Homeodomain protein Sxi1α independently controls cell-cell fusion and gene expression during sexual reproduction in *Cryptococcus deneoformans*

Jun Huang, Anna E. Lehmann, Patricia P. Peterson, Ziyan Xu, Liping Xiong, Sheng Sun, and Joseph Heitman*

Department of Molecular Genetics and Microbiology, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC 27710, USA

* Corresponding author: Joseph Heitman
Email: heitm001@duke.edu

Keywords: Homeodomain protein; Sexual reproduction; Cell fusion; Transcriptional regulation.

Abstract

Sex-specific homeodomain (HD) proteins are key regulators of cell identity and sexual development in fungi, typically functioning as heterodimers to govern transcription. In the human fungal pathogens *Cryptococcus neoformans* and *Cryptococcus deneoformans*, the HD proteins Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** (Sex-inducer 1α and 2**a**) have been characterized as interacting components that play critical roles in sexual development during α x **a** sexual reproduction. α cells are the predominant mating type in natural populations of *Cryptococcus*, and unisexual (same-sex) mating can also occur in certain genetic backgrounds. The roles of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** in unisexual reproduction are not fully understood. To elucidate the functions of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a**, we first applied AlphaFold3 prediction, which identified potential heterodimeric and homodimeric complexes. Formation of a Sxi2**a** homodimer was then experimentally validated through yeast two-hybrid assays. We subsequently deleted *SXI1*α and *SXI2***a** in the hyper-filamentous self-fertile *C. deneoformans* strains XL280α and XL280**a**. Disruption of these genes did not result in noticeable defects in vegetative growth, virulence-associated traits, colony morphology, sporulation, or competitive fitness during unisexual crosses. Interestingly, both bilateral (mutant x mutant) and unilateral (mutant x wildtype) crosses involving the *sxi1*αΔ mutant significantly increased α-α cell fusion efficiency, suggesting a previously unrecognized inhibitory role for Sxi1α in regulating same-sex cell fusion. Consistently, genes encoding mating pheromones and the α-pheromone receptor Ste3 were upregulated in the *sxi1*αΔ fusion assays. Transcriptomic analysis of *sxi1*αΔ and *sxi2***a**Δ mutants led to the identification of unique subsets of genes negatively regulated by each transcription factor during unisexual reproduction. Additionally, α x **a** crosses between null mutants of *sxi1*αΔ and *sxi2***a**Δ revealed differential regulation of mating-type (*MAT*) loci genes dependent only on Sxi1α or Sxi2**a**. Together, our findings reveal a novel role for Sxi1α in governing cell fusion and demonstrate that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** have distinct transcriptional control during unisexual and α x **a** sexual reproduction, potentially exerting opposing regulation of sex-specific *MAT* genes.

Author Summary

Analogous to processes observed in many eukaryotic organisms, fungal sexual reproduction

reshuffles genetic material, producing novel genetic variants with increased fitness and/or adaptive potential.

The human fungal pathogen *Cryptococcus deneoformans* is widespread in the environment and can cause

severe infections in immunocompromised individuals. Sexual reproduction in this species occurs between

cells of either opposite mating types (α x **a** mating) or the same mating type (α x α and **a** x **a** unisexual

reproduction). The mating type-specific homeodomain transcription factors Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** are known to

form a complex that broadly controls sexual development following α and **a** cell fusion. Here, we find that

Sxi1α inhibits cell-cell fusion during unisexual reproduction, while its partner, Sxi2**a**, shows only limited

inhibition in certain genetic contexts. Further, we show that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** regulate transcription of distinct

gene sets during both α x **a** and unisexual reproduction, including many within the mating-type (*MAT*) loci,

often in opposing manners. Together, these findings reveal that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** function both cooperatively

and independently, thereby allowing for a more flexible and finely-tuned mating control system than

previously recognized, providing insight into how this organism generates genetic variation and adapts to

changing environments.

Introduction

Sexual reproduction is a key process in eukaryotic organisms, promoting genetic diversity and

facilitating adaptation to changing environments. In fungi, this process is controlled by the mating-type

(*MAT*) locus, a specific genomic region containing genes required for successful mating [1]. Among these

genes, pheromone and pheromone receptors (P/R) are involved in signal transduction and recognition

between mating partners, and homeodomain (HD) transcription factors act as master regulators that control

the expression of genes necessary for sexual development [2,3]. In the model yeast *Saccharomyces*

cerevisiae, **a**1 and α2 are well-characterized HD proteins, forming **a**1-α2 heterodimers that bind DNA

cooperatively to repress transcription of cell type-specific genes [4,5]. Unlike **a**1, which has no known role

in the absence of α2, α2 can form homodimers, as well as partner with the Mcm1 cofactor to repress **a**-

specific genes in α and **a**/α cells [6–9]. In the corn smut fungus *Ustilago maydis*, the HD proteins bWest

(bW) and bEast (bE) dimerize to regulate fungal morphological switching and interactions with the plant

host [10–13]. Similarly, sexual development in the mushroom *Coprinus cinereus* requires the physical

interaction of two HD proteins, HD1 and HD2 [14]. Conserved and convergent functionality of HD

transcription factors across diverse fungi illustrates their centrality to species survival and proliferation.

The human fungal pathogen *Cryptococcus neoformans* is the predominant cause of cryptococcal

meningoencephalitis worldwide, whereas its sister species *C. deneoformans* displays a more

geographically restricted distribution and is more frequently encountered in certain regions, particularly in

Europe [15–17]. Interestingly, in *C. neoformans* and *C. deneoformans*, the *P/R* and *HD* genes as well as

additional genes reside in a relatively large (>100 kb) *MAT* locus [2,17–19]. In addition to its direct role in

α x **a** sexual reproduction, the *MAT* locus is associated with several other functions in *Cryptococcus*,

including virulence and uniparental mitochondrial inheritance (mito-UPI), in which mitochondrial DNA is

predominantly inherited from the *MAT***a** parent after α x **a** sexual reproduction [20,21]. We previously

identified the *Cryptococcus* sex-specific HD proteins Sxi1α (Sex inducer 1α) and Sxi2**a** (Sex inducer 2**a**),

which heterodimerize upon α-**a** cell fusion and are involved in key development processes including cell

identity determination, sexual development, and mito-UPI [2,21,21–25]. Our group and others have

identified several Sxi1α-Sxi2**a** targets for which proper temporal expression is essential for sexual

development. For example, *CPR2* (*Cryptococcus* pheromone receptor 2) governs α-**a** cell fusion, and *CLP1*

(clampless 1) is required for post-cell fusion dikaryotic filament formation [26–29]. Beyond these well-

characterized targets, the identification of several hundred Sxi1α/Sxi2**a**-bound promoter elements in *C.*

neoformans suggests that this complex has a much broader regulatory role in sexual development [29].

In addition to α x **a** sexual reproduction, unisexual reproduction can also occur between partners

of the same mating type (mainly α x α) in *C. neoformans* and *C. deneoformans* [30–32]. In natural

Cryptococcus populations, *MAT*α isolates are predominant among both clinical and environmental samples,

suggesting that α x **a** heterothallic sexual reproduction is infrequent [20,33], even though population

genomics studies have shown that recombination is occurring among *Cryptococcus* isolates in nature

[33,34]. This strong bias in *MAT* locus distribution may, at least in part, be explained by the occurrence of

unisexual reproduction, which enables genetic recombination and propagation in the absence of a

compatible mating partner [30,35,36]. As key sex-specific transcriptional regulators, the roles of Sxi1α and

Sxi2**a** in unisexual reproduction and their transcriptional targets remain to be elucidated.

In this study, we sought to determine whether Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** are involved in same-sex mating in

C. deneoformans. AlphaFold3 structural prediction suggested that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** may form both

heterodimeric and homodimeric complexes, and the formation of the Sxi2**a** homodimer was further

confirmed by yeast two-hybrid assays. Taking advantage of the hyper-filamentous *C. deneoformans*

congenic isolates XL280α and XL280**a** [37], along with a CRISPR/Cas9-based gene editing system [38,39],

we deleted *SXI1*α and *SXI2***a** in XL280α and XL280**a**, respectively. Consistent with previous results, we

found that *SXI1*α and *SXI2***a** are dispensable for vegetative growth and multiple *in vitro* virulence-relevant

traits, including thermotolerance at 37°C, polysaccharide capsule formation, and melanin production.

Interestingly, compared to fusion between two wildtype *MAT*α strains, we observed a significant increase

in α-α fusion efficiency when Sxi1α was deleted in one or both *MAT*α strains, which is accompanied by

significant upregulation of genes encoding mating pheromones and the α-pheromone receptor *STE3*.

Similarly, increased **a-a** fusion was observed when Sxi2**a** was deleted in one of the two *MAT***a** strains, but

not when Sxi2 was absent in both strains, pointing to a previously unrecognized inhibitory function of Sxi1α

in same-sex cell fusion. No apparent defects in colony morphology, hyphal development, basidium

formation, sporulation, spore germination, or competitive fitness were detected in *sxi1*αΔ or *sxi2***a**Δ mutants

during unisexual reproduction. Transcriptomic analysis revealed distinct sets of genes for which expression

differences are regulated only by Sxi1α, independent of its canonical interacting partner Sxi2**a**. The Sxi1α-

dependent gene set in the unisexual crosses is markedly smaller and has limited overlap with that in α x **a**

crosses. These observations support the hypothesis that Sxi1α has distinct functions during α x **a** and α x

α sexual reproduction that is independent of Sxi2**a**.

Our results suggest a novel function of Sxi1α in regulating cell-cell fusion, expanding our

understanding of how HD proteins contribute to fungal sexual reproduction. Additionally, we show that

Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** have transcriptional regulatory effects both dependently and independently of one another.

These findings, combined with our structural predictions and yeast two-hybrid-validated Sxi2**a** homodimer,

support the hypothesis that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** may have distinct functions independently of their usual HD

partner, analogous to α2 in budding yeast. Overall, these findings further our understanding of how sexual

reproduction is regulated in this important human fungal pathogen and reveal important differences in Sxi1α

and Sxi2**a** transcription factor activity between unisexual and α x **a** sexual reproduction.

Results

Sxi1α and Sxi2a are predicted to form a heterodimer

To study the impact of the homeodomain proteins Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** on unisexual reproduction in *Cryptococcus*, we selected to study XL280α and XL280**a**, a pair of congenic *C. deneoformans* strains that are well-known for their ability to undergo unisexual reproduction involving robust self-filamentation and sporulation [30,37]. Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** are conserved between *C. neoformans* and *C. deneoformans*, and homeodomain (Pfam:00046) or homeobox KN domains (from **KN**OX family transcription factors, Pfam:PF05920) were found within the sequences via an NCBI conserved domain search (Fig 1A). Both domains are structurally related, sharing DNA-binding functions through a helix-turn-helix motif, consistent with potential functional relevance in governing gene expression. Consistent with our previous report with yeast two-hybrid analysis [2,22], a heterodimer between Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** was predicted by AlphaFold3 protein-protein complex prediction (Fig 1B). Pairwise structural alignments between the predicted Sxi1α-Sxi2**a** heterodimer and the crystal structure of the *S. cerevisiae* **a**1-α2 heterodimer [40] revealed robust structural similarity between the two homeodomain complexes with an RMSD value of 0.561 angstroms between 49 pruned atom pairs (Fig 1C). Similarly, the Sxi1α-Sxi2**a** heterodimer exhibited high structural similarity to the AlphaFold3-predicted bW-bE heterodimer from the corn smut fungus *Ustilago maydis*, with a RMSD of 1.069 angstroms across 40 pruned atom pairs. Interestingly, the HD2 proteins [2], represented by Sxi2**a**, **a**1, and bW, superimpose closely, reflecting strong evolutionary conservation. In contrast, greater structural divergence was observed among the HD1 proteins, including Sxi1α, α2, and bE, consistent with their roles in conferring regulatory specificity. Together, these comparisons support a conserved functional framework in which HD2 provides a structurally stable DNA-binding platform, while HD1 contributes specificity to transcriptional regulation, with heterodimer formation serving as a central regulatory module in mating control [41].

Previous studies showed that, in addition to forming a heterodimer with **a**1, *S. cerevisiae* α2 forms a homodimer to repress **a**-specific genes [9]. To benchmark the reliability of our structural predictions, we applied AlphaFold3 to the well-characterized yeast **a**1 and α2. Consistent with experimental evidence, AlphaFold3 predicted robust homodimer formation for α2 but not for **a**1, supporting the validity of this approach for distinguishing biologically relevant homodimerization events (S1 Fig). Using this validated

framework, we next asked whether Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** might also form homodimers, we utilized AlphaFold3

to model Sxi1α-Sxi1α and Sxi2**a**-Sxi2**a** interactions. The predictions indicated potential low-confidence

homodimer formation for Sxi1α-Sxi1α (ipTM = 0.14, pTM = 0.23) and Sxi2**a**-Sxi2**a** (ipTM = 0.20, pTM =

0.24) (Fig 1D). These low interface and predicted TM-scores suggest weak or unstable interactions. It is

also possible that any homodimerization could involve additional interacting partner(s) that are not yet

known, or that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** could have independent roles analogous in function but distinct in structure

from those observed in ascomycetous yeast.

