1

Short linear motifs - Underexplored players driving *Toxoplasma*

***gondii* infection**

Jesús Alvarado Valverde[1,2,3*], Karine Lapouge[4], Arne Boergel[4], Kim Remans[4], Katja Luck[3*],

Toby J. Gibson[1*].

1 Structural and Computational Biology Unit, European Molecular Biology Laboratory,

Heidelberg 69117, Germany

2 Collaboration for a joint PhD degree between EMBL and Heidelberg University, Faculty of

Biosciences

3 Institute of Molecular Biology (IMB) gGmbH, 55128 Mainz, Germany

4 Protein Expression and Purification Core Facility, European Molecular Biology Laboratory,

Heidelberg 69117, Germany

* Correspondence should be addressed to j.alvarado@imb-mainz.de, k.luck@imb-mainz.de

or toby.gibson@embl.de

Abstract

Pathogens infect hosts by interacting with host proteins and exploiting their functions to their advantage. Short linear motifs, small functional regions within intrinsically disordered protein regions, are common mediators of host-pathogen protein interactions. While motifs have been more extensively studied in viruses and bacteria, the extent to which eukaryotic unicellular parasites use motifs during infection remains unexplored. *Toxoplasma gondii* is a widespread intracellular Apicomplexan parasite capable of infecting all warm-blooded animals and invading any of their nucleated cells. *Toxoplasma's* secreted proteins are key in interacting with host proteins during infection, making them potential sources for motifs. To highlight the role of motifs in *Toxoplasma gondii* infection, we curated 21 known motif instances in Toxoplasma proteins from the scientific literature. To identify more motifs in Toxoplasma secreted proteins, we developed a computational pipeline that annotates putative motif matches with structural and functional features. Through this approach, we identified a set of 24,291 motif matches in 295 secreted proteins. We highlight strategies for further prioritisation of likely functional motif matches by focusing on integrin motifs, degrons and TRAF6-binding motifs. We subjected four predicted TRAF6-binding motifs to experimental validation, supporting the predicted motifs in the Toxoplasma proteins RON10 and GRA15. Our motif predictions provide a valuable resource for generating hypotheses and designing experiments to study infection mechanisms. The characterisation of motifs in *Toxoplasma* will be key to understanding the molecular principles underlying its broad host range and more comprehensive Apicomplexan infection strategies.

Importance

Toxoplasma gondii is a widely distributed intracellular parasite that achieves a successful infection by interacting with different host cell proteins. Short linear motifs are small functional modules found in unstructured protein regions and recognised by folded protein domains. Given that unstructured protein regions are a common feature of Toxoplasma's proteins, we hypothesise that motifs play important roles during its infection cycle. Here, we highlight the role of motifs during the Toxoplasma host cell invasion cycle through a curated set of motif examples. Through a computational pipeline, we predict thousands of motifs in secreted proteins, outline strategies for working with these predictions and finally experimentally test proteins containing a motif involved in the innate immune response, successfully showing the binding of two motifs. Our work provides a resource for further motif testing in Toxoplasma proteins, aiming at understanding the molecular mechanisms of its infection strategies and its broad host range.

Introduction

Intracellular pathogens, such as viruses, bacteria or eukaryotic parasites, interact with host cell components throughout their infection cycles. These pathogens can attach to the host membrane, and when internalised, they can interact with the host cytoskeleton and organelles, as well as with its export and translation machinery (1–3). By interfering with host biological processes, pathogens modulate the host immune response, replicate and disperse. Pathogen proteins play a central role in these interactions. A common mode of protein binding that mediates host-pathogen protein-protein interactions (PPIs) consists of a folded domain, e.g. in host proteins, and short linear motifs (hereafter referred to as motifs) in pathogen proteins (2–4). Motifs are

usually between 3 and 10 amino acids long and occur in intrinsically disordered

regions of proteins (IDRs)(5,6). Motifs mediate protein interactions that primarily

participate in regulatory and cell signalling processes. Motifs define sites for post-

translational modifications, subcellular protein localisation, as well as substrate

recognition signals for enzymes such as E3 ligases, proteases, phosphatases, etc (5).

Motifs are unstructured in their unbound state and often adopt an alpha-helix or beta-

strand upon binding to partner proteins (6). Because only a few mutations are needed

to create a motif, they can evolve in much shorter evolutionary timescales compared

to folded protein regions (7). Thus, pathogens have evolved to exploit these host motifs

to infect their hosts, probably because motifs are short and easily emerge in proteins

(7), but also because of their many functional roles in cell signalling. Many instances

of host motif mimicry have been characterised for viruses and bacteria (2,3,8–11).

Although there have been some studies focusing on intracellular eukaryotic parasites

(12,13), the extent to which parasites use motifs is less understood. *Toxoplasma*

gondii, a member of the Apicomplexa phylum of unicellular parasites, has one of the

proteomes with higher levels of IDRs among Eukaryotes (14,15), making it a good

candidate to discover and characterise the role of motifs in its proteins during parasitic

infection.

Toxoplasma is a successful eukaryotic unicellular parasite, as it can infect any warm-

blooded animal and proliferate within any of its nucleated cells. It is estimated that a

third of the human population has been infected with Toxoplasma (16). Even though

most of the infections in humans are asymptomatic, immunocompromised individuals

and susceptible populations can develop different forms of Toxoplasmosis, from

influenza-like symptoms to severe phenotypes such as encephalitis, making

Toxoplasma a global health burden (16,17). *Toxoplasma's* definitive hosts are cats

and all members of the feline family, where it reproduces sexually in their gut to then

disseminate in the environment. In all other hosts, such as all mammals and birds,

Toxoplasma reproduces asexually in different cell types to multiply its numbers and

disseminate along the food chain (18). Having multiple hosts means that *Toxoplasma*

not only has the molecular tools to infect different host cells but also to deal with

diverse cell programmes and immune responses, to thrive in each of its hosts. Motifs

in Toxoplasma proteins might play important roles in mediating the adaptation to the

many different host environments this parasite encounters.

Once consumed by its host, *T. gondii* cell invasion cycles depend on the sequential

secretion of proteins contained in its specialised infection organelles: the micronemes,

rhoptries and dense granules (Fig. 1A). Microneme proteins, or MICs, are targeted to

the parasite cell surface and are involved in host recognition and attachment, while

rhoptry proteins, termed RONs and ROPs, are secreted into the host cytoplasm and

are involved in host invasion and niche establishment (Fig. 1B). During the invasion

process, a parasitophorous vacuole (PV) is created from the invagination of the host

cell membrane (19). From within this space, *Toxoplasma* creates a suitable

environment and continues to secrete proteins from membraneless organelles called

dense granules. These proteins, mostly known as GRAs, are secreted either into the

PV lumen, inserted into its membrane (PVM) or into the host cytoplasm and even into

the host nucleus, helping the parasite in modulating the host cell's regulatory

processes to proliferate (20). All these secreted proteins interact with host proteins

throughout the infection cycle, including host cell receptors, cytoskeletal proteins and

transcription factors (21,22). These host-parasite protein interactions are the subject

of continuous study, serve as a reference to study other Apicomplexans, and are

promising targets for the development of therapies. Knowledge about motifs in

Toxoplasma secreted proteins would increase our mechanistic understanding of

Toxoplasma infection strategies.

To identify motifs in *Toxoplasma gondii* proteins, we collected motif instances in *T.*

gondii from the literature, predicted occurrences of known motif types in its secreted

proteins through the development of an integrative discovery pipeline, and tested the

binding of predicted TRAF6 binding motifs *in vitro,* which might have relevance in the

regulation of innate immune response. The available motif predictions along with

annotations will motivate further functional studies in *Toxoplasma* and other

Apicomplexan parasites to understand mechanisms of infection and provide further

examples of motif repurposing among intracellular pathogens.

