Divergence in a Eukaryotic Transcription Factor's co-TF Dependence Involves Multiple Intrinsically Disordered Regions Affecting Activation and Autoinhibition

Lindsey F. Snyder[1], Emily M. O'Brien[2], Jia Zhao[2#], Jinye Liang[2], Baylee J. Bruce[1],

Yuning Zhang[3^], Wei Zhu[4], Thomas J. Cassier[2], Nicholas J. Schnicker[5, 6],

Xu Zhou[7], Raluca Gordân[3, 4, 8, 9], Bin Z. He[1,2,*]

[1] Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Genetics, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA; [2] Department of Biology, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA; [3] Department of Biostatistics & Bioinformatics, Duke University, Durham, NC; [4] Department of Molecular Genetics & Microbiology, Duke University, Durham, NC; [5] Protein and Crystallography Facility, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA; [6] Department of Molecular Physiology and Biophysics, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA; [7] Department of Pediatrics, Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition, Boston Children's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA; [8] Department of Computer Science, Duke University, Durham, NC [9] Department of Cell Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC

[#] Current addresses: Laboratory of Immunophysiology, The Ragon Institute of Mass General, MIT, and Harvard; Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Cambridge, MA, USA.

[^] Current addresses: Department of Genetics, Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA.

[*] correspondence should be addressed to bin-he@uiowa.edu

Running title: Divergence in a eukaryotic TF's dependence on co-TF

ABSTRACT

Combinatorial control by multiple transcription factors (TFs) is a hallmark of eukaryotic gene

regulation. Despite its prevalence and crucial roles in enhancing specificity and integrating

information, the mechanisms behind why eukaryotic TFs depend on one another, and whether

such interdependence evolves, are not well understood. We exploit natural variation in co-TF

dependence in the yeast phosphate starvation (PHO) response to address this question. In the

model yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, the main TF, Pho4, relies on the co-TF Pho2 to

regulate ~28 genes. In a related yeast pathogen, *Candida glabrata*, its Pho4 exhibits

significantly reduced Pho2 dependence and has an expanded target set of ~70 genes.

Biochemical analyses showed *C. glabrata* Pho4 (CgPho4) binds to the same consensus motif

with 3-4-fold higher affinity than ScPho4 does. A machine-learning-based prediction and yeast

one-hybrid assay identified two Intrinsically Disordered Regions (IDRs) in CgPho4 that boost the

activity of the main activation domain but showed little to no activity on their own. We also found

evidence for autoinhibition behind the co-TF dependence in ScPho4. An IDR in ScPho4 next to

its DNA binding domain was found to act as a double-edged sword: it both allows for enhanced

activity with Pho2, and inhibits Pho4's activity without Pho2. This study provides a detailed

molecular picture of how co-TF dependence is mediated and how its evolution, mainly driven by

IDR divergence, can lead to significant rewiring of the regulatory network.

INTRODUCTION

Transcription factors (TFs) are the cornerstone of gene regulatory networks. In eukaryotes, TFs often work collaboratively to regulate gene expression. This combinatorial control is crucial for enhancing specificity, because most eukaryotic TFs recognize short and degenerate motifs – typically less than 10 bps – that appear hundreds to tens of thousands of times in the genome (Stewart et al., 2012). TFs with the same family of DNA binding domains (DBDs) also recognize highly similar motifs (Berger et al., 2008). Despite these, TFs often bind only a fraction of their motifs *in vivo* and regulate an even smaller subset of the genes they bind to (Zhou and O'Shea, 2011); paralogous TFs regulate distinct sets of genes (Merhej et al., 2016; Sánchez-Higueras et al., 2019). The key to achieving this specific regulation is the requirement of two or more TFs to jointly regulate the target genes (Avsec et al., 2021; Slattery et al., 2011; Todeschini et al., 2014). Another important function of combinatorial control and TF interdependence is to allow cells to integrate multiple upstream signals. In fly development, for example, a combination of tissue-specific "selector" and morphogen gradient – both are TFs – precisely determine the expression pattern and define the cell fate (Guss et al., 2001).

The importance of combinatorial control and the molecular mechanisms behind TF interdependence are traditionally studied using mutations that disrupt TF interactions. For instance, a missense mutation that disrupts the interaction between two cardiac TFs, GATA4 and TBX5, was shown to cause dysregulation of cardiac genes and lead to malformation of heart tissues (Ang et al., 2016). Similarly, studies of combinatorial control evolution often focus on losses (and gains) of TF interactions, like the MADS-box TF, Mcm1, and its co-TFs, MATa2 and MATα2 in the yeast mating type pathway (Baker et al., 2012; Britton et al., 2020). A far less explored type of change in the combinatorial control is a change in the TF interdependence itself, that is, when TFs involved in cooperative regulation evolved to be more or less dependent on the co-TF(s). Such changes are expected to dramatically rewire the network by altering the specificity and signals required for gene regulation, which could have profound implications in

disease and evolution. In relation to this possibility, not all eukaryotic TFs require other TFs to

function. The yeast TF, Gal4, regulates its target genes on its own (Traven et al., 2006). This

raises several intriguing and unanswered questions: if TF interdependence and combinatorial

control evolve, what genetic changes underlie the divergence, what aspects of the TF activities

are impacted, and what are the consequences on the regulatory output?

Intriguingly, natural variation in co-TF dependence exists in the yeast phosphate

starvation (PHO) response network. In the model yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, the main TF

of the PHO response, Pho4 (hereinafter as ScPho4), strongly depends on the co-TF, Pho2, to

induce 27/28 of its target genes (Zhou and O'Shea, 2011). In a related human yeast pathogen,

Candida glabrata, its Pho4 (hereinafter as CgPho4) is far less dependent on Pho2 and induces

twice as many genes (Fig. 1A) (He et al., 2017; Kerwin and Wykoff, 2009). The level of Pho2-

dependence varies quantitatively among Pho4 orthologs in other yeasts and is correlated with

the number of genes induced in a common genome background (He et al., 2017). This latter

observation is consistent with the role of combinatorial control in enhancing specificity. What

remains unknown is what genetic differences between Pho4 orthologs underlie the divergence

in co-TF dependence, and what TF activities are impacted by those variations.

Here, we propose two non-mutually exclusive models for the difference in Pho2-

dependence between ScPho4 and CgPho4 (Fig. 1B). The first "enhanced activity" model is

based on studies showing that ScPho4 requires Pho2 to **(1)** bind cooperatively to the target

gene promoters (Barbaric et al., 1998), **(2)** recruit the histone acetyltransferase (HAT) complex

(Nourani et al., 2004) and **(3)** help recruit general TFs and the PolII complex (Magbanua et al.,

1997). Under this model, we hypothesize that CgPho4 binds more tightly to DNA than ScPho4,

and is more capable of recruiting general transcription factors (TFs) and the PolII complex,

thereby becoming less Pho2-dependent. The second "autoinhibition" model is based on a study

suggesting that ScPho4 is auto-inhibited, and that interaction with Pho2 unmasks its activation

domain and allows it to function (Shao et al., 1996). This model predicts that CgPho4 either

lacks or has far weaker effects of the auto-inhibition and hence doesn't depend on Pho2.

In this study, we tested these two models by comparing the DNA binding and activation

abilities of the two Pho4 orthologs, and systematically swapping regions between the two Pho4s

in a series of 50 chimeric TFs, then quantifying their activities with and without Pho2. Our results

support both models as contributing to the Pho2-dependence variation. To our surprise, while

CgPho4 DBD binds to the same consensus motif with a 3-4-fold higher affinity than ScPho4

DBD, swapping DBD alone failed to yield the expected results. Instead, the differences in Pho2-

dependence originated primarily from differences in the Intrinsically Disordered Regions (IDRs)

in the two TFs that modulate both their Activation Domain (AD) and DNA binding domain (DBD)

activities. Therefore, our results reveal that evolution in a eukaryotic TF protein, particularly

through changes in the IDR, can lead to divergence in co-TF dependence, which in turn results

in a more than two-fold change in the size of the target network.

106   **RESULTS**

Domain organization and sequence divergence between ScPho4 and CgPho4

Based on genetic and biochemical studies, ScPho4 encodes the following functional domains

from its N- to its C-terminus (Fig. 1C): a regulatory region (R1, aa 1-42) interacting with the

negative regulator Pho80 (Jayaraman et al., 1994), the activation domain (AD, aa 43-99)

(McAndrew et al., 1998; Ogawa and Oshima, 1990), a region encoding the nuclear export and

import signals (NLS, aa 100-176) (Komeili and O'Shea, 1999a; O'Neill et al., 1996), a protein-

interaction domain interacting with both Pho80 and the co-TF, Pho2 (referred together as P2ID,

aa 177-242) (Hirst et al., 1994a; Jayaraman et al., 1994), and the bHLH DNA binding domain

(DBD, aa 243-312) (Ogawa and Oshima, 1990; Shimizu et al., 1997). Regarding ScPho4-

ScPho2 interaction, a previous study mapped the region in ScPho4 required for the interaction

to aa 200-218 (Hirst et al., 1994b). The same 18 aa stretch also contains the phosphorylation

site that directly controls the TF-TF interaction (Komeili and O'Shea, 1999b).

Both ScPho4 and CgPho4 were predicted to be mostly intrinsically disordered outside

the DBD, with some low confidence helices in R1 and AD (Fig. S1). CgPho4 is significantly

longer than ScPho4 (533 vs 312 amino acids, Fig. 1C). The NLS and P2ID regions contain four

functionally important phosphorylation sites targeted by the cyclin-dependent kinase complex

Pho80/85 (Kaffman et al., 1994; O'Neill et al., 1996). Those located in the NLS control Pho4's

nuclear translocation, while phosphorylation of the one in P2ID disables ScPho4 from

interacting with Pho2 (Komeili and O'Shea, 1999a). All five Pho80/85 targeted phosphorylation

sites are clearly identifiable in the alignment (Fig. S2); in fact, they were previously found to be

conserved in orthologs outside the Saccharomycotina subphylum (Gomes-Vieira et al., 2018).

Thus, while the protein length and sequence diverged significantly between the two Pho4

orthologs, the domain architecture and post-translational modification motifs appear to be highly

conserved in evolution.

CgPho4 binds the same consensus motif with a higher affinity compared to ScPho4

To test the enhanced activity model, we first compared the DNA binding ability of the two Pho4

orthologs. First, we asked if the two Pho4 orthologs recognize the same DNA sequence. The N-

terminal stretch of the first α-helix in the bHLH domain, known as the basic region, contains the

residues determining sequence specificity. All four residues known to recognize the nucleotide

bases and five additional residues that recognize the phosphate backbone in ScPho4 (Shimizu

et al., 1997) are all conserved in CgPho4 except for an R252K change (number based on

ScPho4, Fig. 2A). Next, we used our published Chromatin-Immunoprecipitation (ChIP-seq)

data for both Pho4 orthologs to identify their respective motifs (He et al., 2017) (Materials and

Methods). Consistent with the amino acid sequence conservation, the results showed that they

bind the same E-box motif "CACGTG", with no obvious differences in the flanking nucleotides

(Fig. 2B). These motifs were based on a relatively small number of ChIP peaks (74 for ScPho4

and 118 for CgPho4). To comprehensively characterize and compare the binding preferences of

the two proteins, we applied Protein Binding Microarray (PBM) to map the binding landscape in

the entire 7-mer space ("universal" PBM, Fig. 2C). The result revealed a lack of divergence in

their sequence preference (Pearson's r = 0.89). To complement the short oligo length in the

universal PBM and further examine differences in the flanking base preference, we designed a

second "genome context" library, which includes 36-bp sequences centered on ChIP-identified

binding sites for both Pho4's in their native genome along with the flanking nucleotides (Gordân

et al., 2013). Similar to the uPBM, the genome context PBM revealed no evidence for binding

specificity differences between ScPho4 and CgPho4 (Fig. S3, Spearman's ρ = 0.84 and 0.86 for

sequences containing the consensus E-box or non-consensus variants, respectively, Materials

and Methods). We conclude that ScPho4 and CgPho4 have the same sequence specificity.

Next, we tested the hypothesis that CgPho4 binds more tightly than ScPho4 does. To do

so, we purified the DBD region of both Pho4s (Materials and Methods) and measured their

binding affinity to a 17-bp oligo based on the *S. cerevisiae PHO5* promoter with the consensus

E-box motif "CACGTG". Biolayer Interferometry (BLI) measurements showed that CgPho4 DBD

binds the consensus motif >3 times more tightly than ScPho4 DBD does (K_D = 5.2 nM vs 1.2 nM

for ScPho4 and CgPho4, respectively; Student's t-test for log K_D difference *P* < 0.01, Fig. 2D,

E). We confirmed this K_D difference using Electrophoretic Mobility Shift Assay (K_D = 5.5 nM vs

1.9 nM for ScPho4 and CgPho4, respectively; Fig. S4). We conclude that CgPho4 recognizes

the same E-box motif and binds with a higher affinity than ScPho4. It is worth noting that this

observed difference in affinity, while statistically significant, is modest ($\Delta\Delta G$ = -0.87 kcal/mol,

based on the mean BLI measurements, assuming a temperature of 25°C). Its potential impact

on gene regulation depends critically on the effective concentration of Pho4 in the nucleus.

CgPho4 encodes two additional Activation Enhancer Domains (AEDs)

We next tested the hypothesis that CgPho4 has increased transactivation potential compared to

ScPho4 under the enhanced activity model. We first predicted regions with activation potential

in both Pho4 orthologs using PADDLE, a Convolutional Neural Network trained on 150

activation domains (ADs) from 164 TFs in *S. cerevisiae* (Sanborn et al., 2021). PADDLE

recovered the experimentally identified AD in ScPho4 between aa 60-102, which contained the

9aaTAD motif previously described as the minimum residues required for activation (Piskacek et

al., 2007) (Fig. 3A, orange triangle). No other regions with significant activation potential were

predicted in ScPho4. By contrast, three regions in CgPho4 were predicted to have activation

capabilities, including one corresponding to the AD in ScPho4, which was predicted to have

strong activity (Z-score > 6, Fig. 3B). Two additional regions, one overlapping R1 and the other

spanning the NLS and P2ID, were predicted to have medium activation strength (Z-score > 4).

We refer to these two regions as E1 and E2, respectively from here on. Interestingly, the best

match to the 9aaTAD motif pattern in CgPho4 was found in E2 rather than in the AD (Fig. 3B).

