Allodiploid hybridization, loss-of-heterozygosity and aneuploidy in the green alga

***Auxenochlorella,* an emerging model for discovery research and bioengineering**

Rory J. Craig[1,2], Marco A. Dueñas[3], Dimitrios J. Camacho[4], Sean D. Gallaher[1,4], Crysten E. Blaby-Haas[5,6], Jeffrey L. Moseley[1], Sabeeha S. Merchant[1,3,4,7]

[1] California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences (QB3), University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
[2] Department of Algal Development and Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Biology Tübingen, Tübingen, 72076, Germany
[3] Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
[4] Department of Molecular and Cell Biology, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
[5] Molecular Foundry, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
[6] US Department of Energy Joint Genome Institute, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
[7] Environmental Genomics and Systems Biology, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

Correspondence: Rory J. Craig, rory.craig@unimelb.edu.au; Sabeeha S. Merchant, sabeeha@berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT

Auxenochlorella are diploid oleaginous green algae that are highly amenable to genetic

transformation by homologous recombination, providing great potential for discovery research

and bioengineering. Vegetatively diploid organisms experience specific evolutionary

phenomena, including allodiploid hybridization, mitotic recombination, loss-of-heterozygosity

and aneuploidy; however, studies of these forces have mostly focused on fungi. Here, we present

a telomere-to-telomere phased diploid genome assembly of *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A,

revealing a streamlined nuclear genome architecture with a haploid length of 22 Mb. We

demonstrate that UTEX 250-A is an allodiploid hybrid via sequencing of *Auxenochlorella*

protothecoides and *Auxenochlorella symbiontica* strains, two close relatives differentiated by

extensive chromosomal rearrangements. The UTEX 250-A haplotypes are a mosaic of each

parental species following mitotic recombination, and two chromosomes are trisomic, which we

confirm via allele-specific transformation of a trisomic chromosome. Loss-of-heterozygosity

events are likely pervasive across *Auxenochlorella* due to mitotic recombination and transient

aneuploidy, and can evolve rapidly in laboratory culture. We present high-quality structural

annotations, yielding ~7,500 genes per haplotype. *Auxenochlorella* have experienced extensive

gene family loss and reduction, including core photosynthesis genes. Nevertheless, a minimal set

of genes required for sexual reproduction is potentially present. We demonstrate periodic

adenine and cytosine methylation around promoters and across gene bodies. Finally, ~10% of

genes, especially those involved in DNA repair and sex, overlap antisense long noncoding

RNAs, potentially representing a regulatory mechanism. These results demonstrate the generality

of several evolutionary forces associated with vegetative diploidy, and provide a genomic

foundation for the use of *Auxenochlorella* as a reference organism.

INTRODUCTION

Microbial organisms that under undergo periods of asexual reproduction as diploids are associated with several molecular and evolutionary phenomena. These processes are best studied in the budding yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and its close relatives, which undergo a facultatively sexual life cycle featuring long periods of asexual division as a diploid (Tsai, et al. 2008; Fischer, et al. 2021). Although inter-tetrad outcrossing is relatively rare in yeast, one interesting facet of this life cycle is occasional alloploid hybridization. Mating of haploid gametes from divergent lineages produces an allodiploid hybrid that inherits one set of chromosomes from each parent, whereas allotetraploid hybrids can arise via conjugation of divergent diploid cells or whole-genome duplication of an allodiploid individual (Sipiczki 2008; Gabaldón 2020). Although allodiploid hybrids may be incapable of meiosis due to incompatibilities between the parental chromosomes, they can persist via asexual division (Gabaldón 2020). Indeed, hybrids may exhibit increased fitness or unique phenotypes relative to their parents (i.e., heterosis), and hybrid *Saccharomyces* strains have successfully adapted to anthropomorphic environments such as alcoholic ferments (Sipiczki 2008; Peris, et al. 2018; Gallone, et al. 2019; Langdon, et al. 2019) and olive brine (Pontes, et al. 2019). Hybridization has also been linked to the evolution of pathogenicity in taxa including *Candida* yeasts (Pryszcz, et al. 2015; Schroder, et al. 2016) and *Aspergillus* filamentous fungi (Steenwyk, et al. 2020). Importantly, allodiploid hybridization is not necessarily an evolutionary dead end, since the correct pairing of homologous chromosomes and sexual compatibility can be restored via whole-genome duplication (Charron, et al. 2019). Exemplifying this process, an ancient hybridization event is thought to have preceded the whole-genome duplication in the lineage leading to *Saccharomyces* (Marcet-Houben and Gabaldón 2015). Allopolyploidy (hybridization and genome duplication) has also long been recognized as a major force in plant evolution and speciation (Soltis and Soltis 2009).

Although recombination is primarily associated with meiotic cell division, various mitotic recombination processes can occur during asexual growth. In *S. cerevisiae*, mitotic recombination occurs randomly due to double-strand breaks at a rate that is orders of magnitude lower than meiotic recombination (Mancera, et al. 2008; Sui, et al. 2020). Nonetheless, over lengthy periods of asexuality, mitotic recombination can drastically homogenize genomes via

loss-of-heterozygosity (LOH) events, where an allele of one chromosome is replaced by the

allele carried by its homologous chromosome. LOH can occur at short regions along

chromosomes of generally less than 10 kb via gene conversion (i.e., interstitial LOH), or at larger

regions that typically extend from an internal location to the telomere (terminal LOH), which are

the product of mitotic crossovers or the break-induced replication DNA repair pathway (Sui, et

al. 2020; Dutta, et al. 2021). Furthermore, in allodiploid hybrids, reciprocal mitotic crossovers

result in the shuffling of haplotypes between the parental sub-genomes, producing chromosomes

that are a mosaic of the ancestral parents (Sipiczki 2008). Mitotic recombination has also been

characterized in diploid oomycetes (Dale, et al. 2019) and diatoms (Bulankova, et al. 2021),

suggesting that it is an important evolutionary process across the tree of life.

Another phenomenon associated with asexual reproduction is the emergence of aneuploidy via

the loss or gain of copies of specific chromosomes. Unbalanced chromosome numbers have been

observed in many eukaryotes and are prevalent in several fungi (Vande Zande, et al. 2023). As

with hybridization, aneuploidy and its subsequent effects (e.g., gene expression changes) are

associated with adaptation to new environments and pathogenicity, although negative fitness

effects are common (Santaguida and Amon 2015). For example, whole or partial aneuploidies

are common among clinical isolates of *Candida albicans* (Hirakawa, et al. 2015), and an

aneuploidy affecting a specific chromosome arm causes antifungal drug resistance (Selmecki, et

al. 2006). Under laboratory evolution of *C. albicans*, chromosomal duplications are also

observed as transient adaptations to abrupt heat stress (Yona, et al. 2012). Transient aneuploidy

can result in LOH at the scale of entire chromosomes via duplication of one chromosome copy

and loss of the other (Yuen, et al. 2007; Andersen, et al. 2008).

These drivers of evolution have received scarce attention in chlorophyte green algae, a highly

diverse group that diverged from the lineage leading to land plants approximately 1 billion years

ago (Del Cortona, et al. 2020). Although facultatively sexual, the model green alga

Chlamydomonas reinhardtii (class Chlorophyceae) grows asexually as a haploid, with the

diploid stage limited to a dormant zygospore that obligately divides by meiosis (Harris 2001).

Similarly, asexual reproduction in the genus *Chlorella* (Trebouxiophyceae) is haploid, with a

possible cryptic sexual cycle that is uncharacterized (Blanc, et al. 2010; Fučiková, et al. 2015).

Ancient mating type loci have also been identified in haploid *Ostreococcus* species

(Mamelliophyceae), demonstrating the presence of haplontic life cycles at the deepest

evolutionary branch of the Chlorophyta (Benites, et al. 2021). Despite this, a number of

vegetatively diploid species have recently been reported (Figure 1A). Diploid genome assemblies

have been assembled for trebouxiophyte algae from the related genera *Nannochloris* (Sanders, et

al. 2022) and *Picochlorum* (Foflonker, et al. 2018; Becker, et al. 2020; Barten, et al. 2022; da

Roza, et al. 2024), and for the lichen-forming *Trebouxia lynniae* (Gazquez, et al. 2024).

Chloropicon primus (Chloropicophyceae) is trisomic (three copies) for a single chromosome and

is otherwise diploid (Lemieux, et al. 2019). In the Chlorophyceae, diploids from the genera

Haematococcus (Volvocales) and *Tetradesmus* (Sphaeropleales) have been reported (Calhoun, et

al. 2021; Marcolungo, et al. 2024). Most notably, Biondi, et al. (2024) described a diploid

Tetradesmus obliquus strain with extensive heterozygosity but one entirely homozygous

chromosome, patterns potentially consistent with hybridization followed by chromosome-scale

LOH. These results suggest that the presence of diplontic life cycles may be underestimated in

Chlorophyta, although the prevalence of hybridization, LOH and aneuploidy is presently

unknown.

Auxenochlorella is a genus of trebouxiophyte algae that is highly amenable to discovery research

and bioengineering (Goold, et al. 2024). Together with its close relatives from the genus

Prototheca, the type species *Auxenochlorella protothecoides* is diploid and targeted

transformation of the nuclear genome by homologous recombination is efficient (Franklin, et al.

2019; Moseley, et al. 2022). While *Prototheca* are obligate heterotrophs that have lost the ability

to photosynthesize, *Auxenochlorella* can grow robustly as a phototroph, mixotroph or

heterotroph, undergoing a metabolic switch that degrades the photosynthetic apparatus when

provided with an organic carbon source (Matsuka, et al. 1966). Resultingly, it is facile to study

photosynthetic gene function through reverse genetics, making *Auxenochlorella* an attractive

model in plant biology. Both *Auxenochlorella* and *Prototheca* are oleaginous, and

Auxenochlorella oil and biomass have generally recognized as safe (GRAS) status, enabling

engineering of specific lipids for bioproducts, food and renewable fuels (Franklin, et al. 2019;

Brooks, et al. 2024). Collectively, these features provide significant advantages relative to

existing models such as *C. reinhardtii*, where incorporation of transgenes mostly occurs via non-

homologous end-joining, making locus-specific transformation challenging (Zorin, et al. 2005).

Demonstrating these capabilities, we recently introduced synthetic gene constructs in to

Auxenochlorella to characterize the mechanism underlying the translation of bicistronic genes

(Dueñas, et al. 2024), which are widespread in green algae (Gallaher, et al. 2021).

Here, we present a fully phased, telomere-to-telomere diploid genome assembly for the

Auxenochlorella strain UTEX 250-A. We find an unusual genome architecture where six of the

twelve chromosome pairs are highly rearranged and non-homologous. We demonstrate that

UTEX 250-A is a putative allodiploid hybrid of *Auxenochlorella protothecoides* and

Auxenochlorella symbiontica, which each differ in their respective karyotypes. Despite the high

heterozygosity introduced by hybridization, several local genomic regions and three entire

chromosomes are homozygous following extensive LOH. Two chromosomes are partially

trisomic, one of which we experimentally verify by allele-specific transformation. We also

introduce a highly curated annotation of gene models, and report a streamlined nuclear genome

architecture and gene content. These resources demonstrate that a green algal genome can be

shaped by forces experienced by diplontic taxa, and provides a platform for the future use of

Auxenochlorella as a model in plant biology and bioengineering.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The genus *Auxenochlorella* and existing genomic data

First isolated in the 1890s as "*Chlorella*" *protothecoides* (Krüger 1894b, a), *Auxenochlorella* was

later established as an independent monotypic genus based on physiological, morphological and

genetic data (Kalina and Punčochárová 1987; Huss, et al. 1999). Indeed, *Auxenochlorella* and

true *Chlorella* species likely diverged more than 550 million years ago (Del Cortona, et al. 2020)

and clearly form distinct lineages within the taxonomically diverse order Chlorellales (Figure

1A). The closest relatives of *Auxenochlorella* have all lost photosynthesis; *Prototheca* is a

polyphyletic assemblage of heterotrophic free-living and opportunistically parasitic algae, and

Helicosporidium are obligate parasites of arthropods (Jagielski, et al. 2019). Collectively, these

algae form the "AHP lineage" (Ueno, et al. 2005), and phylogenetic analyses support multiple

independent transitions to heterotrophy, with *Auxenochlorella* enduring as the sole

photosynthetic lineage (Figueroa-Martinez, et al. 2015; Suzuki, et al. 2018; Guo, et al. 2022).

Several isolates classified as *A. prototheocoides* are maintained in culture centers, including the

original strain isolated by W. Krüger from the sap of a poplar tree (UTEX 25 at the University of

Texas Culture Collection of Algae). *Auxenochlorella* have also been isolated from fresh and salt

water, soil, and as symbionts of freshwater hydrozoans and sponges (Figure 1B). Based on

ribosomal DNA (rDNA) analysis, Darienko and Pröschold (2015) described a second species, *A.*

symbiontica, with the type strain CCAP 211/61 isolated from *Hydra viridis*. We produced an 18S

rDNA phylogeny including some additional isolates (Table S1), which supports an association

between *A. prototheocoides* and both tree sap and freshwater habitats, whereas most *A.*

symbiontica strains were isolated from marine environments (Figure 1B). However, the marine

strain UTEX 2341 groups with *A. prototheocoides* and freshwater symbionts have been isolated

for both species, suggesting that both *A. prototheocoides* and *A. symbiontica* can live in multiple

and overlapping environments.

Gao, et al. (2014) produced the first draft assembly of *A. prototheocoides* "0710" (=UTEX 25, see

below), while additional draft assemblies of UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341 are available at NCBI

(Table S2). Several draft assemblies of *Prototheca* and *Helicosporidium* have been produced

(Pombert, et al. 2014; Severgnini, et al. 2018; Suzuki, et al. 2018; Bakuła, et al. 2021; Guo, et al.

2022). Although these assemblies are all collapsed to haploids, Guo, et al. (2022) reported

heterozygosity in two *Prototheca wickerhamii* genomes. Every available AHP lineage genome is

highly streamlined relative to ~40-60 Mb genomes of *Chlorella* species; for example, the *A.*

prototheocoides 0710 assembly has a haploid length of 22.9 Mb, with ~7,000 predicted genes and

low repeat content (Gao, et al. 2014) (Table 1). It is interesting to note that *Picochlorum* and

Nannochloris species also possess diploid streamlined genomes (Table 1), and phylogenetic

placement of these species relative to *Chlorella* (including *Micractinium*) and the AHP lineage is

uncertain (Figure 1A). Whether the transition to a diplontic lifecycle occurred independently in

the AHP lineage and *Picochlorum*/*Nannochloris*, or whether these lineages may in fact form

sister groups, is an outstanding question.

Figure 1. Phylogenetic relationships of *Auxenochlorella*. A) Maximum likelihood phylogeny based on concatenated protein alignment of 669 single-copy orthologs, using the LG+F+R5 substitution model. All nodes received ultrafast bootstrap values >95, except the node connecting *Picochlorum* and *Nannochloris* to *Chlorella* and *Micractinium* (68 support value). Putative transitions to at least partial vegetative diploidy are shown by the "2n" symbol. Divergence estimates were taken from Del Cortona, et al. (2020). B) Maximum likelihood phylogeny based on 18S ribosomal DNA alignment, using the TNe+I substitution model. See Table S1 for strain metadata.

Genome		Size (Mb)	Genes	TE genes	lncRNA genes	GC (%)	Repeats (%)	Reference
	Haplotype A	22.0	7,515	86	544	63.9	6.22	
Auxenochlorella UTEX250-A	Haplotype B	22.0	7,519	121	572	63.9	6.21	
Auxenochlorella protothecoides 0710		22.9	6,988	26	NA	63.6	5.58	Gao, et al. 2014
Prototheca cutis JCM15793		20.0	5,600	5	NA	61.3	5.84	Suzuki, et al. (2018) Kwon, et al. (2023)
Chlorella vulgaris 211/11P		40.2	10,341	357	NA	61.8	13.1	Cecchin, et al. (2019)
Chlorella sorokiniana UTEX 1602		59.4	9,489	37	NA	64.1	12.9	Arriola, et al. (2018)
Micractinium conductrix SAG 241.80		60.8	9,027	190	NA	67.3	21.5	Arriola, et al. (2018)
Nannochloris desiccata UTEX 2526		21.6	9,123	187	NA	45.0	8.12	Sanders, et al. (2022)
Picochlorum sp. BPE23	Haplotype A	14.8	7,216	11	NA	46.3	9.72	Barten, et al. (2022)
Coccomyxa subellipsoidea v3		48.9	10,836	57	NA	52.9	6.04	Blanc, et al. (2012)
Chlamydomonas reinhardtii v6.1		114.0	16,801	810	NA	64.1	26.4	Craig, et al. (2023)

Table 1. Summary statistics of representative trebouxiophyte genomes with *C. reinhardtii* as an outgroup. See methods for determination of transposable element (TE) genes included in annotations; note that these numbers are not representative of the true number of TE genes in each genome due to differences in annotation methodology.

Telomere-to-telomere, phased diploid assembly of *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A

To serve as a foundation for discovery research and bioengineering, we sought to produce a reference-quality genome assembly of *Auxenochlorella*. We selected the strain UTEX 250 based on its robust performance in high cell density fermentations (Brooks, et al. 2024). Metadata on UTEX 250 are sparse; the strain was isolated before 1950 in the Netherlands by A. J. Kluyver, possibly from freshwater. Although described as *A. protothecoides*, UTEX 250 groups with *A. symbiontica* based on 18S rDNA (Darienko and Pröschold 2015) (Figure 1B). Since our line of the strain has been independently maintained for several years after acquisition from UTEX, we performed single colony purification prior to genome sequencing, and we designate this sub-clone as "UTEX 250-A".

