Using machine learning to predict protein-protein interactions between a zombie ant

fungus and its carpenter ant host

Ian Will[#], William C. Beckerson, Charissa de Bekker[#]

Corresponding authors: Ian Will (ian.will@knights.ucf.edu), Charissa de Bekker

(a.m.debekker@uu.nl)

I.W. and W.C.B are post-doctoral researchers at University of Central Florida, Department of

Biology.

C.dB is a group leader at Utrecht University, Department of Biology: Microbiology and a

courtesy faculty member at University of Central Florida, Department of Biology.

ORCID: I.W. - 0000-0002-2396-6778, W.C.B. - 0000-0001-7132-7578, C.dB - 0000-0002-

7325-172X

Running Head: Zombie ant protein-protein interactions

Keywords: parasitism, protein-protein interactions, fungi, insects, *Ophiocordyceps*

Abstract

Parasitic fungi produce proteins that modulate virulence, alter host physiology, and trigger host responses. These proteins, classified as a type of "effector," often act via protein-protein interactions (PPIs). The fungal parasite *Ophiocordyceps camponoti-floridani* (zombie ant fungus) manipulates *Camponotus floridanus* (carpenter ant) behavior to promote transmission. The most striking aspect of this behavioral change is a summit disease phenotype where the infected host ascends and attaches to an elevated position. Plausibly, cross-species PPIs drive aspects of *Ophiocordyceps* infection and host manipulation. Machine learning PPI predictions offer high-throughput methods to produce mechanistic hypotheses on how this behavioral manipulation occurs. Using D-SCRIPT to predict host-parasite PPIs, we found ca. 6,000 interactions involving 2,083 host proteins and 129 parasite proteins, which are encoded by genes upregulated during manipulated behavior. We identified multiple overrepresentations of functional annotations among these proteins. The strongest signals in the host highlighted neuromodulatory G-protein coupled receptors and oxidation-reduction processes. We also detected *Camponotus* structural and gene-regulatory proteins. In the parasite, we found enrichment of *Ophiocordyceps* proteases and frequent involvement of novel small secreted proteins with unknown functions. From these results, we provide new hypotheses on potential parasite effectors and host targets underlying zombie ant behavioral manipulation.

Introduction

Fungal parasites employ a diverse array of secreted molecules to defend themselves, promote infection, and modify their hosts. In certain cases, infection can even lead to parasitic manipulation of host behavior. Often termed "effectors," secreted fungal molecules play a

critical role in host-parasite dynamics that include both widely shared and highly specific

mechanisms [1–4]. Parasite effectors have been suggested to play key roles during the infection

of insects by entomopathogenic fungi through their interactions with host nucleic acids,

carbohydrates, lipids, small metabolites, and proteins [3,5–7]. Bioinformatic exploration of

effector protein biology offers a high-throughput method to develop mechanistic hypotheses of

how some parasites can modify the behavior of their hosts. Here, we use such approaches to

investigate the behavior-manipulating fungus *Ophiocordyceps camponoti-floridani* (Florida

zombie ant fungus) and its insect host *Camponotus floridanus* (Florida carpenter ant).

Myrmecophilous *Ophiocordyceps* fungi are typically species-specific parasites that have

co-evolved with their ant hosts over millions of years [8]. This close relationship has resulted in

fungus-ant interactions that alter host behaviors in ways that are adaptive for the parasite.

Manipulated host ants succumb to a summit disease, affixing themselves to elevated positions

and dying at locations that promote fungal growth and transmission [9–13]. Behavioral changes

preceding this final summit could include host-adaptive responses, parasite-adaptive

manipulations, or general symptoms of disease that span hyperactivity, uncoordinated foraging,

decreased nestmate communication, and convulsions [9,14–17]. While these modified ant

behaviors have been observed in nature for some time [18], explorations of the fungal effectors

involved are relatively more recent endeavors [14,19–25]. These multi "-omics" studies have

provided hypotheses about the parasite and host molecules that play a role in establishing the

behavioral phenotypes observed, but leave their potential interactions open to interpretation.

A large number of fungal molecules and ant pathways may be involved in

Ophiocordyceps behavioral manipulation, including neuro-modulators and -protectants, insect

hormones, feeding, locomotion, circadian rhythms and light-sensing, and muscular hyperactivity

[14,17,19,21,22,25–29]. Fungal proteins such as bacterial-like enterotoxins, protein tyrosine

phosphatases, peptidases (e.g., S8 subtilisin-like serine proteases), and undescribed small

secreted proteins (uSSPs) have been proposed as mechanisms of manipulation that presumably

function by PPIs. These hypotheses are supported by strong gene upregulation of these

candidates during active manipulation of the ant and genomic comparisons among the

Ophiocordyceps [14,19,24]. Numerous other such proteins are supported as plausible effectors as

well. Testing them *in vivo* will be a costly and laborious process in an emerging, non-traditional

model organism such as *O. camponoti-floridani*. New evidence linking previously hypothesized

candidate proteins and pathways to host-parasite protein-protein interactions (PPIs) would give

strong support to select top predictions for functional validation.

Proteome-scale bioinformatic prediction of PPIs has largely been employed to describe

protein interaction networks within a single organism, as was done for the host species, *C.*

floridanus [30]. However, PPI predictions in some cross-species host-parasite relationships have

also been made, including animal or plant hosts and bacterial, viral, or fungal parasites [31–34].

Predicting PPIs is typically done using either an interolog or machine learning method.

Interologs are orthologous interactions conserved across species: each protein in one PPI has

orthologs in the second PPI [35]. While a useful prediction tool, detecting an interolog in a new

system requires established reference PPIs from other systems. This constraint by available data

would result in a very limited number of predictions when analyzing interactions between non-

model organisms. Machine-learning methods offer a more flexible alternative. Here, predicted

PPIs are still informed by a known set of PPIs used for training data. However, once trained, the

program is able to predict novel interactions outside the original dataset [33,36]. The machine

learning tool D-SCRIPT does this by training models on putative protein structures rather than

primary sequence data [33,34]. The underlying predicted structural interactions were shown to

largely agree with a benchmarking dataset of experimentally measured docked proteins [33,37].

This physically-based approach improves cross-species generalizability of D-SCRIPT's

predictive power, an important step for research on non-model or multi-species systems.

Notably, *Ophiocordyceps* and other fungi secrete a range of taxonomically distinct uSSPs that

are often thought to be effectors in host-parasite interactions [14,19,24,38–40]. Therefore,

bioinformatic techniques that hinge upon well described protein annotations or are subject to

strong species-specific biases can only have limited success in assigning uSSPs to PPIs.

We used D-SCRIPT to predict possible *O. camponoti-floridani* and *C. floridanus* PPIs

involved in behavioral manipulation. We filtered these predictions into subsets we considered

most likely to include relevant interactions. As such, our study focuses on PPIs involving

putatively secreted *O. camponoti-floridani* proteins encoded by genes that were previously found

to be upregulated during manipulated summiting [19]. These fungal proteins are plausibly

exported to the host environment during manipulation, providing support for their involvement

in hypotheses of manipulation of host behavior. We subsequently performed group-level

enrichment analyses for both host and parasite proteins involved in these PPIs. We chose this

approach in consideration of D-SCRIPT error rates having shown ca. 35% recall (i.e., 65% false

negatives) and ca. 80% precision (i.e., 20% false positives) [33], which indicate this tool is

strongest in broad characterizations rather than validating specific, previously hypothesized PPIs.

Our results should well represent group-level trends (enriched annotations) and offer a subset of

the mostly true PPIs to begin focusing attention on their functional characterization.

We further highlight aspects of functional enrichments after filtering out *Camponotus*

protein interactions with fungi that do not naturally infect or manipulate this host ("aspecific"

fungi). These aspecific fungi cover different lifestyles and phylogenetic relationships to

Ophiocordyceps: (*i*) *Cordyceps bassiana* (i.e., *Beauveria bassiana*), a generalist entomopathogen

in the order Hypocreales (which includes *Ophiocordyceps*), (*ii*) *Trichoderma reesei*, a plant-

degrading saprophyte in the order Hypocreales (although the genus also includes

entomopathogens), and (*iii*) *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, a phylogenetically distant saprophytic

yeast in the order Saccharomycetales with a smaller secretome. This approach brought the

unique *Ophiocordyceps* PPIs to the forefront but does not discount the aspecific predictions.

Rather it brings additional attention to a narrower set of specific PPIs that could include co-

evolved adaptations underlying *Ophiocordyceps*-manipulated *Camponotus* behavior.

Materials and Methods

Protein sequences and initial selection: To predict PPIs between *O. camponoti-*

floridani secreted proteins and *C. floridanus* proteins, we retrieved sequence information for both

organisms from high-quality genome assemblies integrating long-read technology (GenBank

accessions GCA_012980515.1 and GCA_003227725.1, respectively) [19,41]. For *Camponotus*

proteins, we used the sequence represented by the single longest isoform (n = 12,512). We

predicted *Ophiocordyceps* proteins to have a localization outside of the cell by combining eight

annotation tools (SignalP v6.0, TMHMM, Phobius, Prosite, PredGPI, NucPred, and TargetP

v2.0) [42–48] following the relatively conservative approaches outlined in Beckerson et al., 2019

[1]. We focused on secreted proteins (n = 586) and excluded transmembrane proteins (n = 1,301)

in our downstream analyses, as we considered these to most plausibly constitute effectors.

Moreover, our preliminary findings showed that transmembrane proteins were generally less

specific in their binding (File S1). All remaining non-secreted, non-transmembrane proteins were

considered intracellular (n = 5,568). We annotated secreted proteins as uSSPs if they were under

300 amino acids in length and lacked any BLAST description, GO term, or PFAM domain (n =

154) [19].

PPI predictions: We used D-SCRIPT (v 0.1.5) with the default human-protein pre-

trained model and settings [33] to predict PPIs. D-SCRIPT assigns each tested protein interaction

an edge value (i.e., a confidence score to rank possible PPIs) with a default threshold for positive

prediction of ≥ 0.5, on a scale of zero to one. These parameters have been previously used to

predict PPIs within insect and fungal model organisms [33]. With these settings, we tested every

PPI combination between secreted *O. camponoti-floridani* proteins and the entire *C. floridanus*

proteome (Fig. 1 step 1). We used proteins shorter than 2,000 amino acids due to computational

constraints. Limiting the length of input proteins removed 63 (1.1%) intracellular

Ophiocordyceps proteins and 299 *Camponotus* proteins (2.4%).