To determine the activity of the predicted regions with activation potential in both Pho4s,

we set up a yeast one-hybrid (Y1H) assay, in which each candidate region was fused to the

Gal4 DBD and its activation potential was measured by a genome-integrated *GAL1*pr-mCherry

reporter in *S. cerevisiae* (Fig. 3C, Materials and Methods). To see if fusing the candidate region

with Gal4 DBD created a new activation domain, we applied PADDLE to all constructs and

observed no peaks either in the Gal4 DBD or in the connecting regions (Fig. S5). The yeast

one-hybrid result confirmed that both ScPho4 and CgPho4 ADs were able to activate the

reporter above the background level (7- and 5.6-fold, Holm-Bonferroni corrected *P* < 0.01). We

were able to further localize the required residues for activation in ScPho4's AD to a region of

32 aa centered on the 9aaTAD motif (Fig. 3A, C). Neither E1 nor E2 from either Pho4 activated

the reporter on its own (Fig. 3C). This was surprising for CgPho4's E1 and E2, since both had a

medium strength Z-score prediction, and the latter also contained a match to the 9aaTAD (Fig.

3B). We hypothesized that E1 and E2 in CgPho4 could enhance the activity of the main AD. To

test this, we first fused ScE1 and CgE1 to their respective AD, and found that only the latter

resulted in a significant enhancement in the activation potential (Fig. 3D). Next, we fused CgE1

or CgE2 in both orientations to the minimal AD of ScPho4 (ScAD_9aa). We found that indeed,

both regions were able to significantly enhance the activity of the ScAD_9aa in an orientation-

independent manner (Fig. 3D). It is worth noting that this enhancement activity does not involve

the endogenous ScPho4 or ScPho2. ScPho4 is inactive in the phosphate replete condition in

which the Y1H experiment was conducted. To test the involvement of ScPho2, we repeated the

assay in a host lacking *pho2*. No significant difference in the boosting effects of either CgE1 or

CgE2 was observed, although CgE1's effect is slightly lower without Pho2 (Fig. S6).

In summary, we found that CgPho4 encodes two Activation Enhancer Domains (AEDs),

both of which are in the Intrinsically Disordered Region (IDR). The AEDs have little activation

capability on their own but can significantly enhance the activation potential of the AD of either

of the Pho4 orthologs. Since these two AEDs are present in CgPho4 but not in ScPho4, we

hypothesize that they contribute to CgPho4 being less dependent on Pho2.

A dual fluorescence reporter assay accurately measures the activity of Pho4 chimeras

with and without Pho2 for dissecting the divergence in co-TF dependence

So far, we compared DNA binding and activation potential between CgPho4 and ScPho4 by

isolating individual regions and testing them either *in vitro* or in a synthetic *in vivo* system. While

they support the enhanced activity model, it remains unclear whether and how they contribute to

divergence in Pho2-dependence in the native Pho4 protein context. They also do not test or rule

out the autoinhibition model, which necessitates intramolecular interactions. To answer these

questions, we divided ScPho4 and CgPho4 into five corresponding parts (Fig. 1C, 4A), with

breakpoints chosen to be on the edge of well-aligned regions to avoid breaking known or

predicted functional domains and secondary structures. Boundaries for all regions used in this

and other experiments can be found in Table 1. We created all 2^5=32 combinations as well as

28 additional ones with alternative breakpoints (Fig. 4A). All constructs were C-terminally tagged

with mNeon to quantify the protein levels, and were expressed from the native *ScPHO4*

promoter and UTRs (Fig. 4B). We also created two *S. cerevisiae* host strains, in which the

ScPHO5 CDS was replaced by an mCherry reporter, and *pho80* was knocked out so that all

Pho4 chimeras were constitutively nuclear localized (Kaffman et al., 1994; O'Neill et al., 1996).

One of the two host strains had *pho2* knocked out. For each chimera, we measured its *PHO5pr-*

mCherry and Pho4-mNeon levels using flow cytometry in both hosts. While mCherry and

mNeon levels for the same Pho4 construct varied between experiments, the ratios between the

two were consistent and characteristic of the specific construct (Fig. 4C, D). We therefore

defined the activity of a Pho4 chimera as the ratio between the median fluorescence intensity

(MFI) of mCherry and mNeon, which we will refer to as A_{PHO2} or $A_{pho2\Delta}$ from hereon.

The two Activation Enhancer Domains (AEDs) in CgPho4 increased the activity of the

chimeric TFs but were insufficient to make them Pho2-independent

The chimeric Pho4 constructs exhibited varied A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$ values (Fig. 5A). Interestingly,

some showed higher A_{PHO2} than either ScPho4 or CgPho4. To identify the potential genetic basis

for the divergence in Pho2-dependence, we first calculated the activity difference when one or

two regions of ScPho4 were replaced with their counterpart(s) from CgPho4. The results were

plotted as two heat maps separated based on the presence of Pho2 (Fig. 5B). For example, a

chimera with its NLS from CgPho4 (NLS:Cg) and the rest from ScPho4 led to estimates of the

activity difference between NLS:Cg and NLS:Sc on ScPho4 background with or without Pho2.

Based on our previous results, we expected R1, NLS, and DBD in CgPho4 to enhance

the activity of the chimera with and without Pho2. In particular, the first two encode CgE1 and a

majority of CgE2_9aa, which we showed enhanced the activity of the main AD (Fig. 3); DBD:Cg

is expected to increase the binding ability of the chimera (Fig. 2). We indeed found R1:Cg and

NLS:Cg to enhance A_{PHO2} on ScPho4's background (Fig. 5C, "R1, AD, NLS" group); contrary to

our expectation, however, DBD:Cg reduced the chimera's activity with Pho2 (Fig. 5C, "bHLH").

Also unexpectedly, R1:Cg and NLS:Cg had a much smaller effect on $A_{pho2\Delta}$ (Fig. 5B bottom, 5C

right), suggesting that despite their ability to increase A_{PHO2}, the chimeras were still dependent

on Pho2. In fact, none of the 1- or 2-region swaps led to large increases in $A_{pho2\Delta}$. It is worth

noting that this result also argues against a classic lock-and-key model for autoinhibition, which

we expect to be broken by swapping one of the regions involved.

To quantitatively examine the contribution of R1, AD, and NLS regions from CgPho4 and

whether they interact non-additively (epistasis), we fit a linear model to the data to estimate the

main and interaction terms for the regions, i.e., $Y = X_0 + R1 + AD + NLS + R1{:}AD + R1{:}NLS +$

$AD{:}NLS + R1{:}AD{:}NLS$. In this model, the first term represents the activity of ScPho4, the next

three terms the main effect of each CgPho4 region (":Cg" omitted for brevity), and the rest are

interaction terms. We found that R1:Cg and NLS:Cg each had significant, positive effects on

their own on both A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$; although the magnitude was much smaller for $A_{pho2\Delta}$ (Fig.

5D, Holm-Bonferroni corrected $P < 0.05$). Both also had a significant and positive interaction

term with AD:Cg on A_{PHO2} (corrected $P < 0.05$ for R1:AD and AD:NLS); the estimates trended in

the same direction but were not significant for $A_{pho2\Delta}$ (Fig. 5D). One explanation for the observed

epistasis may be that the two CgPho4 AEDs work more efficiently with AD:Cg than with AD:Sc.

However, it could also be explained by the disruption of the native conformation and function of

the "interacting" regions resulting in a lower activity in the species-mixed constructs. Note that to

minimize such effects, we designed the breakpoints to avoid any predicted secondary structures

(Fig. S1, S2).

Since the NLS:Cg region encodes both the NLS/NES and a key part of the second AED

(CgE2_9aa), we asked which of these two mechanisms was responsible for its positive effect on

A_{PHO2}. To test the possibility that the enhanced A_{PHO2} was due to a stronger nuclear localization

activity of NLS:Cg, we performed fluorescence microscopy to quantify the concentration of the

nuclear-localized Pho4 proteins and the ratio of nuclear vs total Pho4 proteins in six constructs

that bear either NLS:Sc or NLS:Cg. No significant difference between the two groups was found

(Fig. S7, F-test $P > 0.1$). We thus conclude that the positive effect of NLS from CgPho4 on A_{PHO2}

was mainly due to its ability to boost activation.

We also examined the effect of swapping CgPho4's DBD. On its own, swapping DBD:Cg

decreased both A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$ compared to ScPho4 (Fig. 5B), suggesting that DBD:Cg may

be incompatible with one or multiple regions in ScPho4.

In summary, we found that R1:Cg and NLS:Cg increased the activity of the chimera with

Pho2 but were insufficient to remove the Pho2 dependence alone or in combination. In the

presence of Pho2, R1:Cg and NLS:Cg both showed positive epistasis with AD:Cg on ScPho4's

background. Lastly, no 1- or 2-region swaps from CgPho4 into ScPho4 increased $A_{pho2\Delta}$ to the

level of CgPho4. Together, we conclude that CgPho4's two AEDs can increase the activity of

the chimera in the presence of Pho2, although they fail to restore the activity without Pho2 to

CgPho4's level, suggesting that additional mechanisms are at play. CgPho4's DBD, alone or in

combination with R1 and the NLS region, did not contribute to increased activity.

A double-edged sword: Pho2 Interaction Domain (P2ID) in ScPho4 allows for enhanced

activity with Pho2 but restricts its activity without Pho2

In the 1- and 2- region swap heatmap (Fig. 5B), the P2ID showed a puzzling pattern: swapping

CgPho4's P2ID (P2ID:Cg) into the ScPho4 background had a dominant negative effect on A_{PHO2}

while offering little increase in $A_{pho2\Delta}$. This suggests that P2ID:Sc is essential for ScPho4's

function. Conversely, swapping ScPho4's P2ID (P2ID:Sc) into CgPho4 increased A_{PHO2} beyond

that of CgPho4 (18 to 22) but reduced $A_{pho2\Delta}$ (17 to 4.8). This suggests that P2ID:Sc is a key

factor to Pho2-dependence. To investigate the unique property of the P2ID further, we plotted

all chimeras based on their A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$ values (Fig. 6A). Strikingly, the chimeras fell into

three distinct groups based on the identity of their P2IDs. The first group had P2ID from

CgPho4, and their activities were not dependent on Pho2, falling along the diagonal line. The

second group had P2ID from ScPho4. These had strong activity with Pho2 and low to no activity

without Pho2, like ScPho4 does. The third group included additional chimeras with mixed P2ID

regions, and they filled the intermediate space between the first two groups. Notably, many

chimeras in the second group showed higher A_{PHO2} than ScPho4. Most of them contained the

R1 and NLS regions from CgPho4, consistent with our results above showing that these two

regions enhanced the activity of the Pho4 chimeras in the presence of Pho2 (Fig. 5A, B).

The evidence above suggests that P2ID:Sc has two effects: allowing for collaborative

regulation with Pho2 and restricting Pho4's activity without Pho2. Can these two functions be

separated? To answer this question, we compared the mixed P2ID chimeras to those with

whole P2IDs from either Pho4. We found that swapping P2ID:Sc into CgPho4 resulted in a 1.2-

fold increase in A_{PHO2} and a 71% reduction in $A_{pho2\Delta}$ (Fig. 6B, row 2 vs 3). Interestingly,

swapping just the second half of P2ID:Sc (aa 205-242) into CgPho4 resulted in a ~40%

reduction in A_{PHO2} and 75% reduction in $A_{pho2\Delta}$. By contrast, just swapping the first half of

P2ID:Sc (aa 177-204) resulted in 1.76-fold increase in A_{PHO2} and maintained the same level of

$A_{pho2\Delta}$ (1.1-fold). From this, we deduced that the first half of P2ID:Sc mainly functions to interact

with Pho2 while the second half appears to limit Pho4's activity without Pho2. The same trend

was observed in another set of chimeras with lower activities (Fig. 6B, rows 6-9).

Several chimeras had very low activities even with Pho2 (A_{PHo2} < 3.6, or 20% of A_{PHO2} for

ScPho4). Most of these nonfunctional chimeras have P2ID:Cg and DBD:Sc (Fig. 6C, rows 3-7).

We hypothesize that DBD:Sc requires P2ID:Sc and Pho2 to function in the context of the full

length Pho4. This is contrary to the conventional view that DBDs can function on their own,

which is supported by our own *in vitro* results (Fig. 2). Nonetheless, we reasoned that if the

above hypothesis is correct, putting P2ID:Sc back by inserting it in between P2ID:Cg and

DBD:Sc should rescue the non-functional chimeras in the presence of Pho2. That is what we

observed (Fig. 6C, rows 8-12), with some of the chimeras even exceeding the A_{PHO2} of ScPho4

and CgPho4. However, all of them still required Pho2. These results support the above

hypothesis, showing that the dual-functional P2ID is essential for ScPho4 to function.

Given that chimeras with P2ID:Cg have equal activities with and without Pho2 (Fig. 6A), we

asked if CgPho4 still physically interacts with Pho2 in *S. cerevisiae*. Using the yeast two-hybrid

assay, we were unable to detect an interaction between CgPho4ΔDBD (aa 2-463) and a region

of ScPho2 known to interact with multiple TFs, including ScPho4 (Bhoite et al., 2002) (Fig. 6D).

By contrast, ScPho4ΔDBD (aa 2-250) was able to interact with the same region of ScPho2 as

previously found (Fig. 6D). This is consistent with our observation above, where chimeras with

P2ID:Cg and lacking the region from ScPho4 mediating Pho2-interaction cannot be enhanced

by Pho2 (Fig. 6A).

In summary, our chimera dissection revealed three key regions behind the difference in

co-TF dependence. Notably, all three are IDRs. Among them, a region adjacent to the DBD in

ScPho4 (P2ID:Sc) functions as a double-edged sword: it both allows Pho4 to gain activity with

Pho2's help and restricts it when Pho2 is absent. We showed that these two functions are

encoded by physically separate parts, offering a path for determining their respective

mechanisms of actions. CgPho4 lacks the ability to interact with and use Pho2's help. Instead,

the two AEDs we identified earlier – both in IDR – conferred higher activity independent of

Pho2. This, combined with the lack of the autoinhibition by P2ID:Sc, makes CgPho4 as active

as ScPho4 and not dependent on the co-TF.

338   **DISCUSSION**

Combinatorial control plays crucial roles in eukaryotic gene regulation. Mutations disrupting TF

interactions can cause dysregulation and disease (Ang et al., 2016). However, how mutations

can alter TF interdependence itself, whether in disease or evolution, is less understood. In this

study, we investigated the molecular basis for natural variation in co-TF dependence in the

yeast phosphate starvation (PHO) response. We found three key differences between two

orthologous Pho4s with varying dependence on the co-TF Pho2 (Fig. 7): **(1)** DNA Binding

Affinity: CgPho4 binds the same consensus DNA motif with 3-4-fold higher affinity than ScPho4;

(2) Activation potential**:** CgPho4 has two unique activation enhancing domains (AEDs) that

increase the activation potential of both Pho4s. **(3)** Autoinhibition: ScPho4 contains an IDR next

to its DBD that both allows it to interact with Pho2 to gain enhanced activity, and inhibits its

activity in the absence of Pho2. Therefore, our results support both the enhanced activity model

and the autoinhibition model for the difference in Pho2-dependence between Pho4 orthologs.