Results

Curation of known motifs in *Toxoplasma gondii* secreted proteins

We collected 21 experimentally validated motif instances from 11 Toxoplasma proteins

from the scientific literature that serve as a reference of the current motif knowledge

in *Toxoplasma gondii* (Table 1, Fig. 1). The Eukaryotic Linear Motif (ELM) resource is

a reference point for curated eukaryotic motifs from the scientific literature. Based on

motif sequence patterns, structures, binder information, and functional annotations,

curators define motif types and group motif types into broader motif classes (23). Two

of the Toxoplasma motif instances were previously annotated as substrate recognition

sites in ELM (DOC). Eleven motif instances were novel with respect to ELM content

and were added to known motif classes of scaffolding classes in ELM (LIG). The

remaining eight novel motif instances are similar but were not able to be directly

annotated to ELM. Those correspond to one scaffolding class (LIG) and to three

subcellular localisation classes (TRG in ELM). We did not annotate motif instances in

Toxoplasma secreted proteins reported as motifs of cleavage sites (CLV in ELM),

degradation signals (DEG in ELM) or sites for post-translational modifications (MOD

in ELM). As detailed below, the curated 21 motif instances function throughout parasite

invasion and establishment (Fig. 1).

Figure 1. Motif use and hijacking during the *Toxoplasma* infection process. *Toxoplasma*

gondii secretory organelles and infection cycle illustrating different host-pathogen interaction

contexts, known motif instances and their infection outcomes. Motif names are highlighted in

red, proteins from micronemes are highlighted in yellow, those from rhoptries in blue, and

those from dense granules in green.

Protein name	ToxoDB (UniProt)	Motif name (ELM ID)	Host protein (Domain name)	Instances	Ref.
Rhoptry proteins					
RON2	TGME49_300100 (B6KV60)	PxPxPR (LIG_SH3_CIN85_PxpxPR_1)	CIN85 or CD2AP (SH3)	1	(24)
RON4	TGME49_229010 (S8F0B5)	PxPxPR (LIG_SH3_CIN85_PxpxPR_1)	CIN85 or CD2AP (SH3)	3	(24)
		LYPxL (LIG_LYPXL_S_1)	Alix (V-shaped)	2	(24)
RON5	TGME49_311470 (S8ERS3)	PxPxPR (LIG_SH3_CIN85_PxpxPR_1)	CIN85 or CD2AP (SH3)	1	(24)
		PTAP (LIG_PTAP_UEV_1)	Tsg101 (UEV)	2	(24)
ROP1	TGME49_309590 (A0A125YP48)	FFAT (TRG_ER_FFAT_1 like)	VAP (MSP)	1	(30)
ROP16	TGME49_262730 (Q3YJR5)	NLS (TRG_NLS_MonoExtN_4)	Exportin (Arm)	1	(37)
Toxofilin	TGME49_214080 (S8G4J8)	Actin-binding motif (LIG_Actin_WH2_1 like)	Actin	1	(28)
Dense granule proteins					
GRA14	TGME49_239740 (B5TVE8)	LYPxL (LIG_LYPXL_S_1)	Alix (V-shaped)	1	(32)
		PTAP (LIG_PTAP_UEV_1)	Tsg101 (UEV)	1	(32)
GRA16	TGME49_208830 (Q1JSN3)	Similar to PEXEL (TRG_Pf-PMV_PEXEL_1)	-	1	(36)
		NLS (TRG_NLS_MonoExtN_4)	Exportin (Arm)	2	(35)
GRA24	TGME49_230180 (A0A125YG37)	KIM (DOC_MAPK_GRA24_9)	MAPK (Kinase)	2	(33)
MYR1	TGME49_254470 (S8GT06)	Similar to PEXEL (TRG_Pf-PMV_PEXEL_1)	-	1	(36)
VIP1	TgME49_233220 (S8F2E2)	FFAT (TRG_ER_FFAT_1 like)	VAP (MSP)	1	(31)

Table 1. Experimentally validated linear motif instances. Known *Toxoplasma* motif

instances from the literature and interacting host protein domains. Protein IDs correspond to

the ToxoDB and UniProt accessions, while motif IDs correspond to the ELM motif classes.

Rhoptry proteins RON2, RON4 and RON5 each contain PxpxPR motifs. During host

cell invasion, these motifs help the parasite connect its tight junction (TJ) complex to

the host cytoskeleton (24) (Fig. 1). The PxpxPR motifs bind to the SH3 domain of host

adaptor proteins CIN85 or CD2AP, which are involved in cytoskeletal rearrangements,

vesicle trafficking and endocytosis (25,26). Additionally, RON4 and RON5 contain

instances of the motif types LYPxL and PTAP. The LYPxL motif mediates the

interaction of proteins with ALIX, while the PTAP motif binds to the UEV domain of

class E vacuolar sorting protein TSG101. ALIX and TSG101 are both key components

of the ESCRT membrane remodelling system, and during *Toxoplasma* cell invasion,

they are also recruited to the TJ for an efficient cell entry (24,27). This process is also

aided by parasite proteins such as Toxifilin, which binds to host actin through an actin-

binding motif (ABM) that is similar in sequence pattern to the annotated WH2-binding

motif in ELM (28). Toxofilin sequesters actin and promotes the disassembly of the host

cortical actin meshwork, facilitating an efficient internalisation (29).

Once *Toxoplasma* is established within the host cell, ROP1 and dense granule

proteins, VIP1 and GRA14 are secreted to the parasitophorous vacuole membrane

(PVM) (Fig. 1). ROP1 and VIP1 both contain FFAT motifs (similar in sequence motif

pattern to the FFAT motif type in ELM) that modulate the targeting of proteins to the

endoplasmic reticulum via its interaction with Vesicle Associated Membrane Protein

(VAMP) Associated Proteins (VAPs). As ROP1 and VIP1 are inserted in the PVM,

their interaction with VAP proteins leads to the association of the PVM with the host

ER membrane. Toxoplasma exploits this proximity to sequester the lipids necessary

for its vacuole and plasma membrane biogenesis (30,31). GRA14 harbours both

LYPxL and PTAP motifs in its C-terminal region. Since GRA14 is also inserted into the

PVM with its C-terminus facing the host cytosol, the motifs can recruit ALIX and

TSG101, which, in this case and differently from TJ proteins, help *Toxoplasma*

sequester host cytosolic material through the budding of its PVM (32).

Further, during establishment, more parasite proteins are secreted into the host

cytosol and may then be transported to the host nucleus. Within the host cytosol,

secreted proteins interact with host proteins via motifs. The intrinsically disordered

protein GRA24 contains two instances of a motif that binds to mitogen-activated

protein kinase p38α (MAPK14). These motifs allow GRA24 to bind to a MAPK14

dimer, forming a stable complex that leads to the expression of proinflammatory

factors, which in turn modulate parasite replication (33,34). Parasite protein export is

achieved by the presence of cell compartment localisation motifs, which either use the

parasite or host machinery to be secreted. In the first case, the correct export of dense

granule protein MYR1 to the PV and of GRA16 to the cytosol is dependent on the

cleavage of a short linear motif by a parasite aspartyl protease, in a similar way as the

Plasmodium PEXEL export motif (35,36). In the case of host nuclear targeting,

GRA16, as well as rhoptry protein kinase ROP16, are imported into the host nucleus

via nuclear localisation signals (NLS). ROP16 activates signal transducer and activator

of transcription (STAT) signalling pathways to inhibit host cell death and modulate the

production of interleukins (37,38). Within the nucleus, GRA16 regulates genes

involved in cell cycle progression (35). This set of curated motif instances provides a

non-exhaustive reference and exemplifies their role during important stages of the

Toxoplasma invasion cycle. Nevertheless, the small number of known motifs as well

as their occurrence in a few proteins, highlight the need and potential to find and

characterise many more motif instances to facilitate further mechanistic studies of

Toxoplasma infection strategies.

