1

Altered stereostructures of the DNA binding domains in the mutant mating proteins of *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* and the *Cordyceps sinensis* insect-fungal complex

Xiu-Zhang Li, Yu-Ling Li, Jia-Shi Zhu*

State Key Laboratory of Plateau Ecology and Agriculture, Qinghai Academy of Animal and Veterinary Sciences, Qinghai University, Xining, Qinghai, China

* Corresponding author

E-mail: zhujosh@163.com (JSZ)

Abstract:

The MATα_HMGbox and HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins, respectively, play essential roles in DNA binding and downstream gene transcription regulation, controlling sexual reproduction of *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Alternative splicing, differential occurrence and transcription of the *MAT1-1-1* and *MAT1-2-1* genes have been unveiled in *Hirsutella sinensis*, suggesting the occurrence of self-sterility under heterothallic or hybrid outcrossing. This study further demonstrated that the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins in the wild-type *Cordyceps sinensis* isolates were clustered into 5 clades with or without branches in the Bayesian clustering tree, belonging to diverse 3D structural morphs under 19 AlphaFold codes. The HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins were clustered into 2 clades with branches in the Bayesian clustering tree, belonging to diverse 3D structural morphs under 25 AlphaFold codes. The correlation analysis reviewed that the 1−3 amino acid substitutions occurred in various sites of the DNA binding domains of the mutant mating proteins resulted in alteration of the hydrophobicity, secondary and tertiary structures of the DNA binding domains of the proteins. The fungal origin analysis demonstrated heterospecific fungal or genome-independent genotypical sources of the mating proteins with stereostructure variations in the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates and *O. sinensis* strains, which represent the changed functionalities of the proteins in regulating and ensuring the accuracy and genetic diversity of the heterothallic or hybrid sexual reproductive process of *O. sinensis* in the lifecycle of *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex.

Keywords: MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein; HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein; heteromorphic primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of proteins; Bayesian clustering; *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* strain; wild-type *Cordyceps sinensis* isolates; reproduction of *O. sinensis*; sexual life of the *Cordyceps sinensis* insect-fungal complex

I. Introduction

Natural *Cordyceps sinensis* is one of most expensive therapeutic agents in traditional Chinese medicine and has a rich history of clinical use for several centuries in health maintenance, disease amelioration, post illness and postoperative recovery and antiaging therapy [Zhu *et al*. 1998a, 1998b, 2011]. This prestige natural therapeutic agent consists of the *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* fruiting body and the remains of a *Hepialidae* moth larva containing an intact, thick larval body wall with numerous bristles, intact larval intestine and head tissues, and fragments of other larval tissues [Ren *et al*. 2013; Zhang *et al*. 2014; Lu *et al*. 2016; Zhu & Li 2017; Li *et al*. 2022, 2023a, 2023d, 2023e]. Studies of natural *C. sinensis* have demonstrated its multicellular heterokaryotic structures and genetic heterogeneity, including 17 genomically independent genotypes of *O. sinensis* fungi, >90 other fungal species spanning at least 37 fungal genera, and larval genes [Li 1988; Dai et al. 1989; Kinjo & Zang 2001; Jiang & Yao 2003; Stensrud *et al*. 2005, 2007; Leung *et al*. 2006; Zhu *et al*. 2007, 2010; Yang *et al*. 2008, 2021; Zhang *et al*. 2010, 2018; Li *et al*. 2013, 2016b, 2020b, 2022, 2023e; Ren *et al*. 2013; Meng *et al*. 2015; Xia *et al*. 2015; Guo *et al*. 2017; Zhu & Li 2017; Zhong *et al*. 2018; Kang *et al*. 2024]. Thus, the Chinese Pharmacopoeia defines natural *C. sinensis* as an insect-fungal complex, which is classified as the LEVEL-II endangered natural species [China Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs 2021]. Among the numerous heterogeneous fungal species, *Hirsutella sinensis* has been postulated to be the sole-anamorph of *O. sinensis* by Wei *et al*. [2006]. Ten years later, however, the key authors reported a species contradiction in an artificial cultivation project conducted in an industrial product-oriented setting between anamorphic inoculates of GC-biased Genotype #1 *H. sinensis* on *Hepialidae* moth larvae and the sole teleomorph (the genomically independent AT-biased Genotype #4 of *O. sinensis*) in the fruiting body of cultivated *C. sinensis* [Wei *et al*. 2016]. Notably, the Latin name *Cordyceps sinensis* has been indiscriminately used since the 1840s for both the teleomorph/holomorph of the fungus *C. sinensis* and the wild insect-fungal complex, and the fungus was renamed *O. sinensis* in 2007 with using the *H. sinensis* strain EFCC 7287 as the nomenclature reference [Sung *et al*. 2007; Zhang *et al*. 2012; Ren *et al*. 2013; Zhu & Li 2017; Wang *et al*. 2018; Li *et al*. 2022]. Although Zhang *et al*. [2013] proposed improper implementation of the "One Fungus=One Name" nomenclature rule of the International Mycological Association [Hawksworth *et al*. 2011] while disregarding the presence of multiple genomically independent genotypes of *O. sinensis* fungi and inappropriately replacing the anamorphic name *H. sinensis* with the teleomorphic name *O. sinensis*, we continue using in this paper the anamorphic name *H. sinensis* for GC-biased Genotype #1 of the 17 *O. sinensis* genotypes and refer to the genomically independent Genotypes #2–17 fungi as *O. sinensis* following the taxonomic descriptions in several public depository databases, such as GenBank and

AlphaFold databases, before their systematic positions are individually determined, regardless of whether they are GC- or AT-biased genetically. We continue the customary use of the name *C. sinensis* to refer to the wild or cultivated insect-fungal complex because the renaming of *C. sinensis* to *O. sinensis* in 2007 using the *H. sinensis* strain EFCC 7287 as the nomenclature reference did not involve the indiscriminately used Latin name for the natural insect-fungi complex [Sung *et al*. 2007; Yao & Zhu 2016; Zhu & Li 2017; Li *et al*. 2022], although this practice will likely be revised in the future by the differential use of proprietary and exclusive Latin names for the multiple genome-independent *O. sinensis* genotypic fungi and the insect-fungi complex.

The sexual reproductive behavior of ascomycetes is strictly regulated by transcription factors encoded at the mating-type (*MAT*) locus, which constitute the core mechanism that determine mating compatibility, regulating mating type recognition, and developing fruiting body, reproductive structure ascocarps and ascospores [Turgeon & Yoder 2006; Debuchy *et al*. 2006; Jones & Bennett 2011; Zheng & Wang 2013; Wilson *et al*. 2015; Sun *et al*. 2019; Rams *et al*. 2022]. Similar to other fungi in Ascomycota, reproductive behavior of *O. sinensis* relies on the synergistic interaction of 2 mating proteins, the *MAT1-1* and *MAT1-2* idiomorphs, which contain 2 types of critical domains specifically regulating gene expressions relating to sexual reproduction: (1) the Mating-type alpha High Mobility Group box (MATα_HMGbox) domain in MAT1-1-1 protein, and (2) the High Mobility Group box ROX1-like (HMG-box_ROX1-like) domain in MAT1-2-1 protein [Metin *et al*. 2010; Bushley *et al*. 2013; Hu *et al*. 2013; Zheng & Wang 2013; Li *et al*. 2025]. However, alternative splicing, differential occurrence, and differential transcription of mating-type and pheromone receptor genes and heteromorphic stereostructures of entire MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins in *H. sinensis* strains and wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates were demonstrated, invalidating the self-fertilization hypothesis under homothallism and pseudohomothallism for *H. sinensis* that was postulated as the sole anamorph of *O. sinensis* but suggesting self-fertility under heterothallism or hybridization requiring sexual partners to accomplish sexual reproduction within the lifecycle of natural *C. sinensis* [Wei *et al*. 2006; Zhou *et al*. 2013; Zhang & Zhang 2015; Li *et al*. 2019, 2023c, 2024b, 2025].

Mutant sequences of the 2 critical DNA binding domains of mating proteins with a few amino acid substitutions may cause conformational changes in the core stereostructures of the domains, thereby affecting the synergistic effects probably through regulating complementary downstream genes of 2 idiomorphic mating proteins. Continuing our previous study [Li *et al*. 2025], which demonstrated the heteromorphic stereostructures of entire mating proteins, this study focuses on the amino acid substitutions within the MATα_HMGbox domain of the MAT1-1-1 protein and the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein and correlating the variable primary structures with the changes in hydrophobic properties and secondary and tertiary structures of the DNA binding domains in *O. sinensis* strains and wild-

type *C. sinensis* isolates. Correlations of the changes in hydrophobicity, primary and secondary structures of the DNA binding domains of mating proteins encoded by the genome, transcriptome and metatranscriptome assemblies of *H. sinensis* and C. *sinensis* insect-fungi complexes are also analyzed.