Among the three differences, the contribution of CgPho4's two AEDs to the TF's activity

and dependence on Pho2 is well supported by the yeast one-hybrid data and chimeric Pho4

results (Fig. 3, 5). We are not aware of existing examples or proposed mechanisms for such a

phenomenon. One hypothesis for how AEDs work is that they are weaker ADs with the same

biochemical activities, i.e., recruiting cofactors through protein-protein interactions. As such,

they are not sufficient for activation by themselves but can increase the activity of the nearby AD

(the effect can be non-additive). Alternatively, AEDs may affect the conformation of the AD and

have no activity on their own. Further tests by synthetic constructs and biochemical assays,

such as co-IP followed by mass-spec, will provide mechanistic insight into how AEDs function.

By contrast, the significance of the binding affinity differences between the two Pho4s

remains unclear (Fig. 2E). Binding kinetics predicts that if the nuclear concentrations of both

Pho4 are much higher than their K_D, a 3-4-fold difference in affinity would have little impact.

Conversely, if the nuclear concentration of Pho4 is close to its K_D, the same difference could

significantly affect gene induction. Existence of the second scenario is supported by a study

showing that nuclear ScPho4 levels are much lower at intermediate phosphate concentrations

than in extreme starvation conditions, leading to differential binding and induction of ScPho4's

targets (Ming Yip et al., 2023). In our chimeric Pho4 experiments, replacing ScPho4's DBD with

that from CgPho4 reduced Pho4's activity rather than increasing it both with and without Pho2

(Fig. 5). It seems to suggest that the binding affinity difference has no functional impact *in vivo*.

However, it is worth noting that we assayed the activity of chimeric Pho4s in the *pho80Δ*

background where all Pho4 proteins are constitutively inside the nucleus at near-maximal levels,

hence not allowing us to test the effect of the affinity difference at a lower level of nuclear Pho4.

Future studies will need to measure Pho4 activities at varying nuclear concentrations to test the

above hypothesis.

Surprisingly, we found that ScPho4's DBD requires both ScPho4's P2ID and Pho2 for

full activity (Fig. 6C), challenging the view that TFs are modular, where DBD are expected to

function independently. Although ours and others' studies confirmed that ScPho4 DBD can bind

DNA *in vitro* (Fig. 2) and even *in vivo* when overexpressed on its own (Donovan et al., 2023),

they may not fully reflect its physiological activity, which depends on the nuclear concentration,

nucleosomal context, and interactions with other TF regions and cofactors. Further experiments

are needed to resolve the paradox and re-examine the assumption of TF modularity.

Only one of the three functional differences identified between the two Pho4 orthologs is

in a structured region. The two AEDs and the dual-functional P2ID:Sc are both within IDRs.

IDRs are abundant in eukaryotic TFs, with over 80% having at least one such region (Liu et al.,

2006). Approximately 75% of ScPho4 and CgPho4 were predicted to be IDR (Fig. S1). While

most studies of TF function and evolution focus on the structured regions like the DBD, our work

joins a small number of studies highlighting the significance of IDR divergence in TF evolution

(Hsu et al., 2021; Lynch et al., 2011). On one hand, IDRs play crucial roles in nearly all aspects

of a TF's function, including recruiting cofactors, interacting with co-TFs, contributing to binding

specificity and forming molecular condensates (Brodsky et al., 2020; Ferrie et al., 2023, 2022; Ji

et al., 2024; Krois et al., 2018; Mindel et al., 2023). On the other hand, IDRs evolve much faster

than structured regions, potentially offering more raw variation for natural selection to act on.

Our current understanding of how IDR evolves and affects TF function is limited by challenges

in aligning their sequence and studying their functions. Progress in experimental techniques like

phase separation (Ji et al., 2024) and large language models trained on protein sequences offer

new opportunities to investigate TF IDR's function and evolution (Rives et al., 2021).

Our study focused on dissecting the genetic basis for Pho2-dependence variation in two

Pho4 orthologs. We previously showed that this trait varies across Pho4 orthologs, with reduced

Pho2-dependence potentially evolving independently in more than one lineage (He et al., 2017).

We wonder whether the IDR-associated divergence identified above also correlated with the

level of Pho2-dependence more broadly. Preliminary analyses of the activation potential and

P2ID length across eight Pho4 orthologs with different Pho2-dependence levels supported this

speculation (Fig. S8).

Lastly, our study illustrates a novel mechanism for the evolution of combinatorial control

in eukaryotes. Unlike previous research that focused on the gain and loss of TF interactions in

gene regulatory networks (Tuch et al., 2008; Wapinski et al., 2010), we show that TF's

dependence on co-TF itself can evolve. This divergence can lead to significant rewiring of the

regulatory network, as seen with Pho4, where reduced co-TF dependence correlates with an

expanded target gene network (He et al., 2017). This contrasts with the dominant pattern seen

in the literature on combinatorial control evolution: the Johnson lab, for example, showed that

changes in TF combinations in the yeast mating type pathway altered the mode of regulation

but maintained the overall network output (Baker et al., 2012; Britton et al., 2020; Nocedal and

Johnson, 2015; Tsong et al., 2006). While cases of TF interdependence evolution are still rare,

it is interesting to compare our example with Gain-of-Function mutations in kinases: in the proto-

oncogene ABL, a fusion with another gene called BCL makes the merged protein independent

of the upstream and downstream activators, which drives excessive cell proliferation and leads

to Chronic Myeloid Leukemia (Sherbenou and Druker, 2007). Whether similar changes in TF

dependence on co-TFs lead to misregulation and in turn causes diseases or novel phenotypes

is an extremely interesting question for future studies.

In summary, our study provides a detailed molecular picture of how co-TF dependence

is mediated and how it evolves, particularly through IDR changes. Further exploration of both

questions is essential for understanding gene regulation and regulatory evolution in eukaryotes.

423   **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

424   Breakpoints used for the chimeric Pho4 constructs and individual regions are listed in Table 1.

425   Plasmids and strains are listed in Tables 2 and 3. Computational and statistical analysis scripts

426   performed in this study are available at https://github.com/binhe-lab/E013-Pho4-evolution, which

427   will be archived using Zenodo and minted with a DOI at the time of publication.

Bioinformatic analyses of Pho4 orthologs

Pho4 ortholog sequences were from the Yeast Gene Order Browser (http://ygob.ucd.ie/), and

were aligned using ProbCons (Do et al., 2005) via JalView's Web Service (Troshin et al., 2018;

Waterhouse et al., 2009). The alignment was manually edited to align the five Pho80/85 motifs

(O'Neill et al., 1996). Secondary structures for ScPho4 and CgPho4 were predicted using the

PSIPRED 4.0 (Buchan and Jones, 2019). 9aaTAD motifs were predicted using the webapp

https://www.med.muni.cz/9aaTAD/ (Piskacek et al., 2007). For ScPho4, one match was found

using the moderately stringent pattern, located at aa 75-83; for CgPho4, one match was

identified using the most stringent pattern, at aa 270-278, with three more using the moderately

stringent patterns (aa 20-28, 24-32, 282-290). Among the latter three, aa 24-32 had a lower %

match at 67% vs 83% for the others.

Identifying Pho4 binding motifs from ChIP-seq data

Chromatin Immunoprecipitation (ChIP-seq) for ScPho4 and CgPho4 were previously performed

in *S. cerevisiae*, with both Pho4 expressed from the same endogenous ScPho4 locus with

native regulatory sequences (He et al., 2017). ChIP identified peaks for both Pho4s were

downloaded from the supplementary files of the above publication. The sequences under each

peak were extracted from *S. cerevisiae* genome (sacCer3, NCBI refseq assembly

GCF_000146045.2), which were submitted to the "peak-motifs" tool without control sequences

on the RSAT Fungi server (https://rsat.france-bioinformatique.fr/fungi/) (Thomas-Chollier et al.,

2011). The top motif was reported for each Pho4 ortholog.

Protein expression and purification for DNA binding assays

All recombinant proteins were expressed using pET-11a (Sigma #69436-3) based vectors in

BL21(DE3) *E. coli* cells. Vector maps are available upon request. The DNA binding domain

(DBD) constructs included ScPho4 DBD-6xHIS (aa 236-312) and CgPho4 DBD-6xHIS (aa 452-

533) cloned downstream of the T7 promoter in pET-11a. The transformed bacterial strains were

grown overnight in LB + 100 ug/mL ampicillin. The overnight culture was diluted to OD 0.1 and

the cells were grown to OD 0.6 and induced with 1mM IPTG for 2 hours. Induced cells were

collected by centrifugation at 6000 rpm at 4ºC for 35 minutes, and were snap frozen in liquid

nitrogen, then stored at -80ºC until purification. Our preliminary experiments showed that the

protein of interest was largely in the insoluble fraction. Therefore, we performed a refold protocol

on the Ni-NTA column. Briefly, frozen pellets were resuspended in 1xPBS, pH7.4 with cOmplete

EDTA-free protease inhibitor (Sigma #11836170001) and sonicated for 45 cycles of 1 sec on / 2

sec off repeated 3 times at 50% power to lyse the cells. Sonicated samples were centrifuged at

35k rpm for 30 minutes. The supernatant was discarded, and the pellet was resuspended in the

solubilization buffer (20 mM TrisBase, 0.5 M NaCl, 5 mM imidazole, 5.5 M Guanidine

Hydrochloride, 1 mM 2-mercaptoethanol pH 8.0) and stirred at ~25ºC for an hour. The

solubilized pellet was centrifuged at 35k rpm for 30 minutes and the supernatant was filtered

and loaded onto a 5mL Ni-NTA column. The column was washed with a urea buffer (20 mM

TrisBase, 0.5 M NaCl, 20 mM imidazole, 5.5 M Urea, 1 mM 2-mercaptoethanol pH 8.0). Then,

the protein was refolded with a reverse urea gradient from buffer A (20 mM TrisBase, 0.5 M

NaCl, 20 mM imidazole, 5.5 M Urea, 1 mM 2-mercaptoethanol pH 8.0) to buffer B (20 mM

TrisBase, 0.5 M NaCl, 20 mM imidazole, 1 mM 2-mercaptoethanol pH 8.0) on a BioRad FPLC.

The refolded protein was eluted off of the Ni-NTA column using a gradient from buffer C (20 mM

TrisBase, 0.5 M NaCl, 20 mM imidazole, 1 mM 2-mercaptoethanol pH 8.0) to buffer D (20 mM

TrisBase, 0.5 M NaCl, 500 mM imidazole, 1 mM 2-mercaptoethanol pH 8.0). Fractions

containing the protein of interest were identified by gel electrophoresis, pooled, and diluted with

a no salt buffer (25 mM Na_2HPO_4 pH 7.0, 0.5 mM THP) and run on a Heparin column

equilibrated with low salt buffer (25 mM Na_2HPO_4 pH 7.0, 0.15 M NaCl, 0.5 mM THP). Protein

was eluted with a gradient from low to high salt buffer (25 mM Na_2HPO_4 pH 7.0, 1.5 M NaCl, 0.5

mM THP). Protein-containing fractions were concentrated using a 3 kDa cutoff Amicon

centrifugal filter (Sigma UFC8003) and loaded onto a Superdex 75 size exclusion column

equilibrated with a storage buffer (25 mM Na_2HPO_4 pH 7.0, 0.5 M NaCl, 0.5 mM THP).

Fractions containing the expected size products were collected, analyzed by gel

electrophoresis, and stored in the storage buffer at 4ºC.

N-GST-CgPho4 full length was constructed for the Protein Binding Microarray assay.

The corresponding N-GST-ScPho4 purification has been described before (Zhang et al., 2021).

Both proteins were grown and lysed as described in (Zhang et al., 2021). Briefly, BL21 *E. coli*

cells containing the constructs were induced at OD600 0.8 with 1mM IPTG and collected by

centrifugation after 3 hours of induction at 30ºC. Pellets were snap frozen in liquid nitrogen and

stored at -80ºC until purification. Cells were lysed with rLysozyme (Millipore 71110) for 20

minutes at room temp in the lysis buffer (1xPBS, pH7.4) with the cOmplete protease inhibitor

tablet and 1 mM PMSF. The protein was run on a GST column equilibrated with the lysis buffer

and eluted with a gradient to buffer B (50mM Tris, 10mM glutathione, pH 8). GST-CgPho4

fractions containing the protein were pooled and loaded onto a heparin column equilibrated with

low salt buffer (25mM Na_2HPO_4 pH 7.4, 150mM NaCl, 0.5mM THP) and eluted with a gradient

to high salt buffer (25mM sodium phosphate dibasic pH 7.4, 1.5M NaCl, 0.5mM THP). Fractions

containing the protein were pooled and concentrated with a 30 kDa cutoff Amicon centrifugal

filter (Sigma UFC9030) and loaded onto a Superdex 200 size exclusion column equilibrated with

the storage buffer (25mM HEPES pH 7.4, 500mM NaCl, 0.5mM THP). Protein was run on an

SDS-PAGE and pure fractions were pooled and concentrated. 10% glycerol was added before

snap freezing and storage at -80ºC.

Universal Protein Binding Microarray (uPBM)

The uPBM was performed following the PBM protocol as described in (Berger and Bulyk, 2009).

GST-ScPho4 and GST-CgPho4 (full length) were prepared as described above. Both proteins

were assayed at a final concentration of 1 uM as determined by the optical absorbance. An

8x15k array was used to assay all possible 9-mers, from which a robust 7-mer enrichment score

is derived. The non-parametric enrichment score, or E-score, is invariant to differences in the

concentration of the proteins used in the assay, and thus are suitable for comparisons of relative

affinities between arrays. E-score ranges from -0.5 (lowest enrichment) to +0.5 (highest

enrichment). Scores greater than 0.35 correspond to specific TF-DNA binding (Berger and

Bulyk, 2006; Gordân et al., 2013). Data analysis was performed using custom Perl scripts as

described in (Berger and Bulyk, 2009).

