Full title: Efficacy of Lumefantrine against piperaquine resistant *Plasmodium berghei* parasites is

selectively restored by probenecid, verapamil, and cyproheptadine through ferredoxin NADP+-

reductase and cysteine desulfurase

Short title: Mechanisms of Lumefantrine resistance and reversal in *Plasmodium berghei* ANKA

Authors: Fagdéba David Bara[1,2,3], Loise Ndung'u[1], Noah Machuki Onchieku[1], Beatrice Irungu[2],

Simplice Damintoti Karou[3], Francis Kimani[4], Damaris Matoke-Muhia[4], Peter Mwitari[2], Gabriel

Magoma[1,5], Alexis Nzila[6], Daniel Kiboi[5]*

Affiliations: [1]Department of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Pan African University

Institute for Basic Sciences, Technology and Innovation (PAUSTI), Nairobi, Kenya. [2]Centre for

Traditional Medicine and Drug Research, Kenya Medical Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya.

[3]School of Food and Biology Technology, Universite du Lome, Lome, Togo. [4]Centre for

Biotechnology Research and Development, Kenya Medical Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya.

[5]Department of Biochemistry, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

(JKUAT), Nairobi, Kenya. [6]Department of Life Sciences, King Fahd University of Petroleum and

Minerals, Dharam, Saudi Arabia.

Corresponding author: muthuikiboi@gmail.com ; dmuthui@jkuat.ac.ke

Abstract

The ability of the human malaria parasite, *Plasmodium falciparum* to develop resistance against mainstay drugs remains a public health problem. Currently, the antimalarial drugs, lumefantrine (LM), and piperaquine (PQ) are essential components of the mainstay artemisinin-based therapies used for the treatment of malaria globally. Here, we used a model parasite *Plasmodium berghei,* to investigate the mechanisms of LM and PQ resistance. We employed known resistance reversing agents (RA): probenecid, verapamil, or cyproheptadine to study the mechanisms of LM and PQ resistance in the standard 4-day suppressive test. We then employed reverse genetics to assess the impact of deleting or over-expressing plausible genes associated with the metabolism and transport of drugs. We show that only, cyproheptadine at $5mgkg^{-1}$ restored LM activity by above 65% against LM-resistant parasites (LM^r) but failed to reinstate PQ activity against PQ-resistant parasites (PQ^r). Whereas the PQ^r had lost significant susceptibility to LM, the three RA, cyproheptadine verapamil, and probenecid restored LM potency by above 70%, 60%, and 55% respectively against the PQ^r. We thus focused on the mechanisms of LM resistance in PQ^r. Here we show the partial deletion of the cysteine desulfurase (SUFS) and overexpression of the Ferredoxin NADP+ reductase (FNR) genes in the PQ^r parasite achieved two results; i) abolished the impact of RA on LM activity; ii) restored the susceptibility of PQ^r to LM alone. Our findings associated SUFS and FNR protein with the action of LM and RA action in *P. berghei.* We demonstrate that the incorporation of any of the RA into an antimalarial combination that comprises LM would augment LM activity and concomitantly antagonize the emergence of LM resistance derived from PQ pressure. The impact of RA, deletion of SUFS, and overexpression of FNR on LM activity need to be tested in *Plasmodium falciparum*.

Keywords: Malaria; Lumefantrine, Resistance; Reversal; *Plasmodium berghei*; Ferredoxin NADP+ reductase, cysteine desulfurase

Author summary

Lumefantrine (LM) and piperaquine (PQ) are essential drugs for the treatment of malaria globally. Here, we used *Plasmodium berghei,* a model parasite that infects rodents to study how parasites escape killing by PQ and LM. We first used a second drug: probenecid, verapamil, or cyproheptadine to enhance the activity of LM or PQ. We show that cyproheptadine restores LM activity against LM-resistant parasites (LM^r) but failed to reestablish PQ activity against PQ-resistant parasites (PQ^r). Since PQ^r is resistant to LM, combining LM with either cyproheptadine, verapamil, or probenecid reinstates LM activity against PQ^r. We then focused mainly on LM resistance in PQ^r. After genetically manipulating the PQ^r, we reveal that cysteine desulfurase (SUFS) and ferredoxin NADP+ reductase (FNR) regulate LM capacity to kill parasites. Decreasing the level of SUFS or increasing FNR levels in the PQ^r makes the parasites susceptible to LM but abolishes the impact of probenecid, verapamil, and cyproheptadine on LM activity. Overall, we provide clues on the link between SUFS and FNR in the action of LM and RA in *P. berghei.* This study provides a basis for an in-depth analysis of how LM mediates parasites kill and how the parasite escapes LM action in *Plasmodium falciparum*.

Introduction

Malaria disease affects more than one billion people worldwide (1). Presently, five malaria parasites species infect humans. *Plasmodium falciparum* remains a significant contributor to the global disease burden, with an estimated 200 million cases and 500 000 deaths annually (1). An enormous proportion of this burden affects children under five years of age and pregnant women. In Kenya, over 70% of the population is still at risk of infection by malaria parasites (2). To date, the use of drugs is central to the control and management of malaria. However, this approach is hampered by the ability of the parasite to develop resistance against antimalarial drugs rapidly. Currently, the artemisinin-based combination therapies (ACTs) are the mainstay drugs for the treatment and management of uncomplicated *P. falciparum* malaria. The ACTs comprise a short-acting artemisinin derivative and a long-acting partner drug (2). The long-acting partner drugs reduce the remaining parasite biomass after artemisinin clearance and simultaneously protect against reinfection, especially in high transmission settings (3). Thus, the long-acting drug components within the ACTs are of primary importance in the control of subsequent malaria infection in sub-Saharan Africa. Over the last two decades, extensive use of ACTs has correlated with the reduction of mortality associated with malaria worldwide (1). Despite the widespread use of the ACTs, in which the partner drugs are predicted to act on different molecular targets of the parasite, *P. falciparum* has consistently evolved complex resistance mechanisms that have conferred resistance or reduced efficacy to all mainstay antimalarial drugs meant for the treatment and management of malaria (4,5). The emergence of resistance to the ACTs in South-East Asia (6,7) demonstrates the growing need not only to understand the mechanisms of resistance to the long-acting partner drugs but also the importance of seeking alternative approaches to circumvent the drug resistance

In many African countries, the long-acting antimalarial drugs: lumefantrine (LM) and piperaquine (PQ) are essential components in the mainstay ACTs; Coartem™ and Artekin™, respectively (8). Unfortunately, the high transmission of malaria in endemic regions coupled with the long half-life portend intense selection pressure (9), a recipe for the rapid emergence of LM and PQ resistant parasites. It is imperative to understand how parasites may evade LM and PQ action. Polymorphisms in two genes, primarily mediate resistance to the 4-aminoquinolines and chemically related drugs such as PQ. The *chloroquine resistance transporter (crt)*, the actual determinant of CQ resistance in *P. falciparum,* which can carry Lys76Thr mutation (10) and *multidrug-resistant 1 (mdr1)* gene that encodes a P-glycoprotein homolog 1 (*Pgh-1*) which modulate resistance to CQ and other quinolines drugs such as AQ and PQ (11,12). In recent studies, Cys101Phe mutation in *chloroquine resistance transporter* (*crt*) conferred resistance to both PQ and CQ in *P. falciparum in vitro* (13). Also, using field isolates, a nonsynonymous mutation, Glu415Gly in the exonuclease (PF3D7_1362500), and amplification of Plasmepsin II and III, proteases involved in the heme degradation within the digestive vacuole are linked with PQ resistance (4). LM, on the other hand, is an aryl alcohol antimalarial drug, chemically related to mefloquine and quinine. Although, like the 4-aminoquinoline, LM is predicted to inhibit heme detoxification, several studies have associated reciprocal resistance between CQ and LM (14), suggesting potentially different mechanisms of resistance and action. To date, many questions regarding how LM exerts its antimalarial action and how the parasites may evolve to evade such action remain unanswered.

A recent analysis of *P. falciparum* from The Gambia has associated LM resistance with cysteine desulfurase (15), an enzyme involved in Fe-S biogenesis within the apicoplast. In other studies, V-type H+ pumping pyrophosphatase 2 (*vp2*) and Ca^{2+}/H^+ antiporter (*vcx1*), putative drug

transporter genes have been associated with reducing the biological costs of acquiring the mutation

in both CQ and LM resistance (16,17). Our recent investigation identified for the first time the

association of *vp2* with PQ resistance and gamma glutamyl-cysteine synthetase (*ggcs*),

glutathione-S transferase (*gst)*, and *vcx1* increased transcript levels with PQ and LM resistance in

P. berghei ANKA (18). These studies suggest a complex multi-gene association of PQ and LM

resistance.

With only a few promising chemical compounds in the malaria drug discovery pipeline

(19–21), there is a need for alternative approaches to antagonize the emergence of resistance and

extend the therapeutic lifespan of the currently available drugs. One archetypical method of

studying the mechanisms by which parasites evade drug action and simultaneously generate new

drugs is the use of chemosensitizer (a drug with the ability to enhance/restore activity) in

association with antimalarial drugs for which the parasite is resistant (22). This approach has been

utilized previously to generate prophylactic drugs against malaria parasites (23,24). The

chemosensitizers have no intrinsic antimalarial potency but reverse resistance mechanisms by

either enhancing drug uptake or inhibiting the efflux of drugs from the target site (25–27). Three

chemosensitizers have been used extensively to study the resistance mechanisms and design next-

generation drugs in both malaria and cancer (28–31). In malaria, verapamil, calcium (Ca^{+2})

channel blocker partially reverses CQ resistance in *P. falciparum in vitro* and clinical isolates via

increasing net CQ within the infected erythrocyte parasites (32). Probenecid, anion transporter

inhibitor, reverses methotrexate resistance in cancer (33), CQ, and antifolates resistance in *P.*

falciparum (24). Antihistamine compounds such as cyproheptadine and chlorpheniramine restore

CQ sensitivity in CQ resistant *P. yoelii* and *P. falciparum in vitro* (34,35).