II. Materials and Methods

II-1 The MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 protein sequences of the *O. sinensis* strains and wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates

The AlphaFold database lists the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures for 138 MAT1-1-1 proteins and 74 MAT1-2-1 proteins [Li *et al*. 2025]. Among the proteins, 118 MAT1-1-1 proteins and 69 MAT1-2-1 proteins were full-length listed in Tables S1–S2. Three full-length MAT1-1-1 proteins (ALH24945, AGW27560, and EQK97643) and 2 full-length MAT1-2-1 proteins (AEH27625 and EQL04085) were derived from *H. sinensis* strains. All other full-length mating proteins were from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates that were collected from different production areas on the Qinghai–Tibet Plateau [Zhang *et al*. 2009, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014; Hu *et al*. 2013; Zhang & Zhang 2015; Tunyasuvunakool *et al*. 2021; Li *et al*. 2025]. The mutant full-length MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins were derived from 34 wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates listed in Table S3 with the genotypic information.

The remaining 20 MAT1-1-1 proteins (AGW27517–AGW27536) and 5 MAT1-2-1 proteins (AGW27543, AGW27548, AGW27552, AGW27554, and AGW27555) are truncated (Table S4) [Bushley *et al*. 2013; Li *et al*. 2013]. These protein sequences were derived from the *MAT1-1-1* and *MAT1-2-1* cDNA amplified from the total RNA that were extracted from the *O. sinensis* strains [Bushley *et al*. 2013], which were isolated from either the fresh caterpillar bodies (sclerotium) or the cultures of mono-ascospores of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungal complexes [Li *et al*. 2013]. The primer pairs of *m1cDNAF3/m1cDNAR5* and *Mat1-2F/Mat1-2R* were used to amplify the *MAT1-1-1* and *MAT1-2-1* cDNA, respectively [Bushley *et al*. 2013]. The sequences and locations of primers are shown in Figures S1–S2.

The internal transcribed spacer (ITS) molecular taxonomy/genotyping information for the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates and *O. sinensis* strains in the GenBank database are listed in Tables S3–S6 with further alignment with the reference ITS sequences of genotypes of *O. sinensis*.

II-2 Genome, transcriptome, and metatranscriptome assemblies of *H. sinensis* strains and *C. sinensis* insect–fungal complexes

The GenBank database lists 5 genome assemblies LKHE00000000, NGJJ00000000, ANOV00000000, JAAVMX000000000, and LWBQ00000000 of the *H. sinensis* strains 1229, CC1406-20395, Co18, IOZ07, and ZJB12195, respectively, and a transcriptome assembly GCQL00000000 of the *H. sinensis* strain L0106

[Hu *et al.* 2013; Liu *et al.* 2015, 2020; Li *et al.* 2016a; Jin *et al.* 2020; Shu *et al.* 2020].

The metatranscriptome assembly GAGW00000000 is available in the GenBank database for the *C.*
sinensis insect-fungal specimens (unknown maturation stages) collected from Kangding County, Sichuan
Province of China [Xiang *et al.* 2014].

Another metatranscriptome assembly was derived from mature *C. sinensis* specimens collected from
Deqin, Yunnan Province of China and was uploaded to a repository database,
www.plantkingdomgdb.com/Ophiocordyceps_sinensis/data/cds/Ophiocordyceps_sinensis_CDS.fas [Xia
et al. 2017]. Although this database is currently inaccessible, it was accessed from 18 May 2017 to 18
January 2018 and a cDNA file was downloaded.

The genome, transcriptome, and metatranscriptome assemblies were used for analysis of the
MATα_HMGbox and HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins,
respectively.

II-3 Alignment analysis of the DNA binding domain sequences of the mating proteins

148 The amino acid sequences of the MATα_HMGbox domains of the MAT1-1-1 proteins and the HMG-
149 box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins of the *O. sinensis* strains, wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates,
150 and *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes were aligned using the GenBank Blastp program
151 (https://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ (Bethesda, MD, USA), accessed from 18 October 2024 to 10 June 2025).

II-4 Bayesian clustering analysis for the DNA binding domains of mating proteins

Multi sequence alignment of the DNA binding domains of mating proteins of the *O. sinensis* strains,
wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates, and *C. sinensis* insect-fungal complexes was performed *via* the auto mode of
MAFFT (v7.427; Osaka, Japan). The intron regions were removed using trimAl (v1.4. rev15; Barcelona,
Spain). Under the Bayesian information criterion, ProtTest v3.4.2 (University of Vigo and University of A
Coruña, Spain) was used to find the optimal amino acid substitution model. Bayesian clustering trees of the
DNA binding domain sequences of MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins were then inferred using MrBayes
v3.2.7 software (Markov chain Monte Carlo [MCMC] algorithm; Uppsala, Sweden) with a sampling
frequency of 100 iterations after discarding the initial 25% of the samples from a total of 1 million iterations,
obtaining the final majority rule consensus trees for the MATα_HMGbox domains of the full-length MAT1-
1-1 proteins and the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the full-length MAT1-2-1 proteins [Huelsenbeck &
Ronquist 2001; Ronquist *et al.* 2012; Li *et al.* 2022, 2023c, 2024b, 2025]. Clustering analysis was conducted
at Nanjing Genepioneer Biotechnologies Co. (Nanjing, China).

II-5 Amino acid properties and scale analysis

The amino acid sequences of the DNA binding domains of mating proteins were scaled on the basis of

the general chemical characteristics of their side chains (Table S7) (https://web.expasy.org/protscale/ (Basel,

Switzerland), accessed from 18 October 2024 to 20 May 2025) [Kyte & Doolittle 1982; Deleage & Roux

1987; Gasteiger *et al.* 2005; Peters & Elofsson 2014; Simm *et al.* 2016; Li *et al.* 2024b, 2025]. The

MATα_HMGbox domain (51→225 of the reference sequence AGW27560 derived from the *H. sinensis*

strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang *et al.* 2013]) of MAT1-1-1 proteins and the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain

(127→197 of the reference sequence AEH27625 [Zhang *et al.* 2009]) of MAT1-2-1 proteins with additional

9 amino acid residues extending both upstream and downstream of the domains were plotted sequentially

with a window size of 9 amino acid residues for the hydropathy, α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils of

the proteins using the linear weight variation model of the ExPASy ProtScale algorithms [Kyte & Doolittle

1982; Deleage & Roux 1987; Gasteiger *et al.* 2005; Li *et al.* 2024b, 2025]. The topologies and waveforms

of the ProtScale plots were compared to explore changes in the hydrophobicity and 2D structures of the

DNA binding domains of mating proteins.

II-6   AlphaFold-based prediction of 3D structures of mating proteins

The 3D structures of the MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins of the *O. sinensis* strains and wild-type *C.*

sinensis isolates were computationally predicted from their amino acid sequences using the artificial

intelligence (AI)-based machine learning technology AlphaFold (https://alphafold.com/, Cambridgeshire,

UK) and downloaded from the AlphaFold database (accessed from 18 October 2024 to 10 May 2025) for

heteromorphic stereostructure analysis in this study [Jumper *et al.* 2021; David *et al.* 2022; Monzon *et al.*

2022; Rettie *et al.* 2023; Xu *et al.* 2023; Abramson *et al.* 2024; Varadi *et al.* 2024; Wroblewski & Kmiecik

2024; Li *et al.* 2025].

AlphaFold database provides a per-residue model confidence, the prediction of its score on the local

Distance Difference Test (pLDDT), between 0 and 100, a per-residue score that's assigned to each individual

residue [Jumper *et al.* 2021; David *et al.* 2022; Monzon *et al.* 2022; Xu *et al.* 2023; Abramson *et al.* 2024;

Varadi *et al.* 2024]. The model confidence bands are used to color-code the residues in the 3D structures:

very high (pLDDT>90) in dark blue, high (90>pLDDT>70) in light blue, low (70>pLDDT>50) in yellow,

and very low (pLDDT<50) in orange [Mariani *et al.* 2013; Wroblewski & Kmiecik 2024; Li *et al.* 2025].

II-7   Correlation of the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the DNA binding domains of MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins

The AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures of the mutant MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins

and the mutant HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins were amplified localizing at the sites

of amino acid substitutions. The local magnification of 3D structures at the mutation sites were correlated

with the amino acid substitutions for the primary structures and the topology and waveform changes in

ExPASy ProtScale plots for hydropathy, α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils for altered hydrophobicity

and secondary structures of the DNA binding domains of MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins.

III. Results

III-1 Primary structures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of the full-length MAT1-1-1 proteins

Among the 138 MAT1-1-1 proteins in the AlphaFold database, 118 (85.5%) are full length consisting

of 372 amino acids and contributing to 15 heteromorphic 3D structure models of 5 Bayesian clusters (Table

S1) [Li *et al*. 2025]. Twenty-nine (24.6%) of the 118 full-length MAT1-1-1 proteins that were derived from

wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates contain variable amino acid substitutions.

The MAT1-1-1 proteins contain an MATα_HMGbox domain at the amino acids 51→225 shown in

blue and underlined in Figure S3, as represented by the reference MAT1-1-1 protein AGW27560 derived

from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang *et al*. 2013]. Other MAT1-1-1 proteins derived from wild-

type *C. sinensis* isolates or encoded by the genome assemblies of the *H. sinensis* strains and the

metatranscriptome assemblies of *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes contained various amino acid

substitutions shown in red in Figure S3. The MATα_HMGbox domains of 10 (34.5%) of the 29 mutant

proteins are 100% identical with the query protein AGW27560. The remaining 19 proteins (65.5%) contain

1−2 amino acid substitutions at various mutation sites within the MATα_HMGbox domains.