To identify self-interacting *Ophiocordyceps* PPIs, we tested secreted *Ophiocordyceps*

proteins against intracellular *Ophiocordyceps* proteins (Fig. 1 step 2). We then identified

reciprocal homologs (putative orthologs) between *Ophiocordyceps* and *Camponotus* proteins

using Proteinortho (v 5.0) with default settings [49]. We filtered out PPIs that contained a fungal

secreted protein predicted to bind both one of *Ophiocordyceps'* own intracellular proteins and a

Camponotus protein that was orthologous to that fungal intracellular protein (Fig. 1 step 3). We

reasoned that a cross-species PPI would more likely indicate an interaction related to infection or

manipulation when the *Ophiocordyceps* protein was predicted to only bind a *Camponotus*

protein, without also binding a fungal ortholog to that ant protein. We considered this to be a

favorable tradeoff with possibly overlooking parasite effectors that may target well-conserved

biological processes.

We narrowed the remaining PPIs to those involving secreted fungal proteins encoded by

differentially expressed genes (DEGs) (Fig. 1 step 4). These genes were upregulated during

manipulated summiting behavior in *C. floridanus* ants experimentally infected with *O.*

camponoti-floridani, as compared to their expression in culture [19]. By incorporating empirical

gene expression data, we anchored our computational analyses in predictions that are most

biologically relevant during manipulation. Although the chance exists that some parasite

effectors act during manipulation without increased gene transcription, we presumed that in most

cases, gene expression would be informative.

Hypergeometric enrichment analyses: We performed hypergeometric enrichment

analyses on proteins from PPIs with secreted, upregulated *Ophiocordyceps* proteins that only had

predicted interactions with the host. For enrichment analyses of the fungal proteins in these PPIs,

we used the *O. camponoti-floridani* secretome as the background. For enrichment analyses of the

ant proteins in these PPIs, we used the *C. floridanus* proteome as the background (Fig. 1, step 5).

We examined annotated GO terms (biological processes and molecular functions

combined) [50], PFAM domains [51], and weighted gene co-expression network analysis

(WGCNA) [52] module memberships reported in the transcriptomics study from which we also

obtained the above-mentioned DEGs [19]. These WGCNA modules correlated expression of

gene-networks to sample types in that study, i.e., *i*) healthy ant controls, *ii*) *in vitro* fungus

controls, *iii*) active fungus-manipulated ants, and *iv*) dying fungus-manipulated ants. These

modules were additionally correlated directly between *Ophiocordyceps* gene modules and

Camponotus gene modules [19]. We referenced their previously assigned names following the

convention of ant-module-1 (A1) and fungus-module-1 (F1) as used in that study [19]. For

Camponotus proteins, we also tested for enrichments of DEG class (i.e., upregulated or

downregulated gene expression from healthy controls to active manipulated ants) [19]. For

Ophiocordyceps proteins, we additionally tested for enrichment of uSSP annotations.

We performed the hypergeometric enrichment analyses with the R package

timecourseRNAseq (v 0.0.9000) using default settings (significant enrichment at FDR $\leq$ 0.05) in

R studio (v 2021.09.2) with R (v 4.1) [53–55]. We plotted GO terms in semantic space to cluster

related terms based on R code generated from REVIGO but did not remove any GO terms (R

package ggplot2, v 3.3.5) [56,57].

"Aspecific" fungus-*Camponotus* PPI combinations: For more selective analyses of

species-specific *Ophiocordyceps-Camponotus* PPIs, we produced "aspecific" PPIs from the

secretomes of other fungi tested against the *C. floridanus* proteome. Removal of more common

PPIs, leaving only those potentially unique to *Ophiocordyceps*, provided a view that was easier

to interpret in the context of specialized parasite-host interactions, such as behavioral

manipulation. However, a PPI need not be unique to a certain cross-species interaction to be

relevant [1]. Additionally, computationally predicted protein binding does not indicate that all

such interactions occur in dynamic physiological environments. In and around the cell, protein

localization, transcriptional control, post-translational modification, competing PPIs, and

biochemical conditions (e.g., pH) could affect the likelihood of a predicted PPI to occur. The

cellular environments within fungal cells and insect cells could plausibly differ in many ways,

shaping protein activity. Therefore, we used the removal of aspecific interactions to help us focus

on some of the, likely, more important PPIs involved in establishing *Ophiocordyceps*

manipulation of ant behavior, but still anchored our analyses and discussion on the larger dataset.

We chose three fungi based on lifestyle, phylogeny, and availability of well-annotated

genomes to generate aspecific PPIs: *C. bassiana* (GenBank accession GCA_000280675.1), *T.*

reesei (GenBank accession GCA_000167675.2), and *S. cerevisiae* (GenBank accession

GCF_000146045.2) [7,58,59]. As for *Ophiocordyceps* (see above), we predicted each fungal

secretome and removed secreted proteins over 2,000 amino acids long, which only removed one

T. reesei protein (0.002%). The secretomes of *C. bassiana*, *T. reesei*, and *S. cerevisiae* fungi

included 833, 505, and 153 proteins, respectively. These proteins were then paired with the

Camponotus proteome for D-SCRIPT predictions (see above).

To find orthologous proteins between *Ophiocordyceps* and each of the aspecific fungi we

used Proteinortho (v 6.0) with default settings while enforcing blastp+ and single-best reciprocal

hits (i.e., -sim=1) [49]. Using this information, we identified shared PPIs between

Ophiocordyceps and *Camponotus*, and aspecific fungi and *Camponotus*; i.e., interactions

between orthologous fungal proteins and the same ant protein (Fig. S1). More stringently, we

also applied a filter that eliminated shared host proteins with aspecific fungal interactions,

regardless of orthology. This resulted in a set of *Ophiocordyceps* PPIs where the *Camponotus*

protein was never predicted in any aspecific PPI (Fig. S1). After removing either shared PPIs or

shared host proteins, we again performed enrichment analyses (see above) to investigate

overrepresented annotations among the *Ophiocordyceps*-specific PPIs (Fig. 1 step 6). To

visualize changes in PPI connectivity and abundance that resulted from these aspecific filters, we

used Cytoscape (v 3.8.2) to produce networks of host proteins and their respective

Ophiocordyceps binding partners [60].

Data availability – The genome assemblies used for this study are available on NCBI:

O. camponoti-floridani (GCA_012980515.1), *C. floridanus* (GCA_003227725.1), *C. bassiana*

(GCA_000280675.1), *T. reesei* (GCA_000167675.2), and *S. cerevisiae* (GCF_000146045.2)

[7,19,41,58,59]. Transcriptomic sequence data for *O. camponoti-floridani* and *C. floridanus* are

also hosted on NCBI (BioProject PRJNA600972) [19]. Analyzed transcriptomic data used here

are available on figshare, as supplemental information associated with their original publication

(https://doi.org/10.25387/g3.12121659) [19].

Results

Ophiocordyceps-Camponotus **PPIs:** We tested a total of 7,156,818 potential cross-

species PPIs between the parasite secretome and host proteome (Fig. 1 step 1). Of these possible

protein-protein combinations, 0.33% were positively predicted as PPIs (n = 23,629 PPIs) (Table

1, Fig. S2). This result is in line with a previous 0.95% positive D-SCRIPT prediction rate from a

single-species dataset testing 50 million potential PPIs [33].

From these positively predicted cross-species interactions, we removed 2,850 PPIs that

were homologous to within-*Ophiocordyceps* interactions (Fig. 1 step 2 and 3, Table 1). We then

selected those involving *Ophiocordyceps* proteins encoded by upregulated DEGs during

manipulation. This resulted in 6,011 predicted PPIs. We used this set of putative effector-host

PPIs, containing 129 unique *Ophiocordyceps* proteins and 2,083 unique *Camponotus* proteins,

for further analyses (Fig. 1 step 4, Table 1, File S2).

PPIs between aspecific fungi and *Camponotus* in comparison to *Ophiocordyceps*: The

proportions of positive PPI predictions between aspecific fungi and *C. floridanus* (range 0.26-

0.28%) and secreted proteins predicted to be in at least one PPI (range 68-76%) were similar to

the values observed for *Ophiocordyceps* (0.33% and 69%, respectively) (Table 1, Table S1).

Eliminating orthologous PPIs between *Ophiocordyceps* and any of the aspecific fungi (i.e.,

shared PPIs) removed 1,776 of the 6,011 (30%) *Ophiocordyceps-Camponotus* PPIs (Table 2,

Fig. S1). Eliminating PPIs involving host proteins that were also predicted to be bound by

aspecific fungi, regardless of orthology of the fungal binding partner (i.e., shared host proteins),

removed 1,936 of 2,083 (93%) host proteins, leaving only 157 *Ophiocordyceps-Camponotus*

PPIs (3%) (Table 2, Fig. S1). In line with secretome size, phylogeny, and entomopathogenic

lifestyle, *C. bassiana* shared the most overlap with *Ophiocordyceps* predictions (Fig. S1). As

expected, removing PPIs involving shared host proteins led to major changes in enrichment

results while removing shared PPIs led to more modest changes (Table 2, File S3). We primarily

report the results based on all three fungi that we included in this study. However, those based on

C. bassiana alone were largely similar (Fig. S1, File S3). While these filters assisted us in

ordering and emphasizing results (i.e., signals maintained through the strictest filters are being

prioritized), we did not use this approach to wholly select PPIs of interest. Results presented

below only use aspecific filters where stated.

***Ophiocordyceps* enrichment signals:** We found that *Ophiocordyceps* proteins in PPIs

with *Camponotus* proteins were enriched for one PFAM domain and three WGCNA modules

(Fig. 2, Table 2).