We produced high-coverage Pacific Biosciences (PacBio) HiFi and linked-read OmniC datasets for UTEX 250-A, from which we produced a genome assembly via automated and manual assembly (see Methods). This effort yielded a telomere-to-telomere diploid genome assembly comprising two haplotypes, each featuring 12 gapless nuclear chromosomes spanning ~22.0 Mb (i.e., collectively 24 nuclear chromosomes spanning 44.0 Mb) (Table 1). Heterozygosity between the two haplotypes is 2.71% (i.e., homologous chromosomal regions differ by ~27 single nucleotide polymorphisms per 1 kb; heterozygosity calculations exclude entirely homozygous regions, see below). This extensive inter-haplotype variation made it possible to fully phase the assembled chromosomes using the accurate PacBio reads, so that each haplotype corresponds to a physical chromosome in UTEX 250-A. We arbitrarily label these haplotypes "A" and "B". As presented below, only six of the twelve chromosome pairs exhibit one-to-one homology, and the remaining six are highly rearranged between the two haplotypes.

All chromosomes terminate in the telomeric repeat (TTAGGG)n, except for one chromosome arm per haplotype that terminates in a truncated rDNA array. This telomeric motif differs from the (TTTAGGG)n repeat found in the trebouxiophyte genera *Chlorella* and *Coccomyxa*, which is likely ancestral to green algae, suggesting an independent transition to (TTAGGG)n telomeric repeats as observed in some other green algae (Fulnečková, et al. 2012). The 5S rDNA genes, which generally form tandem arrays independent of the major rDNA arrays, are present as 16 (haplotype A) or 17 (haplotype B) standalone genes dispersed throughout the genome. Similar

non-tandem 5S rDNA genes have been observed in species including the yeasts

Schizosaccharomyces pombe and *Yarrowia lipolytica* (Torres-Machorro, et al. 2010).

As in *A. prototothecoides* 0710, repeat content is low, with interspersed and tandem repeats

spanning 3.4% and 2.8% of the genome, respectively (Table 1). Among the interspersed repeats,

we identified potentially active families of *Metaviridae* long terminal repeat (LTR)

retrotransposons, and *hAT* and *EnSpm-Plavaka* cut-and-paste DNA transposons, with many

insertions segregating as polymorphisms between the two haplotypes (Figure S1, Table S3). The

most abundant repeat is an uncharacterized transposon that encodes a Fanzor protein, which are

RNA-guided endonucleases carried by diverse transposons in protists, fungi and giant viruses

(Saito, et al. 2023). Phylogenetically diverse Fanzors are sporadically found in green algal

genomes including *C. reinhardtii* (Bao and Jurka 2013) and *Chloropicon primus* (Yoon, et al.

2023), and presumably arise via lateral gene transfer.

Green algal centromeres identified thus far are transposon-enriched regions of tens to hundreds

of kilobases in species of *Chlorella*, *Coccomyxa* and *Chlamydomonas* (Blanc, et al. 2012; Craig,

et al. 2021; Wang, et al. 2024). In line with the paucity of repeats, we found no obvious repeat-

rich centromere candidates in UTEX 250-A. We searched for short regional centromeres,

nonrepetitive AT-rich regions of 1-5 kb as found in the red alga *Cyanidioschyzon merolae*

(Kanesaki, et al. 2015) and the diatom *Phaeodactylum tricornutum* (Diner, et al. 2017). On 9 of

the 12 chromosomes, we identified single AT-rich (mean 48.0% GC, relative to 63.9% GC

genome-wide) intergenic regions spanning 2.1 – 7.6 kb (Figure S2, Table S4). Although ChIP-

sequencing of the centromeric histone variant will be required to confirm centromere locations,

considered alongside the low repeat content and non-tandem 5S rDNA genes, these candidates

support a highly streamlined architecture of the UTEX 250-A genome.

We produced complete circular genome assemblies for the plastome (84.6 kb, 30.8% GC; Figure

S3) and mitogenome (54.0 kb, 29.0% GC; Figure S4). The UTEX 250-A plastome is broadly

consistent with existing assemblies from *A. prototothecoides* UTEX 25 (Yan, et al. 2015; Park, et

al. 2022). Briefly, the plastome features 78 protein-coding genes and lacks internal repeats,

introns, and trans-spliced genes, resulting in a more compact architecture relative to most

trebouxiophyte plastomes. The mitogenome features 37 protein-coding genes, including two

LAGLIDADG homing endonucleases encoded by introns in *cox1*, as also observed in the *P.*

wickerhamii mitogenome (Wolff, et al. 1993).

Auxenochlorella UTEX 250 is a putative allodiploid hybrid

Considering the high heterozygosity and rearranged nature of half of the UTEX 250-A diploid

chromosomes, we speculated that UTEX 250 may be an allodiploid hybrid between two distinct

parental species that possess different karyotypes. Given the close evolutionary relationship

between *A. protothecoides* and *A. symbiontica* (Figure 1B), we explored this hypothesis via

genome sequencing of representative strains of both species. We assembled gapless

chromosome-level assemblies for *A. protothecoides* strains UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341, and *A.*

symbiontica CCAP 211/61, from PacBio HiFi data (supplemented by Oxford Nanopore

Technologies, ONT, reads for CCAP 211/61; see Methods). The three assemblies were broadly

consistent with our UTEX 250-A assembly; each nuclear genome comprised 12 diploid

chromosomes, with haploid genome sizes ranging from 21.9 Mb to 23.0 Mb (Table S5).

However, unlike UTEX 250-A, we observed no rearrangements between the homologous

chromosome pairs in each genome, implying a typical diploid karyotype in these strains.

We first considered the six homologous UTEX 250-A chromosomes. Each of these six

chromosomes corresponds to a pair of homologous chromosomes in UTEX 25, UTEX 2341, and

CCAP 211/61, suggesting that they are ancestral to *Auxenochlorella*. In UTEX 250-A, three of

these chromosomes (1, 2 and 6) are mostly heterozygous, whereas the remaining chromosomes

(4, 9 and 10) are entirely homozygous (Figure 2A). We presume that the homozygous

chromosomes were originally heterozygous, with homozygosity arising following chromosome-

scale LOH events (see below). As introduced, heterozygosity in UTEX 250-A is ~2.7%,

although many local genomic regions are homozygous (e.g., the ~73 kb homozygous region at

the left arm terminus of chromosome 1, Figure 2A). In *A. protothecoides*, heterozygosity is

substantially lower at 0.59% (UTEX 25) and 0.62% (UTEX 2341) in heterozygous regions, with

both genomes also exhibiting extensive regional homozygosity. Average heterozygosity in

CCAP 211/61 is 1.35% in heterozygous regions, implying that *A. symbiontica* harbors greater

genetic diversity than *A. protothecoides*.

When comparing the A and B haplotypes of the UTEX 250-A chromosomes to the other *Auxenochlorella* strains, we observed substantial inter-haplotype variation in genetic divergence (Figure 2A). For example, on chromosome 2, haplotype A differs on average by 0.57% and 0.49% relative to the homologous chromosomes of UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341, respectively. Meanwhile, haplotype B differs by 2.69% (UTEX 25) and 2.66% (UTEX 2341). Therefore, for chromosome 2, the divergence between haplotype A and the *A. protothecoides* genomes is comparable to heterozygosity between chromosome pairs in *A. protothecoides*, whereas the divergence between haplotype B and *A. protothecoides* is comparable to heterozygosity in UTEX 250-A. The reciprocal pattern is observed via comparison to *A. symbiontica*; divergence between haplotype B and CCAP 211/61 (1.64%) is comparable to heterozygosity in CCAP 211/61, whereas divergence between haplotype A and CCAP 211/61 (2.84%) is comparable to UTEX 250-A heterozygosity. These results are consistent with haplotype A of chromosome 2 originating from an *A. protothecoides*-like ancestor, and haplotype B originating from an *A. symbiontica*-like ancestor. Extending this logic, it is possible to use genetic divergence to assign a putative parent of origin to all genomic regions in UTEX 250-A (Figure 2A, B).

In contrast to chromosome 2, we observed intra-haplotype switches in assigned parentage on the remaining five homologous chromosome pairs (Figure 2A). On chromosome 1, a single switch corresponds to the 73 kb homozygous region at the left arm terminus, and can be attributed to a LOH event in which the ancestral haplotype A copy of this region was replaced by the haplotype B copy, resulting in both resembling *A. protothecoides*. Conversely, the switches on chromosome 6 are reciprocal, resulting in a ~360 kb region of *A. protothecoides*-like sequence on an otherwise *A. symbiontica*-like chromosome for haplotype A (and vice versa on haplotype B). This mosaicism could be explained by mitotic crossover following hybridization, i.e., each haplotype originally corresponded to one parent (as for chromosome 2), but have subsequently undergone reciprocal exchange. The homozygous chromosomes 4, 9 and 10 also exhibit switches in assigned parentage that are consistent with either LOH or crossover events occurring in a heterozygous state that preceded complete LOH. Note that the A and B labels are arbitrary, and the genomic mosaicism makes it impossible to correspond physical haplotypes to parents of origin in UTEX 250-A.

We next tested whether the UTEX 250-A rearranged chromosomes correspond to the ancestral

karyotypes of *A. protothecoides* and *A. symbiontica*. The extent of the rearrangements among

these chromosomes can only be explained by multiple translocations, one fusion, and one fission

(Figure 2B). Remarkably, eight of the twelve chromosome copies correspond exactly to a

homologous chromosome pair in either *A. protothecoides* (both UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341,

which have an identical karyotype) or *A. symbiontica* (CCAP 211/61). Specifically, UTEX 250-

A chromosomes B05 (i.e., chromosome 5, haplotype B), A08 and A11 correspond to

homologous chromosome pairs in *A. protothecoides*, whereas A05, A07, B08, B11 and A12

correspond to homologous chromosome pairs in *A. symbiontica* (Figure 2C). Therefore, most of

the rearrangements in UTEX 250-A can be explained by direct inheritance from parental species

with different karyotypes. The remaining chromosomal rearrangements can be explained by

events that occurred following hybridization. The UTEX 250-A chromosomes B03 and B12

correspond to a pair of *A. protothecoides* chromosomes, suggesting fission of the ancestral *A.*

protothecoides chromosome 3 and subsequent fusion of one of the resulting chromosomal

fragments (which is predicted to have lacked a centromere) to the ancestral *A. protothecoides*

chromosome 12 (Figure 2C). Interestingly, LTR elements are present at both the *de novo*

terminus of B03 and the fusion site of B12, suggesting that retrotransposons may have invaded

(and potentially stabilized) the unprotected chromosomal ends following fission. Finally, the

UTEX 250-A chromosomes A03 and B07 are consistent with a reciprocal translocation between

the ancestral *A. protothecoides* chromosome 7 and *A. symbiontica* chromosome 3 (Figure 2C).

These ancestral chromosomes feature a common locus of ~6 kb that corresponds to two genes

that are part of the largest *Auxenochlorella*-specific gene family (see below), suggesting that the

translocation occurred via ectopic recombination between these nonhomologous repeats. It is

also noteworthy that switches in the assigned parent of origin are frequently observed on the

rearranged chromosomes (Figure 2B, C), implying that mitotic recombination has occurred

between homologous regions despite the rearrangements.

Finally, we constructed a phylogeny based on genomic regions that i) are present on UTEX 250-

A chromosomes that have not obviously experienced mitotic crossovers, and ii) are not affected

by LOH in any of the four strains. As expected, this analysis clearly divided the UTEX 250-A

genome into regions that clustered with either UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341 (*A. protothecoides*-

like) or CCAP 211/61 (*A. symbiontica*-like), with the longer branch lengths for *A. symbiontica*

reflecting the higher genetic diversity in the species (Figure 2D). We also constructed trees for

the plastome (Figure 2E) and mitogenome (Figure 2F), which demonstrated putative inheritance

from *A. symbiontica* in both cases.

In summary, *A. protothecoides* and *A. symbiontica* represent authentic species that are ~2.7%

divergent at the sequence-level and are distinguished at the chromosome-level by multiple

rearrangements. Assuming that the sequenced strains are representative, genetic diversity may be

more than two-fold higher in *A. symbiontica* than *A. protothecoides*. UTEX 250 is a putative

allodiploid hybrid that presumably originated via the fusion of haploid cells of *A. symbiontica*

and *A. protothecoides*. The ancestrally inherited haplotypes have subsequently been mixed via

nonreciprocal and reciprocal mitotic exchange, and four ancestrally inherited chromosomes have

been involved in post-hybridization rearrangements (including a reciprocal translocation

potentially mediated by ectopic recombination). Given the efficiency of homologous

recombination in *Auxenochlorella*, it is possible that the rapid emergence of chromosomal

differences between the closely related *A. protothecoides* and *A. symbiontica* may have been

driven by similar recombination events. Indeed, assuming a sexual life cycle for

Auxenochlorella, UTEX 250-A is presumably incapable of meiosis due to the non-homologous

nature of its chromosomes (Garagna, et al. 2014), and the karyotypic variation between the two

species may present a barrier to gene flow.

411
412
413   Legend on next page.

Figure 2. Allodiploid hybrid origin of UTEX 250. A) Heterozygosity and divergence for four *Auxenochlorella* strains in 10 kb windows across the six UTEX 250-A chromosomes with one-to-one homology. For divergence metrics the upper panels refer to haplotype A, lower panels to haplotype B. B) Genomic rearrangements among the remaining six diploid UTEX 250-A chromosomes. C) Comparison between rearranged UTEX 250-A chromosomes and diploid *A. protothecoides* and *A. symbiontica* chromosomes. D) Neighbor joining phylogeny of all *Auxenochlorella* haplotypes. E) Neighbor joining phylogeny of plastome sequences. F) Neighbor joining phylogeny of mitogenome sequences.

Pervasive loss-of-heterozygosity and evolution in the laboratory

LOH events are associated with several mechanisms and can affect local genomic regions (interstitial LOH), large regions that extend to a chromosome terminus (terminal LOH), or entire chromosomes. We observed all three LOH categories in UTEX 250-A, resulting in at least 35.5% of the genome being homozygous (conservatively assuming a minimum interstitial LOH length of 1 kb). The three entirely homozygous chromosomes, 4, 9 and 10, collectively span 28.2% of the genome. Terminal LOH events affect seven chromosomal termini (e.g., the left arm terminus of chromosome A01, Figure 2A), ranging from ~12 kb to ~271 kb (mean 111 kb) and collectively spanning 3.5% of the genome. We observed 278 putative interstitial LOH events, 36 of which exceed 5 kb in length, reaching a maximum of 37.1 kb. Notably, LOH is pervasive in all of the sequenced *Auxenochlorella* genomes; 23.3% of the *A. symbiontica* CCAP 211/61 genome is homozygous, whereas levels of homozygosity reach 67.2% (UTEX 25) and 80.3% (UTEX 2341) in *A. protothecoides*.

Since all of the studied *Auxenochlorella* strains have been in culture for decades, we questioned whether LOH could have accumulated in the laboratory. UTEX 25 is one of the oldest microbes in culture, having been isolated in the late 19th century (Krüger 1894b, a). CCAP 211/61 was isolated in 1982, and UTEX 2341 prior to 1984 (Seto, et al. 1984). Conveniently, many of these strains are maintained at different culture centers, including UTEX and CCAP (Culture Collection of Algae and Protozoa). Although records are uncertain, a sister lineage of UTEX 250 has likely been independently maintained for more than 70 years as CCAP 211/7C (Figure 3A). To test whether LOH has occurred during culture, we obtained CCAP 211/7C and performed high-coverage ONT sequencing.

Remarkably, LOH events affect only 19.7% of the CCAP 211/7C genome. Although chromosome 10 is entirely homozygous in both UTEX 250-A and CCAP 211/7C, chromosomes

4 and 9 are heterozygous in CCAP 211/7C (Figure 3B). Thus, two of the chromosome-scale

LOH events must have occurred during culture at UTEX or in our laboratory since obtaining the

strain. Similarly, of the seven UTEX 250-A terminal LOH events, only five are present in CCAP

211/7C. For example, both terminal LOH events on chromosome A07 and the right arm terminal

LOH event on A08 are shared, whereas the event on the left arm terminus of A08 is unique to

UTEX 250-A (Figure 3B). The same pattern is observed for interstitial LOH, for example, the

largest interstitial event in the genome (37.1 kb at ~1.66 Mb on chromosome A08) is shared,

whereas the second largest (29.2 kb, ~0.69 Mb on A07) is unique to UTEX 250-A (Figure 3B).

Interestingly, almost all of the strain-specific LOH events are unique to UTEX 250-A,

suggesting that the frequency of LOH during culture at CCAP is substantially lower.

These results support the rapid accumulation of LOH events under at least some laboratory

conditions, as has been observed experimentally in yeast (Sui, et al. 2020; Dutta, et al. 2021).

Contrastingly, the UTEX 250-A chromosomal rearrangements that likely occurred following

hybridization are also present in CCAP 211/7C, suggesting that these events occurred prior to

sampling of the original strain (or at least before the UTEX and CCAP lineages were

established). Although it is possible that some of the LOH events in UTEX 250-A and CCAP

211/7C were fixed by positive selection to overcome post-hybridization incompatibles, there is

no obvious directionality with respect to parental species: approximately equal numbers of bases

within regions affected by interstitial and terminal LOH events can be assigned to *A.*

protothecoides and *A. symbiontica*. It is possible that the different frequencies of LOH events in

CCAP 211/7C and UTEX 250-A could be attributed to differences in culture conditions (e.g.,

liquid vs agar cultures that would affect clonal population sizes). We recommend

cryopreservation and avoiding bottlenecks in culture sizes where possible to avoid the fixation of

LOH events by drift.