To determine whether Sxi1α or Sxi2**a** could form homodimers, we performed yeast two-hybrid (Y2H)

analyses with Gal4 DNA-binding domain (GBD) and transcriptional activation domain (GAD) fusion

constructs (Fig 1E). Because homeodomain transcription factors frequently function as dimers, we

specifically tested whether either protein could self-associate in this heterologous system. We also included

the putative *C. deneoformans* ortholog of Mcm1*,* a transcription factor involved in the pheromone response

pathway in other fungi including *S. cerevisiae*, where it interacts with the homeodomain protein α2 and

transcription factor Ste12 to regulate mating-specific gene expression [42,43]. We identified C*.*

deneoformans Mcm1 (CNN00060) and *C. neoformans* Mcm1 (CNAG_07924) as orthologs of *S. cerevisiae*

Mcm1 through reciprocal BLASTp searches. Our AlphaFold3 prediction and alignment suggest a

conserved structural organization between the *S. cerevisiae* α2-Mcm1 [44] and the *C. deneoformans* Sxi1α-

Mcm1(CNN00060) (S2 Fig), and we hypothesize that Mcm1 could similarly interact with Sxi1α or Sxi2**a** in

Cryptococcus. Thus, we tested all possible pairwise interactions between Sxi1α, Sxi2**a**, and Mcm1.

Plasmids encoding the fusion proteins were transformed into the Y2H reporter strains Y2HGold

and Y187. Following mating of the two strains, diploids were selected and assayed for Gal4-dependent

activation of *ADE2*, *HIS3*, and *lacZ* reporter genes. In a previous study, full-length Sxi2**a** fused to GBD was

shown to auto-activate reporter gene expression [2]. Consistent with this observation, auto-activation was

also detected in our assays for both Sxi2**a** and Mcm1 (S3 Fig). To avoid false-positive interactions resulting

from auto-activation, we instead analyzed a truncated form of Sxi2**a** (Sxi2**a**N), containing only the N-

terminal region and the homeodomain (HD), for interaction testing. A robust protein-protein interaction was

detected between Sxi2**a**N and full-length Sxi2**a**, supporting the AlphaFold-predicted model of a Sxi2**a**

homodimer (Fig 1E). In contrast, we did not detect evidence for Sxi1α homodimerization, or between Mcm1

and Sxi1α or Sxi2**a** in this assay (S4 Fig). While these results suggest that such interactions are either

weak or absent in this context, we cannot exclude the possibility that dimerization or complex formation

may occur *in vivo* and require post-translational modifications or additional binding partners not

recapitulated in the yeast two-hybrid system.

Sxi1α and Sxi2a are dispensable for *in vitro* growth and virulence-related traits

To further characterize the phenotypic impact of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a**, we generated *SXI1*α and *SXI2***a**

null mutants in XL280α and XL280**a**, respectively, with a CRISPR/Cas9-based strategy following the

previously-established TRACE electroporation protocol [38,39]. Multiple independent drug-resistant

transformants [four for XL280α *sxi1*αΔ::*NAT* and two for XL280**a** *sxi2***a**Δ::*NEO*] were constructed and

confirmed with correct genotypes as deletion mutants based on 5' junction, 3' junction, and internal ORF-

specific PCR analysis (Fig 2A). Mapping of reads generated from Illumina whole-genome sequencing

further confirmed the complete deletion of the genes in all four *sxi1*αΔ mutants and one of the two *sxi2***a**Δ

mutants, and a partial gene deletion in the other *sxi2***a**Δ mutant (Fig 2B and S5 Fig). In some of the mutants,

elevated read-depth was observed in the flanking regions employed for homologous recombination during

gene deletion (Fig 2B and S5 Fig). This could indicate potential concatemeric or ectopic insertion [45] of

the resistance cassette (Fig 2B and S5 Fig). For the partial deletion mutant XL280**a** *sxi2***a**Δ#6, the deletion

occurred between the 5' microhomology sequence and the second gRNA targeting site, instead of at the 3'

microhomology sequence (S5 Fig). This pattern is consistent with a hybrid integration event in which NHEJ

and HR [46] occurred on opposite sides of the construct. Importantly, no sequencing reads mapped to the

N-terminal region of the gene that encompasses the conserved homeodomain (S5 Fig). Therefore, Sxi2**a**

is functionally disrupted in this mutant, and the strain was retained for subsequent analyses.

We next performed competition assays to assess the impact of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** on fungal fitness

during vegetative growth. Equal amounts of mutant and wildtype cells were inoculated in liquid YPD

medium and cultured for 48 hours at 30°C. Samples were collected at 0h, 24h, and 48h to assess

population dynamics. In all cases, the *sxi1*αΔ and *sxi2***a**Δ strains maintained similar proportions to wildtype

during co-culture, indicating that the mutations confer no detectable fitness defect (Fig 2C). Additionally,

we characterized the contributions of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** to several major virulence traits: thermotolerance at

37°C, capsule formation, and melanin production. Consistent with our previous reports in *C. neoformans*

[23], none of the *sxi1α∆* or *sxi2a∆ C. deneoformans* deletion strains displayed fitness differences compared

to the XL280 wildtype strains in these assays (Fig 2D-2F). Taken together, these results indicate that the

loss of *SXI1α* and *SXI2a* does not affect the fitness of the XL280 strain during vegetative growth and has

no detectable impact on virulence-related traits under the conditions tested.

Sxi1α and Sxi2a are dispensable for morphology, sporulation, and cell viability during unisexual

reproduction

We next investigated whether Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** are involved in unisexual reproduction in the XL280

background. When grown on mating- and selfing-inducing MS solid medium [47] as solo-cultures, all of the

tested *sxi1α∆* and *sxi2a∆* mutants produce elongated hyphae, basidia, and basidiospore chains at levels

similar to the XL280 wildtype controls (Fig 3A and 3B). No discernable differences in the basidia and

basidiospores were observed by scanning electron microscope (SEM) (Fig 3C). Thus, the deletion of *SXI1α*

and *SXI2a* did not affect unisexual reproduction morphologically in the XL280 background. Additionally, we

collected random meiotic basidiospores by microdissection to test the effect of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** on spore

germination rates and cell viability and found no significant difference in germination rates between spores

produced by the *sxi1α∆* mutants and XL280α (p-values: 0.682 (*sxi1α∆#4* vs XL280α) and 0.125 (*sxi1α∆#5*

vs XL280α), Welch's t-test), as well as between spores produced by the *sxi2a∆* mutants and XL280**a** (p-

values: 0.591 (*sxi2a∆#6* vs XL280**a**:) and 0.750 (*sxi2a∆ #7* vs XL280**a**), Welch's t-test) (Fig 3D). No

significant difference in spore germination rate was observed between the congenic wildtype strains

XL280α and XL280a (p-value: 0.0856, Welch's t-test) (Fig 3D).

We previously observed that strains capable of undergoing unisexual reproduction outcompete

mutants with unisexual reproduction defects under mating-inducing conditions, attributable to enhanced

hyphal growth and sporulation [48]. To assess the effects of *SXI1α* and *SXI2a* deletion on this metric of

unisexual reproduction efficiency, for each deletion strain we mixed equal numbers of cells from the mutant

(containing a dominant drug-resistant marker) and its wildtype control strain (sensitive to drug), and spotted

the mixture on MS medium to induce unisexual reproduction. After robust sporulation was observed (10

days post plating), we dissected two populations: 1) random basidiospores from the periphery where

sporulation occurs, and 2) the center of the spot where cells remain mostly as yeast (Fig 3E, left panel).

Germinated dissected spores/yeast cells were transferred onto YPD plates containing selective drug (NAT

or NEO) to determine which strain in the mixture they originated from. For both *sxi1α*Δ and *sxi2a*Δ, the

ratios between mutant and wildtype among the basidiospores at the periphery were similar to those among

the yeast cells at the center (spores/yeast, p-values: 0.5398275 (*sxi1α*Δ) and 0.379667 (*sxi2a*Δ), paired t-

test), indicating the loss of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** does not affect competitive fitness during unisexual reproduction

(Fig 3E, right panel).

271    The DNA-binding protein Mcm1 functions as a central transcriptional co-regulator of mating type

homeodomain proteins during sexual development in budding yeast [43,44]. Because *Cryptococcus* Sxi1α

and Sxi2**a** have structural and functional commonalities with *S. cerevisiae* α2 and **a**1, we questioned

whether an analogous co-factor may exist in *Cryptococcus*. We first examined whether deletion of *MCM1*

affects unisexual reproduction by generating *mcm1*Δ mutants in the XL280 background (S6 Fig) and tested

their self-fertility under mating-inducing conditions. Deletion of *MCM1* did not result in obvious defects in

unisexual mating morphology in either XL280α or XL280**a** (S7 Fig). To test for potential synthetic effects

between *MCM1* and *SXI1*α or *SXI2***a**, we constructed *sxi1α*Δ *mcm1*Δ and *sxi2a*Δ *mcm1*Δ double mutants

(S6 Fig). No clear unisexual mating morphology defects were observed in these strains (S7 Fig).

Interestingly, it appears that all of the engineered strains containing *mcm1*Δ deletion displayed an increased

abundance of yeast cells in the center of mating spots, along with a reduced frequency of basidia bearing

robust basidiospore chains (S7 Fig). Additionally, we tested the role of Mcm1 in α x **a** sexual reproduction

with an *mcm1*Δ strain derived from the *C. neoformans* H99 transcription factor deletion collection [49].

Through mating, we generated the congenic strain KN99**a** *mcm1*Δ. Crosses were performed on MS and

V8 (pH=5) media by mating *mcm1*Δ with either wildtype, *sxi1α*Δ, or *sxi2a*Δ strains [23]. Consistent with

previous observations [2,22], crosses involving *sxi1α*Δ or *sxi2a*Δ exhibited clear mating defects in hyphal

development and sporulation (S8 Fig). In contrast, no detectable mating defects were observed in either

unilateral or bilateral α x **a** crosses involving *mcm1*Δ (S8 Fig). Collectively, these results indicate that, unlike

its essential co-regulatory role in budding yeast, Mcm1 is largely dispensable for both unisexual and α x **a**

sexual reproduction in *C. deneoformans* and *C. neoformans.*

Sxi1α is critical for unisexual cell-cell fusion

In the presence of a helper strain serving as a pheromone donor, α x α and **a** x **a** outcrossing can

be facilitated in *C. deneoformans* in so-called Ménage à trois matings [22,30] (Fig 4A). Previously, our

results from α x **a** sexual reproduction suggested that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** function after cell-cell fusion [2].

Although cell-cell fusion is dispensable for solo unisexual reproduction, it may still occur under certain

conditions, such as during α x α outcrossing [22,30]. Given the limited understanding of the role of Sxi1α

in this context, we sought to determine whether Sxi1α is involved in cell-cell fusion during α x α outcrossing

in the presence of a donor strain (JEC20, *MAT***a** *NAT^S NEO^S*). Strains in the XL280α *SXI1*α and *sxi1*αΔ

backgrounds that were differentially resistant to *NAT* and *NEO* were used to set up three types of mating:

*SXI1*α x *SXI1*α, *SXI1*α x *sxi1*αΔ, and *sxi1*αΔ x *sxi1*αΔ. Equal number of cells of the two strains in each

mating were mixed and spotted on V8 agar (pH=7) to induce sexual reproduction. After 72 hours of

incubation, cells were collected. The fusion frequency was fewer than 5.04×10^{-8} in two independent sets

of the XL280α *NAT* x XL280α *NEO* crosses, with fusion products identified by screening colonies for NAT

and NEO resistance. In contrast, significantly higher fusion frequencies were found in *sxi1*αΔ::*NAT* x

*sxi1*αΔ::*NEO* (22.5-fold higher than wildtype, frequency: 1.13×10^{-6}, p-value: 0.0013, Welch's t-test) and

*sxi1*αΔ::*NAT* x XL280α *NEO* (62.9-fold higher than wildtype, frequency: 3.17×10^{-6}, p-value: 0.0288, Welch's

t-test) (Fig 4B). Taken together, these findings demonstrate that cell-cell fusion between *MAT*α cells is

significantly increased when *SXI1*α is absent in at least one of the two strains.