S8 serine peptidases – The enriched PFAM domain was a "peptidase S8 domain,"

indicating an overrepresentation of fungal serine proteases that could cleave host proteins. The

five fungal peptidase S8 proteins in this enrichment were predicted to interact with 34 host

proteins across 39 PPIs (File S2). Among these host proteins, there were seven kinesin-like

proteins (motor proteins), five nuclear pore proteins, and a (pro-)resilin that is an insect cuticle

and connective tissue protein [61]. Even after removing PPIs that were shared with aspecific

fungi, the enrichment signal for S8 peptidases was retained. However, the much more stringent

removal of shared host targets eliminated the S8 peptidase enrichment result (Fig. 1 step 6, Table

2).

Fungal manipulation WGCNA modules – We also found fungal WGCNA modules F1,

F2, and F3 to be enriched (Fig. 2). Modules F1 and F2 were previously described to have

significant positive correlations to manipulation. This means that most of the fungal genes in

those modules were upregulated, in a similar co-expressed manner, during manipulated

summiting behavior. As such, these modules contained multiple genes hypothesized to mediate

infection or manipulation processes (uSSPs and hypothesized effectors modules) (Fig. 2). With

fungal gene expression clearly negatively correlated with control cultures, module F3 was

modestly positively correlated to fungi in both manipulated hosts and dying hosts. This module

largely contained genes related to core cell processes in the fungus (e.g., DNA packaging) (Fig.

2). All three fungal modules also had significant direct correlations to ant WGCNA modules,

with F1 being negatively correlated to ant modules A14 and A15 – both associated with host

neuronal processes (Fig. 2). Core cell processes module F3 was positively correlated with

neuronal process module A15 [19]. The overrepresentations of all three fungal WGCNA

modules was retained after eliminating shared PPIs, but uSSP and effectors module F1 was lost

after removing shared host proteins (Table 2).

***Camponotus* enrichment signals:** We found that *Camponotus* PPI proteins were

enriched for 50 GO terms, 74 PFAM domains and nine WGCNA modules (Table 2). As GO

term and PFAM domain enrichments often indicated similar functions, we present results largely

from the GO term perspective. We highlight PFAM domains for emphasis or to discuss

biologically interesting results not well captured by GO terms alone.

G protein-coupled receptor signaling – We detected GO term enrichments for "G

protein-coupled receptor (GPCR) activity" and "GPCR signaling pathway" (Fig. 3). These

enrichments resulted from 71 GPCR-related PPIs with 16 unique *Ophiocordyceps* proteins (File

S2). All but two receptor proteins in these PPIs carried the PFAM domain "7 transmembrane

receptor (rhodopsin family)." We found 33 unique GPCR-related protein genes (of 128 possible

with these GO terms), with a range of putative ligands: 11 neuropeptides (n = 12 receptors), four

biogenic monoamines (dopamine, serotonin, octopamine, tyramine) (n = 11 receptors),

acetylcholine (n = 2 receptors), a spider venom toxin protein (alpha-latrotoxin) (n = 1 receptor),

and opsin blue- and ultraviolet-sensitive receptors (n = 2 receptors). Fourteen of these 33

Camponotus receptors (or receptor subunits) belonged in ant-neuronal processes WGCNA

modules A14 and A15, which showed overall reduced expression during manipulation compared

to healthy ants (i.e., the modules were negatively correlated to manipulation) [19]. Host GPCR-

related PPI proteins were predicted to bind 16 fungal proteins that included five uSSPs, a

carboxylesterase, a glycosyl hydrolase, a CAP cysteine-rich secretory protein, and a protein

tyrosine phosphatase. Most of these fungal proteins were previously assigned to fungal uSSPs

and effectors module F2 (n = 9) but included some in modules F1-4 (File S2), which all were

also correlated to infection and manipulation of hosts.

The enrichment signals for GPCRs were retained after we removed both PPIs and host

proteins shared with aspecific fungi (Fig. 4). Twenty-eight of the 33 GPCR host proteins

remained after removing shared PPIs. However, only seven remained after filtering out shared

host proteins. These host proteins, predicted to be uniquely bound by *Ophiocordyceps* during

manipulation, were a putative dopamine receptor 2, Oamb octopamine receptor, methuselah-like

10 receptor, orexin receptor, trissin receptor, cAMP-dependent protein kinase subunit, and

receptor without an informative BLAST description ("uncharacterized protein"). The four

Ophiocordyceps proteins binding these host receptors were predicted in many PPIs (range = 101

to 458). The dopamine receptor 2, Oamb octopamine receptor, and uncharacterized receptor

shared the same fungal uSSP partner. The orexin and trissin receptors also shared an unannotated

secreted fungal protein (larger than an uSSP).

Oxidation-reduction – We also found the enrichment of oxidation-reduction functions

among *Camponotus* proteins in PPIs (six supporting GO terms) (Fig. 3, File S2). Altogether, 159

host proteins had oxidation-reduction annotations, forming 321 PPIs with 48 parasite proteins. A

plurality of the host proteins were encoded by cytochrome P450 genes (70 unique genes, 15

putative subtypes). This abundance of cytochrome P450, a hemoprotein, also contributed to the

enrichment of "heme-binding" and "iron ion binding" GO terms (Fig. 3) and the PFAM domain

"cytochrome P450" (File S2). These *Camponotus* cytochrome P450 proteins paired with 10

unique *Ophiocordyceps* genes, consisting of uSSPs and fungal cytochrome P450s. Other notable

contributors to the host enrichment of oxidation reduction related functions were peroxiredoxins,

laccases, dehydrogenases, and a vat-1 synaptic vesicle membrane-like protein (File S2). The 48

fungal proteins included cytochrome P450s, oxidases and oxidoreductases, amidases, peptidases,

and an enterotoxin.

Enrichment signals for four of the six oxidation-reduction GO terms were retained after

we removed PPIs that were shared with the aspecific fungi. Only two remained after we applied

the more stringent shared host protein filter (File S3). Additionally, indicators of cytochromes,

heme and iron binding GO terms and the "cytochrome P450" PFAM domain, continued to be

enriched after either filter (File S3). Most host proteins passed the shared PPI filter (140 of 159),

but only 19 remained after removing shared host proteins (Fig. 4). Cytochrome P450 proteins

shifted from a plurality to a dominant majority after shared host protein filtering (17 of 19

proteins), with eight cytochrome P450 subtypes: 3A19, 315a1, 4C1, 49a1, 6a13, 6a14, 6k1, and

9e2.

Transcription and DNA-binding – Multiple enrichments that can be associated to gene

transcription and regulation were enriched. We found 204 host proteins annotated for any of

"DNA binding," "DNA-binding transcription factor activity," "sequence-specific DNA binding,"

"DNA helicase activity," "regulation of transcription, DNA-templated," and "mRNA binding"

GO terms (Fig. 3). These proteins similarly contributed to the high enrichment of PFAM

domains such as "helix-loop-helix DNA-binding domain," "zinc Finger C4 type," "'paired box'

domain," and "bZIP transcription factor" (File S2). These 204 host proteins interacted with 43

fungal proteins to generate 922 PPIs. Among the 204 host proteins, we found transcription

factors and regulators with many functions, which included examples associated with insect

behavior and neuronal function such as Mushroom body large type Kenyon specific protein 1

(e.g., elevated in worker bees, foraging behavior), Gooseberry (e.g., neuromuscular junction

function), Hairy (e.g., juvenile hormone mediated gene repression), photoreceptor specific

nuclear receptor (light sensing), CLOCK (circadian clocks), and steroid and ecdysone nuclear

receptors and induced proteins [62–66]. Other proteins, most clearly understood from the

neuronal development perspective thus far, produce atypical behavioral or locomotor phenotypes

when dysregulated and include Jim Lovell, Dead ringer, Hairy/enhancer-of-split related,

Achaete-scute complex proteins, and Forkhead [67–72]. These 34 proteins taken as biologically

relevant examples account for 186 of the 922 gene regulation PPIs, interacting with 20

Ophiocordyceps proteins covering a similar breadth of protein types as the 43 parasite proteins

overall (File S2). The 43 fungal proteins included five uSSPs that were also found in the PPIs

reported above (Fig. 4A), three that were not, and various hydrolases, oxidoreductases,

peptidases, and carboxylesterases.

All of the aforementioned GO terms and PFAM domains continued to be enriched after

removing shared PPIs (191 of 204 host proteins retained), but none of these annotations

continued to be enriched after removing shared aspecific host proteins (five host proteins

retained) (Fig. 4, File S3).

Cuticular proteins – We found 28 ant proteins that shared the enriched GO term

"structural constituent of cuticle" (Fig. 3) and PFAM domain "insect cuticle protein" (File S2).

We predicted these ant proteins interacted with 22 fungal proteins to form 138 PPIs (Fig. 4A).

These host proteins included (pro-)resilin, endocuticle structural proteins, and a range of "cuticle

proteins" (e.g., "cuticle protein 7"). The fungal proteins included a CAP protein and a

carboxylesterase also predicted to bind GPCRs (see above). Four fungal uSSPs were shared with

the transcription and DNA-binding host proteins. We additionally identified a glycosyl

hydrolase, a disintegrin/reprolysin-like peptidase, a S8 subtilisin-like serine peptidase, M43

peptidases, an uSSP, and an unannotated secreted protein (larger than an uSSP). These

enrichments were only kept under the aspecific shared PPI filter (with all 28 original cuticular

proteins) and lost with the shared host protein filter (none of the 28 proteins were uniquely bound

by *Ophiocordyceps*) (Fig. 4, File S3).

Ant DEGs and WGCNA modules –*Camponotus* genes that were previously determined

to be differentially expressed during manipulation, as well as host gene modules, which were

found to be correlated to manipulation, were enriched among PPI proteins (File S2). Both up-

and downregulated host DEGs were enriched. The upregulated host DEGs were enriched for

gene/DNA regulatory functions and the downregulated DEGs for oxidation-reduction (File S2).

Three ant WGCNA modules were enriched that had significant correlations to manipulation,

with an additional six that did not (of 22 possible modules total). Neuronal processes module

A14 was negatively correlated to manipulation and fungal uSSP and effectors module F1 (Fig.

