludes the mRNA channel and interacts with eEF2, locking ribosomes in an “idle” conformation incompatible with elongation (32, 33, 53–55). NT-2, therefore, generates ribosomal substrates that are preferentially stabilized by SERBP1. This expands the known

role of SERBP1 as a ribosome preservation factor, previously observed in cold-treated embryos (33) and mirrors the yeast ortholog Stm1, which promotes dormant 80S complexes under nutrient stress via TORC1 regulation (56, 57). The R2-SERBP1 80S signature induced by NT-2 links chemical inhibition to cellular pathways that preserve inactive ribosomes.

The identification of NT-2 as a translation inhibitor has implications for health, agriculture, and drug discovery. *Fusarium sporotrichioides*, the fungal source of NT-2, is a major cereal pathogen, and the presence of poorly characterized trichothecenes such as NT-2 highlights risks to food safety and the global feed supply (13). This work defines NT-2 as a potent, eukaryote-specific peptidyl transferase inhibitor that arrests elongation and promotes the formation of dormant ribosomes. More broadly, our scalable human cell-free translation screening platform provides a high-resolution strategy for discovering translation-modulating compounds and linking environmental toxins to ribosome biology.

### Limitations of the study

While the CFTS platform enables high-throughput, human-specific screening of translation modulators with exceptional sensitivity, it has inherent limitations. First, the current setup relies on bulk lysates from immortalized cell lines, which may not fully capture cell-type-specific translational regulation or physiological variability. Expanding to lysates from primary or disease-relevant cells could reveal context-dependent vulnerabilities. Second, the screening defines Luciferase inhibitors as false positive hits and additional assays are needed to verify translation inhibition. Finally, like all lysate-based systems, CFTS lacks compartmentalization, which may influence compound bioavailability and stability. Despite these limitations, CFTS offers a robust and scalable foundation for translation-focused screening and discovery.

## Resource availability

### Lead contact

Evangelos D. Karousis evangelos.karousis@unibe.ch

### Technical contact:

Evangelos D. Karousis evangelos.karousis@unibe.ch

### Materials availability:

This study did not generate new unique reagents.

### Data and code availability:

This study did not generate/analyze datasets/code.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Grants awarded to EDK from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF CRSK-3_220624), the Multidisciplinary Center of Infectious Diseases from the University of Bern (MCID), the Fondation Claude et Giuliana, the Forschungsstiftung of the University of Bern, and the Holcim Stiftung. Figure 1A was made using Biorender. The screening was performed at the Biomolecular Screening Core Facility, EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland, and the Cryo-EM analysis was conducted at the ETH Zurich Cryo-EM Knowledge Hub, Zurich, Switzerland, in collaboration with the NCCR RNA and Disease. We thank Wojciech Teodorowicz and Nikolaos Kouvelas for their critical reading of the manuscript.

## Author contributions

**N.S., D.A., J.L., J.R.:** Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Visualization, **M.C., G.T.:** Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Validation, Visualization **E.K.:** Funding acquisition, Project administration, Supervision, Writing –original draft **All authors:** Writing – review & editing

## Declaration of interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

## Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies

During the preparation of this work, the authors utilized GPT-5 to enhance clarity. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

# Resources

## KEY RESOURCES TABLE

| REAGENT or RESOURCE | SOURCE | IDENTIFIER |
|---|---|---|
| **Antibodies** | | |
| Donkey anti-mouse 680LT | LI-COR Biosciences | Cat. No. 926–68022<br>RRID:AB_10715072 |
| Donkey anti-rabbit 800CW | LI-COR Biosciences | Cat. No. 926–32212<br>RRID:AB_621847 |
| Goat anti-mouse 680LT | LI-COR Biosciences | Cat. No. 926-68020<br>RRID:AB_10706161 |
| Goat anti-mouse IgG1 680LT | LI-COR Biosciences | Cat. No. 926-68050<br>RRID:AB_2783642 |
| Goat anti-mouse IgG2a 800CW | LI-COR Biosciences | Cat. No. 926-32351<br>RRID:AB_2782998 |
| Mouse anti-eIF2α | Cell Signaling Technology | Cat. No. 2103 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | RRID:AB_836874 |
| Mouse anti-FLAG M2 | Sigma | Cat. No. F1804<br>RRID:AB_262044 |
| Mouse anti-GAPDH | Santa Cruz Biotechnology | Cat. No. sc-47724<br>RRID:AB_627678 |
| Mouse anti-Puromycin | Millipore | Cat. No. MABE343<br>RRID:AB_2566826 |
| Mouse anti-Vinculin | Santa Cruz Biotechnology | Cat. No. sc-73614<br>RRID:AB_1131294 |
| Rabbit anti-phospho-eIF2α (Ser51) | Cell Signaling Technology | Cat. No. 9721<br>RRID:AB_330951 |
| **Bacterial and virus strains** | | |
| *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) pLysS | Provided by Dr. J.-M. Jeckelmann, University of Bern | |
| *E. coli* Stellar competent cells | TakaRa | Cat. No. 636766 |
| **Biological samples** | | |
| HeLa S3 lysate | Custom preparation | Prepared as described in the Star Protocol |
| **Chemicals, peptides, and recombinant proteins** | | |
| BsmFI | New England Biolabs | Cat. No. R0572 |
| Citrate Buffer 1mM, pH 6.5 | Invitrogen | Cat. No. AM7001 |
| CleanCap reagent AG | TriLink BioTechnologies | Cat No. N-7113–5 |
| Creatine kinase | Roche | Cat. No. 10127566001 |
| Creatine phosphate | Roche | Cat. No. 10621714001 |
| CutSmart Buffer 10x | New England Biolabs | Cat. No. B6004S |
| Cycloheximide | Focus Biomolecules | Cat. No. SC-108071 |
| DL-Dithiothreitol (DTT) 1M in $H_2O$ | Merck | Cat. No. 43816-10ml |
| DMEM/F-12 | Gibco | Cat. No. 32500043 |
| Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. 472301-500ML |
| EDTA | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. E5134-500G |
| Fetal Bovine Serum | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. F7524-500ML |
| HEPES 0.5M, pH 7.5 | Thermo Scientific | Cat. No. J61275.AK |
| HEPES 1M, pH 7.3 | Fisher bioreagents | Cat. No. BP299-100 |
| *Hind*III-HF | New England Biolabs | Cat. No. R3104 |
| Inorganic Pyrophosphatase (PPase, 0.1 U/µL) | Thermo Scientific | Cat. No. EF0221 |
| K-acetate 3M, pH 5.3 | Jena Bioscience | Cat. No. BU-107 |
| KCl 1M | Thermo Scientific | Cat. No. J62422.AK |
| L-azidohomoalanine (AHA) | TargetMol | Cat. No. T41090 |
| LDS sample loading buffer 4X | Invitrogen | Cat. No. NP0008 |
| MES | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. M3671-250G |
| Mg-Acetate 1M | Thermo Scientific | Cat. No. J60041.AE |
| $MgCl_2$ 1M | Jena Bioscience | Cat. No. BU-110-1M |
| Murine RNase inhibitor | Vayzme | Cat. No. R301-01-AA |
| NaCl 5M in $H_2O$ | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. S5150-1L |
| Penicillin-Streptomycin | Bio-Concept | Cat. No. 4-01F00-H |
| Phosphatase inhibitor cocktail 100X | Biotool | Cat. No. B15001 |
| Phosphate buffered saline (PBS), 1X, pH 7.4 | Gibco | Cat. No. 10010-031 |
| poly-L-glutamic acid | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. P4761-25MG |
| Protease inhibitor cocktail 100X | Bimake | Cat. No. B14002 |
| Puromycin | Santa Cruz Biotechnology | Cat. No. sc-108071 |
| RNase-free water | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. W4502-1L |
| rNTPs (100 mM each) | Thermo Scientific | Cat. No. R0481 |
| SDS 10% | Fisher Bioreagents | Cat. No. BP2436-1 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sodium deoxycholate | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. D6750 |
| T7 RNA polymerase, incl. 5X Transcription Buffer | Thermo Scientific | Cat. No. EP0111 |
| Tetracycline | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. T3383 |
| Tris base | Fisher Bioreagents | Cat. No. BP152.5 |
| Tris-HCl 1M pH 7.0 | Ambion | Cat. No. AM9850G |
| Tris-HCl 1M pH 7.5 | Fisher Bioreagents | Cat. No. BP1756-100 |
| Tris-HCl 1M pH 8.0 | Gibco | Cat. No. 15568-025 |
| Triton X-100 | Thermo Scientific | Cat. No. 327371000 |
| Trypan Blue Stain | Gibco | Cat. No. 15250-061 |
| Trypsin-EDTA PBS | Bio-Concept | Cat. No. 5-51F00-H |
| Turbo DNase (2 U/µL) | Thermo Scientific | Cat. No. AM2238 |
| Tween 20 | Fisher Bioreagents | Cat. No. BP337-500 |
| XFD488 alkyne fluorophore | AAT Bioquest | Cat. No. 1700 |
| Zymolyase 20T | Carl Roth | Cat. No. 9324.1 |
| **Critical commercial assays** | | |
| ChIP DNA Clean & Concentrator Kit | Zymo Research | Cat. No. D5205 |
| Monarch RNA Cleanup Kit | New England Biolabs | Cat. No. T2040L |
| Renilla-Glo Luciferase Assay System | Promega | Cat. No. E2720 |
| S30 Extract System for Linear Templates | Promega | Cat. No. L1030 |
| Vaccinia Capping System | New England Biolabs | Cat. No. M2080S |
| **Deposited data** | | |
| NT-2 bound to the PTC of the human 60S large ribosomal subunit | This study | EMDB-55306<br>PDB 9SWB |
| **Experimental models: Cell lines** | | |
| HEK293 Flp-In T-Rex cells | Invitrogen | Cat. No. R78007<br>RRID:CVCL_U427 |
| HeLa S3 cells | Sigma-Aldrich | Cat. No. 87110901<br>ATCC Cat. No. CCL-2.2<br>RRID:CVCL_0058 |
| **Experimental models: Organisms/strains** | | |
| *S. cerevisiae* PJ69-4a | Provided by Dr. C. Sanderson, University of Liverpool | |
| **Oligonucleotides** | | |
| Not applicable | | |
| **Recombinant DNA** | | |
| Human Beta Globin Rluc: pCRII-HBB-3xFLAG-RLuc-A30 | Described in Ziegelmüller et al. - 2025 | |
| p200: pCRII-RLuc-SV40-6xMS2-A80 | Described in Karousis et al. – 2020 [6] | |
| **Software and algorithms** | | |
| GraphPad Prism | GraphPad Software | Version 10.5.0<br>https://www.graphpad.com/updates/prism-10-5-0-release-notes |
| Excel | Microsoft | Version 16.99.2<br>https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/microsoft-365/download-office |
| Image J | NIH | Version 1.54<br>https://imagej.net/ij/download.html |
| FlowJo | FlowJo LLC | Version 10.10.0<br>https://flowjo.com/flowjo10/download |