We then asked whether Sxi2**a** has a similar effect on cell-cell fusion during **a** x **a** unisexual mating

(Fig 4A). Interestingly, with the presence of a donor strain (JEC21, *MAT*α, *NAT^S NEO^S*), the fusion

frequency between XL280**a** *NAT* and XL280**a** *NEO* was 2.43×10^{-6}, while no significant difference in fusion

frequency was found in *sxi2***a**Δ::*NAT* x *sxi2***a**Δ::*NEO* (20% of the wildtype, frequency 5.43×10^{-7}, p-value:

0.1204, Welch's t-test). In contrast, the fusion frequencies between *sxi2***a**Δ::*NAT* x XL280**a** *NEO* (7.2-fold

higher than wildtype, frequency 1.79×10^{-5}, p-value: 0.0086, Welch's t-test), XL280**a** *NAT* x *sxi2***a**Δ::*NEO*

(4.6-fold higher than wildtype, frequency 1.13×10^{-5}, p-value: 0.0002, Welch's t-test) were significantly higher

than the wildtype cross (Fig 4C).

We hypothesized that NAT and NEO resistant colonies, carrying both selectable markers after cell-

cell fusion event, would exhibit diploid DNA content, or triploid if the fusion involved a non-selective donor

strain (Fig 4A). To verify the ploidy of fusion products from α x α and **a** x **a** outcrosses, flow cytometry

analysis was performed. With *C. neoformans* haploid strain H99 and diploid strain CnLC6683 as controls

[50], all NAT- or NEO- containing outcrossing parent strains were confirmed to possess haploid DNA content

(Fig 4D). Two independent NAT and NEO resistant colonies from Ménage à trois matings were randomly

selected for analysis. As expected in the α x α fusion assay, diploid DNA content was observed in bilateral

crosses between *sxi1α∆* deletion mutants. In contrast, haploid DNA content was detected in XL280α *NAT*

x XL280α *NEO* and *sxi1α∆::NAT* x XL280α *NEO* crosses. The presence of haploid NAT and NEO resistant

colonies suggests that our assay may slightly overestimate the true frequency of cell-cell fusion events,

likely due to genome recombination during unisexual reproduction. Similarly, in **a** x **a** crosses, FACS

analysis revealed diploid DNA content in fusion products from XL280**a** *NAT* x XL280**a** *NEO*, *sxi2**a**∆::NAT* x

*sxi2**a**∆::NEO*, and XL280**a** *NAT* x *sxi2**a**∆::NEO*, whereas haploid DNA content was found in the *sxi2**a**∆::NAT*

x XL280**a** *NEO* cross (Fig 4D). To further confirm whether the donor cell directly participated in fusion

events, genotyping PCR was performed to amplify *STE20**a*** and *STE20*α, allelic variants of the same

mating-type-specific genes located with the *MAT* locus. None of the independent fusion products contained

the *STE20* allele from the pheromone donor's mating type, indicating that any triploid products involving

the donor strain are rare and were not observed in our analysis (Fig 4D and 4E).

To dissect the transcriptional differences underlying increased cell fusion frequency, we performed

3' enriched RNA-sequencing for wildtype and *sxi1α∆* bilateral Ménage à trois matings conducted on V8

(pH=7) for 72 hours, the identical conditions used for fusion frequency assays. Wildtype samples consisted

of XL280α NAT x XL280α NEO x JEC20, while *sxi1α∆* bilateral samples consisted of *sxi1α∆::NAT* x

sxi1α∆::NEO x JEC20. Libraries were prepared with a 3' enriched RNA-seq protocol incorporating unique

molecular identifiers to enable deduplication and accurate transcript quantification, yielding an average of

11.75 million aligned reads per sample (S9 Fig). Principal component analysis revealed clear separation

between wildtype and *sxi1α∆* samples along PC1, which explained 63.2 percent of the variance, while PC2

accounted for 19 percent of the variance and showed partial overlap between groups (Fig 4F). Differential

expression analysis with an adjusted p-value threshold of 0.05 or less (adjusted p-value<=0.05) and an

absolute fold change cutoff of at least two (Fold Change >= 2) identified 134 differentially expressed genes,

including 18 upregulated and 116 downregulated genes in *sxi1α∆* bilateral matings relative to wildtype

(Table S1). Consistent with previous findings, the known Sxi1α target *CLP1* was significantly

downregulated in *sxi1αΔ* matings. Notably, the pheromone receptor gene *STE3α* and pheromone genes

MFα1–3 were significantly upregulated in *sxi1αΔ* matings (Fig 4G). Because genome-wide DEG analysis

applies stringent statistical thresholds that may exclude biologically relevant mating and fusion genes, we

next examined normalized expression levels using log2 counts per million (CPM) to directly compare

transcript abundance across conditions. Examination of log2 CPM for mating and cell fusion related genes

confirmed elevated expression of *MFα1–3* and *STE3α*, but not for the key transcription factor gene *STE12α*,

in *sxi1αΔ* matings. Pheromone genes at the *MAT***a** locus, *MF***a***1–3*, were also upregulated, whereas *STE3***a**

and *STE12***a** showed no significant changes (Fig 4H). In addition, significant expression differences were

observed for additional Sxi1α targets such as *CPR2* and for key mating regulators *ZNF2* [51] and *CFS1*

[52], while no significant differences were detected for *SXI2***a**, *MAT2*, *CVA1* and the fusion associated genes

PRM1 and *KAR5* [53] (Fig 4H).

Sxi1α and Sxi2a regulate expression of unique gene subsets in unisexual crosses

To explore potential transcriptional regulatory roles for Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** in unisexual and α x **a**

sexual reproduction, we performed RNA-seq of solo-cultures (XL280α, XL280**a**, *sxi1αΔ*, and *sxi2***a***Δ*), and

co-cultures including a wildtype cross (XL280α x XL280**a**), unilateral crosses (*sxi1αΔ* x XL280**a** and XL280α

x *sxi2***a***Δ*), and a bilateral mutant cross (*sxi1αΔ* x *sxi2***a***Δ*). Reads were mapped to a concatenated assembly

consisting of a chromosome-level XL280α genome and the XL280**a** *MAT***a** locus [54], with *MAT***a**- or *MATα*-

masked versions used for solo-cultures and the unmasked assembly for co-cultures. We acquired a mean

of 22.4 million reads per sample (SD = 7.6 M) and achieved a mean alignment rate of 95.2% (SD = 0.8%).

Genes with at least 1 transcript per million (TPM) in at least one sample were retained for downstream

analysis. In both α and **a** solo-cultures, principal component analysis (PCA) of the 500 most variable

transcripts showed that the presence/absence of *SXI1α* or *SXI2***a** explained the majority of the variance

(S10A and S10B Fig). One replicate from the *sxi1αΔ* solo culture clustered separately from the others in

both principal component space and in hierarchical clustering of the relative (scaled variance stabilizing

transformation (vst) normalized) expression of the top 500 most variable genes (S10C Fig). Therefore, this

replicate was excluded from downstream expression analysis. Re-analysis without this replicate resulted

in reduced variance between replicates and a larger proportion of variance explained by PC1 (S10D Fig).

All four co-culture crosses showed clear clustering of technical replicates and separation by genotype,

indicating that transcriptional differences in these experiments are explained primarily by the independent

variable with minimal contributions from confounding variables (S1E Fig). PC1 (62% variance) appears to

be explained by the presence of a functional copy of both *SXI1*α and *SXI2***a**, with the samples from the

wildtype cross clustering separately from the crosses where one or both genes were deleted. Interestingly,

PC2 (25%) shows strong, discrete clustering by genotype, indicating transcriptional differences between

crosses lacking *SXI1*α, *SXI2***a**, and both *SXI1*α and *SXI2***a** (S10E Fig).

We next performed differential gene expression analysis, treating genes with a false discovery rate

(FDR)-adjusted p-value less than or equal to 0.05 and at least a twofold positive or negative expression

change as significantly differentially expressed. In the *sxi1*αΔ comparison, *SXI1*α was identified as a DEG,

and further analysis of the mapped RNA-seq reads showed that reads mapping to *SXI1*α were concentrated

at the same regions with a high mapping rate of the Illumina DNA-seq reads (S11 Fig and Fig 2B). No

reads were detected in the open reading frame. This suggests that the 5' UTR region used for homologous

recombination may have integrated ectopically in the genome and/or increased in copy number. A *MAT*α-

adjacent gene, *FAO1*, was also identified as a DEG in the *sxi1*αΔ solo culture. Reads mapping to this gene

were concentrated at the 3' end that was also part of the homology region used for integration of the

selectable marker during *SXI1*α gene deletion. It is therefore likely that this effect is also an artifact of

ectopic integration of the resistance cassette. Based on these observations, *SXI1*α, *FAO1*, and *SXI2***a** were

excluded from consideration as DEGs.

In solo-cultures, *sxi1*αΔ had 19 DEGs compared to XL280α, while *sxi2***a**Δ had 23 DEGs relative to

XL280**a** (Fig 5A, 5B and Table S2). There were notably no shared DEGs between *sxi1*αΔ and *sxi2***a**Δ (Fig

5C). Amt2 (CNJ01880) [55], homologous to a well-characterized ammonium permease required for mating

under low-nitrogen conditions in *C. neoformans*, was upregulated in the *sxi1*αΔ mutant. Gene ontology

(GO) enrichment analysis of the identified DEGs in the *sxi1*αΔ mutant revealed two significantly enriched

terms, *nucleobase transport* and *transmembrane transport* (S12A Fig), whereas no significant enrichment

was observed for DEGs from the *sxi2***a**Δ mutant.

SXI1α and SXI2a have distinct and overlapping transcriptional effects in unisexual and α x a sexual crosses

Given the apparent α- and **a**- specific transcriptional roles of *SXI1*α and *SXI2***a** during unisexual reproduction, we next questioned whether these transcription factors may also function independently of one another, in addition to their known function as a heterodimer, during α x **a** sexual reproduction. We compared transcriptional changes in α x **a** crosses of opposite mating type XL280 parents deficient for one (unilateral cross) or both (bilateral cross) transcription factors. Comparing all mutant crosses to the wildtype cross XL280α x XL280**a**, we identified 336, 190, and 202 DEGs in *sxi1*αΔ x XL280**a**, XL280α x *sxi2***a**Δ, and *sxi1*αΔ x *sxi2***a**Δ, respectively (Table S2). In contrast to the solo-cultures undergoing unisexual reproduction, where the sets of DEGs were markedly smaller and primarily upregulated in *sxi1*αΔ and *sxi2***a**Δ relative to wildtype, DEGs had both increased and decreased expression relative to the XL280α x XL280**a** co-culture cross (Fig 5D-5F). GO term enrichment analysis revealed that DEGs from the unilateral cross *sxi1*αΔ x XL280**a** were predominantly associated with carbohydrate transport and metabolism, including monosaccharide, hexose, and glucose transmembrane transport, as well as carbohydrate catabolic processes (S12B Fig). The unilateral cross XL280α x *sxi2***a**Δ showed enrichment for broader carbohydrate metabolic and catabolic processes (S12B Fig). In the bilateral mutant cross *sxi1*αΔ x *sxi2***a**Δ, enriched terms were similar to those in the *sxi1*αΔ unilateral cross, with strong representation of carbohydrate transport, catabolism, and glucose-related processes (S12B Fig). These results suggest that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** are involved in broad metabolic regulation during sexual reproduction, evidencing their functionality beyond processes directly implicated in sexual development. Further, observations that deletion of *SXI1*α has a more pronounced impact on carbohydrate-related pathways during mating compared to deletion of *SXI2***a** provide additional support for the existence of distinct roles for these transcription factors.

There were eight DEGs in common between solo *sxi1*αΔ cultures and the *sxi1*αΔ x XL280**a** cross and five DEGs in common between solo *sxi2***a**Δ and the XL280α x *sxi2***a**Δ cross (Fig 5G and 5H). These genes are largely uncharacterized, with functions that remain unknown, except for *DHA1* (CND04870) [56], a secreted protein whose expression is regulated by copper availability and which was identified as a DEG in both modes of sexual reproduction in the *sxi2***a**Δ mutant. Comparison of the predicted protein sequences

of these shared genes with *S. cerevisiae* proteins shows potential orthologs with roles in metabolic

processes (Table S3).

Given the enrichment for metabolic processes in the transcriptomic data, we used Biolog YT

phenotypic plates to assess whether these changes translated into altered substrate utilization [57,58]. The

Biolog YT panel is specifically designed for yeast metabolic phenotyping and contains 94 wells, each

preloaded with a different carbon source, enabling comprehensive assessment of both respiratory and

growth-based metabolic activity over time. PCA of metabolic activity at 72, 96, and 120 h showed partial

separation between *sxi1α*Δ and XL280α (PC1 = 24.4% variance) (S13A Fig), with PERMANOVA confirming

a significant difference (R^2 = 0.123, p = 0.026). *sxi2***a**Δ and XL280**a** showed greater overlap (PC1 = 43%)

(S13B Fig), with no significant difference (R^2 = 0.057, p = 0.389). To pinpoint the substrates contributing to

these differences, pairwise t-tests were performed for each carbon source at each time point. In the *sxi1α*Δ

mutant, significant differences (p < 0.05) compared to XL280α were observed for utilization of D-gluconic

acid, D-sorbitol, L-malic acid, N-acetyl-L-glutamic acid plus D-xylose, and palatinose at one or more tested

time points (S14 Fig). In the *sxi2***a**Δ mutant, utilization of β-methyl-D-glucoside, gentibiose, quinic acid plus

D-xylose, D-galactose, D-raffinose, D-sorbitol, and dextrin differed significantly from XL280**a** in at least one

of the tested time points (S15 Fig). These phenotypic differences in carbon source utilization are consistent

with the RNA-seq GO term enrichment results, which indicated that the Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** mutations affect

genes involved in carbohydrate transport and metabolism.