Prediction of motif instances in *Toxoplasma* secreted proteins

To identify novel motif instances that function in the Toxoplasma infection process via

interaction with host proteins, we focused on *Toxoplasma gondii* proteins from the

strain ME49 that are secreted into host cells. To determine the subcellular localisation

of secreted proteins, we used the dataset from the hyperLOPIT experiment (39) and

annotations from the ToxoDB, a database from the VEuPathDB resource, the

reference database for the research of eukaryotic pathogens (protists and fungi), their

hosts and invertebrate vectors (40). The secreted proteins were subsequently filtered

for those with evidence of expression using mass spectrometry datasets from the

ToxoDB. To predict motif instances in these 314 secreted proteins, we developed a

computational pipeline based on sequence pattern searches as well as structural and

functional annotations of predicted motifs (Fig. 2). To find putative motif instances, we

used regular expressions defined for annotated motif classes in the ELM database,

which capture the preferences for certain amino acids at certain motif positions. We

scanned the selected proteins with 298 regular expressions corresponding to motif

classes with interacting domains that could be present either in Toxoplasma or in the

host using the taxonomic range annotations provided by the ELM resource. This motif

search resulted in a total of 68,066 motif matches in 309 proteins. Since motifs occur

primarily in IDRs and need to be accessible for binding to the partner proteins, we

deployed structural annotations to further restrict to more likely functional motif

matches. To this end, we evaluated the location of the motif match in IDRs using the

software IUPRed3(41). In addition, in cases where a full-length structural model of a

given protein was available from the EBI AlphaFold database (42), we evaluated motif

accessibility through low pLDDT values and high relative solvent accessibility (RSA).

In cases where a structural model was not available, we excluded motif matches that

fell within annotated folded domain boundaries as annotated in UniProt (43) (Fig. 2).

Using this framework, we obtained a set of 24,291 motif matches within 295 proteins

from micronemes, rhoptries and dense granules (Fig. 2, Fig. 3A) (Table S1).

Figure 2 - Motif prediction pipeline. Diagram outlining the protein and motif model selection

for motif prediction, as well as motif accessibility filtering criteria.

Our computational pipeline captured 16 of the 21 known motif instances within our

retained motif matches. Two PTAP motifs in RON5 were missed because they have

low protein IDR scores. The FFAT motifs in ROP1 and VIP1, and the actin-binding

motif in Toxofilin were not captured because their sequences did not match any ELM

regular expression. These last two examples highlight that current annotated motif

types in the ELM resource do not fully capture the diversity of motifs in *Toxoplasma*

proteins. Our curated motif instances could thus be used to reevaluate and extend

ELM motif type annotations. When further analysing the curated motif instances here,

we found a previously unreported PxpxPR motif in the N-terminal region of RON4 as

well as two SxIP motifs. SxIP motifs modulate the binding to microtubule plus-end

tracking proteins (+TIPs), which have an important role in chromosome segregation,

cell signalling and organelle trafficking (36). SxIP motifs are already known to be

exploited by the Apicomplexan parasite *Theileria* (13). RON8, which, together with

RON2, RON4, and RON5, forms part of the TJ (22), also contained matches of the

SxIP and LYPxL motifs. The presence of extra motif matches related to host

cytoskeleton in TJ proteins indicates that the current model of motif-hijacking during

this stage of host cell invasion is still incomplete and will benefit from our motif

predictions. Furthermore, the identification of 4,822 strong motif matches in our

dataset from 66 proteins annotated as "hypothetical" in ToxoDB and with expression

evidence (Fig. 3B) represents a potential venue to explore, assign and understand

their function.

Figure 3 - Matches in secreted proteins. A. Number of filtered motif matches from secreted

proteins across different motif categories. **B**. Split of proteins with filtered matches according

to their annotation. **C**. Split of filtered phospho-motifs according to whether they have

phosphorylation evidence. **D**. Additional motif filtering strategies according to motif type

functions and properties.

On average, our pipeline obtained 82 retained motifs per secreted protein: 59 in

micronemes, 77 in rhoptries and 97 in dense granules (Fig. 3A). While proteins,

especially those with longer IDRs such as dense granule proteins (Fig. S1A), are

expected to have multiple motif occurrences, the relatively high number of predicted

motif instances still points to some of those being likely non-functional. Most of the

motif matches come from motif types that denote sites for PTMs such as

phosphorylation (Fig. 3A). This most likely results from very degenerate regular

expressions available for motif types from the PTM class, such as …[ST]...[ST]

defining sites phosphorylated by GSK kinase. In regular expressions, a "." corresponds

to any amino acid possible at this position and amino acids in brackets denote possible

amino acids at this position in the motif. More than 2,000 motif matches alone were

identified with this GSK kinase phosphorylation motif pattern. Phosphoproteomics data

can be used to provide evidence for actual modification of these predicted motifs (45).

Using available phosphosite datasets from ToxoDB, we found evidence of

phosphorylation for ~6% of predicted phosphorylation sites (Fig. 3C-D), assigning

higher confidence to these predicted motifs (Table S1). We generally observe that for

most motif classes, motif matches were identified only for a fraction of annotated motif

types in ELM. For example, 38% of motif matches from the targeting class (TRG)

correspond to diArg motifs, 35% of motif matches from the degradation class (DEG)

correspond to SPOP degrons (see below), and 18% of scaffolding motifs bind SH3

domains (Fig. S1B).

To further select for more likely functional motif matches, one can take into account

functional aspects of the different motif types and the cellular context of secreted

proteins (Fig. 3D). For example, as microneme proteins will be present in extracellular

environments, motifs known to interact with domains from extracellular proteins would

be expected to have more likely functional relevance. In our dataset (Table S1), we

found 401 motif matches from 12 motif extracellular types in 48 microneme proteins

that could be relevant during the recognition and attachment stages. Integrin binding

is a common strategy for pathogens to attach to the host cell membrane (46–48). The

most common integrin-binding motif is the RGD motif, which can bind to eight of the

different alpha and beta integrin heterodimers (49). Within our dataset, we found three

motif matches of the RGD motif in three microneme proteins: MIC17C, Toxolysin 4

(TLN4) and chitinase-like protein CLP1. As some microneme proteins might be

localised to the host cytosol, e.g. during host cell lysis and egress (50), we did not filter

out matches from other cytosolic motif types in microneme proteins. Degradation

signals, or degrons, are motifs recognised by E3 ubiquitin ligases and mark proteins

for proteasomal degradation (51). Degrons might be relevant motif candidates for

Toxoplasma infection, as other pathogens are known to modify protein levels via

degrons to achieve outcomes such as the stabilisation of host components necessary

for their survival (2) or modulating the activity of their proteins once inside the host

(52). We found 475 degrons in 182 secreted proteins: 73 in micronemes, 157 in

rhoptries and 245 in dense granule proteins. Speckle-type POZ protein (SPOP), an

E3 ubiquitin ligase, recognises its substrates via an ST-rich degron (53). We found

155 SPOP degron matches in 80 secreted proteins. Since multivalency is a known

mechanism by which SPOP substrates enhance their affinity to SPOP (53), one could

prioritise the 34 secreted proteins containing two or more SPOP motif matches in our

dataset. Rhoptry protein toxolysin 1 (TLN1), a metalloprotease with a role in rhoptry

maturation (54), but potentially detrimental for host establishment once secreted into

the host cytosol, has 10 identical SPOP degron matches, which could be used to

modulate TLN1 levels once within the host cytoplasm. Overall, these examples

illustrate how our dataset can be further explored to prioritise motif candidates for

experimental characterisation.

Experimental validation of predicted TRAF6-binding motifs

For the experimental validation of predicted motifs, we focused on motifs that bind the

tumour necrosis factor (TNF) receptor-associated factor 6 (TRAF6) protein. TRAF6

binds to proteins containing a P.E..[DE(Φ)] motif through its C-terminal MATH domain

(Φ denotes hydrophobic residues). TRAF6 plays important roles in immunity and

development by contributing to the formation of various signalling protein complexes.

During the innate immune response, TRAF6 is activated by interleukin 1 receptor (IL-

1R), linking this receptor to the canonical activation of the transcription factor NF-κB

(55). Through the addition of K63-linked polyubiquitin chains, TRAF6 primes proteins

for complex assembly and not for proteasomal degradation. The TRAF6-binding motif

is present in proteins such as IL-1R, Tumour necrosis factor protein CD40, and

Mitochondrial antiviral-signalling protein (MAVS) (56). In the context of infection,

herpesviruses have been shown to use the TRAF6 motif-containing protein Tio to

stimulate NF-κB activation (57).