| Python | Python Software Foundation | Version 3.11 https://www.python.org/downloads/ |
|---|---|---|
| **Other** | | |
| 2 ml screw cap microtubes for dual centrifuge | Sarstedt | Cat. No. 72.693 |
| BioTek MultiFlo dispenser | Agilent | |
| BioTek Synergy Neo Plate Reader | Agilent | |
| Clear, untreated 48-well plate | Greiner Bio-One | Cat. No. 677180 |
| GloMax Explorer - Microplate Reader | Promega | Cat. No. GM3500 |
| Gradient Station ip | Biocomp Instruments | |
| Infinite M1000 Plate reader | Tecan | |
| LABCYTE Echo 655 & Access Workstation | BECKMAN COULTER | |
| LUNA II cell counter | Logos Biosystems | Cat. No. L40002 |
| mPAGE 4–12% Bis-Tris gel | Millipore | Cat. No. MP41G |
| PGF ip Piston Gradient Fractionator | Biocomp Instruments | |
| Poly-lysine magnetic beads | MCLAB | Cat. No. PLYSMB-50 |
| Trans-Blot Turbo Transfer Pack | BIO-RAD | Cat. No. 1704158 |
| Ultracentrifuge Optima XPN-80 | BECKMAN COULTER | |
| White-bottom 384-well plates | Greiner Bio-One | Cat. No. 781073 |
| White-bottom 96-well plate | Greiner Bio-One | Cat. No. 655073 |
| ZentriMix Dual centrifuge | Hettich AG | Cat. No. 380 R |

# EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND STUDY PARTICIPANT DETAILS

HeLa S3 (ATCC CCL-2.2) is a human (*Homo sapiens*) female cervical cancer cell line, a clonal derivative of HeLa, originally derived from a 31-year-old woman. HEK293 Flp-In T-REx is a human (*Homo sapiens*) embryonic kidney cell line, derived from the parental HEK293 line, originally generated from the kidney of a female fetus.

Sample size: Unless otherwise stated, experiments were performed with n = 3 independent biological replicates per condition. For Rluc assays, each biological replicate was measured in triplicate (technical replicates). Cells and cell lysates were randomly assigned to experimental groups, including control and treatment conditions.

All cell lines were tested as mycoplasma negative by PCR and were authenticated by genotyping.

# METHOD DETAILS

### Cell lines and cell culture

HeLa S3 cells (Sigma-Aldrich, ECACC, Cat. No. 87110901) and HEK293 Flp-In T-REx cells (Invitrogen Cat. No. R78007) were cultured in DMEM/F-12 (Gibco, Cat. No. 32500–043) containing 10% FCS (SIGMA, Cat. No. F7524-500ML), 100 U/ml Penicillin-Streptomycin (Bio-Concept, Cat. No. 4-01F00-H) (termed DMEM+/+) at 37°C and 5% $CO_2$ in humid atmosphere.

HEK293 cells were detached with Trypsin-EDTA PBS (BioConcept, Cat. No. 5-51F00-H). Cell counting was performed with Trypan Blue Stain (Gibco, Cat. No. 15250-061) using the automated LUNA II cell counter (Logos Biosystems, Cat. No. L40002).

**Preparation of HeLa translation-competent lysate.**

Lysates were prepared from HeLa S3 cell cultures like previously (26) grown to a density ranging from 1 to 2 x $10^6$ cells/ml, pelleted at 200 x g, 4°C for 5 min, washed twice with cold 1x PBS (pH 7.4) and resuspended in a translation-competent buffer, (33.78 mM HEPES (pH 7.3), 63.06 mM KOAc, 0.68 mM MgCl2, 54.05 mM KCl, 13.51 mM creatine phosphate, 229.73 ng/µL creatine kinase and 1x protease inhibitor cocktail (Bimake, Cat. No. B14002)) to a final concentration of 2 x $10^8$ cells/ml in 2 mL screw cap microtubes (Sarstedt, Cat. No. 72.693). The cells were lysed by dual centrifugation at 500 RPM at -5°C for 4 min using the ZentriMix 380 R system (Hettich AG) with a 3206 rotor with 3209 adapters. After dual centrifugation, the lysate was pelleted at 13'000 x g, 4°C for 10 min. The supernatant (the lysate) was aliquoted, snap-frozen and stored at -80°C. The lysate could be thawed and refrozen multiple times for subsequent applications with only a minor loss of translation efficiency as previously reported (26).

**Preparation of reporter RLuc mRNA**

Reporter mRNAs were encoded from plasmids with a pCRII backbone. The 3xFLAG-RLuc (humanized) reporter contains an AG initiator sequence for capping with the CleanCap reagent AG, the human beta globin 5' UTR, a 20 bp 3' UTR, a 30 nucleotide-long template-encoded poly(A) sequence and a BsmFI binding site downstream for linearization. The previously described (37) p200-RLuc (humanized) reporter contains a 70 bp 5'UTR, a 500 bp 3' UTR with 6xMS2, an 80 nucleotide-long template-encoded poly(A) sequence and a *Hind*III binding site downstream for linearization.