Genomic Context Protein Binding Microarray (gcPBM)

All probes in the DNA library are 60 bp in length with 24 bp complementary to the primer used

for double stranding and 36 bp of genomic region centered on the E-box motif or its variant. The

library contains 1) 5711 *S. cerevisiae* genomic regions with putative Pho4 binding sites; 2) 150

negative controls from the *S. cerevisiae* genome not specifically bound by Pho4 (Zhang et al.,

2021); 3) 4000 DNA sequences used in previous MITOMI experiments to calibrate the binding

affinities (Maerkl and Quake, 2007); 4) 150 genomic regions from *C. glabrata* that contain Pho4

consensus and nonconsensus binding sites (He et al., 2017); 5) 100 probes from the library of

sequences we tested with Biolayer Interferometry; and 6) 150 negative controls from the *C.*

glabrata genome not bound by CgPho4. We used the NNNNGTG, CACNNN, and GTGNNN

libraries from Maerkl and Quake (2007) in our gcPBM design. The MITOMI and BLI probes

required the addition of random flanks to maintain the 36bp length;10 different flanking

sequences were generated for each sequence. Each probe is represented by six replicates,

including three replicates in each orientation and were distributed randomly across the array.

The custom 8x60k (8 chambers, 60,000 DNA spots per chamber) was synthesized by Agilent

Technologies. The gcPBM was performed following the PBM protocol as described in (Gordân

et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2021). The log transformed median intensity of the 6 replicate probes

were used for comparisons. Because the log signal intensities are not directly comparable

between the two Pho4 proteins, which were assayed on separate arrays, we used Spearman's

rank correlation coefficient to quantify the level of concordance in their sequence preference.

Any difference in preference should result in a change in the ranks within each Pho4's data.

Biolayer interferometry (BLI)

A library of 17-bp dsDNA was used for the assay. The consensus probe had the sequence

"CTAGTCC**CACGTG**TGAG", with the E-box motif bolded, and was identical to the DNA used in

the crystal structure of ScPho4's DBD (Shimizu et al., 1997). Nine half-site variants, including

"AACGTG, TACGTG, … CAAGTG, ACGGTG, CATGTG" were constructed on this background.

For each probe, the complementary ssDNA oligos were synthesized by Integrated DNA

Technologies (IDT). One of the two probes was biotinylated on the 5' end. To anneal them into

dsDNA, 1 pmol (5 uL of 200 uM) of the biotinylated oligo was mixed with 2 pmol (10 uL of 200

uM) of the complementary, unmodified strand in the Nuclease-Free Duplex Buffer (30 mM

HEPES, pH 7.5; 100 mM potassium acetate). The mixture was heated to 95ºC and then left at

room temperature for it to cool down. Annealed probes were stored at -20ºC until use.

ScPho4 DBD and CgPho4 DBD were purified and stored as described above. Protein

quality was checked weekly for signs of degradation using Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS) on a

DynaPro NanoStar instrument. Before each experiment, the concentration of the protein prep

was measured in triplicates using a NanoDrop instrument. The mean concentration was used to

prepare the protein dilutions and calculate K_D.

BLI experiments were performed on an Octet RED 96 instrument at 30ºC with 1000 rpm

shaking. For each protein-probe pair, eight streptavidin (SA) biosensors were hydrated for 15-20

min at room temperature in the 1x kinetics buffer (1x PBS pH 7.4, 0.01% BSA, 0.002% Tween-

20, 0.005% Sodium azide). A black 96 well flat-bottom plate was loaded with experimental

components also diluted in the 1x kinetics buffer. To begin the experiment, biosensors were

equilibrated in a 1x kinetics buffer for 60 seconds to reach the baseline. Seven biosensors were

then submerged in 35 nM biotinylated annealed DNA for 30 seconds, while one biosensor was

submerged in the 1x kinetics buffer as a no-DNA control. Biosensors were then submerged in 1

ug/ml biocytin for 60 seconds to block any empty streptavidin pocket on their surface, before

being dipped back into a 1x kinetics buffer for 60 seconds for a baseline measurement. Loaded

and blocked biosensors were then submerged into a gradient of protein concentrations

calculated for each probe based on the K_D. To obtain reliable measurements, we use a

concentration range that spans 10x to 1/10 of the K_D values. Biosensors stayed in the protein

solution for 900-1000 seconds or until equilibrium was reached.

Data analysis was performed in the ForteBio Data analysis v11 software. After

subtracting the background and aligning the y-axis, the processed data were subjected to either

a steady state analysis or a kinetic curve fitting. For steady state analysis, the equilibrium-level

signal from each biosensor was plotted against the protein concentration, from which K_D was

calculated. Kinetic curve fitting was done using a one-site specific binding with Hill slope model

as implemented in the Data analysis v11 software. The latter more effectively fit the BLI data

and thus were utilized for most of the analysis. For the consensus sequence, we found the

kinetic curve-based estimates for both ScPho4 and CgPho4 to have higher variance, likely due

to the fast kinetics not adequately captured by the model (Weeramange et al., 2020). Steady-

state analysis gave consistent mean K_D as the kinetic analysis did, but resulted in lower

variance, and was used instead. Two to four replicates were performed for each 17bp DNA

library sequence, using at least two independent protein preps.

Electrophoretic Mobility Shift Assay (EMSA)

IR700 labeled 17bp consensus DNA (same as the consensus DNA for BLI above, Integrated

DNA technologies) was diluted to 0.1 nM and mixed 1:1 with a 2x dilution series of the DBD of

interest starting at 32nM in binding buffer (20mM Tris-HCL, pH 8, 150mM KCl, 10% glycerol,

5mM MgCl2, 1mM EDTA, and 1mM DTT). The mixture was incubated for 1 hour at 4°C. A 10%

native PAGE gel in 1x Tris Glycine buffer (2.5 mM Tris pH 8.3, 19.2 mM glycine) was prerun at

200V for 20 min. The DNA/protein mixture was then loaded onto the gel and ran for 25-35

minutes. The gel was imaged using the Odyssey FC imager in the 700 nm channel. To estimate

K_D, the unbound band in each protein-containing lane was quantified using the ImageStudio

software (with background subtraction) and divided by the no protein control. This value was

then subtracted from 1 and plotted against the protein concentrations. A nonlinear curve fitting

was performed in Prism v10.2.1 using the one site specific binding model. K_D estimates and the

standard deviations were reported.

Yeast media and growth

Yeast cells were grown in Yeast extract-Peptone Dextrose (YPD) medium or Synthetic

Complete (SC) medium, using Yeast Nitrogen Base without amino acids (Sigma Y0626)

supplemented with 2% glucose and amino acid mix. Phosphate starvation medium was made

using Yeast Nitrogen Base with ammonium sulfate, without phosphates, without sodium chloride

(MP Biomedicals, 114027812) and supplemented to a final concentration of 2% glucose, 1.5

mg/ml potassium chloride, 0.1 mg/ml sodium chloride and amino acids, as described previously

(He et al., 2017). Phosphate concentration in the medium was measured using a Malachite

Green Phosphate Assay kit (Sigma, MAK307).

Yeast strain and plasmid construction

The hosts containing the endogenous *PHO5*pr-mCherry reporter were constructed by replacing

the endogenous coding sequence with mCherry using CRISPR/Cas9. Briefly, guide RNAs

targeting *PHO5* were designed in Benchling (https://www.benchling.com) and cloned into

bRA89 (AddGene 100950), a plasmid that contains the Cas9 protein and gRNA scaffold (Anand

et al., 2017). Homology arms to the *PHO5* 5'UTR and 3' UTR were added onto an mCherry

donor DNA using PCR. The donor DNA and plasmid were co-transformed into the host using

the standard LiAc transformation protocol. Transformants were selected for the CRISPR

plasmid using hygromycin resistance and screened with PCR. Positive clones were validated

using Sanger sequencing and fluorescence microscopy. Pho2 was then knocked out using a

HIS3 cassette with homology arms to the *PHO2* 5'UTR and 3'UTR.

The chimeric Pho4 plasmid library was constructed using Golden Gate. The fragments

of CgPho4 and ScPho4 were PCR amplified using Phusion Flash polymerase (Thermo

Scientific F548S) with unique overhangs for Golden Gate. They were then assembled and

inserted into a pRS315-based backbone that contains the Sc*PHO4* promoter, a C-terminal in-

frame mNeon tag followed by the Sc*PHO4* 3' UTR and terminator. Primers were designed using

the NEBridge Golden Gate assembly tool. The inserts were verified with PCR and Sanger

sequencing and then transformed into the yeast hosts using either the standard LiAc protocol

(Gietz and Schiestl, 2007) or the Zymo yeast transformation kit (Zymo research T2001) and

plated onto SD-leu media.

Flow cytometry

Cells were inoculated into a 96 deep-well plate (Fisher Scientific 07-200-700) and grown

overnight in SD-Leu or SC medium supplemented to final concentrations of 0.13 mg/ml adenine

and 0.1 mg/ml tryptophan to reduce autofluorescence (Lam et al., 2008). Cultures were diluted

in the morning to an OD600 of 0.15 and grown to an OD600 of 0.6. These cells were directly

subjected to flow cytometry at a flow rate of 25 uL/min on an Attune NxT flow cytometer

(ThermoFisher) fitted with an autosampler. Data were collected using the Attune NxT software

v3.1 for FSC, SSC and the appropriate fluorescence channels. Calibration beads (Spherotech

RCP305A) were run routinely to ensure that experiments from different days were comparable.

Pho4-mNeon was measured in the BL1 channel with 488 nm excitation and 510±10 nm

emission; mCherry was measured in the YL2 channel using 561 nm excitation and 615±25 nm

emission. Voltages for each channel were set by the brightest sample and negative control so

the sample signals were between 10^2-10^5. Events were gated based on FSC-H / SSC-H to

remove non-cells, then on the FSC-W / FSC-H to isolate singlets (Fig. S9). At least 10,000

gated events were collected per sample. Each strain was measured at least three times, and on

two different dates. A nonfluorescent strain was included in every experiment for subtracting the

autofluorescence. Further gating and analyses were performed in R using the FlowClust and

FlowCore packages. Detailed analysis scripts are available in the project github repository.

Fluorescent microscopy for Pho4 nuclear localization

Six Pho4 constructs were chosen, with three bearing NLS:Sc (SSSSS, CCSCC, SSSCC) and

three bearing NLS:Cg (SSCSS, CCCCC, SSCCS). They were transformed into either a *PHO2*

wild type or *pho2Δ* background. Yeast cells were grown to mid-log phase in SD-Leu and fixed

using 4% paraformaldehyde for 10 minutes, washed twice with 1xPBS before DAPI staining.

4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI, Sigma, D9542) was diluted in the respective medium and

added to the fixed cells at a final concentration of 10 ug/mL. Cells were incubated with DAPI in

the dark for 30 minutes before DAPI was removed and cells were washed twice with 1xPBS.

Fixed cells were mounted on a 1.2% agarose pad on a depression slide for image. Fluorescent

imaging was performed on a Leica epifluorescence microscope. A 405 nm laser was used for

DAPI excitation and 430-550 nm for emission. For Pho4-mNeON, 488nm was used for

excitation and 530 nm for emission. A bright field image was also taken to show the cell

boundaries. A total of three images were recorded for each field of view.

Microscopy analysis was performed in ImageJ (v 1.53). To quantify the nuclear fraction

of Pho4 proteins, ten cells were randomly selected for each construct in each host background,

and the experiment was repeated two times, resulting in a total of 15 or 20 cells quantified in

PHO2 and *pho2Δ* backgrounds, respectively. Cell boundaries were manually traced using the

bright field channel, and nucleus using the DAPI channel. Both were added to the ROI manager,

and the raw integrated density (sum of pixel values) was quantified for both areas. The ratio of

nuclear vs whole cell integrated density was used for plotting and statistical analysis.

Yeast one-hybrid and yeast two-hybrid

Indicated regions from CgPho4, ScPho4, and ScPho2 were PCR amplified and cloned into

pGBD-C3 (James et al., 1996) containing the Gal4 DBD using Gibson Assembly. Plasmids were

verified with PCR and Sanger sequencing. The *GAL1*pr-mCherry reporter was created using a

pRS306 based integrative plasmid digested with StuI and inserted into the *ura3* locus of a *gal4Δ*

gal80Δ S. cerevisiae strain. The reporter was tested using flow cytometry according to the

protocol above using only the red (YL2) channel. Plasmids were then transformed into this yeast

strain using the standard LiAc method (Gietz and Schiestl, 2007) or the Zymo yeast

transformation kit (Zymo research T2001) and selected for on SD-trp. For the yeast two-hybrid,

the Gal4 activation domain (AD) and Gal4 DNA binding domain (DBD) fusion plasmids were

constructed by PCR amplifying the indicated regions and cloning into pGBD-C3 and pGAD-C3

(James et al., 1996) using Gibson Assembly. The plasmids were co-transformed and selected

for on SD -leu -trp. Positive colonies were patched onto fresh plates and grown at 30ºC for 24

hours before replica plating onto SD -leu -trp -ade -his to test for interactions. Plates were

imaged after 45-50 hours.

Statistical analyses

All replicates are biological. For yeast strains, the same strain was grown and measured in

separate vials. Independent transformants were tested for the flow cytometry host strains and

randomly selected constructs and were found to generate consistent results. For recombinant

proteins, the same constructs were independently transformed into the bacteria and separate

batches of purified proteins were used for the measurements.

Binding affinity comparison by BLI (Fig. 2): K_D estimates from either steady state or kinetic curve

fitting analyses were log10 transformed and a Student's t-test was used to compare ScPho4 vs

CgPho4 DBDs against the same 17-bp DNA. Raw two-sided *P*-values and Holm-Bonferroni

corrected *P* values for the 10 tests were reported; *Activation* (Fig. 3): median fluorescence

intensity (MFI) for the *GAL1pr*-mCherry reporter was recorded from flow cytometry for each

sample. For Fig. 3C, each Gal4 DBD fusion construct was compared to the background level.

Because the host (with *GAL1pr*-mCherry but no Gal4 DBD plasmid) and Gal4 DBD alone

showed a similar level of low MFI, we combined them as the reference group. A linear model

was fit in R with the following command `lm(MFI ~ Genotype)`, where "Genotype" is a factor

representing the constructs. This model estimates a common standard deviation for all

constructs and tests the significance of each construct against the reference group with a two-

sided t-test. The raw *P*-values were corrected for multiple testing using the Holm-Bonferroni

procedure. Constructs with a corrected *P*-value <= 0.05 were considered significant. For Fig.

