

Supplementary Information for

Genome-wide analysis of heat stress-stimulated transposon mobility in the

human fungal pathogen *Cryptococcus deneoformans*

Asiya Gusaª, Vikas Yadavª, Cullen Roth^b, Jonathan D. Williamsª, Eva Mei Shouseª, Paul Magwene^b, Joseph Heitman^a, and Sue Jinks-Robertson^{a*}

aDepartment of Molecular Genetics and Microbiology, *bDepartment of Biology, Duke University* Medical Center, Durham, NC 27710

*Sue Jinks-Robertson

Email: [sue.robertson@duke.edu](mailto:sue.robertson@duke.edux)

This PDF file includes:

Supplementary text Figures S1 to S11 Tables S1 to S6 SI References

Supplementary Information Text

Materials and Methods

Illumina sequencing and TE mapping

Pair-end reads from whole-genome sequencing were analyzed to identify discordant pairs mapping between a TE and the XL280α reference genome (similar to analysis presented in (1,2)). This was done by first identifying reads that align to the sequence of a TE (either the T1 or Tcn12 element) with BLAT – the BLAST like alignment tool (3) – using default settings. The mated pairs of these TE-associated reads that failed to align to the TE were then mapped (again using BLAT) to the XL280α genome. Reads mapping to the TE were labeled as supporting reads while their mates that mapped to the reference genome were denoted as anchor reads. Anchor reads were only considered if they mapped uniquely to the XL280α genome. Per chromosome, windows of 10 kb were used to quantify and identify the number and position of anchor reads throughout the genome. This analysis was conducted on both TA lines and the non-passaged XL280α strain.

Two methods of standardization were used to identify TE insertion and copy loss in TA lines, using the corresponding signal of anchor reads in non-passaged strains. For TE insertions in TA lines, the number of anchor reads (per 10 kb) was divided by the corresponding number of TE anchor reads (plus one) within the non-passaged strain. For TE copy loss, the anchor read signal of each non-passaged strain was divided by the negative of the anchor read count (plus one) of the given TA line. When plotted, this generates a positive or negative, genome-wide signal of anchor reads relative to the non-passaged strain for TE insertions or loss (respectively) in each TA line.

Loci that demonstrated a potential insertion or loss of a TE were identified per TA line by retaining 10 kb windows with greater than 10x (+ or -, respectively) anchor read coverage, removing regions that were identified in all TA lines, and regions with a position in a native TE site of the XL280α reference genome. The locations of predicted TE insertions and TE copy losses in passaged TA lines were confirmed by PCR and Sanger sequencing (see Table S5 for primers used).

Permutation Testing

A permutation strategy was implemented in python to test if the T1 insertion patterns are non-random within gene orientation categories; tandem, convergent, and divergent (Table S2). The underlying null-hypothesis: insertion sites are random and follow the distribution of gene orientation patterns. To generate a null-distribution, the portion of the summed intergenic distances between gene pairs, across the three orientation groups, was used to calculate the probability of a T1 insertion within that category (excluding non-positive, intergenic distances from overlapping gene pairs). The total number of identified T1 insertions (41), with these proportions was used to calculate the expected T1 insertion counts per gene orientation category. Across 10,000 permutations a multinomial distribution (built on the summed portion of intergenic distances per gene retention group) was used to randomly draw a random sample of T1 insertion counts across the three orientation groups. A chi-squared test was used to compare these randomly drawn T1 counts and their distribution across orientation patterns with the expected (Fig. S5*C*).

Variant Calling

Pair-end Illumina-sequenced reads for each sample were aligned to the Nanopore XL280α reference genome using bwa-mem (4) and its default settings. Duplicate reads were identified using samblaster (5). Duplicate marked alignments were filtered via the samtools view command (6) with the additional filtering options of -F 3852 and mapping quality threshold of ten (with -q 10). Read groups were added to each binary alignment map file using bamaddrg (7).

All filtered alignments were fed into samtools mpileup and bcftools to identify genetic variants segregating across the passaged isolates. The default parameters were used in the call to mpileup with the addition of the -d 100 flag to cap the maximum number of aligned reads considered in detecting variants (7). The default consensus calling strategy in bcftools, with a ploidy setting of one and the addition of the options "-vc" were used to detect variants.

Variant calls were filtered using bcftools and custom scripts in python. Specifically, using the bcftools view command, only variants with a quality score greater than 900 were considered. Invariant sites – loci with fixed genetic variants across all samples – were removed from analysis. Per isolate, variant loci were considered only if they had greater than 6x coverage with 80% of reads suggesting a variant call. Per isolate, only variants detected and consistent across each technical replicate were retained for further consideration.