482
483
484 **Figure 3.** Loss-of-heterozygosity and evolution in the laboratory. A) Putative strain history of UTEX 250.
485 B) Heterozygosity in 10 kb windows across three example chromosomes. Chromosomes are shaded
486 according to parental species of origin and candidate centromeres are marked where available (see Figure
487 1). LOH = loss-of-heterozygosity. Different LOH categories in UTEX 250-A are shown by colored
488 boxes.
489
Aneuploidy is widespread in *Auxenochlorella* and can be confirmed by allele-specific
transformation
While assembling the UTEX250-A genome, we noticed that two genomic regions exhibited
unexpectedly high read coverage. Specifically, when mapping the PacBio reads against the
diploid assembly, the entirety of chromosome B03 and a 932 kb fragment of B05 exhibit median
read coverages of 528x and 519x, respectively, approximately twice the 272x coverage of the
other individual chromosomes, suggesting that these regions are trisomic when considering both
A and B haplotypes (Figure 4A). The putatively duplicated part of B05 features the right arm
terminus and associated telomere, and we identified reads featuring telomeric repeats that map
internally to B05 precisely at the location where coverage doubles (Figure S5). Conceivably,
B05 may have duplicated and then undergone fission, with the fragment retaining the centromere
acquiring a de novo telomere at its left terminus, yielding a partly aneuploid chromosome. We
compared read coverage between UTEX 250-A and CCAP 211/7C to explore whether the
observed aneuploidies could have evolved during laboratory culture. Surprisingly, B05 exhibited
normal coverage in the CCAP 211/7C ONT read dataset, whereas B03 had three times the
expected coverage (163x relative to 53x genome-wide, Figure 4B), suggesting tetrasomy for this

chromosome (three copies of B03 and one copy of the homologous region on A03). Thus, the

B05 duplication appears to have occurred during culture leading to UTEX 250-A (or

alternatively CCAP 211/7C has reverted to disomy), whereas aneuploidy of B03 may have

existed prior to sampling, with subsequent copy number change during culture.

To explicitly test the predicted aneuploidy in UTEX 250-A, we took advantage of the

amenability of *Auxenochlorella* to genetic transformation via homologous recombination, in

combination with the characteristic metabolic switch of the organism. The ammonium

transporter gene *AMT1B*, which is highly upregulated under N-depletion in heterotrophic growth

in UTEX 25 (Yan, et al. 2013), is located on the right arms of chromosomes A03 and B03, with

a putative third copy on the duplicate of B03 (termed "C03", Figure 4C). Since A03 and

B03/C03 are heterozygous at this region, we designed an allele-specific construct with homology

arms that specifically correspond to the flanking sequences of the *AMT1B* open reading frame

(ORF) of the B03/C03 allele (termed *AMT1B-1*, Figure 4C). The construct replaced the *AMT1B-*

1 ORF with an ORF encoding the Venus fluorescent protein, which is under the control of the

endogenous *AMT1B-1* promoter, and a neomycin phosphotransferase II (*neoR*) gene that served

as a transformation marker conferring resistance to G418 (Geneticin) (Moseley, et al. 2022;

Dueñas, et al. 2024). We designed allele-specific PCR primers that targeted the left and right

flanks of the endogenous *AMT1B* alleles, in addition to primer pairs that targeted the construct,

with one primer within the construct and the other in the sequence flanking the homology arms

(Fig. 4C). Wild-type sequences for both *AMT1B* alleles (*AMT1B-1* on B03 or C03, *AMT1B-2* on

A03) could be amplified from wild-type UTEX 250-A and from three representative

transformants (see Methods for transformation details), but the transformants also contained

mutant *amt1B-1::Venus* integrations, consistent with the presence of one copy of *AMT1B-2* and

two copies of *AMT1B-1* in the wild-type nuclear genome (Figure 4D). Transformants displayed

an average of 66-fold higher Venus fluorescence compared to a UTEX 250-A wild-type negative

control when measured in late-log phase heterotrophic cells (Figure 4E). Heterotrophic cells had

an average of 19-fold higher fluorescence than photoautotrophic cells, consistent with activation

of Venus expression by the *AMT1B-1* promoter in response to N-depletion (Figure 4E, F).

Finally, we checked for possible aneuploidies in *A. protothecoides* UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341,

and *A. symbiontica* CCAP 211/61, by mapping PacBio reads for each strain against one

representative haplotype from their respective genome assembly. For UTEX 2341 and CCAP

211/61, coverage estimates were consistent across all chromosomes, suggesting euploidy (Figure

S6). However, median read coverage for chromosome 1 (76x) of UTEX 25 was approximately

50% higher than median coverage across the rest of the genome (54x), implying trisomy (Figure

4G). We also noted that the existing *A. protothecoides* "0710" genome assembly exhibited

almost no variation relative to our UTEX 25 assembly, indicating that they are replicates of the

same strain. Surprisingly, when mapping the "0710" Illumina genomic reads to our UTEX 25

assembly we found no increase in coverage for chromosome 1, whereas coverage for

chromosomes 7 and 10 (131 and 134x, respectively) were ~50% higher than the median of 89x

across the rest of the genome (Figure 4G). Thus, it appears that the evolution of aneuploidy is

dynamic, occurring on short timescales of laboratory culture, at least in the UTEX 250 and

UTEX 25 genetic backgrounds. Transient aneuploidy may explain the rapid emergence of

whole-chromosome LOH, suggesting that it is a prominent evolutionary force in

Auxenochlorella. It is unclear whether any of the observed aneuploidies confer a selective

advantage; at least one additional copy of B03 has been maintained over decades of culture in

UTEX 250 and CCAP 211/7C, potentially indicating that it could be beneficial. There are 149

genes on B03, and analyses focusing on the effects of dosage on gene and protein expression will

be required to address this.

Figure 4. Aneuploidy in *Auxenochlorella.* A) UTEX 250-A PacBio read coverage for 20-kb windows across the phased diploid genome assembly of UTEX 250-A. B) CCAP 211/7C ONT read coverage for 20-kb windows across the phased diploid genome assembly of UTEX 250-A. C) Schematic of chromosome 3 copies (A03 and B03/C03) with green triangles marking the location of *AMT1B*. The mutant locus features a gene cassette comprised of a *Venus* ORF and a 537 bp terminator sequence containing the endogenous 3' UTR of *MLDP1* (*MAJOR LIPID DROPLET PROTEIN 1*), and a gene cassette comprised of a *neoR* ORF flanked by the endogenous promoter/5' UTR and terminator/3' UTR of *PGK1B* (*PHOSPHOGLYCERATE KINASE 1B*), which is targeted to the *AMT1B-1* allele of B03/C03. *Venus* expression is under the control of the endogenous *AMT1B-1* promoter. D) PCR amplification of *AMT1B-1* (B03/C03) and *AMT1B-2* (A03) 5' and 3' flanking regions using allele-specific primers in wild-type UTEX 250-A and three representative *amt1B-1::Venus* transformants, with additional amplification of *amt1B-1::Venus* integration in the transformants. E) Venus fluorescence detection in late-log heterotrophic transformant cultures compared to wildtype UTEX 250-A negative control. F) Comparison of chlorophyll autofluorescence (red) and Venus fluorescence (cyan) in wild-type UTEX 250-A versus a representative transformant under heterotrophic (het.) or photoautotrophic (phot.) conditions using confocal fluorescence microscopy. G) UTEX 25 PacBio read coverage and strain "0710" Illumina read coverage for 20-kb windows across a representative haplotype of the UTEX 25 genome assembly.

Gene family reduction and loss contribute to the streamlined *Auxenochlorella* genome

To facilitate the development of *Auxenochlorella* as a model system, we aimed to produce a reference quality gene annotation for the UTEX 250-A genome. We sequenced PacBio RNAseq (IsoSeq) libraries from UTEX 250-A grown either autotrophically or with glucose, and multiple Illumina RNAseq libraries from different growth conditions. Utilizing these datasets as evidence, we annotated gene models independently for the A and B haplotypes using a combination of gene predictors and extensive manual curation (see Methods). This yielded 7,515 and 7,519 protein-coding genes on the A and B haplotypes, respectively, with an additional 86 and 121 genes carried by transposable elements included in the annotation (Table 1). More than two thirds of the gene models are derived from multiple full-length IsoSeq reads, enabling high confidence identification of transcription start sites, terminators, and alternative splice variants. Approximately 43% of genes are annotated with at least one alternative transcript, totaling 13,134 and 13,352 transcripts on the A and B haplotypes, respectively. Finally, 612 gene models were corrected based on manual curation, including 43 bicistronic loci analyzed by Dueñas, et al. (2024), which are frequently misannotated by automated approaches (Gallaher, et al. 2021). Speaking to the compactness of the UTEX 250-A genome, 74% of genes encode a protein with a Pfam domain (Table S6), a metric that is 25-50% in most algal genomes (Blaby-Haas and Merchant 2019). Via orthology to *C. reinhardtii* proteins, one-third of genes were also assigned a

formal gene symbol (Table S7), which generally correspond to at least some level of functional

curation (Blaby, et al. 2014; Craig, et al. 2023).

Via synteny analysis, we were able to match ~98% of genes as allelic pairs between the A and B

haplotypes. Genes were given a unique ID featuring the haplotype and chromosome (e.g., A11,

B08) and a five-digit identifier that is shared between allelic pairs, e.g., despite being located on

rearranged chromosomes, UTEX250_A11.30955 and UTEX250_B08.30955 refer to alleles of

the same gene. As expected, heterozygosity between the A and B alleles at four-fold degenerate

sites in coding sequence is substantially higher (3.44%) than at zero-fold degenerate sites

(0.84%), although this nonetheless corresponds to more than 35,000 allelic variants that result in

amino acid differences. Only ~15% of the haplotype-specific genes encode a predicted protein

with a Pfam domain, and many of these genes may be evolutionarily young or misannotated

lncRNAs that carry a spurious ORF. Some haplotype-specific genes are the result of structural

variation between the A and B haplotypes, including a few copy number and presence/absence

variants.

Although we identified over 500 new genes in our UTEX 250-A genome relative to the existing

A. protothecoides 0710 assembly, the *Auxenochlorella* gene number remains lower than that of

most trebouxiophyte species, and substantially lower than that of chlorophyceaen species such as

C. reinhardtii (Table 1). We performed an orthology analysis of UTEX 250-A proteins against

the best quality chlorophyte annotations, arbitrarily using the A haplotype genes supplemented

with genes unique to the B haplotype. Figure 1A presents a phylogeny based on 669 single-copy

orthologs identified by this analysis, and Figure 5A shows the intersecting sets of orthogroups

among Chlorellales species, with *C. subellipsoidea* and *C. reinhardtii* as outgroups. Ignoring

species-specific orthogroups, the largest set corresponds to gene families present in all species

(2,974 orthogroups), many of which are presumably essential core-Chlorophyte gene families.

The second largest set features gene families specifically absent in the non-photosynthetic *P.*

cutis (520 orthogroups), most of which are expected to have functions related to photosynthesis

(Suzuki, et al. 2018). With respect to reduced gene content in *Auxenochlorella*, 297 orthogroups

are absent across all Chlorellales species, and 201 orthogroups are specifically absent in

Auxenochlorella UTEX 250-A and *P. cutis* but present in all other species.

For more detailed analyses, we compared the *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A annotation to the

high-quality gene models of *Chlorella vulgaris* (Cecchin, et al. 2019) and *C. reinhardtii* (Craig,

et al. 2023), excluding any genes carried by transposable elements. Considering gene family loss,

there are 782 orthogroups that are absent from UTEX 250-A but present in both other species,

featuring 1,025 *C. vulgaris* genes and 1,212 *C. reinhardtii* genes. Considering gene family size,

there are 1,341 orthogroups that are present in all three species and have more than one gene in

at least one species, featuring 2,228 UTEX 250-A genes, 2,915 *C. vulgaris* genes, and 3,272 *C.*

reinhardtii genes. Approximately 56% of these orthogroups feature a single UTEX 250-A gene,

relative to 35% and 29% for *C. vulgaris* and *C. reinhardtii*, respectively (Figure 5B). UTEX 250-

A genes also contain fewer and shorter introns (mean 5.1 introns per gene, mean length 179 bp)

relative to *C. vulgaris* (means 7.3 and 206 bp) and *C. reinhardtii* (means 7.8 and 272 bp) (Figure

5C, D). Thus, the streamlined *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A genome can be explained by both

complete loss or lower complexity of gene families, alongside lower repeat content (Table 1) and

shorter gene lengths via the presence of fewer and shorter introns.

Many of the lost genes can be linked to known metabolic pathways. Two distinguishing features

of *Auxenochlorella* are an absolute requirement for thiamine and the inability to grow on nitrate

as a N source (Kalina and Punčochárová 1987). Expectedly, the nitrate reductase gene *NIA1*, and

THIC1, encoding a hydroxymethylpyrimidine phosphate synthase necessary for thiamine

biosynthesis, are among the genes present in *C. vulgaris* and *C. reinhardtii* but absent in UTEX

250-A. All other components of the thiamine biosynthesis pathway are present in UTEX 250-A,

enabling thiamine production via salvage of breakdown products. Similarly, as reported by Gao,

et al. (2014), *Auxenochlorella* cannot utilize urea as an N source and genes responsible for urea

assimilation (*DUR1*, *DUR2*) and transport (*DUR3*) have been specifically lost in

Auxenochlorella. Several other transporters present in at least one copy in both *C. vulgaris* and

C. reinhardtii are also absent in UTEX 250-A, including the borate transporter *BOR1* and the

SLT-family sodium/sulfate co-transporters. Other transporter gene families feature a single copy

in UTEX 250-A, including the *CTR*-type copper ion transporters (three genes in each of *C.*

vulgaris and *C. reinhardtii*) and the *PTB*-family sodium/phosphate symporters (four genes in *C.*

vulgaris, at least nine in *C. reinhardtii*).

The reduction in gene complexity can also be seen by BUSCO (Benchmarking Universal Single

Copy Orthologs) (Manni, et al. 2021) analysis against the UTEX 250-A predicted proteins. Of

the 1,519 chlorophyte BUSCO genes, 1,488 (98%) were identified as complete, with only nine

(0.6%) complete and duplicated. One protein was called as fragmented, although it was manually

confirmed to be a correct gene model. Of the 30 missing BUSCOs, eight could be manually

recovered by cross-checking against the orthogroup analysis. The remaining 22 genes were also

undetected when searching BUSCOs against the UTEX 250-A genome, suggesting they are

biologically absent and not misannotated (Table S8). Most notably, nine of the 22 missing

BUSCOs are part of GreenCut2, a set of almost 600 genes conserved among select

photosynthetic eukaryotes and absent from non-photosynthetic species (Karpowicz, et al. 2011).

Intrigued by the potential loss of core photosynthesis genes, we next queried the UTEX 250-A

and *C. vulgaris* annotated proteins against the entire GreenCut2 dataset, using *C. reinhardtii*

proteins as a reference set. GreenCut2 is divided into four categories: genes conserved among

green algae and land plants (CGL, i.e., the green lineage), the green lineage and the red alga *C.*

merolae (CPL), the green lineage and diatoms (CGLD), and all of these groups (CPLD). While

12.5% of the GreenCut2 genes were not found in *C. vulgaris*, 18.0% were absent in UTEX 250-

A, corresponding to the specific loss of 33 photosynthesis-related genes despite retaining

photosynthesis (Figure 5E; Table S9). For example, UTEX 250-A encodes a reduced repertoire

of light-harvesting complex proteins. Three of the *LHCA* genes that encode the antenna system

of photosystem I are absent, namely *LHCA4, LHCA5* and *LHCA6*, but are present in all analyzed

trebouxiophytes including *C. vulgaris* (Figure 5E; Table S10). This suggests that the PSI-LHCI

supercomplex of *Auxenochlorella* likely consists of a single LHCI tetramer (with subunits

LHCA1, LHCA8, LHCA7 and LHCA3) and one LHCI dimer (LHCA2 and LHCA9), as in

Dunaliella species (class Chlorophyceae) (Caspy, et al. 2020; Liu, et al. 2024). The *PSBS*

(GreenCut2) and *LHCSR* (not GreenCut2) genes, encoding light-harvesting complex-like

subunits involved in nonphotochemical quenching (Allorent, et al. 2016), are also absent in

Auxenochlorella UTEX 250-A but present in *C. vulgaris* (Cecchin, et al. 2019).

Although only examples, the absence of GreenCut2 genes in *Auxenochlorella* demonstrates that

they are not essential for photosynthesis despite their deep conservation in photosynthetic

organisms. However, it is important to note that our approach of comparison to only *C.*

reinhardtii is limited and some false negatives are expected. Small, divergent proteins with

organellar targeting peptides would be especially susceptible to exclusion in the orthology

analysis. One example is RBCX (Table S9), a protein chaperone that is essential for proper

assembly of the RuBisCo large subunit into the octameric $RbcL_8$ intermediate, and subsequent

association with RuBisCo small subunit to form the holoenzyme (Saschenbrecker, et al. 2007;

Liu, et al. 2010). Eukaryotic RBCX proteins are found in two distinct isoforms; RBCX-I is most

similar to cyanobacterial rbcX, and RBCX-II is more divergent (Saschenbrecker, et al. 2007;

Bracher, et al. 2015). While *Arabidopsis thaliana* has both forms, the *C. reinhardtii RBCX2A*

and *RBCX2B* genes both encode RBCX-II proteins (Kolesiński, et al. 2011; Bracher, et al. 2015).

As in the examples above, we found an ortholog of the *C. reinhardtii* RBCX genes in *C.*

vulgaris, but no ortholog in UTEX 250-A, despite its chaperone function likely being

indispensable. However, manual searches using the RBCX-I proteins from *A. thaliana* and

Synechocystis sp. PCC 6803 did reveal a candidate protein (UTEX250_A12.36490, Figure S7A)

featuring an RbcX-like domain and a 56 amino acid N-terminus plastid transit peptide predicted

by TargetP-2.0 (Almagro Armenteros, et al. 2019). Interestingly, *C. vulgaris* also encodes a

highly similar protein, suggesting that both RBCX-I and RBCX-II isoforms are present (as in *A.*

thaliana, Figure S7B), whereas UTEX 250-A has only RBCX-I and *C. reinhardtii* only RBCX-

II. Comparisons of monomer AlphaFold structure models of the putative RBCX-I proteins from

UTEX 250-A and *C. vulgaris* with the corresponding crystal structures from *Synechocystis* sp.