Before *in vitro* transcription, the plasmids were linearized using *BsmF*I (New England Biolabs, Cat. No. R0572 L) or *Hind*III-HF (New England Biolabs, Cat. No. R3104L) in reactions containing 40 ng/ml DNA (8 µg in total) in 1x CutSmart buffer (New England Biolabs, Cat No. B6004S) overnight at 37°C. After confirming linearization by agarose gel electrophoresis, the linearized DNA was purified and concentrated using the ChIP DNA Clean & Concentrator kit (ZYMO research, Cat No. D5205) and eluted in 10 µl elution buffer. *In vitro* transcription, using the linearized plasmid as a template (10 µl of elution), was performed in a 100 µL reaction containing 1x T7 transcription buffer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat No. EP0111), 1 mM of each NTP (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat No. R0481), 1 U/ml RNase inhibitor (Vazyme, Cat No. R301–03), 0.001 U/ml pyrophosphatase (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat No. EF0221) and 1.5 U/ml T7 polymerase (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat No. EP0111). For the 3xFLAG-RLuc

reporters, 0.8 mM CleanCap reagent AG (TriLink Biotechnologies, Cat No. N-7113–5) was included in the reaction. The transcription reaction was incubated at 37°C 1 h. An additional 1.5 U/ml T7 polymerase was added, and the reaction was further incubated for 1 h at 37°C. Subsequently, 0.15 U/ml Turbo DNase (Invitrogen, Cat No. AM2238) was added, and the reaction was incubated at 37°C for 30 min to digest the plasmid DNA. The transcribed mRNA was isolated using the Monarch RNA Cleanup Kit (New England Biolabs, Cat No. T2040 L), eluted in 1 mM sodium citrate pH 6.5 (Invitrogen, Cat. No. AM7001), and quantified by A260 measurement.

The p200-RLuc reporter was capped using the Vaccinia Capping System (NEB, Cat. No. M2080S) according to the manufacturer's instructions, with the modification that 1 U/ml RNase inhibitor (Vazyme, Cat. No. R301–03) was added to the reaction. The capped mRNA was isolated and quantified as described above after transcription. All *in vitro* transcribed mRNAs were aliquoted, snap-frozen, and stored at -80°C.

**High throughput screening**

Compounds from the screening library, along with DMSO and cycloheximide controls, were pre-spotted into 384-well plates (Greiner Bio-One CELLSTAR, Cat. No. 781073) at 5 nL, 10 mM using the LABCYTE Echo 655 and Access Workstation. Plates were stored at -20 °C until use in the BSF Screening facility at the EPFL. A translation-competent premix was prepared in advance by diluting HeLa S3 lysate to a concentration of $1 \times 10^8$ cell equivalents/ml, adding RLuc reporter mRNA at a final concentration of 5 fmol/µL and Murine RNase inhibitor (Vazyme, Cat. No. R301-03-AA) at a final concentration of 1 U/µL, frozen in liquid nitrogen and transferred to the BSF facility in dry ice. Using the BioTek MultiFlo dispenser, 5 µL of lysate was added to each well, yielding a final compound concentration of 10 µM. Translation reactions were incubated at 33°C for 50 minutes. Subsequently, 5 µL of 1x Renilla-Glo substrate (Promega, Cat. No. E2720) was added, followed by a 10-minute incubation at room temperature. Luminescence was measured using the BioTek Synergy Neo Plate Reader. The Z′ factor was calculated as described (28), measuring the separation between positive and negative controls.

**Hela S3 cell-free translation assays**

For *in vitro* translation, the HeLa S3 lysate was used at a concentration of $1 \times 10^8$ cell equivalents/ml (stock = $2 \times 10^8$ cell equivalents/ml) and supplemented with 1 U/ml RNase inhibitor (Vazyme, Cat. No. R301-01-AA). The *in vitro* transcribed and capped mRNAs were incubated at 65°C for 5 min and cooled on ice before addition. Unless otherwise stated, *In vitro* translation was performed at 37°C for 1 hour in 12.5 µL reactions and stopped on ice. To evaluate the effect of NT-2 on translation, the following conditions were tested in parallel: water

as negative control for inhibition (CTR), NT-2 at 0.05 µM, 0.5 µM, 1.5 µM, 3 µM, 5 µM, 15 µM 50 µM and 100 µM, or 1 mg/ml puromycin (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Cat. No. sc-108071) as positive control for translation inhibition.

To monitor the protein synthesis output by the luciferase assay, 12.5 µL of each translation reaction was mixed with 12.5 µL 1x Renilla-Glo substrate in Renilla-Glo assay buffer (Promega Cat. No. E2720) and supplemented with 35 µL of $H_2O$ in a white-bottom 96-well plate (Greiner, Cat. No. 655073). The luminescence was measured with the Promega GloMax Explorer GM3500 plate reader after 10 min of incubation at room temperature with 0.3s integration time per well. Three luminescence measurements were taken from each biological replicate, which were averaged and plotted.

**Polysome profiling**

75–90% confluent HEK293 cells were cultured in 150 mm dishes and treated with either 2 µM NT-2 Toxin or 0.2% DMSO (CTR) in DMEM+/+ medium for 2 h at 37 °C and 5% $CO_2$. After medium removal, the cells were scraped in ice-cold PBS and transferred to a 2 ml microcentrifuge tube. The cells were pelleted for 5 min at 4°C and 500 x g, washed with ice-cold PBS, pelleted again and resuspended in 1x lysis buffer (10 mM HEPES pH 7.5 (Thermo Scientific Cat. No. J61275.AK), 100 mM KCl (Thermo scientific, Cat. No. J62422.AK), 5 mM $MgCl_2$ (Jena Bioscience, Cat. No. BU-110-1M), 1 mM Triton X-100 (Thermo Scientific, Cat. No. 327371000), 1% Sodium deoxycholate (SIGMA-ALDRICH, Cat. No. D6750-25G), 1 mM DTT (Merk, Cat. No. 43816-10mL), 0.1 U/µL Murine RNase inhibitor (Vayzme, Cat. No. R301-01-AA), 0.1 x Protease inhibitor cocktail (Bimake, Cat. No. B14002) and 0.0125 U/µL Turbo DNase (Invitrogen, Cat No. AM2238) and incubated for 2 min on ice. After incubation on ice, the cell lysate was centrifuged for 5 min at 4°C and 16,000 x g, and the supernatant was collected.

15% and 50% (w/v) sucrose solutions (20 mM HEPES pH 7.5, 200 mM KCl, 10 mM $MgCl_2$ in $H_2O$) were supplemented with 1 mM DTT (Merck, Cat. No. 43816-10mL) and gradients were generated using a Biocomp Gradient Station ip in SW41 tubes (SETON, Cat. No. 7030).

300 µL of lysed cells were loaded onto the gradients and the tubes were spun in the SW 41 Ti rotor for 2 h at 274355 x g, 4°C in a BECKMAN COULTER Optima XPN-80 ultracentrifuge. The gradients were fractionated using the Biocomp PGF ip Piston Gradient Fractionator at a speed of 0.3 mm/s in 20 microcentrifuge tubes per replicate. During fractionation, the A260 profile was recorded, and absorption measurements were visualized using Graph Pad Prism (version 10.0.2). The sucrose fractions were directly used for Cryo-EM sample preparation.

**Cryo-EM sample preparation**

For cryo-EM, sucrose was removed from the collected and combined monosome fraction using the RAPPL protocol (58). Briefly, the selected fraction from the NT-2 treated sample and the DMSO treated control was diluted 1:5 with wash buffer (100 mM HEPES pH 7.5, 50 mM KCl, 10 mM $Mg(OAc)_2$, 1 mM DTT, 1x protease inhibitor cocktail and 0.1 U/µL Murine RNase inhibitor (Vayzme, Cat. No. R301-01-AA). Poly-lysine magnetic beads (MCLAB, Cat. No. PLYSMB-50) were equilibrated with wash buffer, then combined with the diluted sample and incubated for 30 min at 4 °C under rotation. The beads were separated using a magnetic rack, washed three times with wash buffer and eluted in 50 µL elution buffer (wash buffer + 2 mg/mL poly-glutamic acid (SIGMA-ALDRICH, Cat. No. P4761-25MG)) for 30 min at 4 °C on a thermomixer (1,000 rpm). The eluate was quantified by $A_{260}$ measurement and diluted with elution buffer as needed to reach an absorbance between 4 and 8 $A_{260}$ units. Samples were snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80 °C until further use.