Using the Integrative Genomics Viewer (IGV), variant positions were visually inspected to remove those called within telomeric regions that displayed as artifacts, i.e. appearing with identical alignments across multiple, unrelated isolates in the passaging experiments (8). In total, 836 raw genetic variants were called via bcftools and after scripted filtering, 198 variants were examined in IGV, resulting in the identification and analysis of 142 unique variant sites. IGV was also used to examine inheritance patterns of genetic variants and estimate potential changes in amino acid sequences across isolates.

Nanopore sequencing and TE mapping

High molecular-weight DNA was isolated by a CTAB-DNA extraction method (9) and tested for its quality using NanoDrop. Samples were sequenced on the MinION system using the R9.4.1 Flow-Cell and SQK-LSK109 library preparation kit. For multiplexing of multiple samples in a single flow-cell, Native Barcoding Expansion 1-12 kit (EXP-NBD104) was used during the library preparation as instructed by the manufacturer's protocol. Nanopore sequencing was performed at the default voltage for 48 hours as per the MinION sequencing protocol provided by the manufacturer. MinION sequencing protocol and setup was controlled using the MinKNOW software. Base-calling was performed outside the MinKNOW software on the lab server using the standalone Guppy basecaller from Nanopore and the sequence reads thus obtained were used for genome assembly. In case of multiplexed runs, the reads were de-multiplexed using qcat or Guppy_barcoder before the genome assembly. Canu (10) was used to assemble the genome of most strains using reads that are longer than 2 kb (-minReadLength=2000) in length. The genome assembly was checked for integrity by mapping the reads back to the genome assembly using minimap2 (11), and duplicated small contigs were discarded. The contigs that were broken at centromeres were assembled manually after a synteny comparison and analysis using Geneious Prime 2020.1.1. All the chromosome-level contigs thus generated were then reoriented

4

to have the same configuration as the wildtype XL280α genome. Transposon locations were determined using BLASTn analysis and annotated using Geneious Prime 2020.1.1.

Detection of 5mC methylation

5mC DNA methylation was calculated using the scripts available with nanopolish, as previously described (12). Briefly, the XL280α nanopore reads were mapped to the genome assembly, and methylation status was identified using "call-methylation" followed by calculating methylation frequency. The frequency was then converted to bedGraph for visualization purposes in IGV and the final figures were generated in Adobe Illustrator.

Gene liftover and orientation analysis

Individual gene sequences were taken from the JEC21 reference genome (version 48, FungiDB) and mapped via BLAT to the assembled XL280α nanopore reference genome. After this mapping, those gene sequences with greater than 90% sequence identity were retained for analysis. Per chromosome, the distance between and orientation of pairs of genes were determined via python.

SI Appendix Figures

Figure S1. Locations of the four unique 2.7 kb T1 mobile elements in the XL280α genome. *(A)* Gene-level view of T1 copies and proximity to nearby genes. The sequence of the 11-bp terminal inverted repeats (TIRs) is indicated. *(B)* Sequence differences that distinguish each T1 element from T1.1. Single lines indicate SNPs, triangles indicate INDELs; black triangles indicate INDELs diagnostic for each element. *(C)* Number of *de novo* insertions of each T1 element in the *URA3/5* genes of 5FOA-resistant mutants (13).

Figure S2. Southern analysis of TE movement in fifteen independent XL280α TA lines passaged ~800 generations on YPD at 30° or 37° as indicated. *(A)* Location of the restriction sites (dotted lines) and probes (black bars) used in Southern analysis. *(B)* Genomic DNA of non-passaged XL280α (left lane) and passaged isolates digested with BspEI, probed for T1. *(C)* DNA digested with PvuII, probed for Tcn12. Arrowheads indicate *de novo* TE insertions and asterisks indicate

Figure S3. 5-methylcytosine (5mC) DNA methylation in XL280α as detected by Nanopore sequencing. *(A)* Genome-wide 5mC methylation pattern with predicted open reading frames (ORFs) and repetitive element sequences. 5mC methylation at regions of chromosomes encoding mobile T1 and Tcn12 sequences *(B)* and Cnl1 sequences, zoomed in to show fulllength copies (black arrowheads) and truncated copies (gray arrowheads) in the left and right sub-telomeres *(C).*