Using model malaria parasite, *Plasmodium berghei* ANKA as a surrogate of the human

malaria parasite *P. falciparum*; we previously selected PQ- and LM-resistant parasites. Further

analysis of the PQ-resistant parasites showed that the parasite had lost significant susceptibility to

LM, AQ, primaquine (PMQ), and dihydroartemisinin (DHA). On the other hand, although LM-

resistant parasites retained sensitivity to PQ, the parasites lost significant susceptibility to DHA,

PMQ, and CQ (36,37). Also, the resistant parasites acquired significant growth fitness cost

probably associated with the changes within the genomes that affect the essential gene necessary

for the growth of the asexual blood-stage parasites (38). Here we designed to study the molecular

mechanisms of PQ and LM resistance and reversal in *P. berghei* ANKA. We utilized known

resistance reversing agents (RA): probenecid, verapamil, or cyproheptadine to restore the

susceptibility of the resistant parasite to LM or PQ. Using the resistant lines and drug-sensitive

parasite as a reference, we evaluated the differential expression of a panel of plausible genes

associated with the metabolism and transport of quinoline and aryl alcohol drugs. Among the gene

evaluated are; *crt, mdr1, multidrug resistance-associated protein 2 (mrp2), pantothenate kinase*

(pank), ferredoxin NADP$^+$-reductase (fnr), cysteine desulfurase (sufs), Plasmepsin IV (pmiv),

Plasmepsin IX (pmix), Plasmepsin X (pmx) or phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (pi3k). We employed

a reverse genetics approach, using highly efficient gene knockout and overexpression,

PlasmoGEM vectors for *P. berghei*, we partially deleted and over-expressed SUFS and FNR

respectively, then measured the impact on drug susceptibility and reversal of resistance. Finally,

we used *in silico* approaches to predict binding profiles of the SUFS and FNR with the antimalarial

drug; LM and the reversing agents.

Here we describe a potential novel combination of therapy between LM and

cyproheptadine that antagonizes LM resistance in *P. berghei* ANKA. As highlighted, the selection

of PQ resistance is accompanied by a significant loss in LM activity (18,36). We report two critical

aspects regarding LM cross-resistance in PQ-resistant *P. berghei* ANKA; First, using LM and

cyproheptadine, verapamil, or probenecid, we highlight new combination therapies that restore

LM activity against the PQ-resistant parasites. Second, using reverse genetics, we provide

evidence that mRNA alteration of SUFS and FNR genes in the PQ-resistant parasites restores the

activity of LM. The mRNA alteration also abolishes the action of RA on LM activity, suggesting

that the reversal of LM activity is via SUFS and FNR proteins. We provide the essential basis for

the design and synthesis of novel inhibitors for FNR and SUFS able also to circumvent LM

resistance in PQ resistant parasites.

Results

Cyproheptadine selectively restores LM activity against lumefantrine and piperaquine

resistant parasites

We first determined the activity profile of cyproheptadine alone against PQ[s], PQ[r], LM[s,] and

LM[r] parasites to select the appropriate dosage for combination with either LM or PQ. Interestingly,

30mg/kg of cyproheptadine killed above 90% and 40% of the LM-resistant and PQ resistance

parasites, respectively (Figure 1). However, at a lower concentration of 5mg/kg, cyproheptadine

had no significant activity against either sensitive or resistant parasites. On the other hand,

100mg/kg of LM or 75mg/kg of PQ could not suppress parasite growth above 20% in LM[r] and

PQ[r] phenotypes, respectively. We, therefore, selected 5mg/kg or 2.5mg/kg of cyproheptadine for

combination with 100mg/kg of LM or 75mg/kg of PQ. Using a combination of 5mg/kg of

cyproheptadine and 100mg/kg of LM, the activity of LM was significantly restored from 18% to

70% (p<0.001) (Figure 2A). Encouragingly, four of the five mice treated with this combination

had no patent parasitemia 28 days post-infection, suggesting that the combination continued to

suppress the parasite growth beyond the day four post parasite infection. We thus, associate this

combination with a 60-80% protection range. We then reasoned that the activity recorded in a

combination of LM (100mg/kg) and cyproheptadine (5mg/kg) was an additive effect of both drugs.

We assayed cyproheptadine and LM at lower dosages of 2.5mg/kg and 25mg/kg, respectively;

these concentrations, when administered alone, had recorded zero (0%) parasite killing (Figure

2B). The combination yielded 66%, a significant parasite killing (p<0.001) suggesting a lack of

additive effect. We then hypothesized that the restoration of LM activity was dose-dependent. To

dissect this hypothesis, cyproheptadine at 2.5mg/kg and 5mg/kg with 25 or 50mg/kg of LM was

evaluated. The chemo-sensitization power in the different combinations was not significantly

different (p<0.08) (Figure 2B), signifying that the restoration of LM activity was not dose-

dependent. To evaluate the selectivity of cyproheptadine on the resistant parasites, 2.5 and 5mg/kg

of cyproheptadine was combined with 0.375mg/kg of LM against the sensitive parasites (Table

1b). Lumefantrine at 0.375mg/kg against sensitive drug parasite was below 20% parasite

suppression (Table 1b), thus no significant activity. Neither of the cyproheptadine concentration

increased the susceptibility of the sensitive parasites to LM (p<0.09), meaning that the potentiation

was selective only in the resistant parasites. We were, however, surprised that 5mg/kg of

cyproheptadine failed to potentiate 75mg/kg of PQ against PQ^r (Table 2). As mentioned earlier,

PQ^r parasites are also highly resistant to LM (36). We, therefore, sought to investigate whether

cyproheptadine would restore LM activity against PQ^r. As expected, 50mg/kg of LM alone had no

measurable antimalarial activity. Surprisingly, LM activity was re-established by 5mg/kg of

cyproheptadine to above 70% (p<0.001) (Figure 3). From these results, the study concluded that

cyproheptadine selectively reverses LM resistance in LM^r parasites but does not restore PQ activity

against PQ^r phenotypes. However, it selectively restores LM activity against PQ^r parasites.

Probenecid reinstates the activity of LM against the piperaquine resistant but not against

the lumefantrine resistant parasites

By screening the effect of probenecid on the growth of the asexual blood-stage parasites,

we found that 400mg/kg of probenecid had no significant antimalarial effect on LM and PQ

resistant parasites (p<0.07) (Table 1a). A combination of 400mg/kg of probenecid and 100mg/kg

of LM or 75 mg/kg of PQ against LM^r and PQ^r parasites respectively failed to restore the activity

of either LM or PQ (Figure 2A; Table 2). We then sought to evaluate whether probenecid could

restore LM activity against PQ^r parasites. To our surprise, probenecid at 400mg/kg reinstated the

activity of LM (50mg/kg) against PQ^r parasites to above 60% (p<0.0001) (Figure 3).

Verapamil re-establishes LM activity against the piperaquine resistant but not against lumefantrine resistant parasites

We next queried the effect of verapamil on PQ^r and LM^r parasites. 50mg/kg of verapamil lacked any antimalarial activity against both resistant parasites (Table 1a). Similarly, a combination of verapamil at 50mg/kg and 100mg/kg of LM or 75 mg/kg of PQ against LM^r and PQ^r parasites respectively failed to enhance the activity of either drug (Figure 2A; Table 2). In a peculiar but familiar trend with other reversing agents, 50mg/kg of verapamil significantly re-established the activity of LM (50mg/kg) against PQ^r parasites to above 55% (p<0.0001) (Figure 3).

Essential drugs transporters and enzymes are differentially expressed between drug-resistant and sensitive parasites

To dissect the possible molecular mechanisms of PQ and LM resistance and reversal, we hypothesized that major transporters or enzymes involved in drug transport and metabolism could mediate LM and PQ resistance through altered mRNA amounts; these genes are; *crt, mdr1, mrp2, pank, fnr, pmiv, pmix, pmx, sufs, and pi3k*. Only one gene, the *pmiv,* had high mRNA levels with a 1.78-fold (p<0.001) in LM^r parasites (Figure 4B). In PQ^r parasites, two genes, *sufs,* and *pmix* had 0.67-fold (p<0.0001) and 0.36-fold (p<0.0001) increase in the mRNA amount (Figure 5B and 5C). Overall, we recorded a low expression of mRNA in *crt, mdr1, mrp2, pank, fnr, pmx,* and *pi3k* genes in both LM^r and PQ^r parasites.

Transfection of PQ^r parasites with SUFS knockout and FNR over-expression vectors yielded transgenic parasites

To gain insight into whether reduced expression of the FNR or increased expression of the SUFS reduced the susceptibility of PQ^r parasites to LM or the two genes associated with restoring

the activity of LM potency against the PQ^r parasites, two transgenic parasite lines; one with a

deleted SUFS gene (PQ^R_SUFS_KD) and the other with an overexpressed FNR gene

(PQ^R_FNR_OE) were generated (Figure 6). For the FNR transfection assays, the three mice

infected with the transfected schizont and treated with pyrimethamine from day one (D1) post-

infection onwards had an average parasitemia of above 5% on day seven post parasite infection.

For SUFS, all the three mice yielded parasitemia of between 6-8% on day six post parasite

infection. After isolation of parasitic DNA, we confirmed the genotype of the SUFS knockdown

(PQ^r_SUFS_KD) and FNR over-expression (PQ^r_FNR_OE) parasites by PCR amplification using

three sets of primers; QCR2/GW2, GT/GW1, and QCR1/QCR2. As expected, using the vector-

specific QCR2 and the standard GW2 primers, we obtained a fragment of 0.9kb, and 1.5kb,

respectively, in PQ^r_SUFS_KD and PQ^r_FNR_OE parasites (Figure 6). PCR amplification

analysis using vector-specific quality control primers, the QCR1, and QCR2 amplified in both PQ^r

parasites and PQ^r_FNR_OE parasites as expected. The QCR1/QCR2 quality control primers also

amplified in both PQ^r and PQ^r_SUFS_KD parasites showing that although the vector used in

deleting SUFS gene is a knock out vector (39), the vector does not cover the entire gene thus a

possibility of generating a knockdown transgenic parasite. The mRNA expression was, however,

measured to assess the partial disruption of the SUFS gene in PQ^r_SUFS_KD parasites resulted in

reduced expression of the SUFS mRNA amounts, as shown in section 3.6. To confirm integrated

into the correct chromosome and position, we utilized the standard primers GW1 and the vector-

specific primers GT, and as expected, we obtained a PCR product of 1.9kb and 3.9kb for

PQ^r_SUFS_KD and PQ^r_FNR_OE parasites, respectively (Figure 6).