**Vitrification**

Single particle cryo-EM samples were vitrfied using the plunge freeze technique (PMID: 27572723). Amorphous carbon with a thickness of 1.0 nm was deposited by evaporation onto freshly cleaved mica in a CCU-010 carbon coater (Safematic, Zizers, Switzerland). Continuous carbon foil was deposited on R2/2 holey carbon grids (Quantifoil, Großlöbichau, Germany) by floatation in distilled water. The grids were subjected to negative glow discharge in a PELCO easiGlow glow discharger (Ted Pella, Redding CA, USA) at 15 mA for 15 s prior to vitrification. The climate chamber of a Vitrobot Mark 4 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham MA, USA) was equilibrated to 4°C and the humidity was adjusted to 95%. 4 µl of protein sample were applied to the grid and the sample was incubated on the grid for 30 s. The grid was subsequently blotted for 2.5 s and - without further incubation - plunged immediately into liquid ethane-propane mixture maintained at liquid nitrogen temperature. The grid was stored submerged in liquid nitrogen until data collection.

**Cryo-EM data collection**

Single-particle cryo-EM data was collected on a Titan Krios G3i cryo-electron microscope (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham MA, USA) equipped with a GIF BioQuantum energy filter and a K3 direct electron detector (Gatan, Pleasanton CA, USA). Micrographs were recorded in superresolution counting mode, using a magnification of 130,000 x, resulting in a pixel size of 0.648 Å/pixel. The energy filter was set to a slit width of 20 eV. Micrographs for both datasets were acquired with a total dose of 50 $e^-/Å^2$ (NT-2 incubated sample) and 60.3 $e^-/Å^2$ (controls). Automated image acquisition with aberration-free image shift was controlled by EPU software (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham MA, USA). Defocus was adjusted between -0.8 µm and -2.8 µm in 0.2 µm increments.

**Cryo-EM image processing, model building, and refinement**

Image processing was carried out in cryoSPARC (Structura Biotechnology, Toronto, Canada) as outlined in the scheme Fig. SX. The atomic model of the 60S ribosomal subunit of human ribosome (PMID: 39658079) was rigid body fitted into the cryo-EM density map in UCSF Chimera (PMID: 15264254). The model was rebuilt in coot (PMID: 20383002) and refined using phenix real space refinement (PMID: 31588918).

**Puromycin incorporation & eIF2 alpha assay**

HEK293 cells were seeded in DMEM+/+ 24h before treatment and grown to approximately 80% confluency. For the puromycin incorporation assay, cells were treated with DMEM +/+ containing different concentrations of NT-2 (2 µM, 1 µM, 0.5 µM, 0.25 µM, 0.125 µM, 0.0625 µM, 0.03125 µM), 0.02% DMSO as a vehicle control (matching the concentration in the highest NT-2 dilution), or cycloheximide (100 µg/mL) as a positive control for translation inhibition. After 90 minutes of treatment, puromycin (10 µg/mL) was added for 10 minutes, followed by a 30-minute recovery in the respective treatment medium. For the eIF2α phosphorylation assay, cells were treated with 2 µM NT-2 or 0.02 % DMSO control for 2h.

After treatments, cells were washed with PBS, detached using trypsin, and collected by centrifugation. Pellets were washed twice with cold PBS, then lysed in RIPA buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 1% NP-40, 0.5% sodium deoxycholate, 1% SDS) containing 1x Protease inhibitor cocktail (Bimake, Cat. No. B14002); for the eIF2α phosphorylation assay 1x phosphatase inhibitor cocktail (Biotool, Cat. No. B15001) was also included. Samples were incubated on ice for 20 minutes, with occasional gentle mixing by flicking. The lysate was cleared by centrifugation and stored at -80 °C until Western blot analysis.

**Western blot analysis**

For Western blot analysis of *in vitro* translation reactions, 4 µL of each reaction (described above) was loaded onto a mPAGE 4–12% Bis-Tris 12-well gel (Millipore, Cat. No. MP41G12). For cell lysates from puromycin incorporation and eIF2α assay, volumes were adjusted to correspond to 1 µg of total RNA per lane, and samples were loaded onto a mPAGE 4–12% Bis-Tris 10-well gel (Millipore, Cat. No. MP41G10). Gels were run for 45 minutes in MES running buffer (50 mM MES (SIGMA, Cat. No. M3671-250G), 50 mM Tris base (Fisher Bioreagents, Cat. No. BP152.5), 0.1% SDS (Fisher Bioreagents, Cat. No. BP2436-1), 1 mM EDTA (SIGMA-ALDRICH, Cat. No. E5134-500G), pH 7.3).

Proteins were transferred onto nitrocellulose membranes using the Trans-Blot Turbo Transfer Pack (BIO-RAD, Cat. No. 1704158). Membranes were then cut according to molecular weight of the target proteins and blocked for 30 minutes in 5% milk in TBS-Tween (0.1%). Primary antibody incubations were performed overnight at 4 °C under gentle agitation using the following antibodies:

Mouse anti-FLAG M2 (Sigma, Cat. No. F1804, 1:1000),

Mouse anti-Vinculin (Santa Cruz Biotechnologies, Cat. No. sc-73614, 1:2000),

Mouse anti-Puromycin (Millipore, Cat. No. MABE343, 1:15'000, IgG2a),

Mouse anti-GAPDH (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Cat. No. sc-47724, 1:10'000, IgG1),

Mouse anti-eIF2α (Cell Signaling Technology, Cat. No. 2103, 1:1000),

Rabbit anti-phospho-eIF2α (Ser51) (Cell Signaling Technology, Cat. No. 9721, 1:1000).

After washing twice for 10 minutes in TBS-Tween (0.1%), membranes were incubated with fluorescent secondary antibodies:

Donkey anti-mouse 680LT (LI-COR, Cat. No. 926–68022, 1:10'000),

Donkey anti-rabbit 800CW (LI-COR, Cat. No. 926–32212, 1:10'000),

Goat anti-mouse IgG2a 800CW (LI-COR, Cat. No. 926-32351, 1:10'000),

Goat anti-mouse IgG1 680LT (LI-COR, Cat. No. 926-68050, 1:10'000),

Goat anti-mouse 680LT (LI-COR, Cat. No. 926-68020, 1:10'000).

Secondary antibody incubations were carried out for 1 hour at room temperature under gentle agitation. Membranes were washed twice for 10 minutes in TBS-Tween (0.1%) before signal detection using the Odyssey Infrared Imaging System (LI-COR). For *in vivo* $IC_{50}$ determination, the signal intensities of the puromycin and GAPDH bands were quantified using ImageJ (NIH). Puromycin signals were normalized to GAPDH to account for loading differences, and relative translation levels were calculated accordingly.

### *E.coli* cell-free translation

*In vitro* translation reactions were performed using the S30 Extract System for Linear Templates (Promega, Cat. No. L1030) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Briefly, translation reactions (total volume: 25 µL) were assembled by mixing S30 Premix, S30 extract, and complete amino acids mix at the recommended concentrations. Additionally, the reactions were supplemented with 1U/µL Murine RNase inhibitor (Vazyme, Cat. No. R301-01-AA). *In vitro* transcribed, uncapped RLuc reporter mRNA was added at a concentration of 125 fmol/µL. To evaluate the effect of NT-2 on bacterial translation, the following conditions were tested in parallel: addition of water (baseline), NT-2 at 5 µM and 50 µM, DMSO (0.5%) as vehicle control, tetracycline as a positive control for translation inhibition (10 ng/µL), and cycloheximide (CHX, 100 µg/mL).

Reactions were incubated at 37 °C for 2 hours, and translation products were analyzed by luciferase assay as described above, by mixing 25µL of each reaction with 25 µL 1x Renilla-Glo. Negative controls without RNA were included to assess background translation levels.

**Bacteria growth curve**

The effect of NT-2 on *E. coli* growth was evaluated using the BL21 (DE3) pLysS strain. An overnight culture was diluted in fresh LB medium to an initial optical density ($OD_{600}$) of 0.05, and 400 µL aliquots were dispensed into an untreated 48-well plate (Greiner Bio-One, Cat. No. 677180). The following conditions were tested in triplicate: no additive (untreated control), DMSO (0.08%) as vehicle control, NT-2 (2 µM), tetracycline (10 µg/mL) as a positive control for growth inhibition, and LB medium only as a background (no bacteria) control.