Among our predicted motif instances, we found 111 motif matches in 68 rhoptry and

dense granule proteins. Given that the TRAF6-binding motif is known to appear

multiple times within proteins (58), we hypothesised that the motif repetitions could

interact with the TRAF6 trimer in a multivalent way. Following this criterion, we

selected rhoptry neck protein RON6, which harbours 17 matches of the TRAF6-

binding motif, most of them being identical repeats, and RON10, which harbours two

different TRAF6-binding motif matches (Fig. 4A). RON10 is known to interact with

RON9, but RON10 and RON9 do not have clear roles during infection (59). TRAF6

has been shown previously to interact with the dense granule proteins GRA7 and

GRA15, which themselves play a role in modulating the innate immune response

during *Toxoplasma* infection (60–63). However, the actual interaction interfaces of

GRA7 and GRA15 with TRAF6 have not been described (22), making the TRAF6 motif

matches in GRA7 and GRA15 interesting candidates for further experimental

characterisation (Fig. 4A).

We proceeded to determine the dissociation constants of the TRAF6-binding motifs in

RON6, RON10, GRA7 and GRA15 to the TRAF6 MATH domain using the microscale

thermophoresis (MST) binding assay. To this end, we expressed and purified the

human TRAF6 MATH domain and ordered peptides containing the sequence of the

following motif matches. In the case of RON6, we selected the most frequent version

of its motif repeats. For RON10, we selected the second motif match that contained

multiple negative charges, which might contribute to binding (Fig. 4B). GRA7 and

GRA15 only have one TRAF6-binding motif match each, which was selected for

experimental testing. In addition, we ordered these wildtype peptide sequences with a

Glutamate to Serine mutation at position 3 in the motifs supposed to weaken or

abrogate binding to the MATH domain because the conserved glutamate residue forms a hydrogen bond with backbone atoms of residue A458 in TRAF6 (Fig. 4B) (Table S2). Our experimental results confirm that the peptides containing the motifs from RON10 and GRA15 can bind to the TRAF6 MATH domain, and these interactions were lost when testing the mutant peptide versions. The dissociation constants for the RON10 (Kd 18.2 ±1.46 µM) and GRA15 peptides (Kd 26.9 ±1.43 µM) are as expected, for functional motif interactions, in the lower micromolar range (Fig. 4C-D, Data S1, Table S2). These results represent the first evidence that RON10 can bind TRAF6, pointing to a role of RON10 in the regulation of the innate immune response.

Figure 4 - TRAF6 motif binding assays. A. Protein diagrams of RON6, RON10, GRA7 and GRA15 indicating the position of their TRAF6-binding motifs with accompanying multiple sequence alignment showing their presence in different Toxoplasma strains and Coccidian

species. **B.** AlphaFold model of TRAF6 MATH domain with TRAF6-binding motif from RON10.

Right panels display the potential hydrogen bond network at the interaction interface (top) and

secondary structure adopted by the TRAF6-binding motif (bottom). **C.** RON10 TRAF6 motif

testing. MST traces (top graph) and dose-response curves (bottom panel) of TRAF6 MATH

domain binding to RON10 TRAF6 motif containing peptide (left) and the E>S mutant (right).

In the MST traces, the cold region is set at 0 s (blue) and the hot detection region at 5 s (red).

D. Same as in A, but for the GRA15 TRAF6 motif and the E>S motif mutant.

Discussion

It has been previously speculated that *Toxoplasma* induces NF-kB activation and

macrophage recruitment to limit tissue invasion, assuring host survival and promoting

development into the chronic bradyzoite form (50). The experimentally confirmed

TRAF6-binding motifs in RON10 and GRA15 might support this process by connecting

TRAF6-dependent IL-1 signalling with NF-kB activation. However, proving the

functional relevance of these motifs would require further experimentation. Even

though the RON6 peptide did not show binding to the TRAF6 MATH domain, it might

still display binding in cells via multivalent interactions involving its 17 putative TRAF6-

binding motif matches and TRAF6 trimers.

Our filtered dataset of 24,291 motif matches within 295 Toxoplasma proteins still likely

contains many non-functional motif matches. More sophisticated computational

approaches for match filtering would require machine learning on larger sets of

validated motif instances, which, at the moment, are not available for *Toxoplasma* and

other parasites. Conservation of motif matches is often used as an additional line of

evidence for the prioritisation of likely functional motif matches. Unfortunately,

Toxoplasma secreted proteins tend to be more novel, less conserved overall and

display longer regions of disorder (Fig. S1A) (59). This makes it difficult to build good

sequence alignments to compute common motif conservation metrics like in (65).

Nevertheless, we included the assessment of the presence of our motif matches in

different *Toxoplasma* strains and the few closely related parasite species as

supplementary conservation metrics (Table S1), which could be useful when working

with different strains or in understanding motif variation and evolution.

This study represents the first comprehensive survey of short linear motifs in

Toxoplasma gondii or any other Apicomplexan parasite. There have been other efforts

to predict and validate short linear motifs in pathogenic proteins (32,66). However,

they focus on only a subset of proteins or specific motifs, or other pathogens such as

viruses (61). Identification of novel motif instances in parasites such as Toxoplasma

also enables refinement of current motif type annotations, as highlighted by some

examples described in this study.

Our systematic approach for predicting instances of known motif types in Toxoplasma

secreted proteins indicates that there might be a substantial number of motifs in

Toxoplasma to be characterised, also in non-secreted proteins, e.g. motifs that

participate in endogenous processes for parasite motility, cytoskeletal

rearrangements, and parasite development. Thus, this dataset represents a valuable

resource for hypothesis generation and design of downstream experiments to study

molecular mechanisms of *Toxoplasma gondii* infection and biology. Structural models

of predicted domain-motif interactions could further be used to design disruptive

mutations to validated predicted modes of binding (4). Identified and experimentally

validated pathogen-host motif-domain interactions can form the basis for the

development of therapeutic strategies aimed at perturbing these interactions and thereby interfering with infection processes (4,10). Motif discovery in pathogens remains a much unexplored area of research, but holds great promise for improved understanding of infection mechanisms and the better design of effective treatments for parasite infection.

Acknowledgements

We are thankful to members of the Gibson team for discussions at various stages of this work. We also express our gratitude to the curators and contributors of the ELM and the ToxoDB resources. This project was partly funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 449991970 granted to K.Lu.

Author contributions

J.A.V., T.G. conceptualised the study, J.A.V. produced code and performed computational analyses, K.R., K.La., A.B. performed experiments, J.A.V. wrote the manuscript. J.A.V., T.G., K.R., K.La., K.Lu. edited the manuscript, T.G. and K.Lu. provided funding.

Data and Code Availability

The motif discovery pipeline, processing and analysis code is made available on GitHub.(https://github.com/JesnsAV/Toxo_Motifs)

Materials and Methods

Retrieval of sequence, structure and motif data

Toxoplasma strain proteomes, as well as those of five closely related organisms from the Sarcocystidae clade, were retrieved from the ToxoDB resource (40). The fasta files of the annotated proteomes were collected for the following organisms: *Toxoplasma gondii* GT1 (Type I), *T. gondii* MAS and *T. gondii* ME49 (Type II and reference strain), *T. gondii* RUB and *T. gondii* VEG (Type III), *T. gondii* VAND, *Hammondia hammondii, Neospora caninum, Besnoitia besnoitii, Cystoisospora suis* Wien I and *Sarcosystis neurona* SN3. Using the ToxoDB search strategies, we retrieved mass spectrometry proteomic peptide mapping data, phosphosites, and cellular location predictions from the HyperLOPIT experiment (39) for the proteins of *T. gondii* ME49. All available AlphaFold database (AFDB) (67) predicted structures for *Toxoplasma gondii* ME49 were retrieved from the Google Cloud Console public-datasets-deepmind-alphafold-v4, taxonomy id: 50877 (02.05.2025). The latest dataset of motif classes was downloaded from the ELM resource (30.04.2025) (23). The file contained each motif code name, its regular expression (REGEX) and supplementary information. We did manual annotation of the motif classes to determine if their taxonomic range included vertebrates and *Toxoplasma*, i.e. if the domain was annotated in ELM to be present in the respective organism for interaction with the motif, ultimately excluding motif classes of organisms such as plants, insects and fungi. We also added a manual annotation on whether the motif is functional in an extracellular context and if it requires a phosphorylation or modification to interact with its domain partner. We retrieved available T. gondii domain mappings from UniProt (29.07.2025) (43), which came from Pfam, PROSITE and SMART.