Disruption of the SUFS and FNR genes' expression confirms the successful generation of the

PQ^r_FNR_OE and PQ^r_SUFS_KD transgenic lines.

To confirm the partial deletion and overexpression of the SUFS and FNR, respectively, we

quantified the mRNA amount in PQ^r_SUFS_OE and PQ^r_FNR_OE relative to the PQ^r parasites.

The results indicated that the mRNA amount of the FNR gene in the PQ^r_FNR_OE parasites

increased by 5-fold (p<0.0001). The mRNA amount of SUFS in the PQ^r_SUFS_KD parasites was

2-fold less as compared to the PQ^r, suggesting downregulation of the SUFS gene (p<0.0001)

(Figure 7). Overall, these results affirmed the successful generation of the transgenic parasites.

The transgenic parasites were then utilized to measure the impact of deleting SUFS or

overexpressing FNR genes on drug responses relative to the PQ^r and sensitive parasites.

The alteration of SUFS and FNR genes results in significant attenuation of the growth rate

of the asexual blood-stage parasites.

Here we hypothesized that alteration of a gene in parasites might concomitantly alter the

growth rates of the asexual blood-stage parasites. To evaluate this hypothesis, we assessed the

growth rates of the transgenic parasites. As expected, the drug-sensitive wildtype parasite grew

normally with parasitemia reaching an average of 15% on Day four post parasite inoculation (D4

PI). Similarly, the PQ^r parasite had an average parasitemia of 13% on D4 PI. However, the growth

rate of the transgenic parasite was significantly low, for instance, PQ^R_FNR_OE and

PQ^R_SUFS_KD yielded an average parasitemia of 8% and 10% respectively suggesting a fitness

cost on the growth of the asexual blood-stage parasites (Figure 8). After quantifying the growth

fitness cost, the study revealed that alteration of FNR and SUFS significantly reduces normal

parasite growth rate phenotype by 47% and 33%, respectively.

The PQ^r_SUFS_KD and the PQ^r_FNR_OE lines gained significant susceptibility to LM

alone or in combination with the RA.

To query the potential role of SUFS and FNR in mediating LM and RA activity, we

evaluated the activity of LM alone or in combination with the RA against the transgenic and PQ^r

parasites Surprisingly and interestingly, the LM alone at 50mg/kg killed above 64% and 67% of

the PQ^r_FNR_OE and PQ^r_SUFS_KD parasites respectively as compared to 0% parasite reduction

in the PQ^r parasites (Figures 9-10). A combination of LM at 50 mg/kg with either of the RA

eliminated between 53% and 73% of the PQ^r_FNR_OE parasites. On the other hand, LM at

50mg/kg, in combination with any of the RA significantly reduced the PQ^r_SUFS_KD parasites

by above 73%. As expected, similar combinations against PQ^r yielded percentage drug killing of

above 61%, while 5mg/kg of LM yielded 100% activity against the parent sensitive parasites

(PQ^S). Overall, these results indicate that the partial deletion of SUFS or overexpression of FNR

in PQ^r parasites restores parasite susceptibility to LM; however, this alteration seems to abolish

the action of RA on LM activity in the transgenic parasites.

Lumefantrine and cyproheptadine exhibited higher binding affinities for both FNR and

SUFS proteins than verapamil or probenecid.

We used *in silico* approaches to confirm *in vivo* drug profiles results. For all the structures

modeled, the Z-scores from the PROSA-web server that indicates the degree of correctness showed

scores of -8.49 and -8.67 for FNR and SUFS, respectively (Table 3). The results of the Z-scores

obtained imply that the modeled protein structures were within the range of scores typical of the

experimentally defined proteins. As expected, LM yielded high but equal binding affinities of -

7.9kcal/mol on both SUFS and FNR., indicating a better binding between LM and the proteins.

Surprisingly, cyproheptadine showed the highest binding affinity to SUFS (-9.5kcal/mol). The

lowest binding affinity of -6.3 kcal/mol was between FNR and verapamil (Figure 11).

Discussion

Using both traditional and high-end technologies, we studied the mechanisms of LM and

PQ resistance in *P. berghei*. We provide evidence that cyproheptadine, verapamil, or probenecid

selectively restore LM activity against PQ^r parasites through the ferredoxin NADP$^+$-reductase and

cysteine desulfurase. At 10mg/kg, cyproheptadine appears to have two functions; first, and as

expected, is the parasite killing ability against both the LM^r and the sensitive parasites, possibly

by inhibition of heme polymerization as previously elaborated (34). Second, cyproheptadine

enhances parasite kill by selectively restoring LM activity against both the LM^r and PQ^r parasites.

Inhibition of heme polymerization is the predicted mechanism of action for PQ, and therefore, the

low susceptibility of the PQ^r parasites to cyproheptadine compared to the LM^r and the sensitive

parasites suggest that PQ and cyproheptadine also share common resistance mechanisms. The fact

that cyproheptadine failed to restore PQ activity against PQ^r parasites suggests that the PQ^r

parasites possess at least two types of resistance mechanisms, one which code for PQ resistance

and is cyproheptadine insensitive and second, which mediates LM resistance and is cyproheptadine

sensitive. It is, however, not clear whether the genes associated with cyproheptadine modifiable

mechanisms in both LM^r and PQ^r are similar or different. A lower dose of 5mg/kg had only one

biological function of restoring LM activity against both LM^r and PQ^r parasites.

Resistance to quinoline antimalarials is associated with acidification of the digestive

vacuole (DV) (22). Verapamil mediates reversal by replacement of positive charge and

normalization of pH, blocking efflux of quinoline drugs from digestive vacuole (DV) via the

mutated PfCRT protein (40). The mechanism of action of PQ and LM is predicted to be similar to

that of standard quinoline; chloroquine (41). Thus, these drugs may share some resistance

mechanisms. However, *PbCRT* in PQ^r or LM^r parasites were found not to carry mutations (18).

We have confirmed that resistance mechanisms mediating the loss of LM activity against the PQ^r

parasites are verapamil sensitive, but the loss of LM activity against LM[r] parasites are independent

of verapamil action suggesting a complex emergence of LM resistance. We provide clues that the

reversal of LM resistance in PQ[r] suggests that verapamil may bind to other protein(s) apart from

the traditional CRT protein to restore and enhance LM activity in PQ[r] parasites. Currently, LM

and PQ are used in respective ACTs combination therapies in many African countries (42). We

show that verapamil selectively restored LM activity against PQ[r] but not in LM[r] parasites. If

mechanisms of resistance to LM are similar in *P. berghei* and *P. falciparum*, then the emergence

of LM resistance may proceed through two possible mechanisms; first is through the indirect PQ

selection pressure via the PQ/DHA combination. The second mechanisms are by the direct LM

pressure via the LM/ATM combination. The fact that the deletion of the SUFS gene and

overexpression of FNR abolished the impact of verapamil on LM activity against PQ[r] parasites

suggest a potential interaction between SUFS and FNR proteins with both verapamil and LM.

However, the molecular mechanisms of how verapamil enhances LM activity via SUFS or FNR

is not understood and requires further studies.

We also show organic anion inhibitors, probenecid chemo-sensitizes LM against PQ[r]

parasites. Through a direct or indirect action on the *Pfcrt* gene associated with CQ resistance in *P.*

falciparum, probenecid selectively sensitizes chloroquine-resistant isolates by increasing the level

of chloroquine accumulation *in vitro* (24). Similarly, probenecid unselectively potentiates the

activities of antifolates agents against both antifolates resistant and sensitive *P. falciparum* (24).

Reversal of antifolates resistance is associated with inhibition of multi-resistance-associated

proteins (43) and inhibition of endogenous folate transport (24). Multi-resistance associated

proteins are implicated in resistance to quinoline antimalarial drugs in both *P. falciparum* and *P.*

berghei (44). We have previously confirmed PQ[r] parasites as multidrug-resistant parasites; thus,

probenecid mediated inhibition of multi-resistance proteins in re-establishing LM activity against

PQ^r parasites is a possible alternative. Indeed, we confirm that altering the expression of SUFS

and FNR, two proteins linked with different parasite pathway blocks the impact of probenecid on

LM activity against the PQ^r parasites.

The next generation of antimalarial drugs has envisioned the incorporation of three drugs

comprising of two long-acting drugs and a short-acting artemisinin drug (45). Currently,

cyproheptadine, an H-1 antagonist, at 4mg/kg, is recommended for the treatment of allergic

reactions and improvement of appetite (www.medscape.com). We have shown that 2.5mg/kg of

cyproheptadine is a potent modulator of lumefantrine resistance in both PQ^r and LM^r parasites, at

least in *P. berghei*. In humans, the recommended dosage for verapamil and probenecid is 80mg/kg

and 500mg/kg, respectively (www.medscape.com). Here, we have used a lower dosage to restore

the activity of LM against PQ^r parasites. Taken together, we demonstrate that incorporation of

cyproheptadine into antimalarial combination therapy that comprises LM would achieve two aims;

first is to augment LM activity and possibly delay the emergence of LM resistance and; second,

an optimized cyproheptadine concentration would offer an added advantage in the combination by

exerting extra antimalarial. The data also confirms the existence of at least more than one controls

channels for PQ resistance, one associated with LM resistance and is verapamil, probenecid, or

cyproheptadine inhibitable channel only in the presence of LM and the other linked with PQ

resistance which is verapamil, probenecid or cyproheptadine insensitive channel. The selective

potentiation of LM activity against PQ resistance by probenecid, verapamil, and cyproheptadine

is appealing since PQ^r parasites are resistant to CQ, dihydroartemisinin (DHA), and amodiaquine

(AQ) (36). Therefore, incorporation of any of the reversing agent into an antimalarial combination

therapy that comprises LM as one of the components would concomitantly antagonize the

emergence of LM resistance derived from PQ selection pressure.

In the malaria parasite, drug resistance may arise as a result of a change in the expression

levels of genes associated with transport or metabolism of drugs (17,46). Amplification of PMII

and III is associated with PQ resistance (4). Further interrogation of other plasmepsins IX and X

confirmed druggability and the role in the growth of the asexual blood parasite (47). *Plasmodium*

falciparum expresses a total of ten plasmepsins (aspartyl protease) during the asexual and sexual

stage of the parasites, four of the seven proteases; the PMI, PMII, histoaspartic protease (HAP)

and PMIV localized within the digestive vacuole and digest hemoglobin in the red blood cells (48).