Figure S3 also lists the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins that are encoded by the

genome assemblies ANOV01017390 (794←1129 & 1280←1396), LKHE01001116 (4183←4620 &

4667←4759), and JAAVMX010000001 (6,699,061→6,699,153 & 6,699,203→6,699.637) of the *H.*

sinensis strains Co18, 1229, and IOZ07, respectively [Hu *et al*. 2013; Li *et al*. 2016a; Shu *et al*. 2020].

(Note: "&" refers to the deleted intron section; the arrows "→" and "←" indicate sequences in the sense

and antisense strands of the genomes, respectively.) The genome-encoded MAT1-1-1 proteins are truncated

at the C-termini, which locate far downstream of the MATα_HMGbox domains.

The genome assemblies LWBQ00000000 and NGJJ00000000 and the transcriptome assembly

GCQL00000000 of the *H. sinensis* strains ZJB12195, CC1406-20395, and L0106, respectively, do not

contain the genes or transcript encoding MAT1-1-1 proteins [Jin *et al*. 2020; Liu *et al*. 2015, 2020].

The metatranscriptome assemblies OSIN7648 (1→1065) and GAGW01008880 (300←1127) of

natural *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes encode the MAT1-1-1 proteins (*cf*. Figure S3) [Xiang *et al*. 2014;

Xia *et al*. 2017]. The MAT1-1-1 protein OSIN7648 is midsequence truncated by 18 aa between residues

863 and 864, locating downstream of the MATα_HMGbox domain (151→675). The N-terminus of the

MATα_HMGbox domain (741←1127) of MAT1-1-1 protein encoded by GAGW01008880 is truncated by 46 aa (AAASRATRQTKEASCDRAKRPLNAFMAFRSYYLKLFPDVQQKTASG).

III-2 Primary structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the full-length MAT1-2-1 proteins

Among the 74 MAT1-2-1 proteins listed in the AlphaFold database, 69 (93.2%) are full length containing 249 amino acids and contributed to 17 heteromorphic AlphaFold tertiary structure morphs of 5 Bayesian clusters (Table S2) [Li *et al.* 2025]. Among the 69 full-length proteins, 39 (56.5%) are 100% identical to the representative MAT1-2-1 protein AEH27625 that was derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 [Zhang *et al.* 2009]. The remaining 30 full-length proteins (43.5%) contain amino acid substitutions at various mutation sites shown in red in Figure S4. The HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the MAT1-2-1 proteins are located at the amino acids 127→197 shown in blue and underlined in Figure S4 and the external 9 amino acids both upstream and downstream of the domain are in blue but not underlined. The HMG-box_ROX1-like domain sequences of 3 of the 30 variable AMT1-2-1 proteins are 100% identical to the domain sequence of the query protein AEH27625, while the domains of the remaining 27 proteins contain 1−3 amino acid substitutions shown in red in Figure S4.

Figure S4 also shows the MAT1-2-1 proteins encoded by the genome assemblies ANOV01000063, LKHE01001605, LWBQ01000021, and NGJJ01000619 of the *H. sinensis* strains Co18, 1229, ZJB12195, and CC1406-20395, respectively [Hu *et al.* 2013; Li *et al.* 2016a; Jin *et al.* 2020; Liu *et al.* 2020]. A substitution of S-to-A occurred in each of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of genomically encoded MAT1-2-1 proteins, ANOV01000063 (9759→9851 & 9907→10,026), LKHE01001605 (14,016←14,135 & 14,191←14,283), LWBQ01000021 (239,029←239,148 & 239,204←239,269), and NGJJ01000619 (23,186←23,305 & 23,361←23,453). An additional Y-to-H substitution occurred in the domains of LKHE01001605, LWBQ01000021 and NGJJ01000619 but not in the domain of ANOV01000063, resulting in 97.2– 98.6% similarities to the domain sequence of the query protein AEH27625 [Zhang *et al.* 2009].

The genome assembly JAAVMX000000000 of the *H. sinensis* strain IOZ07 and the metatranscriptome assembly GAGW00000000 of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex do not contain the gene or transcript encoding MAT1-2-1 proteins [Xiang *et al.* 2014; Shu *et al.* 2020].

Figure S4 also shows a protein sequence encoded by the MAT1-2-1 transcript of the transcriptome assembly GCQL01020543 (397←1143) of the *H. sinensis* strain L0106 [Liu *et al.* 2015]. The HMG-box_ROX1-like domain (553←765) of this protein contains a Y-to-H substitution, resulting in 98.6% similarity to the domain sequence of the query protein AEH27625 [Zhang *et al.* 2013].

The metatranscriptome assembly OSIN7649 (1→249) of the mature *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex

represents a transcript encoding the MAT1-2-1 protein. The HMG-box_ROX1-like domain (379→591) of the protein is 100% identical to the query sequence AEH27625 [Zhang *et al*. 2013; Xia *et al*. 2017].

III-3 Bayesian analysis of the MATα_HMGbox domains of the full-length MAT1-1-1 protein sequences

The MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of 19 full-length MAT1-1-1 proteins that have various amino acid substitutions were subjected to the Bayesian clustering analysis, comparing with 6 MAT1-1-1 protein sequences as references (Figure 1). The MATα_HMGbox domains of the full-length MAT1-1-1 proteins were clustered into 5 Bayesian clusters (Figure 1), among which Clusters a and d are branched. The domains of the 19 proteins with various amino acid substitutions were clustered into Clusters/Branches a2, b, d, and e1−e2 in the Bayesian clustering tree. Cluster d has a longer clustering distance and Branch e2 has the longest clustering distance. The MATα_HMGbox domains encoded by genome assemblies JAAVMX010000001 (6,699,061→6,699,153 & 6,699,203→6,699.637) and LKHE01001116 (4183←4620 & 4667←4759) of *H. sinensis* strains 1229 and IOZ07 contain Y-to-M substitutions [Li *et al*. 2016; Shu *et al*. 2020]. While the domains encoded by genome assembly ANOV01017390 (794←1129 & 1280←1396) of *H. sinensis* strain Co18 and the metatranscriptome assembly OSIN7648 (151→675) of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex contain no mutant amino acids [Hu *et al*. 2013; Xia *et al*. 2017]. The domain encoded by metatranscriptome assembly GAGW01008880 (714←1127) of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex is truncated at the N-terminus (Figure S3) [Xiang *et al*. 2014]. The MATα_HMGbox domains encoded by the genome assembly ANOV01017390 and metatranscriptome assemblies OSIN7648 and GAGW01008880 were clustered into Branch a1 in the Bayesian clustering tree, together with the 6 authentic MAT1-1-1 proteins (Figure 1).

Figure 1. The Bayesian majority rule consensus clustering tree was inferred *via* MrBayes v3.2.7 software for the
MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of the 25 MAT1-1-1 proteins of the *O. sinensis* strains and wild-type *C. sinensis*
isolates and the corresponding domain sequences encoded by the genome and metatranscriptome assemblies of the
H. sinensis strains and *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes.

Tables S8–S9 summarize the Bayesian clustering results with the amino acid substitutions or deletions

in the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins derived from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates or

encoded by the genome and metatranscriptome assemblies of *H. sinensis* strains and natural *C. sinensis*

insect-fungal complexes, respectively.

III-4 Bayesian analysis of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the full-length MAT1-

2-1 protein sequences

Thirty full-length MAT1-2-1 proteins that have various amino acid substitutions in the HMG-

box_ROX1-like domains derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates or encoded by the genome and transcriptome assemblies of *H. sinensis* strains and by the metatranscriptome assembly of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex were subjected to the Bayesian clustering analysis, comparing with the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of 6 authentic MAT1-2-1 proteins. Figure 2 shows 2 branched clusters (a and b). Branches b2–b3 have longer clustering distances and Branch b2β has the longest clustering distance.

Figure 2. The Bayesian majority rule consensus clustering tree was inferred *via* MrBayes v3.2.7 software for the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain sequences of 35 full-length MAT1-2-1 proteins of the *O. sinensis* strains and wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates and the corresponding domain segments of translated genome, transcriptome, and metatranscriptome assemblies of the *H. sinensis* strains and *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes.

The HMG-box_ROX1-like domain encoded by the genome assembly ANOV01000063 (9759→9851 & 9907→10,026) of *H. sinensis* strain Co18 contains a S-to-A substitution and was clustered into Branch a2 with a slightly longer clustering distance (Figures 2 and S4) [Hu *et al*. 2013]. The domains encoded by

other genome assemblies LKHE01001605 (14,016←14,135 & 14,191←14,283), LWBQ01000021

(239,029←239,148 & 239,204←239,269), and NGJJ01000619 (23,186←23,305 & 23,361←23,453) of *H.*

sinensis strains 1229, ZJB12195, and CC1406-20395 [Li *et al.* 2016; Jin *et al.* 2020; Liu *et al.* 2020],

respectively, contain Y-to-H and S-to-A substitutions and were clustered into Branch b3 in the Bayesian

clustering tree (Figures 2 and S4).

The HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein encoded by the transcriptome assembly

GCQL01020543 (553←765) of the *H. sinensis* strain L0106 contains a Y-to-H substitution [Liu *et al.* 2015].