Figure S4. Sequencing depth of Illumina reads for the genomes of *(A)* XL280α and TA lines passaged at 30° and *(B)* TA lines passaged at 37°. Normalized read counts were transformed to

Figure S5. Analysis of *de novo* T1 insertions between genes in XL280α TA lines. *(A)* Percentage of mapped T1 insertions (red arrowheads) between genes in tandem, divergent or convergent orientations. *(B)* Distribution of tandem, divergent and convergent gene orientations in the XL280α genome. Overlapping genes in all orientations were excluded. *(C)* A histogram displaying the null-distribution of chi-squared statistics (grey, x-axis) and observed statistic (red, vertical line) testing the non-random distribution of T1 insertions within gene orientation patterns (see Table S2). A randomization strategy using the portion of summed, intergenic distances between genes across orientation groups (tandem, divergent, and convergent) was used to generate the nulldistribution. The x-axis delineates the value of the chi-squared statistic while the y-axis shows the counts on a log10 scale. *(D)* Distance of mapped T1 insertions upstream of the nearest +1 start of transcription (as annotated for the *C. deneoformans* JEC21 reference genome, EnsemblFungi).

Figure S6. T1 insertions and changes in gene expression in 37°-passaged lines 37-01 and 37- 02. *(A)* Locations of *de novo* T1 insertions (red arrowheads) relative to predicted genes and fold changes in expression compared to the non-passaged XL280α strain are shown. Black or white shading represents forward or reverse gene orientation, respectively, in the JEC21 reference genome (EnsemblFungi). Blue arrows indicate the relative fold-changes in transcript compared to the non-passaged XL280α strain measured by qRT-PCR. *(B)* Fold change in expression of control genes in 37°-passaged lines 37-01 and 37-02 relative to the XL280α strain. These control genes are not proximal to the *de novo* T1 insertions in 37-01 and 37-02 shown in *(A).* Gene expression levels were normalized to the endogenous reference gene *GPD1* using the comparative $\Delta\Delta C_{\text{T}}$ method. For each target gene and each sample, technical triplicate and biological triplicate qRT-PCR reactions were performed. Error bars represent standard error of the means (SEM) for three biological replicates. Statistical analyses were performed using the GraphPad Prism 9 software. A Welch's unpaired t test (two-tailed) was performed for each pairwise comparison using the mean ΔC_T values for three biological replicates (ns, not significant; * indicates 0.01<*p*≤0.05; and ** indicates 0.001<*p*≤0.01).

Figure S7. Analysis of *de novo* Tcn12 integration sites in TA lines passaged at 37°. Gene-level view of the 14 novel Tcn12 insertions (triangles) within gene-coding regions. Arrows indicate the forward or reverse orientation of Tcn12 with respect to the *gag-pol* polyprotein encoded within the element.

URA5 insertion hotspot

Figure S8. Alignment of *de novo* Tcn12 integration sites with respect to the forward orientation of the element. *(A) URA5* insertion hotspot for Tcn12, centered at the TSD [6]. The 15-bp 5' to 3' *URA5* sequence is shown for both DNA strands. *(B)* Sequence logo (WebLogo 3.7.4) generated by aligning 17 *de novo* Tcn12 integration sites (Table S3) in 37° TA lines. *(C)* Sequence logo generated by aligning unique Tcn12 integration sites in the *URA5* locus of 5FOA-resistant XL280α mutants recovered from mouse organs (13).

Figure S9. Full-length and truncated copies of the non-LTR Cnl1 retrotransposon at the subtelomeres of chromosomes of TA lines passaged at 30° (30-01, 30-02) and 37° (remaining isolates), sequenced by Nanopore. Left and right panels for each isolate indicate the left or right sub-telomeric region as indicated. The size of each block arrows approximates the percent length of the 3.4 kb Cnl1 element with the darkest color (black) indicating full-length copies and lighter shades of gray indicating truncated copies of the element. The distribution of Cnl1 on chromosomes for the non-passaged XL280α strain is shown in Fig. 5A.

