NAD+-capped RNAs are widespread in the Arabidopsis transcriptome and can

probably be translated

Wang et al.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION





Figure S1. NAD captureSeq workflow and quality control. (A) Diagram of the workflow of NAD captureSeq. (B) A gel blot assay to demonstrate the selectivity of NAD capture. In vitro transcribed 5' pppRNA and 5' NAD+-RNA were treated or not with ADPRC, and then subjected to the click chemistry with biotin azide. The RNAs were resolved in a 2% agarose gel, transferred to a nylon membrane, and probed by Streptavidin-HRP to detect biotinylated RNA. (C) Clustering analysis of NAD

captureSeq samples. The 10000 top-varying transcripts in seedling and inflorescence libraries were used for the analysis.



Figure S2. Features of NAD captureSeq read output. (A) The abundance of RNAs in ADPRC- samples was largely proportional to that in polyA RNA-seq libraries. (B) NAD captureSeq read distribution along gene bodies. The solid and dotted lines represent the ADPRC+ and ADPRC- libraries, respectively, in various samples as indicated. S, seedling; I, inflorescence. "total", total RNAs. "mRNA", polyA RNAs. Two to three lines of the same color represent biological replicates.



Figure S3. GO enrichment analysis of 1000 genes with the highest ADPRC+/ADPRC- ratio from seedling NAD captureSeq.



Figure S4. Genome browser views of reads from seedling total RNA and polyA RNA NAD captureSeq for two genes. The gene models are at the bottom, with boxes and thin lines representing exons and introns, respectively. Three and two biological replicates (R) were performed.



Figure S5. NAD captureSeq with polyA RNAs from seedlings. (A) Clustering analysis of NAD captureSeq with polyA RNAs from seedlings. Two biological replicates were performed. The 10000 top-varying transcripts were used in the analysis. (B) Comparison of read counts in ADPRC-treated (ADPRC+) and mocktreated (ADPRC-) samples of polyA RNA NAD captureSeq. Green dots indicate NAD-RNAs; black dots indicate non-NAD-RNAs. "All", all genes with detectable transcripts. "NAD", genes producing NAD-RNAs. (C) Venn diagram showing the degree of overlap among genes producing NAD-RNAs in total RNA and polyA RNA NAD caputreSeq.



Figure S6. NAD captureSeq with total RNAs and polysomal RNAs. (A) A representative profile of ribosomes along a 15-60% sucrose gradient. The fractions to the left of the dotted line contain ribosomal subunits and monosomes, while the fractions to the right contain polysomes. (B) Clustering analysis of NAD captureSeq with polysomal RNAs and total RNAs isolated from the same plant samples. The 10000 top-varying transcripts were used in the analysis.



Figure S7. Diagrams depicting two scenarios with respect to NAD-RNAs on polysomes. Black curves represent multiple transcripts derived from one gene. (A) NAD+-capped transcripts are preferentially polysome-associated relative to m7G-capped transcripts. The proportion of NAD-RNAs is higher in polysomal RNAs than in total RNAs. (B) The proportion of NAD-RNAs is similar in total RNAs and polysomal RNAs, but the level of NAD-RNAs maybe higher in the polysomal fraction as the level of total transcripts (both NAD+-capped and m7G-capped) is higher in the polysomal fraction.



Figure S8. Genes with higher levels of NAD-RNAs have higher translation efficiency. Published ribo-seq data (GSE50597, no stress group)(1) from plants at a similar developmental stage as those in our NAD captureSeq were used to derive the levels of ribosome protected fragments (RPF). RNA-seq from the same published study was used to derive the mRNA FPKM. The RPF/mRNA FPKM ratio represents translation efficiency. The translation efficiencies of 1000 genes with the highest ADPRC+/ADPRC- ratio (labeled as "Top") and 1000 randomly selected genes (labelled as "Random") were compared. (***) p < 0.001 (two-tailed Wilcoxon test).

References

 P. Juntawong, T. Girke, J. Bazin, J. Bailey-Serres, Translational dynamics revealed by genome-wide profiling of ribosome footprints in Arabidopsis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 111, E203-212 (2014).

Supplemental Table

Table S1. Oligonucleotides used in this study

Name	Sequence
IVT template	CAG TAATACGACTCACTAT TAGGCCTCTCGCTCTGGGTGTGCG
	CTTGCTTGGCTTGCTT GTGGTCTGCGGTTCGTTCCCGCTTTGGT
IVT template	Forward: CAGTAATACGACTCACTATTAGGCC
PCR	Reverse: CCCCCCCCCCCCCCACCAAAGCGGGAACGAAC
AT5G38420	Forward: AGTCATCCGCTTCTTTCCCG
RT-PCR	Reverse: ACGGTACACAAATCCGTGCT
AT5G58250	Forward: ACCTCCATCGAGCAACAGTC
RT-PCR	Reverse: ATTGCTCCTGGAAGTGCTCC
AT5G42530	Forward: GCACAAGAGGAAGCCCAGA
RT-PCR	Reverse: CCAGGTTCGAGTGTGCCTTT
AT2G03340	Forward: CTCTGATCCGGAGCCAAACC
RT-PCR	Reverse: GTAGCCGGTCTGTGTGTGTTGT
AT4G38840	Forward: AGCAGATTCTCCGACAAGCC
RT-PCR	Reverse: CAAGGGATTGTGAGGCCACC
ATMG00110	Forward: CGTCGTAACGCCCTTAATGC
RT-PCR	Reverse: ATTCTCATACCGGTGGCAGC
ATMG01170	Forward: ACTAACGACGTTCTGCCAGG
RT-PCR	Reverse: CAGTTTGCTCCCGAGGAGTT
ATMG01130	Forward: ACGAAGCCTCCTCCTCAGAT
RT-PCR	Reverse: CTATTCCTCGGTAAGCGGGC
ATMG00160	Forward: TCGCGCTTTATGGCATTTCC
RT-PCR	Reverse: AGTGAGTGACTGCTCATCGG
ATMG00516	Forward: TGTTCTTTCCAGGAGGTTGGC
RT-PCR	Reverse: CTTTCCGGCCAAGTCCCATT
ATMG00670	Forward: ACGTGCGTTTCATTCTGTGC
RT-PCR	Reverse: AGCCTGACCACCCAGTAGAT
ATCG01110	Forward: ACCGTATGTAACGCGATGGG
RT-PCR	Reverse: ATTCTCATACCGGTGGCAGC

ATCG00430	Forward: TCCTAGACAGGCGGACCTTA
RT-PCR	Reverse: TGGTTTAGGTGGACAACCCG
5.8S rRNA	Forward: CAACGGATATCTCGGCTCTC
RT-PCR	Reverse: AACTTGCGTTCAAAGACTCG
18S rRNA	Forward: AATGAACGAGACCTCAGCCT
RT-PCR	Reverse: CCCAGAACATCTAAGGGCAT
SNOR77	Forward: GACATGAGAGGTGTTTAACT
RT-PCR	Reverse: GTGCTTAAGACTACTAGACCA
SNO111	Forward: GTGCTTAAGACTACTAGACCA
RT-PCR	Reverse: GTGCTTAAGACTACTAGACCA
RBCS1B/2B/	Forward: CGGCTTGAAGTCATCCGCT
3B probe	Reverse: TCCGTGTTTTGTGTTTATTACCTC