PCC 6803 (Tanaka, et al. 2007) and *A. thaliana* (Kolesiński, et al. 2013) confirmed structural

homology, supporting the contention that they perform the same RbcL chaperone function

(Figure S7C).

716　

The putative hybrid origin of UTEX 250 suggests the presence of a cryptic life cycle stage in

Auxenochlorella species, which may include meiosis of otherwise vegetatively diploid cells and

the formation of gametes (or at least implies an asexual transition between diploid and haploid

cells). Direct evidence for sexual reproduction in the Trebouxiophyceae is scarce, although

Fučiková, et al. (2015) identified a core set of nine meiosis genes that are mostly present in

trebouxiophyte genomes. Although *Chlorella* species have never been observed to form ciliated

gametes, Blanc, et al. (2010) identified orthologs of *C. reinhardtii* "CiliaCut" genes, which are

conserved among ciliated organisms but absent from species without cilia (Merchant, et al.

2007). Specifically, *Chlorella variablis* has genes encoding the outer and inner dynein arm

proteins, but lacks most or all of the genes encoding components of the intraflagellar transport

particle, radial spoke and central pair complex (Blanc, et al. 2010). The cilia genes encoded by

C. variablis significantly overlap with those present in the centric diatom *Thalassiosira*

pseudonana (i.e., the "CentricCut"), which produces male gametes with motile cilia (Moore, et

al. 2017). Cecchin, et al. (2019) confirmed this result, finding an even more substantial intersect

between "MotileCut" cilia genes common to *C. vulgaris* and *T. pseudonana*, but absent in

Caenorhabditis elegans (which produces sensory cilia, but not motile cilia), suggesting that

Chlorella species may carry the necessary repertoire of genes to produce motile ciliated gametes.

Most recently, Gazquez, et al. (2024) demonstrated that the ciliated life stage of the lichen-

forming *Trebouxia lynniae* corresponds to gametes, providing one of the few characterizations of

a sexual lifecycle in a trebouxiophyte alga.

Only 25.3% of CiliaCut genes from *C. reinhardtii* are present in the UTEX 250-A genome,

relative to 38.5% in *C. vulgaris* (Figure 5F). However, 58.3% of the genes that form the intersect

of the MotileCut and CentricCut are present in UTEX 250-A, relative to 66.7% in *C. vulgaris*,

corresponding to only four genes that are uniquely absent in UTEX 250-A (Table S11).

Fučiková, et al. (2015) identified four of the nine core meiosis genes in the *A. protothecoides*

0710 genome, with *HOPP1*, *REC8*, *MER3*, *MSH4* and *MSH5* absent. We identified *HOPP1* and

REC8 in UTEX 250-A (Figure 5E), suggesting that they were previously missed due to

misannotation. *MSH4* and *MSH5*, homologs of the bacterial mismatch repair *MutS* family, are

absent in some sexual species such as *Plasmodium vivax*, although *MER3*, encoding a helicase

involved in the formation of meiotic crossovers (Altmannova, et al. 2023), is universally present

in sexual species (Fučiková, et al. 2015). We also identified UTEX 250-A orthologs of two

critical genes for syngamy, *GEX1*, which functions in nuclear fusion (Ning, et al. 2013), and

HAP2, which functions in gamete fusion (Fedry, et al. 2017). Thus, *Auxenochlorella* species may

be able to reproduce sexually, possibly via the formation of ciliated gametes, although as with

photosynthesis the set of genes functioning in these processes has been substantially reduced.

Finally, we analyzed a small number of gene families that have specifically expanded in UTEX

250-A. Import of glucose and galactose in *Chlorella kessleri* is facilitated by three genes

encoding H+/Hexose symporters (*HUP1, HUP2* and *HUP3*) (Stadler, et al. 1995), and three

paralogous genes that are most similar to *C. kessleri HUP2* were identified in the *A.*

protothecoides 0710 genome (Gao, et al. 2014). We identified five *HUP* genes on both

haplotypes of the UTEX 250-A genome, including a tandem array of three genes on

chromosome A12/B12 that is disrupted by contig breaks in the 0710 assembly that resulted in

misannotation. For orthogroups featuring genes from UTEX 250-A, *C. vulgaris* and *C.*

reinhardtii (Figure 5B), we identified 13 cases involving UTEX 250-A specific expansion via

multiple gene duplications (Table S12). A tandem array of four genes on A07/B12 encode

predicted ribonuclease (RNAse) T2 proteins, which have diverse functions including roles in

stress response and pathogen defense (MacIntosh 2011), although the function of the single

RNAse T2 gene from *C. reinhardtii* is unknown. A tandem array of six (A01) or five (B01)

genes encode homologs of *C. reinhardtii* ferrireductase *FRE1*, which reduces Fe(III) to Fe(II) for

Fe acclimation (Allen, et al. 2007). Four of the expanded orthogroups are associated with

glycosylation. Three of these correspond to gene families (*HPAT*, *RRA* and xyloglucanase-113)

that are specifically involved in arabinose *O*-glycosylation of the Hyp-rich glycoproteins

(HRGPs) that form the vegetative and zygote cell walls in *C. reinhardtii* (Joo, et al. 2017). With

respect to proteins potentially involved in cell wall formation, it is also notable that UTEX 250-A

carries multiple genes encoding polyketide synthases, as reported previously for *Auxenochlorella*

0710 (He, et al. 2016; Heimerl, et al. 2018). These include homologs of *PKS1* from *C.*

reinhardtii, encoding a type I polyketide synthase involved in formation of the zygote cell wall

(Heimerl, et al. 2018), and *LAP5* from *A. thaliana*, encoding a type III polyketide synthase

involved in the formation of sporopollenin (Kim, et al. 2010; He, et al. 2016). Further functional

characterization of these expanded gene families may provide new insights into the unique

biology of *Auxenochlorella* species.

Of the 146 and 655 genes that are uniquely present in the AHP lineage or only in UTEX 250-A,

respectively, only 9.9% encode predicted proteins with an identifiable domain. Most notably, 61

A haplotype genes are present in five AHP/*Auxenochlorella*-specific orthogroups that are

associated with pentapeptide repeat domains, and a further 39 genes are present in a single

similarly associated orthogroup that otherwise features only one gene in each of the Chlorellales species (including *P. cutis*). Genes encoding pentapeptide repeat proteins are abundant in many bacterial genomes, particularly those of some cyanobacteria, although their functions remain elusive (Vetting, et al. 2006). Two highly conserved GreenCut2 proteins feature a pentapeptide repeat domain of unknown function, *CPLD59* and *CPLD44*, and are localized to the thylakoid lumen (Kieselbach, et al. 1998; Schubert, et al. 2002). Some mycobacterial pentapeptide repeat proteins adopt a fold that mimics double-stranded DNA and can compete with DNA in DNA-protein interactions (Feng, et al. 2021). Although their functions are unclear, these 100 genes are dispersed throughout the UTEX 250-A genome, and their repetitive nature can apparently mediate genomic rearrangements via ectopic recombination (Figure 2B, C).

Figure 5. Gene family loss and reduction in *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A. A) Upset plot showing intersection between the presence and absence of orthogroups among Trebouxiophyte algae, with *C. reinhardtii* as an outgroup. Only intersects with more than 100 orthogroups are shown. B) Number of genes per orthogroup for orthogroups that are present in each of *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A, *C. vulgaris* and *C. reinhardtii*, and have more than one gene in at least one of the species. C) Introns per gene for multi-exonic genes. D) Intron length distributions. E) Presence of GreenCut2 genes in UTEX 250-A and *C. vulgaris* relative to *C. reinhardtii*. Light-harvesting complex genes of the photosystem I antenna (LHCA) and genes functioning in nonphotochemical quenching (NPQ) are highlighted; *PSBS* and *LHCSR* are present as two and three paralagous genes in *C. reinhardtii* and single orthologs in *C. vulgaris* (see Table S10). The CGL, CPL, CGLD and CPLD divisions are defined in the main text. F) Presence of CiliaCut, meiosis and syngamy genes in UTEX 250-A and *C. vulgaris* relative to *C. reinhardtii*.

Periodic cytosine and adenine methylation supports widespread internal antisense transcription

The DNA modification 5-methylcytosine (5mC) is widespread across all domains of life and has several essential functions (Mattei, et al. 2022), although relatively little is understood about cytosine methylation in green algae. In *C. variablis*, gene bodies are extensively methylated at CpG dinucleotides, whereas promoter regions are hypomethylated (Zemach, et al. 2010). Although 5mC is generally restricted to centromeres and subtelomeres in *C. reinhardtii* (Lopez, et al. 2015; Chaux-Jukic, et al. 2021; Craig, et al. 2023), extensive gene body methylation was recently shown for the chlorophyceaen alga *T. obliquus* (Biondi, et al. 2024), suggesting that this pattern may be widespread in chlorophytes. In the extremely compact genomes of prasinophytes such as *Ostreococcus lucimarinus* and *Micromonas pusilla*, CpG dinucleotides in gene bodies are also highly methylated, although 5mC occurs in periodic clusters that correspond to the linker DNA between nucleosomes (Huff and Zilberman 2014). Notably, periodic adenine methylation (6mA), mostly at ApT dinucleotides, was also discovered in *C. reinhardtii* (Fu, et al. 2015). Periodicity of 6mA is also due to specific methylation of nucleosome linkers, although unlike for 5mC, the adenine methylation is present around transcription start sites (TSS) and not in the gene body. Romero Charria, et al. (2024) demonstrated that periodic adenine methylation of linker DNA downstream of TSSs is also present in both prasinophytes and *C. variablis*, as well as in other distantly related taxa, suggesting that it is an ancient feature of eukaryotic genomes. The function of 6mA in this context is not known; the biophysical properties of this modification may play some role in promoting transcription (Bochtler and Fernandes 2021), and 6mA could also facilitate the coordination of promoter chromatin marks such as H3K4me3 (Romero Charria, et al. 2024).

We used the ONT reads from CCAP 211/7C (equivalent to UTEX 250, Figure 3A) to call both 5mC at CpG sites and 6mA at ApT sites across the UTEX 250-A genome. Using only the high-confidence TSSs from IsoSeq-based gene models, periodicity of both modifications was evident (Figure 6A). Cytosine methylation is essentially absent at sites adjacent to the majority of TSSs, and universal at the hypermethylated peaks within gene bodies (on average 5mC is called at ~95% of CpG sites at the highest point of the peaks). Conversely, two periodic peaks of 6mA are present downstream of the TSS, although far fewer ApT sites are methylated and the signal is

noisier between the peaks (Figure S8). Assuming that the peaks correspond to nucleosome

linkers, it appears that the first two linkers downstream of the TSS are specifically associated

with adenine methylation, whereas cytosine methylation is present at the third linker and reaches

a stable maximum at subsequent linkers. These patterns closely resemble those of the

prasinophytes, as opposed to *C. variablis* where 6mA exhibits periodicity but 5mC is relatively

constant across the gene body (Romero Charria, et al. 2024). Huff and Zilberman (2014)

proposed that 5mC periodicity contributes to nucleosome positioning, and hypothesized that this

could be an adaptation to extremely compact nuclei and small cell sizes. Our results suggest this

unusual genomic architecture may have been present in the common ancestor of the core-

Chlorophyta (Trebouxiophyceae and Chlorophyceae in Figure 1A), or alternatively that it re-

evolved on the lineage leading to *Auxenochlorella*.

Aside from the biological importance of periodic methylation, these signatures also provide

evidence for promoter regions, similar to H3K4me3 ChIP-seq datasets that only exist for a

limited number of green algae (Strenkert, et al. 2022; Petroll, et al. 2024). Figure 6B shows a

representative locus featuring four genes where CpG hypomethylation clearly corresponds to the

regions downstream of the IsoSeq-based TSSs. Notably, one of these genes

(UTEX250_A08.19925) is a lncRNA transcribed from a bidirectional hypomethylated promoter

located within the CiliaCut gene *FAP57* (UTEX250_A08.19920), which is essential for the

correct assembly of inner dynein arms (Lin, et al. 2019). While manually curating genes in the

UTEX 250-A genome, we noticed multiple similar cases and subsequently performed a thorough

search for lncRNA genes that are supported by multiple IsoSeq reads (Table 1). After manual

verification, 165 protein-coding genes were identified with internal bidirectional promoters that

produced antisense lncRNAs on at least one of the two haplotypes (Table S13). For genes such

as *FAP57*, it is unclear whether the truncated isoforms transcribed from the internal promoter

could be functional, while for many others the truncated isoforms clearly have no coding

capacity. We also identified 615 protein-coding genes that exhibit substantial overlap with an

antisense lncRNA (>30% of the transcript length) transcribed from an internal, or immediately

adjacent, unidirectional promoter.

To explore the potential functions of widespread antisense transcription in UTEX 250-A, we
analyzed the predicted functions of these genes. Manual curation of the proteins encoded by the
genes with internal birdirectional promoters found that potential functions associated with DNA,
such as repair, chromatin and replication, were most abundant, followed by functions related to
post-translational regulation, cilia, and the cell wall. A gene ontology (GO) enrichment analysis
focusing on the full set of 780 genes with evidence for antisense transcription supported these
observations. The most significant terms for biological processes were all related to DNA repair
and recombination, including the repair of double-strand breaks by homologous recombination
(Figure 6C, Table S14). Indeed, the list includes many fundamental DNA repair genes, including
RAD51, *RAD21*, the RECQ helicases *RECQ1* and *RECQ5*, and the DNA polymerases *POLK1*
and *POLQ2* (Table S13). For cellular compartments, the two most significant terms, "condensed
nuclear chromosome" and "cohesin complex", are both related to mitosis, meiosis and
recombination, whereas the next two significant terms are related to cilia. The most significant
molecular function term, "calcium ion binding" (Table S14), is also associated with cilia genes.
Indeed 14 of the CiliaCut genes (including *FAP57*) exhibit antisense transcription, alongside five
of the eight UTEX 250-A core meiotic and syngamy genes (Figure 5F), representing a
significant enrichment (χ^2= 32.05, p = 1.5x10^{-8}). The nuclear fusion gene *GEX1* represents an
extreme case where all of the IsoSeq reads at the locus are antisense (Figure S9).
887
Based on these results, it is interesting to speculate that antisense lncRNAs may play a regulatory
role in *Auxenochlorella*. In synchronized cultures of *C. reinhardtii*, some DNA repair genes are
specifically upregulated at the transition from dark to light (e.g., the ribonucleotide reductase
subunit *RIR2L*, which features an antisense lncRNA in UTEX 250-A), suggesting a possible role
in photodamage response (Strenkert, et al. 2019). Many human DNA repair genes are also
upregulated under genotoxic stresses such as UV radiation and ROS (Christmann and Kaina
2013). In *C. reinhardtii*, several of the core meiotic genes are among a small set of genes that
lack H3K4me3 at their TSSs during vegetative growth, supporting expression restricted to the
sexual cycle (Strenkert, et al. 2022). It therefore seems plausible that genes overlapped by
antisense lncRNAs must be specifically translated at certain points of the cell and life cycles, or
under specific conditions. While this gene set is enriched for putative functions in DNA repair
and sex, we also observe this phenomenon for many genes that are predicted to have unrelated

functions, suggesting that this may be a general regulatory mechanism. Antisense lncRNAs can regulate expression of associated protein-coding genes by several mechanisms (Werner, et al. 2024). For example, in compact genomes such as *S. cerevisiae*, transcriptional interference can occur via the physical collision of polymerase complexes on opposite strands (Prescott and Proudfoot 2002; Hobson, et al. 2012). Experimental characterization, including differential expression analyses of the protein-coding and lncRNA gene pairs at these loci, will be required to test this hypothesis. However, we are aware of no similar observations in green algae, suggesting widespread antisense transcription may have emerged as an unusual gene regulatory mechanism during *Auxenochlorella* evolution.

Figure 6. Promoter methylation and antisense lncRNAs in *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A. A) Median per site 5mC (red) and 6mA (grey) around transcription start sites. B) IGV screenshot showing example of internal bidirectional promoter producing antisense lncRNA and truncated isoform for *FAP57* (UTEX_A08.19920). The top row shows the B haplotype of the UTEX 250-A genome mapped against the A haplotype, with colored bands corresponding to single nucleotide polymorphisms. The second row shows read coverage of ONT reads from CCAP 211/7C where only CpG sites are shown. The proportion of red to blue corresponds to the proportion of 5mC calls in the ONT reads. The third row shows IsoSeq data, where pink reads are on the forward strand, and blue reads the reverse. The final row shows the annotated gene models, where the thin lines correspond to introns, intermediate lines to UTRs, and thick lines to CDS. C) GO term enrichment analysis for 780 genes overlapped by antisense lncRNAs. See Table S14 for full results.

CONCLUSIONS

Species that reproduce clonally as diploids may experience specific phenomena including allodiploid hybridization, mitotic recombination, loss-of-heterozygosity and aneuploidy. Although these processes can act as strong evolutionary forces, for example in speciation or adaptation to new environments, most of our knowledge is currently based upon yeasts and filamentous fungi. In green algae, observations consistent with these phenomena have been reported sporadically, including trisomy in *C. primus* (Lemieux, et al. 2019), and chromosome-scale LOH and possible hybridization in *T. obliquus* (Biondi, et al. 2024). Here, we find that each of these phenomena occur in the trebouxiophyte genus *Auxenochlorella*, demonstrating the generality of these important molecular and evolutionary processes in vegetatively diploid eukaryotes.