The digestive vacuole is the predicted site of action for PQ and LM. PMIV is the only protease

found in all *Plasmodium* species (48), and in *P. berghei,* it is the only Plasmepsin localized within

the DV vacuole (49), suggesting a sole potential role of heme metabolism. We hypothesized that

PQ^r and LM^r parasites have unique expression pattern for the PMs IV, IX and X. However, we

found no apparent pattern in the expression profiles of the PMs between PQ^r and LM^r parasites

(Figure 4 and 5) suggesting that PQ and LM selection pressure follow independent patterns.

Nonetheless, the PMIV, PMIX, and PMIV were differentially expressed in the PQ^r and LM^{r,}

suggesting a possible association between LM and PQ resistance in PQ^r and LM^r. The actual link

between PQ and LM resistance in *P. berghei* and the differential expression of PMIV, PMIX and

PMX need further interrogation through forward and reverse genetics in both *P. berghei* and *P.*

falciparum using CRISPR/Cas9 approach.

Enzymes are essential to drug activators and a potential target for the drug metabolites

(50,51), Here, we evaluated four enzymes. Enzymes involved in energy generation, potential drug

activators, and Fe-S biogenesis pathways such as SUFS (15), FNR (52), PANK (53), and PI3K

(54) have been proposed as targets for the development of specific new anti-malarial agents.

Indeed, one of the ways of identifying and validating a drug target is by dissecting polymorphism

after drug selection pressure. For instance, a mutation in one of the cysteine desulfurases, NFS, is

associated with resistance to LM in *P. falciparum* (15). In the current study, the expression of

SUFS in PQ[r] and LM[r] relative to the sensitive parental parasites was antagonistic, suggesting that

the high expression of SUFS in PQ[r] may be one of the mechanisms for mediating LM cross-

resistance. On the contrary, the low expression of SUFS in the LM[r] may suggest adaptive

mechanisms for the parasites to reduce potential binding targets for the LM. Indeed, the adaptive

parasite mechanism is supported by the low growth profiles of the parasite observed in this study

after partial deletion of the SUFS in the PQ[r] parasites.

Next, we proceeded to assay the other three enzymes, FNR, PI3K, and PANK, which were

downregulated in both PQ[r] and LM[r] parasites. The FNR is involved in the generation of reducing

equivalents for the synthesis of isoprenoid within the apicoplast compartment (55). The interaction

between FNR and the ferredoxin (Fd) proteins has been exploited to design new chemical

compounds that kill the parasite by inhibiting the generation of reducing equivalent for powering

biochemical pathways in the apicoplast (52). Further validation of the FNR redox system as a

potential target and resistance marker for the artemisinins was revealed by the nonsynonymous

background mutation (Asp193Tyr) in the *Fd* protein in parasite exposed to the ACTs(56). This

study associates reduced FNR expression with LM resistance in both PQ[r] and LM[r]. For instance,

overexpression of FNR in the PQ[r] parasites was accompanied by increased sensitivity to LM and

the loss of RA action, suggesting a link between the FNR protein, LM, and RA. Further study on

the modes of action of LM and RA action in the *P. falciparum* may be investigated through the

editing of the FNR and its interacting partner Fd by editing the expression profiles using the

CRISPR/Cas9 followed by the assessment of drug response profiles.

We then focused on a unique protein; the Pantothenate kinase (PANK). PANK though not

essential for the growth of the asexual blood-stage parasite, catalyzes the phosphorylation of

pantothenic acid in the first step of the biosynthesis of essential cofactor coenzyme A (53,57).

Analogs of pantothenic acid and pantothenamides inhibited the growth of the malaria parasite via

competitive inhibition of PANK and inhibition of PANK activity, respectively (58). The

nonessential genes may not be critical drug targets; however, such proteins are likely drug

activators or detoxifiers (59). Coenzyme A biosynthetic enzymes, including PANK, convert

pantothenamides into coenzymes A analogs (60). Drug resistance studies show reciprocal

resistance between LM and CQ despite their predicted similar modes of action (61). This means

that LM may have a different molecular target; PANK may be one of the targets. It is likely that

PANK may be an activator for LM; thus, the reduced expression of PANK in both PQ^r and LM^r

may be one of the ways the parasite reduces activation of LM, thus reducing the concentration of

drug metabolites available for action.

A previous study on the cross-resistance profile of LM^r revealed that the acquisition of LM

resistance is also accompanied by loss of DHA activity (36), suggesting that the LM^r also possess

gene expression changes that also mediate DHA and by extension artemisinin resistance. One such

gene is the phosphatidylinositol-3-kinase (PI3K), in which increased expression decreases parasite

susceptibility to the artemisinin. This study thus hypothesized that changes in gene expression in

PI3K occur in both PQ^r and LM^r parasites. In agreement to prediction, but contrary to expectation,

PI3K was found to be downregulated, suggesting an antagonistic resistance mechanism between

the artemisinins and bisquinoline-PQ and aryl alcohol- LM in *P. berghei*. Chemically, LM, and

PQ are different from the artemisinin; thus, it would be expected that they may involve different

mechanisms of resistance. However, the actual link between reduced expression of the PI3K

enzyme, PQ, and LM resistance in *P. berghei* requires further studies.

Transporters are vital mediators of drug entry for antimalarial action and efflux in the case

of drug resistance (44). Findings in this study associate reduced expression of *crt*, *mrp2,* and *mdr1*

genes in PQ[r] and LM[r] parasites. Different studies have revealed differing expressions of essential

transporters with mediating reciprocal drug susceptibility to antimalarial drugs. For instance, an

increase in the copy number variation in the *mdr1* gene does not alter parasite susceptibility to PQ

(13). On the contrary, a decrease in the copy number variation is associated with an increase in the

LM susceptibility in both *P. falciparum* and *P. chabaudi* (11,62). These studies highlight

reciprocal resistance mechanisms between the quinoline drugs such as PQ and aryl alcohol, such

as LM. In the acquisition of drug resistance, an increase rather than a decrease in the expression

of major transporters is the most prevalent occurrence. Also, changes in the expression of *mdr1*

and *mrp2* maybe act as compensatory resistance mechanisms (46). Thus, we argue that the

decreased expression of *mrp2*, *mdr1,* and *crt* may act as compensatory mechanisms in both PQ[r]

and LM[r] parasites. Overall, this study has revealed that PQ[r] and LM[r] parasites have differential

expression patterns in key drug transporters and enzymes associated with metabolism or potential

targets.

Using PQ[r] parasites and a reverse genetics approach, the study dissected the mechanisms

of LM resistance by assessing the link between gene expression of two genes; SUFS and FNR,

LM activity, and reversal of resistance by RA. The essentiality of the sulfur mobilization

(SUF) pathway for apicoplast maintenance and parasite survival in erythrocytic stages, as recently

confirmed from disruption of the *P. falciparum sufC* gene (63), identifies it as a leading potential

target for antimalarial drug discovery. Recent studies have provided evidence that the cysteine

desulfurase is involved in the initial stages of sulfur trafficking within cells. The cysteine

desulfurase decomposes L-cysteine to L-alanine and sulfane sulfur via the formation of an enzyme-

bound persulfide intermediate. The persulfide sulfur is then incorporated into the biosynthetic

pathways of sulfur-containing biofactors (64). We confirm a significant attenuation of the growth

rates of the asexual blood-stage in the transgenic parasites providing evidence that SUFS and FNR

are essential for the growth of asexual blood-stage parasites. Second, SUFS is associated with LM

activity in *P. berghei* since partial deletion in PQ^r parasites resulted in a significant increase in LM

susceptibility. Third, SUFS protein is associated with mediating reversal of LM resistance in the

PQ^r parasites since partial deletion of the SUFS abolished the impact of cyproheptadine, verapamil,

and probenecid. On the other hand, this study finds increase expression of SUFS as predictive of

LM activity.

To further understand the link between LM resistance in PQ^r parasites, restoration of LM

activity by verapamil, cyproheptadine, and probenecid and the expression profiles, we focused on

FNR protein. Several studies have established that the malaria parasite plant-type ferredoxin (Fd),

and ferredoxin NADP$^+$ reductase (FNR), a plastidic-derived organelle called the apicoplast,

possesses metabolic pathways, which is not found in the human host (65). The Fd/FNR redox

system, which potentially provides reducing power for essential biosynthetic pathways in the

apicoplast (66), has been proposed as a target for the development of specific new anti-malarial

agents (52). We provide a clear link between LM activity, RA action, and overexpression of the

FNR gene. Thus two possible assumptions exist; First, FNR may be a target for LM. Reduced

expression of FNR in the PQ^r parasites may potentially result in reduced binding targets for LM.

The overexpression of FNR in the transgenic parasites PQ^r_FNR_OE seems to restore the

concentration of the FNR, thus more binding targets for LM and a consequent high susceptibility

of PQ^r_FNR_OE to LM. Second, the FNR is a potential activator for LM, thus reduced expression

of FNR in the PQ^r is accompanied by reduced active metabolites from LM, thus less activity. The

increase in the FNR, as confirmed in the PQ^r_FNR_OE transgenic parasites, seems to reinstate the

activator; thus, more of the LM metabolite is generated restoring LM activity in the PQ^r_FNR_OE

transgenic parasites as compared to PQ^r parasites. The fact that all the RA lost the ability to

potentiate LM activity in the PQ^r_FNR_OE parasites confirms the interaction between FNR and

LM and RA. Also, we show that the amount of FNR is predictive of LM activity. The reversing

agents restore the activity of antimalarial drugs by enhancing the accumulation of drugs within the

target site (27). It is likely that in the event the FNR amount is low, the threshold concentration for

LM action is not achieved, the threshold may be enhanced by an RA possibly by increasing the

uptake of the few active LM metabolites.