2). This host module included many genes putatively associated with neuronal function,

including GPCRs reported above [19]. The other host neuronal processes module, A15, was not

enriched for PPIs. Module A10 was positively correlated to manipulation and contained

enrichment signals for GO terms indicating signal transduction and transcription [19] (Fig. 2).

Module A4 had a positive correlation to manipulation and contained enrichment signals for

proteasomes and odor detection [19] (Fig. 2). All three of these host modules passed the shared

PPI filter but did not persist after removing shared host targets with aspecific fungi.

Discussion

The inter-species molecular interactions during manipulation of *C. floridanus* by *O.*

camponoti-floridani are likely mediated by parasite effector proteins that target host proteins. To

predict such protein-protein interactions (PPIs), we used the machine learning tool D-SCRIPT,

which infers structural relationships between proteins without relying on protein-wide sequence

homology to known interactions. This flexibility allows D-SCRIPT models to extend predictions

across organisms and beyond previously documented PPIs. As such, D-SCRIPT was able to

predict several thousand PPIs between *Camponotus* host proteins and upregulated, secreted

Ophiocordyceps proteins.

Due to the unfamiliar terrain of leveraging this approach between non-model species, we

sought to propose hypotheses balancing biological plausibility and the possibility of novel

interactions. On the one hand, we considered PPI predictions in the light of previous knowledge

of protein and cellular function. However, since the molecular aspects of parasitic manipulation

are still largely to be uncovered, we also considered that undescribed or unusual mechanisms

may underlie these interactions. Often, we found that single proteins, especially from

Ophiocordyceps, were in multiple host-parasite PPIs. Although in some cases these could be

errant predictions (D-SCRIPT's precision rate is 80%) [33], *Ophiocordyceps* effectors may

indeed bind many host proteins across different pathways. This is a commonly observed

phenomenon in microbe-plant interactions, and is possibly even the norm [2,4]. Moreover, we

found that only the S8 peptidase annotation term was enriched among *Ophiocordyceps* secreted,

upregulated proteins that were in PPIs with *Camponotus* proteins. This finding indicates that the

PPI proteins are not a sharply distinct subset from the fungal secretome (i.e., background

proteins of the enrichment analysis), which is functionally enriched for pathogenesis and

proteolytic activity overall [19]. In contrast, we detected many enriched annotations for the host

side of the interactions.

***Ophiocordyceps* proteolysis of core intracellular host proteins –** Fungal PPI proteins

were enriched for S8 peptidase domains, indicating that a significant number of these proteins

had proteolytic functions with possibly diverse targets [73]. Cuticular host proteins are a

canonical target for such effectors as we discuss below. Additionally, multiple host kinesin

motor proteins were in PPIs with these *Ophiocordyceps* proteases. Kinesins play a role in mitotic

and intracellular transport processes – with key functions in vesicle transport towards the

periphery of neurons [74]. Defects in kinesin activity can lead to dysregulated neurotransmitter

release at synapses, thereby contributing to impaired neurological functions and development

[74,75]. From these predicted S8 peptidase-kinesin interactions, we infer that the fungus may be

dysregulating core host cell processes. The effects of which possibly impair neuron signaling and

neurotransmitter release to contribute to modified behavioral phenotypes. We also predicted

these peptidases to interact with multiple *Camponotus* nuclear pore proteins. Although some

components of the nuclear pore undergo proteolytic post-translational modification to remove

SUMOylation [76,77], those peptidases are in a different family than S8 peptidases. If the

predicted S8 peptidase-nucleopore proteins interactions are genuine, this could mean the parasite

alters transport of molecules in and out of the host nucleus. Speculatively, this could facilitate

entry of the fungal proteins that bind host transcription factors.

***Camponotus* G protein-coupled receptors as targets to modify behavior –** We

detected over 30 ant GPCRs or GPCR subunits in PPIs with fungal proteins. Most GPCRs were

from the rhodopsin/A family and included receptors related to biogenic monoamines,

acetylcholine, and neuropeptides. These receptors offer a wide range of hypothetical connections

to manipulated ant behavior. Commonly, these receptors and their ligands have been linked to

locomotion, feeding, and circadian rhythms – processes that have been previously highlighted in

hypotheses of *Ophiocordyceps* and other fungus-insect summit-disease behavioral manipulations

[10,14,19,78,79].

The monoamine neurotransmitters dopamine, serotonin, octopamine (analogous to

vertebrate norepinephrine), and tyramine have been implicated in modulating locomotor,

foraging, learning, social, reproductive, and aggressive behaviors in many insects, with

experimental evidence in social insects, including ants [80–85]. Compared to the aspecific fungi

tested, both a *C. floridanus* dopamine and octopamine receptor were uniquely bound by

Ophiocordyceps upregulated secreted proteins. This interaction hypothetically implicates these

host receptors in specific *Ophiocordyceps* interactions such as behavioral manipulation. We

additionally detected two muscarinic acetylcholine receptors associated with sensory and motor

neurons in non-insect animals [86–88]. In bees, excessive activation of acetylcholine receptors

can cause changes in locomotor, navigational, foraging, and social behaviors [89]. Changes in

such behaviors have also been observed in *C. floridanus* ants infected with *O. camponoti-*

floridani. Locomotor behavior is enhanced in these ants, while social behaviors are diminished,

daily timed foraging activities become arrhythmic and navigation capabilities appear less

effective [17].

The neuropeptide GPCRs in PPIs had a range of putative ligands linking parasite

interference with behavior-regulating processes such as circadian rhythm, nutritional signaling,

insect hormones, and odor reception. These GPCRs included a host trissin receptor and an

allatotropin receptor (i.e., annotated as an "orexin" receptor, but likely an allatotropin receptor in

insects), which, compared to the aspecific fungi, only *Ophiocordyceps* was predicted to bind.

Between these two receptors, dysregulation of feeding and circadian control of locomotor

activity, juvenile hormone production, immune activation, and muscle stimulation are possible

effects [90–96]. Circadian rhythm is related to ant foraging behavior (and, perhaps indirectly,

feeding) and is affected by *Ophiocordyceps* infection [17]. The synchronized time-of-day

summiting and biting behavior further suggests a role for circadian control of activity [15,19,23].

Interlaced with feeding and foraging processes in ants, juvenile hormone mediates

insulin/feeding related signaling and social caste identity (e.g., foraging workers) [28,97–99].

Among the host neuropeptide GPCR targets shared with the aspecific fungi, we predicted

binding of receptors also associated with locomotion and activity levels, feeding, aggression,

muscle control, juvenile hormone, reproductive behavior, or pheromones that included those

activated by: allatostatin-A [100–103], adipokinetic hormone or corazonin (i.e., a "gondaotropin-

releasing hormone" receptor) [104], cholecystokinin-like peptides [105], CCHamide-2 [106], and

pyrokinin, pheromone biosynthesis activating neuropeptide (PBAN) and/or capa type

neuropeptides [107–109]. Odor and pheromone detection are key elements of ant

communication, behavioral regulation, and social interactions [110–112]. Possibly, GPCRs

typically involved in odorant response could become dysregulated by fungal effectors to dampen

nestmate interaction and/or induce aberrant behavior without normal cues. Taken together, we

found multiple PPIs involving ant GPCRs putatively involved in signaling systems that could

control which and when certain behaviors are performed by manipulated ants.

We also predicted PPIs involving a putative host cAMP-dependent protein kinase

catalytic subunit, found only between *Ophiocordyceps* and *Camponotus*, and a host G-protein

subunit alpha, both of which serve important roles as components of GPCRs. This alpha subunit

was also found previously to be downregulated in manipulated *Camponotus* [19].

Ophiocordyceps interference with host GPCR signaling has been previously hypothesized to be

mediated, at least in part, by enterotoxins and other fungal protein toxins that interfere with

cAMP levels and signal transduction [14,19,24,25].

Given the signal for GPCR interference, with both our broadest and narrowest analyses,

and that many of these receptors/ligands overlap in their behavioral associations, we suggest that

this provides evidence for host-parasite GPCR PPIs as one mechanism of behavioral

manipulation used by *Ophiocordyceps*. The fungal counterparts in these host GPCR-parasite

effector PPIs were often predicted in many interactions. These fungal proteins included five

uSSPs upregulated during manipulation and correlated to manipulation in WGCNA modules

[19]. Given that these fungal proteins lack annotations, we cannot yet determine if they might be

agonists or antagonists and if they bind the ligand-site or elsewhere on the receptor. As these

uSSPs were not predicted to be specific to only binding these host proteins, their interaction with

the receptors may be less likely mediated by specific receptor-ligand binding sites than more

generic contact sites elsewhere on the host protein.

Host-pathogen interactions involving oxidation-reduction – We predicted over 300

PPIs that contributed to an enrichment of oxidation-reduction processes among the host proteins.

Oxidation-reduction processes can be involved in a range of metabolic, development, and host-

parasite interaction pathways that have been previously hypothesized to play a role in

Ophiocordyceps infections [14,19,113,114]. Approximately half of the host proteins were

putative cytochrome P450s, with enrichment signals for cytochrome P450s maintained after

aspecific fungi filtering. In insects, cytochrome P450 proteins are often involved in hormone

metabolism (e.g. ecdysone and juvenile hormone), stress response, xenobiotic detoxification

processes, and cuticular development [115–121]. For example, we found multiple cytochrome

p450 proteins bound uniquely by *Ophiocordyceps* of the 4C1 subtype that has been implicated in

stress response (e.g., social isolation, temperature, UV, or starvation) and insecticide/xenobiotic

detoxification, and is regulated by hormones including juvenile hormone [117,122–125]. In turn,

D-SCRIPT predicted that many of those host cytochrome P450s interacted with fungal

cytochrome P450s. Although cytochrome P450 proteins often act independently, homo- and

hetero-dimer formation of cytochrome P450 proteins can modulate protein function in positive,

negative, and substrate-specific manners [126]. Oxidation-reduction related PPIs might most

strongly represent the physiological stress and antagonistic cellular processes between host and

parasite. However, fungal interference with these pathways may also be critical elements of

creating a host susceptible to manipulation.