The domain of MAT1-2-1 protein encoded by the metatranscriptome assembly OSIN7649 (379→591) of

the *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex is 100% identical to the reference MAT1-2-1 protein AEH27625

[Zhang *et al.* 2009; Xia *et al.* 2017]. The domains of the MAT1-2-1 proteins encoded by transcriptome and

metatranscriptome assemblies were clustered into Branch b1α in the Bayesian clustering tree (Figures 2,

S4).

Tables S10–S11 summarize the Bayesian clustering results with the amino acid substitutions or

deletions in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins derived from wild-type *C. sinensis*

isolates or encoded by genome, transcriptome and metatranscriptome assemblies of *H. sinensis* strains and

natural *C. sinensis* insect-fungal complexes, respectively.

III-5 Heteromorphic stereostructures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of full-length MAT1-1-1 proteins derived from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates

Section III-5 analyzes the correlations between the changes in the structures and hydrophobicity of the

MATα_HMGbox domains of full-length MAT1-1-1 proteins (under 7 AlphaFold 3D structure models; *cf.*

Table S8) derived from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates, comparing with the reference MAT1-1-1 protein

AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 (*cf.*

Table S1) [Zhang *et al.* 2013]. The MATα_HMGbox domain sequences (amino acids 51→225) were

extended with external 9 amino acids both upstream and downstream of the domains because of the setting

of the ExPASy ProtScale plotting for the hydropathy, α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils with a window

size of 9 amino acid residues (*cf.* Section II-5 of Materials and Methods).

Figure 3 examined the structures of the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein ALH24992

under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9R5B3 derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate SC09_65 (*cf.* Tables

S1and S8) [Zhang & Zhang 2015], comparing with the reference protein AGW27560 under the AlphaFold

code U3N942 derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang *et al.* 2013]. Panel A shows an A-

to-T substitution (aliphatic alanine to threonine with polar side chains; hydropathy indexes of 1.8 to -0.7),

which caused reduced hydrophobicity, where the larger the hydropathy value, the stronger the

hydrophobicity; negative value indicates hydrophilicity [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]. The reduced hydrophobicity is illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation site in the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein ALH24992 [Zhang & Zhang 2015], as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. As shown in Panels G–H for 3D structures, the substitution is located upstream of the core structure of 3 α-helices and may not directly participate in stabilizing the hydrophobic core structure of DNA binding domain [Baxevanis *et al.* 1995; Thapar 2015]. However, the residue replacement with reduced hydrophobicity caused the altered stereostructure of the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein ALH24992 under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9R5B3 probably through long-range spatial interactions.

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AGW27560 42   ADVLTPVSTAAASRATRQTKEASCDRAKRPLNAFMAFRSYYLKLFPDVQQKTASGFLTTL 101
ALH24992 42   ---------T------------------------------------------------- 101

AGW27560 102  WHKDPFRNKWALIAKVYSFVRDQIGKDKVSLSYFMSLACPTMTIIEPAAYLNALGWCVQD 161
ALH24992 102  ----------------------------------------------------------- 161

AGW27560 162  DDAGSQKLFQDESSANLDQSSLLSAEYPSTEIELLSALVNIGYFPDHGADLVERMGSSHS 221
ALH24992 162  ----------------------------------------------------------- 221

AGW27560 222  GIMAPRAANCTPP                                               234
ALH24992 222  -------------                                               234
```

353
Figure 3. Correlation of the changes in the hydrophobicity, primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the
MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins: the reference protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code
U3N942) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 and the mutant protein ALH24992 (under the AlphaFold
code A0A0N9R5B3) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate SC09_65. Panel A shows alignment of amino
acid sequences of the MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of the MAT1-1-1 proteins with amino acid substitution in
red; the hyphens indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in
hydrophobicity (Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open
rectangles in blue outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of Panels G–H show the 3D
structures of the full-length proteins on the left and the locally amplified structures surrounding the mutation site on
the right. Model confidence for the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ■ very high (pLDDT>90); ■ high
(90>pLDDT>70); ▢ low (70>pLDDT>50); ■ very low (pLDDT<50).

Figure 4 examined the structures of the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein ALH24948 under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9QUF3 derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate GS09_143 (*cf.* Table S1) [Zhang & Zhang 2015], comparing with the reference protein AGW27560 under the AlphaFold code U3N942 derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang *et al*. 2013]. Panel A shows substitutions of adjacent Q-to-S (glutamine to serine, both having polar side chains; hydropathy indexes of -3.5 to -0.8 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]) and I-to-F (aliphatic isoleucine to aromatic phenylalanine; hydropathy indexes of 4.5 to 2.8), which caused the altered hydrophobicity, as illustrated in Panel B by topology and waveform changes for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation sites in the MATα_HMGbox domain, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. As shown in Panels G–H for 3D structures, the adjacent amino acid substitutions are located at the end of one of the 3 α-helices that form the hydrophobic core stereostructure [Baxevanis *et al*. 1995; Thapar 2015] and caused the altered tertiary structure of the MATα_HMGbox domain of mutant protein ALH24948 under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9QUF3 [Zhang & Zhang 2015].

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AGW27560  42   ADVLTPVSTAAASRATRQTKEASCDRAKRPLNAFMAFRSYYLKLFPDVQQKTASGFLTTL 101
ALH24948  42   ----------------------------------------------------------- 101

AGW27560  102  WHKDPFRNKWALIAKVYSFVRDQIGKDKVSLSYFMSLACPTMTIIEPAAYLNALGWCVQD 161
ALH24948  102  --------------------SF------------------------------------- 161

AGW27560  162  DDAGSQKLFQDESSANLDQSSLLSAEYPSTEIELLSALVNIGYFPDHGADLVERMGSSHS 221
ALH24948  162  ----------------------------------------------------------- 221

AGW27560  222  GIMAPRAANCTPP                                               234
ALH24948  222  -------------                                               234
```

381
382
383
Figure 4. Correlation of the changes in the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the MATα_HMGbox
domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins: the reference protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from
the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 and the mutant MAT1-1-1 protein ALH24948 (under the AlphaFold code
A0A0N9QUF3) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate GS09_143. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid
sequences of the MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of the MAT1-1-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red;
the hyphens indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity
(Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue
outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of Panels G–H show the 3D structures of the full-
length proteins on the left and the locally amplified structures at the sites of substitutions on the right. Model
confidence for the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ■ very high (pLDDT>90); ■ high (90>pLDDT>70); ■ low
(70>pLDDT>50); ■ very low (pLDDT<50).

Figure 5 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1

proteins ALH25043, ALH25045, ALH25046, and ALH25048 (under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9QMS9) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates YN09_22, YN09_51, YN09_6, and YN09_64 (*cf*. Table S1) [Zhang & Zhang 2015], respectively, comparing with the reference protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang *et al*. 2013]. Panel A shows substitutions of R-to-I (basic arginine to aliphatic isoleucine; hydropathy indexes of -4.5 to 4.5 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]) and P-to-T (proline to threonine both with polar neutral side chains; hydropathy indexes of -1.6 to -0.7), which caused increases in hydrophobicity, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation sites in the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins ALH25043, ALH25045, ALH25046, and ALH25048 [Zhang & Zhang 2015], as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. As shown in Panels G–H for 3D structures, the R-to-I and P-to-T substitutions are located inside and outside the hydrophobic core of the 3 α-helices, respectively, with substantial increases in hydrophobicity altered the tertiary structures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9QMS9.

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AGW27560  42  ADVLTPVSTAAASRATRQTKEASCDRAKRPLNAFMAFRSYYLKLFPDVQQKTASGFLTTL 101
ALH25043  42  ----------------------------------------------------------- 101
ALH25045  42  ----------------------------------------------------------- 101
ALH25046  42  ----------------------------------------------------------- 101
ALH25048  42  ----------------------------------------------------------- 101

AGW27560 102  WHKDPFRNKWALIAKVYSFVRDQIGKDKVSLSYFMSLACPTMTIIEPAAYLNALGWCVQD 161
ALH25043 102  ----------------------------------------------------------- 161
ALH25045 102  ----------------------------------------------------------- 161
ALH25046 102  ----------------------------------------------------------- 161
ALH25048 102  ----------------------------------------------------------- 161

AGW27560 162  DDAGSQKLFQDESSANLDQSSLLSAEYPSTEIELLSALVNIGYFPDHGADLVERMGSSHS 221
ALH25043 162  ---------------------------------------------------I------ 221
ALH25045 162  ---------------------------------------------------I------ 221
ALH25046 162  ---------------------------------------------------I------ 221
ALH25048 162  ---------------------------------------------------I------ 221