Overall, this study highlights two critical aspects regarding LM resistance in PQ resistant

P. berghei ANKA; First, using LM and cyproheptadine, verapamil, or probenecid, the study

reports new combination therapies that restored LM activity against the PQ^r parasites. Second,

using reverse genetics, the study shows that alteration of two essential parasite enzymes (SUFS

and FNR) restores LM activity against PQ^r parasites. Thus, mRNA expression of the two enzymes

in PQ-resistant parasites is predictive of LM activity against the PQ resistant *P. berghei* ANKA,

and the alteration of their expression profiles alter the parasite to LM. Taken together, this study

provides essential clues of SUFS and FNR as potential resistance markers and targets for LM in

P. berghei ANKA. The role of SUFS and FNR and the impact of differential expression in drug

susceptibility should be investigated in the human malaria parasite *P. falciparum* in vitro using the

CRISPR/Ca9 technique. Also, the expression profiles of SUFS and FNR may be used as a potential

monitor for the emergence of LM resistance in the *P. falciparum* field isolates.

Materials and methods

Parasites, Host, and Compounds

We used two drug-sensitive parasite reference lines *of P. berghei* ANKA, the MRA-865

and MRA-868 reference lines obtained from MR4, ATCC® Manassas, Virginia. Also, two

multidrug-resistant parasite lines; the PQ-resistant (PQ^r) and LM-resistant (LM^r) *P. berghei*

ANKA parasites previously selected from MRA-865 and MRA-868 lines, respectively (36) were

studied. We utilized male Swiss albino mice weighing 20±2g out-bred at KEMRI, Animal house

Nairobi. Experimental mice were kept in standard polypropylene cages clearly labeled with

experimental details and fed on commercial rodent food and water *ad libitum*. The knockout (KO)

vector (PbGEM-018972), as well as the overexpression (OE) vector (PbGEM-456502), were

kindly provided by the *Plasmo*GEM project under an agreement of a material transfer (PG-MTA-

0093). Verapamil, probenecid, and cyproheptadine were purchased from Carramore international

limited (UK). LM and PQ were donated from Universal Corporation, Kikuyu, Kenya. All drugs;

PQ, LM, verapamil, probenecid, and cyproheptadine were freshly prepared by dissolving them in

a solvent consisting of 70% Tween-80 (d=1.08g/ml) and 30% ethanol (d=0.81g/ml) and

subsequently diluted 10-fold with double distilled water which was used as a vehicle and control

for the drug profile assays.

Ethics statement

This study was conducted at KEMRI and JKUAT. All mouse experiments were carried out

as per relevant national and international standards (The ARRIVE Guidelines) and as approved by

523 KEMRI-Animal Use and Care Committee. This study was permitted and ethically approved by

524 KEMRI under the SERU No 3914.

Drug sensitivity assays

The activity profiles of probenecid, verapamil, or cyproheptadine alone and in combination

with PQ, or LM against the drug-sensitive, resistant, or the transgenic parasites were assessed in

the standard 4-day suppressive test (4-DT) in which the parasite is exposed to four daily drug doses

(67). Infection in mice was by intraperitoneal inoculation of approximately 1×10^6 parasites per

mouse. The infected mice were then randomly allocated to the test groups and the control group

(at least three mice per group). Treatment was performed orally starting on day 0 (4 h post-

infection) and continued for four (4) days, days 0–3 (24, 48, and 72 hours post-infection). Parasite

density was estimated microscopically ($\times 100$) on day 4 (96 hours) post parasite inoculation using

thin blood films made from tail blood. Parasite growth was then followed for at least 11 days post-

infection to assess the recrudescence of the parasites after cessation of drug treatment. Percentage

(%) activity (parasite reduction) was determined using the following equation: [(A-B)/A] x 100]

= % Chemo-suppression; where A is the mean parasitemia in the negative control group and B is

the parasitemia in the test group.

Extraction of RNA, synthesis of cDNA, and qRT-PCR assays

The quantification of mRNA transcripts of *Pbcrt, Pbmdr1, Pbmrp2, Pbpank, Pbfnr,*

Pbsufs, Pbpm4, Pbpm9, Pbpm10, and *Pbpi3k* was carried out after cDNA synthesis from mRNA

extracted from sensitive parental parasites, LM[r], PQ[r,] and transgenic parasites. All buffer and

solutions for parasite preparation and mRNA extraction were treated with 0.1% (v/v) of

diethylpyrocarbonate (DEPC). Total RNA was extracted from approximately 1×10^6 fresh parasites

pellets. The parasite pellet was prepared as per the previous protocol (68). Total RNA was purified

using Quick-RNA™ MiniPrep (Zymo Research™) following instructions form the manufacturer.

The first-strand cDNA synthesis was performed in a final volume of 20μl using RevertAid First

Strand cDNA synthesis kit and Oligo(dT)$_{18}$ as primers. The mix contained 4μl Reaction buffer

(5×), 2μl of dNTPs (10mM), 1μl of RevertAid RT (200U/μl), 1μl RiboLock RNase Inhibitor

(U/μl), 1μl of oligo-DT and 5μg of total RNA. To synthesize cDNA, the reaction mix was

incubated at 42°C for 60min, then at 70°C for 10min and finally chilled on ice. The cDNA

synthesized was later used as a template for qRT-PCR assays. Gene expression levels were

measured in a total reaction of 20μl using Maxima SYBR Green/ROX qPCR Master Mix (Thermo

Scientific™). Oligonucleotides for *Pbcrt, Pbmdr1, Pbmrp2, Pbpank, Pbfnr, Pbsufs, Pbpm4,*

Pbpm9, Pbpm10, and *Pbpi3k* were designed for cycling using similar conditions relative to the

housekeeping gene; *Pbβ-actin I* (Table S1). The reaction mix contained 3μl water, 2.0μl (0.25μM)

of forward and reverse primers each and 12μl of Maxima SYBR mix. The mix was cycled for pre-

treatment step at 50°C, for 2 min; initial denaturation of 95°C for 10 min; denaturation of 95°C for

15 secs; and annealing at 60°C for 60 secs for 45 cycles.

Generation of the transgenic parasites

Isolation, digestion, and purification of the vector DNA

Using the QIAfilter Plasmid Midi Kit (Qiagen™), Plasmid DNA for each of the vectors

was isolated from cultures of *E. coli* (vector hosts) in terrific broth (TB) supplemented with

kanamycin after overnight culture. Following a standard protocol, the extracted plasmid DNA was

restricted using Not I enzyme to release the vector backbone, followed by concentration using

conventional ethanol precipitation protocol (69). The vector was dried for 5 min at 65˚C and then

dissolved in 10μl of PCR water. Besides Not I restriction digest, a diagnostic PCR was performed

using standard primer pair (GW2 and a vector-specific QCR2) (39) to verify the isolated vector of

interest

Purification of the *P. berghei* schizonts for transfection

Using standard protocols as described by (70), we collected *P. berghei* schizonts for

transfection. Briefly, at least three mice were used for schizont culture for each of the vectors.

Propagation of *P. berghei* parasites was done by intraperitoneal (IP) injection into the mice, and

parasites were harvested using cardiac puncture for schizont culture at 3% parasitemia. For

schizonts propagation, rings stage parasites (the asexual blood-stages) were incubated at 37˚C in

vitro as reported previously (71,72). A 100ml schizont, culture medium contained 25ml freshly

thawed FBS, 72 ml RPMI1640, 2ml 0.5M NaHC03, and 1ml of antibiotic Pen/Strep (1:100

Penicillin/ streptomycin, and 2ml of parasitized mice blood. The mixture was gassed with malaria

gas (3% oxygen, 5% carbon dioxide, and 92% Nitrogen) for 2 minutes, tightly sealed, and

incubated at 37°C for with minimal shaking. After 22 hours, the schizonts were harvested and

purified by Nycodenz density gradient centrifugation, and each pellet was re-suspended in schizont

culture media, ready for transfection.

Transfection and selection of transgenic parasite lines

A SUFS specific knockout vector (PbGEM-018972) and an FNR overexpression vector

(PbGEM-456502) were separately transfected in the PQ^r parasites. Each of the transfection mixes

contained, 20μl of schizonts, 10μl (5μg) of plasmid DNA, and 100ml of supplemented

nucleofector solution (Amaxa™). Exactly 100μl of the transfection mix in Amaxa cuvette was

electroporated in a Nucleofector 2B Device (Lonza™) using the program U33. A naïve mouse was

intravenously injected with the electroplated parasites. Three transfections were performed for

each of the vectors to increase the chance of recovering transgenic parasites. Pyrimethamine drug

591 at 7 mg/mL, for the selection of transgenic parasites, was provided in drinking water, 24hours post-

592 parasite inoculation for a total of 12 days. Freshly prepared pyrimethamine drug was provided

593 every 72 hours. After the recovery of transgenic parasites, genetically homogenous parasite lines

594 were generated by dilution cloning protocol (18,70).

595 **Genotyping of transgenic parasites**

596 Genomic DNA (gDNA) was extracted from the transgenic parasite lines using the QIAamp

597 DNA Blood Mini Kit (Qiagen™) following manufacturer instructions. Three pairs of primers were

598 used for diagnosis and genotyping, as detailed in Table S2; i) QCR2/GW2 pair ii) QCR1/QCR2

599 and iii) GT/GW1 or GW2. Each of the reaction mixes contained 1µl of gDNA, 12.5µl of 2xGoTag

600 Green master mix (Promega™), 6.5µl of water and 2.5µl of each of the primers. The PCR reactions

601 were optimized, as detailed in Table 4. The PCR products were resolved on a 1% agarose gel.

602 **Molecular docking**

603 **Homology modeling**

604 The 3D structures of the SUFS; PBANKA_0614300, and FNR; PBANKA_1122100, were

605 predicted by selecting as templates, the best structures with the highest similarity to their sequences

606 available in NCBI protein database http://ncbi.nlm.nih.gov and *Plasmodium* database

607 http://plasmodb.org/. SWISS-MODEL (73) available at https://swissmodel.expasy.org/ was used

608 to predict the homology models. The SWISS-MODEL was a preferred modeling server because it

609 annotates essential cofactors and ligands as well as quaternary structures, allowing for modeling

610 of complete structures with less complicated software packages (73). The structures were then

611 downloaded and saved in PDB format.

Structure validation

The models were analyzed using PROCHECK (74) and PRoSA-web (75) to determine the

quality of the modeled structures. PROCHECK was used to evaluate the general stereochemistry

of the protein, while PRoSA-web was employed to evaluate for potential errors in the 3D

structures. Verify_3D was used to determine the compatibility of an atomic model (3D) with its

amino acid sequence (1D), (76).