3D, the first two groups were tested using a two-sample t-test, while the third involved multiple

levels, and were tested as described above for Fig. 3C. A Holm-Bonferroni correction was

applied to the raw *P*-values for all six tests together. *Epistasis between regions R1, AD, and*

NLS of CgPho4 (Fig. 5D): to determine the main and interaction terms in these swaps from

CgPho4 on ScPho4's background, we fit a linear model, $Y = X_0 + R1 + AD + NLS + R1:AD +$

R1:NLS + AD:NLS + R1:AD:NLS in R, using the command `lm(A ~ R1 * AD * NLS)`, where "A"

is either A_{PHO2} or $A_{pho2\Delta}$, and the independent variables are coded as ScPho4 = 0, CgPho4 = 1.

The raw *P*-values were adjusted for multiple testing using the Holm-Bonferroni procedure. *Split*

P2ID (Fig. 6B): The same procedure as applied to the activation region test above (Fig. 3) was

applied to the split P2ID swaps. Two sets of four chimeras were chosen, each with a reference

construct having P2ID:Cg, one with the entire P2ID swapped for the ScPho4 version, and two

with the first or second half of P2ID swapped for the ScPho4 version. The latter three were

compared to the reference using a linear model `lm(MFI ~ Genotype)`, for A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$

separately. Holm-Bonferroni correction was applied to the two sets combined (6 tests in total),

again separately for A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$. A corrected *P* < 0.05 was considered significant. *Nuclear*

fraction of Pho4 chimeras (Fig. S7): The ratio of the sum of pixel values in the GFP channel

inside the nucleus vs the whole cell was treated as the response variable, and the identity of the

NLS region ("Cg" vs "Sc") as the predictor. First, a two-way ANOVA was performed with the

formula `lm(Nuc_frac ~ NLS + Host)`, where Host is either *PHO2* or *pho2Δ*. Second, given that

ratios are often non-normally distributed, we performed the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test

with the command `kruskal.test(Nuc_frac ~ NLS)` separately in the *PHO2* and *pho2Δ* hosts. The

ANOVA F-test *P*-value (0.13) was reported in the results. The two *P*-values for the second test

were 0.42 (*PHO2*) and 0.36 (*pho2Δ*).

DATA AVAILABILITY

711   Source data for figures in this paper are available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14501732.

712   Raw microscopy images for quantifying Pho4 nuclear concentration are available from the

713   corresponding author upon request. No restrictions apply to any of the data generated in this

714   study.

CODE AVAILABILITY

716   Scripts for figures and statistical tests are available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14501732.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Dr. Miles Pufall's lab for teaching us EMSA. We thank Dr. Jan Fassler

for sharing many yeast plasmids for the yeast one- and two-hybrids. Dr. Kim Harold generously

shared the TET-on inducible promoter plasmid with us. Drs. Jan Fassler, Miles Pufall, Craig

Ellermeier and Todd Washington all critically read the thesis chapter by LFS, on which this

manuscript is based. We thank Kyle Malcolm for helping with the early development of the BLI

assay. Christian Weinrich discovered the P2ID's effect on Pho2-dependence during his rotation.

We thank Dr. Yann Vanrobaeys for helping with an initial analysis using PADDLE. We would

like to acknowledge the use of resources at the Protein and Crystallography Facility within the

Carver College of Medicine at the University of Iowa and thank Lokesh Gakhar, Zhen Xu, and

Devin Reusch for assistance with protein purification and BLI assays.

FUNDING

729   LFS is supported by the NIH Predoctoral Training Grant T32GM008629. BJB is supported by

730   the NIH Predoctoral Training Grant T32GM1454441. BZH is supported by NIH R35GM137831

731   and a startup fund from the University of Iowa.

 FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1 Different co-TF (Pho2) dependence between orthologous TF (Pho4) in yeast

species. (A) Cartoon summary of previous work: *S. cerevisiae* Pho4 (ScPho4) depends on the

co-TF, Pho2, for DNA binding and activation of Phosphate Starvation (PHO) Response genes

(top row), while Pho4 from *C. glabrata* (CgPho4) can bind and activate without the co-TF. See

text for references. (B) Two non-mutually exclusive models to explain the divergence in Pho2-

dependence. (C) The tiles in the middle show the conservation scores at aligned positions of the

two Pho4 orthologs; the box diagrams represent ScPho4 and CgPho4, with gray lines

connecting matching residues to the alignment tiles. Five regions were delineated based on

knowledge about ScPho4: R1 = regulatory, interact with Pho80; AD = activation domain; NLS =

nuclear import and export signals; P2ID = Pho2-interaction domain (also includes a region

contacting Pho80); DBD = basic Helix-Loop-Helix DNA binding domain. The lines and cylinders

above and below the region diagrams show predicted α helices in each protein, with lighter

color corresponding to lower prediction confidence. Prediction was done using PSIPRED 4.0.

Fig. 2 CgPho4 DBD recognizes the same motif as ScPho4 DBD and has a higher affinity

towards the consensus DNA. (A) Alignment of the DBD region between the two Pho4

orthologs. Top: sequence logo for the bHLH domain (PROSITE PS50888). Middle: coordinates

above are based on ScPho4. Filled and open triangles indicate residues in ScPho4 DBD

making either base or phosphate backbone contacts (Shimizu *et al*., 1997). Bottom: predicted α-

helices in both Pho4 DBDs. (B) WebLogo motifs for ScPho4 and CgPho4 are derived from

ChIP-seq peaks. (C) Universal Protein Binding Microarray (uPBM) comparing the binding of full

length ScPho4 and CgPho4 against all possible 9-mers. A rank-order based E-score is plotted

for all 7-mers, where a score greater than 0.35 indicates specific TF-DNA binding (Gordân *et al*.,

2013). Red dots in the top right corner represent oligos with the "CACGTG" motif. (D) Binding to

the 17bp oligo containing a consensus E-box motif is measured by Biolayer interferometry (BLI).

Fractional binding is plotted vs the concentration of purified ScPho4 or CgPho4 DBD. One of the

representative binding curves is shown here. (E) Dissociation constants (K_D) are determined

from the binding curves and shown as dots (n = 5). The bars and the red dots are the means

and the red lines the 95% confidence intervals from bootstrapping. Two-sided Student's t-test

was performed on the log transformed K_D. A Wilcoxon rank-sum test on raw K_D similarly yielded

$P < 0.01$.

Fig. 3 CgPho4 encodes two Activation Enhancer Domains (AEDs) that can enhance the

activation potential of the main AD. (A, B) PADDLE prediction of activation potential in

ScPho4 and CgPho4. Predictions were made in 53 aa blocks and plotted using the middle of

each block as the x coordinate. As a result, the first and last 26 aa positions have no scores. Z-

scores > 4 and 6 indicate regions with medium and strong activation potential, respectively. The

five regions in each protein are labeled as in Fig. 1. Orange triangles mark the 9aaTAD motif

matches. Below the plots are diagrams of the Gal4DBD fusion constructs used to test the

activation potential, with their boundaries labeled on the right. C) Activation potential of each

region was tested in the context of a Gal4 DBD fusion driving a *GAL1pr*-mCherry reporter.

Shown are the mean (bar) and individual data points (n=3, except for "host", for which n = 6).

"host" has the mCherry reporter but no plasmid; "Gal4_DBD" has the reporter and the Gal4 DBD

alone. ANOVA was used to compare the Gal4 DBD fusions to the two negative controls

combined; an asterisk indicates significant difference at a 0.05 level after Holm-Bonferroni

correction. D) CgE1 and CgE2_9aa can enhance the activation capability of ScAD_9aa in an

orientation-independent manner. An asterisk indicates significance difference at a 0.05 level by

a t-test between the indicated groups after Holm-Bonferroni correction.

Fig. 4 A dual fluorescence reporter system for accurately quantifying the activity of Pho4

chimeras with and without Pho2. (A) ScPho4 and CgPho4 were divided into five

corresponding parts. Names of each region were based on the annotations for ScPho4.

Predicted alpha helices were drawn as cartoons outside of the box diagrams. All $2^5 = 32$

combinations (2 were the original proteins) were made in the main chimera set, and an

additional set of chimeras were constructed to test specific hypotheses. (B) A diagram showing

the design of the dual fluorescence reporter system. The chimeric Pho4 fragments were cloned

downstream of the endogenous *ScPHO4* promoter and were tagged at the C-terminus with an

in-frame mNeon fluorescent protein, followed by the endogenous *ScPHO4* 3'UTR and

terminator. The plasmid contains a CEN/ARS element, resulting in stable inheritance and low

biological variation. (C) The *PHO5pr-mCherry* levels correlate with the ScPho4-mNeon levels

between biological replicates. The linear regression line is shown in blue and a 95% confidence

band as a gray ribbon. (D) A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$ values for ScPho4 and CgPho4 across 6 different

days of experiments showing consistent results (n = 3 for all groups except ScPho4 with Pho2,

where n = 12)

Fig. 5. R1 and NLS of CgPho4 confer stronger activity than their counterparts in ScPho4.

(A) Pho4 chimeras (black), endogenous ScPho4 (green) and CgPho4 (blue) were plotted based

on their activity with and without Pho2. The solid line indicates equal activity (independent of

Pho2). (B) Heatmap showing the difference in activity between the CgPho4 region(s) and the

counterpart of ScPho4 measured in the ScPho4 background. The upper half shows the

difference with Pho2 and the lower half without Pho2. The triangles (e.g., a) show the difference

between single regions while the squares on the top show the differences when swapping two

regions (see key to the right). Red color indicates a higher activity of the region from CgPho4

than the counterpart in ScPho4 and blue color indicates decreased activity. (C) A subset of the

chimeras were shown with their A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$ values. Bars represent the means; lines are

95% confidence intervals based on bootstrap; plus signs are individual data points (n>=5),

which were not shown for the endogenous ScPho4 and CgPho4 (n>=36). Vertical dotted lines

equal the endogenous ScPho4 level. (D) Epistasis analysis of CgPho4 R1, AD and NLS. A

linear model was fit to the data with all two and three-way interactions. Shown are estimates of

the individual and interaction terms (bar and point) for the CgPho4 region(s). Line ranges

indicate the standard errors of the estimates. Dark gray indicates the term is significant at 0.05

level after Holm-Bonferroni correction.

Fig. 6 P2ID in ScPho4 allows for enhanced activation with Pho2 via physical interaction

with the co-TF. (A) Scatter plot of all chimeric Pho4 constructs based on their A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$

values, colored by the identity of their P2ID region. Mixed P2ID uses an additional breakpoint

that separates the region into two halves (Fig. S2). (B) Comparing the effects of swapping the

whole P2ID from ScPho4 into CgPho4 vs individual halves. Bars represent the means; lines are

95% confidence intervals based on bootstrap; plus signs are individual data points (n>=5),

which were not shown for the endogenous ScPho4 and CgPho4 (n>=36). Two sets were tested

(rows 2-5 and 6-9). Two-sided Student's t-tests were performed as indicated by the bars and

lines to the right. Holm-Bonferroni correction was applied to the raw P-values for both sets,

separately for A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$. An asterisk indicates corrected $P < 0.05$. (C) Testing the hypothesis

that ScPho4 DBD requires the P2ID:Sc and Pho2 to be fully functional. Plot designs are the

same as in (B). Compared with the chimeras with P2ID:Cg + P2ID:Sc, which are all non-

functional even with Pho2, adding back P2ID:Sc ("4+5") rescued the activity with Pho2, but not

without. (D) Pho4-Pho2 physical interaction was tested with a yeast two-hybrid assay. The bait

and target regions were fused to the activation domain (AD) and DNA binding domain (DBD) of

the yeast Gal4 protein. Interaction between them reconstitutes a functional Gal4 and allows

cells to grow on the dropout media (right column), while all strains are able to grow on the rich

media (left column). "Vector" indicates a Gal4 DBD or Gal4 AD only plasmid without a bait or

target fused to it and is included as a control. Two independent transformants are shown.

Fig. 7 Summary of Pho4 protein divergence and its contribution to the Pho2-

dependence variation in ScPho4 and CgPho4. Left (1): CgPho4 DBD recognizes the

same DNA sequences as ScPho4 DBD, but binds the consensus motif with a 3-4 fold higher

affinity. While consistent with the enhanced activity model, further studies found no evidence for

the enhanced activity to be a major factor for the reduced Pho2-dependence. (2) Two regions in

the IDR of CgPho4 (red asterisks) can enhance the activity of the main activation domain (AD)

but are not sufficient on their own to activate gene expression. These two Activation Enhancing

Domains (AEDs) directly contribute to CgPho4's reduced Pho2-dependence. Right (3): An IDR

(green asterisk) adjacent to the DBD in ScPho4, named P2ID, can both interact with ScPho2

and boost the activity of Pho4 and also repress its activity when Pho2 is absent, providing

support for the autoinhibition model.

Fig. S1 ScPho4 and CgPho4 structural prediction shows both proteins are largely

disordered outside the DBD. (A, B) Secondary structure predictions for ScPho4 and CgPho4

using the PSIPRED 4.0 server. (C, D) AlphaFold2 predicted monomer 3D structure for ScPho4

and CgPho4. Color represents model confidence. It has been shown that low and very low

confidence regions overlap significantly and are predictive of protein disorder.

Fig. S2 ScPho4 and CgPho4 alignment and annotation. Protein sequence alignment was

generated using ProbCons with 2 passes of consistency transformation and 100 iterative

refinements and was manually edited to align the known Pho85 recognition motifs (red lines).

The shading behind the amino acid symbols represents the level of conservation based on

BLOSUM62 scores. The functional annotation on the top were based on ScPho4. The orange

boxes and texts refer to the breakpoints used for constructing chimeric Pho4 constructs (BR4-4

only used in Fig. 6).

Fig. S3 Genome context Protein Binding Microarray (gcPBM) reveals little divergence in sequence preference between ScPho4 and CgPho4. (A) 36-bp probes were designed with ChIP-identified binding peaks for both ScPho4 and CgPho4 in their respective genome, centered on the consensus E-box motif, CACGTG, along with the flanking nucleotides. Recombinantly purified full length ScPho4 and CgPho4 were hybridized to separate arrays, and the log signal intensities by the two Pho4 proteins for the same oligo were plotted as a scatterplot. A Spearman's rank correlation coefficient and the *P*-value based on a permutation test for the correlation being 0 (no correlation) are provided at the top of the graph. Number of probes is provided in the lower right. (B) Same as A, except the 36-bp probes were ChIP-identified peaks with a non-consensus E-box motifs (mostly with 1-bp-mismatch to the consensus).