The identification of shared DEGs between unisexual and α x **a** sexual crosses indicates that Sxi1α,

and potentially Sxi2**a**, could have distinct transcriptional effects from their heterodimer interacting partner.

These observations, coupled with the computational prediction and yeast two-hybrid assays that Sxi2**a** may

be capable of forming homodimers, led us to question the extent of Sxi1α- and Sxi2**a**-dependent

transcriptional effects occurring independently of the presence of a functional heterodimer interacting

partner during α x **a** crosses. To differentiate between transcriptional events dependent on the Sxi1α-Sxi2**a**

heterodimer as opposed to only Sxi1α or only Sxi2**a**, we examined the direction of differential expression

in DEGs identified in one or more crosses (Fig 6A). Compared to the XL280α x XL280**a** cross, candidate

heterodimer-regulated genes should undergo either a positive (heterodimer-repressed) or negative

(heterodimer-activated) change in expression in crosses lacking *SXI1*α, *SXI2***a**, or both (Fig 6A, top panel).

By these criteria, we identified 57 and 65 potential heterodimer-repressed and -activated genes,

respectively (Fig 6A, top panel). Consistent with previous reports [26,29], *CLP1* (CNB01190) was among

the set of heterodimer-activated genes. We next reasoned that any genes whose expression depends only

on Sxi1α would have either increased (Sxi1α-repressed) or decreased (Sxi1α-activated) expression relative

to wildtype in the *sxi1α*Δ x XL280**a** cross, but no expression change in the XL280α x *sxi2***a**Δ cross because

XL280α has a functional copy of Sxi1α (Fig 6A, middle panel). Strikingly, we identified a larger gene set

that fit these criteria than potential heterodimer-regulated genes, with 78 and 109 Sxi1α-activated and -

repressed DEGs, respectively (Fig 6A, middle panel). Lastly, we applied similar reasoning to identify DEGs

whose expression depends only on a functional copy of *SXI2***a** (Fig 6A, bottom panel). From this

comparison, we identified 14 and 27 potential Sxi2**a**-activated and -repressed genes, respectively (Fig 6A,

bottom panel). Surprisingly, *CPR2* (CNB04250) [27], a gene thought to be activated by the Sxi1α-Sxi2**a**

heterodimer, was present in the set of 27 genes with potential Sxi2**a**-dependent activation.

_SXI1_α and _SXI2_a have distinct regulatory effects on the α and a _MAT_ loci

We observed an enrichment of *MAT*α and *MAT***a** genes in the Sxi1α- and Sxi2**a**-only dependent

sets of DEGs compared to the heterodimer set, in which only two genes (*MF***a***1* and *MF***a***2*) were predicted

to be heterodimer repressed (Fig 6A, top panel). Plotting expression change in all crosses for the *MAT*α

and *MAT***a** loci revealed an even more surprising pattern, where a majority of genes in each locus appear

to be controlled by Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** in opposing directions. *MAT*α genes tend to have increased expression

in the absence of Sxi1α and decreased expression in the absence of Sxi2**a**, suggesting a negative

regulatory role for Sxi1α and a positive regulatory role for Sxi2**a** (Fig. 6B). Conversely, *MAT***a** genes

generally have positive expression changes in the absence of Sxi2**a** and negative expression changes in

the absence of Sxi1α (Fig. 6C). In the case of *MAT***a** genes, expression differences in the *sxi1α*Δ x *sxi2***a**Δ

crosses more closely mirror those in the XL280α x *sxi2***a**Δ than in *sxi1α*Δ x XL280**a**. Therefore, while *sxi2***a**Δ

may result in a smaller set of uniquely differentially expressed genes, Sxi2**a** may have an important role in

driving *MAT***a** gene expression change in opposition to Sxi1α. Taken together, these results support distinct

roles for *SXI1*α and *SXI2***a** in both mating-type-specific and more general gene regulation.

Discussion

The AlphaFold3-predicted heterodimer structure of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** closely resembles the yeast **a**1-α2 complex [40] and the predicted *U. maydis* bW-bE heterodimer, consistent with prior studies [2,22]. This apparent conservation across diverse yeast species supports an evolutionarily important role of the Sxi1α-Sxi2**a** complex in α x **a** mating. Lower-confidence predictions indicate that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** may also form homodimers, similar to α2 in *S. cerevisiae*, raising the possibility of independent, non-heterodimer functions. Importantly, results from yeast two-hybrid assay support functional asymmetry between the two HD proteins. Whereas HD2 Sxi2**a** appears capable of forming a homodimer, comparable homodimerization by HD1 Sxi1α has not been observed. This distinction suggests that Sxi2**a** may possess a greater capacity for autonomous regulatory activity, while Sxi1α may depend more strongly on alternative co-factors or context-specific interactions. Such asymmetry provides a potential mechanistic explanation for the opposing and gene-specific regulatory effects of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** observed across multiple mating contexts. Interestingly, homodimerization of HD2 has been reported in the homothallic fungus *Cystofilobasidium capitatum*, where HD2 homodimers can substitute for the canonical HD1-HD2 heterodimer and thereby provide an alternative mechanism for regulating sexual reproduction [59]. Likewise, in the basidiomycetous yeast *Phaffia rhodozyma*, the homeodomain proteins HD1 and HD2 display only a weak heterodimer interaction, while experimental assays revealed potential homodimer formation [60]. In contrast, in *Ustilago maydis* the bE and bW homeodomain transcription factors strictly function through non-self heterodimerization, and no evidence for functional homodimerization has been found [61]. These examples suggest that HD homodimerization, although rare, may provide lineage-specific solutions for regulating sexual development. Together with our transcriptomic findings, this led us to hypothesize that these transcription factors can act both together and separately, whether as homodimers or by another means regulating mating before and after cell-cell fusion in unisexual and α x **a** reproduction.

Our transcriptomic results provide further evidence for this model, as we observed Sxi2**a**-independent transcriptional regulation by Sxi1α and Sxi1α-independent regulation by Sxi2**a** in both unisexual and α x **a** sexual matings. In addition to regulating largely distinct gene sets, Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** exert contrasting effects on the two mating-type loci. We observed an enrichment of *MAT*α and *MAT***a** genes in the Sxi1α-only and Sxi2**a**-only dependent DEG sets in α x **a** crosses, whereas the heterodimer-

dependent set contained only two repressed genes (*MF**a***1* and *MF**a***2*). Strikingly, most *MAT*α genes

showed increased expression in the absence of *Sxi1*α but decreased expression in the absence of *Sxi2**a***,

suggesting that Sxi1α functions primarily as a negative regulator and Sxi2**a** as a positive regulator at this

locus. The pattern was reversed for *MAT**a*** genes, with *Sxi1*α acting positively and *Sxi2**a*** negatively. These

results indicate that, beyond their shared role as a heterodimer, Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** also engage in mating-

type-specific regulatory programs that act in opposition to each other, potentially fine-tuning the expression

of *MAT*-linked genes during α x **a** sexual reproduction. Deletion of Sxi1α caused an increase in α-α cell

fusion, consistent with a functional role beyond that of Sxi1α-Sxi2**a** heterodimer. To further interpret the

molecular basis of altered fusion frequency, we considered transcriptional changes associated specifically

with fusion-competent mating conditions. Under these conditions, genes involved in pheromone sensing

and signaling, including the pheromone receptor gene *STE3* and multiple pheromone genes, were

upregulated, whereas canonical membrane fusion and karyogamy genes such as *PRM1* and *KAR5* [53]

did not show corresponding induction. This pattern suggests that enhanced fusion may arise from elevated

mating competence or increased responsiveness to pheromone cues rather than from direct transcriptional

activation of the fusion machinery itself. Such regulation at the level of upstream signaling could provide a

flexible mechanism for modulating fusion probability without broadly altering the core fusion apparatus.

These results support the possibility that Sxi1α may act independently of Sxi2**a**, and future work will

continue to explore potential co-factors/interacting partner(s). In α x **a** reproduction, both Sxi1α and Sxi2**a**

are essential for normal hyphal development and sporulation in multiple genetic backgrounds [2,22]. In

contrast, in the XL280 background, deletion of either gene did not impair unisexual colony morphology or

sporulation. These results, coupled with the observation of *SXI1*α - and *SXI2**a***-dependent transcriptional

activity during unisexual and α x **a** sexual reproduction, suggest that these transcription factors are active

but may play distinct roles in α x α and **a** x **a** versus α x **a** reproduction, and that unisexual reproduction is

likely regulated in a manner that is at least partially distinct from α x **a** sexual reproduction. This is also

consistent with recent reports that Sxi2**a** is dispensable for unisexual reproduction in *C. neoformans* [31].

Functional differences between the two HD proteins were most evident in unisexual fusion assays.

Sxi1α inhibited fusion in both unilateral and bilateral mutant crosses, whereas Sxi2**a** inhibition was observed

only in unilateral crosses. This may indicate that Sxi2**a** plays a less-prominent or context-dependent role

in **a** x **a** cell fusion, possibly masked in bilateral crosses by redundancy with other transcription factors.

Testing this possibility will require identifying Sxi2**a**'s non-Sxi1α partners and determining their contributions

to fusion regulation.

Our transcriptomic analysis identified distinct subsets of Sxi1α- and Sxi2**a**-regulated genes in both

unilateral and bilateral crosses. A majority of these genes remain uncharacterized, inviting future functional

investigation into their potential involvement in cell-cell fusion and sexual reproduction. Notably, GO term

enrichment highlighted metabolism-related processes, and Biolog YT plate profiling revealed subtle but

reproducible shifts in carbon source utilization between wildtype and mutants. Together, these findings

suggest that Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** influence metabolic pathways, which may, in turn, modulate mating efficiency

under nutrient-variable conditions, thereby linking metabolic state to the mating regulatory network and

highlighting carbohydrate metabolism as an important area for future investigation of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a**

function.

By analyzing 341 *MAT*α clinical and environmental isolates out of the total 387 isolates in the *C.*

neoformans Strain Diversity Collection [33] through a similar pipeline [62] as reported in our previous work

[63], we found there were only two closely related environmental isolates (Muc504-1 and Muc489-1) that

harbored an identical high-impact nonsense mutation in the *SXI1*α gene, resulting in truncation of the C-

terminal 23 amino acids. The widespread conservation of this gene suggests that it is under positive

selection and likely has important functions in a variety of ecological contexts. Unisexual reproduction,

which allows cells to produce stress-resistant spores under harsh environmental conditions in the absence

of an opposite mating type partner, provides one hypothetical avenue by which sex-specific genes like

*SXI1*α could continue to be selected for in a predominantly *MAT*α population. While the inhibitory role of

Sxi1α on unisexual α-α fusion could, in principle, be expected to limit the expansion of *MAT*α lineages and

favor *MAT***a** cells, this prediction appears inconsistent with the observed predominance of *MAT*α in natural

populations. This paradox suggests that additional mechanisms beyond Sxi1α regulation must contribute

to shaping the observed mating-type distribution. Further studies are needed to clarify the downstream

regulators involved in the novel repressive role of Sxi1α in unisexual reproduction and other potential

mating-independent functions. These lines of investigation have the potential to elucidate fitness-

enhancing strategies employed by this organism to undergo unisexual meiosis and produce infectious

spores. Over evolutionary time, it is conceivable that selection for alternative reproductive strategies such

as unisexual reproduction could have contributed to the widespread dominance of *MAT*α strains. In this

context, we speculate that repression of α–α cell fusion by the α-specific homeodomain protein Sxi1α

represents a *Cryptococcus*-specific evolutionary adaptation that fine-tunes unisexual development to permit

efficient spore production in the absence of a conidiospore-based asexual program. Such a mechanism

may balance the selective advantage of abundant basidiospore formation with controlled mating behavior

under partner-limited conditions.