Motif prediction and structural assessments

We determined the presence of motif matches in the *T. gondii* ME49 by doing a

baseline REGEX search. To assess the accessibility of these motif predictions, two

approaches were selected: one that takes into account the intrinsic disorder of the

sequence and another that evaluates the accessibility of the motif from predicted

AlphaFold DB (AFDB) structures. The IUPred3 software (41) was used to calculate

the disorder probability of the full proteome of *T. gondii* ME49. Once a REGEX match

was determined, the IUPred3 score from all motif residues was retrieved and

averaged. Complementarily, using available AFDB structures, we took the pLDDT

scores from all motif residues and averaged them (68). We calculated residue

accessibility using DSSP (Dictionary of Secondary Structure of Proteins) software (69)

on each AFDB structure. The individual residue scores were then standardised

according to (70) to obtain relative surface accessibility scores (RSA). We then took

the RSA scores of all motif residues and averaged them. We determined if a motif

match overlapped with known domain boundaries from UniProt by using positional

information.

Motif organism presence assessment

A reciprocal best hit search was carried out using BLAST to construct sets of

orthologous sequence groups among *Toxoplasma* strains and related species. These

sequence groups contained the sequences with the lowest e-value from each

organism's proteome, so alignments contained a standard number of sequences and

were easily comparable. Multiple sequence alignments were produced for each

sequence group using ClustalO with default parameters (71). Standard conservation

measurements (65) were not possible as our alignments contained only a few species.

Thus, the conservation of the motifs was approximated by carrying out a presence

assessment. A motif was considered present in another organism if a match of the

same class was present in its sequence within a window of 15 amino acids in the

alignment around the start site of the motif match of the reference *Toxoplasma* strain

ME49. And then the presence proportion of the total number of both strains and

species was calculated and associated with each motif match, resulting in three

different scores: the proportion of strains, species and overall organisms.

Data enrichment and filtering

The data from the ELM REGEX motifs matches, their conservation, IUPred3, pLDDT,

and accessibility scores were combined into a single table together with their

respective protein information on subcellular location, annotations, domain overlap,

and modifications. This was carried out using their unique ToxoDB identifiers and the

motif name, match number and residue positions. Data filtering to define a set of motif

matches was carried out with three different strategies. Firstly, we retained motifs from

proteins with at least one peptide mapped to them from retrieved mass spectrometry

data, to make sure proteins were expressed. We then made use of the ELM taxonomy

range by ensuring that the taxonomic range of the motif instance, if the motif has been

reported in a certain group of organisms, was valid for the *Toxoplasma* matches. Only

motif classes that apply to Vertebrates and Apicomplexans were kept, mainly

excluding those characterised in plants, insects or fungi. The classes valid in

Vertebrates were kept if the motifs were located in secreted proteins, as they would

be in contact with the vertebrate host (human, a mammal or birds) cell components.

The classes only valid in extracellular contexts were kept if the motifs were located in

microneme proteins, as among secreted proteins, they would be the ones in this

location. We applied structural filters in two steps; only motif matches with IUPred3

scores above 0.4 were considered, following disordered region filters in (72).

Secondly, for motifs in proteins with available AFDB structures, we retained the ones

with a pLDDT<=80 (68) and an average RSA>= 0.25 (73). For motifs without AFDB

structures, we retained only the ones outside of known domain boundaries.

AlphaFold modelling

The TRAF6 MATH domain and the RON10 TRAF6-binding motif were selected for

structural modelling. We used a local installation of AlphaFold Multimer version

2.3.219 (74). We manually defined domain boundaries to include missing secondary

structure with high pLDDT values. We extended the motif sequence by including 5

residues at each sequence end. Structural model visualisations were produced using

ChimeraX-1.10 (75).

The local installation of AlphaFold Multimer version 2.3.2 was run using the following

parameters and following Alphafold GitHub instructions

(https://github.com/deepmind/alphafold#running-alphafold):

--model_preset=multimer \

--db_preset=full_dbs \

--max_template_date=2020-05-14 \

--num_multimer_predictions_per_model=1 \

--use_gpu_relax=True \

--

bfd_database_path=/mnt/storage/alphafold/v232/bfd/bfd_metaclust_clu_complete_id

30_c90_final_seq.sorted_opt \

--

mgnify_database_path=/mnt/storage/alphafold/v232/mgnify/mgy_clusters_2022_05.f

a \

--obsolete_pdbs_path=/mnt/storage/alphafold/v232/pdb_mmcif/obsolete.dat \

--

pdb_seqres_database_path=/mnt/storage/alphafold/v232/pdb_seqres/pdb_seqres.tx

t \

--template_mmcif_dir=/mnt/storage/alphafold/v232/pdb_mmcif/mmcif_files \

--uniprot_database_path=/mnt/storage/alphafold/v232/uniprot/uniprot.fasta \

--uniref90_database_path=/mnt/storage/alphafold/v232/uniref90/uniref90.fasta \

--uniref30_database_path=/mnt/storage/alphafold/v232/uniref30/UniRef30_2021_03

\

--use_precomputed_msas=True

Protein Expression and Purification

A gene encoding the human TRAF6 C-domain (residues 346-504, UniProt ID

Q9Y4K3) was synthesised (GeneArt, Thermo Fisher Scientific) and subcloned into the

pCoofy4 plasmid (76) containing an N-terminal His6-MBP-3C fusion tag. For the

human TRAF6 C-domain (InterPro: IPR008974) gene, the native DNA sequence was

used. The resulting bacterial expression construct was freshly transformed into *E. coli*

BL21(DE3) codon + RIL cells (Stratagene). Precultures were grown overnight at 37°C

in LB medium supplemented with 30 µg/ml Kanamycin and 35 µg/ml Chloramphenicol

and used to inoculate the large-scale expression cultures. 10 ml preculture was added

to 1 litre of TB-FB medium supplemented with 30 µg/ml Kanamycin and 35 µg/ml

Chloramphenicol. The cultures were grown at 37°C until the OD600 reached ~0.8,

after which the temperature was reduced to 18°C and expression of the hTRAF6 C-

domain was induced with 0.5 mM IPTG. After overnight expression at 18°C, the

cultures were harvested by centrifugation (30 min, 5000 g, 4°C), and the pellets were

flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C until the start of the protein

purification.