Ligand selection

To perform docking experiments, the most potent RA, as well as LM, were selected as test

ligands. The molecular structures of the four selected ligands were downloaded from the

ChemSpider (http://www.chemspider.com/), an online database to access unique chemical

compounds   (77).   For   compatibility   with   the   docking   software

(https://cactus.nci.nih.gov/translate/), we converted the chemical structures from the Mol2 format

into PDB format using the CADD Group's Chemoinformatics Tools and User Services

Binding site analysis and ligand docking

PyMOL version 1.6.x (Delano, 2002) was used to visualize the modeled structures and

binding sites. The grid box parameters of the ligands and the receptors optimization were executed

using scripts within AutoDock Tools (ADT). The files were then saved in PDBQT format, and

their corresponding coordinates rewrote into a configuration file used for docking. The

configuration file specified the pdbqt files for both the ligand and the proteins as well as the

docking parameters (dimensions and spacing angstrom). Optimization of the inputs involved the

removal of water molecules from the receptor and the addition of missing hydrogen ions. Docking

of a single receptor and a single ligand was carried out using the Autodock Vina (78,79). Autodock

Vina employs the Lamarckian genetic algorithm (LGA). FNR and SUFS, whose 3D structures

were available in the protein data bank (PDB;

http://www.rcsb.org/pdb/explore.do?structureId=2hvp) were also included. The binding energies

and the positional root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) of the proteins and the ligands were

presented on an output file. A ligand orientation with low binding energy signifies a better affinity

towards a receptor.

Data presentation and statistical analysis

The percentage parasitemia and the percentage of drug killing were analyzed using the

Nonparametric Mann-Whitney U Test in the R statistical software with a *p*-value set at 0.05. The

means for the gene expression levels from three independent experiments and triplicate assays

were compared using the Nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test with a p-value set at 0.05. The

relative expression level data were normalized using β-actin I as the housekeeping based on the

formula $2^{\Delta\Delta CT}$ by (Livak and Schmittgen 2001).

Acknowledgments

We thank the Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute *Plasmo*GEM project team for providing the highly

efficient gene modification resources used in this study.

References

1.   WHO. World Malaria Report 2017. 2017.

2.   WHO. Guidelines for the treatment of malaria, 3rd edition. World Health Organization.

2016.

3.   Tse EG, Korsik M, Todd MH. The past, present and future of anti-malarial medicines.

Malar J [Internet]. 2019;18(1):93. Available from:

https://malariajournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12936-019-2724-z

4.   Amato R, Lim P, Miotto O, Amaratunga C, Dek D, Pearson RD, et al. Genetic markers

associated with dihydroartemisinin–piperaquine failure in Plasmodium falciparum malaria

in Cambodia: a genotype–phenotype association study. Lancet Infect Dis.

2017;17(2):164–73.

5.   Amato R, Pearson RD, Almagro-Garcia J, Amaratunga C, Lim P, Suon S, et al. Origins of

the current outbreak of multidrug-resistant malaria in southeast Asia: a retrospective

genetic study. Lancet Infect Dis [Internet]. 2018;18(3):337–45. Available from:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(18)30068-9

6.   Imwong M, Suwannasin K, Kunasol C, Sutawong K, Mayxay M, Rekol H, et al. The

spread of artemisinin-resistant Plasmodium falciparum in the Greater Mekong subregion:

a molecular epidemiology observational study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2017;17(5).

7.   Noedl H, Se Y, Schaecher K, Smith BL, Socheat D, Fukuda MM. for the Artemisinin

Resistance in Cambodia 1 (ARC1) Study Consortium. n engl j med. 2008;35924.

8.   Nosten F, White NJ. Artemisinin-based combination treatment of falciparum malaria. Am

J Trop Med Hyg. 2007;

9.   White NJ. Malaria parasite clearance. Malar J. 2017;16(1):1–14.

10.   Fidock DA, Nomura T, Talley AK, Cooper RA, Dzekunov SM, Ferdig MT, et al.

Mutations in the P. falciparum digestive vacuole transmembrane protein PfCRT and

evidence for their role in chloroquine resistance. Mol Cell [Internet]. 2000;6(4):861–71.

Available from: http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-

0033636607&partnerID=tZOtx3y1%5Cn%3CGo to ISI%3E://WOS:000090136700010

11.   Sidhu ABS, Uhlemann A, Valderramos SG, Valderramos J, Krishna S, Fidock DA.

Decreasing pfmdr1 Copy Number in Plasmodium falciparum Malaria Heightens

Susceptibility to Mefloquine, Lumefantrine, Halofantrine, Quinine, and Artemisinin. J

Infect Dis [Internet]. 2006;194(4):528–35. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/jid/article-lookup/doi/10.1086/507115

12.   Sidhu ABS, Valderramos SG, Fidock DA. pfmdr1 mutations contribute to quinine

resistance and enhance mefloquine and artemisinin sensitivity in Plasmodium falciparum.

Mol Microbiol. 2005;57(4):913–26.

13.   Dhingra SK, Redhi D, Combrinck JM, Yeo T, Okombo J, Henrich PP, et al. A variant

pfcrt isoform can contribute to plasmodium falciparum resistance to the first-line partner

drug piperaquine. MBio. 2017;8(3).

14.   Nzila A, Okombo J, Ohuma E, Al-Thukair A. Update on the in vivo tolerance and in vitro

reduced susceptibility to the antimalarial lumefantrine. Vol. 67, Journal of Antimicrobial

Chemotherapy. 2012. p. 2309–15.

15.   Amambua-ngwa A, Jeffries D, Amato R, Worwui A, Karim M, Ceesay S, et al. Consistent

signatures of selection from genomic analysis of pairs of temporal and spatial Plasmodium

falciparum populations from The Gambia. 2018;(June):1–10.

16.   Jiang H, Patel JJ, Yi M, Mu J, Ding J, Stephens R, et al. Genome-wide compensatory

changes accompany drug-selected mutations in the Plasmodium falciparum crt gene.

PLoS One. 2008;

17.   Mwai L, Diriye A, Masseno V, Muriithi S, Feltwell T, Musyoki J, et al. Genome wide

adaptations of Plasmodium falciparum in response to Lumefantrine selective drug

pressure. PLoS One. 2012;

18.   Kiboi D, Irungu B, Orwa J, Kamau L, Ochola-Oyier LI, Ngángá J, et al. Piperaquine and

lumefantrine resistance in Plasmodium berghei ANKA associated with increased

expression of Ca2+/H+antiporter and glutathione associated enzymes. Exp Parasitol.

2014;147:23–32.

19.   Burrows JN, Duparc S, Gutteridge WE, Hooft Van Huijsduijnen R, Kaszubska W,

706   Macintyre F, et al. New developments in anti-malarial target candidate and product

707   profiles. Vol. 16, Malaria Journal. 2017.

708   20.   Gamo FJ, Sanz LM, Vidal J, De Cozar C, Alvarez E, Lavandera JL, et al. Thousands of

709   chemical starting points for antimalarial lead identification. Nature. 2010;465(7296):305–

710   10.

711   21.   Hooft van Huijsduijnen R, Wells TN. The antimalarial pipeline. Current Opinion in

712   Pharmacology. 2018.

713   22.   Henry M, Alibert S, Rogier C, Barbe J, Pradines B. Inhibition of Efflux of Quinolines as

714   New Therapeutic Strategy in Malaria. Curr Top Med Chem. 2008;

715   23.   Gutman J, Kachur S, Slutsker L, Nzila A, Mutabingwa T. Combination of probenecid-

716   sulphadoxine-pyrimethamine for intermittent preventive treatment in pregnancy. Vol. 11,

717   Malaria Journal. 2012.

718   24.   Nzila A, Mberu E, Bray P, Kokwaro G, Winstanley P, Marsh K, et al. Chemosensitization

719   of Plasmodium falciparum by probenecid in vitro. Antimicrob Agents Chemother.

720   2003;47(7):2108–12.

721   25.   Bates SE, Wilson WH, Fojo AT, Alvarez M, Zhan Z, Regis J, et al. Clinical reversal of

722   multidrug resistance. Stem Cells. 1996;14(1):56–63.

723   26.   Lehane AM, Hayward R, Saliba KJ, Kirk K. A verapamil-sensitive chloroquine-associated

724   H+ leak from the digestive vacuole in chloroquine-resistant malaria parasites. J Cell Sci.

725   2008;121(10):1624–32.

27.   Warhurst DC, Craig JC, Adagu IS. Lysosomes and drug resistance in malaria. Lancet

(London, England) [Internet]. 2002;360(9345):1527–9. Available from:

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673602115777

28.   Zheng W, Li M, Lin Y, Zhan X. Encapsulation of verapamil and doxorubicin by MPEG-

PLA to reverse drug resistance in ovarian cancer. Biomed Pharmacother. 2018;

29.   Berger D, Citarella R, Dutia M, Greenberger L, Hallett W, Paul R, et al. Novel multidrug

resistance reversal agents. J Med Chem. 1999;

30.   De Luca A, Parker LJ, Ang WH, Rodolfo C, Gabbarini V, Hancock NC, et al. A structure-

based mechanism of cisplatin resistance mediated by glutathione transferase P1-1. Proc

Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2019;

31.   H. Peyton D. Reversed Chloroquine Molecules as a Strategy to Overcome Resistance in

Malaria. Curr Top Med Chem. 2012;

32.   Martiney JA, Cerami A, Slater AFG. Verapamil reversal of chloroquine resistance in the

malaria parasite Plasmodium falciparum is specific for resistant parasites and independent

of the weak base effect. J Biol Chem. 1995;

33.   Sirotnak FM, Wendel HG, Bornmann WGB, Tong WP, Miller VA, Scher HI, et al. Co-

administration of probenecid, an inhibitor of a cMOAT/MRP-like plasma membrane

ATPase, greatly enhanced the efficacy of a new 10-deazaaminopterin against human solid

tumors in vivo. Clin Cancer Res. 2000;

34.   Agrawal R, Tripathi R, Tekwani BL, Jain SK, Dutta GP, Shukla OP. Haem polymerase as

a novel target of antimalarial action of cyproheptadine. Biochem Pharmacol.

2002;64(9):1399–406.

35.   van Schalkwyk DA, Egan TJ. Quinoline-resistance reversing agents for the malaria

parasite Plasmodium falciparum. Drug Resist Updat. 2006;9(4–5):211–26.