AGW27560 222  GIMAPRAANCTPP                                              234
ALH25043 222  ----T--------                                              234
ALH25045 222  ----T--------                                              234
ALH25046 222  ----T--------                                              234
ALH25048 222  ----T--------                                              234
```

414
Figure 5. Correlation of the changes in the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the MATα_HMGbox
domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins: the reference protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from
the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 and the mutant MAT1-1-1 proteins ALH25043, ALH25045, ALH25046, and
ALH25048 (under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9QMS9) derived from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates YN09_22,
YN09_51, YN09_6, and YN09_64, respectively. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the
MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of the MAT1-1-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red; the hyphens
indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B)
and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) and hydropathy with open rectangles in blue
outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of Panels G–H show the 3D structures of the full-
length proteins on the left and the locally amplified structures at the sites of substitutions on the right. Model
confidence for the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ▮ very high (pLDDT>90); ▮ high (90>pLDDT>70); ▮ low
(70>pLDDT>50); ▮ very low (pLDDT<50).

Figure 6 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1

proteins ALH25054, ALH24951, ALH24952, ALH24953, ALH24962, ALH24963, ALH24964, ALH24966,

and ALH24994 (under the AlphaFold code A0A0N7G845) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates

GS09_311, GS09_229, GS09_281, GS10_1, QH09_164, QH09_173, QH09_201, QH09_210, and

SC09_87 (*cf.* Table S1) [Zhang & Zhang 2015], respectively, comparing with the reference protein

AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang

et al. 2013].

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AGW27560  42  ADVLTPVSTAAASRATRQTKEASCDRAKRPLNAFMAFRSYYLKLFPDVQQKTASGFLTTL  101
ALH25054  42  ------------------------------------------------------------  101
ALH24951  42  ------------------------------------------------------------  101
ALH24952  42  ------------------------------------------------------------  101
ALH24953  42  ------------------------------------------------------------  101
ALH24962  42  ------------------------------------------------------------  101
ALH24963  42  ------------------------------------------------------------  101
ALH24964  42  ------------------------------------------------------------  101
ALH24966  42  ------------------------------------------------------------  101
ALH24994  42  ------------------------------------------------------------  101

AGW27560  102 WHKDPFRNKWALIAKVYSFVRDQIGKDKVSLSYFMSLACPTMTIIEPAAYLNALGWCVQD  161
ALH25054  102 --------------------L--------------------------------------- 161
ALH24951  102 --------------------L--------------------------------------- 161
ALH24952  102 --------------------L--------------------------------------- 161
ALH24953  102 --------------------L--------------------------------------- 161
ALH24962  102 --------------------L--------------------------------------- 161
ALH24963  102 --------------------L--------------------------------------- 161
ALH24964  102 --------------------L--------------------------------------- 161
ALH24966  102 --------------------L--------------------------------------- 161
ALH24994  102 --------------------L--------------------------------------- 161

AGW27560  162 DDAGSQKLFQDESSANLDQSSLLSAEYPSTEIELLSALVNIGYFPDHGADLVERMGSSHS  221
ALH25054  162 ------------------------------------------------------------  221
ALH24951  162 ------------------------------------------------------------  221
ALH24952  162 ------------------------------------------------------------  221
ALH24953  162 ------------------------------------------------------------  221
ALH24962  162 ------------------------------------------------------------  221
ALH24963  162 ------------------------------------------------------------  221
ALH24964  162 ------------------------------------------------------------  221
ALH24966  162 ------------------------------------------------------------  221
ALH24994  162 ------------------------------------------------------------  221

AGW27560  222 GIMAPRAANCTPP                                                234
ALH25054  222 -------------                                                234
ALH24951  222 -------------                                                234
ALH24952  222 -------------                                                234
ALH24953  222 -------------                                                234
ALH24962  222 -------------                                                234
ALH24963  222 -------------                                                234
ALH24964  222 -------------                                                234
ALH24966  222 -------------                                                234
ALH24994  222 -------------                                                234
```

Page 21

Figure 6. Correlation of the changes in the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the MATα_HMGbox
domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins: the reference protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from
the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 and the mutant MAT1-1-1 proteins ALH25054, ALH24951, ALH24952,
ALH24953, ALH24962, ALH24963, ALH24964, ALH24966, and ALH24994 (under the AlphaFold code
A0A0N7G845) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate GS09_311, GS09_229, GS09_281, GS10_1,
QH09_164, QH09_173, QH09_201, QH09_210, and SC09_87, respectively. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid
sequences of the MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of the MAT1-1-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red;
the hyphens indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity
(Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue
outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of Panels G–H show the 3D structures of the full-
length proteins on the left and the locally amplified structures at the site of substitution on the right. Model confidence
for the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ▪ very high (pLDDT>90); ▪ high (90>pLDDT>70); ▪ low
(70>pLDDT>50); ▪ very low (pLDDT<50).

Panel A of Figure 6 shows I-to-L substitutions (aliphatic isoleucine to aliphatic leucine; hydropathy

indexes of 4.5 to 3.8 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]), which caused reduced hydrophobicity as illustrated by

topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation sites in the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins ALH25054, ALH24951, ALH24952, ALH24953, ALH24962, ALH24963, ALH24964, ALH24966, and ALH24994 (*cf*. Table S1) [Zhang & Zhang 2015], as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. As shown in Panels G–H for the 3D structures, the amino acid substitutions with reduced hydrophobicity are located within the core structures of α-helices and destabilized the hydrophobicity core [Baxevanis *et al*. 1995; Thapar 2015], which caused the altered tertiary structures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins under the AlphaFold code A0A0N7G845.

Figure 7 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins ALH24999 and ALH25057 (under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9QMT4) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates XZ07_H2 and XZ12_16 (*cf*. Table S1) [Zhang & Zhang 2015], respectively, comparing with the reference protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang *et al*. 2013].

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AGW27560  42   ADVLTPVSTAAASRATRQTKEASCDRAKRPLNAFMAFRSYYLKLFPDVQQKTASGFLTTL 101
ALH24999  42   ---------V----T--------------------------------------------- 101
ALH25057  42   ---------V----T--------------------------------------------- 101

AGW27560 102   WHKDPFRNKWALIAKVYSFVRDQIGKDKVSLSYFMSLACPTMTIIEPAAYLNALGWCVQD 161
ALH24999 102   ----------------------------------------------------------- 161
ALH25057 102   ----------------------------------------------------------- 161

AGW27560 162   DDAGSQKLFQDESSANLDQSSLLSAEYPSTEIELLSALVNIGYFPDHGADLVERMGSSHS 221
ALH24999 162   ----------------------------------------------------------- 221
ALH25057 162   ----------------------------------------------------------- 221

AGW27560 222   GIMAPRAANCTPP                                               234
ALH24999 222   -------------                                               234
ALH25057 222   -------------                                               234
```

Figure 7. Correlation of the changes in the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the MATα_HMGbox
domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins: the reference protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from
the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 and the mutant MAT1-1-1 proteins ALH24999 and ALH25057 (under the
AlphaFold code A0A0N9QMT4) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates XZ07_H2 and XZ12_16,
respectively. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of the
MAT1-1-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red; the hyphens indicate identical amino acid residues. The
ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices,
β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots.
Each of Panels G–H show the 3D structures of the full-length proteins on the left and the locally amplified structures
at the sites of substitutions on the right. Model confidence for the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ■ very high
(pLDDT>90); ■ high (90>pLDDT>70); ■ low (70>pLDDT>50); ■ very low (pLDDT<50).

Panel A of Figure 7 shows substitutions of A-to-V (aliphatic alanine to aliphatic valine; hydropathy

indexes of 1.8 to 4.2 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]) and A-to-T (aliphatic isoleucine to threonine with polar

neutral side chains; hydropathy indexes of 1.8 to -0.7), which caused changes in hydrophobicity, as

illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted

in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation sites in the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-

1-1 proteins ALH24999 and ALH25057 [Zhang & Zhang 2015], as illustrated by topology and waveform

changes in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. As shown

in Panels G–H for 3D structures, the mutation sites are located upstream the hydrophobic core structure of

3 α-helices in the MATα_HMGbox domains and altered the tertiary structures of the MATα_HMGbox

domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9QMT4.

Figure 8 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1

protein ALH25001 (under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9R4Q4) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis*

isolate XZ05_2 (*cf*. Table S1) [Zhang & Zhang 2015], comparing with the reference protein AGW27560

(under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang *et al*. 2013].

Panel A shows substitutions of A-to-V (aliphatic alanine to aliphatic valine; hydropathy indexes of 1.8 to

4.2 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]) and A-to-T (aliphatic isoleucine to threonine with polar neutral side chains;

hydropathy indexes of 1.8 to -0.7), which caused changes in hydrophobicity, as illustrated by topology and

waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary

structures surrounding the mutation sites in the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein ALH25001,

as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-

helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. As shown in Panels G–H for the 3D structures, the amino acid

substitutions are located upstream the core structures of 3 α-helices of the domains and altered the tertiary

structures of the domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9R4Q4.

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AGW27560  42   ADVLTPVSTAAASRATRQTKEASCDRAKRPLNAFMAFRSYYLKLFPDVQQKTASGFLTTL 101
ALH25001  42   ---------V----T--------------------------------------------- 101

AGW27560 102   WHKDPFRNKWALIAKVYSFVRDQIGKDKVSLSYFMSLACPTMTIIEPAAYLNALGWCVQD 161
ALH25001 102   ----------------------------------------------------------- 161

AGW27560 162   DDAGSQKLFQDESSANLDQSSLLSAEYPSTEIELLSALVNIGYFPDHGADLVERMGSSHS 221
ALH25001 162   ----------------------------------------------------------- 221

AGW27560 222   GIMAPRAANCTPP                                               234
ALH25001 222   -------------                                               234
```

509
Figure 8. Correlation of the changes in the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the MATα_HMGbox
domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins: the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from
the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 and the mutant MAT1-1-1 protein ALH25001 (under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9R4Q4)
derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate XZ05_2. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the
MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of the MAT1-1-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red; the hyphens
indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B)
and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining the
changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of Panels G–H show the 3D structures of the full-length proteins
on the left and the locally amplified structures at the sites of substitutions on the right with dashed brackets in blue
indicating 2 extra β-sheets structures. Model confidence for the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ▮ very high
(pLDDT>90); ▮ high (90>pLDDT>70); ▮ low (70>pLDDT>50); ▮ very low (pLDDT<50).