The cells were lysed by 5 passages through a microfluidiser device, followed by

centrifugation (30 min, 140.000 g, 4°C). The cleared lysate was loaded onto a 5 ml

Protino Ni-NTA column (Macherey-Nagel) pre-equilibrated with 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH

8.0, 500 mM NaCl and 20 mM imidazole. After loading, the Ni-NTA column was

washed with equilibration buffer until the A280 nm signal returned to baseline and

eluted in a 60 ml gradient going from 0 to 100% of Ni-NTA elution buffer (50 mM Tris-

HCl, pH 8.0, 500 mM NaCl, 350 mM imidazole). The Ni-NTA elution fractions were

analysed by SDS-PAGE, and the fractions containing the His6-MBP-3C-hTRAF6 C-

domain fusion protein were pooled. 2 mg of His6-tagged HRV 3C protease was added,

and the sample was dialysed overnight at 4°C to IEX buffer (25 mM HEPES, pH 7.5,

100 mM NaCl, 20 mM imidazole). The next day, the dialysed sample was loaded onto

a 5 ml Protino Ni-NTA column (Macherey-Nagel) coupled to a 5 ml HiTrap Q HP anion

exchange column (Cytiva), both equilibrated with IEX buffer. The untagged hTRAF6

C-domain protein was present in the flow-through of the coupled columns, which was

concentrated to 5 ml and injected into a HiLoad 16/600 Superdex 75 pg size exclusion

chromatography column (Cytiva) pre-equilibrated with 25 mM HEPES pH 7.5, 150 mM

NaCl and 1 mM DTT. The elution fractions containing pure hTRAF6 C-domain protein

were pooled and concentrated to 2.1 mg/ml (111 µM). The final hTRAF6 C-domain

protein samples were aliquoted, flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C until

further usage. The identity of the hTRAF6 C-domain protein was verified by mass

spectrometry (EMBL Proteomics Core Facility), and the oligomerisation state

(monomeric) and absence of aggregates were confirmed by size exclusion

chromatography column coupled to multi-angle light scattering (SEC-MALS). The

stability of the hTRAF6 C-domain protein in the storage buffer was assessed by nano-

Differential Scanning Fluorimetry (nano-DSF; Tm ~ 46.8 °C).

Binding assays

We selected 4 motifs from 4 different *Toxoplasma* proteins with different AF model

scores for carrying out binding assays as described in Results, together with the

human MAVS TRAF6 motif, being selected as a control (56). Peptides of 15 amino

acids containing the motifs were defined, as well as versions containing E>S point

mutations at motif position +3. The peptides were labelled with 5-Carboxyfluorescein

(5-Fluo) at the C-terminus by Biosyntan GmbH (https://www.biosyntan.de) to carry out

Microscale thermophoresis (MST). The lyophilised peptides were resuspended in

25mM HEPES, pH 7.5 and 150mM NaCl to a concentration of 2mM, and the pH was

adjusted to 7.5 when necessary. MST measurements were performed using a

Monolith NT.115 (NanoTemper Technology). Two-fold serial dilutions of the hTRAF6

protein (99 µM) were mixed in a 1:1 ratio with 100nM peptides. Titration measurements

were taken for all *Toxoplasma* peptides, and the human MAVS control, with two-fold

serial dilutions of the hTRAF6 protein (99 µM) mixed in a 9:1 ratio with 500nM. All

measurements were performed in triplicate and carried out at 25°C with an LED

excitation power of 20% and a medium MST power. Finally, the data were analysed

assuming a 1:1 binding model and graphed using the MO.Affinity Software

(NanoTemper Technology).

References

1. Omotade TO, Roy CR. Manipulation of Host Cell Organelles by Intracellular Pathogens. Cossart P, Roy CR, Sansonetti P, editors. Microbiol Spectr. 2019 Apr 12;7(2):7.2.37.

2. Davey NE, Travé G, Gibson TJ. How viruses hijack cell regulation. Trends Biochem Sci. 2011 Mar;36(3):159–69.

3. Sámano-Sánchez H, Gibson TJ. Mimicry of Short Linear Motifs by Bacterial Pathogens: A Drugging Opportunity. Trends Biochem Sci. 2020 Jun;45(6):526–44.

4. Baptista D, Gomez-Lucas L, Jänes J, Krogan NJ, Amorim MJ, Ivarsson Y, et al. AlphaFold models of host-pathogen interactions elucidate the prevalence and structural modes of molecular mimicry [Internet]. Bioinformatics; 2025 [cited 2025 Aug 8]. Available from: http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2025.06.04.657796

5. Davey NE, Van Roey K, Weatheritt RJ, Toedt G, Uyar B, Altenberg B, et al. Attributes of short linear motifs. Mol Biosyst. 2012 Jan;8(1):268–81.

6. Van Roey K, Uyar B, Weatheritt RJ, Dinkel H, Seiler M, Budd A, et al. Short linear motifs: ubiquitous and functionally diverse protein interaction modules directing cell regulation. Chem Rev. 2014 Jul 9;114(13):6733–78.

7. Davey NE, Cyert MS, Moses AM. Short linear motifs – ex nihilo evolution of protein regulation. Cell Commun Signal. 2015 Dec;13(1):43.

8. Mészáros B, Sámano-Sánchez H, Alvarado-Valverde J, Čalyševa J, Martínez-Pérez E, Alves R, et al. Short linear motif candidates in the cell entry system used by SARS-CoV-2 and their potential therapeutic implications. Sci Signal. 2021 Jan 12;14(665):eabd0334.

9. Mihalič F, Simonetti L, Giudice G, Sander MR, Lindqvist R, Peters MBA, et al. Large-scale phage-based screening reveals extensive pan-viral mimicry of host short linear motifs. Nat Commun. 2023 Apr 26;14(1):2409.

10. Simonetti L, Nilsson J, McInerney G, Ivarsson Y, Davey NE. SLiM-binding pockets: an

attractive target for broad-spectrum antivirals. Trends Biochem Sci. 2023 May;48(5):420–

7.

11. Giménez A, Del Giudice MG, López PV, Guaimas F, Sámano-Sánchez H, Gibson TJ, et

al. *Brucella* NpeA is a secreted Type IV effector containing an N-WASP-binding short

linear motif that promotes niche formation. Roy CR, editor. mBio. 2024 Jul

17;15(7):e00726-24.

12. Boddey JA, Moritz RL, Simpson RJ, Cowman AF. Role of the *Plasmodium* Export Element

in Trafficking Parasite Proteins to the Infected Erythrocyte. Traffic. 2009 Mar;10(3):285–

99.

13. Huber S, Karagenc T, Ritler D, Rottenberg S, Woods K. Identification and characterisation

of a *Theileria annulata* proline-rich microtubule and SH3 domain-interacting protein

(TaMISHIP) that forms a complex with CLASP1, EB1, and CD2AP at the schizont surface.

Cell Microbiol. 2018 Jul;20(7):e12838.

14. Mohan A, Sullivan Jr WJ, Radivojac P, Dunker AK, Uversky VN. Intrinsic disorder in

pathogenic and non-pathogenic microbes: discovering and analyzing the unfoldomes of

early-branching eukaryotes. Mol Biosyst. 2008;4(4):328.

15. Pancsa R, Tompa P. Structural Disorder in Eukaryotes. Buday L, editor. PLoS ONE. 2012

Apr 5;7(4):e34687.

16. De Barros RAM, Torrecilhas AC, Marciano MAM, Mazuz ML, Pereira-Chioccola VL, Fux

B. Toxoplasmosis in Human and Animals Around the World. Diagnosis and Perspectives

in the One Health Approach. Acta Trop. 2022 Jul;231:106432.

17. Milne G, Webster JP, Walker M. Toxoplasma gondii: An Underestimated Threat? Trends

Parasitol. 2020 Dec;36(12):959–69.

18. Dubey JP. Toxoplasmosis of Animals and Humans [Internet]. 3rd ed. Boca Raton: CRC

Press; 2021 [cited 2025 Aug 8]. Available from:

https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781003199373

19. Boothroyd JC, Dubremetz JF. Kiss and spit: the dual roles of Toxoplasma rhoptries. Nat

Rev Microbiol. 2008 Jan;6(1):79–88.

20. Rastogi S, Cygan AM, Boothroyd JC. Translocation of effector proteins into host cells by

Toxoplasma gondii. Curr Opin Microbiol. 2019 Dec;52:130–8.

21. Kemp LE, Yamamoto M, Soldati-Favre D. Subversion of host cellular functions by the

apicomplexan parasites. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2013 Jul;37(4):607–31.

22. Hakimi MA, Olias P, Sibley LD. *Toxoplasma* Effectors Targeting Host Signaling and

Transcription. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2017 Jul;30(3):615–45.

23. Kumar M, Michael S, Alvarado-Valverde J, Zeke A, Lazar T, Glavina J, et al. ELM-the

Eukaryotic Linear Motif resource-2024 update. Nucleic Acids Res. 2024 Jan

5;52(D1):D442–55.