Fig. S4 Electrophoretic Mobility Shift Assay (EMSA) confirms difference in binding affinity to the consensus motif between the two orthologous Pho4 DBDs. (A) EMSA with ScPho4 DBD and IR700 labeled 17bp consensus DNA. Lanes 2-8 contain 2x diluted protein; lane 1 is a no protein (NP) control. (B) Fraction of bound DNA was calculated from the unbound DNA band normalized to the NP lane. A one-site specific-binding with Hill coefficient model was fit to the data in GraphPad Prism v10. Estimated dissociation constant K_d was shown. (C) and (D) are the same as (A) and (B), but for CgPho4 DBD. Two replicates were performed for each protein and yielded consistent results.

Fig. S5 PADDLE prediction for synthetic yeast one-hybrid constructs revealed no new regions with activation potential. PADDLE was run on the full length yeast one-hybrid constructs as was done for the endogenous ScPho4 and CgPho4. Results were plotted using a fixed x axis ranging from 0 to 350 aa even though most constructs were shorter. Like in Fig. 3,

the first and last 26 aa had no score due to the design of the prediction algorithm. The greyed

region indicates the location of the Gal4 DBD. Its first 22 positions received a Z-score < 0 and

hence not visible in the plot. Two constructs had peaks exceeding the Z-score limit of 10. They

were plotted with an extended y-axis limit of 0 to 12 (red asterisks). The horizontal dotted lines

indicate the thresholds for medium and strong activation potentials, respectively.

Fig. S6 Testing Pho2-dependence for the activation potential in the Yeast-1-Hybrid (Y1H)

assay. (A) Y1H was performed both with and without *PHO2* (gray and orange bars,

respectively). "Host" = no plasmids All names are as specified in Fig. 3 of the main text. Bars

represent the means of n>3 replicates; individual data points are shown as dots; lines are the

standard deviations. Student's t-tests were used to compare the activity of each construct with

vs without Pho2. None of the tested constructs was significant at a 0.05 level after Bonferroni-

Holm correction. Full length Gal4 was tested in the same experiment but plotted separately to

avoid compressing the scale. (B) Constructs highlighted by the blue vertical line in the left panel

contain CgE1 and were tested for the boosting effect without Pho2 by comparing their activity

against the corresponding AD alone. Two-sided student's t-tests were performed and the

difference in the mean and raw *P*-values were reported.

Fig. S7 NLS from ScPho4 and CgPho4 conferred similar levels of nuclear localization. Six

Pho4 constructs with either NLS:Sc or NLS:Cg were quantified for nuclear Pho4 concentration

and fraction of Pho4 in the nucleus, in either *PHO2* or *pho2Δ* host background. Endogenous or

chimeric Pho4 protein levels were quantified by the C-terminal mNeon tag. Nucleus was labeled

by DAPI. Nuclear concentration was estimated using the average gray intensity inside the

nucleus. Nuclear fraction was calculated by dividing the Integrated density inside the nucleus by

the total integrated density in the whole cell. A total of 10 cells were randomly selected from the

bright field image per construct in each background. Individual estimates are shown as dots and

a boxplot, where the box represents the interquartile range, the middle line represents the

median and the whiskers 1.5 times the interquartile range. ANOVA test found no significant

differences for either the identity of the NLS ("Cg" or "Sc") or Host (*PHO2* or *pho2Δ*) factors (F-

test raw *P* = 0.41 and 0.15, respectively).

Fig. S8 Evolutionary patterns of AED and P2ID length among Pho4 orthologs. Time-

calibrated species tree on the left is based on Shen et al. 2018 (PMID: 30415838). Pho4 is a

single gene family in all budding yeasts, including the 8 species shown. Among these Pho4

orthologs, three showed reduced dependence on Pho2 based on He et al. 2017 (PMID:

28485712). Middle: P2ID length is calculated based on the multiple sequence alignment

constructed using ProbCons (Supplementary data 1). Right: activation potential is predicted

using PADDLE. Medium (Z-score between 4 and 6) and strong (Z-score > 6) activation potential

regions are shown as light and dark blue stripes. The bHLH DBD is shown as a green box for

reference.

Fig. S9 Example gating strategy for flow cytometry data. (A) All events were plotted on

FSC.H and SSC.H. A rectangular gate is used to exclude non-cell events. (B) Events within the

first gate ("cell") were plotted on FSC.H and FSC.W. Singlets (single cell event as opposed to

doublets or multilets) were selected by excluding events with a higher FSC.W given the same

FSC.H.

TABLES

Table 1. Breakpoints for chimeric Pho4 and individual regions tested in this study

Origin	Region Name	Start	End	Length	Used in figure(s)
CgPho4	R1	1	44	44	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
CgPho4	AD	45	112	68	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
CgPho4	NLS	113	282	170	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
CgPho4	P2ID	283	458	176	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
CgPho4	DBD	459	533	75	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
ScPho4	R1	1	42	42	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
ScPho4	AD	43	99	57	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
ScPho4	NLS	100	176	77	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
ScPho4	P2ID	177	242	66	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
ScPho4	DBD	243	312	70	Fig. 1,4,5,6,S2,S4
CgPho4	P2ID first half	283	327	45	Fig. 6, S2
CgPho4	P2ID second half	328	458	131	Fig. 6, S2
ScPho4	P2ID first half	177	204	28	Fig. 6, S2
ScPho4	P2ID second half	205	242	38	Fig. 6, S2
CgPho4	E1	2	44	43	Fig. 3,S5
CgPho4	AD	45	126	82	Fig. 3,S5
CgPho4	E2	252	463	212	Fig. 3,S5
CgPho4	AD.1	45	75	31	Fig. 3,S5
CgPho4	AD.2	76	126	51	Fig. 3,S5
CgPho4	E2_9aa	252	288	37	Fig. 3,S5
ScPho4	E1	2	42	41	Fig. 3,S5
ScPho4	AD	43	101	59	Fig. 3,S5
ScPho4	AD_9aa	70	101	32	Fig. 3,S5
ScPho4	E2	156	250	95	Fig. 3,S5
ScPho2	AD	404	559	156	Fig. 3
ScPho4	Alternative NLS	100	156	57	Fig. 5
CgPho4	Alternative P2ID	253	463	211	Fig. 5
ScPho4	ΔbHLH	2	250	249	Fig. 6 Y2H
CgPho4	ΔbHLH	2	463	462	Fig.6 Y2H
ScPho2	Pho4int	112	407	296	Fig. 6 Y2H
CgPho4	purified DBD	452	533	82	Fig. 2,S4
ScPho4	purified DBD	236	312	77	Fig. 2,S4

936 **Table 2. Plasmids used in this study**

ID	Plasmid	Derived	Source	Comment
pH246	pGAD-C3		PMID:8978031, gift from Fassler lab	Yeast two-hybrid
pH247	pGBD-C3		PMID:8978031, gift from Fassler lab	Yeast one-hybrid
pH343	pRS306-GAL1pr-mCherry	pRS306	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH346	pRS314-GAL4pr-Gal4	pRS314	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH349	pGBD-Gal4DBD-ScE1	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH350	pGBD-Gal4DBD-CgE1	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH351	pGBD-Gal4DBD-ScE1-ScAD	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH352	pGBD-Gal4DBD-CgE1-CgAD	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH362	pGBD-Gal4DBD-CgAD	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH363	pGBD-Gal4DBD-ScAD	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH377	pGBD-Gal4DBD-CgE2	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH378	pGBD-Gal4DBD-ScE2	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH379	pGBD-Gal4DBD-ScAD.9aa	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH380	pGBD-Gal4DBD-CgAD.2	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH386	pGBD-Gal4DBD-CgE2.9aa	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH387	pGBD-Gal4DBD-CgAD.1	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH388	pGBD-Gal4DBD-CgE1-ScAD.9aa	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH389	pGBD-Gal4DBD-ScAD.9aa-CgE1	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH390	pGBD-Gal4DBD-ScAD.9aa-CgE2.9aa	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH391	pGBD-Gal4DBD-CgE2.9aa-ScAD.9aa	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH434	pGBD-Gal4DBD-ScPho2AD	pH247	this study	Yeast one-hybrid
pH394	pGAD-ScPho4ΔDBD	pH246	this study	Yeast two-hybrid
pH395	pGBD-Pho2Pho4int	pH247	this study	Yeast two-hybrid
pH396	pGAD-CgPho4ΔDBD	pH246	this study	Yeast two-hybrid
pH050	pET-11a-ScPho4 DBD-6xHis	pET11a	this study	BLI
pH051	pET-11a-CgPho4 DBD-6xHis	pET11a	this study	BLI
bH404	pET-11a-GST-CgPho4	pET11a	this study	PBM
pH073	bRA89, Cas9, CEN/ARS, HygR		PMID: 28405019 gift from Malkova lab	CRISPR
pH173	ScPHO4pr, mNeon, CEN/ARS, LEU2	pRS315	this study	Chimera backbone
pH188	Cg(1-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH194	Sc(1-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera

pH209	Cg(1-112) Sc(100-176) Cg(283-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH210	Cg(1-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH211	Cg(1-282) Sc(177-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH212	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH213	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-99) Cg(113-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH215	Sc(1-99) Cg(113-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH216	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH217	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-176) Cg(283-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH218	Cg(1-112) Sc(100-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH219	Cg(1-282) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH220	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-112) Sc(100-176) Cg(283-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH221	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-99) Cg(113-282) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH222	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-282) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH223	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-99) Cg(113-282) Sc(177-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH224	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-112) Sc(100-176) Cg(283-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH227	Sc(1-176) Cg(283-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH229	Sc(1-176) Cg(283-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH230	Sc(1-99) Cg(113-282) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH231	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH232	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-112) Sc(100-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH233	Sc(1-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH234	Cg(1-112) Sc(100-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH235	Sc(1-99) Cg(113-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH236	Cg(1-76) Sc(71-99) Cg(113-282) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH237	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-70) Cg(77-282) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH239	Sc(1-99) Cg(113-282) Sc(177-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH240	Cg(1-112) Sc(100-176) Cg(283-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera

pH241	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH250	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-176) Cg(283-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH251	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-282) Sc(177-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH252	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-112) Sc(100-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH253	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-99) Cg(113-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH254	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-176) Cg(283-327) Sc(205-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH255	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-204) Cg(328-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH256	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-220) Cg(377-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH257	Cg(1-282) Sc(177-204) Cg(328-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH258	Cg(1-327) Sc(205-242) Cg(459-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH265	Sc(1-204) Cg(328-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH266	Sc(1-153) Cg(250-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH276	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-282) Sc(177-204) Cg(328-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH277	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-99) Cg(113-282) Sc(177-204) Cg(328-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH278	Sc(1-204) Cg(328-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH279	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-204) Cg(328-458) Sc(243-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH294	Cg(1-470) Sc(251-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH301	Sc(1-247) Cg(464-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH326	Sc(1-156) Cg(253-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH327	Cg(1-252) Sc(157-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH328	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-252) Sc(157-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH329	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-247) Cg(464-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH330	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-156) Cg(253-463) Sc(251-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH331	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-156) Cg(253-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH332	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-463) Sc(251-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH334	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-252) Sc(157-247) Cg(464-533)	pH173	this study	Chimera

pH436	Cg(1-112) Sc(100-176) Cg(283-458) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH438	Sc(1-176) Cg(283-458) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH440	Cg(1-44) Sc(43-99) Cg(113-458) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH441	Sc(1-42) Cg(45-458) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera
pH442	Sc(1-99) Cg(113-458) Sc(177-312)	pH173	this study	Chimera

938 **Table 3. Yeast strains**

ID	Genotype	Source
yH373	pho4::NAT; pho2::HIS3; pho80::TRP1; pho5::mCherry	this study
yH555	pho4::NAT; his3::pRS303-HIS3; pho80::TRP1; pho5::mCherry	this study
yH549	gal4delta gal80delta LYS2::GAL1-HIS3 GAL2-ADE2 MET2::GAL7-lacZ	PMID: 8978031, gift from Fassler lab
yH696	gal4delta gal80delta LYS2::GAL1-HIS3; GAL2-ADE2; MET2::GAL7-lacZ; ura3::pRS306-*GAL1pr*-mCherry-URA3	this study
yH156	pho80::TRP1	PMID: 28485712
various	chimeric Pho4 plasmids transformed into yH373 and yH555	this study
various	yeast two-hybrid plasmids transformed into yH696	this study
various	yeast one-hybrid plasmids transformed into yH696	this study

940 <div align="center">**REFERENCES**</div>

941
Anand R, Memisoglu G, Haber J. 2017. Cas9-mediated gene editing in Saccharomyces
cerevisiae.
Ang Y-S, Rivas RN, Ribeiro AJS, Srivas R, Rivera J, Stone NR, Pratt K, Mohamed TMA, Fu J-
D, Spencer CI, Tippens ND, Li M, Narasimha A, Radzinsky E, Moon-Grady AJ, Yu H,
Pruitt BL, Snyder MP, Srivastava D. 2016. Disease Model of GATA4 Mutation Reveals
Transcription Factor Cooperativity in Human Cardiogenesis. *Cell* **167**:1734-1749.e22.
doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.11.033
Avsec Ž, Weilert M, Shrikumar A, Krueger S, Alexandari A, Dalal K, Fropf R, McAnany C,
Gagneur J, Kundaje A, Zeitlinger J. 2021. Base-resolution models of transcription-factor
binding reveal soft motif syntax. *Nat Genet*. doi:10.1038/s41588-021-00782-6
Baker CR, Booth LN, Sorrells TR, Johnson AD. 2012. Protein modularity, cooperative binding,
and hybrid regulatory states underlie transcriptional network diversification. *Cell* **151**:80–
95. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2012.08.018
Barbaric S, Münsterkötter M, Goding C, Hörz W. 1998. Cooperative Pho2-Pho4 Interactions at
the PHO5 Promoter Are Critical for Binding of Pho4 to UASp1 and for Efficient
Transactivation by Pho4 at UASp2. *Mol Cell Biol* **18**:2629–2639.
Berger MF, Badis G, Gehrke AR, Talukder S, Philippakis AA, Peña-Castillo L, Alleyne TM,
Mnaimneh S, Botvinnik OB, Chan ET, Khalid F, Zhang W, Newburger D, Jaeger SA,

Morris QD, Bulyk ML, Hughes TR. 2008. Variation in homeodomain DNA binding revealed by high-resolution analysis of sequence preferences. *Cell* **133**:1266–1276. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2008.05.024

Berger MF, Bulyk ML. 2009. Universal protein-binding microarrays for the comprehensive characterization of the DNA-binding specificities of transcription factors. *Nat Protoc* **4**:393–411. doi:10.1038/nprot.2008.195

Berger MF, Bulyk ML. 2006. Protein Binding Microarrays (PBMs) for Rapid, High-Throughput Characterization of the Sequence Specificities of DNA Binding ProteinsGene Mapping, Discovery, and Expression. New Jersey: Humana Press. pp. 245–260. doi:10.1385/1-59745-097-9:245

Bhoite LT, Allen JM, Garcia E, Thomas LR, Gregory ID, Voth WP, Whelihan K, Rolfes RJ, Stillman DJ. 2002. Mutations in the Pho2 (Bas2) Transcription Factor That Differentially Affect Activation with Its Partner Proteins Bas1, Pho4, and Swi5. *J Biol Chem* **277**:37612–37618.