Auxenochlorella UTEX 250 is an allodiploid hybrid of two closely related species, *A. protothecoides* and *A. symbiontica*, that are differentiated by extensive karyotypic variation and possibly ecological niches. Following hybridization, the parental haplotypes have presumably been shuffled by mitotic crossovers, and homogenized via LOH events mediated by recombination, DNA repair, and potentially transient aneuploidy. Post hybridization, the outcomes of these events can be driven by selection to resolve genomic incompatibles between the divergent parental genomes in a process termed genome stabilization (Sipiczki 2008; Gabaldón 2020). It is currently unclear to what extent the crossovers, LOH events and aneuploidies of UTEX 250 are involved in stabilization, although at least some of the LOH events that occurred prior to laboratory culture were presumably beneficial (e.g., at rDNA arrays). However, our observations from authentic strains of *A. protothecoides* and *A. symbiontica* suggest that LOH and aneuploidy are not only associated with hybridization, and are generally expected to be prominent evolutionary forces in *Auxenochlorella* that can occur on the timescale of laboratory culture. It is also unclear whether the sampling of the hybrid UTEX 250 was a rare chance event, or whether it may represent a successful hybrid lineage that is persistent and potentially abundant (albeit likely sterile, assuming a sexual life cycle). Given the number of *Auxenochlorella* strains in culture, and the potential to isolate new strains (Asker and Awad 2019; Chen, et al. 2024), it would be interesting to apply population genomics approaches to

investigate the prevalence of LOH, aneuploidy, and possibly other hybridization events, in the

genus.

Auxenochlorella has great potential to be developed as an algal model for fundamental discovery

research and bioengineering (Goold, et al. 2024). The resources produced here will serve as a

foundation for functional genomics and systems biology analyses, as well as the design of

transformation constructs for molecular manipulation of the genome. The streamlined nature of

Auxenochlorella genomes and gene content are also expected to be advantageous in this

direction. Gene families containing multiple members in green algae, and especially in the main

algal model *C. reinhardtii*, more frequently feature only a single gene in *Auxenochlorella* UTEX

250-A. This reduced genetic redundancy is expected to improve the likelihood of achieving

informative phenotypes following gene knockout or knockdown, analogous to the lower

redundancy of regulatory gene families in the liverwort *Marchantia polymorpha* relative to *A.*

thaliana and other angiosperms (Bowman, et al. 2017). Although hundreds of genes and gene

families have been entirely lost, including many genes that are expected to play roles in

photosynthesis, these genes could be re-introduced to the *Auxenochlorella* genome to probe their

functions in other species. Mutations in essential genes involved in photosynthesis are also

possible due to the facultative autotrophy of the species. Genomic manipulation also presents

opportunities to address fundamental questions related to genetic mechanisms, as demonstrated

by the dissection of the mechanism underlying the translation of bicistronic genes (Dueñas, et al.

2024). *Auxenochlorella* species are highly oleaginous and have GRAS status, and other genomic

features reported here could also find utility in bioengineering. The introduction of artificial

chromosomes is a powerful technique that enables multiple novel traits to be stacked on a single

locus (Birchler, et al. 2024). If the short AT-rich regions present on *Auxenochlorella*

chromosomes can be confirmed to function as centromeres, it may be possible to maintain

minichromosomes by introducing an AT-rich region, similar to the synthetic episomes that can

be maintained in diatoms (Diner, et al. 2017). Alternatively, the aneuploidy of UTEX 250-A and

UTEX 25 could be exploited. We demonstrated allele-specific knock-in to a trisomic

chromosome, and presumably it would be possible to sequentially manipulate this chromosome

with minimal impact on fitness. Collectively, the unique biology of *Auxenochlorella* among

green algae presents many exciting prospects for discovery in plant biology and utilization in
bioengineering.
996

METHODS
Strains, media and growth conditions
Auxenochlorella strains UTEX 250, UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341 were originally obtained from
the University of Texas Culture Collection of Algae. A single colony of UTEX 250 was isolated
and used in all experimental work (i.e., UTEX 250-A). *Auxenochlorella symbiontica* CCAP
211/61 and *Auxenochlorella* CCAP 211/7C were obtained from the Culture Collection of Algae
and Protozoa. Strains were typically grown in TAP (for DNA extraction) or HPv1 (for RNA)
culture media using the trace element recipe of Kropat, et al. (2011). HPv1 is a modified version
of TP that replaces 20 mM Tris with 20 mM HEPES. Standard liquid cultures were generally
grown under constant light (100 μmol photons m^{-2} sec^{-1}) and shaken at 200 rpm. Specific growth
conditions were used for preparing RNA from UTEX 250-A for the generation of IsoSeq and
RNAseq datasets. These included a range of photoautotrophic, mixotrophic or heterotrophic
conditions, different light conditions, CO_2 levels, and elemental adjustments to media (Table
S15).
1011

Extraction and sequencing of nucleic acids
UTEX 250-A DNA was extracted at UC Davis DNA Technologies Core from a frozen cell pellet
and used to prepare and sequence PacBio HiFi and OmniC linked-read libraries. Individual
IsoSeq libraries were produced from RNA extracted from cultures grown in autotrophic replete
and heterotrophic with 2% (w/v) glucose conditions (HPv1 media), and each library was
sequenced on a Sequel II SMRT cell at UC Davis. For all remaining conditions (Table S15),
Illumina RNAseq with poly(A) selection was performed on a Novoseq 6000 platform at UC
Davis, generating stranded 150 bp paired-end reads.
1020

1021 UTEX 25, UTEX 2341, CCAP 211/61 and CCAP 211/7C were cultured mixotrophically in TAP
1022 medium. High molecular weight DNA was extracted using a modified version of a CTAB and
1023 Phenol:Chloroform protocol developed for *C. reinhardtii* (Chaux, et al. 2024). Cell pellets were

1024 ground in liquid nitrogen in a mortar and pestle prior to the CTAB incubation. Size selection was

1025 performed using the PacBio short read eliminator (SRE) kit following user instructions.

1026

1027 DNA from UTEX 25, UTEX 2341 and CCAP 211/61 was prepared in a multiplexed library

1028 along with five other unrelated samples and sequenced on a single PacBio Sequel II SMRT cell

1029 at QB3 Genomics, UC Berkeley. ONT sequencing for CCAP 211/61 and CCAP 211/7C was

1030 performed using the Ligation Sequencing Kit V14, two independent R10.1.4 flow cells, and a

1031 MinION Mk1B device following user instructions.

1032

Genome assembly of *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A

The UTEX 250-A PacBio HiFi reads were first subsampled to remove any reads shorter than 18

kb, resulting in ~0.98 Gb of total sequence. An initial phased diploid assembly was produced by

passing the filtered HiFi reads and Omni-C reads to Hifiasm v0.16.1-r375 (Cheng, et al. 2022),

which was run with default parameters. The initial assembly consisted of two sets of phased

contigs, haplotype 1 and 2, featuring 17 and 21 nuclear contigs, respectively.

1039

Several steps of manual assessment and assembly were then performed to achieve a final

telomere-to-telomere phased diploid assembly. First, haplotype 1 and haplotype 2 contigs were

aligned to each other using minimap2 v2.23-r1117 (Li 2021) with the parameter "-x asm20". The

raw PacBio HiFi reads were also mapped against each haplotype assembly with minimap2 ("-x

map-hifi"). Assembly and read-based alignments were manually inspected using IGV v2.16.2

(Robinson, et al. 2011). Due to the rearranged nature of the parental haplotypes, we found that

the two automated haplotype sets did not individually represent a complete copy of the haploid

genome (i.e. some genomic regions were present twice in one haplotype assembly, and absent

from the other). We therefore transferred contigs between the two haplotype assemblies to arrive

at two sets of contigs that each represented a complete haploid genome, which were arbitrarily

labelled haplotype A and B.

1051

Via comparison of the haplotype A and B assemblies it was possible to identify contigs that

could potentially be fused i.e. at locations where the ends of two contigs from one haplotype

mapped to a single assembled region from the other haplotype. Based on manual inspection of

the raw reads, four pairs of contigs were successfully fused. This process involved either

removing redundant sequence from one of the contig ends, or adding additional sequence that

filled the gap between the two contigs. Where gap filling was required, haplotype-specific raw

reads spanning the gap were extracted, aligned with MAFFT v7.490 (Katoh and Standley 2013),

and reduced to a single consensus sequence that was subsequently trimmed and inserted between

the two contigs. Following a similar approach, the termini of several chromosomes were

manually extended to reach the telomeric repeats. Uniquely mapped reads that exhibited soft-

clipped bases extending beyond the assembled chromosome were extracted, aligned, and reduced

to a consensus sequence that was trimmed and appended to the chromosome. These manual steps

resulted in the A and B haplotypes each being represented by 12 gapless chromosomes that

either terminated in telomeric repeats or rDNA arrays.

1066

Two additional contigs represented the third copies of the trisomic chromosomes, C03 and C05.

The contig corresponding to chromosome C05 was manually truncated at the location of the

internal telomere (see Figure S5), since the original contig was misassembled as an exact

duplicate of chromosome B05. Finally, eight short contigs were removed from the assembly; six

contigs entirely featured rDNA that is already represented as truncated arrays on the assembled

chromosomes, and two contigs were identified as duplicate redundant sequences that are

similarly represented in the chromosomal assembly. The assembly and phasing of the entire final

assembly was manually verified by examining read alignments to each haplotype.

1075

1076   The plastome and mitogenome were each identified as single linear contigs in the Hifiasm

1077   assembly. Circularization was performed manually by identifying and removing redundant

1078   sequence from one end of each of the organellar contigs.

1079

Oxford Nanopore basecalling and methylation analyses

ONT raw reads derived from CCAP 211/61 were basecalled using Dorado v0.3.2

(https://github.com/nanoporetech/dorado), which was run in super accuracy basecalling mode

using the command "basecaller" and the model "dna_r10.4.1_e8.2_400bps_sup@v4.2.0". ONT

reads for CCAP 211/7C were bascalled using Dorado v0.6.0 using the options

"sup,5mCG_5hmCG" or "sup,6mA" to perform basecalling in super accuracy mode with the

detection of 5mC and 5-hydroxymethylcytosine (5hmC) calls at CpG dinucleotides, or 6mA

calls, respectively. The resulting BAM files were converted to FASTQ using samtools 1.18-1

(Danecek, et al. 2021) using the "-T '*'" option to retain base modifications. The resulting

FASTQ files were mapped against the UTEX 250-A assembly using minimap2 with

recommended parameters for ONT 10.4.1 chemistry ("-x map-ont -k19 -w19 -U50,500 -g10k -a

-y"). The 5mC status of each CpG site was then called using modkit v0.2.7

(https://github.com/nanoporetech/modkit) with the command "pileup --preset traditional", which

aggregates methylation calls on both strands and returns only 5mC information. The 6mA status

of each ApT site was similarly called using the command "pileup --motif AT 0". Sites with less

than 5 mapped reads were removed. For each site, the fraction of modified bases at each site was

then extracted, and the median for each nucleotide position relative to the TSS was calculated

across all genes that were predicted using IsoSeq data (see below).

1098

Genome assembly of *Auxenochlorella prototothecoides* UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341, and

***Auxenochlorella symbiontica* CCAP 211/61**

The UTEX 25, UTEX 2341 and CCAP 211/61 genome assemblies were produced using Hifiasm

v0.19.8-r603. For UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341, all PacBio HiFi reads were passed to Hifiasm,

which was run with default parameters. For CCAP 211/61, PacBio HiFi reads were

supplemented with ONT reads, which were passed to Hifiasm with the flag "--ul".

1105

When run without linked-read data (e.g. Omni-C), Hifiasm produces a primary haploid

assembly, as well as a diploid assembly consisting of two partially phased haplotypes. For each

strain, we first mapped the two (pseudo)haplotypes of the diploid assembly to each other using

minimap2 ("-x asm20"), and manually inspected the alignments to confirm that all contigs

exhibited a one-to-one syntenic relationship between the two haplotypes (i.e. they are

homologous without interchromosomal rearrangements as observed in UTEX 250-A). We then

produced a representative haploid assembly by mapping the primary contigs to the UTEX 250-A

genome assembly with minimap2 ("-x asm20") and manually inspecting alignments. For CCAP

211/61, 14 primary contigs corresponded to 12 nuclear chromosomes and two circular organellar

genomes. For both UTEX 25 and UTEX 2341, one pair of nuclear contigs and one pair of

plastome contigs were each fused to produce the final assemblies, with all other major contigs

corresponding to near-complete chromosomes. Contig fusion and circularization of the

organellar contigs was performed using the manual assembly approaches described above. As

with the UTEX 250-A assembly, additional short contigs featuring rDNA or redundant sequence

were removed.

1121

Quantification of heterozygosity and divergence among strains

To quantify heterozygosity (i.e. individual-level genetic diversity) between the A and B

haplotypes of the UTEX 250-A assembly, the haplotype A and B chromosomes were aligned

against each other using minimap2 ("-x asm20"). Variants segregating between the A and B

haplotypes were then identified using the minimap2 script paftools.js and the parameters "call -l

2000 -L 10000" (i.e., a minimum alignment length to compute coverage of 2 kb, and a minimum

alignment length to call variants of 10 kb). Chromosomes were divided in to 10 kb windows, and

heterozygosity was calculated based on the number of single nucleotide variants (mapping

quality of 60) relative to the number of alignable sites per window. Windows with <2000 aligned

sites were excluded. Zero-fold and four-fold degenerate sites were extracted from the coding

sequence of the primary transcript of each A haplotype gene model using the degenotate tool

(https://github.com/harvardinformatics/degenotate). All overall heterozygosity values were

reported after removing homozygous genomic tracts that are putatively the product of LOH (see

below).

1136

Since the UTEX 25, UTEX 2341, and CCAP 211/61 genomes were assembled to the haploid-

level, a different approach was used to quantify heterozygosity. Raw PacBio HiFi reads for each

strain were mapped against the A haplotype of the UTEX 250-A assembly using minimap2 ("-x

map-hifi"). DeepVariant v1.6.0 (Poplin, et al. 2018) was then used to call variants directly from

the PacBio HiFi read alignments for each strain independently, using the parameter "model_type

PACBIO". Heterozygosity was calculated in 10 kb windows by identifying heterozygous single

nucleotide variants segregating among the reads of the strain in question. Callable sites for each

strain were determined by mapping the haploid genome assembly of the relevant strain against

the A haplotype of UTEX 250 with minimap2 ("-x asm20") and identifying alignment blocks

with paftools.js ("call -l 2000 -L 10000"). Genetic divergence for a given strain was calculated in

10 kb windows as the proportion of variant sites relative to the UTEX 250-A haplotype A.

Divergence was averaged over both haplotypes for each strain (i.e., a site where only one of the

two haplotypes varied relative to the UTEX 250-A reference contributed half as much to

divergence as a site where both haplotypes varied). Divergence was also calculated relative to

the UTEX 250 B haplotype using the same approach.

1152

Neighbor joining trees for nuclear genome, plastome and mitogenome sites were produced using

MEGA v11.0.13 (Tamura, et al. 2021) with the Tamura Nei substitution model and default

parameters. For the organelles, either the plastome or mitogenome assembly of each strain was

aligned to the UTEX 250-A plastome or mitogenome assembly with minimap2 ("-x asm20"),

and variant and invariant sites were called with paftools.js ("call -l 2000 -L 10000"). To be

included in the nuclear genome analysis, a site had to meet two criteria, i) to be on a UTEX 250-

A chromosome that had not undergone any reciprocal crossovers, and ii) to be in a region that

was not affected by a LOH event in any of the strains. These criteria were enforced to ensure that

ancestral evolutionary relationships among haplotypes were recovered, and resulted in the

analysis of 651,399 sites on chromosome A11. Variants were extracted from either the

paftools.js analysis (for variants segregating between the UTEX 250 A and B haplotypes) or the

DeepVariant analyses (for variants segregating within and between the other strains). Variants in

UTEX 25, UTEX 2341 and CCAP 211/61 were phased relative to their respective genome

assemblies (note that these may represent pseudohaplotypes with a small number of phase

changes per chromosome).

1168

Loss-of-heterozygosity events

LOH events in the UTEX 250-A genome were called from the alignment of the A and B

haplotype assemblies and paftools.js analysis (see above). LOH events were arbitrarily assigned

to regions that featured no heterozygous sites over a stretch of 1 kb or more. Events were

designated as terminal if they extended to a chromosome end, or interstitial if they fell within a

chromosome.

1175

1176   LOH events were similarly called as invariant regions of at least 1 kb for UTEX 25, UTEX 2341

1177   and CCAP 211/61 based on heterozygous variants identified from the DeepVariant analysis.

1178   CCAP 211/7C heterozygous sites and LOH events were also identified using DeepVariant, ran

1179   with the parameter "model_type ONT_R104" and supplied with an alignment of the raw ONT

1180   reads against the UTEX 250-A haplotype A assembly (minimap2 "-x map-ont").

1181

Aneuploidy events and allele-specific transformation

The raw reads for all available strains were first mapped against the relevant genome assembly to

calculate coverage. For PacBio datasets, the UTEX 250-A reads were mapped against the phased

UTEX 250-A assembly, whereas UTEX 25, UTEX 2341 and CCAP 211/61 reads were mapped

against the representative haplotype from their respective haploid assemblies, all using minimap2

("-x map-hifi"). CCAP 211/7C ONT reads were mapped against the UTEX 250-A assembly

using minimap2 ("-x map-ont"), and the "0710" reads were mapped against the UTEX 25

assembly using bwa mem (Li 2013). The coverage at each nucleotide was calculated using the

samtools "depth" command, and the average coverage per 20-kb sliding window was calculated.

1191

1192   Transformation, fluorescence measurements and microscopy were performed following Dueñas,

1193   et al. (2024). Full details are provided in Supplementary Note 1, and a detailed description of all

1194   templates, primers and plasmids used in this study can be found in Tables S16 and S17.

1195

1196   ***Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A gene model annotation**

1197   Gene models were annotated using a hybrid approach that utilized both the IsoSeq and RNAseq

1198   datasets, followed by extensive manual annotation. The A and B haplotypes of the UTEX 250

1199   assembly were annotated independently, except for the entirely homozygous chromosomes (04,

1200   09 and 10).