Alteration of *Camponotus* gene regulation – We found signs that suggest

Ophiocordyceps could interfere with *Camponotus* gene regulation via proteins that bind host

transcription factors and DNA- or mRNA-binding proteins. Using the host's own cells to

dysregulate behavioral pathways could be metabolically favorable for the parasite. Some of the

fungal proteins in these PPIs were uSSPs and we, therefore, cannot predict the functional result

of those PPIs. However, several parasite proteins were hydrolases. We suggest that these

hydrolases most plausibly cleave host proteins or their post-translational modifications.

Depending on the role of the protein and specific bond broken, parasite hydrolase activity could

increase or decrease transcription of host genes. Among the ca. 200 host proteins in the

nucleotide-binding category, we found many tied to behavioral activity via changes in

locomotion, feeding/foraging, gravitaxis, light perception, circadian clocks, development and

social caste related hormones, and neuronal maintenance. Covering a similar breadth of

processes as the host GPCRs in PPIs, transcriptional interference may be a complementary

parasite strategy to modify their hosts. However, very few of these putative targets passed the

strictest shared aspecific host protein filter. As such, specific hypotheses about individual

transcription factors are difficult to parse. However, as a broader functional category, many of

these host proteins intersect with processes that appear relevant to manipulated ant behavior.

Destruction of *Camponotus* structural proteins – During manipulation, the fungus also

secretes proteins predicted to bind host cuticle and connective tissue proteins. Being an

endoparasite, *Ophiocordyceps* has direct access to internal host connective tissues, the

endocuticle layer (once the epidermis is breached), and the cuticular lining of the gut and

trachea, which include tissues that contain chitin [61,127]. However, the fungal cell wall also

contains chitin. As such, we cannot fully discount that some of these secreted fungal proteins

may simply be cell wall modifying proteins that have falsely been predicted to bind chitin-

associated ant proteins. Nevertheless, the fungus could be degrading cuticular proteins for

nutrition, detaching muscles, or in preparation for emerging hyphae to later grow out of the host

cadaver. Corroborating evidence for the disruption of the musculature stems from detailed

microscopy work on *Ophiocordyceps*-infected ants at the time of manipulated summiting and

biting behavior. These reports describe visual signs of fungal invasion, tissue degradation, and

atrophy of manipulated ant mandible muscles [15,22,29,128].

The predicted fungal interactors with host structural proteins included multiple proteases

such as a M43-like metalloprotease and S8 subtilisin-like serine peptidase. S8 peptidases can

degrade insect cuticle and are found in many fungi [129,130]. We also detected unannotated

secreted proteins in cuticular protein PPIs that could have similar or different functions. The

aspecific fungi included a generalist entomopathogen capable of degrading a wide variety of

insect tissue (*C. bassiana*); consistent with this, we found no *Ophiocordyceps*-specific cuticular-

protein host targets.

Gene networks and expression broadly implicate PPIs in manipulation –

Ophiocordyceps PPI proteins were enriched for WGCNA modules transcriptionally associated

with manipulation and containing uSSPs and other previously hypothesized effectors (F1 and F2)

[19]. In *Camponotus*, gene modules associated with neuronal processes and GPCRs (A14) and

signaling and transcription (A10) further support the involvement of these processes with

manipulation [19]. Assuming "guilt-by-association," in some cases this could indicate these PPIs

are related to infection and manipulation processes even if we yet lack clear mechanistic

hypotheses of how (e.g., PPIs with uSSPs) [131–133]. Additionally, both upregulated and

downregulated host DEGs [19] were enriched in predicted PPIs, possibly indicating homeostatic

responses to fungal modulation of functional protein levels. As such, the proteome-level

predictions that we made in this study are well in line with previous transcriptomics work.

Therefore, this work serves as an additional line of evidence for certain host processes and

narrows the pool of well-supported effector candidates involved with behavioral manipulation.

Conclusion – Faced with the challenge of uncovering how a parasitism with two non-

model species may operate at the molecular level, we combined multiple datatypes and tools to

predict host-parasite PPIs. These approaches are feasible in many study systems, even for those

that may lack the tools for sophisticated functional testing. We employed a structurally aware

machine learning program, D-SCRIPT, to predict PPIs beyond well-documented interactions. By

combining genomic and transcriptomic data we selected PPIs of interest with multiple

bioinformatic tools to: (*i*) annotate secreted fungal proteins, (*ii*) filter interactions predicted

across different species, and (*iii*) select proteins linked to increased gene expression during

infection. Using the resulting PPIs, we performed enrichment analyses to identify functional

categories that should be robust to computational error rates at the individual PPI level. Taken

together, we produced multiple hypotheses connecting host-parasite cross-species PPIs to

processes related to infection and manipulation of *Camponotus* by *Ophiocordyceps*. We

highlighted evidence for PPIs involving fungal S8 proteases and PPIs involving host oxidation-

reduction processes, cuticular proteins, gene regulation, and GPCRs. Especially, with

analytically robust results and direct biological links to behavior, we emphasize parasitic

dysregulation of GPCR signaling as a mechanism of parasitic behavioral manipulation.

Key Points

- Producing high-throughput predictions of host-parasite protein interactions can offer initial

insights and hypotheses that lay the foundation for future functional validation. However, this

can be a challenge if the taxa and proteins studied are dissimilar from preexisting data.

- To reduce the constraints based on approaches only using protein sequence homology, we used

a sequence-to-structure based machine learning tool (D-SCRIPT).

- We also used multiple supporting bioinformatic steps to select PPIs based the plausibility of the

parasite protein being an effector (secretion and gene upregulation during infection) and

specificity of the interaction across multiple species tested.

- Group-level enrichment analyses indicated multiple host-parasite processes may be at play,

with notable signals for interactions with host GPCRs related to behavioral processes.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation [CAREER IOS-1941546 to

C.dB].

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Biplabendu Das, who was involved in discussions of project

goals and approaches, and Anna Savage, who provided constructive comments on a draft of this

manuscript. I.W., W.C.B., and C.dB. conceived the project and wrote the manuscript. W.C.B.

performed the secretome annotation. I.W. performed PPI predictions, enrichment analyses, and

visualization.

References

1. Beckerson WC, Rodríguez De La Vega RC, Hartmann FE, et al. Cause and effectors: Whole-

genome comparisons reveal shared but rapidly evolving effector sets among host-specific plant-

castrating fungi. MBio 2019; 10:

2. Hogenhout SA, Van Der Hoorn RAL, Terauchi R, et al. Emerging concepts in effector biology

of plant-associated organisms. Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact. 2009; 22:115–122

3. Wang H, Peng H, Li W, et al. The Toxins of Beauveria bassiana and the Strategies to Improve

Their Virulence to Insects. Front. Microbiol. 2021; 12:2375

4. Win J, Chaparro-Garcia A, Belhaj K, et al. Effector Biology of Plant-Associated Organisms:

Concepts and Perspectives. Cold Spring Harb. Symp. Quant. Biol. 2012; 77:235–247

5. Cen K, Li B, Lu Y, et al. Divergent LysM effectors contribute to the virulence of Beauveria

bassiana by evasion of insect immune defenses. PLOS Pathog. 2017; 13:e1006604

6. Wang C, Wang S. Insect Pathogenic Fungi: Genomics, Molecular Interactions, and Genetic

Improvements. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-031616-035509 2017; 62:73–90

7. Xiao G, Ying S-H, Zheng P, et al. Genomic perspectives on the evolution of fungal

entomopathogenicity in Beauveria bassiana. Sci. Rep. 2012; 2:483

8. Araújo JPM, Hughes DP. Zombie-Ant Fungi Emerged from Non-manipulating, Beetle-

Infecting Ancestors. Curr. Biol. 2019;

9. Andersen SB, Gerritsma S, Yusah KM, et al. The Life of a Dead Ant: The Expression of an

Adaptive Extended Phenotype. Am. Nat. 2009; 174:424–433

10. de Bekker C, Beckerson WC, Elya C. Mechanisms behind the Madness: How Do Zombie-

Making Fungal Entomopathogens Affect Host Behavior To Increase Transmission? MBio 2021;

11. Lovett B, St. Leger RJ, de Fine Licht HH. Going gentle into that pathogen-induced

goodnight. J. Invertebr. Pathol. 2020; 174:107398

12. Andriolli FS, Ishikawa NK, Vargas-Isla R, et al. Do zombie ant fungi turn their hosts into

light seekers? Behav. Ecol. 2019; 30:609–616

13. Will I, Linehan S, Jenkins DG, et al. Natural history and ecological effects on the

establishment and fate of Florida carpenter ant cadavers infected by the parasitic manipulator

Ophiocordyceps camponoti-floridani. Funct. Ecol. 2022; Accepted:

14. de Bekker C, Ohm RA, Loreto RG, et al. Gene expression during zombie ant biting behavior

reflects the complexity underlying fungal parasitic behavioral manipulation. BMC Genomics

2015; 16:620

15. Hughes DP, Andersen SB, Hywel-Jones NL, et al. Behavioral mechanisms and

morphological symptoms of zombie ants dying from fungal infection. BMC Ecol. 2011; 11:13

16. Pontoppidan MB, Himaman W, Hywel-Jones NL, et al. Graveyards on the move: The spatio-

temporal distribution of dead ophiocordyceps-infected ants. PLoS One 2009; 4:e4835

17. Trinh T, Ouellette R, de Bekker C. Getting lost: the fungal hijacking of ant foraging

behaviour in space and time. Anim. Behav. 2021; 181:165–184

18. Evans HC. Entomogenous fungi in tropical forest ecosystems: an appraisal. Ecol. Entomol.

1982; 7–60

19. Will I, Das B, Trinh T, et al. Genetic Underpinnings of Host Manipulation by

Ophiocordyceps as Revealed by Comparative Transcriptomics. G3 (Bethesda). 2020; 10:2275–

2296

20. Beckerson WC, Krider C, Mohammad UA, et al. 28 Minutes Later: A behavioural and

transcriptomic investigation into the potential role of aflatrem-like compounds in establishing

Ophiocordyceps extended phenotypes in zombie ants. bioRxiv 2022; 2022.09.08.507134