24. Guérin A, Corrales RM, Parker ML, Lamarque MH, Jacot D, El Hajj H, et al. Efficient

invasion by Toxoplasma depends on the subversion of host protein networks. Nat

Microbiol. 2017 Aug 28;2(10):1358–66.

25. Havrylov S, Jolanta Redowicz M, Buchman VL. Emerging Roles of Ruk/CIN85 in Vesicle-

Mediated Transport, Adhesion, Migration and Malignancy. Traffic. 2010 Mar

17;11(6):721–31.

26. Jozic D, Cárdenes N, Deribe YL, Moncalián G, Hoeller D, Groemping Y, et al. Cbl

promotes clustering of endocytic adaptor proteins. Nat Struct Mol Biol. 2005

Nov;12(11):972–9.

27. Henne WM, Buchkovich NJ, Emr SD. The ESCRT Pathway. Dev Cell. 2011 Jul;21(1):77–

91.

28. Lee SH, Hayes DB, Rebowski G, Tardieux I, Dominguez R. Toxofilin from *Toxoplasma*

gondii forms a ternary complex with an antiparallel actin dimer. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2007

Oct 9;104(41):16122–7.

29. Delorme-Walker V, Abrivard M, Lagal V, Anderson K, Perazzi A, Gonzalez V, et al.

Toxofilin upregulates the host cortical actin cytoskeleton dynamics facilitating *Toxoplasma*

invasion. J Cell Sci. 2012 Jan 1;jcs.103648.

30. Mehra C, Alvarado Valverde J, Matias AMN, Torelli F, Medeiros TC, Straub J, et al.

Toxoplasma effector TgROP1 establishes membrane contact sites with the endoplasmic

reticulum during infection. Nat Microbiol. 2025 Nov 25;10(12):3331–45.

31. Romano JD, Buh R, Grudda T, Box JR, Beltran J, Khan SM, et al. Toxoplasma gondii

VIP1 mediates parasitophorous vacuole–host endoplasmic reticulum interactions to

facilitate parasite development. Nat Microbiol. 2025 Oct 10;10(12):3315–30.

32. Rivera-Cuevas Y, Mayoral J, Di Cristina M, Lawrence ALE, Olafsson EB, Patel RK, et al.

Toxoplasma gondii exploits the host ESCRT machinery for parasite uptake of host

cytosolic proteins. Olias P, editor. PLOS Pathog. 2021 Dec 13;17(12):e1010138.

33. Braun L, Brenier-Pinchart MP, Yogavel M, Curt-Varesano A, Curt-Bertini RL, Hussain T,

et al. A *Toxoplasma* dense granule protein, GRA24, modulates the early immune

response to infection by promoting a direct and sustained host p38 MAPK activation. J

Exp Med. 2013 Sep 23;210(10):2071–86.

34. Pellegrini E, Palencia A, Braun L, Kapp U, Bougdour A, Belrhali H, et al. Structural Basis

for the Subversion of MAP Kinase Signaling by an Intrinsically Disordered Parasite

Secreted Agonist. Structure. 2017 Jan;25(1):16–26.

35. Bougdour A, Durandau E, Brenier-Pinchart MP, Ortet P, Barakat M, Kieffer S, et al. Host
Cell Subversion by Toxoplasma GRA16, an Exported Dense Granule Protein that Targets
the Host Cell Nucleus and Alters Gene Expression. Cell Host Microbe. 2013
Apr;13(4):489–500.

36. Coffey MJ, Sleebs BE, Uboldi AD, Garnham A, Franco M, Marino ND, et al. An aspartyl
protease defines a novel pathway for export of Toxoplasma proteins into the host cell.
eLife. 2015 Nov 18;4:e10809.

37. Saeij JPJ, Coller S, Boyle JP, Jerome ME, White MW, Boothroyd JC. Toxoplasma co-opts
host gene expression by injection of a polymorphic kinase homologue. Nature. 2007
Jan;445(7125):324–7.

38. Chang S, Shan X, Li X, Fan W, Zhang SQ, Zhang J, et al. *Toxoplasma gondii* Rhoptry
Protein ROP16 Mediates Partially SH-SY5Y Cells Apoptosis and Cell Cycle Arrest by
Directing Ser15/37 Phosphorylation of p53. Int J Biol Sci. 2015;11(10):1215–25.

39. Barylyuk K, Koreny L, Ke H, Butterworth S, Crook OM, Lassadi I, et al. A Comprehensive
Subcellular Atlas of the Toxoplasma Proteome via hyperLOPIT Provides Spatial Context
for Protein Functions. Cell Host Microbe. 2020 Nov;28(5):752-766.e9.

40. Alvarez-Jarreta J, Amos B, Aurrecoechea C, Bah S, Barba M, Barreto A, et al.
VEuPathDB: the eukaryotic pathogen, vector and host bioinformatics resource center in
2023. Nucleic Acids Res. 2024 Jan 5;52(D1):D808–16.

41. Erdős G, Pajkos M, Dosztányi Z. IUPred3: prediction of protein disorder enhanced with
unambiguous experimental annotation and visualization of evolutionary conservation.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2021 Jul 2;49(W1):W297–303.

42. Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, et al. Highly accurate
protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. Nature. 2021 Aug;596(7873):583–9.

43. The UniProt Consortium, Bateman A, Martin MJ, Orchard S, Magrane M, Ahmad S, et al.
UniProt: the Universal Protein Knowledgebase in 2023. Nucleic Acids Res. 2023 Jan
6;51(D1):D523–31.

44. Honnappa S, Gouveia SM, Weisbrich A, Damberger FF, Bhavesh NS, Jawhari H, et al.
An EB1-Binding Motif Acts as a Microtubule Tip Localization Signal. Cell. 2009
Jul;138(2):366–76.

45. Sámano-Sánchez H, Gibson TJ, Chemes LB. Using Linear Motif Database Resources to
Identify SH2 Domain Binders. In: Carlomagno T, Köhn M, editors. SH2 Domains [Internet].
New York, NY: Springer US; 2023 [cited 2025 Oct 29]. p. 153–97. (Methods in Molecular
Biology; vol. 2705). Available from: https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-0716-3393-
9_9

46. Berinstein A, Roivainen M, Hovi T, Mason PW, Baxt B. Antibodies to the vitronectin
receptor (integrin alpha V beta 3) inhibit binding and infection of foot-and-mouth disease
virus to cultured cells. J Virol. 1995 Apr;69(4):2664–6.

47. Kwok T, Zabler D, Urman S, Rohde M, Hartig R, Wessler S, et al. Helicobacter exploits
integrin for type IV secretion and kinase activation. Nature. 2007 Oct;449(7164):862–6.

48. Zimmermann L, Peterhans E, Frey J. RGD Motif of Lipoprotein T, Involved in Adhesion of
Mycoplasma conjunctivae to Lamb Synovial Tissue Cells. J Bacteriol. 2010 Jul
15;192(14):3773–9.

49. D'Souza SE, Ginsberg MH, Plow EF. Arginyl-glycyl-aspartic acid (RGD): a cell adhesion
motif. Trends Biochem Sci. 1991 Jan;16:246–50.

50. Liu Q, Li FC, Zhou CX, Zhu XQ. Research advances in interactions related to Toxoplasma
gondii microneme proteins. Exp Parasitol. 2017 May;176:89–98.

51. Mészáros B, Kumar M, Gibson TJ, Uyar B, Dosztányi Z. Degrons in cancer. Sci Signal.

2017 Mar 14;10(470):eaak9982.

52. Schnupf P, Portnoy DA, Decatur AL. Phosphorylation, ubiquitination and degradation of
listeriolysin O in mammalian cells: role of the PEST-like sequence. Cell Microbiol. 2006
Feb;8(2):353–64.

53. Pierce WK, Grace CR, Lee J, Nourse A, Marzahn MR, Watson ER, et al. Multiple Weak
Linear Motifs Enhance Recruitment and Processivity in SPOP-Mediated Substrate
Ubiquitination. J Mol Biol. 2016 Mar;428(6):1256–71.