In *S. cerevisiae*, the α2 transcription factor functions both as a homodimer and heterodimer with

a1, playing key roles in mating-type regulation [6–9]. The transcriptional regulation of **a**-specific and

haploid-specific genes involves interactions with the transcription factor Mcm1 [6,43]. Given this precedent,

a similar dual functionality with/without mating partner may exist for the sex-specific HD transcription factor

Sxi1α in *Cryptococcus*, and non-Sxi2**a** interacting partners may exist. Interestingly, orthologs of *S.*

cerevisiae Mcm1 are also present in *C. neoformans* and *C. deneoformans*, where they have been reported

to function in α x **a** sexual reproduction [49]. However, our functional analysis suggests that the

Cryptococcus Mcm1 ortholog does not play a central role in *Cryptococcus* mating under the conditions

examined. In contrast to its well-established function in budding yeast, loss of Mcm1 did not result in clear

defects in unisexual or α x **a** sexual reproduction. Together with the absence of strong evidence for direct

association with either Sxi1α or Sxi2**a**, these observations indicate that *Cryptococcus* mating circuits have

diverged substantially from the canonical budding yeast α2–Mcm1 regulatory framework, relying instead

on alternative or redundant transcriptional circuits. Our results suggest that Sxi1α might act as both a

positive (e.g., in α x **a** mating development) and a negative regulator (e.g., in α x α cell fusion and over

transcription of certain *MAT* genes) [23]. This phenomenon is reminiscent of the mitogen-activated protein

kinase Kss1 in *S. cerevisiae*, which regulates pseudohyphal differentiation through complex signaling

mechanisms and functions as a multifunctional regulator in fungal development with counter-balanced

positive and negative roles [64]. Efforts to identify potential Sxi1α - and Sxi2**a** - specific transcription factor

binding sites in the promoter regions of differentially expressed genes were not successful, likely due to the

presence of numerous derivative consensus sequences (similar to what has previously been observed in

C. neoformans), as well as the potential activation of regulatory cascades as a result of changes in Sxi1α

and Sxi2**a** activity, meaning that many promoters of DEGs are not bound by the homeodomain proteins themselves. Future efforts to elucidate direct targets of the heterodimer and putative homodimers will involve ChIP-seq–based experimental validation of binding sites in the presence and absence of each transcription factor, ideally integrated with transcriptomic analyses to distinguish direct from indirect regulatory effects.

While the HD proteins Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** are dispensable for colony morphology, sporulation, and cell viability during unisexual reproduction, Sxi1α plays a key inhibitory role in α x α cell fusion, and the contribution of Sxi2**a** to this process appears to be more limited. RNA-seq analysis further revealed that the heterodimer partners also have distinct and independent regulatory programs, supporting functional roles beyond their shared activity as a complex. These findings suggest that Sxi1α may have novel functions during *Cryptococcus* mating that are yet to be characterized, potentially analogous to those in other well studied fungal species, and highlight an additional facet in the complex regulation of sexual reproduction in this important human fungal pathogen. Our findings also raise important questions regarding the functional conservation of sex-specific homeodomain proteins in ascomycetes and basidiomycetes. Future studies will investigate protein complexes involving Sxi1α, Sxi2**a**, and additional interacting partners to elucidate the extent of conservation with well-characterized homeodomain complexes such as **a**1-α2 in *S. cerevisiae*. Collectively, these findings support a model in which Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** act through partially independent regulatory programs that modulate pheromone signaling, transcriptional responsiveness, and developmental timing, rather than functioning exclusively as an obligate heterodimeric switch. Taken together, our findings demonstrate that gene regulation by Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** is more complex than previously appreciated and provide a foundation for future molecular analyses aimed at further delineating the *Cryptococcus* developmental program.

Materials and methods

Fungal strains and growth conditions

C. deneoformans and *C. neoformans* strains for this study are listed in Table S4. The strains were

stored in 15% glycerol at -80°C for long-term storage. Fresh strains were streaked from glycerol stocks

and maintained on solid YPD medium (1% yeast extract, 2% Bacto Peptone, 2% dextrose) at 30°C.

Spot dilution assays were performed with overnight cultures of the tested strains grown in liquid

YPD at 30°C. Strains were diluted to an OD_{600} of 0.5 in sterile water. These cultures were further serially

diluted 5-fold and spotted (3 µL for each dilution) onto YPD plates. The plates were incubated at 30°C and

37°C (testing thermotolerance) for 2 days before imaging.

Protein structural predictions

Protein structure predictions were made with AlphaFold3 [65] on the AlphaFold server

(https://alphafoldserver.com/). The predicted models and error plots were further processed with Chimera

X (v 1.9) [66] for predicted local distance difference test (pLDDT) value filtering, alignment, and visualization.

Yeast two-hybrid assay

Sxi1α, Sxi2**a**, and Sxi2**a**N constructs were generated previously [2]. Briefly, *SXI1*α and *SXI2***a**

coding sequences from XL280 were cloned from cDNA into Gal4 DNA-binding domain (GBD) and Gal4

activation domain (GAD) vectors, and truncated *SXI2***a** fragments were generated by PCR amplification of

the defined N-terminal region (encoding amino acids 1-217). For this study, the putative *C. deneoformans*

MCM1 coding sequence was amplified from XL280 cDNA and cloned into GBD and GAD vectors to

generate yeast two-hybrid constructs. All previously generated and newly constructed plasmids were

sequence-verified prior to use (Table S4). Reporter strains Y2HGold and Y187 were transformed with

plasmids via the high-efficiency transformation method [67]. Diploids were generated by mating and

selected for on synthetic dextrose (SD) dropout medium (0.67% yeast nitrogen base, 2% dextrose) minus

leucine and tryptophan. Adenine sulfate was added to the medium at a concentration of 20 mg/L, and

amino acids and uracil were included at standard concentrations to support auxotrophic growth

requirements. Gal4-dependent activation of *ADE2* and *HIS3* reporter genes was assessed by growth on

SD medium additionally lacking adenine or histidine, respectively. β-galactosidase activity was measured

using a chlorophenol red-β-D-galactopyranoside (CPRG)–based liquid assay (OZ Biosciences) according

to the manufacturer's instructions. Absorbance was measured at 595 nm, and enzyme activity (milliunits)

was calculated based on a linear standard curve.

Gene deletion and confirmation

Approximately 1.0 kb 5' and 3' flanking regions of the *SXI1*α gene and 60 bp 5' and 3' flanking

regions of the *SXI2***a** and *MCM1* gene were constructed with primers listed in Table S5 to target their

respective genes in XL280 for homologous recombination [46]. Overlap PCR with a selectable marker was

used to construct the DNA donor with 1.0 kb homology, while 60 bp microhomology was included in the

primers for donor amplification. *C. neoformans* codon optimized Cas9, gRNAs (a single gRNA targeting

*SXI1*α and two gRNAs targeting *SXI2***a**), and drug resistance cassettes (*NAT* from pAI3 or *NEO* from pJAF1)

containing homologous flanking sequences were introduced into XL280 wildtype strains via the previously

reported Transient CRISPR-Cas9 Coupled with Electroporation (TRACE) system [38,39]. Transformants

were screened with PCR internal to the ORF, and 5′ and 3′ junction PCR to the drug resistance marker

integration sites to confirm integration at the genomic locus. Illumina whole-genome sequencing was

performed on positive transformants with Novaseq X Plus platform (2x150 bp). The sequencing reads were

mapped to a modified version of the XL280α genome [54] with the Burrows-Wheeler Alignment tool (BWA)

(v 0.7.17) [68] to further confirm the deletion mutant strains. The modification included adding the *MAT***a**

locus sequence of JEC20 (GenBank: AF542530.2) as an additional contig.

H99 *mcm1*Δ was obtained from [49] and crossed with KN99**a** to obtain KN99**a** *Mcm1*Δ. Both

mutants were verified by internal PCR targeting the *MCM1* ORF with the primers listed in Table S5.

Capsule formation and melanin production assays

Tested strains, with an initial OD_{600} of 0.1 in 4 mL liquid RPMI medium (RPMI 1640 with 2%

dextrose), were incubated on a roller drum at 70 rpm and 30°C for 3 days. After washing and resuspension

in water, the cells were negatively stained with an equal volume of India ink to visualize the capsules.

To assess melanin production, overnight saturated cultures of test strains were spotted (10 µL)

onto Niger seed agar plates (7% Niger seed, 0.1% dextrose). The Niger seed plates were incubated at

30°C and 37°C for 8 days before photographing.

Competition assays

Overnight cultures of tested strains grown in liquid YPD at 30°C were diluted to OD_{600} of 0.2 and

equally mixed in a 1:1 ratio in 5 mL of liquid YPD for co-culture. *sxi1α::NAT* mutants (resistant to NAT)

and *sxi2a*Δ*::NEO* mutants (resistant to NEO) were mixed with XL280α and XL280**a**, respectively. The

mixture was plated on YPD plates, YPD + nourseothricin (NAT), and YPD + neomycin (NEO) to confirm

starting ratio. After 24 and 48 hours of co-culture, an aliquot of the mixture was sampled, and plating was

repeated with OD_{600} diluted to 0.1 to track changes in relative abundance of mutants. Four independent

replicates were performed for each competition.

For the competition assay performed on MS medium, overnight cultures were similarly diluted to

OD_{600} of 1. *sxi1α::NAT* or *sxi2a*Δ*::NEO* mutants and the corresponding XL280 wildtype strain were equally

mixed in a 1:1 ratio and spotted on MS medium. Spores were dissected 10 to 14 days post spotting. Yeast

cells from internal regions were also collected. Spores or yeast cells were further transferred to YPD+NAT,

YPD+NEO and YPD to determine the ratio of mutants in the population. Five independent spots were

investigated for each competition.

Mating and cell-cell fusion assay

Mating plates were set up as described previously [69]. α x α and **a** x **a** unisexual reproduction

assays were performed on Murashige and Skoog (MS, Sigma, USA) plates for 1 to 2 weeks before imaging

and dissection. Basidiospores generated during unisexual reproduction were randomly dissected and

plated on YPD plates for 2 to 3 days to determine spore viability and germination rates.

Cell-cell fusion frequency during α x α unisexual outcrossing in XL280α *NAT* (XL561 and XL562)

and XL280α *NEO* (XL563 and XL564) was compared to bilateral mutant crosses of *sxi1α::NAT* and *sxi1α*:

NEO or unilateral crosses of *sxi1α::NAT* and XL280α *NEO*. Similarly, **a** x **a** unisexual outcrossing in

XL280**a** *NAT* (CF1816) and XL280**a** *NEO* (JHG223) was compared to bilateral mutant crosses of

*sxi2**a**Δ::NAT* and *sxi2**a**Δ::NEO* or unilateral crosses of *sxi2**a**Δ::NAT* and XL280**a** *NEO* or *sxi2**a**Δ::NEO* and

XL280**a** *NAT*.

Cells were diluted in sterile water to an OD_{600} of 1. Two *MAT*α strains (α x α outcrossing) or *MAT***a**

strains (**a** x **a** outcrossing) containing either *NAT* or *NEO* resistance cassettes were mixed equally with

JEC20 (*MAT***a**) or JEC21 (*MAT*α) for Ménage à trois matings on V8 agar (pH=7) and incubated for 72 hours

in the dark at room temperature. The cells were then collected and plated on YPD + NAT (100 µg/mL) +

NEO (200 µg/mL) and YPD alone to determine the ratio of colonies with dual resistance four to five days

post-plating (i.e., fusion product) out of the total cells. Genotypes at mating type locus of the fusion products

was validated via *STE20***a** or *STE20*α genotyping PCR.

Flow cytometry analysis

Ploidy of the fusion products from α x α or **a** x **a** cell fusion was determined by fluorescence-

activated cell sorting (FACS) analysis as previously described [70]. Cells were grown overnight on solid

YPD medium at 30 °C, harvested, and washed with 1 mL PBS. The cells were fixed in 70% ethanol at 4 °C

overnight, pelleted and washed with 1 x NS buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH=7.5, 0.25 M sucrose, 1 mM EDTA,

1 mM $MgCl_2$, 0.13 mM $CaCl_2$, 0.1 mM $ZnCl_2$, 0.5 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride, 7 mM β-

mercaptoethanol). Samples were treated with RNase A (1.05 mg/mL) and stained with propidium iodide

(PI, 30 µg/mL) in a total volume of 200 µL 1x NS solution. Stained cells were diluted in 1x Tris-PI buffer

(0.964 M Tris-HCl pH=7.5, 35 µg/mL PI) prior to analysis. FACS was performed at Duke Cancer Institute

Flow Cytometry Core Facility with approximately 10,000 cells analyzed per sample. Flow cytometry data

were visualized using FlowJo (v.10.10.0).

Light and scanning electron microscopy (SEM)

Mating structures from MS plates were imaged with an AxioSkop 2 fluorescence microscope to

visualize hyphae, basidia and basidiospores under brightfield. SEM samples were prepared following a

previously described protocol [50] with minor modifications. Briefly, a ~2 cm x 2 cm agar plug containing

patch of mated cells from MS plates was fixed in PBS containing 4% formaldehyde and 2% glutaraldehyde

at 4°C for 2 hours. The fixed samples were then gradually dehydrated in a graded ethanol series (30%,

50%, 70%, 95%), with each step performed at 4°C for 15 min. This was followed by three washes in 100%

ethanol, each at 4°C for 15 min. The samples were further dehydrated with a Ladd CPD3 Critical Point

Dryer and subsequently coated with a thin layer of gold with a Denton Desk V Sputter Coater (Denton

Vacuum, USA). Hyphae, basidia and basidiospores were observed with a scanning electron microscope

equipped with an EDS detector (Apreo S, ThermoFisher, USA).