Britton CS, Sorrells TR, Johnson AD. 2020. Protein-coding changes preceded cis-regulatory gains in a newly evolved transcription circuit. *Science* **367**:96–100. doi:10.1126/science.aax5217

Brodsky S, Jana T, Mittelman K, Chapal M, Kumar DK, Carmi M, Barkai N. 2020. Intrinsically Disordered Regions Direct Transcription Factor In Vivo Binding Specificity. *Mol Cell*. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2020.05.032

Buchan DWA, Jones DT. 2019. The PSIPRED Protein Analysis Workbench: 20 years on. *Nucleic Acids Res* **47**:W402–W407. doi:10.1093/nar/gkz297

Do CB, Mahabhashyam MSP, Brudno M, Batzoglou S. 2005. ProbCons: Probabilistic consistency-based multiple sequence alignment. *Genome Res* **15**:330–340. doi:10.1101/gr.2821705

Donovan BT, Chen H, Eek P, Meng Z, Jipa C, Tan S, Bai L, Poirier MG. 2023. Basic helix-loop-helix pioneer factors interact with the histone octamer to invade nucleosomes and generate nucleosome-depleted regions. *Mol Cell* **83**:1251-1263.e6. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2023.03.006

Ferrie JJ, Karr JP, Graham TGW, Dailey GM, Zhang G, Tjian R, Darzacq X. 2023. p300 is an obligate integrator of combinatorial transcription factor inputs. *Mol Cell* S1097-2765(23)01023–7. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2023.12.004

Ferrie JJ, Karr JP, Tjian R, Darzacq X. 2022. "Structure"-function relationships in eukaryotic transcription factors: The role of intrinsically disordered regions in gene regulation. *Mol Cell* **0**. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2022.09.021

Gietz RD, Schiestl RH. 2007. High-efficiency yeast transformation using the LiAc/SS carrier DNA/PEG method. *Nat Protoc* **2**:31–34. doi:10.1038/nprot.2007.13

Gomes-Vieira AL, Wideman JG, Paes-Vieira L, Gomes SL, Richards TA, Meyer-Fernandes JR. 2018. Evolutionary conservation of a core fungal phosphate homeostasis pathway coupled to development in Blastocladiella emersonii. *Fungal Genet Biol* **115**:20–32. doi:10.1016/j.fgb.2018.04.004

Gordân R, Shen N, Dror I, Zhou T, Horton J, Rohs R, Bulyk ML. 2013. Genomic regions flanking E-box binding sites influence DNA binding specificity of bHLH transcription factors through DNA shape. *Cell Rep* **3**:1093–1104. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2013.03.014

Guss KA, Nelson CE, Hudson A, Kraus ME, Carroll SB. 2001. Control of a Genetic Regulatory Network by a Selector Gene. *Science* **292**:1164–1167. doi:10.1126/science.1058312

He BZ, Zhou X, O'Shea EK. 2017. Evolution of reduced co-activator dependence led to target expansion of a starvation response pathway. *eLife* **6**. doi:10.7554/eLife.25157

Hirst K, Fisher F, McAndrew PC, Goding CR. 1994a. The transcription factor, the Cdk, its cyclin and their regulator: directing the transcriptional response to a nutritional signal. *EMBO J* **13**:5410–5420.

Hirst K, Fisher F, McAndrew PC, Goding CR. 1994b. The transcription factor, the Cdk, its cyclin
and their regulator: directing the transcriptional response to a nutritional signal. *EMBO J*
13:5410–5420.
Hsu IS, Strome B, Lash E, Robbins N, Cowen LE, Moses AM. 2021. A functionally divergent
intrinsically disordered region underlying the conservation of stochastic signaling. *PLOS*
Genet **17**:e1009629. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1009629
James P, Halladay J, Craig EA. 1996. Genomic libraries and a host strain designed for highly
efficient two-hybrid selection in yeast. *Genetics* **144**:1425–1436.
doi:10.1093/genetics/144.4.1425
Jayaraman PS, Hirst K, Goding CR. 1994. The activation domain of a basic helix-loop-helix
protein is masked by repressor interaction with domains distinct from that required for
transcription regulation. *EMBO J* **13**:2192–2199.
Ji D, Shao C, Yu J, Hou Y, Gao X, Wu Y, Wang L, Chen P. 2024. FOXA1 forms biomolecular
condensates that unpack condensed chromatin to function as a pioneer factor. *Mol Cell*
84:244-260.e7. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2023.11.020
Kaffman A, Herskowitz I, Tjian R, O'Shea EK. 1994. Phosphorylation of the transcription factor
PHO4 by a cyclin-CDK complex, PHO80-PHO85. *Science* **263**:1153–1156.
Kerwin CL, Wykoff DD. 2009. Candida glabrata PHO4 Is Necessary and Sufficient for Pho2-
Independent Transcription of Phosphate Starvation Genes. *Genetics* **182**:471–479.
doi:10.1534/genetics.109.101063
Komeili A, O'Shea EK. 1999a. Roles of Phosphorylation Sites in Regulating Activity of the
Transcription Factor Pho4. *Science* **284**:977–980. doi:10.1126/science.284.5416.977
Komeili A, O'Shea EK. 1999b. Roles of Phosphorylation Sites in Regulating Activity of the
Transcription Factor Pho4. *Science* **284**:977–980. doi:10.1126/science.284.5416.977
Krois AS, Dyson HJ, Wright PE. 2018. Long-range regulation of p53 DNA binding by its
intrinsically disordered N-terminal transactivation domain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
115:E11302–E11310. doi:10.1073/pnas.1814051115
Lam FH, Steger DJ, O'Shea EK. 2008. Chromatin decouples promoter threshold from dynamic
range. *Nature* **453**:246–250.
Liu J, Perumal NB, Oldfield CJ, Su EW, Uversky VN, Dunker AK. 2006. Intrinsic Disorder in
Transcription Factors. *Biochemistry* **45**:6873–6888. doi:10.1021/bi0602718
Lynch VJ, May G, Wagner GP. 2011. Regulatory evolution through divergence of a
phosphoswitch in the transcription factor CEBPB. *Nature* **480**:383–386.
doi:10.1038/nature10595
Maerkl SJ, Quake SR. 2007. A Systems Approach to Measuring the Binding Energy
Landscapes of Transcription Factors. *Science* **315**:233–237.
doi:10.1126/science.1131007
Magbanua JP, Ogawa N, Harashima S, Oshima Y. 1997. The transcriptional activators of the
PHO regulon, Pho4p and Pho2p, interact directly with each other and with components
of the basal transcription machinery in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *J Biochem (Tokyo)*
121:1182–1189.
McAndrew PC, Svaren J, Martin SR, Hörz W, Goding CR. 1998. Requirements for Chromatin
Modulation and Transcription Activation by the Pho4 Acidic Activation Domain. *Mol Cell*
Biol **18**:5818–5827. doi:10.1128/MCB.18.10.5818
Merhej J, Thiebaut A, Blugeon C, Pouch J, Ali Chaouche MEA, Camadro J-M, Le Crom S,
Lelandais G, Devaux F. 2016. A Network of Paralogous Stress Response Transcription
Factors in the Human Pathogen Candida glabrata. *Front Microbiol* **7**.
doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.00645
Mindel V, Brodsky S, Cohen A, Manadre W, Jonas F, Carmi M, Barkai N. 2023. Intrinsically
disordered regions of the Msn2 transcription factor encode multiple functions using

interwoven sequence grammars. *Nucleic Acids Res* gkad1191.
doi:10.1093/nar/gkad1191

Ming Yip H, Cheng S, Olson EJ, Crone M, Maerkl SJ. 2023. Perfect adaptation achieved by
transport limitations governs the inorganic phosphate response in S. cerevisiae. *Proc*
Natl Acad Sci U S A **120**:e2212151120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2212151120

Nocedal I, Johnson AD. 2015. How Transcription Networks Evolve and Produce Biological
Novelty. *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol* **80**:265–274.
doi:10.1101/sqb.2015.80.027557

Nourani A, Utley RT, Allard S, Côté J. 2004. Recruitment of the NuA4 complex poises the PHO5
promoter for chromatin remodeling and activation. *EMBO J* **23**:2597–2607.
doi:10.1038/sj.emboj.7600230

Ogawa N, Oshima Y. 1990. Functional domains of a positive regulatory protein, PHO4, for
transcriptional control of the phosphatase regulon in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Mol*
Cell Biol **10**:2224–2236. doi:10.1128/mcb.10.5.2224-2236.1990

O'Neill EM, Kaffman A, Jolly ER, O'Shea EK. 1996. Regulation of PHO4 nuclear localization by
the PHO80-PHO85 cyclin-CDK complex. *Science* **271**:209–212.

Piskacek S, Gregor M, Nemethova M, Grabner M, Kovarik P, Piskacek M. 2007. Nine-amino-
acid transactivation domain: establishment and prediction utilities. *Genomics* **89**:756–
768. doi:10.1016/j.ygeno.2007.02.003

Rives A, Meier J, Sercu T, Goyal S, Lin Z, Liu J, Guo D, Ott M, Zitnick CL, Ma J, Fergus R.
2021. Biological structure and function emerge from scaling unsupervised learning to
250 million protein sequences. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* **118**:e2016239118.
doi:10.1073/pnas.2016239118

Sanborn AL, Yeh BT, Feigerle JT, Hao CV, Townshend RJ, Lieberman Aiden E, Dror RO,
Kornberg RD. 2021. Simple biochemical features underlie transcriptional activation
domain diversity and dynamic, fuzzy binding to Mediator. *eLife* **10**:e68068.
doi:10.7554/eLife.68068

Sánchez-Higueras C, Rastogi C, Voutev R, Bussemaker HJ, Mann RS, Hombría JC-G. 2019. In
vivo Hox binding specificity revealed by systematic changes to a single cis regulatory
module. *Nat Commun* **10**:3597. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-11416-1

Shao D, Creasy CL, Bergman LW. 1996. Interaction of Saccharomyces cerevisiae Pho2 with
Pho4 increases the accessibility of the activation domain of Pho4. *Mol Gen Genet MGG*
251:358–364. doi:10.1007/BF02172527

Sherbenou DW, Druker BJ. 2007. Applying the discovery of the Philadelphia chromosome. *J*
Clin Invest **117**:2067–2074. doi:10.1172/JCI31988

Shimizu T, Toumoto A, Ihara K, Shimizu M, Kyogoku Y, Ogawa N, Oshima Y, Hakoshima T.
1997. Crystal structure of PHO4 bHLH domain–DNA complex: flanking base recognition.
EMBO J **16**:4689–4697. doi:10.1093/emboj/16.15.4689

Slattery M, Riley T, Liu P, Abe N, Gomez-Alcala P, Dror I, Zhou T, Rohs R, Honig B,
Bussemaker HJ, Mann RS. 2011. Cofactor binding evokes latent differences in DNA
binding specificity between Hox proteins. *Cell* **147**:1270–1282.
doi:10.1016/j.cell.2011.10.053

Stewart AJ, Hannenhalli S, Plotkin JB. 2012. Why Transcription Factor Binding Sites Are Ten
Nucleotides Long. *Genetics* **192**:973–985. doi:10.1534/genetics.112.143370

Thomas-Chollier M, Herrmann C, Defrance M, Sand O, Thieffry D, Helden J van. 2011. RSAT
peak-motifs: motif analysis in full-size ChIP-seq datasets. *Nucleic Acids Res* gkr1104.
doi:10.1093/nar/gkr1104

Todeschini A-L, Georges A, Veitia RA. 2014. Transcription factors: specific DNA binding and
specific gene regulation. *Trends Genet* **30**:211–219. doi:10.1016/j.tig.2014.04.002

Traven A, Jelicic B, Sopta M. 2006. Yeast Gal4: a transcriptional paradigm revisited. *EMBO Rep*
7:496–499. doi:10.1038/sj.embor.7400679

Troshin PV, Procter JB, Sherstnev A, Barton DL, Madeira F, Barton GJ. 2018. JABAWS 2.2
distributed web services for Bioinformatics: protein disorder, conservation and RNA
secondary structure. *Bioinformatics* **34**:1939–1940. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty045
Tsong AE, Tuch BB, Li H, Johnson AD. 2006. Evolution of alternative transcriptional circuits with
identical logic. *Nature* **443**:415–420. doi:10.1038/nature05099
Tuch BB, Galgoczy DJ, Hernday AD, Li H, Johnson AD. 2008. The evolution of combinatorial
gene regulation in fungi. *PLoS Biol* **6**:e38. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0060038
Wapinski I, Pfiffner J, French C, Socha A, Thompson DA, Regev A. 2010. Gene duplication and
the evolution of ribosomal protein gene regulation in yeast. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
107:5505–5510. doi:10.1073/pnas.0911905107
Waterhouse AM, Procter JB, Martin DMA, Clamp M, Barton GJ. 2009. Jalview Version 2--a
multiple sequence alignment editor and analysis workbench. *Bioinforma Oxf Engl*
25:1189–1191. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp033
Weeramange CJ, Fairlamb MS, Singh D, Fenton AW, Swint-Kruse L. 2020. The strengths and
limitations of using biolayer interferometry to monitor equilibrium titrations of
biomolecules. *Protein Sci* pro.3827. doi:10.1002/pro.3827
Zhang Y, Ho TD, Buchler NE, Gordân R. 2021. Competition for DNA binding between
paralogous transcription factors determines their genomic occupancy and regulatory
functions. *Genome Res* **31**:1216–1229. doi:10.1101/gr.275145.120
Zhou X, O'Shea EK. 2011. Integrated approaches reveal determinants of genome-wide binding
and function of the transcription factor Pho4. *Mol Cell* **42**:826–836.
doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2011.05.025
1134
1135

Fig. 1 Different co-TF (Pho2) dependence between orthologous TF (Pho4) in yeast species. (A) Cartoon summary of previous work: *S. cerevisiae* Pho4 (ScPho4) depends on the co-TF, Pho2, for DNA binding and activation (top row), while Pho4 from *C. glabrata* (CgPho4) can bind and activate without the co-TF. See text for references. (B) Two *non-mutually exclusive* models to explain the divergence in Pho2-dependence. (C) The tiles in the middle show the conservation scores at aligned positions of the two Pho4 orthologs; the box diagrams represent ScPho4 and CgPho4, with gray lines connecting matching residues to the alignment tiles. Five regions were delineated based on knowledge about ScPho4: R1 = regulatory, interact with Pho80; AD = activation domain; NLS = nuclear import and export signals; P2ID = Pho2-interaction domain (also includes a region contacting Pho80); DBD = basic Helix-Loop-Helix DNA binding domain. The lines and cylinders above and below the region diagrams show predicted α helices in each protein, with lighter color corresponding to lower prediction confidence. Prediction was done using PSIPRED 4.0.