Panels A of Figures 9–10 show the same substitutions of A-to-V and A-to-T in the MATα_HMGbox

domains of the protein ALH25001 under AlphaFold code A0A0N9R4Q4 and the proteins ALH24999 and ALH25057 under the AlphaFold code A0A0N9QMT4 [Zhang & Zhang 2015]. However, Panels H of Figures 9–10 show different tertiary structures of the domains of the MAT1-1-1 proteins under 2 different AlphaFold 3D morphs. In particular, the protein ALH25001 contains 2 extra short β-sheet structures both upstream and downstream of the mutation sites in the MATα_HMGbox domain shown in Figure 8, which are marked with dashed brackets in blue, as compared with the tertiary structures for the mutant proteins ALH24999 and ALH25057 shown in Figure 7 [Zhang et al. 2013].

Figure 9 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein ALH25003 (under the AlphaFold code A0A0N7G850) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate XZ05_6 (*cf*. Table S1) [Zhang & Zhang 2015], comparing with the reference protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang et al. 2013]. Panel A shows a S-to-G substitution (serine with polar neutral side chains to unique amino acid glycine; hydropathy indexes of -0.8 to -0.4 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982], which caused a slight increase in hydrophobicity, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes caused the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation site in the MATα_HMGbox domain of mutant MAT1-1-1 protein ALH25003, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. As shown in Panels G–H for the 3D structures, the last animo acid (serine) positioning at the end of one of the 3 α- helices that form the hydrophobic core structure of the MATα_HMGbox domain [Baxevanis et al. 1995; Thapar 2015] was substituted with glycine that became the first residue after the α-helix in the domain. The single residue substitution plus other E-to-K and Y-to-H downstream the domain (*cf*. Figure S3) caused the significantly altered tertiary structure of the protein ALH25003 under the unique AlphaFold code A0A0N7G850.

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AGW27560  42   ADVLTPVSTAAASRATRQTKEASCDRAKRPLNAFMAFRSYYLKLFPDVQQKTASGFLTTL 101
ALH25003  42   ----------------------------------------------------------- 101

AGW27560 102   WHKDPFRNKWALIAKVYSFVRDQIGKDKVSLSYFMSLACPTMTIIEPAAYLNALGWCVQD 161
ALH25003 102   ----------------------------------------------------------- 161

AGW27560 162   DDAGSQKLFQDESSANLDQSSLLSAEYPSTEIELLSALVNIGYFPDHGADLVERMGSSHS 221
ALH25003 162   ------------------------------------------------------G-- 221

AGW27560 222   GIMAPRAANCTPP                                               234
ALH25003 222   -------------                                               234
```

Panel H: ALH25003 (A0A0N7G850);Average pLDDT: 67.56

548
Figure 9. Correlation of the changes in the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the MATα_HMGbox
domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins: the reference protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from
the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 and the mutant MAT1-1-1 protein ALH25003 (under the AlphaFold code
A0A0N7G850) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate XZ05_6. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid
sequences of the MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of the MAT1-1-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red;
the hyphens indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity
(Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue
outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of Panels G–H show the 3D structures of the full-
length proteins on the left and the locally amplified structures at the sites of substitutions on the right. Model
confidence for the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ▣ very high (pLDDT>90); ▣ high (90>pLDDT>70); ▢ low
(70>pLDDT>50); ▢ very low (pLDDT<50).

In aggregation, Panels A of Figures 5–11 demonstrated the 1–2 amino acid substitutions in the

MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins under various AlphaFold 3D structure codes derived from

wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates, comparing with the reference MAT1-1-1 protein AGW27560 under the

AlphaFold code U3N942 [Zhang *et al*. 2013]. The substitutions in the domains caused the changes in the

topologies and waveforms of ExPASy ProtScale plots shown in Panels B–F of Figures 5–11, indicating the

subsequently altered hydrophobicity and the secondary structures (α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils)

of the mutant full-length proteins. The changes in hydrophobicity and primary and secondary structures of

the domains then caused alterations of the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures of the MATα_HMGbox

domains of the proteins under various AlphaFold codes (*cf*. Panels H of Figures 5–11). The mutant domain

sequences with 1 or 2 amino acid substitutions were clustered into different clades in the Bayesian clustering

tree (*cf*. Figure 1, Table S8) and the altered 3D structures, ultimately changing the DNA binding affinities

and the functionalities of gene transcription regulations relating to the sexual reproduction of *O. sinensis*.

III-6 Diverse stereostructures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of N-terminally

truncated MAT1-1-1 proteins derived from *O. sinensis* strains

In addition to the 118 full-length proteins analyzed above, 20 other MAT1-1-1 proteins

(AGW27517–AGW27536) are truncated at the N-termini of the MATα_HMGbox domains (Figure 10)

[Bushley *et al*. 2013; Li *et al*. 2013, 2025]. These truncated proteins exhibited 66–93% query coverage

compared with the domain of the query sequence MAT1-1-1 protein AGW27560 under the AlphaFold UniProt code U3N942 [Zhang *et al*. 2013; Li *et al*. 2025]. The truncated MAT1-1-1 proteins derived from *O. sinensis* strains exhibited variable lengths shown in Figure 10, although the *MAT1-1-1* cDNA encoding the truncated proteins were amplified using the same pair of forward primer *m1cDNAF3* and revere compliment primer *m1cDNAR5* shown in Figure S1 [Bushley *et al*. 2013]. In addition to the variable truncation mutations, the protein AGW27526 contained an additional A-to-T substitution (aliphatic isoleucine to threonine with polar neutral side chains; hydropathy indexes of 1.8 to -0.7, *cf*. Table S7; indicating reduced hydrophobicity) and the protein AGW27536 had a deletion of leucine residue (hydropathy index of 3.8). The 20 truncated proteins exhibited diverse tertiary structures under 9 different AlphaFold 3D structure codes (Figure 10).

Figure 10. Sequence distribution of the N-terminally truncated MATα_HMGbox domains of 20 subject MAT1-1-1 proteins derived from the listed *O. sinensis* strains aligned with the full-length MATα_HMGbox domain (51→225) of the query MAT1-1-1 protein AGW27560 of the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229.

The 20 *O. sinensis* strains listed in Figure 10 were isolated either from the fresh caterpillar bodies or the cultures of mono-ascospores, marked as TS and SS in Table S4 reported by Li *et al*. [2013], respectively, of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungal complexes. Ten (CS18-266, CS25-273, CS37-295, CS68-2-1229, CS71-1219, CS71-1228, CS76-1284, CS91-1291, CS560-961, and CS561-964) of the 20 strains were genetically homogenous belonging to GC-biased Genotype #1 *H. sinensis* shown in blue in Table S4. However, 5 other strains in red in Table S4 (CS6-251, CS34-291, CS68-2-1228, CS70-1208, and CS71-1220) were

genetically heterogeneous, cooccurring GC-biased Genotype #1 and AT-biased Genotype #5 of *O. sinensis* [Bushley *et al.* 2013; Li *et al.* 2013]. Worth noting, the 17 GC- and AT-biased genotypes of *O. sinensis* are genome independent, belonging to different fungi [Kinjo & Zang 2001; Stensrud *et al.* 2007; Xiao *et al.* 2009; Yao & Zhu 2016; Zhu & Li 2017; Li *et al.* 2020b, 2022, 2023d, 2023e]. The remaining 5 strains (CS26-277, CS36-1294, CS68-5-1216, CS70-1211, and CS70-1212) shown in black in Table S4 lacked ITS molecular genotyping information in the GenBank database.

The variable lengths of MATα_HMGbox domains of the 20 truncated proteins shown in Figure 10 were derived from the *MAT1-1-1* cDNA that were amplified using the same pair of primers (*m1cDNAF3* and *m1cDNAR5*) [Bushley *et al.* 2013]. The variable MAT1-1-1 proteins and the heterogeneous genotypic backgrounds for the *O. sinensis* strains (CS6-251, CS34-291, CS68-2-1228, CS70-1208, and CS71-1220; *cf.* Table S4) indicate different fungal sources of the truncated proteins, derived from either GC-biased Genotype #1 or AT-biased Genotype #5 of *O. sinensis* fungi. While Strains CS26-277, CS36-1294, CS68-5-1216, CS70-1211, and CS70-1212 that produced variable MAT1-1-1 proteins might also present fungal heterogeneity but to date without ITS molecular genotyping evidence in the GenBank database, in addition to the 4 other ascosporic strains (1210, 1213, 1223, and 1226) without ITS molecular taxonomic evidence [Bushley *et al.* 2013; Li *et al.* 2013, 2025].

III-7 Diverse primary and secondary structures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins encoded by genome and metatranscriptome assemblies of *H. sinensis* and *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex

Figure 11 examined the hydrophobicity and secondary structures (α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) of the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein that were encoded by the genome assemblies JAAVMX010000001 (6,699,061→6,699,153 & 6,699,203→6,699,637, removed the intron section) and LKHE01001116 (4183←4614 & 4655←4759, removed the intron section) of the *H. sinensis* strains IOZ07 and 1229, comparing with the reference MAT1-1-1 protein AGW27560 derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang *et al.* 2009; Li *et al.* 2016a; Shu *et al.* 2020]. Panel A shows a Y-to-M substitution (aromatic tyrosine to methionine with polar neutral side chains; hydropathy indexes of -1.3 to 1.9 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]), which caused increased hydrophobicity in the domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins that were encoded by the genome assemblies JAAVMX010000001 and LKHE01001116 [Li *et al.* 2016a; Shu *et al.* 2020], illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation sites in the domains of the MAT1-1-1 proteins, as illustrated in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. The MATα_HMGbox domains of the MAT1-1-1 proteins were clustered into Branch c in the Bayesian

    clustering tree (*cf*. Figure 1, Table S9).

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AGW27560         42          ADVLTPVSTAAASRATRQTKEASCDRAKRPLNAFMAFRSYYLKLFPDVQQKTASGFLTTL 101
JAAVMX010000001  6,699,034   ---------------------------------------------M-------------------- 6,699,213
LKHE01001116     4786        ---------------------------------------------M------------------- 4555

AGW27560         85          WHKDPFRNKWALIAKVYSFVRDQIGKDKVSLSYFMSLACPTMTIIEPAAYLNALGWCVQD 161
JAAVMX010000001  6,699,214   -------------------------------------------------------------------- 6,699,393
LKHE01001116     4554        -------------------------------------------------------------------- 4375

AGW27560         145         DDAGSQKLFQDESSANLDQSSLLSAEYPSTEIELLSALVNIGYFPDHGADLVERMGSSHS 221
JAAVMX010000001  6,699,214   -------------------------------------------------------------------- 6,699,573
LKHE01001116     4374        -------------------------------------------------------------------- 4195

AGW27560         205         GIMAPRAANCTPP                                                     234
JAAVMX010000001  6,699,574   -------------                                                     6,699,664
LKHE01001116     4194        -------------                                                     4156
```