The culture plates were incubated at 37 °C with continuous shaking, and optical density at 600 nm ($OD_{600}$) was measured every 15 minutes over an 8-hour period using a Tecan Infinite M1000 plate reader. Growth curves were analyzed to assess the effect of each treatment on bacterial proliferation.

**Yeast cell-free translation**

For the preparation of translation-competent lysates from *S. cerevisiae*, we followed the protocol described in (59) with some adaptations. Yeast cells (PJ69-4a strain) were grown aerobically in YPD medium. A starter culture was first grown at 30 °C with agitation until the stationary phase and subsequently used to inoculate large-scale cultures. Cells were cultivated overnight in YPD at 30 °C with vigorous shaking until reaching a density of approximately 1–2 x $10^7$ cells/mL ($OD_{600} \approx 1$). Cells were harvested by centrifugation at 500 x g at 4 °C for 10 min, washed once with cold sterile water and once with 1 M sorbitol.

Spheroplasts were generated by incubation of the washed cell pellet in 10 ml spheroplasting buffer (1 M sorbitol, 10 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5) per g of wet pellet supplemented with 1 mg/ml zymolyase (20T, Carl Roth, Cat. No. 9324.1) and 1mM DTT (Merk, Cat. No. 43816-10mL). The suspension was gently agitated at 30 °C in the dark for 1.5h, while cell wall digestion was assessed by a decrease in $OD_{800}$. Spheroplasts were collected by centrifugation at 700 x g at 4 °C for 15 min, washed twice with cold spheroplasting buffer, and resuspended in 0.5 ml of ice-cold translation buffer (100 mM HEPES pH 7.3, 2.5 mM Mg-acetate, 120 mM K-acetate, 100 mM sucrose, 1 µM spermidine, 2.5 mM ATP, 1 mM GTP, 1 mM DTT, 20 mM creatine phosphate, 200 µg/ml creatine kinase and 1x protease inhibitor cocktail) per g of original wet pellet. Cells were disrupted on ice using a glass Dounce homogenizer. The homogenate was cleared by centrifugation at 16,000 × g for 10 min at 4 °C, and the supernatant was carefully collected while avoiding both the lipid layer and pellet. The resulting extracts were snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80 °C.

*In vitro* translation reactions were set up in a final volume of 12.5 µL containing: 8.75 µL yeast cell-free lysate, 1 U/µL Murine RNase inhibitor, amino acid mixture (0.04 mM of each AA), 5 fmol/µL capped and polyadenylated *in vitro* transcribed mRNA (3x-FLAG RLuc) and RNase free water. *In vitro* translation was performed at 30°C for 1 hour and stopped on ice. To evaluate the effect of NT-2 on fungal translation, the following conditions were tested in parallel: no supplement (CTR), NT-2 at 5 µM and 50 µM, DMSO (0.5%) as vehicle control, or 1 mg/ml puromycin (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Cat. No. sc-108071) as positive control for translation inhibition. To monitor the protein synthesis output by the luciferase assay, each translation reaction was mixed with 40 µL 1x Renilla-Glo substrate in Renilla-Glo assay buffer (Promega Cat. No. E2720) and transferred into a white-bottom 96-well plate (Greiner, Cat. No. 655073). The luminescence was measured with the Promega GloMax Explorer GM3500 plate reader after 10 min of incubation at room temperature with 0.3s integration time per well. Three luminescence measurements were taken from each biological replicate, which were averaged and plotted.

**Yeast growth curve**

The effect of NT-2 on *S. cerevisiae* growth was assessed using the PJ69-4a strain. An overnight culture grown in YPD medium was diluted to an initial optical density ($OD_{600}$) of approximately 0.1, and 400 µL of the diluted culture was transferred into each well of an untreated 48-well plate (Greiner Bio-One, Cat. No. 677180). The following conditions were tested in triplicate: no additive (untreated control), DMSO (0.25%) as vehicle control, NT-2 (25 µM), cycloheximide (CHX, 10 µg/mL) as a positive control for growth inhibition, and YPD medium only (no cells) as a background control.

Plates were incubated at 30 °C with continuous shaking, and $OD_{600}$ measurements were recorded every 15 minutes for 19 hours using a Tecan Infinite M1000 plate reader. Growth kinetics were analyzed to compare the impact of the different treatments on yeast proliferation.

**Yeast AHA labelling**

To assess the effect of NT-2 on the translation rate in *S. cerevisiae,* PJ69-4a yeast cells were grown and labeled with L-azidohomoalanine (AHA) following the protocol described in (60) with minor modifications. Briefly, a single colony was inoculated in YPD and grown overnight at 30 °C. The next day, cultures were diluted to OD600 ≈ 0.1 in fresh synthetic complete medium and grown to mid-log phase (OD600 ≈ 0.4). Cells were collected, washed with sterile water, and resuspended in SC medium lacking methionine but supplemented with L-AHA (TargetMol, Cat. No. T41090). Treatments were applied for the pulse-labelling step as follows: 25 µM NT-2, 0.25 % DMSO (vehicle control), or 50 µg/mL cycloheximide (CHX). An additional control was incubated in YPD medium to assess background fluorescence of non-labelled

yeast. After incubation, cells were permeabilized and subjected to click chemistry with an alkyne-fluorophore (AAT Bioquest, Cat. No. 1700) to label newly synthesized proteins. Fluorescence was measured by flow cytometry, and mean fluorescence values were used to quantify relative translation rates under each condition.

# Quantification and Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism (v10.5.0) unless otherwise specified. Exact details of the statistical approach are reported in the figure legends for each experiment.

**Definition of n:** n represents independent biological replicates (separately prepared translation reactions, independently grown cell cultures, or independently performed growth curves, as appropriate). Technical replicates (e.g., luminescence readings from the same biological replicate) were averaged before statistical analysis.

**Measures of center and dispersion:** Unless otherwise indicated, data are presented as the mean of biological replicates with error bars showing either standard deviation (SD) or standard error of the mean (SEM), as specified in figure legends.

**Assay quality:** Z′ factor calculations were performed according to Zhang et al. (28) to assess separation between positive and negative controls in the screening assays.

**Randomization and blinding:** Samples were randomly assigned to experimental conditions (e.g., compound vs. DMSO, NT-2 vs. controls). Blinding was not systematically applied but all data were collected by automated plate readers or imaging systems with preset acquisition parameters, minimizing experimenter bias.

**Sample size and reproducibility:** No formal statistical power analysis was performed; sample sizes were chosen according to common practice in translation biochemistry and screening experiments to ensure reproducibility. In all cases, results were reproducible across at least three independent biological replicates unless otherwise stated. No data points were excluded.

**Software:** Data fitting, curve analysis, and statistical tests were carried out in GraphPad Prism v10.5.0. ImageJ (NIH) was used for densitometric quantification of Western blot signals.

# Additional resources

Step-by-step protocol for preparing cell-free reactions using human lysates (27):
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xpro.2025.104073

## References

1. Corman,A., Kanellis,D.C., Michalska,P., Häggblad,M., Lafarga,V., Bartek,J., Carreras-Puigvert,J. and Fernandez-Capetillo,O. (2021) A chemical screen for modulators of mRNA translation identifies a distinct mechanism of toxicity for sphingosine kinase inhibitors. *PLOS Biology*, **19**, e3001263.

2. Schneider-Poetsch,T., Ju,J., Eyler,D.E., Dang,Y., Bhat,S., Merrick,W.C., Green,R., Shen,B. and Liu,J.O. (2010) Inhibition of eukaryotic translation elongation by cycloheximide and lactimidomycin. *Nat Chem Biol*, **6**, 209–217.

3. Molina Molina,E., Bech-Serra,J.J., Franco-Trepat,E., Jarne,I., Perez-Zsolt,D., Badia,R., Riveira-Muñoz,E., Garcia-Vidal,E., Revilla,L., Franco,S., *et al.* (2025) Targeting eEF1A reprograms translation and uncovers broad-spectrum antivirals against cap or m6A protein synthesis routes. *Nat Commun*, **16**, 1087.