Fig. 2 CgPho4 DBD recognizes the same motif as ScPho4 DBD and has a higher affinity towards the consensus DNA. (A) Alignment of the DBD region between the two Pho4 orthologs. Top: sequence logo for the bHLH domain (PROSITE PS50888). Middle: coordinates above are based on ScPho4. Filled and open triangles indicate residues in ScPho4 DBD making either base or phosphate backbone contacts (Shimizu *et al*., 1997). Bottom: predicted α-helices in both Pho4 DBDs. (B) WebLogo motifs for ScPho4 and CgPho4 are derived from ChIP-seq peaks. (C) Universal Protein Binding Microarray (uPBM) comparing the binding of full length ScPho4 and CgPho4 against all possible 9-mers. A rank-order based E-score is plotted for all 7-mers, where a score greater than 0.35 indicates specific TF-DNA binding (Gordân *et al*., 2013). Red dots in the top right corner represent oligos with the "CACGTG" motif. (D) Binding to the 17bp oligo containing a consensus E-box motif is measured by Biolayer interferometry (BLI). Fractional binding is plotted vs the concentration of purified ScPho4 or CgPho4 DBD. One of the representative binding curves is shown here. (E) Dissociation constants (K_D) are determined from the binding curves and shown as dots (n = 5). The bars and the red dots are the means and the red lines the 95% confidence intervals from bootstrapping. Two-sided Student's t-test was performed on the log transformed K_D. A Wilcoxon rank-sum test on raw K_D similarly yielded $P < 0.01$.

Fig. 3 CgPho4 encodes two Activation Enhancer Domains (AEDs) that can enhance the activation potential of the main AD. (A, B) PADDLE prediction of activation potential in ScPho4 and CgPho4. Predictions were made in 53 aa blocks and plotted using the middle of each block as the X coordinate. As a result, the first and last 26 aa positions have no scores. Z-scores > 4 and 6 indicate regions with medium and strong activation potential, respectively. The five regions in each protein are labeled as in Fig. 1. Orange triangles mark the 9aaTAD motif matches. Below the plots are diagrams of the Gal4DBD fusion constructs used to test the activation potential, with their boundaries labeled on the right. C) Activation potential of each region was tested in the context of a Gal4 DBD fusion driving a *GAL1pr*-mCherry reporter. Shown are the mean (bar) and individual data points (n=3, except for "host", for which n = 6). "host" has the mCherry reporter but no plasmid; "Gal4_DBD" has the reporter and the Gal4 DBD alone. ANOVA was used to compare the Gal4 DBD fusions to the two negative controls combined; an asterisk indicates significant difference at a 0.05 level after Holm-Bonferroni correction. D) CgE1 and CgE2_9aa can enhance the activation capability of ScAD_9aa in an orientation-independent manner. An asterisk indicates significance difference at a 0.05 level by a t-test between the indicated groups after Holm-Bonferroni correction.

Fig. 4 A dual fluorescence reporter system for accurately quantifying the activity of Pho4 chimeras with and without Pho2. (A) ScPho4 and CgPho4 were divided into five corresponding parts. Names of each region were based on the annotations for ScPho4. Predicted alpha helices were drawn as cartoons outside of the box diagrams. All 2^5 = 32 combinations (2 were the original proteins) were made in the main chimera set, and an additional set of chimeras were constructed to test specific hypotheses. (B) A diagram showing the design of the dual fluorescence reporter system. The chimeric Pho4 fragments were cloned downstream of the endogenous *ScPHO4* promoter and were tagged at the C-terminus with an in-frame mNeon fluorescent protein, followed by the endogenous *ScPHO4* 3'UTR and terminator. The plasmid contains a CEN/ARS element, resulting in stable inheritance and low biological variation. (C) The *PHO5pr-mCherry* levels correlate with the ScPho4-mNeon levels between biological replicates. The linear regression line is shown in blue and a 95% confidence band as a gray ribbon. (D) A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$ values for ScPho4 and CgPho4 across 6 different days of experiments showing consistent results (n = 3 for all groups except ScPho4 with Pho2, where n = 12)

Fig. 5. R1 and NLS of CgPho4 confer stronger activity than their counterparts in ScPho4. (A) Pho4 chimeras (black), endogenous ScPho4 (green) and CgPho4 (blue) were plotted based on their activity with and without Pho2. The solid line indicates equal activity (independent of Pho2). (B) Heatmap showing the difference in activity between the CgPho4 region(s) and the counterpart of ScPho4 measured in the ScPho4 background. The upper half shows the difference with Pho2 and the lower half without Pho2. The triangles (e.g., a) show the difference between single regions while the squares on the top show the differences when swapping two regions (see key to the right). Red color indicates a higher activity of the region from CgPho4 than the counterpart in ScPho4 and blue color indicates decreased activity. (C) A subset of the chimeras were shown with their A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$ values. Bars represent the means; lines are 95% confidence intervals based on bootstrap; plus signs are individual data points (n>=5), which were not shown for the endogenous ScPho4 and CgPho4 (n>=36). Vertical dotted lines equal the endogenous ScPho4 level. (D) Epistasis analysis of CgPho4 R1, AD and NLS. A linear model was fit to the data with all two and three-way interactions. Shown are estimates of the individual and interaction terms (bar and point) for the CgPho4 region(s). Line ranges indicate the standard errors of the estimates. Dark gray indicates the term is significant at 0.05 level after Holm-Bonferroni correction.

Fig. 6 P2ID in ScPho4 allows for enhanced activation with Pho2 via physical interaction with the co-TF. (A) Scatter plot of all chimeric Pho4 constructs based on their A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$ values, colored by the identity of their P2ID region. Mixed P2ID uses an additional breakpoint that separates the region into two halves (Fig. S2). (B) Comparing the effects of swapping the whole P2ID from ScPho4 into CgPho4 vs individual halves. Bars represent the means; lines are 95% confidence intervals based on bootstrap; plus signs are individual data points (n>=5), which were not shown for the endogenous ScPho4 and CgPho4 (n>=36). Two sets were tested (rows 2-5 and 6-9). Two-sided Student's t-tests were performed as indicated by the bars and lines to the right. Holm-Bonferroni correction was applied to the raw *P*-values for both sets, separately for A_{PHO2} and $A_{pho2\Delta}$. An asterisk indicates corrected $P < 0.05$. (C) Testing the hypothesis that ScPho4 DBD requires the P2ID:Sc and Pho2 to be fully functional. Plot designs are the same as in (B). Compared with the chimeras with P2ID:Cg + P2ID:Sc, which are all non-functional even with Pho2, adding back P2ID:Sc ("4+5") rescued the activity with Pho2, but not without. (D) Pho4-Pho2 physical interaction was tested with a yeast two hybrid assay. The bait and target regions were fused to the activation domain (AD) and DNA binding domain (DBD) of the yeast Gal4 protein. Interaction between them reconstitutes a functional Gal4 and allows cells to grow on the dropout media (right column), while all strains are able to grow on the rich media (left column). "Vector" indicates a Gal4 DBD or Gal4 AD only plasmid without a bait or target fused to it, and is included as a control. Two independent transformants are shown.

Fig. 7 Summary of Pho4 protein divergence and its contribution to the Pho2-dependence variation in ScPho4 and CgPho4. Left (1): CgPho4 DBD recognizes the same DNA sequences as ScPho4 DBD, but binds the consensus motif with a 3-4 fold higher affinity. While consistent with the enhanced activity model, further studies found no evidence for the enhanced activity to be a major factor for the reduced Pho2-dependence. (2) Two regions in the IDR of CgPho4 (red asterisks) can enhance the activity of the main activation domain (AD) but are not sufficient on their own to activate gene expression. These two Activation Enhancing Domains (AEDs) directly contribute to CgPho4's reduced Pho2-dependence. Right (3): An IDR (green asterisk) adjacent to the DBD in ScPho4, named P2ID, can both interact with ScPho2 and boost the activity of Pho4 and also repress its activity when Pho2 is absent, providing support for the autoinhibition model.

Fig. S1 ScPho4 and CgPho4 structural prediction shows both proteins are largely disordered outside the DBD. (A, B) Secondary structure predictions for ScPho4 and CgPho4 using the PSIPRED 4.0 server. (C, D) AlphaFold2 predicted monomer 3D structure for ScPho4 and CgPho4. Color represents model confidence. It has been shown that low and very low confidence regions overlap significantly and are predictive of protein disorder.

Fig. S2 ScPho4 and CgPho4 alignment and annotation. Protein sequence alignment was generated using ProbCons with 2 passes of consistency transformation and 100 iterative refinement, and was manually edited to align the known Pho85 recognition motifs (red lines). The shading behind the amino acid symbols represent level of conservation based on BLOSUM62 scores. The functional annotation on the top were based on ScPho4. The orange boxes and texts refer to the breakpoints used for constructing chimeric Pho4 constructs (BR4-4 only used in Fig. 6).

Fig. S3 Genome context Protein Binding Microarray (gcPBM) reveals little divergence in sequence preference between ScPho4 and CgPho4. (A) 36-bp probes were designed with ChIP-identified binding peaks for both ScPho4 and CgPho4 in their respective genome, centered on the consensus E-box motif, CACGTG, along with the flanking nucleotides. Recombinantly purified full length ScPho4 and CgPho4 were hybridized to separate arrays, and the log signal intensities by the two Pho4 proteins for the same oligo were plotted as a scatterplot. A Spearman's rank correlation coefficient and the *P*-value based on a permutation test for the correlation being 0 (no correlation) are provided at the top of the graph. Number of probes is provided in the lower right. (B) Same as A, except the 36-bp probes were ChIP-identified peaks with a non-consensus E-box motifs (mostly with 1-bp-mismatch to the consensus).

Fig. S4 Electrophoretic Mobility Shift Assay (EMSA) confirms difference in binding affinity to the consensus motif between the two orthologous Pho4 DBDs. (A) EMSA with ScPho4 DBD and IR700 labeled 17bp consensus DNA. Lanes 2-8 contain 2x diluted protein; lane 1 is a no protein (NP) control. (B) the unbound DNA was quantified from (A) and used calculate the fraction bound normalized to the NP lane. A one-site specific-binding with Hill coefficient model was fit to the data in GraphPad Prism v10. Estimated dissociation constant Kd is shown. (C) and (D) are the same as (A) and (B), but for CgPho4 DBD. Two replicates were performed for each protein and yielded consistent results.

Fig. S5 PADDLE prediction for synthetic yeast one-hybrid constructs revealed no new regions with activation potential. PADDLE was run on the full length yeast one-hybrid constructs as was done for the endogenous ScPho4 and CgPho4. Results were plotted using a fixed x axis ranging from 0 to 350 aa even though most constructs were shorter. Like in Fig. 3, the first and last 26 aa had no score due to the design of the prediction algorithm. The greyed region indicates the location of the Gal4 DBD. Its first 22 positions received a Z-score < 0 and hence not visible in the plot. Two constructs had peaks exceeding the Z-score limit of 10. They were plotted with an extended y-axis limit of 0 to 12 (red asterisks). The horizontal dotted lines indicate the thresholds for medium and strong activation potentials, respectively.

Fig. S6 Testing Pho2-dependence for the activation potential in the Yeast-1-Hybrid (Y1H) assay. (A) Y1H was performed both with and without *PHO2* (gray and orange bars, respectively). "Host" = no plasmids All names are as specified in Fig. 3 of the main text. Bars represent the means of n>3 replicates; individual data points are shown as dots; lines are the standard deviations. Student's t-tests were used to compare the activity of each construct with vs without Pho2. None of the tested constructs was significant at a 0.05 level after Bonferroni-Holm correction. Full length Gal4 was tested in the same experiment and plotted on the right to avoid compressing the scale. (B) Constructs highlighted by the blue vertical line in the left panel contain CgE1 and were tested for the boosting effect without Pho2 by comparing their activity against the corresponding AD alone. Two-sided student's t-tests were performed and the difference in the mean and raw *P*-values were reported.

Fig. S7 NLS from ScPho4 and CgPho4 conferred similar levels of nuclear localization. Six Pho4 constructs with either NLS:Sc or NLS:Cg were quantified for nuclear Pho4 concentration and fraction of Pho4 in the nucleus, in either *PHO2* or *pho2Δ* host background. Endogenous or chimeric Pho4 protein levels were quantified by the C-terminal mNeon tag. Nucleus was labeled by DAPI. Nuclear concentration was estimated using the average gray intensity inside the nucleus. Nuclear fraction was calculated by dividing the Integrated density inside the nucleus by the total integrated density in the whole cell. A total of 10 cells were randomly selected from the bright field image per construct in each background. Individual estimates are shown as dots and also as a boxplot, where the box represents the interquartile range, the middle line represents the median and the whiskers 1.5 times the interquartile range. ANOVA test found no significant differences for either the identity of the NLS ("Cg" or "Sc") or Host (*PHO2* or *pho2Δ*) factors (F-test raw P = 0.41 and 0.15, respectively).

Fig. S8 Evolutionary patterns of AED and P2ID length among Pho4 orthologs. Time-calibrated species tree on the left is based on Shen et al. 2018 (PMID: 30415838). Pho4 is a single gene family in all budding yeasts, including the 8 species shown. Among these Pho4 orthologs, three showed reduced dependence on Pho2 based on He et al. 2017 (PMID: 28485712). Middle: P2ID length is calculated based on the multiple sequence alignment constructed using ProbCons (Supplementary data 1). Right: activation potential is predicted using PADDLE. Medium (Z-score between 4 and 6) and strong (Z-score > 6) activation potential regions are shown as light and dark blue stripes. The bHLH DBD is shown as green box for reference.

Fig. S9 Example gating strategy for flow cytometry data. (A) All events were plotted on FSC.H and SSC.H. A rectangular gate is used to exclude non-cell events. (B) Events within the first gate ("cell") were plotted on FSC.H and FSC.W. Singlets (single cell event as opposed to doublets or multilets) were selected by excluding events with a higher FSC.W given the same FSC.H.