54. Hajagos BE, Turetzky JM, Peng ED, Cheng SJ, Ryan CM, Souda P, et al. Molecular
dissection of novel trafficking and processing of the Toxoplasma gondii rhoptry
metalloprotease toxolysin-1. Traffic Cph Den. 2012 Feb;13(2):292–304.

55. Takeda K, Akira S. TLR signaling pathways. Semin Immunol. 2004 Feb;16(1):3–9.

56. Shi Z, Zhang Z, Zhang Z, Wang Y, Li C, Wang X, et al. Structural Insights into
Mitochondrial Antiviral Signaling Protein (MAVS)-Tumor Necrosis Factor Receptor-
associated Factor 6 (TRAF6) Signaling. J Biol Chem. 2015 Oct;290(44):26811–20.

57. Heinemann S, Biesinger B, Fleckenstein B, Albrecht JC. NFκB Signaling Is Induced by
the Oncoprotein Tio through Direct Interaction with TRAF6. J Biol Chem. 2006
Mar;281(13):8565–72.

58. Ye H, Arron JR, Lamothe B, Cirilli M, Kobayashi T, Shevde NK, et al. Distinct molecular
mechanism for initiating TRAF6 signalling. Nature. 2002 Jul;418(6896):443–7.

59. Lamarque MH, Papoin J, Finizio AL, Lentini G, Pfaff AW, Candolfi E, et al. Identification
of a New Rhoptry Neck Complex RON9/RON10 in the Apicomplexa Parasite Toxoplasma
gondii. Moreno SN, editor. PLoS ONE. 2012 Mar 12;7(3):e32457.

60. Alaganan A, Fentress SJ, Tang K, Wang Q, Sibley LD. *Toxoplasma* GRA7 effector

increases turnover of immunity-related GTPases and contributes to acute virulence in the

mouse. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2014 Jan 21;111(3):1126–31.

61. Hunter CA, Sibley LD. Modulation of innate immunity by Toxoplasma gondii virulence

effectors. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2012 Nov;10(11):766–78.

62. Ihara F, Fereig RM, Himori Y, Kameyama K, Umeda K, Tanaka S, et al. Toxoplasma gondii

Dense Granule Proteins 7, 14, and 15 Are Involved in Modification and Control of the

Immune Response Mediated via NF-κB Pathway. Front Immunol. 2020 Jul 31;11:1709.

63. Yang CS, Yuk JM, Lee YH, Jo EK. Toxoplasma gondii GRA7-Induced TRAF6 Activation

Contributes to Host Protective Immunity. Adams JH, editor. Infect Immun. 2016

Jan;84(1):339–50.

64. Wilson BA, Foy SG, Neme R, Masel J. Young genes are highly disordered as predicted

by the preadaptation hypothesis of de novo gene birth. Nat Ecol Evol. 2017 Apr

24;1(6):0146.

65. Davey NE, Cowan JL, Shields DC, Gibson TJ, Coldwell MJ, Edwards RJ. SLiMPrints:

conservation-based discovery of functional motif fingerprints in intrinsically disordered

protein regions. Nucleic Acids Res. 2012 Nov;40(21):10628–41.

66. Idrees S, Paudel KR, Banik M, Suwal N, Thapa R, Bashyal S. Predicting Motif-Mediated

Interactions Based on Viral Genomic Composition. Int J Mol Sci. 2025 Apr 13;26(8):3674.

67. Varadi M, Anyango S, Deshpande M, Nair S, Natassia C, Yordanova G, et al. AlphaFold

Protein Structure Database: massively expanding the structural coverage of protein-

sequence space with high-accuracy models. Nucleic Acids Res. 2022 Jan

7;50(D1):D439–44.

68. Wilson CJ, Choy WY, Karttunen M. AlphaFold2: A Role for Disordered Protein/Region

Prediction? Int J Mol Sci. 2022 Apr 21;23(9):4591.

69. Kabsch W, Sander C. Dictionary of protein secondary structure: pattern recognition of
hydrogen-bonded and geometrical features. Biopolymers. 1983 Dec;22(12):2577–637.

70. Tien MZ, Meyer AG, Sydykova DK, Spielman SJ, Wilke CO. Maximum Allowed Solvent
Accessibilites of Residues in Proteins. Porollo A, editor. PLoS ONE. 2013 Nov
21;8(11):e80635.

71. Sievers F, Wilm A, Dineen D, Gibson TJ, Karplus K, Li W, et al. Fast, scalable generation
of high-quality protein multiple sequence alignments using Clustal Omega. Mol Syst Biol.
2011 Jan;7(1):539.

72. Davey NE, Seo M, Yadav VK, Jeon J, Nim S, Krystkowiak I, et al. Discovery of short linear
motif-mediated interactions through phage display of intrinsically disordered regions of the
human proteome. FEBS J. 2017 Feb;284(3):485–98.

73. Levy ED. A simple definition of structural regions in proteins and its use in analyzing
interface evolution. J Mol Biol. 2010 Nov 5;403(4):660–70.

74. Evans R, O'Neill M, Pritzel A, Antropova N, Senior A, Green T, et al. Protein complex
prediction with AlphaFold-Multimer [Internet]. Bioinformatics; 2021 [cited 2025 Jun 5].
Available from: http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.10.04.463034

75. Meng EC, Goddard TD, Pettersen EF, Couch GS, Pearson ZJ, Morris JH, et al. UCSF
CHIMERAX : Tools for structure building and analysis. Protein Sci. 2023 Nov;32(11):e4792.

76. Scholz J, Besir H, Strasser C, Suppmann S. A new method to customize protein
expression vectors for fast, efficient and background free parallel cloning. BMC
Biotechnol. 2013 Dec;13(1):12.

Supplementary information

Table S1 – Motif predictions in microneme, rhoptry and dense granule proteins

Table S2 – Selected TRAF6 motif-containing peptides and binding assay results

Data S1 – MST binding extended results for the selected TRAF6 motif-containing peptides

Supplementary Figure 1 - Protein disorder in different locations and matches in secreted proteins. A. IUPred3 mean score for proteins of the different LOPIT subcellular locations. **B**. Motif matches of the most frequent motif classes by motif.

Figure 1. Motif use and hijacking during the *Toxoplasma* infection process. *Toxoplasma gondii* secretory organelles and infection cycle illustrating different host-pathogen interaction contexts, known motif instances and their infection outcomes. Motif names are highlighted in red, proteins from micronemes are highlighted in yellow, those from rhoptries in blue, and those from dense granules in green.

Figure 2 - Motif prediction pipeline. Diagram outlining the protein and motif model selection for motif prediction, as well as motif accessibility filtering criteria.

Figure 3 - Matches in secreted proteins. A. Number of filtered motif matches from secreted proteins across different motif categories. **B.** Split of proteins with filtered matches according to their annotation. **C.** Split of filtered phospho-motifs according to whether they have phosphorylation evidence. **D.** Additional motif filtering strategies according to motif type functions and properties.

Figure 4 - TRAF6 motif binding assays. A. Protein diagrams of RON6, RON10, GRA7 and GRA15 indicating the position of their TRAF6-binding motifs with accompanying multiple sequence alignment showing their presence in different Toxoplasma strains and Coccidian species. **B.** AlphaFold model of TRAF6 MATH domain with TRAF6-binding motif from RON10. Right panels display the potential hydrogen bond network at the interaction interface (top) and secondary structure adopted by the TRAF6-binding motif (bottom). **C.** RON10 TRAF6 motif testing. MST traces (top graph) and dose-response curves (bottom panel) of TRAF6 MATH domain binding to RON10 TRAF6 motif containing peptide (left) and the E>S mutant (right). In the MST traces, the cold region is set at 0 s (blue) and the hot detection region at 5 s (red). **D**. Same as in A, but for the GRA15 TRAF6 motif and the E>S motif mutant.

Supplementary Figure 1 - Protein disorder in different locations and matches in secreted proteins. A. IUPred3 mean score for proteins of the different LOPIT subcellular locations. **B**. Motif matches of the most frequent motif classes by motif.