Figure 11. Correlation of the changes in the primary and secondary structures of the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins: the reference protein AGW27560 derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 and the truncated MAT1-1-1 proteins encoded by the genome assemblies JAAVMX010000001 and LKHE01001116 of the *H. sinensis* strains IOZ07 and 1229, respectively. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the MATα_HMGbox domain sequences of the MAT1-1-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red; the hyphens

indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots.

No changes were found in the amino acid sequences, hydrophobicity, and the secondary structures (α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) in the MATα_HMGbox domains of MAT1-1-1 proteins that were encoded by the genome assembly ANOV01017390 (794←1229 & 1280←1369, removed the intron section) of the *H. sinensis* strain Co18 and the metatranscriptome assembly OSIN7648 (1→1065) of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex collected from Deqin, Yunnan of China, comparing with the reference MAT1-1-1 protein AGW27560 (*cf*. Figure S3, Table S9) [Kyte & Doolittle 1982; Zhang *et al*. 2013; Hu *et al*. 2013; Liu *et al*. 2015]. The MATα_HMGbox domains of the genome- and metatranscriptome-encoded MAT1-1-1 proteins were clustered into Branch a1 in the Bayesian clustering tree (*cf*. Figure 1, Table S9).

The MATα_HMGbox domain of the MAT1-1-1 protein encoded by the metatranscriptome assembly GAGW01008880 (714←1127) of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex is largely truncated at the N-terminus shown in Figure S3 and in Panel A of Figure S5 [Xiang *et al*. 2014]. The remaining portion of the MATα_HMGbox domain of the metatranscriptome-encoded MAT1-1-1 protein was 100% identical to the query protein AGW27560 (under the AlphaFold code U3N942) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 [Zhang *et al*. 2013] and showed no apparent changes in hydrophobicity and secondary structures, as illustrated by the identical topology and waveform in Panels B–F of Figure S5 of the ExPASy ProtScale plots for hydropathy, α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. Although the MATα_HMGbox domain of the metatranscriptome-encoded protein was clustered into Branch a1 in the Bayesian clustering tree together with the 6 reference authentic MAT1-1-1 proteins (*cf*. Figure 1, Table S9), the remaining portion of the truncated domain missing 50 and 48 amino acids that encoded by the exons I and II of the gene, respectively, may not be able to form the core stereostructure of the 3 α-helices to support the high affinity of DNA binding and fully functionality for gene transcription regulation relating to the sexual reproduction of *O. sinensis* [Baxevanis *et al*. 1995; Thapar 2015].

The genome assemblies LWBQ00000000 and NGJJ00000000 and the transcriptome assembly GCQL00000000 of the *H. sinensis* strains ZJB12195, CC1406-20395, and L0106, respectively, do not contain the genes or transcripts that encode the MAT1-1-1 proteins [Liu *et al*. 2015, 2020; Jin *et al*. 2020].

III-8 Heteromorphic stereostructures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the MAT1-2-1 proteins derived from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates

This section analyzes the correlation between the hydrophobicity and structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins derived from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates under 12

AlphaFold codes (Table S10), comparing with the reference MAT1-2-1 proteins represented by AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 (*cf.* Table S2) [Zhang *et al.* 2009]. The HMG-box_ROX1-like domain sequences (amino acids 127→197) were extended both upstream and downstream with external 9 amino acids because the ExPASy ProtScale plotting for the hydropathy, α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils was set up with a window size of 9 amino acids (*cf.* Section II-5 of Materials and Methods).

Figure 12 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein AIV43040 (under the AlphaFold code A0A0A0RCF5) derived from the *C. sinensis* isolate XZ12_16 (*cf.* Table S2) [Zhang *et al.* 2014], comparing with the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 [Zhang *et al.* 2009]. Panel A shows 3 amino acid substitutions: Y-to-H (aromatic tyrosine to basic histidine; hydropathy index -1.3 to -3.2 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]), M-to-I (methionine with polar neutral side chains to aliphatic isoleucine; hydropathy index 1.9 to 4.5), and Q-to-R (glutamine with polar neutral side chains to basic arginine; hydropathy index -3.5 to -4.5), which caused decreases and an increase in hydrophobicity, respectively, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation sites in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein AIV43040 [Zhang *et al.* 2014], as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. As shown in Panels G–H for 3D structures, the replaced residues are located in each of the 3 core α-helices that altered the stability of hydrophobic core of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain [Baxevanis *et al.* 1995; Thapar 2015] and the stereostructure of the domain of MAT1-2-1 protein AIV43040 under the AlphaFold code A0A0A0RCF5. The mutant HMG-box_ROX1-like domain was clustered into Branch b2β with the longest clustering distance in the Bayesian clustering tree (*cf.* Figure 2, Table S10).

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AEH27625 118 APPSPKDIKIPRPPNAYILYRKERHHYVKDANPGITNNEISQILGKAWNMESNDVRQKYK 177
AIV43040 118 ------------------------H---------------------I---------- 177

AEH27625 178 DMSQQVKQALLEKHPDYQYKPRRPCERRR                              206
AIV43040 178 ----R------------------------                              206
```

696
Figure 12. Correlation of the changes in the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like
domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins: the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from
the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 and the mutant MAT1-2-1 protein AIV43040 (under the AlphaFold code A0A0A0RCF5)
derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate XZ12_16. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the
HMG-box_ROX1-like domain sequences of the MAT1-2-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red; the hyphens
indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B)
and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining the
changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of Panels G–H show the 3D structures of the full-length proteins
on the left and the locally amplified structures at the sites of substitutions on the right. Model confidence for the
AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ▮ very high (pLDDT>90); ▮ high (90>pLDDT>70); ▮ low (70>pLDDT>50); ▮
very low (pLDDT<50).

Figure 13 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-

2-1 proteins under the AlphaFold code D7F2J7 (ACV60417, ACV60418, AFH35020, and AFX66443

derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates XZ-LZ07-H1, XZ-LZ07-H2, XZ06-124, and XZ05_8) and

of the proteins under the AlphaFold code D7F2F5 (ACV60375, ACV60415, AFX66441, AFX66446, and

AFX66461 derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates XZ-SN-44, XZ-LZ05-6, XZ05_2, XZ06_260,

and XZ09_80) (*cf*. Table S2) (*cf*. Table S2) [Zhang *et al*. 2009, 2012, 2014], respectively, comparing with

the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain

CS2 [Zhang *et al*. 2009]. Panel A of Figure 13 shows substitutions of Y-to-H (aromatic tyrosine to basic

histidine; hydropathy indexes of -1.3 to -3.2 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]) and M-to-I (methionine with polar

neutral side chains to aliphatic isoleucine; hydropathy indexes of 1.9 to of 4.5), which caused changes in

hydrophobicity, respectively, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the

hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation sites

in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of mutant MAT1-2-1 proteins ACV60417, ACV60418, AFH35020,

and AFX66443 under the AlphaFold code D7F2J7 and of the proteins ACV60375, ACV60415, AFX66441,

AFX66446, and AFX66461 under the AlphaFold code D7F2F5 [Zhang *et al*. 2009, 2012, 2014], as

illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices,

β-sheets, β-turns, and coils.

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AEH27625 118 APPSPKDIKIPRPPNAYILYRKERHHYVKDANPGITNNEISQILGKAWNMESNDVRQKYK 177
ACV60417 118 ------------------------------H-----------------------I---------- 177
ACV60418 118 ------------------------------H-----------------------I---------- 177
AFH35020 118 ------------------------------H-----------------------I---------- 177
AFX66443 118 ------------------------------H-----------------------I---------- 177
ACV60375 118 ------------------------------H-----------------------I---------- 177
ACV60415 118 ------------------------------H-----------------------I---------- 177
AFX66441 118 ------------------------------H-----------------------I---------- 177
AFX66446 118 ------------------------------H-----------------------I---------- 177
AFX66461 118 ------------------------------H-----------------------I---------- 177

AEH27625 178 DMSQQVKQALLEKHPDYQYKPRRPCERRR                              206
ACV60417 178 ----------------------------                               206
ACV60418 178 ----------------------------                               206
AFH35020 178 ----------------------------                               206
AFX66443 178 ----------------------------                               206
ACV60375 178 ----------------------------                               206
ACV60415 178 ----------------------------                               206
AFX66441 178 ----------------------------                               206
AFX66446 178 ----------------------------                               206
AFX66461 178 ----------------------------                               206
```