Figure S10. Southern analysis probing for the Cnl1 retrotransposon in the genomes of XL280α TA lines passaged at 30° and 37°. *(A)* Location of the PvuII restriction site (dotted line) and probe (black bar) used to identify Cnl1 copies. *(B)* Southern analysis of Cnl1 copies in XL280α and TA lines passaged at 30° (left) or 37° (right). The far-right panel shows a reduced exposure of the

Figure S11. Southern analysis of TE movements in *Cryptococcus* XL280α *rdp1*Δ mutants passaged 40 times (~800 generations) at 30° and 37°. Genomic DNA from the wildtype XL280α strain, *rdp1*Δ mutant strain and passaged *rdp1*Δ TA lines was digested with PvuII and probed for Table S1. Novel T1 and Tcn12 insertions mapped in lines passaged 40 times at 30° or 37°. Genomic locations of novel TEs are defined as upstream (US) or downstream (DS) of predicted transcription start sites for proximal genes, as annotated for the *C. deneoformans* JEC21 reference genome (EnsemblFungi and FungiDB).

Table S2. Distribution of genes in tandem, divergent and convergent orientation in the XL280α genome compared to the distribution of novel T1 insertions between genes in each orientation. Gene predictions based on those annotated in the JEC21 reference genome (EnsemblFungi).

Table S3. Location and alignment of novel Tcn12 insertion sites centered around the target site duplication (TSD) sequence (red letters).

Table S4. Sequence variations detected in Illumina-sequenced TA lines.

Table S4 cont. Sequence variations detected in Illumina-sequenced TA lines.

ID	5'-> 3' DNA Sequence	Target region	Chr	TA line	TE
ES90	AAGTAGCTTTCTCCTCTATCGTCCCTCCC				
ES91	CCTCTGTTCTTTGTGTTCGGCAATTCTCG	CNE03200/CNE03210	5	$XL280\alpha$	T1.1 (native)
ES92	CAGGTGGACATCATCATCCAGAGGTATGC				
ES93	TCTTTAAAGGCATCTTGTTCCCGCTTTGC	CND03770/CND03780	4	XL280α	T1.2 (native)
ES94	GAGATGAACGTAGCGCGCTTAGTAGTAGG				
ES95	GGCTGTAAAGTAGCGAAGAAACAAAGCCC	CND00180/CND00190	4	XL280α	T1.3 (native)
ES96	AGTGTCGTGAGAGTAGTGACAATCAAGCG				
ES97	TGGGATTGAATGTGGCAGAATAGGGATCG	CNF00100/CNF00110	6	XL280α	T1.4 (native)
ES102	TGCCATTTTGAAGAAGAGCTGAATGGTGC				
ES103	AGCTCTAAGCACAGATATGTCCGACATGC	CNA08210/CNA08220	1	XL280α	T1.4 (native)
ES62	GTGGACGATGGTAAAACGCATTTGGTAGC				
ES63	CTCCGTATCCCATAGACTGGTTTTTGGGG	CNH02250/CNH02260	8	$30 - 01$	T ₁
ES203	ATGAGAAAGCGTCCCGGGGACAAG				
ES204	TGGTAAATAAATGGAGCGAAGAGAGC	CNB02620/CNB02630	\overline{c}	30-02	T ₁
ES134	AAGACTGCGATGACGATGAACGCG				
ES135	TGGTCGACGTTACCCCATCCCATC	CNC05220	3	30-02	T1
ES136	TCGATGATCAGAAGGGGCTCTGGC				
ES137	ATGGTGGTGGTCAAAGCTGTGCAC	CNK03170/CNK03180	11	30-02	T1
ES138	CAATTTGATCCCGTGGTGGAGGGC				
ES139	TCCAAACCCAGCACCCAGAGACTC	CNM02230/CNM02240	13	30-02	T1
ES146	CGCTACAGCCTTGCAGCATCTCTG				
ES147	CAACTGGCTGGACACAGAACTGCC	CNG03170/CNG03180	7	$30 - 03$	T ₁
ES140	TCCATCCTTCCGGGCCAGTACAAG				
ES141	CCCGCCCAATCACAGCAATAGACG	CNC01660/CNC01670	3	$30 - 16$	T1
ES142	GAGTCGGTGTTGACAGCAAGCTGG				
ES143	TTGGAGAGGGGGTCATCTTGCTCG	CNF02870/CNF02875	6	$30 - 16$	T ₁
ES144	TATTCGGAGAGCTGGGTGCGGTAC				
ES ₁₄₅	AGGGTCTGATCGGGCTGGATCAAC	CNF00090/CNF00080	6	$30 - 17$	T ₁
ES199	ATCTGGGTGCTGCACACAAATCCG				
ES200	GTGATAGTGGAGCTTGCGGCAGTG	CNJ02860/CNJ02870	10	30-20	T1
ES66	AATTCGAGAAGAGCGGGGTCATGAATACC				
ES67	AAATAAGGTGACAGAAAGCTGAGGAGGGC	CNG01990/CNG02000	7	37-01	T1
ES68	TTACTTCCCGTTGCACTGTCATCTTCTCC				
ES69	ACTATAGGCTGACTGAGAGAGTAGAGCGC	CNH01775/CNH01780	8	37-01	T ₁
ES64	CTGAATGTTAAGTGCAGCGTAATGAGCCG				
ES65	TCAATTCCAGTGGATAGCGTACGTTACCG	CNJ00540/CNJ00550	10	37-01	T1
ES70	CTGGACAACCTCCACCTTTGTTTCTTTGC				
ES71	TCTGCTTCTTGTCCATCCATTTCTTCCCC	CNJ02660/CNJ02670	10	37-01	Τ1
ES116	ATTAGAAGCTACCCTTGTTGTCGTCGTCG				
ES117	TGTGAGCAATTCGACATTGGGCATAAACG	CNA06700	1	37-01	Tcn12
ES114	TAAACGAATTGTCACTAGGTCGTGGAGCC				
ES115	TGGCAATATTTGGTCCCGCTATCTGATCC	CNB03750	2	37-01	Tcn12
ES74	ACTTACTACTGCACTCTCAATGGTGTGGC				
ES75	ACCGAATTTAGGGATGAGGATCTTGGTGC	CNA06050/CNA06060	1	37-02	T ₁
ES72	CCTGCTTTTGCTTATGCCCAATCATACCC				
ES73	GTCTCTTCCCACTCTCCTTCTGTCTTTGC	CNA07360/CNA07370	1	37-02	T ₁
ES118	TAGCCAACTGCGGATTGTTTGTTACAAGC				
ES119	ATTGCTGTTTCTCCGACTCATACAGTCCC	CNA07360/CNA07370	$\mathbf 1$	37-02	T ₁
ES76	GACGTTGGCTGCCGTAATAATCTTTGTCC				
ES77	TCGATGGAATGGAAGGAAAGACACTGACG	CNB02690/CNB02680	\overline{c}	37-02	T1