1201

IsoSeq reads were pre-processed using the IsoSeq3 pipeline v3.8.1

(https://github.com/PacificBiosciences/IsoSeq). Primers and poly(A) tails were first removed

from circular consensus sequencing (CCS) reads. The resulting reads from the two libraries were

then combined and mapped against the UTEX 250-A genome assembly using minimap2 ("-x

splice:hq"). These read mappings were used to partition the reads into sets that either primarily

mapped to the A haplotype (>=20 mapping quality), primarily mapped to the B haplotype, or

mapped to neither with high quality (<20 mapping quality; this set was enriched for reads

derived from homozygous genomic regions). Read clustering was then performed individually

on each read set ("isoseq3 cluster –use-qvs"), to avoid clustering reads that derived from

different alleles of the same gene. The three clustered read sets were then re-combined and

aligned collectively to the UTEX 250-A assembly using pbmm2 v1.9.0 ("--preset ISOSEQ").

Unique isoforms were called using the isoseq3 collapse command with the options "--do-not-

collapse-extra-5exons --max-5p-diff 20 --max-3p-diff 20". These options were selected

following manual assessment of the quality of the IsoSeq data, and effectively enabled

alternative TSSs (within a different exon of a longer isoform, or >20 bp away if on the same

exon) and termination sites (>20 bp if on the same exon) to be preserved as independent

isoforms.

1219

Gene models were predicted from the isoseq3 output using SQANTI3 v5.1 in QC mode with

default parameters (Pardo-Palacios, et al. 2024), which utilizes GeneMarkS-T (Tang, et al. 2015)

to predict ORFs from isoforms. The isoseq3 pipeline groups neighboring genes under a single

gene model if any of their isoforms overlap on the same strand, which is a frequent occurrence in

compact genomes such as that of *Auxenochlorella*. We thus had to "decouple" the isoforms of

incorrectly merged genes based on comparison of the protein-coding coordinates of each isoform

(i.e. isoforms which did not share coding sequence were separated to independent gene models).

Next, we removed any isoforms that were supported by <5 reads or that were derived from <5%

of the total reads associated with a given gene. This step minimized the number of false isoforms

derived from 5' truncated reads. Finally, the primary isoform for each gene was selected based

on a combination of read abundance and length criteria. For the majority of genes with multiple

isoforms, the isoform with the longest coding sequence was also the most abundant and was

deemed the primary isoform (where multiple isoforms had the same coding length but differed in

their UTRs, the most abundant was selected). For genes where the longest CDS was not the most

abundant, it was deemed the primary isoform if it was supported >=50% of the reads associated

with the most abundant isoform. If this was not the case, the most abundant isoform was selected

if its coding length was >=80% of the isoform with the longest coding length. In all other cases,

the longest isoform was selected to avoid overly short isoforms being selected. since they may be

overrepresented in IsoSeq data.

1239

We noticed that many ORFs were truncated due to predicted initiation at an internal ATG codon.

To perform ORF extension, we first built a model of the Kozak sequence surrounding annotated

initiation sites from primary transcripts that had no in-frame upstream ATG codons (i.e. ORFs

that could not be extended), based on the assumption that most of these annotations represented

true initiation sites. The strength of the Kozak sequence surrounding in-frame upstream ATG

codons for the remaining transcripts was then calculated by comparison to this Kozak model (see

Cross (2015) and Dueñas, et al. (2024) for details). ORF extension was performed if an upstream

in-frame start codon existed with a Kozak score greater than the 25th percentile of the scores

from which the Kozak model was built, or if the upstream Kozak score was simply higher than

that of the annotated start codon.

1250

In parallel to the above annotation, we used high confidence gene models derived from the

photoautotrophic IsoSeq dataset to train the AUGUSTUS v3.3.2 gene predictor tool (Stanke, et

al. 2008), following the protocols described by Hoff and Stanke (2019). Pre-processing and gene

model annotation using isoseq3 and SQANTI3 was performed as above. The training set of gene

models was produced by extracting the most abundant isoform supported by a minimum of 10

reads from gene models derived from IsoSeq reads that mapped uniquely to the A haplotype.

Accurate AUGUSTUS training requires information on the noncoding DNA flanking the

training set genes. To avoid including unannotated genes in the flanking regions, we performed a

preliminary de novo gene annotation using BRAKER v2.1.2 (Hoff, et al. 2016). Each RNAseq

dataset was mapped against the UTEX 250-A assembly using STAR v2.7.10a ("--twopassMode

Basic --alignIntronMax 5000") (Dobin, et al. 2013), and subsequently passed to the braker.pl

script using default parameters. We then extracted BRAKER gene models that had no overlap

with the IsoSeq-derived training gene set using bedtools v2.30.0 (Quinlan and Hall 2010). The

combined dataset of IsoSeq training genes and nonoverlapping BRAKER genes was then used to

compute the flanking region length (1,366 bp), and the final training set was produced by

extracting the training set genes with flanking DNA. This dataset was then split randomly into a

gene set for training (N=3,444 genes) and for testing the trained parameters (N=1,000). Training

was performed using both the standard hidden-Markov model and the conditional random field

(CRF) approach, which can result in more accurate gene prediction but is less robust to errors in

the training dataset. We selected the CRF parameters based on increased sensitivity when applied

to the test dataset. A final RNAseq-based gene model prediction was then performed by passing

the RNAseq BAM files (see above) to BRAKER using the trained CRF parameters ("—

useexisting").

1274

The IsoSeq and AUGUSTUS-based gene models were then semi-manually integrated. IsoSeq-

based models were given precedence, and an AUGUSTUS model was automatically retained if it

did not share any same-strand coding exons with an IsoSeq model. AUGUSTUS models that

exactly matched an IsoSeq model (with the exception of the first and/or last exon, which was

often incorrectly predicted by AUGUSTUS) were immediately filtered. All other AUGUSTUS

models, which could have partial overlap with an IsoSeq model, were manually curated using all

IsoSeq and RNAseq evidence.

1282

1283 Annotation of the plastome and mitogenome was performed using the GeSeq webserver (Tillich,

1284 et al. 2017), which was provided with existing annotations from *A. protothecoides* "0710" and

1285 *Prototheca wickerhamii* (Yan, et al. 2015). Additional genes were manually annotated by

1286 searching for long ORFs in the unannotated sequence.

1287

Repeat annotation

Preliminary annotation of interspersed repeats was performed by running RepeatModeler 2.0.5

(Flynn, et al. 2020) on the UTEX 250-A genome with the parameter "–LTRStruct". Consensus

sequences for specific transposon families were then manually curated following Goubert, et al.

(2022) (see Table S3, Figure S1). The manually curated models were then combined with the

automated models and passed to RepeatMasker v4.1.6 (https://github.com/Dfam-

consortium/RepeatMasker) ("–gccalc"). Tandem Repeats Finder v4.10.0 was run on the UTEX

250-A genome to identify tandem repeats using the parameters "2 7 7 80 10 50 2000 -f -d -m -

ngs". Total repeat density was calculated by combining the output of RepeatMasker and TRF.

Transposon genes (see Table 1, Figure S1) were identified and marked in the GFF3 annotation

by intersecting the coordinates of manually curated transposons and gene model coding

sequence, followed by manual inspection.

1300

1301   Repeat densities for the genome assemblies in Table 1 were similarly performed by combining

1302   the output of RepeatModeler/RepeatMasker and TRF. RepeatModeler was not run for *A.*

1303   *prototheocoides* 0710, which was repeat masked using the UTEX 250-A repeat library (see

1304   above), nor *C. reinhardtii*, for which an extensive repeat library exists (Craig, et al. 2021).

1305

Gene family and phylogenetic analyses

Gene family analyses were performed using the 19 species shown in Figure 1A. Protein

sequences for each species were reduced to their primary isoforms, and where possible genes on

the organelle genomes were removed. Annotated transposon proteins were included if known.

For UTEX 250-A, all A haplotype genes were arbitrarily selected and supplemented by genes

that are putatively unique to the B haplotype (see below). For *Picochlorum* sp. BPE23, the genes

from only haplotype A were arbitrarily used. Metadata for protein datasets are presented in Table

S18.

1314

OrthoFinder v2.5.5 was run on the 19 protein sets using the Diamond search method ("-S

diamond_ultra_sens") (Emms and Kelly 2019). Orthogroups featuring a known transposon

protein were filtered out (the results of which are reflected in Table 1). GreenCut2 and CiliaCut

orthologs were extracted for UTEX 250-A and *C. vulgaris* by comparison to *C. reinhardtii* (i.e.,

from the "orthologues" output directory of OrthoFinder). For the specific genes shown in Figure

E and F (LHCA, NPQ, meiosis and syngamy), the gene trees for the underlying orthogroups

were manually validated.

1322

The species tree in Figure 1A was produced from a concatenated alignment of the 669 single-

copy orthologs identified by OrthoFinder. For each ortholog, proteins were aligned using

MAFFT v7.525 ("–maxiterate 1000 –localpair"), and the resulting alignments were trimmed

using trimAl v1.4.rev22 ("–automated1") (Capella-Gutiérrez, et al. 2009). The trimmed

alignments were concatenated and a maximum likelihood phylogeny was produced using IQ-

TREE v2.3.0 ("-m MFP -bb 1000") (Minh, et al. 2020). For Figure 1B, rDNA sequences were

accessed from NCBI (Table S1), aligned with MAFFT ("L-INS-i"), manually trimmed, and

passed to IQ-TREE as above.

1331

Gene IDs and functional annotation

Allelic gene pairs were determined by running SynChro (Drillon, et al. 2014), a tool for detecting syntenic orthologs between genomes, on the A and B haplotype genomes and gene models. Genes were assigned a unique 5-digit number starting with "00005" for the first gene on chromosome A01 (i.e., UTEX250_A01.00005), with each subsequent gene along the A chromosomes receiving a number that increased in increments of five (i.e., UTEX250_A01.00010, UTEX250_A01.00015, etc.). Genes on the B haplotype that had been identified as part of an allelic pair were assigned the gene number of the A gene, regardless of their order on the B chromosomes. Genes that were determined to be unique to haplotype B were given new gene numbers that extended beyond the last number that was used on haplotype A. Genes on the plastome were given unique numbers starting at "80000" (e.g., UTEX250_xCp.80000), and genes on the mitogenome starting at "90000" (e.g., UTEX250_xMt.90000). Isoforms were distinguished by adding a number to the gene ID, with the primary isoform labelled as "1", e.g., UTEX250_A01.00030.1.

In addition to IDs, genes were also assigned a unique name or "gene symbol" where available following the nomenclature of *C. reinhardtii* (Craig, et al. 2023). Gene symbols were transferred based on the gene orthology relationships between *C. reinhardtii* and *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A determined by OrthoFinder ("Orthologues" output directory). For genes with 1:1 orthology the *C. reinhardtii* symbol was directly transferred to UTEX 250-A. For multicopy gene families in *C. reinhardtii* that are represented by a single gene in UTEX 250-A, either the symbol with the lowest number was used (e.g., *FOX1*/*FOX2* gene pair orthologous to *FOX1* in UTEX 250-A), or if letters are used, they were removed (e.g., *CMT1A*/*CMT1B* gene pair orthologous to *CMT1* in UTEX 250-A). For the reverse situation, letters were appended to the UTEX 250-A gene symbol where possible (e.g., *LPAAT1* orthologous to *LPAAT1A*/*LPAAT1B* gene pair in UTEX 250-A). Genes on the nuclear genome in *C. reinhardtii* but on an organelle genome in UTEX 250-A were changed accordingly (e.g., *CHLI1* orthologous to *chlI* in UTEX 250-A plastome). Several gene symbols were manually curated, including a small number of genes that are absent from *C. reinhardtii* (e.g., the photosystem I subunit gene *psaM*), and all of the histone genes (for which orthology relationships are difficult to determine). All gene symbol relationships between *C. reinhardtii* and UTEX 250-A are presented in Table S7.

1363   Protein domains were identified by running InterProScan v5.67-99.0 ("-dp -goterms").

1364

Identification of antisense long noncoding RNA genes

LncRNA genes were annotated based on IsoSeq data using two approaches. First, IsoSeq-based

gene models that had initially been annotated as protein-coding but had no orthology to proteins

from other species, nor a recognized Pfam or CDD domain, were reassigned as lncRNAs if they

overlapped coding sequence of another gene that did meet one of these criteria. Second, IsoSeq

gene models supported by at least 5 reads for which no ORF had been annotated by SQANTI3

were added. The first category of genes had been assigned gene IDs as described above, and

retained these IDs as lncRNAs instead of protein-coding genes. New gene IDs starting from

"50000" and increasing in increments of 5 were introduced for the second category of lncRNA

genes.

1375

The coordinates of protein-coding genes with either a homolog in at least one other species or a

recognized domain were then intersected with the lncRNA gene coordinates, and those with

antisense overlap spanning at least 30% of the protein-coding gene length were selected for

manual curation. Validated gene models with antisense lncRNAs were then divided into those

with internal birdirectional promoters, or those with internal or immediately adjacent promoters

without evidence for birdirectional activity. Gene ontology enrichment analysis was performed

using topGO (Alexa and Rahnenfuhrer 2023) using the GO term output from InterProScan and

the classic Fisher Test option.

1384

1385

1386

1387

1388

1389

1390

1391

1392

1393

DATA AVAILABILITY

All sequencing data associated with *Auxenochlorella* UTEX 250-A is available from NCBI under the BioSample SAMN45466464. The UTEX 250-A genome and gene annotations are specifically available under the BioProjects PRJNA1195245 (Haplotype A) and PRJNA1195244 (Haplotype B).

FUNDING

This work was supported by the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science, Biological and Environmental Research program under award no. DE-SC0023027 (to SSM and JLM). MAD was supported, in part, by the Newton Graduate Fellowship in Synthetic Biology (QB3-Berkeley).

REFERENCES

Alexa A, Rahnenfuhrer J. 2023. topGO: enrichment analysis for gene ontology. Version R package version 2.54.0.

Allen MD, del Campo JA, Kropat J, Merchant SS. 2007. *FEA1*, *FEA2*, and *FRE1*, encoding two homologous secreted proteins and a candidate ferrireductase, are expressed coordinately with *FOX1* and *FTR1* in iron-deficient *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. Eukaryot Cell 6:1841-1852.

Allorent G, Lefebvre-Legendre L, Chappuis R, Kuntz M, Truong TB, Niyogi KK, Ulm R, Goldschmidt-Clermont M. 2016. UV-B photoreceptor-mediated protection of the photosynthetic machinery in *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 113:14864-14869.

Almagro Armenteros JJ, Salvatore M, Emanuelsson O, Winther O, von Heijne G, Elofsson A, Nielsen H. 2019. Detecting sequence signals in targeting peptides using deep learning. Life Sci Alliance 2.

Altmannova V, Firlej M, Muller F, Janning P, Rauleder R, Rousova D, Schaffler A, Bange T, Weir JR. 2023. Biochemical characterisation of Mer3 helicase interactions and the protection of meiotic recombination intermediates. Nucleic Acids Res 51:4363-4384.

Andersen MP, Nelson ZW, Hetrick ED, Gottschling DE. 2008. A genetic screen for increased loss of heterozygosity in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Genetics 179:1179-1195.

Arriola MB, Velmurugan N, Zhang Y, Plunkett MH, Hondzo H, Barney BM. 2018. Genome sequences of *Chlorella sorokiniana* UTEX 1602 and *Micractinium conductrix* SAG 241.80: implications to maltose excretion by a green alga. Plant J 93:566-586.

Asker D, Awad TS. 2019. Isolation and characterization of a novel lutein-producing marine microalga using high throughput screening. Food Res Int 116:660-667.

1434

1435 Bakuła Z, Siedlecki P, Gromadka R, Gawor J, Gromadka A, Pomorski JJ, Panagiotopoulou H,
1436 Jagielski T. 2021. A first insight into the genome of *Prototheca wickerhamii*, a major causative
1437 agent of human protothecosis. Bmc Genomics 22:168.

1438

1439 Bao W, Jurka J. 2013. Homologues of bacterial TnpB_IS605 are widespread in diverse
1440 eukaryotic transposable elements. Mob DNA 4:12.

1441

1442 Barten R, van Workum DM, de Bakker E, Risse J, Kleisman M, Navalho S, Smit S, Wijffels RH,
1443 Nijveen H, Barbosa MJ. 2022. Genetic mechanisms underlying increased microalgal
1444 thermotolerance, maximal growth rate, and yield on light following adaptive laboratory
1445 evolution. BMC Biol 20:242.

1446

Becker SA, Spreafico R, Kit JL, Brown R, Likhogrud M, Fang W, Posewitz MC, Weissman JC,
Radakovits R. 2020. Phased diploid genome sequence for the fast-growing microalga
Picochlorum celeri. Microbiol Resour Announc 9.
Benites LF, Bucchini F, Sanchez-Brosseau S, Grimsley N, Vandepoele K, Piganeau G. 2021.
Evolutionary genomics of sex-related chromosomes at the base of the green lineage. Genome
Biol Evol 13.

1453

1454 Biondi TC, Kruse CPS, Koehler SI, Kwon T, Davis AK, Eng W, Kunde Y, Gleasner CD, Mak
1455 KTY, Polle J, et al. 2024. The telomere-to-telomere, gapless, phased diploid genome and
1456 methylome of the green alga *Scenedesmus obliquus* UTEX 3031 reveals significant
1457 heterozygosity and genetic divergence of the haplotypes. Algal Research 79.

1458

1459 Birchler JA, Kelly J, Singh J, Liu H, Zhang Z, Char SN, Sharma M, Yang H, Albert PS, Yang B.
1460 2024. Synthetic minichromosomes in plants: past, present, and promise. Plant J.

1461

1462 Blaby IK, Blaby-Haas CE, Tourasse N, Hom EF, Lopez D, Aksoy M, Grossman A, Umen J,
1463 Dutcher S, Porter M, et al. 2014. The Chlamydomonas genome project: a decade on. Trends
1464 Plant Sci 19:672-680.