RNA preparation and sequencing

For Ménage à trois matings, cells were diluted in sterile water to an OD_{600} of 1. Two *MAT*α strains

(α x α outcrossing) containing either *NAT* or *NEO* resistance cassettes were mixed equally with JEC20

(*MAT***a**) on V8 agar (pH = 7) and incubated for 72 hours in the dark at room temperature after harvesting.

Three biological replicates were performed for each strain or mating pair. Harvested samples were

lyophilized and processed for RNA extraction using the RNeasy Mini Kit (Qiagen), following the

manufacturer's instructions. Library preparation and sequencing was performed by Plasmidsaurus (USA).

RNA libraries were generated from total RNA using a strand-specific 3' end counting protocol with unique

molecular identifiers (UMIs) to enable accurate transcript abundance quantification

(https://plasmidsaurus.com/rna). Libraries were sequenced on the Illumina platform, yielding deduplicated

3' end enriched reads for gene expression analysis.

For both unisexual and α x **a** sexual crosses, strains were collected from 2 to 3-day-old cultures

grown on solid YPD medium and diluted to an OD_{600} of 1. For unisexual crosses, 10 µL of the diluted culture

($OD_{600=}$1) was spotted onto V8 agar plates (pH= 7), with 10 spots per plate and three technical replicate

plates per biological replicate. For α x **a** crosses, equal volumes of *MAT*α and *MAT***a** cell suspensions

(each at $OD_{600=}$1) were mixed prior to spotting under the same conditions. Three biological replicates were

performed for each strain or mating pair. Plates were incubated at room temperature for 72 hours in the

dark, after which cells were washed off and collected. Harvested samples were lyophilized and processed

for RNA extraction using the RNeasy Mini Kit (Qiagen), following the manufacturer's instructions.

RNA was sequenced by the Duke University Sequencing and Genomic Technologies Core Facility.

Poly-A enriched libraries were prepared from samples with RIN ≥ 7 using the Kapa mRNA-seq HyperPrep

kit (Kapa Bioscience). Pooled libraries were sequenced on an Illumina Novaseq X Plus instrument in 150

bp paired-end reads.

RNA-sequencing data analysis

762   For Plasmidsaurus RNA-seq, data was analyzed following Plasmidsaurus's instructions. Briefly,

raw reads were quality filtered by fastp (v0.24.0) [71], then aligned to the XL280α reference genome with

an additional *MAT***a** sequences from JEC20 using STAR aligner (v.2.7.11b) [72], with non-canonical splice

junction disallowed. PCR duplication was removed through UMI-based deduplication with UMIcollapse

(v1.1.0) [73]. Alignment quality metrics, strand specificity, and read distribution across genomic features

including enrichment toward transcript 3' ends were assessed using RSeQC (v5.0.4) [74] and Qualimap

(v2.3) [75], with results aggregated into a comprehensive quality control report using MultiQC (v1.32) [76].

Gene-level expression quantification was performed by using featureCounts (v2.1.1) [77]. PCA were

calculated on normalized counts (TMM, trimmed mean of M-values) using Pearson correlation. Differential

expression was done with edgeR [78] (v4.0.16) using standard practice including filtering for low-expressed

genes with edgeR::filterByExprwith default values. Differentially expressed genes (DEGs) were identified

using a significance threshold of adjusted p-value <= 0.05 and an absolute $\log_2$ fold change cutoff of 1.

FeatureCounts gene level counts were filtered and TMM normalized using edgeR, and $\log_2$ counts per

million (CPM) values were calculated. Significance was determined using Welch two sample t-tests with

Benjamini Hochberg false discovery rate correction.

777   For RNA-seq data from both unisexual and α x **a** sexual crosses, Illumina universal adaptors were

trimmed from paired reads with CutAdapt (v4.9) [79]. Trimmed reads were aligned to the XL280α + *MAT***a**

concatenated reference assembly. Modified assemblies with *MAT*α (Chr4 coordinates 1522691-1656182)

and *MAT***a** (MATa coordinates 0-148067) masked were generated by using the bedtools (v2.31.1)

maskfasta function on the concatenated assembly [80]. XL280α background unisexual crosses were

mapped to the *MAT***a**-masked assembly, XL280**a** background unisexual crosses to the *MAT*α-masked

assembly, and α-**a** sexual crosses to the full, unmasked assembly with HISAT2 (v2.2.1) [81]. Counts per

gene were quantified with featureCounts (v2.0.6) [77] with a gff annotation file generated by Liftoff (v1.6.3)

[82] of annotated features from JEC20 and JEC21 [83].

Exploratory data analysis and differential expression analysis were performed with DESeq2

(v1.44.0) [84]. Prior to analysis, transcript counts were normalized by transcripts per million (TPM) within

each replicate and genes with at least 1 TPM in 1 sample were retained. Clustering and principal

component analyses were performed using vst normalized values for the top 500 most variable genes

generated by DESeq2. Differential expression analysis was carried out in DESeq2 with alpha = 0.05 and

a log_2FC cutoff of +/- 1 was applied to identify DEGs from the resulting expression data. The R packages

EnhancedVolcano (v1.22.0) (https://github.com/kevinblighe/EnhancedVolcano) and pheatmap (v1.0.13)

(https://github.com/raivokolde/pheatmap) were used for data visualization. DEG sets were analyzed with

the FungiDB (https://fungidb.org/fungidb/app) GO Enrichment tool using the JEC21 genome as background.

Significance was assessed using Fisher's exact test with Benjamini-Hochberg correction, retaining terms

with FDR < 0.05. Enriched terms were visualized in RStudio as dot plots ranked by log_2(fold enrichment)

or FDR, colored by $-log_{10}$(FDR), and annotated with gene counts.

Biolog phenotypic assays

Overnight cultures grown on solid YM agar (5 g peptone, 3 g yeast extract, 3 g malt extract, 10 g

dextrose, 20g agar, pH=6.2) were collected and diluted in sterile water to an OD_{600} of 0.2. A volume of 100

µL of the diluted samples was inoculated into each well of the Biolog Yeast Identification Test Panel (YT

Microplate) and cultured at 28 °C in the dark. Three biological replicates were performed for each strain.

Cell growth was monitored daily with SpectraMax iD3 plate reader at OD_{590} (oxidation test) and

OD_{600} (Assimilation test). Growth on each substrate was normalized using the formula (Abs_sample -

Abs_water)/(Abs_glucose-Abs_water). Principal component analysis (PCA) was performed using scaled

data from Biolog YT plate assays. Differences in global metabolic profiles between genotypes were

assessed using PERMANOVA (adonis2 function, vegan R package), with 999 permutations and Euclidean

distance as the dissimilarity metric.

Statistical analysis

Spore germination and unisexual competitiveness were analyzed with paired or unpaired student

t-tests in Rstudio (version 2024.04.1) with the "t.test" function with argument "paired = TRUE" for paired

tests or "paired = FALSE" for unpaired tests.

Fusion efficiency data were analyzed in RStudio (version 2024.04.1). Welch's t-tests were

performed using the t.test function with the argument "var.equal = FALSE" to compare fusion rates between

selected sample groups. Mean values and standard deviations were plotted using ggplot2, with individual

data points overlaid.

Data availability

Raw WGS sequencing and RNA-seq reads have been deposited in Bioproject: PRJNA1219566. Scripts associated with RNA-seq data from both unisexual and α x **a** sexual crosses are available at: https://github.com/annalehmann/XL280_Sxi_transcriptome. Scripts related to Plasmidsaurus RNA-seq analysis are available at: https://github.com/Jhuang90/Huang-et-al.-Sxi1_Plasmidsaurus-RNA-seq-script.

Acknowledgments

We thank Anna Floyd Averette for constant support, Connor Larmore for critical reading, Dr. Marco Dias Coelho for constructive criticism on the manuscript and suggestions on data presentation, Moayad Shehadeh and Dr. Zhuyun Bian for technical support, and all of the members of the Heitman Lab for constructive suggestions. We also thank Dr. Xiaorong Lin (University of Georgia) for sharing the XL280 congenic strains, Dr. Ruiyun Zeng (North Carolina State University) for assistance in data visualization, Dr. Paul Magwene and Claudia Zirión Martinez (Department of Biology, Duke) for sharing unpublished pipeline for variant detection from Strain Diversity Collection, Dr. Bin Li (Duke Cancer Institute Flow Cytometry Core Facility), Julian Liber (Department of Biology, Duke), and Dr. Devi Swain Lenz (Duke's Sequencing and Genomic Technologies Core Facility) for advice and expertise.

Funding

This study was supported by NIH/NIAID R01 grants (AI039115-28, AI050113-20, and AI133654-07. to J. Heitman) J. Heitman is co-director and fellow of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (CIFAR) program Fungal Kingdom: Threats & Opportunities. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests

I have read the journal's policy and the authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests:. All other authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

References

1. Coelho MA, David-Palma M, Marincowitz S, Aylward J, Pham NQ, Yurkov AM, et al. Tracing the evolution and genomic dynamics of mating-type loci in *Cryptococcus* pathogens and closely related species. bioRxiv; 2025. doi:10.1101/2025.02.12.637874

2. Hull CM, Boily M-J, Heitman J. Sex-Specific homeodomain proteins Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** coordinately regulate sexual development in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. Eukaryot Cell. 2005;4: 526–535. doi:10.1128/EC.4.3.526-535.2005

3. Yadav V, Sun S, Heitman J. On the evolution of variation in sexual reproduction through the prism of eukaryotic microbes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2023;120: e2219120120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2219120120

4. Goutte C, Johnson AD. a1 protein alters the dna binding specificity of α2 repressor. Cell. 1988;52: 875–882. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(88)90429-1

5. Li T, Stark MR, Johnson AD, Wolberger C. Crystal structure of the MATa1/MATα2 homeodomain heterodimer bound to DNA. Science. 1995;270: 262–269. doi:10.1126/science.270.5234.262

6. Keleher CA, Goutte C, Johnson AD. The yeast cell-type-specific repressor α2 acts cooperatively with a non-cell-type-specific protein. Cell. 1988;53: 927–936. doi:10.1016/S0092-8674(88)90449-7

7. Herskowitz I. A regulatory hierarchy for cell specialization in yeast. Nature. 1989;342: 749–757. doi:10.1038/342749a0

8. Goutte C, Johnson AD. Yeast a1 and α2 homeodomain proteins form a DNA-binding activity with properties distinct from those of either protein. Journal of Molecular Biology. 1993;233: 359–371. doi:10.1006/jmbi.1993.1517

9. Dranginis AM. Binding of yeast a1 and α2 as a heterodimer to the operator DNA of a haploid-specific gene. Nature. 1990;347: 682–685. doi:10.1038/347682a0

10. Gillissen B, Bergemann J, Sandmann C, Schroeer B, Bölker M, Kahmann R. A two-component regulatory system for self/non-self recognition in *Ustilago maydis*. Cell. 1992;68: 647–657. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(92)90141-X

11. Kämper J, Reichmann M, Romeis T, Bölker M, Kahmann R. Multiallelic recognition: Nonself-dependent dimerization of the bE and bW homeodomain proteins in *Ustilago maydis*. Cell. 1995;81: 73–83. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(95)90372-0

12. Wahl R, Zahiri A, Kämper J. The *Ustilago maydis b* mating type locus controls hyphal
proliferation and expression of secreted virulence factors *in planta*. Molecular
Microbiology. 2010;75: 208–220. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2958.2009.06984.x

13. Vollmeister E, Schipper K, Baumann S, Haag C, Pohlmann T, Stock J, et al. Fungal
development of the plant pathogen *Ustilago maydis*. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2012;36:
59–77. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6976.2011.00296.x

14. Kües U, Göttgens B, Stratmann R, Richardson WV, O'Shea SF, Casselton LA. A
chimeric homeodomain protein causes self-compatibility and constitutive sexual
development in the mushroom *Coprinus cinereus*. EMBO J. 1994;13: 4054–4059.
doi:10.1002/j.1460-2075.1994.tb06722.x

15. Francisco EC, de Jong AW, Hagen F. Cryptococcosis and *Cryptococcus*.
Mycopathologia. 2021;186: 729–731. doi:10.1007/s11046-021-00577-7

16. Brown GD, Ballou ER, Bates S, Bignell EM, Borman AM, Brand AC, et al. The
pathobiology of human fungal infections. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2024;22: 687–704.
doi:10.1038/s41579-024-01062-w

17. Sun S, Coelho MA, David-Palma M, Priest SJ, Heitman J. The evolution of sexual
reproduction and the mating-type Locus: links to pathogenesis of *Cryptococcus*
human pathogenic fungi. Annu Rev Genet. 2019;53: 417–444. doi:10.1146/annurev-
genet-120116-024755

18. Bian Z, Xu Z, Peer A, Choi Y, Priest SJ, Akritidou K, et al. Essential genes encoded by the
mating-type locus of the human fungal pathogen *Cryptococcus neoformans*.
Genetics; 2024. doi:10.1101/2024.12.02.626420