Table S5. Primers used in this study.

Table S5 cont. Primers used in this study.

Table S5 cont. Primers used in this study.

Table S6. Whole-genome sequencing data for the progenitor and evolved lines in this study.

SI References

- 1. J. Chen, T. R. Wrightsman, S. R. Wessler, J. E. Stajich, RelocaTE2: a high resolution transposable element insertion site mapping tool for population resequencing. *PeerJ* **5**, e2942 (2017).
- 2. S. Han *et al.*, Transposable element profiles reveal cell line identity and loss of heterozygosity in Drosophila cell culture, *Genetics* 219.2 (2021).
- 3. W. J. Kent, BLAT--the BLAST-like alignment tool. *Genome Res* **12**, 656-664 (2002).
- 4. H. Li, R. Durbin, Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1754-1760 (2009).
- 5. G. G. Faust, I. M. Hall, SAMBLASTER: fast duplicate marking and structural variant read extraction. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2503-2505 (2014).
- 6. P. Danecek *et al.*, Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. *Gigascience* **10** (2021).
- 7. E. P. Garrison, G. T. Marth, Haplotype-based variant detection from short-read sequencing. *arXiv: Genomics* (2012).
- 8. H. Thorvaldsdóttir, J. T. Robinson, J. P. Mesirov, Integrative Genomics Viewer (IGV): high-performance genomics data visualization and exploration. *Brief Bioinform* **14**, 178- 192 (2013).
- 9. J. W. Pitkin, D. G. Panaccione, J. D. Walton, A putative cyclic peptide efflux pump encoded by the TOXA gene of the plant-pathogenic fungus Cochliobolus carbonum. *Microbiology* **142**, 1557-1565 (1996).
- 10. S. Koren *et al.*, Canu: scalable and accurate long-read assembly via adaptive k-mer weighting and repeat separation. *Genome Res* **27**, 722-736 (2017).
- 11. H. Li, Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics* **34**, 3094- 3100 (2018).
- 12. K. Schotanus, V. Yadav, J. Heitman, Epigenetic dynamics of centromeres and neocentromeres in *Cryptococcus deuterogattii*. *PLoS Genet* **17**, e1009743 (2021).
- 13. A. Gusa *et al.*, Transposon mobilization in the human fungal pathogen *Cryptococcus* is mutagenic during infection and promotes drug resistance in vitro. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* **117**, 9973 (2020).