21. Loreto RG, Hughes DP. The metabolic alteration and apparent preservation of the zombie ant

brain. J. Insect Physiol. 2019; 118:103918

22. Zheng S, Loreto R, Smith P, et al. Specialist and Generalist Fungal Parasites Induce Distinct

Biochemical Changes in the Mandible Muscles of Their Host. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 2019; 20:

23. de Bekker C, Quevillon LE, Smith PB, et al. Species-specific Ant Brain Manipulation by a

Specialized Fungal Parasite. BMC Evol. Biol. 2014; 14:166

24. de Bekker C, Ohm RA, Evans HC, et al. Ant-infecting Ophiocordyceps genomes reveal a

high diversity of potential behavioral manipulation genes and a possible major role for

enterotoxins. Sci. Rep. 2017; 7:12508

25. Kobmoo N, Wichadakul D, Arnamnart N, et al. A genome scan of diversifying selection in

Ophiocordyceps zombie-ant fungi suggests a role for enterotoxins in co-evolution and host

specificity. Mol. Ecol. 2018; 27:3582–3598

26. de Bekker C. Ophiocordyceps–ant interactions as an integrative model to understand the

molecular basis of parasitic behavioral manipulation. Curr. Opin. Insect Sci. 2019; 33:19–24

27. de Bekker C, Merrow M, Hughes DP. From behavior to mechanisms: An integrative

approach to the manipulation by a parasitic fungus (Ophiocordyceps unilateralis s.l.) of its host

ants (Camponotus spp.). Integr. Comp. Biol. 2014; 52:166–176

28. de Bekker C, Das B. Hijacking time: How Ophiocordyceps fungi could be using ant host

clocks to manipulate behavior. Parasite Immunol. 2022; 44:e12909

29. Mangold CA, Ishler MJ, Loreto RG, et al. Zombie ant death grip due to hypercontracted

mandibular muscles. J. Exp. Biol. 2019; 222:jeb200683

30. Gupta SK, Srivastava M, Osmanoglu Ö, et al. Genome-wide inference of the Camponotus

floridanus protein-protein interaction network using homologous mapping and interacting

domain profile pairs. Sci. Rep. 2020; 10:2334

31. Loaiza CD, Duhan N, Lister M, et al. In silico prediction of host–pathogen protein

interactions in melioidosis pathogen Burkholderia pseudomallei and human reveals novel

virulence factors and their targets. Brief. Bioinform. 2021; 22:1–18

32. Ma S, Song Q, Tao H, et al. Prediction of protein–protein interactions between fungus

(Magnaporthe grisea) and rice (Oryza sativa L.). Brief. Bioinform. 2019; 20:448–456

685 33. Sledzieski S, Singh R, Cowen L, et al. D-SCRIPT translates genome to phenome with

686 sequence-based, structure-aware, genome-scale predictions of protein-protein interactions. Cell

687 Syst. 2021; 12:969-982.e6

688 34. Chen H, Li F, Wang L, et al. Systematic evaluation of machine learning methods for

689 identifying human–pathogen protein–protein interactions. Brief. Bioinform. 2021; 22:1–21

690 35. Walhout AJM, Sordella R, Lu X, et al. Protein interaction mapping in C. elegans Using

691 proteins involved in vulval development. Science (80-.). 2000; 287:116–122

692 36. Chen M, Ju CJ-T, Zhou G, et al. Multifaceted protein–protein interaction prediction based on

693 Siamese residual RCNN. Bioinformatics 2019; 35:i305–i314

694 37. Hwang H, Vreven T, Janin J, et al. Protein–protein docking benchmark version 4.0. Proteins

695 Struct. Funct. Bioinforma. 2010; 78:3111–3114

696 38. Cheng Q, Wang H, Xu B, et al. Discovery of a novel small secreted protein family with

697 conserved N-terminal IGY motif in Dikarya fungi. BMC Genomics 2014; 15:1–12

698 39. Feldman D, Yarden O, Hadar Y. Seeking the Roles for Fungal Small-Secreted Proteins in

699 Affecting Saprophytic Lifestyles. Front. Microbiol. 2020; 11:455

700 40. Fischer R, Requena N. Small-secreted proteins as virulence factors in nematode-trapping

701 fungi. Trends Microbiol. 2022;

702 41. Shields EJ, Sheng L, Weiner AK, et al. High-Quality Genome Assemblies Reveal Long Non-

703 coding RNAs Expressed in Ant Brains. Cell Rep. 2018; 23:3078–3090

704 42. Teufel F, Almagro Armenteros JJ, Johansen AR, et al. SignalP 6.0 predicts all five types of

705 signal peptides using protein language models. Nat. Biotechnol. 2022 407 2022; 40:1023–1025

706 43. Krogh A, Larsson B, von Heijne G, et al. Predicting transmembrane protein topology with a

707 hidden markov model: application to complete genomes. J. Mol. Biol. 2001; 305:567–580

44. Käll L, Krogh A, Sonnhammer ELL. A Combined Transmembrane Topology and Signal

Peptide Prediction Method. J. Mol. Biol. 2004; 338:1027–1036

45. Sigrist CJA, Cerutti L, Hulo N, et al. PROSITE: A documented database using patterns and

profiles as motif descriptors. Brief. Bioinform. 2002; 3:265–274

46. Pierleoni A, Martelli P, Casadio R. PredGPI: A GPI-anchor predictor. BMC Bioinformatics

2008; 9:1–11

47. Brameier M, Krings A, MacCallum RM. NucPred—Predicting nuclear localization of

proteins. Bioinformatics 2007; 23:1159–1160

48. Emanuelsson O, Nielsen H, Brunak S, et al. Predicting Subcellular Localization of Proteins

Based on their N-terminal Amino Acid Sequence. J. Mol. Biol. 2000; 300:1005–1016

49. Lechner M, Findeiß S, Steiner L, et al. Proteinortho: Detection of (Co-)orthologs in large-

scale analysis. BMC Bioinformatics 2011; 12:1–9

50. Ashburner M, Ball CA, Blake JA, et al. Gene Ontology: tool for the unification of biology.

Nat. Genet. 2000; 25:25–29

51. Finn RD, Bateman A, Clements J, et al. Pfam: the protein families database. Nucleic Acids

Res. 2014; 42:D222–D230

52. Langfelder P, Horvath S. WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network analysis.

BMC Bioinformatics 2008; 9:559

53. Das B. timecourseRnaseq: Analyses And Visualisation Of Timecourse RNASeq Data. 2022;

54. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2021;

55. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development for R. 2015;

56. Supek F, Bošnjak M, Škunca N, et al. REVIGO Summarizes and Visualizes Long Lists of

Gene Ontology Terms. PLoS One 2011; 6:e21800

57. Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. 2016;

58. Engel SR, Wong ED, Nash RS, et al. New data and collaborations at the Saccharomyces

Genome Database: updated reference genome, alleles, and the Alliance of Genome Resources.

Genetics 2022; 220:

59. Martinez D, Berka RM, Henrissat B, et al. Genome sequencing and analysis of the biomass-

degrading fungus Trichoderma reesei (syn. Hypocrea jecorina). Nat. Biotechnol. 2008 265 2008;

26:553–560

60. Shannon P, Markiel A, Ozier O, et al. Cytoscape: a software environment for integrated

models of biomolecular interaction networks. Genome Res. 2003; 13:2498–2504

61. Burrows M, Sutton GP. Locusts use a composite of resilin and hard cuticle as an energy store

for jumping and kicking. J. Exp. Biol. 2012; 215:3501–3512

62. Guo Z, Qin J, Zhou X, et al. Insect Transcription Factors: A Landscape of Their Structures

and Biological Functions in Drosophila and beyond. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 2018; 19:

63. Liu F, Wu L, Zhang Y, et al. Mblk-1 regulates sugar responsiveness in honey bee (Apis

mellifera) foragers. Insect Sci. 2022; 29:683–690

64. Marie B, Pym E, Bergquist S, et al. Synaptic Homeostasis Is Consolidated by the Cell Fate

Gene gooseberry, a Drosophila pax3/7 Homolog. J. Neurosci. 2010; 30:8071–8082

65. Saha TT, Shin SW, Dou W, et al. Hairy and Groucho mediate the action of juvenile hormone

receptor Methoprene-tolerant in gene repression. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2016;

113:E735–E743

66. Velarde RA, Robinson GE, Fahrbach SE. Nuclear receptors of the honey bee: annotation and

expression in the adult brain. Insect Mol. Biol. 2006; 15:583–595

67. Bjorum SM, Simonette RA, Alanis R, et al. The Drosophila BTB Domain Protein Jim Lovell

Has Roles in Multiple Larval and Adult Behaviors. PLoS One 2013; 8:61270

68. Cheng YC, Chiang MC, Shih HY, et al. The transcription factor hairy/E(spl)-related 2

induces proliferation of neural progenitors and regulates neurogenesis and gliogenesis. Dev.

Biol. 2015; 397:116–128

69. García-Bellido A, De Celis JF. The Complex Tale of the achaete–scute Complex: A

Paradigmatic Case in the Analysis of Gene Organization and Function During Development.