750 36. Kiboi DM, Irungu BN, Langat B, Wittlin S, Brun R, Chollet J, et al. Plasmodium berghei

751   ANKA: Selection of resistance to piperaquine and lumefantrine in a mouse model. Exp

752   Parasitol. 2009;122(3):196–202.

753 37. Langat B, Kiboi D, Irungu B, Kimoloi S. Lumefantrine-resistant and Piperaquine-resistant

754   Plasmodium berghei show cross-resistance to Primaquine but not to Atovaquone. African

755   J Pharmacol Ther. 2012;1(2):35–40.

756 38. Gimode WR, Kiboi DM, Kimani FT, Wamakima HN, Burugu MW, Muregi FW. Fitness

757   cost of resistance for lumefantrine and piperaquine-resistant Plasmodium berghei in a

758   mouse model. Malar J. 2015;14(1).

759 39. Schwach F, Bushell E, Gomes AR, Anar B, Girling G, Herd C, et al. PlasmoGEM, a

760   database supporting a community resource for large-scale experimental genetics in

761   malaria parasites. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015;

762 40. Warhurst DC, Steele JCP, Adagu IS, Craig JC, Cullander C. Hydroxychloroquine is much

763   less active than chloroquine against chloroquine-resistant Plasmodium falciparum, in

764   agreement with its physicochemical properties. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2003;

765 41. Robert A, Benoit-Vical F, Dechy-Cabaret O, Meunier B. From classical antimalarial drugs

766   to new compounds based on the mechanism of action of artemisinin. Pure Appl Chem

767   [Internet]. 2001;73(7):1173–88. Available from:

768   http://iupac.org/publications/pac/73/7/1173/

769 42. Eastman RT, Fidock DA. Artemisinin-based combination therapies: A vital tool in efforts

770   to eliminate malaria. Vol. 7, Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2009. p. 864–74.

771 43. Hooijberg JH, Broxterman HJ, Kool M, Assaraf YG, Peters GJ, Noordhuis P, et al.

772   Antifolate resistance mediated by the multidrug resistance proteins MRP1 and MRP2.

Cancer Res. 1999;

44.   Valderramos SG, Fidock DA. Transporters involved in resistance to antimalarial drugs.

Vol. 27, Trends in Pharmacological Sciences. 2006. p. 594–601.

45.   J KM, Krishna S. Triple artemisinin‐containing combination anti‐malarial treatments

should be implemented now to delay the emergence of resistance : the case against. Malar

J [Internet]. 2019;1–3. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-019-2976-7

46.   Gonzales JM, Patel JJ, Ponmee N, Jiang L, Tan A, Maher SP, et al. Regulatory hotspots in

the malaria parasite genome dictate transcriptional variation. PLoS Biol. 2008;

47.   Nasamu AS, Glushakova S, Russo I, Vaupel B, Oksman A, Kim AS, et al. Plasmepsins IX

and X are essential and druggable mediators of malaria parasite egress and invasion.

Science (80-). 2017;358(6362):518–22.

48.   Dame JB, Yowell CA, Omara-Opyene L, Carlton JM, Cooper RA, Li T. Plasmepsin 4, the

food vacuole aspartic proteinase found in all Plasmodium spp. infecting man. Mol

Biochem Parasitol. 2003;

49.   Liu P, Robbins AH, Marzahn MR, McClung SH, Yowell CA, Stevens SM, et al.

Enzymatic characterization of recombinant food vacuole plasmepsin 4 from the rodent

malaria parasite plasmodium berghei. PLoS One. 2015;

50.   Camarda G, Jirawatcharadech P, Priestley RS, Saif A, March S, Wong MHL, et al.

Antimalarial activity of primaquine operates via a two-step biochemical relay. Nat

Commun. 2019;

51.   Gil JP. Amodiaquine pharmacogenetics. Pharmacogenomics. 2008;9(10):1385–90.

52.   Suwito H, Jumina, Mustofa, Pudjiastuti P, Fanani MZ, Kimata-Ariga Y, et al. Design and

synthesis of chalcone derivatives as inhibitors of the ferredoxin - Ferredoxin-NADP+

reductase interaction of Plasmodium falciparum: Pursuing new antimalarial agents.

Molecules. 2014;19(12):21473–88.

53. Tjhin ET, Spry C, Sewell AL, Hoegl A, Barnard L, Sexton AE, et al. Mutations in the

pantothenate kinase of Plasmodium falciparum confer diverse sensitivity profiles to

antiplasmodial pantothenate analogues [Internet]. Vol. 14, PLoS Pathogens. 2018.

Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1006918

54. Mbengue A, Bhattacharjee S, Pandharkar T, Liu H, Estiu G, Stahelin R V., et al. A

molecular mechanism of artemisinin resistance in Plasmodium falciparum malaria.

Nature. 2015;

55. Milani M, Balconi E, Aliverti A, Mastrangelo E, Seeber F, Bolognesi M, et al.

Ferredoxin-NADP+ Reductase from Plasmodium falciparum Undergoes NADP+-

dependent Dimerization and Inactivation: Functional and Crystallographic Analysis. J Mol

Biol. 2007;

56. Miotto O, Amato R, Ashley EA, Macinnis B, Almagro-Garcia J, Amaratunga C, et al.

Genetic architecture of artemisinin-resistant Plasmodium falciparum. Nat Genet.

2015;47(3):226–34.

57. Saliba KJ, Ferru I, Kirk K. Provitamin B5 (Pantothenol) inhibits growth of the

intraerythrocytic malaria parasite. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2005;49(2):632–7.

58. Spry C, Macuamule C, Lin Z, Virga KG, Lee RE, Strauss E, et al. Pantothenamides Are

Potent, On-Target Inhibitors of Plasmodium falciparum Growth When Serum

Pantetheinase Is Inactivated. PLoS One. 2013;8(2).

59. Cowell AN, Istvan ES, Lukens AK, Gomez-Lorenzo MG, Vanaerschot M, Sakata-Kato T,

et al. Mapping the malaria parasite druggable genome by using in vitro evolution and

chemogenomics. Science (80-). 2018;

60.   Schalkwijk J, Allman EL, Jansen PA, Vries LE de, Jackowski S, Botman PN, et al.

Antimalarial pantothenamide metabolites target acetyl-CoA synthesis in Plasmodium

falciparum. bioRxiv. 2018;

61.   Mwai L, Kiara SM, Abdirahman A, Pole L, Rippert A, Diriye A, et al. In vitro activities of

piperaquine, lumefantrine, and dihydroartemisinin in Kenyan plasmodium falciparum

isolates and polymorphisms in pfcrt and pfmdr1. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2009;

62.   Borges S, Cravo P, Creasey A, Fawcett R, Modrzynska K, Rodrigues L, et al.

Genomewide scan reveals amplification of mdr1 as a common denominator of resistance

to mefloquine, lumefantrine, and artemisinin in Plasmodium chabaudi malaria parasites.

Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2011;

63.   Gisselberg JE, Dellibovi-Ragheb TA, Matthews KA, Bosch G, Prigge ST. The Suf Iron-

Sulfur Cluster Synthesis Pathway Is Required for Apicoplast Maintenance in Malaria

Parasites. PLoS Pathog. 2013;

64.   Charan M, Singh N, Kumar B, Srivastava K, Siddiqi MI, Habib S. Sulfur mobilization for

fe-s cluster assembly by the essential suf pathway in the plasmodium falciparum

apicoplast and its inhibition. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014;

65.   Lim L, McFadden GI. The evolution, metabolism and functions of the apicoplast. Philos

Trans R Soc B Biol Sci [Internet]. 2010;365(1541):749–63. Available from:

http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/cgi/doi/10.1098/rstb.2009.0273

66.   Balconi E, Pennati A, Crobu D, Pandini V, Cerutti R, Zanetti G, et al. Balconi et al 2009

The ferredoxin-NADP+ reductase∕ferredoxin electron.pdf [Internet]. Vol. 276, FEBS

Journal The Authors Journal compilation. 2009. p. 3825–36. Available from:

http://www.bsb.unimi.it/

67. Fidock DA, Rosenthal PJ, Croft SL, Brun R, Nwaka S. Antimalarial drug discovery:

Efficacy models for compound screening. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2004;3(6):509–20.

68. Ndung'u L, Langat B, Magiri E, Ng'ang'a J, Irungu B, Nzila A, et al. Amodiaquine

resistance in Plasmodium berghei is associated with PbCRT His95Pro mutation, loss of

chloroquine, artemisinin and primaquine sensitivity, and high transcript levels of key

transporters. Wellcome Open Res [Internet]. 2017;2:44. Available from:

https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/articles/2-44/v1

69. Pfander C, Anar B, Schwach F, Otto TD, Brochet M, Volkmann K, et al. A scalable

pipeline for highly effective genetic modification of a malaria parasite. Nat Methods.

2011;8(12):1078–84.

70. Janse CJ, Ramesar J, Waters AP. High-efficiency transfection and drug selection of

genetically transformed blood stages of the rodent malaria parasite Plasmodium berghei.

Nat Protoc. 2006;1(1):346–56.

71. Onchieku NM, Mogire R, Ndung'u L, Mwitari P, Kimani F, Matoke-Muhia D, et al.

Deciphering the targets of retroviral protease inhibitors in Plasmodium berghei. PLoS

One. 2018;13(8):1–16.

72. Gomes AR, Bushell E, Schwach F, Girling G, Anar B, Quail MA, et al. A genome-scale

vector resource enables high-throughput reverse genetic screening in a malaria parasite.

Cell Host Microbe. 2015;

73. Biasini M, Bienert S, Waterhouse A, Arnold K, Studer G, Schmidt T, et al. SWISS-

MODEL: Modelling protein tertiary and quaternary structure using evolutionary

information. Nucleic Acids Res. 2014;42(W1):252–8.

74.   Laskowski RA, MacArthur MW, Moss DS, Thornton JM. PROCHECK: a program to

866   check the stereochemical quality of protein structures. J Appl Crystallogr. 1993;

867   75.   Wiederstein M, Sippl MJ. ProSA-web : interactive web service for the recognition of

868   errors in three-dimensional structures of proteins. Nucleic Acids Res. 2007;35(2):407–10.