1465

1466 Blaby-Haas CE, Merchant SS. 2019. Comparative and functional algal genomics. Annu Rev
1467 Plant Biol 70:605-638.

1468

1469 Blanc G, Agarkova I, Grimwood J, Kuo A, Brueggeman A, Dunigan DD, Gurnon J, Ladunga I,
1470 Lindquist E, Lucas S, et al. 2012. The genome of the polar eukaryotic microalga *Coccomyxa*
1471 *subellipsoidea* reveals traits of cold adaptation. Genome Biology 13.

1472

1473 Blanc G, Duncan G, Agarkova I, Borodovsky M, Gurnon J, Kuo A, Lindquist E, Lucas S,
1474 Pangilinan J, Polle J, et al. 2010. The Chlorella variabilis NC64A genome reveals adaptation to
1475 photosymbiosis, coevolution with viruses, and cryptic sex. Plant Cell 22:2943-2955.

1476

1477 Bochtler M, Fernandes H. 2021. DNA adenine methylation in eukaryotes: Enzymatic mark or a
1478 form of DNA damage? Bioessays 43:e2000243.

1479

Bowman JL, Kohchi T, Yamato KT, Jenkins J, Shu S, Ishizaki K, Yamaoka S, Nishihama R,
Nakamura Y, Berger F, et al. 2017. Insights into land plant evolution garnered from the
Marchantia polymorpha genome. Cell 171:287-304 e215.

Bracher A, Hauser T, Liu C, Hartl FU, Hayer-Hartl M. 2015. Structural analysis of the Rubisco-
assembly chaperone RbcX-II from *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. PLoS One 10:e0135448.

Brooks G, Franklin S, Avila J, Decker SM, Baliu E, Rakitsky W, Piechocki J, Zdanis D, Norris
LM. 2024. Microalgal flour. United States US12037630B2, filed November 5, 2021, and issued
July 16, 2024.

Bulankova P, Sekulić M, Jallet D, Nef C, van Oosterhout C, Delmont TO, Vercauteren I, Osuna-
Cruz CM, Vancaester E, Mock T, et al. 2021. Mitotic recombination between homologous
chromosomes drives genomic diversity in diatoms. Curr Biol 31:3221-3232 e3229.

Calhoun S, Bell TAS, Dahlin LR, Kunde Y, LaButti K, Louie KB, Kuftin A, Treen D, Dilworth
D, Mihaltcheva S, et al. 2021. A multi-omic characterization of temperature stress in a
halotolerant *Scenedesmus* strain for algal biotechnology. Commun Biol 4:333.

Capella-Gutiérrez S, Silla-Martínez JM, Gabaldón T. 2009. trimAl: a tool for automated
alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. Bioinformatics 25:1972-1973.

Caspy I, Malavath T, Klaiman D, Fadeeva M, Shkolnisky Y, Nelson N. 2020. Structure and
energy transfer pathways of the *Dunaliella Salina* photosystem I supercomplex. Biochim
Biophys Acta Bioenerg 1861:148253.

Cecchin M, Marcolungo L, Rossato M, Girolomoni L, Cosentino E, Cuine S, Li-Beisson Y,
Delledonne M, Ballottari M. 2019. *Chlorella vulgaris* genome assembly and annotation reveals
the molecular basis for metabolic acclimation to high light conditions. Plant J 100:1289-1305.

Charron G, Marsit S, Henault M, Martin H, Landry CR. 2019. Spontaneous whole-genome
duplication restores fertility in interspecific hybrids. Nat Commun 10:4126.

Chaux F, Agier N, Eberhard S, Xu Z. 2024. Extraction and selection of high-molecular-weight
DNA for long-read sequencing from *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. PLoS One 19:e0297014.

Chaux-Jukic F, O'Donnell S, Craig RJ, Eberhard S, Vallon O, Xu Z. 2021. Architecture and
evolution of subtelomeres in the unicellular green alga *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. Nucleic
Acids Res 49:7571-7587.

Chen H, Sosa A, Chen F. 2024. Growth and cell size of microalga *Auxenochlorella*
prototheoides AS-1 under different trophic modes. Microorganisms 12.

Cheng H, Jarvis ED, Fedrigo O, Koepfli KP, Urban L, Gemmell NJ, Li H. 2022. Haplotype-
resolved assembly of diploid genomes without parental data. Nat Biotechnol 40:1332-1335.
1525

1526 Christmann M, Kaina B. 2013. Transcriptional regulation of human DNA repair genes following
1527 genotoxic stress: trigger mechanisms, inducible responses and genotoxic adaptation. Nucleic
1528 Acids Res 41:8403-8420.
1529
1530 Craig RJ, Gallaher SD, Shu S, Salome PA, Jenkins JW, Blaby-Haas CE, Purvine SO, O'Donnell
1531 S, Barry K, Grimwood J, et al. 2023. The Chlamydomonas Genome Project, version 6:
1532 Reference assemblies for mating-type plus and minus strains reveal extensive structural mutation
1533 in the laboratory. Plant Cell 35:644-672.
1534
1535 Craig RJ, Hasan AR, Ness RW, Keightley PD. 2021. Comparative genomics of *Chlamydomonas*.
1536 Plant Cell 33:1016-1041.
1537
Cross FR. 2015. Tying down loose ends in the *Chlamydomonas* genome: functional significance
of abundant upstream open reading frames. G3 (Bethesda) 6:435-446.
da Roza PA, Muller H, Sullivan GJ, Walker RSK, Goold HD, Willows RD, Palenik B, Paulsen
IT. 2024. Chromosome-scale assembly of the streamlined picoeukaryote *Picochlorum* sp.
SENEW3 genome reveals Rabl-like chromatin structure and potential for C(4) photosynthesis.
Microb Genom 10.
1544
1545 Dale AL, Feau N, Everhart SE, Dhillon B, Wong B, Sheppard J, Bilodeau GJ, Brar A, Tabima
1546 JF, Shen D, et al. 2019. Mitotic Recombination and Rapid Genome Evolution in the Invasive
1547 Forest Pathogen Phytophthora ramorum. mBio 10.
1548
1549 Danecek P, Bonfield JK, Liddle J, Marshall J, Ohan V, Pollard MO, Whitwham A, Keane T,
1550 McCarthy SA, Davies RM, et al. 2021. Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. Gigascience
1551 10:giab008.
1552
1553 Darienko T, Pröschold T. 2015. Genetic variability and taxonomic revision of the genus
1554 *Auxenochlorella* (Shihira et Krauss) Kalina et Puncocharova (Trebouxiophyceae, Chlorophyta). J
1555 Phycol 51:394-400.
1556
1557 Del Cortona A, Jackson CJ, Bucchini F, Van Bel M, D'Hondt S, Skaloud P, Delwiche CF, Knoll
1558 AH, Raven JA, Verbruggen H, et al. 2020. Neoproterozoic origin and multiple transitions to
1559 macroscopic growth in green seaweeds. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 117:2551-2559.
1560
1561 Diner RE, Nodding CM, Lian NC, Kang AK, McQuaid JB, Jablanovic J, Espinoza JL, Nguyen
1562 NA, Anzelmatti MA, Jansson J, et al. 2017. Diatom centromeres suggest a mechanism for
1563 nuclear DNA acquisition. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 114:E6015-E6024.
1564
1565 Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, Batut P, Chaisson M, Gingeras
1566 TR. 2013. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. Bioinformatics 29:15-21.
1567
1568 Drillon G, Carbone A, Fischer G. 2014. SynChro: a fast and easy tool to reconstruct and
1569 visualize synteny blocks along eukaryotic chromosomes. PLoS One 9:e92621.
1570

1571 Dueñas MA, Craig RJ, Gallaher SD, Moseley JL, Merchant SS. 2024. Leaky ribosomal scanning
1572 enables tunable translation of bicistronic ORFs in green algae. bioRxiv.
1573 https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.605010
1574
1575 Dutta A, Dutreux F, Schacherer J. 2021. Loss of heterozygosity results in rapid but variable
1576 genome homogenization across yeast genetic backgrounds. Elife 10.
1577
1578 Emms DM, Kelly S. 2019. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for comparative
1579 genomics. Genome Biol 20:238.
1580
Fedry J, Liu Y, Pehau-Arnaudet G, Pei J, Li W, Tortorici MA, Traincard F, Meola A, Bricogne
G, Grishin NV, et al. 2017. The ancient gamete fusogen HAP2 is a eukaryotic class II fusion
protein. Cell 168:904-915 e910.
Feng L, Mundy JEA, Stevenson CEM, Mitchenall LA, Lawson DM, Mi K, Maxwell A. 2021.
The pentapeptide-repeat protein, MfpA, interacts with mycobacterial DNA gyrase as a DNA T-
segment mimic. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 118.
1587
1588 Figueroa-Martinez F, Nedelcu AM, Smith DR, Reyes-Prieto A. 2015. When the lights go out:
1589 the evolutionary fate of free-living colorless green algae. New Phytologist 206:972-982.
1590
1591 Fischer G, Liti G, Llorente B. 2021. The budding yeast life cycle: More complex than
1592 anticipated? Yeast 38:5-11.
1593
1594 Flynn JM, Hubley R, Goubert C, Rosen J, Clark AG, Feschotte C, Smit AF. 2020.
1595 RepeatModeler2 for automated genomic discovery of transposable element families. Proc Natl
1596 Acad Sci U S A 117:9451-9457.
1597
1598 Foflonker F, Mollegard D, Ong M, Yoon HS, Bhattacharya D. 2018. Genomic analysis of
1599 *Picochlorum* species reveals how microalgae may adapt to variable environments. Mol Biol Evol
1600 35:2702-2711.
1601
1602 Franklin S, Somanchi A, Wee J, Rudenko G, Moseley JL, Rakitsky W, Zhao X, Bhat R. 2019.
1603 Tailored oils produced from recombinant oleaginous microorganisms. United States
1604 US20190100780A1, filed September 7, 2018, and issued April 4, 2019.
1605
1606 Fu Y, Luo GZ, Chen K, Deng X, Yu M, Han D, Hao Z, Liu J, Lu X, Dore LC, et al. 2015. *N6*-
1607 methyldeoxyadenosine marks active transcription start sites in *Chlamydomonas*. Cell 161:879-
1608 892.
1609
1610 Fučíková K, Pažoutová M, Rindi F. 2015. Meiotic genes and sexual reproduction in the green
1611 algal class Trebouxiophyceae (Chlorophyta). J Phycol 51:419-430.
1612
1613 Fulnečková J, Hasíková T, Fajkus J, Lukešová A, Eliáš M, Sýkorová E. 2012. Dynamic
1614 evolution of telomeric sequences in the green algal order Chlamydomonadales. Genome Biology
1615 and Evolution 4:248-264.
1616

Gabaldón T. 2020. Hybridization and the origin of new yeast lineages. FEMS Yeast Res 20.

Gallaher SD, Craig RJ, Ganesan I, Purvine SO, McCorkle SR, Grimwood J, Strenkert D, Davidi L, Roth MS, Jeffers TL, et al. 2021. Widespread polycistronic gene expression in green algae. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 118.

Gallone B, Steensels J, Mertens S, Dzialo MC, Gordon JL, Wauters R, Thesseling FA, Bellinazzo F, Saels V, Herrera-Malaver B, et al. 2019. Interspecific hybridization facilitates niche adaptation in beer yeast. Nat Ecol Evol 3:1562-1575.

Gao C, Wang Y, Shen Y, Yan D, He X, Dai J, Wu Q. 2014. Oil accumulation mechanisms of the oleaginous microalga *Chlorella protothecoides* revealed through its genome, transcriptomes, and proteomes. BMC Genomics 15:582.

Garagna S, Page J, Fernandez-Donoso R, Zuccotti M, Searle JB. 2014. The Robertsonian phenomenon in the house mouse: mutation, meiosis and speciation. Chromosoma 123:529-544.

Gazquez A, Bordenave CD, Montero-Pau J, Pérez-Rodrigo M, Marco F, Martínez-Alberola F, Muggia L, Barreno E, Carrasco P. 2024. From spores to gametes: A sexual life cycle in a symbiotic Trebouxia microalga. Algal Research 84.

Goold HD, Moseley JL, Lauersen KJ. 2024. The synthetic future of algal genomes. Cell Genom 4:100505.

Goubert C, Craig RJ, Bilat AF, Peona V, Vogan AA, Protasio AV. 2022. A beginner's guide to manual curation of transposable elements. Mob DNA 13:7.

Guo J, Jian J, Wang L, Xiong L, Lin H, Zhou Z, Sonnenschein EC, Wu W. 2022. Genome sequences of two strains of *Prototheca wickerhamii* provide insight into the prototheosis evolution. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 12:797017.

Harris EH. 2001. *Chlamydomonas* as a Model Organism. Annu Rev Plant Physiol Plant Mol Biol 52:363-406.

He X, Dai J, Wu Q. 2016. Identification of sporopollenin as the outer layer of vell eall in microalga *Chlorella protothecoides*. Front Microbiol 7:1047.

Heimerl N, Hommel E, Westermann M, Meichsner D, Lohr M, Hertweck C, Grossman AR, Mittag M, Sasso S. 2018. A giant type I polyketide synthase participates in zygospore maturation in *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. Plant J 95:268-281.

Hirakawa MP, Martinez DA, Sakthikumar S, Anderson MZ, Berlin A, Gujja S, Zeng Q, Zisson E, Wang JM, Greenberg JM, et al. 2015. Genetic and phenotypic intra-species variation in *Candida albicans*. Genome Res 25:413-425.

Hobson DJ, Wei W, Steinmetz LM, Svejstrup JQ. 2012. RNA polymerase II collision interrupts convergent transcription. Mol Cell 48:365-374.

1663

1664 Hoff KJ, Lange S, Lomsadze A, Borodovsky M, Stanke M. 2016. BRAKER1: unsupervised
1665 RNA-Seq-based genome annotation with GeneMark-ET and AUGUSTUS. Bioinformatics
1666 32:767-769.

1667

1668 Hoff KJ, Stanke M. 2019. Predicting genes in single genomes with AUGUSTUS. Curr Protoc
1669 Bioinformatics 65:e57.

1670

1671 Huff JT, Zilberman D. 2014. Dnmt1-independent CG methylation contributes to nucleosome
1672 positioning in diverse eukaryotes. Cell 156:1286-1297.

1673

1674 Huss VAR, Frank C, Hartmann EC, Hirmer M, Kloboucek A, Seidel BM, Wenzeler P, Kessler
1675 E. 1999. Biochemical taxonomy and molecular phylogeny of the genus *Chlorella* sensu lato
1676 (Chlorophyta). Journal of Phycology 35:587-598.

1677

1678 Jagielski T, Bakuła Z, Gawor J, Maciszewski K, Kusber WH, Dylag M, Nowakowska J,
1679 Gromadka R, Karnkowska A. 2019. The genus *Prototheca* (Trebouxiophyceae, Chlorophyta)
1680 revisited: Implications from molecular taxonomic studies. Algal Research-Biomass Biofuels and
1681 Bioproducts 43.

1682

1683 Joo S, Nishimura Y, Cronmiller E, Hong RH, Kariyawasam T, Wang MH, Shao NC, El Akkad
1684 SE, Suzuki T, Higashiyama T, et al. 2017. Gene regulatory networks for the haploid-to-diploid
1685 transition of *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. Plant Physiology 175:314-332.

1686

1687 Kalina T, Punčochárová M. 1987. Taxonomy of the subfamily Scotiellocystoideae Fott 1976
1688 (Chlorellaceae, Chlorophyceae). Algol Stud 45:473-521.

1689

1690 Kanesaki Y, Imamura S, Matsuzaki M, Tanaka K. 2015. Identification of centromere regions in
1691 chromosomes of a unicellular red alga, *Cyanidioschyzon merolae*. FEBS Letters 589:1219-1224.

1692

1693 Karpowicz SJ, Prochnik SE, Grossman AR, Merchant SS. 2011. The GreenCut2 resource, a
1694 phylogenomically derived inventory of proteins specific to the plant lineage. J Biol Chem
1695 286:21427-21439.

1696

1697 Katoh K, Standley DM. 2013. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
1698 improvements in performance and usability. Mol Biol Evol 30:772-780.

1699

1700 Kieselbach T, Mant A, Robinson C, Schroder WP. 1998. Characterisation of an *Arabidopsis*
1701 cDNA encoding a thylakoid lumen protein related to a novel 'pentapeptide repeat' family of
1702 proteins. FEBS Lett 428:241-244.

1703

1704 Kim SS, Grienenberger E, Lallemand B, Colpitts CC, Kim SY, Souza Cde A, Geoffroy P, Heintz
1705 D, Krahn D, Kaiser M, et al. 2010. *LAP6/POLYKETIDE SYNTHASE A* and *LAP5/POLYKETIDE
1706 SYNTHASE B* encode hydroxyalkyl alpha-pyrone synthases required for pollen development and
1707 sporopollenin biosynthesis in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant Cell 22:4045-4066.

1708

Kolesiński P, Golik P, Grudnik P, Piechota J, Markiewicz M, Tarnawski M, Dubin G,
Szczepaniak A. 2013. Insights into eukaryotic Rubisco assembly - crystal structures of RbcX
chaperones from *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Biochim Biophys Acta 1830:2899-2906.

Kolesiński P, Piechota J, Szczepaniak A. 2011. Initial characteristics of RbcX proteins from
Arabidopsis thaliana. Plant Mol Biol 77:447-459.

Kropat J, Hong-Hermesdorf A, Casero D, Ent P, Castruita M, Pellegrini M, Merchant SS,
Malasarn D. 2011. A revised mineral nutrient supplement increases biomass and growth rate in
Chlamydomonas reinhardtii. Plant J 66:770-780.
Krüger W. 1894a. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Organismen des Saftflusses (sog. Schleimflusses)
der Laubbäume. II. Über zwei aus Saftflüssen rein gezüchtete Algen. Zopf Beitr Physiol
Morphol Organ 4:91-116.

Krüger W. 1894b. Kurze Charakteristik einiger niederer Organismen im Saftflusse der
Laubbäume. Hedwigia 33:241-266.

Kwon T, Hanschen ER, Hovde BT. 2023. Addressing the pervasive scarcity of structural
annotation in eukaryotic algae. Sci Rep 13:1687.