19. Sun S, Coelho MA, David-Palma M, Huang J, Bian Z, Heitman J. Fungal sexual
reproduction and mating-type loci. Current Biology. 2025;35: R496–R503.
doi:10.1016/j.cub.2025.04.061

20. Kwon-Chung KJ, Bennett JE. Distribution of alpha and alpha mating types of
Cryptococcus neoformans among natural and clinical isolates. American Journal of
Epidemiology. 1978;108: 337–340. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a112628

21. Yan Z, Hull CM, Heitman J, Sun S, Xu J. *SXI1*α controls uniparental mitochondrial
inheritance in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. Current Biology. 2004;14: R743–R744.
doi:10.1016/j.cub.2004.09.008

22. Hull CM, Davidson RC, Heitman J. Cell identity and sexual development in
Cryptococcus neoformans are controlled by the mating-type-specific homeodomain
protein Sxi1α. Genes Dev. 2002;16: 3046–3060. doi:10.1101/gad.1041402

23. Hull CM, Cox GM, Heitman J. The α-specific cell identity factor Sxi1α is not required for
virulence of *Cryptococcus neoformans*. Infect Immun. 2004;72: 3643–3645.
doi:10.1128/IAI.72.6.3643-3645.2004

24. Sun S, Fu C, Ianiri G, Heitman J. The pheromone and pheromone receptor mating-type
locus is involved in controlling uniparental mitochondrial inheritance in
Cryptococcus. Genetics. 2020;214: 703–717. doi:10.1534/genetics.119.302824

25. Hsueh Y-P, Fraser JA, Heitman J. Transitions in sexuality: recapitulation of an ancestral
tri- and tetrapolar mating system in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. Eukaryot Cell. 2008;7:
1847–1855. doi:10.1128/EC.00271-08

26. Ekena JL, Stanton BC, Schiebe-Owens JA, Hull CM. Sexual development in
Cryptococcus neoformans requires *CLP1* , a target of the homeodomain transcription
factors Sxi1α and Sxi2**a**. Eukaryot Cell. 2008;7: 49–57. doi:10.1128/EC.00377-07

27. Hsueh Y-P, Xue C, Heitman J. A constitutively active GPCR governs morphogenic
transitions in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. EMBO J. 2009;28: 1220–1233.
doi:10.1038/emboj.2009.68

28. Heimel K, Scherer M, Schuler D, Kämper J. The *Ustilago maydis* Clp1 protein
orchestrates pheromone and *b* -dependent signaling pathways to coordinate the cell
cycle and pathogenic development. The Plant Cell. 2010;22: 2908–2922.
doi:10.1105/tpc.110.076265

29. Mead ME, Stanton BC, Kruzel EK, Hull CM. Targets of the Sex Inducer homeodomain
proteins are required for fungal development and virulence in *Cryptococcus*
neoformans. Mol Microbiol. 2015;95: 804–818. doi:10.1111/mmi.12898

30. Lin X, Hull CM, Heitman J. Sexual reproduction between partners of the same mating
type in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. Nature. 2005;434: 1017–1021.
doi:10.1038/nature03448

31. Sun S, Bian Z, Xu Z, Choi Y, Heitman J. Unisexual reproduction in the global human
fungal pathogen *Cryptococcus neoformans*. bioRxiv; 2025.
doi:10.1101/2025.06.02.657540

32. Sun S, Roth C, Floyd Averette A, Magwene PM, Heitman J. Epistatic genetic
interactions govern morphogenesis during sexual reproduction and infection in a
global human fungal pathogen. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2022;119: e2122293119.
doi:10.1073/pnas.2122293119

33. Desjardins CA, Giamberardino C, Sykes SM, Yu C-H, Tenor JL, Chen Y, et al. Population
genomics and the evolution of virulence in the fungal pathogen *Cryptococcus*
neoformans. Genome Res. 2017;27: 1207–1219. doi:10.1101/gr.218727.116

34. Hitchcock M, Thorn V, Samarasinghe H, Sun S, Heitman J, Xu J. Genomic evidence for
a-α heterothallic and α-α unisexual mating and recombination in an environmental
Cryptococcus deneoformans population. Wang L, editor. PLoS Genet. 2025;21:
e1011844. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1011844

35. Sun S, Billmyre RB, Mieczkowski PA, Heitman J. Unisexual reproduction drives meiotic
recombination and phenotypic and karyotypic plasticity in *Cryptococcus neoformans*.
Butler G, editor. PLoS Genet. 2014;10: e1004849. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004849

36. Roth C, Sun S, Billmyre RB, Heitman J, Magwene PM. A high-resolution map of meiotic
recombination in *Cryptococcus deneoformans* demonstrates decreased
recombination in unisexual reproduction. Genetics. 2018;209: 567–578.
doi:10.1534/genetics.118.300996

37. Zhai B, Zhu P, Foyle D, Upadhyay S, Idnurm A, Lin X. Congenic strains of the
filamentous form of *Cryptococcus neoformans* for studies of fungal morphogenesis
and virulence. Infect Immun. 2013;81: 2626–2637. doi:10.1128/IAI.00259-13

38. Huang MY, Joshi MB, Boucher MJ, Lee S, Loza LC, Gaylord EA, et al. Short homology-
directed repair using optimized Cas9 in the pathogen *Cryptococcus neoformans*
enables rapid gene deletion and tagging. Genetics. 2022;220: iyab180.
doi:10.1093/genetics/iyab180

39. Fan Y, Lin X. Multiple applications of a transient CRISPR-Cas9 coupled with
electroporation (TRACE) system in the *Cryptococcus neoformans* species complex.
Genetics. 2018;208: 1357–1372. doi:10.1534/genetics.117.300656

40. Li T. Crystal structure of the MATa1/MATalpha2 homeodomain heterodimer in complex
with DNA containing an A-tract. Nucleic Acids Research. 1998;26: 5707–5718.
doi:10.1093/nar/26.24.5707

41. Casselton LA, Olesnicky NS. Molecular Genetics of Mating Recognition in
Basidiomycete Fungi. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 1998;62: 55–70.
doi:10.1128/MMBR.62.1.55-70.1998

42. Passmore S, Maine GT, Elble R, Christ C, Tye BK. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* protein
involved in plasmid maintenance is necessary for mating of MAT alpha cells. J Mol
Biol. 1988;204: 593–606. doi:10.1016/0022-2836(88)90358-0

43. Elble R, Tye BK. Both activation and repression of a-mating-type-specific genes in
yeast require transcription factor Mcm1. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1991;88: 10966–
10970. doi:10.1073/pnas.88.23.10966

44. Tan S, Richmond TJ. Crystal structure of the yeast MATα2/MCM1/DNA ternary
complex. Nature. 1998;391: 660–666. doi:10.1038/35563

45. Huang J, Rowe D, Subedi P, Zhang W, Suelter T, Valent B, et al. CRISPR-Cas12a
induced DNA double-strand breaks are repaired by multiple pathways with different
mutation profiles in *Magnaporthe oryzae*. Nat Commun. 2022;13: 7168.
doi:10.1038/s41467-022-34736-1

46. Huang J, Cook DE. The contribution of DNA repair pathways to genome editing and
evolution in filamentous pathogens. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2022;46: fuac035.
doi:10.1093/femsre/fuac035

47. Xue C, Tada Y, Dong X, Heitman J. The human fungal pathogen *Cryptococcus* can
complete its sexual cycle during a pathogenic association with plants. Cell Host &
Microbe. 2007;1: 263–273. doi:10.1016/j.chom.2007.05.005

48. Phadke SS, Feretzaki M, Heitman J. Unisexual reproduction enhances fungal
competitiveness by promoting habitat exploration via hyphal growth and sporulation.
Eukaryot Cell. 2013;12: 1155–1159. doi:10.1128/EC.00147-13

49. Jung K-W, Yang D-H, Maeng S, Lee K-T, So Y-S, Hong J, et al. Systematic functional
profiling of transcription factor networks in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. Nat Commun.
2015;6: 6757. doi:10.1038/ncomms7757

50. Peterson PP, Choi J-T, Fu C, Cowen LE, Sun S, Bahn Y-S, et al. The *Cryptococcus
neoformans* STRIPAK complex controls genome stability, sexual development, and
virulence. PLoS Pathog. 2024;20: e1012735. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1012735

51. Lin X, Jackson JC, Feretzaki M, Xue C, Heitman J. Transcription factors Mat2 and Znf2
operate cellular circuits orchestrating opposite- and same-sex mating in
Cryptococcus neoformans. Dutcher SK, editor. PLoS Genet. 2010;6: e1000953.
doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000953

52. Liu H, Yao X, Ke W, Ding H, He G-J, Ma S, et al. A velvet transcription factor specifically
activates mating through a novel mating-responsive protein in the human fungal
pathogen *Cryptococcus deneoformans*. Gao B, editor. Microbiol Spectr. 2022;10:
e02653-21. doi:10.1128/spectrum.02653-21

53. Fu C, Heitman J. PRM1 and KAR5 function in cell-cell fusion and karyogamy to drive
distinct bisexual and unisexual cycles in the *Cryptococcus* pathogenic species
complex. PLoS Genet. 2017;13: e1007113. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1007113

54. Fu C, Davy A, Holmes S, Sun S, Yadav V, Gusa A, et al. Dynamic genome plasticity
during unisexual reproduction in the human fungal pathogen *Cryptococcus
deneoformans*. PLoS Genet. 2021;17: e1009935. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1009935

55. Rutherford JC, Lin X, Nielsen K, Heitman J. Amt2 permease is required to induce
ammonium-responsive invasive growth and mating in *Cryptococcus neoformans*.
Eukaryot Cell. 2008;7: 237–246. doi:10.1128/EC.00079-07

56. Gyawali R, Upadhyay S, Way J, Lin X. A family of secretory proteins Is associated with
different morphotypes in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. Schottel JL, editor. Appl Environ
Microbiol. 2017;83: e02967-16. doi:10.1128/AEM.02967-16

57. Coelho MA, David-Palma M, Kachalkin AV, Kolařík M, Turchetti B, Sampaio JP, et al.
Genomic and phenotypic insights into the expanding phylogenetic landscape of the
Cryptococcus genus. bioRxiv; 2025. doi:10.1101/2025.06.18.660340

58. Mackie AM, Hassan KA, Paulsen IT, Tetu SG. Biolog phenotype microarrays for
phenotypic characterization of microbial cells. Methods Mol Biol. 2014;1096: 123–
130. doi:10.1007/978-1-62703-712-9_10

59. Cabrita A, David-Palma M, Brito PH, Heitman J, Coelho MA, Gonçalves P. Multiple
pathways to homothallism in closely related yeast lineages in the basidiomycota.
mBio. 2021;12: e03130-20. doi:10.1128/mBio.03130-20

60. David-Palma M, Sampaio JP, Gonçalves P. Genetic dissection of sexual reproduction in
a primary homothallic basidiomycete. PLoS Genet. 2016;12: e1006110.
doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1006110

61. Gillissen B, Bergemann J, Sandmann C, Schroeer B, Bölker M, Kahmann R. A two-
component regulatory system for self/non-self recognition in Ustilago maydis. Cell.
1992;68: 647–657. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(92)90141-X

62. Zirión-Martínez C, Magwene PM. WeavePop: A bioinformatics workflow to explore and
analyze genomic variants of eukaryotic populations. Gresham D, editor. G3: Genes,
Genomes, Genetics. 2026; jkag039. doi:10.1093/g3journal/jkag039

63. Huang J, Larmore CJ, Priest SJ, Xu Z, Dietrich FS, Yadav V, et al. Distinct evolutionary
trajectories following loss of RNA interference in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. Proc Natl
Acad Sci USA. 2024;121: e2416656121. doi:10.1073/pnas.2416656121

64. Madhani HD, Styles CA, Fink GR. MAP kinases with distinct Inhibitory functions impart
signaling specificity during yeast differentiation. Cell. 1997;91: 673–684.
doi:10.1016/S0092-8674(00)80454-7

65. Abramson J, Adler J, Dunger J, Evans R, Green T, Pritzel A, et al. Accurate structure
prediction of biomolecular interactions with AlphaFold 3. Nature. 2024;630: 493–500.
doi:10.1038/s41586-024-07487-w

66. Meng EC, Goddard TD, Pettersen EF, Couch GS, Pearson ZJ, Morris JH, et al. UCSF
CHIMERAX : Tools for structure building and analysis. Protein Science. 2023;32: e4792.
doi:10.1002/pro.4792

67. Gietz D, St Jean A, Woods RA, Schiestl RH. Improved method for high efficiency
transformation of intact yeast cells. Nucleic Acids Res. 1992;20: 1425.
doi:10.1093/nar/20.6.1425

68. Li H, Durbin R. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler
transform. Bioinformatics. 2009;25: 1754–1760. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp324

69. Sun S, Priest SJ, Heitman J. *Cryptococcus neoformans* mating and genetic Crosses.
Current Protocols in Microbiology. 2019;53: e75. doi:10.1002/cpmc.75

70. Tanaka R, Taguchi H, Takeo K, Miyaji M, Nishimura K. Determination of ploidy in
Cryptococcus neoformans by flow cytometry. J Med Vet Mycol. 1996;34: 299–301.