869   76.   Bowie JU, Lüthy R, Eisenberg D. A Method to Identify Protein Sequences That into

870   Structure a Known Three-Dimensional Structure. Science (80-). 1991;253(5016):164–70.

871   77.   Williams AJ, Pence HE. ChemSpider : An Online Chemical Information Resource. J

872   Chem Educ. 2010;87(11).

873   78.   Forli S, Huey R, Pique ME, Sanner M, Goodsell DS, Arthur J. 00006565-201002000-

874   00017. 2016;11(5):905–19.

875   79.   Trott O, Olson A. Autodock vina: improving the speed and accuracy of docking. J

876   Comput Chem. 2010;31(2):455–61.

Table 1a: Effect of verapamil (Ver) and probenecid (Prob) alone against piperaquine (PQ) and lumefantrine (LM) resistant Plasmodium berghei ANKA assessed in the 4-Day Test. Results presented as percentage (%) parasite killing ± SD (Standard Deviation) of five mice per dose.

Reversing agent	Dose (mg/kg)	% chemo-suppression ± SE (LM^r)	% chemo-suppression ± SE (PQ^r)
Probenecid (Prob)	400	8.44±3.07	8.03±1.86
	200	0.00	4.06±2.75
Verapamil (Ver)	50	0.00	0.81±1.31
	25	0.00	0.78±1.56

Table 1b: Effects of cyproheptadine (Cyp) alone or in combination with lumefantrine (LM) against drug-sensitive Plasmodium berghei ANKA assessed in the 4-day Test. Results presented as percentage (%) parasite killing ± SD (standard deviation) of five mice per dose

Drug	Dose (mg/kg)	% chemo-suppression ± SE
Cyp	5	4.44±1.65
Cyp	2.5	5.32±4.12
LM	0.375	17.12±4.12
LM + Cyp	0.375 + 5	20.77±5.25
LM + Cyp	0.375 + 2.5	5.93±2.57

Table

Table 2: Lack of potentiation effects of cyproheptadine (Cyp), verapamil (Ver), and probenecid (Prob) in combination with PQ against PQ-resistant *Plasmodium berghei* ANKA assessed in the 4-day Test. Results presented as percentage (%) parasite killing ± SD (standard deviation) of five mice per dose

Drugs	Dose (mg/kg)	% chemo-suppression ± SE
PQ	75	8.39±3.85
Prob + PQ	400 + 75	0.00
	200 + 75	0.00
Ver + PQ	50 + 75	0.00
	25 + 75	0.00
Cyp + PQ	5.0 + 75	14.18±1.77
	2.5 + 75	8.71±3.85

Table

Table 3: Validation of the modeled 3D structures of the *Plasmodium berghei* ferredoxin NADP+ reductase (*PbFNR*) and *Plasmodium berghei* cysteine desulfurase (*PbSUFS*) proteins as determined using PROSA-web server.

Protein	Gene ID	Z-Score	score Averaged 3D-1D score > = 0.2 (%)	Residues in most favored regions (%)	Residues in additional allowed regions (%)	Residues in disallowed regions (%)
PbFNR	PBANKA_112210	-8.49	86.21	85.9	13.2	0.4
PbSUFS	PBANKA_061430	-8.67	75.11	82.2	14.1	1.6

Table

Fig 12: Interaction of Lumefantrine (LM) with the Ferredoxin NADP+ reductase (FNR) and Cysteine desulfurase (SUFS) (A) The crystallographic structure of (1) FNR and (2) SUFS in complex with LM as visualized using PyMOL. (B) 2D: (1) LM-FNR and (2) LM-SUFS interaction diagram with the oxygen atoms shown in red, nitrogen atoms shown in blue, while hydrogen bonds are shown as olive-green dotted parasites. The interaction plots were generated using LigPlot+.

Figure

LIGAND	PROTEIN				
	Ferredoxin NADP-reductase (FNR)			Cysteine desulfurase (SUFS)	
	Ligand mode		Binding affinity (kcal/mol)	Ligand mode		Binding affinity (kcal/mol)
Cyproheptadine	1		-7.8	1		-9.5
Verapamil	1		-6.3	1		-7.4
Probenecid	1		-7.1	1		-6.5
Lumefantrine	1		-7.9	1		-7.9

Fig 11: Ligand best docking modes with respective binding energies towards FNR and SUFS proteins. The binding geometries for docking of a single ligand with a single receptor as modeled using the Autodock Vina. The figure portrays low binding affinities for cyproheptadine and lumefantrine to the FNR and SUFS proteins.

Figure

Fig 5: Expression profiles of transporters and enzymes. **(A)** Drug transporters: *chloroquine resistance transporter (CRT), multidrug resistance protein (MDR1), multidrug resistance-associated protein 1 (MRP1),* **(B)** Plasmepsins*: Plasmepsin IV (PMIV), Plasmepsin IX (PMIX), Plasmepsin X (PMX) or phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (PI3K)* **(C)** Enzymes: *pantothenate kinase (PANK), ferredoxin NADP-reductase (FNR), cysteine desulfurase (SUFS),* as measured from cDNA amount derived from 5μg/μl of total RNA isolated from piperaquine resistant clones relative to their wild type drug-sensitive parental clones piperaquine sensitive (PQ^S). The differential expression from a mean of three independent experiments were significantly different for CRT ($p<0.001$), MDR1 ($p<0.0001$), MRP ($p<001$), PANK ($p<0.0001$), FNR ($p<001$), SUFS ($p<001$), PM4 ($p<001$), PM9 ($p<001$), PM10 and PI3K ($p<001$) after Student's t-test analysis with p-value set at 0.05.

Figure

Fig 4: Expression profiles of transporters and enzymes. **(A)** Drug transporters: *chloroquine resistance transporter (CRT), multidrug resistance protein (MDR1), multidrug resistance-associated protein 1 (MRP1),* **(B)** Plasmepsins: *Plasmepsin IV (PMIV), Plasmepsin IX (PMIX), Plasmepsin X (PMX) or phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (PI3K)* **(C)** Enzymes: *pantothenate kinase (PANK), ferredoxin NADP-reductase (FNR), cysteine desulfurase (SUFS),* as measured from cDNA amount derived from 5μg/μl of total RNA isolated from lumefantrine resistant parasites (LMR) relative to their wild type drug-sensitive parental clones lumefantrine sensitive (LMS). The differential expression from a mean of three independent experiments were significantly different for CRT ($p < 0.001$), MDR1 ($p < 0.0001$), MRP ($p < 001$), PANK ($p < 0.0001$), FNR ($p < 001$), SUFS ($p < 001$), PM4 ($p < 001$), PM9 ($p < 001$), PM10 and PI3K ($p < 001$) after Student's t-test analysis with p-value set at 0.05.

Figure

Fig 3: The **e**ffect of reversing agents (RA); probenecid (Prob), verapamil (Ver), or cyproheptadine (Cyp) on lumefantrine (LM) activity against piperaquine resistant *Plasmodium berghei* ANKA parasites (PQ^r) as assessed in the 4-day Test. The results are presented as percentage (%) drug killing of parasites in at least five mice per dose.

Figure

Fig 2: Effect of reversing agents (RA); probenecid (Prob), verapamil (Ver), or cyproheptadine (Cyp) on lumefantrine (LM) activity as assessed in the 4-day Test. **(A)** The effects of LM alone or in combination with the RA against lumefantrine resistant (LM^R) *Plasmodium berghei* ANKA **(B)** Lack of synergistic and additive effects of cyproheptadine in combination with LM against LM^R parasites. The results are presented as percentage (%) drug killing of parasites in at least five mice per dose.

Figure

1A

1B

Fig 1: Parasite killing potential of cyproheptadine as assessed in the standard 4-Day suppressive test. **(A)** The activity of cyproheptadine (CYP) and lumefantrine (LM) against the lumefantrine resistant (LM^R) and lumefantrine sensitive *Plasmodium berghei* ANKA parasites (LM^S). **(B)** The activity of cyproheptadine and piperaquine (PQ) against the piperaquine resistant (PQ^R) and piperaquine sensitive *Plasmodium berghei* ANKA parasites (PQ^S). The results are presented as percentage (%) drug killing of parasites in at least five mice per dose

Figure

Fig 10: The activity profile of LM alone or in combination with either cyproheptadine (Cyp), verapamil (Ver), and probenecid (Prob) against the transgenic parasites (PQ^R_SUFS_KD) relative to piperaquine resistant parasites (PQ^R) as assessed in the standard 4-Day test. The results are presented as percentage (%) drug killing of parasites from at least five mice per dose.

Figure

Fig 9: The activity profile of LM alone or in combination with either cyproheptadine (Cyp), verapamil (Ver), and probenecid (Prob) against the transgenic parasites (PQ^R_FNR_OE) relative to piperaquine-resistant parasites (PQ^R) as assessed in the standard 4-Day test. The results are presented as percentage (%) drug killing of parasites from at least five mice per dose.

Figure

Fig 8: The growth rates of transgenic parasites: Average growth rate profiles of $PQ^R\_SUFS\_KD$ or $PQ^R\_FNR\_OE$ relative to the drug-sensitive (PQ^S), and the piperaquine resistant parasites (PQ^R) as determined on day 3, day 4, and day 7 post parasite inoculation. The results are presented as the average percentage (%) parasitemia calculated on day 3, day 4, and day 7 in at least five mice.

Figure

Fig 6: PCR genotyping of the SUFS-knockdown (KD) and FNR over-expression (OE) parasites. **(A)** SUFS_KD, **(B)** FNR_OE, and the parent (PQR) control lines here referred to as WT. The PCR amplification used three sets of primer pairs; QCR2/GW2 to confirm the presence of the vector, GT/GW1, to verify the integration of the vector into the parasite genome and QCR1/QCR2 to confirm the modification of the specific genes. The QCR1, QCR2, and GT are vector-specific primers, while GW2 and GW1 primers are standard primers.

Figure

Fig 7: Expression profiles in ferredoxin NADP-reductase (FNR), cysteine desulfurase (SUFS) as measured from cDNA amount derived from 5μg/ul of total RNA isolated from transgenic parasites (PQ^R_FNR_OE and PQ^R_SUFS_KD) relative to the drug-resistant parent piperaquine resistant parasites (PQ^R). The differential expression from a mean of three independent experiments was significantly different for FNR ($p<0.001$), and SUFS ($p<0.0001$) after Student's t-test analysis with p-value set at 0.05.

Figure