Langdon QK, Peris D, Baker EP, Opulente DA, Nguyen HV, Bond U, Goncalves P, Sampaio JP,
Libkind D, Hittinger CT. 2019. Fermentation innovation through complex hybridization of wild
and domesticated yeasts. Nat Ecol Evol 3:1576-1586.

Lemieux C, Turmel M, Otis C, Pombert JF. 2019. A streamlined and predominantly diploid
genome in the tiny marine green alga *Chloropicon primus*. Nat Commun 10:4061.

Li H. 2013. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM.
Arxiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1303.3997

Li H. 2021. New strategies to improve minimap2 alignment accuracy. Bioinformatics 37:4572-
4574.

Lin J, Le TV, Augspurger K, Tritschler D, Bower R, Fu G, Perrone C, O'Toole ET, Mills KV,
Dymek E, et al. 2019. FAP57/WDR65 targets assembly of a subset of inner arm dyneins and
connects to regulatory hubs in cilia. Mol Biol Cell 30:2659-2680.

Liu C, Young AL, Starling-Windhof A, Bracher A, Saschenbrecker S, Rao BV, Rao KV,
Berninghausen O, Mielke T, Hartl FU, et al. 2010. Coupled chaperone action in folding and
assembly of hexadecameric Rubisco. Nature 463:197-202.

Liu HW, Khera R, Grob P, Gallaher SD, Purvine SO, Nicora CD, Lipton MS, Niyogi KK,
Nogales E, Iwai M, et al. 2024. Fe starvation induces a second LHCI tetramer to photosystem I
in green algae. bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.11.624522
1753

1754 Lopez D, Hamaji T, Kropat J, De Hoff P, Morselli M, Rubbi L, Fitz-Gibbon S, Gallaher SD,
1755 Merchant SS, Umen J, et al. 2015. Dynamic changes in the transcriptome and methylome of
1756 *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* throughout Its life cycle. Plant Physiology 169:2730-2743.
1757
1758 MacIntosh GC. 2011. RNase T2 family: enzymatic properties, functional diversity, and evolution
1759 of ancient ribonucleases. In: Nicholson AW, editor. Ribonucleases. p. 89-114.
1760
1761 Mancera E, Bourgon R, Brozzi A, Huber W, Steinmetz LM. 2008. High-resolution mapping of
1762 meiotic crossovers and non-crossovers in yeast. Nature 454:479-485.
1763 Manni M, Berkeley MR, Seppey M, Simao FA, Zdobnov EM. 2021. BUSCO Update: Novel and
1764 Streamlined Workflows along with Broader and Deeper Phylogenetic Coverage for Scoring of
1765 Eukaryotic, Prokaryotic, and Viral Genomes. Mol Biol Evol 38:4647-4654.
1766
1767 Marcet-Houben M, Gabaldón T. 2015. Beyond the whole-genome duplication: phylogenetic
1768 evidence for an ancient interspecies hybridization in the baker's yeast lineage. PLoS Biol
1769 13:e1002220.
1770
1771 Marcolungo L, Bellamoli F, Cecchin M, Lopatriello G, Rossato M, Cosentino E, Rombauts S,
1772 Delledonne M, Ballottari M. 2024. *Haematococcus lacustris* genome assembly and annotation
1773 reveal diploid genetic traits and stress-induced gene expression patterns. Algal Research-
1774 Biomass Biofuels and Bioproducts 80.
1775
1776 Matsuka M, Otsuka H, Hase E. 1966. Changes in contents of carbohydrate and fatty acid in cells
1777 of *Chlorella protothecoides* during processes of de- and re-generation of chloroplasts. Plant and
1778 Cell Physiology 7:651-662.
1779
1780 Mattei AL, Bailly N, Meissner A. 2022. DNA methylation: a historical perspective. Trends
1781 Genet 38:676-707.
1782
1783 Merchant SS, Prochnik SE, Vallon O, Harris EH, Karpowicz SJ, Witman GB, Terry A, Salamov
1784 A, Fritz-Laylin LK, Marechal-Drouard L, et al. 2007. The *Chlamydomonas* genome reveals the
1785 evolution of key animal and plant functions. Science 318:245-250.
1786
1787 Minh BQ, Schmidt HA, Chernomor O, Schrempf D, Woodhams MD, von Haeseler A, Lanfear
1788 R. 2020. IQ-TREE 2: new models and efficient methods for phylogenetic inference in the
1789 genomic era. Mol Biol Evol 37:1530-1534.
1790
1791 Moore ER, Bullington BS, Weisberg AJ, Jiang Y, Chang J, Halsey KH. 2017. Morphological
1792 and transcriptomic evidence for ammonium induction of sexual reproduction in *Thalassiosira*
1793 *pseudonana* and other centric diatoms. PLoS One 12:e0181098.
1794
1795 Moseley JL, Lee B, Im CS, Kim J, Kim D, Bhat R. 2022. Production of lipids and terpenoids in
1796 *Auxenochlorella protothecoides*. United States US12037630B2, filed November 5, 2021, and
1797 issued July 16, 2024.
1798

1799   Ning J, Otto TD, Pfander C, Schwach F, Brochet M, Bushell E, Goulding D, Sanders M,
1800   Lefebvre PA, Pei J, et al. 2013. Comparative genomics in *Chlamydomonas* and *Plasmodium*
1801   identifies an ancient nuclear envelope protein family essential for sexual reproduction in protists,
1802   fungi, plants, and vertebrates. Genes Dev 27:1198-1215.
1803
Pardo-Palacios FJ, Arzalluz-Luque A, Kondratova L, Salguero P, Mestre-Tomas J, Amorin R,
Estevan-Morio E, Liu T, Nanni A, McIntyre L, et al. 2024. SQANTI3: curation of long-read
transcriptomes for accurate identification of known and novel isoforms. Nat Methods. 21:793-
797
Park SH, Kyndt JA, Brown JK. 2022. Comparison of *Auxenochlorella prototothecoides* and
Chlorella spp. chloroplast genomes: evidence for endosymbiosis and horizontal virus-like gene
transfer. Life (Basel) 12.
1811
1812   Peris D, Perez-Torrado R, Hittinger CT, Barrio E, Querol A. 2018. On the origins and industrial
1813   applications of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* x *Saccharomyces kudriavzevii* hybrids. Yeast 35:51-
1814   69.
1815
1816   Petroll R, Papareddy RK, Krela R, Laigle A, Riviere Q, Bišová K, Mozgová I, Borg M. 2024.
1817   The expansion and diversification of epigenetic regulatory networks underpins major transitions
1818   in the evolution of land plants. bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.22.614159
1819
1820   Pombert JF, Blouin NA, Lane C, Boucias D, Keeling PJ. 2014. A lack of parasitic reduction in
1821   the obligate parasitic green alga *Helicosporidium*. PLoS Genet 10:e1004355.
1822
1823   Pontes A, Cadez N, Goncalves P, Sampaio JP. 2019. A quasi-domesticate relic hybrid population
1824   of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* x *S. paradoxus* adapted to olive brine. Front Genet 10:449.
1825
1826   Poplin R, Chang PC, Alexander D, Schwartz S, Colthurst T, Ku A, Newburger D, Dijamco J,
1827   Nguyen N, Afshar PT, et al. 2018. A universal SNP and small-indel variant caller using deep
1828   neural networks. Nat Biotechnol 36:983-987.
1829
1830   Prescott EM, Proudfoot NJ. 2002. Transcriptional collision between convergent genes in budding
1831   yeast. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 99:8796-8801.
1832
1833   Pryszcz LP, Nemeth T, Saus E, Ksiezopolska E, Hegedusova E, Nosek J, Wolfe KH, Gacser A,
1834   Gabaldon T. 2015. The genomic aftermath of hybridization in the opportunistic pathogen
1835   *Candida metapsilosis*. PLoS Genet 11:e1005626.
1836
1837   Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic
1838   features. Bioinformatics 26:841-842.
1839
1840   Robinson JT, Thorvaldsdóttir H, Winckler W, Guttman M, Lander ES, Getz G, Mesirov JP.
1841   2011. Integrative Genomics Viewer. Nature Biotechnology 29:24-26.
1842
1843   Romero Charria P, Navarrete C, Ovchinnikov V, Sarre LA, Shabardina V, Casacuberta E, Lara-
1844   Astiaso D, Sebé-Pedrós A, de Mendoza A. 2024. Adenine DNA methylation associated to

1845   transcription is widespread across eukaryotes. bioRxiv.
1846   https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.28.620566
1847
1848   Saito M, Xu P, Faure G, Maguire S, Kannan S, Altae-Tran H, Vo S, Desimone A, Macrae RK,
1849   Zhang F. 2023. Fanzor is a eukaryotic programmable RNA-guided endonuclease. Nature
1850   620:660-668.
1851
1852   Sanders CK, Hanschen ER, Biondi TC, Hovde BT, Kunde YA, Eng WL, Kwon T, Dale T. 2022.
1853   Phylogenetic analyses and reclassification of the oleaginous marine species *Nannochloris* sp.
1854   "desiccata" (Trebouxiophyceae, Chlorophyta), formerly *Chlorella desiccata*, supported by a
1855   high-quality genome assembly. J Phycol 58:436-448.
1856
1857   Santaguida S, Amon A. 2015. Short- and long-term effects of chromosome mis-segregation and
1858   aneuploidy. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 16:473-485.
1859
1860   Saschenbrecker S, Bracher A, Rao KV, Rao BV, Hartl FU, Hayer-Hartl M. 2007. Structure and
1861   function of RbcX, an assembly chaperone for hexadecameric Rubisco. Cell 129:1189-1200.
1862
1863   Schroder MS, Martinez de San Vicente K, Prandini TH, Hammel S, Higgins DG, Bagagli E,
1864   Wolfe KH, Butler G. 2016. Multiple origins of the pathogenic yeast *Candida orthopsilosis* by
1865   separate hybridizations between two parental species. PLoS Genet 12:e1006404.
1866
1867   Schubert M, Petersson UA, Haas BJ, Funk C, Schroder WP, Kieselbach T. 2002. Proteome map
1868   of the chloroplast lumen of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. J Biol Chem 277:8354-8365.
1869
1870   Selmecki A, Forche A, Berman J. 2006. Aneuploidy and isochromosome formation in drug-
1871   resistant *Candida albicans*. Science 313:367-370.
1872
1873   Seto A, Wang HL, Hesseltine CW. 1984. Culture conditions affect eicosapentaenoic acid content
1874   of *Chlorella minutissima*. Journal of the American Oil Chemists Society 61:892-894.
1875
1876   Severgnini M, Lazzari B, Capra E, Chessa S, Luini M, Bordoni R, Castiglioni B, Ricchi M,
1877   Cremonesi P. 2018. Genome sequencing of Prototheca zopfii genotypes 1 and 2 provides
1878   evidence of a severe reduction in organellar genomes. Sci Rep 8:14637.
1879
1880   Sipiczki M. 2008. Interspecies hybridization and recombination in *Saccharomyces* wine yeasts.
1881   FEMS Yeast Res 8:996-1007.
1882
1883   Soltis PS, Soltis DE. 2009. The role of hybridization in plant speciation. Annu Rev Plant Biol
1884   60:561-588.
1885
1886   Stadler R, Wolf K, Hilgarth C, Tanner W, Sauer N. 1995. Subcellular localization of the
1887   inducible *Chlorella* HUP1 monosaccharide-H+ symporter and cloning of a co-Induced galactose-
1888   H+ symporter. Plant Physiology 107:33-41.
1889

1890   Stanke M, Diekhans M, Baertsch R, Haussler D. 2008. Using native and syntenically mapped
1891   cDNA alignments to improve *de novo* gene finding. Bioinformatics 24:637-644.
1892
1893   Steenwyk JL, Lind AL, Ries LNA, Dos Reis TF, Silva LP, Almeida F, Bastos RW, Fraga da
1894   Silva TFC, Bonato VLD, Pessoni AM, et al. 2020. Pathogenic allodiploid hybrids of *Aspergillus*
1895   fungi. Curr Biol 30:2495-2507 e2497.
1896
1897   Strenkert D, Schmollinger S, Gallaher SD, Salome PA, Purvine SO, Nicora CD, Mettler-
1898   Altmann T, Soubeyrand E, Weber APM, Lipton MS, et al. 2019. Multiomics resolution of
1899   molecular events during a day in the life of Chlamydomonas. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
1900   116:2374-2383.
1901
1902   Strenkert D, Yildirim A, Yan J, Yoshinaga Y, Pellegrini M, O'Malley RC, Merchant SS, Umen
1903   JG. 2022. The landscape of Chlamydomonas histone H3 lysine 4 methylation reveals both
1904   constant features and dynamic changes during the diurnal cycle. Plant J 112:352-368.
1905
1906   Sui Y, Qi L, Wu JK, Wen XP, Tang XX, Ma ZJ, Wu XC, Zhang K, Kokoska RJ, Zheng DQ, et
1907   al. 2020. Genome-wide mapping of spontaneous genetic alterations in diploid yeast cells. Proc
1908   Natl Acad Sci U S A 117:28191-28200.
1909
1910   Suzuki S, Endoh R, Manabe R, Ohkuma M, Hirakawa Y. 2018. Multiple losses of
1911   photosynthesis and convergent reductive genome evolution in the colourless green algae
1912   *Prototheca*. Scientific Reports 8.
1913
1914   Tamura K, Stecher G, Kumar S. 2021. MEGA11: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis
1915   Version 11. Mol Biol Evol 38:3022-3027.
1916
1917   Tanaka S, Sawaya MR, Kerfeld CA, Yeates TO. 2007. Structure of the RuBisCO chaperone
1918   RbcX from *Synechocystis* sp. PCC6803. Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr 63:1109-1112.
1919
1920   Tang S, Lomsadze A, Borodovsky M. 2015. Identification of protein coding regions in RNA
1921   transcripts. Nucleic Acids Res 43:e78.
1922
1923   Tillich M, Lehwark P, Pellizzer T, Ulbricht-Jones ES, Fischer A, Bock R, Greiner S. 2017.
1924   GeSeq - versatile and accurate annotation of organelle genomes. Nucleic Acids Res 45:W6-W11.
1925
1926   Torres-Machorro AL, Hernandez R, Cevallos AM, López-Villaseñor I. 2010. Ribosomal RNA
1927   genes in eukaryotic microorganisms: witnesses of phylogeny? FEMS Microbiol Rev 34:59-86.
1928
1929   Tsai IJ, Bensasson D, Burt A, Koufopanou V. 2008. Population genomics of the wild yeast
1930   *Saccharomyces paradoxus*: Quantifying the life cycle. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 105:4957-
1931   4962.
1932
1933   Ueno R, Hanagata N, Urano N, Suzuki M. 2005. Molecular phylogeny and phenotypic variation
1934   in the heterotrophic green algal genus *Prototheca* (Trebouxiophyceae, Chlorophyta). Journal of
1935   Phycology 41:1268-1280.

1936
1937 Vande Zande P, Zhou X, Selmecki A. 2023. The dynamic fungal genome: polyploidy,
1938 aneuploidy and copy number variation in response to stress. Annu Rev Microbiol 77:341-361.
1939
1940 Vetting MW, Hegde SS, Fajardo JE, Fiser A, Roderick SL, Takiff HE, Blanchard JS. 2006.
1941 Pentapeptide repeat proteins. Biochemistry 45:1-10.
1942
1943 Wang B, Jia Y, Dang N, Yu J, Bush SJ, Gao S, He W, Wang S, Guo H, Yang X, et al. 2024.
1944 Near telomere-to-telomere genome assemblies of two *Chlorella* species unveil the composition
1945 and evolution of centromeres in green algae. BMC Genomics 25:356.
1946
1947 Werner A, Kanhere A, Wahlestedt C, Mattick JS. 2024. Natural antisense transcripts as versatile
1948 regulators of gene expression. Nat Rev Genet 25:730-744.
1949
1950 Wolff G, Burger G, Lang BF, Kück U. 1993. Mitochondrial genes in the colourless alga
1951 *Prototheca wickerhamii* resemble plant genes in their exons but fungal genes in their introns.
1952 Nucleic Acids Res 21:719-726.
1953
1954 Yan D, Dai J, Wu Q. 2013. Characterization of an ammonium transporter in the oleaginous alga
1955 *Chlorella protothecoides*. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 97:919-928.
1956
1957 Yan D, Wang Y, Murakami T, Shen Y, Gong JH, Jiang HF, Smith DR, Pombert JF, Dai JBA,
1958 Wu QY. 2015. *Auxenochlorella protothecoides* and *Prototheca wickerhamii* plastid genome
1959 sequences give insight into the origins of non-photosynthetic algae. Scientific Reports 5:14465.
1960
1961 Yona AH, Manor YS, Herbst RH, Romano GH, Mitchell A, Kupiec M, Pilpel Y, Dahan O. 2012.
1962 Chromosomal duplication is a transient evolutionary solution to stress. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
1963 109:21010-21015.
1964
1965 Yoon PH, Skopintsev P, Shi H, Chen L, Adler BA, Al-Shimary M, Craig RJ, Loi KJ, DeTurk
1966 EC, Li Z, et al. 2023. Eukaryotic RNA-guided endonucleases evolved from a unique clade of
1967 bacterial enzymes. Nucleic Acids Res 51:12414-12427.
1968
1969 Yuen KW, Warren CD, Chen O, Kwok T, Hieter P, Spencer FA. 2007. Systematic genome
1970 instability screens in yeast and their potential relevance to cancer. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
1971 104:3925-3930.
1972
1973 Zemach A, McDaniel IE, Silva P, Zilberman D. 2010. Genome-wide evolutionary analysis of
1974 eukaryotic DNA methylation. Science 328:916-919.
1975
1976 Zorin B, Hegemann P, Sizova I. 2005. Nuclear-gene targeting by using single-stranded DNA
1977 avoids illegitimate DNA integration in *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. Eukaryot Cell 4:1264-1272.
1978