4. McKim,J.M. (2010) Building a tiered approach to in vitro predictive toxicity screening: a focus on assays with in vivo relevance. *Comb Chem High Throughput Screen*, **13**, 188–206.

5. Blay,V., Tolani,B., Ho,S.P. and Arkin,M.R. (2020) High-Throughput Screening: today's biochemical and cell-based approaches. *Drug Discov Today*, **25**, 1807–1821.

6. Silverman,A.D., Karim,A.S. and Jewett,M.C. (2020) Cell-free gene expression: an expanded repertoire of applications. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, **21**, 151–170.

7. Vaklavas,C., Meng ,Zheng, Choi ,Hyoungsoo, Grizzle ,William E, Zinn ,Kurt R and and Blume,S.W. (2015) Small molecule inhibitors of IRES-mediated translation. *Cancer Biology & Therapy*, **16**, 1471–1485.

8. Green,K.M., Sheth,U.J., Flores,B.N., Wright,S.E., Sutter,A.B., Kearse,M.G., Barmada,S.J., Ivanova,M.I. and Todd,P.K. (2019) High-throughput screening yields several small-molecule inhibitors of repeat-associated non-AUG translation. *J Biol Chem*, **294**, 18624–18638.

9. Zemella,A., Thoring,L., Hoffmeister,C. and Kubick,S. (2015) Cell-Free Protein Synthesis: Pros and Cons of Prokaryotic and Eukaryotic Systems. *Chembiochem*, **16**, 2420–2431.

10. Pisareva,V.P., Muslimov,I.A., Tcherepanov,A. and Pisarev,A.V. (2015) Characterization of Novel Ribosome-Associated Endoribonuclease SLFN14 from Rabbit Reticulocytes. *Biochemistry*, **54**, 3286–3301.

11. Karousis,E.D., Gurzeler,L.-A., Annibaldis,G., Dreos,R. and Mühlemann,O. (2020) Human NMD ensues independently of stable ribosome stalling. *Nature Communications*, **11**, 4134.

12. Ziegelmüller,J., Kouvelas,N., Schwaller,N., Thambythurai,P., Hofer,A.M., Mühlemann,O. and Karousis,E.D. (2025) Efficient cell-free translation from diverse human cell types. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, **0**.

13. Janik,E., Niemcewicz,M., Ceremuga,M., Stela,M., Saluk-Bijak,J., Siadkowski,A. and Bijak,M. (2020) Molecular Aspects of Mycotoxins—A Serious Problem for Human Health. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, **21**, 8187.

14. Khan,R., Anwar,F. and Ghazali,F.M. (2024) A comprehensive review of mycotoxins: Toxicology, detection, and effective mitigation approaches. *Heliyon*, **10**, e28361.

15. McCormick,S.P., Stanley,A.M., Stover,N.A. and Alexander,N.J. (2011) Trichothecenes: From Simple to Complex Mycotoxins. *Toxins (Basel)*, **3**, 802–814.

16. Case,N.T., Gurr,S.J., Fisher,M.C., Blehert,D.S., Boone,C., Casadevall,A., Chowdhary,A., Cuomo,C.A., Currie,C.R., Denning,D.W., *et al.* (2025) Fungal impacts on Earth's ecosystems. *Nature*, **638**, 49–57.

17. Shifrin,V.I. and Anderson,P. (1999) Trichothecene Mycotoxins Trigger a Ribotoxic Stress Response That Activates c-Jun N-terminal Kinase and p38 Mitogen-activated Protein Kinase and Induces Apoptosis*. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, **274**, 13985–13992.

18. Azconaolivera,J.I., Ouyang,Y., Murtha,J., Chu,F.S. and Pestka,J.J. (1995) Induction of Cytokine mRNAs in Mice After Oral Exposure to the Trichothecene Vomitoxin (Deoxynivalenol): Relationship to Toxin Distribution and Protein Synthesis Inhibition. *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology*, **133**, 109–120.

19. Li,M. and Pestka,J.J. (2008) Comparative Induction of 28S Ribosomal RNA Cleavage by Ricin and the Trichothecenes Deoxynivalenol and T-2 Toxin in the Macrophage. *Toxicological Sciences*, **105**, 67–78.

20. Pestka,J.J. (2010) Deoxynivalenol: mechanisms of action, human exposure, and toxicological relevance. *Arch Toxicol*, **84**, 663–679.

21. Ryu,S.M., Lee,H.M., Song,E.G., Seo,Y.H., Lee,J., Guo,Y., Kim,B.S., Kim,J.-J., Hong,J.S., Ryu,K.H., *et al.* (2017) Antiviral Activities of Trichothecenes Isolated from Trichoderma albolutescens against Pepper Mottle Virus. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, **65**, 4273–4279.

22. Chen,K., Si,Y., Guan,J.-S., Zhou,Z., Kim,S., Kim,T., Shan,L., Willey,C.D., Zhou,L. and Liu,X. (2022) Targeted Extracellular Vesicles Delivered Verrucarin A to Treat Glioblastoma. *Biomedicines*, **10**, 130.

23. Saravanan,K., Manickam,R., Govindasamy,C., El Newehy,A.S., Hussein-Al-Ali,S.H. and Senthilkumar,S. (2024) Fabrication of verrucarin-a-loaded zinc oxide nanocomposite for inducing apoptosis in triple-negative breast cancer cells. *Process Biochemistry*, **145**, 13–21.

24. Ishii,K. and Ueno,Y. (1981) Isolation and characterization of two new trichothecenes from Fusarium sporotrichioides strain M-1-1. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, **42**, 541.

25. Wu,Q., Dohnal,V., Kuca,K. and Yuan,Z. (2013) Trichothecenes: Structure-Toxic Activity Relationships. *CDM*, **14**, 641–660.

26. Gurzeler,L.-A., Ziegelmüller,J., Mühlemann,O. and Karousis,E.D. (2022) Production of human translation-competent lysates using dual centrifugation. *RNA Biology*, 10.1080/15476286.2021.2014695.

27. Schwaller,N. and Karousis,E.D. (2025) Protocol for monitoring mRNA translation and degradation in human cell-free lysates. *STAR Protocols*, **6**, 104073.

28. Zhang,J.-H., Chung,T.D.Y. and Oldenburg,K.R. (1999) A Simple Statistical Parameter for Use in Evaluation and Validation of High Throughput Screening Assays. *SLAS Discovery*, **4**, 67–73.

29. Behrmann,E., Loerke,J., Budkevich,T.V., Yamamoto,K., Schmidt,A., Penczek,P.A., Vos,M.R., Bürger,J., Mielke,T., Scheerer,P., *et al.* (2015) Structural Snapshots of Actively Translating Human Ribosomes. *Cell*, **161**, 845–857.

30. Xing,H., Taniguchi,R., Khusainov,I., Kreysing,J.P., Welsch,S., Turoňová,B. and Beck,M. (2023) Translation dynamics in human cells visualized at high resolution reveal cancer drug action. *Science*, **381**, 70–75.

31. Wells,J.N., Buschauer,R., Mackens-Kiani,T., Best,K., Kratzat,H., Berninghausen,O., Becker,T., Gilbert,W., Cheng,J. and Beckmann,R. (2020) Structure and function of yeast Lso2 and human CCDC124 bound to hibernating ribosomes. *PLOS Biology*, **18**, e3000780.

32. Brown,A., Baird,M.R., Yip,M.C., Murray,J. and Shao,S. (2018) Structures of translationally inactive mammalian ribosomes. *eLife*, **7**, e40486.

33. Nurullina,L., Terrosu,S., Myasnikov,A.G., Jenner,L.B. and Yusupov,M. (2024) Cryo-EM structure of the inactive ribosome complex accumulated in chick embryo cells in cold-stress conditions. *FEBS Letters*, **598**, 537–547.

34. Meurs,R., Matos,M.D., Bothe,A., Guex,N., Weber,T., Teleman,A.A., Ban,N. and Gatfield,D. (2024) An in vitro assay of MCTS1-DENR-dependent re-initiation and ribosome profiling uncover the activity of MCTS2 and distinct function of eIF2D. 10.1101/2024.06.05.597545.