Genetics 2009; 182:631

70. Häcker U, Kaufmann E, Hartmann C, et al. The Drosophila fork head domain protein

crocodile is required for the establishment of head structures. EMBO J. 1995; 14:5306

71. Shandala T, Takizawa K, Saint R. The dead ringer/retained transcriptional regulatory gene is

required for positioning of the longitudinal glia in the Drosophilaembryonic CNS. Development

2003; 130:1505–1513

72. Tang B, Becanovic K, Desplats PA, et al. Forkhead box protein p1 is a transcriptional

repressor of immune signaling in the CNS: implications for transcriptional dysregulation in

Huntington disease. Hum. Mol. Genet. 2012; 21:3097

73. Muszewska A, Stepniewska-Dziubinska MM, Steczkiewicz K, et al. Fungal lifestyle

reflected in serine protease repertoire. Sci. Reports 2017 71 2017; 7:1–12

74. Klinman E, Holzbaur ELF. Walking Forward with Kinesin. Trends Neurosci. 2018; 41:555–

556

75. Liu L, Downs M, Guidry J, et al. Inter-organelle interactions between the ER and mitotic

spindle facilitates Zika protease cleavage of human Kinesin-5 and results in mitotic defects.

iScience 2021; 24:102385

76. Hang J, Dasso M. Association of the Human SUMO-1 Protease SENP2 with the Nuclear

Pore *. J. Biol. Chem. 2002; 277:19961–19966

77. Zhang H, Saitoh H, Matunis MJ. Enzymes of the SUMO modification pathway localize to

filaments of the nuclear pore complex. Mol. Cell. Biol. 2002; 22:6498–6508

78. de Bekker C, Will I, Hughes DP, et al. Daily rhythms and enrichment patterns in the

transcriptome of the behavior-manipulating parasite Ophiocordyceps kimflemingiae. PLoS One

2017; 12:

79. Elya C, Lok TC, Spencer QE, et al. Robust manipulation of the behavior of Drosophila

melanogaster by a fungal pathogen in the laboratory. Elife 2018; 7:1–34

80. Adamo SA. Norepinephrine and octopamine: linking stress and immune function across

phyla. ISJ 2008; 5:12–19

81. Adamo SA, Linn CE, Beckage NE. Parasites: evolution's neurobiologists. J. Exp. Biol. 2013;

216:3–10

82. Aonuma H, Watanabe T. Changes in the content of brain biogenic amine associated with

early colony establishment in the Queen of the ant, Formica japonica. PLoS One 2012;

7:e43377–e43377

83. Finetti L, Roeder T, Calò G, et al. The Insect Type 1 Tyramine Receptors: From Structure to

Behavior. Insects 2021; 12:315

84. Kamhi JF, Arganda S, Moreau CS, et al. Origins of aminergic regulation of behavior in

complex insect social systems. Front. Syst. Neurosci. 2017; 11:74

85. Verlinden H. Dopamine signalling in locusts and other insects. Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol.

2018; 97:40–52

86. Lee YS, Park YS, Nam S, et al. Characterization of GAR-2, a Novel G Protein-Linked

Acetylcholine Receptor from Caenorhabditis elegans. J. Neurochem. 2000; 75:1800–1809

87. Stankiewicz M, Hamon A, Benkhalifa R, et al. Effects of a centipede venom fraction on

insect nervous system, a native Xenopus oocyte receptor and on an expressed Drosophila

muscarinic receptor. Toxicon 1999; 37:1431–1445

88. Tsentsevitsky AN, Kovyazina I V., Nurullin LF, et al. Muscarinic cholinoreceptors (M1-,

M2-, M3- and M4-type) modulate the acetylcholine secretion in the frog neuromuscular junction.

Neurosci. Lett. 2017; 649:62–69

89. Grünewald B, Siefert P. Acetylcholine and Its Receptors in Honeybees: Involvement in

Development and Impairments by Neonicotinoids. Insects 2019; 10:

90. Hernaândez-Martõânez S, Saânchez-Zavaleta M, Brito K, et al. Allatotropin: A pleiotropic

neuropeptide that elicits mosquito immune responses. PLoS One 2017; 12:e0175759

91. Lismont E, Vleugels R, Marchal E, et al. Molecular cloning and characterization of the

allatotropin precursor and receptor in the desert locust, Schistocerca gregaria. Front. Neurosci.

2015; 9:84

92. Nagata S, Matsumoto S, Mizoguchi A, et al. Identification of cDNAs encoding allatotropin

and allatotropin-like peptides from the silkworm, Bombyx mori. Peptides 2012; 34:98–105

93. Nässel DR, Zandawala M. Recent advances in neuropeptide signaling in Drosophila, from

genes to physiology and behavior. Prog. Neurobiol. 2019; 179:101607

94. Petri B, Homberg U, Loesel R, et al. Evidence for a role of GABA and Mas-allatotropin in

photic entrainment of the circadian clock of the cockroach Leucophaea maderae. J. Exp. Biol.

2002; 205:1459–1469

95. Abruzzi KC, Zadina A, Luo W, et al. RNA-seq analysis of Drosophila clock and non-clock

neurons reveals neuron-specific cycling and novel candidate neuropeptides. PLOS Genet. 2017;

13:e1006613

96. Roller L, Čižmár D, Gáliková Z, et al. Molecular cloning, expression and identification of the

promoter regulatory region for the neuropeptide trissin in the nervous system of the silkmoth

Bombyx mori. Cell Tissue Res. 2016; 364:499–512

97. Schwinghammer MA, Zhou X, Kambhampati S, et al. A novel gene from the takeout family

involved in termite trail-following behavior. Gene 2011; 474:12–21

98. Ament SA, Corona M, Pollock HS, et al. Insulin signaling is involved in the regulation of

worker division of labor in honey bee colonies. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2008; 105:4226–

31

99. Chandra V, Fetter-Pruneda I, Oxley PR, et al. Social regulation of insulin signaling and the

evolution of eusociality in ants. Science (80-.). 2018; 361:398–402

100. Aguilar R, Maestro JL, Vilaplana L, et al. Allatostatin gene expression in brain and midgut,

and activity of synthetic allatostatins on feeding-related processes in the cockroach Blattella

germanica. Regul. Pept. 2003; 115:171–177

101. Chen J, Reiher W, Hermann-Luibl C, et al. Allatostatin A Signalling in Drosophila

Regulates Feeding and Sleep and Is Modulated by PDF. PLOS Genet. 2016; 12:e1006346

102. Hergarden AC, Tayler TD, Anderson DJ. Allatostatin-A neurons inhibit feeding behavior in

adult Drosophila. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2012; 109:3967–3972

103. Tsao CH, Chen CC, Lin CH, et al. Drosophila mushroom bodies integrate hunger and

satiety signals to control innate food-seeking behavior. Elife 2018; 7:

104. Sakai T, Shiraishi A, Kawada T, et al. Invertebrate gonadotropin-releasing hormone-related

peptides and their receptors: An update. Front. Endocrinol. (Lausanne). 2017; 8:217

105. Nässel DR, Williams MJ. Cholecystokinin-Like Peptide (DSK) in Drosophila, Not Only for

Satiety Signaling. Front. Endocrinol. (Lausanne). 2014; 5:

106. Ren GR, Hauser F, Rewitz KF, et al. CCHamide-2 Is an Orexigenic Brain-Gut Peptide in

Drosophila. PLoS One 2015; 10:e0133017

107. Choi M-Y, Vander Meer RK, Coy M, et al. Phenotypic impacts of PBAN RNA interference

in an ant, Solenopsis invicta, and a moth, Helicoverpa zea. J. Insect Physiol. 2012; 58:1159–1165

108. Jurenka R, Nusawardani T. The pyrokinin/ pheromone biosynthesis-activating neuropeptide

(PBAN) family of peptides and their receptors in Insecta: evolutionary trace indicates potential

receptor ligand-binding domains. Insect Mol. Biol. 2011; 20:323–334

109. Ragionieri L, Özbagci B, Neupert S, et al. Identification of mature peptides from pban and

capa genes of the moths Heliothis peltigera and Spodoptera littoralis. Peptides 2017; 94:1–9

110. Chang H, Liu Y, Yang T, et al. Pheromone binding proteins enhance the sensitivity of

olfactory receptors to sex pheromones in Chilo suppressalis. Sci. Rep. 2015; 5:13093

111. Ferguson ST, Park KY, Ruff AA, et al. Odor coding of nestmate recognition in the eusocial

ant Camponotus floridanus. J. Exp. Biol. 2020;

112. Gotzek D, Shoemaker DD, Ross KG. Molecular variation at a candidate gene implicated in

the regulation of fire ant social behavior. PLoS One 2007; 2:e1088

113. Dubovskii IM, Grizanova E V., Chertkova EA, et al. Generation of reactive oxygen species

and activity of antioxidants in hemolymph of the moth larvae Galleria mellonella (L.)

(Lepidoptera: Piralidae) at development of the process of encapsulation. J. Evol. Biochem.

Physiol. 2010 461 2010; 46:35–43

114. Iwanicki NSA, Delalibera I, Eilenberg J, et al. Comparative RNAseq Analysis of the Insect-

Pathogenic Fungus Metarhizium anisopliae Reveals Specific Transcriptome Signatures of

Filamentous and Yeast-Like Development. G3 Genes|Genomes|Genetics 2020; 10:2141–2157

115. Iga M, Kataoka H. Recent Studies on Insect Hormone Metabolic Pathways Mediated by

Cytochrome P450 Enzymes. Biol. Pharm. Bull. 2012; 35:838–843

116. Scott JG, Wen Z. Cytochromes P450 of insects: the tip of the iceberg. Pest Manag. Sci.

2001; 57:958–967

117. Su L, Yang C, Meng J, et al. Comparative transcriptome and metabolome analysis of

Ostrinia furnacalis female adults under UV-A exposure. Sci. Reports | 2021; 11:6797

118. Sztal T, Chung H, Berger S, et al. A Cytochrome P450 Conserved in Insects Is Involved in

Cuticle Formation. PLoS One 2012; 7:e36544

119. Wang H, Shi Y, Wang L, et al. CYP6AE gene cluster knockout in Helicoverpa armigera

reveals role in detoxification of phytochemicals and insecticides. Nat. Commun. 2018 91 2018;

9:1–8

120. Xing X, Yan M, Pang H, et al. Cytochrome P450s Are Essential for Insecticide Tolerance in

the Endoparasitoid Wasp Meteorus pulchricornis (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). 2021;

121. Zhang B zhong, Kong F chao, Wang H tang, et al. Insecticide induction of O-demethylase

activity and expression of cytochrome P450 genes in the red imported fire ant (Solenopsis invicta

Buren). J. Integr. Agric. 2016; 15:135–144

122. Kim Lien NT, Hong Ngoc NT, Lan NN, et al. Transcriptome Sequencing and Analysis of

Changes Associated with Insecticide Resistance in the Dengue Mosquito (Aedes aegypti) in

Vietnam. Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg. 2019; 100:1240

123. Lu K-HH, Bradfield JY, Keeley LL. Juvenile hormone inhibition of gene expression for

cytochrome P4504C1 in adult females of the cockroach, Blaberus discoidalis. Insect Biochem.