71. Chen S. fastp 1.0: An ultra-fast all-round tool for FASTQ data quality control and
preprocessing. iMeta. 2025;4: e70078. doi:10.1002/imt2.70078

72. Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, et al. STAR: ultrafast
universal RNA-seq aligner. Bioinformatics. 2013;29: 15–21.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bts635

73. Liu D. Algorithms for efficiently collapsing reads with Unique Molecular Identifiers.
PeerJ. 2019;7: e8275. doi:10.7717/peerj.8275

74. Wang L, Wang S, Li W. RSeQC: quality control of RNA-seq experiments.
Bioinformatics. 2012;28: 2184–2185. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bts356

75. Okonechnikov K, Conesa A, García-Alcalde F. Qualimap 2: advanced multi-sample
quality control for high-throughput sequencing data. Bioinformatics. 2016;32: 292–
294. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btv566

76. Ewels P, Magnusson M, Lundin S, Käller M. MultiQC: summarize analysis results for
multiple tools and samples in a single report. Bioinformatics. 2016;32: 3047–3048.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btw354

77. Liao Y, Smyth GK, Shi W. featureCounts: an efficient general purpose program for
assigning sequence reads to genomic features. Bioinformatics. 2014;30: 923–930.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btt656

78. Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK. edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential
expression analysis of digital gene expression data. Bioinformatics. 2010;26: 139–140.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp616

79. Kechin A, Boyarskikh U, Kel A, Filipenko M. cutPrimers: A new tool for accurate cutting
of primers from reads of targeted next generation sequencing. Journal of
Computational Biology. 2017;24: 1138–1143. doi:10.1089/cmb.2017.0096

80. Quinlan AR, Hall IM. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic
features. Bioinformatics. 2010;26: 841–842. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq033

81. Kim D, Paggi JM, Park C, Bennett C, Salzberg SL. Graph-based genome alignment and
genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. Nat Biotechnol. 2019;37: 907–915.
doi:10.1038/s41587-019-0201-4

82. Shumate A, Salzberg SL. Liftoff: accurate mapping of gene annotations.
Bioinformatics. 2021;37: 1639–1643. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa1016

83. Loftus BJ, Fung E, Roncaglia P, Rowley D, Amedeo P, Bruno D, et al. The genome of the
basidiomycetous yeast and human pathogen *Cryptococcus neoformans*. Science.
2005;307: 1321–1324. doi:10.1126/science.1103773

84. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for
RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol. 2014;15: 550. doi:10.1186/s13059-014-
0550-8

1099

Main Figures

1101

Figure 1. AlphaFold3 predicts heterodimer and homodimers of Sxi1α and Sxi2a.

(A) Predicted domain structures of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** in *C. neoformans* and *C. deneoformans*. (B) AlphaFold3

(AF3)-predicted heterodimer structure of Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** from *C. deneoformans*. C-terminal disordered

regions were hidden for visualization. Only regions with a predicted local distance difference test (pLDDT)

score >60 were colored and surfaced. The predicted alignment error (PAE) plot of the predicted Sxi1α-

Sxi2**a** heterodimer is displayed in the right panel. (C) Overlay of AlphaFold3-predicted Sxi1α-Sxi2**a**

heterodimer with crystal structure of **a**1-α2 (from *S. cerevisiae*, PDB:1AKH) and predicted bW-bE

heterodimer (from *U. maydis*, with high confidence ipTM = 0.74 pTM = 0.64). Pairing was performed with

the "Matchmaker" function in Chimera X. (D) AlphaFold3-predicted homodimer structures with PAE plots

for Sxi1α-Sxi1α (left panel) and Sxi2**a**-Sxi2**a** (right panel). Only regions with a pLDDT score >50 were

colored and surfaced. (E) Yeast two-hybrid analysis of interactions among Sxi1α, Sxi2**a**, and the N terminal

region of Sxi2**a** (Sxi2**a**N). Schematics of Sxi2**a** and Sxi2**a**N constructs are shown on the left, with the

homeodomain indicated. *S. cerevisiae* strains expressing Gal4 DNA-binding domain (BD) or Gal4

activation domain (AD) fusions were mated, and diploids were selected on synthetic dextrose medium.

Protein-protein interactions between bait and prey fusions drive Gal4-dependent activation of *ADE2* and

HIS3 reporter genes, allowing for growth on medium lacking adenine or histidine. Activation of *ADE2* in the

ade2 mutant reporter strain background also reduces red pigment accumulation, resulting in lighter colony

coloration on nonselective medium. Quantification of *lacZ* reporter activation was performed using a

chlorophenol red-β-D-galactopyranoside (CPRG) liquid assay, and β-galactosidase activity is shown on the

right.   Error bars indicate mean ± standard deviation from three technical replicates.

1122

Figure 2. Sxi1α and Sxi2a are not involved in growth, capsule formation, and melanin production.

(A) Generation of independent *sxi1*αΔ and *sxi2*aΔ mutants in XL280α and XL280**a**, respectively. Transformants were verified through internal PCR targeting the ORF, along with 5' and 3' junction PCRs specific to the drug resistance marker to confirm proper integration at the genomic locus. (B) Whole-genome sequencing (WGS) reads mapping confirming the complete or partial deletion of *SXI1*α (red block arrow) and *SXI2***a** (blue block arrow). Genes located within and outside of the mating-type locus are highlighted in green and gray, respectively. (C) *In vitro* competition assays of the *sxi1*αΔ and *sxi2*aΔ mutants, each carrying either the *NAT* or *NEO* resistance markers, and their corresponding XL280 wildtype strains. Each

competition was assayed after 0, 24, 48 hours of incubation, with four independent replicates. Error bars

indicate standard deviation. (D) Serial dilutions of *sxi1α*Δ and *sxi2***a**Δ mutants, along with the corresponding

XL280 wildtype strains, were spotted on solid YPD media and incubated at 30°C and 37°C. (E) Saturated

cultures of the indicated strains, grown in RPMI medium, were stained with India ink to visualize capsule

formation. The H99 strain and isogenic *cap59*Δ mutant served as positive and negative controls,

respectively. (F) Overnight cultures of the indicated strains were spotted on Niger seed medium to monitor

melanin formation. The wildtype H99 strain and isogenic *lac1*Δ mutant served as positive and negative

controls, respectively.

1139

Figure 3. Sxi1α and Sxi2a are not required for hyphal growth or basidium and spore production.

(A and B) Colony morphology (top), self-filamentation (middle), and sporulation (bottom) phenotypes of

independent *sxi1*αΔ (A) and *sxi2***a**Δ (B) mutants when grown under mating-inducing conditions. Scale bars,

1 cm (upper panel), 100 μm (middle panel) and 20 μm (bottom panel). (C) Scanning electron microscopy

(SEM) images of basidia and basidiospores from the indicated solo-culture. Samples were grown on MS

media for 1 to 2 weeks before microscopy. Scale bar: 5 μm. (D) Germination rate of random spores

dissected from the indicated solo-cultures. At least 3 replicates were performed for each strain (indicated

by dots), with error bars depicting standard deviation among replicates. (E) Competition assays of *sxi1*αΔ,

*sxi2***a**Δ mutants against their corresponding XL280 wildtype strain. The co-cultures were grown on MS

1149   medium under mating-inducing conditions. Spores from the periphery, and yeast cells from the center, of

1150   the co-culture spots were dissected and analyzed to determine their origin (i.e., wildtype or mutant), which

1151   were then used to infer the relative competitiveness of the mutant strains. Five different co-culture spots

1152   were analyzed for each competition.

1153

Figure 4. Fusion frequency and ploidy analysis of products from α x α and a x a Ménage à trois
matings.

(A) Schematic of the Ménage à trois mating assay. In each mating-type background, two strains carrying

different selectable markers (NAT or NEO) were co-cultured with a pheromone donor of the opposite mating

type to induce cell-cell fusion. NAT and NEO resistant colonies were recovered on selective medium. (B-C)

Quantification of α x α (B) and **a** x **a** (C) fusion frequencies for the indicated bilateral and unilateral crosses.

Cells from the indicated mating assay on V8 agar (pH = 7.0) for 72 h were plated on YPD + NAT + NEO

and YPD to determine the ratio of cell-cell fusion products in the population. Data are presented as mean

± SD from four to five independent biological replicates; each point represents an individual replicate. ns,

not significant; * (p-value < 0.05), ** (p-value < 0.01), *** (p-value < 0.001) indicate statistical significance

compared to wildtype control. (D) Fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS) analysis of DNA content in

parental strains and fusion products. H99 (1N control) and CnLC6683 (2N control) originate from the same

experiment; their profiles are duplicated in both the left and right panels to facilitate comparison. Fusion

products (highlighted by dashed boxes) are annotated with their mating type(s) as determined by

genotyping PCR (right). 1N and 2N indicate haploid and diploid DNA content, respectively. (E) Proportion

of mating type of fusion products from the indicated crosses. (F) Principal component analysis (PCA) of 3'

enriched RNA sequencing data from WT (XL280α *NAT* x XL280α *NEO* x JEC20) and *sxi1αΔ* bilateral

(*sxi1αΔ::NAT* x *sxi1αΔ::NEO* x JEC20) Ménage à trois mating harvested after 72 h on V8 (pH=7) medium.

Each point represents an independent biological replicate. The percentage of variance explained by PC1

and PC2 is indicated. (G) Volcano plot showing differential gene expression between *sxi1αΔ* bilateral and

WT ménage à trois mating. Genes classified as differentially expressed are highlighted in red based on |

$\log_2$ fold change| >=1 and adjusted p-value <= 0.05 thresholds, while non-differentially expressed genes

are shown in gray. Selected genes of interest are labeled. (H) Bar plots showing normalized CPM

expression levels for representative differentially expressed genes DEG and non-differentially expressed

genes across WT and *sxi1αΔ* bilateral ménage à trois mating. Data are presented as mean ± standard

deviation across biological replicates. Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences. Statistical

significance was assessed using two sample Welch t tests on TMM normalized $\log_2$ CPM values for each

gene, with p values adjusted for multiple testing with the Benjamini–Hochberg method. Genes labeled as

DEG correspond to those classified as differentially expressed in the DEG analysis.

1183

Figure 5. Sxi1α and Sxi2a regulate transcription of distinct subsets of genes during unisexual and

bisexual reproduction.

(A and B) Differentially expressed genes in *sxi1αΔ* (A) and *sxi2aΔ* (B) relative to wild-type XL280α or

XL280**a**, respectively, during solo cultures (72h at RT on V8 medium). Dashed lines indicate p_{adj} = 0.05 and

log_2FC = ± 1. (C) Comparison of DEGs in (A) and (B). (D-F) DEGs relative to XL280α x XL280**a** in crosses

between *sxi1αΔ* x XL280**a** (D), XL280α x *sxi2aΔ* (E), and *sxi1αΔ* x *sxi2aΔ* (F). (G and H) Comparisons of

DEGs in *sxi1αΔ* (G) and *sxi2aΔ* (H) mutants between solo cultures and α x **a** crosses, with overlapping

genes highlighted in the boxes.

1192

Figure 6. Sxi1α and Sxi2a control mating genes in distinct and opposing manners.

(A) Schematic of 3 hypotheses for Sxi1α and Sxi2**a** function during α x **a** sexual reproduction. Genes in the first scenario are either positively or negatively regulated by the Sxi1α-Sxi2**a** heterodimer and undergo similar expression changes in all crosses lacking functional Sxi1α and/or Sxi2**a**. Genes in the second scenario are regulated by Sxi1α and are differentially expressed in crosses lacking a functional copy of Sxi1α but not in the XL280α x *sxi2a*Δ cross because expression changes are independent of Sxi2**a**. Genes in the third scenario are differentially expressed in crosses lacking functional Sxi2**a** (XL280α x *sxi2a*Δ and *sxi1*αΔ x *sxi2a*Δ) but unchanged in the presence of a functional copy of Sxi2**a** (*sxi1*αΔ x XL280**a**). (B and C) log$_2$FC expression values of *MAT*α (B) and *MAT***a** (C) genes in *sxi1*αΔ x XL280**a**, XL280α x *sxi2a*Δ, and *sxi1*αΔ x *sxi2a*Δ mutant crosses relative to XL280α x XL280**a** wildtype cross.

Supporting information captions

Table S1 DEGs identified during Ménage à trois matings.

Table S2 DEGs identified under different mating comparisons.

Table S3 DEGs shard between unisexual and α x **a** sexual reproduction.

Table S4 Strains and plasmids used in this study.

Table S5 Primers used in this study.