35. Schubert,K., Karousis,E.D., Jomaa,A., Scaiola,A., Echeverria,B., Gurzeler,L.-A., Leibundgut,M., Thiel,V., Mühlemann,O. and Ban,N. (2020) SARS-CoV-2 Nsp1 binds the ribosomal mRNA channel to inhibit translation. *Nature Structural & Molecular Biology*, **27**, 959–966.

36. Schubert,K., Karousis,E.D., Ban,I., Lapointe,C.P., Leibundgut,M., Bäumlin,E., Kummerant,E., Scaiola,A., Schönhut,T., Ziegelmüller,J., *et al.* (2023) Universal features of Nsp1-mediated translational shutdown by coronaviruses. *Molecular Cell*, **83**, 3546-3557.e8.

37. Bäumlin,E., Andenmatten,D., Luginbühl,J., Lalou,A., Schwaller,N. and Karousis,E.D. (2025) The impact of Coronavirus Nsp1 on host mRNA degradation is independent of its role in translation inhibition. *Cell Reports*, **44**.

38. Schneider-Poetsch,T., Ju,J., Eyler,D.E., Dang,Y., Bhat,S., Merrick,W.C., Green,R., Shen,B. and Liu,J.O. (2010) Inhibition of eukaryotic translation elongation by cycloheximide and lactimidomycin. *Nature Chemical Biology*, **6**, 209–217.

39. Aviner,R. (2020) The science of puromycin: From studies of ribosome function to applications in biotechnology. *Comput Struct Biotechnol J*, **18**, 1074–1083.

40. Abbas,H.K., Yoshizawa,T. and Shier,W.T. (2013) Cytotoxicity and phytotoxicity of trichothecene mycotoxins produced by Fusarium spp. *Toxicon*, **74**, 68–75.

41. Low,W.-K., Dang,Y., Schneider-Poetsch,T., Shi,Z., Choi,N.S., Merrick,W.C., Romo,D. and Liu,J.O. (2005) Inhibition of Eukaryotic Translation Initiation by the Marine Natural Product Pateamine A. *Molecular Cell*, **20**, 709–722.

42. Avis,T., Wilson,F.X., Khan,N., Mason,C.S. and Powell,D.J. (2021) Targeted microbiome-sparing antibiotics. *Drug Discovery Today*, **26**, 2198–2203.

43. Spaulding,C.N., Klein,R.D., Schreiber,H.L., Janetka,J.W. and Hultgren,S.J. (2018) Precision antimicrobial therapeutics: the path of least resistance? *npj Biofilms Microbiomes*, **4**, 4.

44. Klis,F.M., Mol,P., Hellingwerf,K. and Brul,S. (2002) Dynamics of cell wall structure in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *FEMS Microbiol Rev*, **26**, 239–256.

45. Ebrahimi,H., Siavoshi,F., Jazayeri,M.H., Sarrafnejad,A., Saniee,P. and Mobini,M. (2023) Physicochemical properties of intact fungal cell wall determine vesicles release and nanoparticles internalization. *Heliyon*, **9**, e13834.

46. De Groot,P.W.J., Ram,A.F. and Klis,F.M. (2005) Features and functions of covalently linked proteins in fungal cell walls. *Fungal Genetics and Biology*, **42**, 657–675.

47. Faille,A., Dent,K.C., Pellegrino,S., Jaako,P. and Warren,A.J. (2023) The chemical landscape of the human ribosome at 1.67 Å resolution. 10.1101/2023.02.28.530191.

48. Fromm,S.A., O'Connor,K.M., Purdy,M., Bhatt,P.R., Loughran,G., Atkins,J.F., Jomaa,A. and Mattei,S. (2023) The translating bacterial ribosome at 1.55 Å resolution generated by cryo-EM imaging services. *Nat Commun*, **14**, 1095.

49. Ban,N., Nissen,P., Hansen,J., Moore,P.B. and Steitz,T.A. (2000) The Complete Atomic Structure of the Large Ribosomal Subunit at 2.4 Å Resolution. *Science*, **289**, 905–920.

50. Wilson,D.N. and Doudna Cate,J.H. (2012) The structure and function of the eukaryotic ribosome. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol*, **4**, a011536.

51. Jobe,A., Liu,Z., Gutierrez-Vargas,C. and Frank,J. (2019) New Insights into Ribosome Structure and Function. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol*, **11**, a032615.

52. Garreau de Loubresse,N., Prokhorova,I., Holtkamp,W., Rodnina,M.V., Yusupova,G. and Yusupov,M. (2014) Structural basis for the inhibition of the eukaryotic ribosome. *Nature*, **513**, 517–522.

53. Liu,B. and Qian,S.-B. (2016) Characterizing inactive ribosomes in translational profiling. *Translation (Austin)*, **4**, e1138018.

54. Leesch,F., Lorenzo-Orts,L., Pribitzer,C., Grishkovskaya,I., Roehsner,J., Chugunova,A., Matzinger,M., Roitinger,E., Belačić,K., Kandolf,S., *et al.* (2023) A molecular network of conserved factors keeps ribosomes dormant in the egg. *Nature*, **613**, 712–720.

55. Anger,A.M., Armache,J.-P., Berninghausen,O., Habeck,M., Subklewe,M., Wilson,D.N. and Beckmann,R. (2013) Structures of the human and Drosophila 80S ribosome. *Nature*, **497**, 80–85.

56. Shetty,S., Hofstetter,J., Battaglioni,S., Ritz,D. and Hall,M.N. (2023) TORC1 phosphorylates and inhibits the ribosome preservation factor Stm1 to activate dormant ribosomes. *The EMBO Journal*, **42**, e112344.

57. Hayashi,H., Nagai,R., Abe,T., Wada,M., Ito,K. and Takeuchi-Tomita,N. (2018) Tight interaction of eEF2 in the presence of Stm1 on ribosome. *J Biochem*, **163**, 177–185.

58. Erath,J., Kemper,D., Mugo,E., Jacoby,A., Valenzuela,E., Jungers,C.F., Beatty,W.L., Hashem,Y., Jovanovic,M., Djuranovic,S., *et al.* (2025) A rapid, simple, and

economical method for the isolation of ribosomes and translational machinery for structural and functional studies. *Nat Commun*, **16**, 7185.

59. Wang,X., Zhao,L. and Zhao,K.-N. (2014) An optimized yeast cell-free lysate system for in vitro translation of human virus mRNA. *Methods Mol Biol*, **1118**, 219–230.

60. Jha,M.P. and Mapa,K. (2025) Evaluation of Translation Rate Through L-azidohomoalanine (AHA) Incorporation and Subsequent Alkyne Fluorophore-Mediated Click Chemistry in Yeast. *Bio Protoc*, **15**, e5379.

# Supplementary Material




**Supplementary Figure 1 | Characterization of Tifenazoxide as a *Renilla* luciferase inhibitor**
**(A)** Western blot of an *in vitro* translation assay supplemented with tifenazoxide. Cell-free translation reactions were performed with *Renilla* luciferase mRNA in HeLa S3 lysate with increasing Tifenazoxide concentrations (30 nM - 30 µM) and were analyzed by SDS-PAGE and immunoblotting for *Renilla* luciferase (translation product) and Vinculin (loading control). **(B)** Cell-free translation reactions as described in (A) were performed with Tifenazoxide supplementation either before (red) or after (blue) translation. The measured luminescence was normalized to the negative control containing no supplement (CTR). Data are presented as mean values of three biological replicates (sets of translation reactions) averaged after three measurements ± SD.




**Supplementary Figure 2 | Effect of NT-2 on translation rates in *S. cerevisiae***
Fluorescence intensity of AHA-labeled yeast cells under different treatments. Cells were treated with NT-2 (25 µM), DMSO (0.25 %, control), CHX (50 µg/mL), or incubated in complete YPD medium (background control) and processed as described in Materials & Methods. Histograms show the distribution of single-cell fluorescence measured by flow cytometry of the three biological replicates.