Mol. Biol. 1999; 29:667–673

124. Scharf I, Stoldt M, Libbrecht R, et al. Social isolation causes downregulation of immune

and stress response genes and behavioural changes in a social insect. Mol. Ecol. 2021; 30:2378–

2389

125. Shen X, Liu W, Wan F, et al. The Role of Cytochrome P450 4C1 and Carbonic Anhydrase

3 in Response to Temperature Stress in Bemisia tabaci. Insects 2021; 12:

126. Kandel SE, Lampe JN. Role of Protein–ProteinInteractions in CytochromeP450-Mediated

Drug Metabolism and Toxicity. Chem. Res. Toxicol. 2014; 27:1474

127. Davies RG. Insect structure and function. Outlines Entomol. 1988; 7–96

128. Fredericksen MA, Zhang Y, Hazen ML, et al. Three-dimensional visualization and a deep-

learning model reveal complex fungal parasite networks in behaviorally manipulated ants. Proc.

Natl. Acad. Sci. 2017; 114:201711673

129. Arnesen JA, Małagocka J, Gryganskyi A, et al. Early Diverging Insect-Pathogenic Fungi of

the Order Entomophthorales Possess Diverse and Unique Subtilisin-Like Serine Proteases. G3

2018; 8:3311–3319

130. St Leger R, Joshi L, Bidochka MJ, et al. Construction of an improved mycoinsecticide

overexpressing a toxic protease. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 1996; 93:6349–54

131. Carlson MRJ, Zhang B, Fang Z, et al. Gene connectivity, function, and sequence

conservation: Predictions from modular yeast co-expression networks. BMC Genomics 2006;

7:1–15

132. Gillis J, Pavlidis P. "Guilt by Association" Is the Exception Rather Than the Rule in Gene

Networks. PLOS Comput. Biol. 2012; 8:e1002444

133. Stuart JM, Segal E, Koller D, et al. A gene-coexpression network for global discovery of

conserved genetic modules. Science (80-.). 2003; 302:249–255

Tables

Table 1. PPI sets overview.

We tested 7,156,818 combinations of secreted *O. camponoti-floridani* (*O.*) proteins (n = 586) with every *C.*

floridanus (*C.*) protein (n = 12,213). Predicted PPIs were combinations returned with an edge value of ≥ 0.5. We

then created PPI subsets based on homologous interaction between secreted and intracellular fungal proteins and

fungal gene upregulation during manipulation.

PPI set	Predicted PPIs (% of protein combinations tested)	*Ophiocordyceps* proteins in PPIs	*Camponotus* proteins in PPIs
All secreted *O.* & *C.*	23,629 (0.33%)	402	3289
no homologous fungal-self PPIs	20,779 (0.29%)	399	3143
no homologous fungal-self PPIs & *O.* upregulated	6,011 (0.08%)	129	2083

Table 2. Annotation enrichments of PPI proteins.

We performed enrichment analyses on cross-species PPIs without homology to *Ophiocordyceps* self-interactions and involving upregulated, secreted *Ophiocordyceps* proteins and any *Camponotus* proteins (Fig. 1 step 5) with or without additional filtering based on shared aspecific fungal interactions (Fig. 1 step 6). We found no enrichment signal for uSSPs in the fungus. Only in the unfiltered analysis were *Camponotus* DEGs overrepresented – for both upregulated and downregulated genes. The number of gene co-expression modules enriched are given under column WGCNA. While typically more stringent filtering reduced the number of enrichments detected, it increased the number of enriched GO terms for *Ophiocordyceps*. These enrichments included oxidation-reduction terms and various general binding terms (e.g., "binding," "catalytic activity," "cofactor binding," or "ion binding").

Test proteins (n)	GO	PFAM	WGCNA
Ophiocordyceps (129)	0	1	3
after shared PPIs removed (125)	1	1	3
after shared host proteins removed (26)	11	0	2
Camponotus (2,083)	50	74	9
after shared PPIs removed (1,901)	44	64	9
after shared host proteins removed (147)	12	3	2

Figures

Figure 1. Conceptual framework for PPI testing, selection, and analysis.

Step 1) We tested every secreted *O. camponoti-floridani* protein (secretome) with every *C. floridanus* host protein
(proteome). Steps 2, 3) If a cross-species PPI and an *Ophiocordyceps* self-interaction PPI shared a common fungal
protein paired with a protein homologous between both species, we removed that PPI from our predictions. Step 4)
Subsequently, we filtered predicted PPIs to focus on those that involved fungal proteins encoded by genes that were
upregulated during manipulation. Step 5) We analyzed host and parasite proteins from these PPIs with
hypergeometric enrichment analyses. For enrichment analyses, the background protein set was either the parasite
secretome (*Ophiocordyceps*) or host proteome (*Camponotus*). Step 6) We also performed enrichment analyses after
removing PPIs or host proteins that were predicted in interactions between aspecific fungi and *C. floridanus*. Fungal

proteins are shown as circles and ant proteins as squares. Proteins are color-coded, with *Ophiocordyceps*

upregulated, secreted proteins in cross-species PPIs indicated in red and their interacting *Camponotus* proteins in

bright blue. Shades of orange represent other secreted fungal protein categories while blue-gray indicates other host

proteins in PPIs. All other proteins are shown in gray. Proteins "A" are *Ophiocordyceps* and *Camponotus* homologs,

and protein "B" is a single fungal protein.

Figure 2. Enriched WGCNA modules and their correlations to manipulation and each other.

Module membership, correlations, and functional summary of modules were based on previous work [19]. Each

module is a mutually exclusive network of genes that are coexpressed across control, manipulated ant, and dying ant

conditions. Here, we only depict modules enriched among PPIs and only their correlations to the manipulated state

or between host-parasite modules directly. Core cell processes module F3 was clearly negatively correlated to

control conditions, with modest positive correlations divided between both live manipulation and dying ants [19], as

indicated by "+" here. While module F1 and F3 were also notably correlated to neuronal process module A15, this

ant module is not depicted here as it was not enriched among the PPIs detected in this study.

Figure 3. Enrichments for *C. floridanus* proteins in PPIs with upregulated secreted fungal proteins. GO terms are plotted in semantic space, which lacks any inherent unit or value other than to cluster terms by functional similarity. Some labels were omitted for readability and when not relevant to our discussion of the results.

Figure 4. PPI network with host proteins contributing to selected GO term enrichments.

Host proteins (blue square nodes) are clustered and labeled by their general GO term functional category and

connected (gray line edges) to their fungal PPI partners that are either secreted proteins (small pink circle nodes) or

uSSPs (large red triangle nodes) that were found to be upregulated during *Ophiocordyceps* manipulation of

Camponotus behavior. Proteins may have PPI connections outside of those depicted here. A) PPI network without

aspecific PPI filtering. B) Network of remaining PPIs after removing shared PPIs with aspecific fungi. Although

nearly 30% of PPIs (edges) were removed, most proteins (nodes) and enrichment results were kept. C) Network of

remaining PPIs after removing PPIs with all host proteins that also interacted with aspecific fungi, regardless of

orthology of the fungal binding partner. GO terms related to G-protein coupled receptor signaling and some

oxidation-reduction enrichments persisted after this filter. Enrichment signals for transcription and DNA-binding

were lost, but some individual proteins remained.

Supplemental Material

File S1: a Word document briefly describing preliminary analysis of transmembrane fungal

proteins.

File S2: *Ophiocordyceps-Camponotus* PPI protein and enrichment data in a single Excel file

with multiple tabs.

File S3: Aspecific fungi PPI data in a single Excel file with multiple tabs.

Table S1: Aspecific fungi and *Ophiocordyceps* PPI overview. Results do not reflect any DEG

or self-homology filtering steps, predictions are based on fungal secretome by host proteome.

"Predicted PPIs" reflect the percent of positive predictions from D-SCRIPT relative to the total

number of protein combinations tested, with the count of positive PPIs in parentheses. "Fungal

proteins" is the percent of fungal proteins that were in at least one positive PPI, relative to the

secretome size. "*Camponotus* proteins" is the precent of host proteins that were in at least one

positive PPI, relative to the proteome size. "Fungal connectivity" shows the range of how many

host proteins each fungal protein was predicted to bind and the median in parentheses.

"*Camponotus* connectivity" shows the range of how many fungal proteins each host protein was

predicted to bind and the median in parentheses.

1002

1003   **Figure S1: Filtering aspecific PPIs and host proteins shared between *Ophiocordyceps* and**

1004   **alternative fungi.** Aspecific filtering steps were performed after selecting PPIs based on

1005   *Ophicordyceps* secretion signals, upregulated DEGs, and no homology to self-PPIs. Both *C.*

bassiana and *T. reesei* were similarly phylogenetically distant from *Ophiocordyceps*, with *S. cerevisiae* most distantly related. *C. bassiana* was most similar to *Ophiocordyceps* by lifestyle, being a generalist entomopathogen. A) All PPIs shared between *Ophiocordyceps* and at least one of *C. bassiana*, *T. reesei*, or *S. cervisiae* were removed. We defined aspecific homologous PPIs as those that involved a single host protein predicted to bind fungal proteins in *Ophiocordyceps* and an alternative fungus that were orthologous to each other (i.e., proteins "A" in the figure). Most PPIs were specific (4,235 of 6,011) to *Ophiocordyceps*. With most aspecific PPIs shared with *C. bassiana*. B) Removing aspecific host proteins (and therefore all PPIs and *Ophiocordyceps* proteins only predicted with these host proteins) was the strictest filter. Only 147 of the initially predicted 2,083 host proteins passed this filter. Again, most were shared with *C. bassiana*.

Figure S2: D-SCRIPT edge values for tested protein pairings between extracellular fungal proteins and the ant proteome. D-SCRIPT edge values indicate the confidence of the model prediction for a given PPI to be true. We used the default edge value cutoff of ≥ 0.5 (green). These positive predictions comprised 0.41% of the ca. 23 million protein combinations tested. D-SCRIPT assigned most negative predictions with decisively low values far below the 0.5 threshold.