**Supplementary Figure 3 | Cryo-EM data processing flowcharts.**
Image processing workflows for the three datasets: 80S ribosomes isolated from NT-2–treated cells, 80S isolated from DMSO-treated (CTR) cells and NT-2–soaked 80S ribosomes. Flowcharts summarize particle selection, classification, and refinement steps leading to the final reconstructions.




**Supplementary Figure 4 | Local resolution maps of final cryo-EM reconstructions.**
Local resolution distributions for the three datasets: 80S ribosomes isolated from NT-2–treated cells, 80S isolated from DMSO-treated (CTR) cells and NT-2–soaked 80S ribosomes. Resolution variations within each reconstruction are colored according to the indicated scale.

**A**




**B**

| Method | Sample | 60S | 80S | 80S with eEF2 | unclassified |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **hetero** | **NT-2** | 15.9 | 34.0 | 49.6 | 0.4 |
| | **CTR** | 12.3 | 86.7 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| | **CTR + NT-2** | 13.4 | 78.1 | 0.0 | 8.5 |
| | | | | | |
| **focus** | **NT-2** | 13.7 | 41.3 | 41.3 | 3.7 |
| | **CTR** | 8.9 | 86.4 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
| | **CTR + NT-2** | 10.4 | 85.0 | 0.0 | 4.6 |

**Supplementary Figure 5 | Ribosomal States**

**(A)** Focused classification of ribosomes using an intersubunit mask covering the A-, P-, and E-site tRNAs and eEF2. Monosomes from NT-2–treated cells (NT-2) or untreated cells (CTR; directly analyzed or incubated with NT-2 before cryo-EM) were classified into 60S subunits, 80S ribosomes, 80S ribosomes with eEF2, or unclassified particles. **(B)** Comparative table of ribosome class distributions obtained from heterogeneous refinement (Fig. 5D) and focused refinement (panel A).

**Sup. Table 1 | DRC's confirmed hits:**

| | | | ***In vitro*: inhibits…** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Compound Name** | **CAS** | **Library** | *Renilla luciferase* | Translation | ***In vivo* active?** |
| NT 2 Toxin | 76348-84-0 | Natural Product | | X | *Yes* |
| F3292-0451 | 306958-80-5 | NP-inspired | | X | *No* |
| Mitoxantrone dihydrochloride | 70476-82-3 | Prestwick | | X | *No* |
| RA-XII | 143343-98-0 | Natural Product | | X | *No* |
| UNC0224 | 1197196-48-7 | Repurposing | | X | *No* |
| Alizapride HCl | 59338-87-3 | Prestwick | X | | |
| BIX-01294 | 1392399-03-9 | Repurposing | X | | |
| GR46611 | 185259-85-2 | Repurposing | X | | |
| Khasianine | 32449-98-2 | Natural Product | X | | |
| Mdivi-1 | 338967-87-6 | Repurposing | X | | |
| PI4KIIIbeta-IN-10 | 1881233-39-1 | Repurposing | X | | |
| Prenylamine lactate | 69-43-2 | Prestwick | X | | |
| Solamargine | 20311-51-7 | Repurposing | X | | |
| Sulfaquinoxaline sodium salt | 967-80-6 | Prestwick | X | | |
| tifenazoxide | 279215-43-9 | Repurposing | X | | |
| Walrycin B | 878419-78-4 | Repurposing | X | | |
| ZCL278 | 587841-73-4 | Repurposing | X | | |

**Sup. Table 2 | Known translation inhibitors in DRC's confirmed hits:**

| Compound Name | CAS | Library |
|---|---|---|
| 15-Monoacetoxyscirpenol | 2623-22-5 | Natural Product |
| Anguidine | 2270-40-8 | Natural Product |
| Anisomycin | 22862-76-6 | Repurposing |
| Cycloheximide | 66-81-9 | Prestwick |
| Emetine (dihydrochloride hydrate) | 316-42-7 | Repurposing |
| Harringtonine | 26833-85-2 | Repurposing |
| Homoharringtonine | 26833-87-4 | Repurposing |
| Hygromycin B | 31282-04-9 | Repurposing |
| Puromycin (dihydrochloride) | 58-58-2 | Repurposing |
| T2 toxin | 21259-20-1 | Natural Product |

**Sup. Table 3 | DRC's confirmed hits without further characterization:**

| Compound Name | CAS | Library |
|---|---|---|
| 2,4,7,9-tetramethylbenzo[b][1,8]naphthyridin-5-amine | 309726-06-5 | CDC |
| 3-(2-chlorophenyl)-1-ethyl-6-methylpyrimido[5,4-e][1,2,4]triazine-5,7(1H,6H)-dione | 891030-35-6 | CDC |
| 3-(phenylsulfonyl)-2-piperazino-6,7,8,9-tetrahydropyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrido[3,4-e]pyrimidine | 1194864-48-6 | CDC |
| 3,7-dimethyl-2,6-acridinediamine | 931328-91-5 | CDC |
| 4-{[3-(diethylamino)propyl]amino}benzo[g]quinolinium-1-olate | n.a | CDC |
| 5-{[3-(dimethylamino)propyl]amino}-9,10-dimethyl-8H-thieno[2',3':4,5]pyrimido[2,1-a]phthalazin-8-one | 380455-04-9 | CDC |
| Bruceantin | 41451-75-6 | Repurposing |
| Ethyl 3-[[[(4-fluorophenyl)methyl]amino]sulfonyl]benzo[b]thiophene-2-carboxylate | 941962-39-6 | PPI |
| Halofuginone | 55837-20-2 | Repurposing |
| Hemin | 16009-13-5 | Repurposing |
| 4-(2-(3,5-dimethyl-2-oxocyclohexyl)-2-hydroxyethyl)piperidine-2,6-dione | 17280-60-3 | Natural Product |
| Rubiadin-primveroside | 26388-47-6 | Natural Product |
| Solamargine derivative (catalogID NP-014212) | n.a | Natural Product |
| (2R,2′S,3R,5R,5aR,7S,9aR)-5a-[(Acetyloxy)methyl]-2,3,4,5,5a,6,7,9a-octahydro-3-hydroxy-5,8-dimethylspiro[2,5-methano-1-benzoxepin-10,2′-oxiran]-7-yl 3-methylbutanoate | 1471987-91-3 | Natural Product |
| Propidium iodide | 25535-16-4 | Prestwick |
| RA-XIII | 143277-28-5 | Natural Product |
| (-)-Emetine | 483-18-1 | Natural Product |
| T 2 Toxin derivative (catalogID STOCK1N-56995) | n.a | Natural Product |
| Lycorine | 476-28-8 | Natural Product |

**Sup. Table 4 | Cryo-EM data collection, refinement and validation statistics**

| | PTC with NT-2<br>(EMDB-55306)<br>(PDB 9SWB) |
|---|---|
| **Data collection and processing** | |
| Magnification | 130000 |
| Voltage (kV) | 300 |
| Electron exposure (e–/Å$^2$) | 50 |
| Defocus range (μm) | -0.8 – - 2.8 |
| Pixel size (Å) | 0.648 |
| Symmetry imposed | C1 |
| Initial particle images (no.) | 3490267 |
| Final particle images (no.) | 1585354 |
| Map resolution (Å) | 1.72 (0.143) |
| FSC threshold | |
| Map resolution range (Å) | 1.430 – 27.486 |
| | |
| **Refinement** | |
| Initial model used (PDB code) | 8K2C |
| Model resolution (Å) | 1.7 (0.143) |
| FSC threshold | |
| Model resolution range (Å) | |
| Map sharpening *B* factor (Å$^2$) | 37.1 |
| Model composition | |
| Non-hydrogen atoms | 665 |
| Protein residues | 0 |
| Nucleotides | 27 |
| Ligands | 43 |
| *B* factors (Å$^2$) | |
| Nucleotide | 1.56/62.86/10.71 |
| Ligand | 5.93/21.65/12.80 |
| Water | 3.60/16.48/8.49 |
| R.m.s. deviations | |
| Bond lengths (Å) | 0.004 |
| Bond angles (°) | 0.677 |
| Validation | |
| MolProbity score | 2.45 |
| Clashscore | 5.56 |
| Poor rotamers (%) | 0.00 |
| Ramachandran plot | |
| Favored (%) | - |
| Allowed (%) | - |
| Disallowed (%) | - |