728
729 Figure 13. Correlation of the changes in the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like
730 domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins: the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from

the *H. sinensis* strain CS2, the mutant MAT1-2-1 proteins under the AlphaFold code D7F2J7 (ACV60417, ACV60418, AFH35020, and AFX66443 derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate XZ-LZ07-H1, XZ-LZ07-H2, XZ06-124, and XZ05_8), and the mutant proteins under the AlphaFold code D7F2F5 (ACV60375, ACV60415, AFX66441, AFX66446, and AFX66461 derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate XZ-SN-44, XZ-LZ05-6, XZ05_2, XZ06_260, and XZ09_80). Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain sequences of the MAT1-2-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red; the sequences in brown and green represent the MAT1-2-1 proteins under the AlphaFold codes D7F2J7 and D7F2F5, respectively; the hyphens indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C−F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of Panels G–H show the 3D structures of the full-length proteins on the left and the locally amplified structures at the sites of substitutions on the right. Model confidence for the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ▮ very high (pLDDT>90); ▯ high (90>pLDDT>70); ▯ low (70>pLDDT>50); ▯ very low (pLDDT<50).

As shown in Panels G–I of Figure 13 for 3D structures, the replaced residues are located in two of the 3 core α-helices that differentially altered the stability of core structure of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain [Baxevanis *et al*. 1995; Thapar 2015] and the tertiary structures of the domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins under the AlphaFold 3D structural codes D7F2J7 and D7F2F5. The variable domain sequences of the mutant proteins ACV60417, ACV60418, AFH35020, AFX66443, ACV60375, ACV60415, AFX66441, AFX66446, and AFX66461 were clustered into Branch b2α in the Bayesian clustering tree (*cf*. Figure 2, Table S10).

Figure 14 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein under the AlphaFold codes V9LWC9 (AFX66476), V9LVS8 (AFX66472, AFX66473, and AFX66474), D7F2E3 (ACV60363, ACV60364, AFX66388, AFH35018, and AGW27542), V9LVU8 (AFX66475), D7F2G5 (ACV60385), V9LW71 (AFX66401), V9LWG5 (AFX66484), and U3N6V5 (AGW27537) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates YN09_64, YN09_6, YN09_22, YN09_51, XZ-NQ-154, XZ-NQ-155, GS09_111, QH09-93, CS560-961, QH-YS-199, QH09_11, ID10_1, and CS6-251, respectively (*cf*. Table S2) [Zhang *et al*. 2014], comparing with the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 [Zhang *et al*. 2009]. Panel A shows Y-to-H substitutions (aromatic tyrosine to basic histidine; hydropathy indexes of -1.3 to -3.2 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]) in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of all the MAT1-2-1 proteins aforementioned, which caused reduced hydrophobicity, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plots. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation sites in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C−F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils.

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AEH27625 118 APPSPKDIKIPRPPNAYILYRKERHHYVKDANPGITNNEISQILGKAWNMESNDVRQKYK 177
AFX66476 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AFX66472 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AFX66473 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AFX66474 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
ACV60363 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
ACV60364 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AFX66388 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AFH35018 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AGW27542 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AFX66475 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
ACV60385 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AFX66401 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AFX66484 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177
AGW27537 118 ------------------------H--------------------------------- 177

AEH27625 178 DMSQQVKQALLEKHPDYQYKPRRPCERRR                             206
AFX66476 178 -----------------------------                             206
AFX66472 178 -----------------------------                             206
AFX66473 178 -----------------------------                             206
AFX66474 178 -----------------------------                             206
ACV60363 178 -----------------------------                             206
ACV60364 178 -----------------------------                             206
AFX66388 178 -----------------------------                             206
AFH35018 178 -----------------------------                             206
AGW27542 178 -----------------------------                             206
AFX66475 178 -----------------------------                             206
ACV60385 178 -----------------------------                             206
AFX66401 178 -----------------------------                             206
AFX66484 178 -----------------------------                             206
AGW27537 178 -----------------------------                             206
```

Panel B: Hydropathy   **Panel C: α-Helices**   **Panel D: β-Sheets**

AlphaFold code V9LVS8: AFX66476
AlphaFold code V9LVS8: AFX66472 AFX66473 AFX66474
AlphaFold code D7F2E3: ACV60363 ACV60364 AFX66388 AFH35018 AGW27542
AlphaFold code V9LVU8: AFX66475
AlphaFold code V9LVU8: ACV60385
AlphaFold code V9LW71: AFX66401
AlphaFold code V9LWG5: AFX66484
AlphaFold code U3N6V5: AGW27537

Panel E: β-Turns

Panel F: Coils

AlphaFold code V9LVS8: AFX66476
AlphaFold code V9LVS8: AFX66472 AFX66473 AFX66474
AlphaFold code D7F2E3: ACV60363 ACV60364 AFX66388 AFH35018 AGW27542
AlphaFold code V9LVU8: AFX66475
AlphaFold code V9LVU8: ACV60385
AlphaFold code V9LW71: AFX66401
AlphaFold code V9LWG5: AFX66484
AlphaFold code U3N6V5: AGW27537

Panel G: AEH27625 (D7F2E9); Average pLDDT: 67.31

Panel H: AFX66476 (V9LVS8); Average pLDDT: 74.44

Panel I: AFX66472, AFX66473, and AFX66474 (V9LVS8)
Average pLDDT: 74.44

Panel L: ACV60385 (V9LVU8); Average pLDDT: 69.5

Panel M: AFX66401 (V9LW71); Average pLDDT: 67.56

Figure 14. Correlation of the changes in the hydrophobicity, and primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the
HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins: the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code
D7F2E9) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 and the mutant MAT1-2-1 proteins under the AlphaFold codes
V9LWC9 (AFX66476), **V9LVS8** (AFX66472, AFX66473, and AFX66474), **D7F2E3** (ACV60363, ACV60364,
AFX66388, AFH35018, and AGW27542), **V9LVU8** (AFX66475), **D7F2G5** (ACV60385), **V9LW71** (AFX66401),
V9LWG5 (AFX66484), and **U3N6V5** (AGW27537) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates YN09_64,
YN09_6, YN09_22, YN09_51, XZ-NQ-154, XZ-NQ-155, GS09_111, QH09-93, CS560-961, QH-YS-199,
QH09_11, ID10_1, and CS6-251, respectively. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the HMG-
box_ROX1-like domain sequences of the MAT1-2-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red; the sequences in
various colors represent the MAT1-2-1 proteins under the AlphaFold codes V9LWC9, V9LVS8, D7F2E3, V9LVU8,
D7F2G5, V9LW71, V9LWG5, and U3N6V5; the hyphens indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy
ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets,
β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of
Panels G–O shows the 3D structures of the full-length proteins on the left and the locally amplified structures at the
mutation site of substitution on the right. Model confidence for the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ▉ very high
(pLDDT>90); ▢ high (90>pLDDT>70); ▢ low (70>pLDDT>50); ▉ very low (pLDDT<50).

As shown in Panels G–O of Figure 14 for tertiary structures, the replaced residues with reduced

hydrophobicity are located within the core α-helices that destabilized and altered the hydrophobic

stereostructures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains [Baxevanis *et al*. 1995; Thapar 2015]. Although

Panels A of Figure 14 shows the same Y-to-H substitutions in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the

mutant MAT1-2-1 proteins derived from various wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates, which caused the same

changes in the hydrophobicity and second structures shown in Panels B–F for the ExPASy ProtScale plots,

additional amino acid substitutions outside of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains (*cf*. Figure S4) might play

synergistic roles through long-range spatial interactions with the substituted residues within the domains on

the alterations of the tertiary structures (Panels H–O of Figure 14; Table S10) under various AlphaFold

codes. The domain sequences of the MAT1-2-1 proteins under variable AlphaFold codes were clustered

into Branch b1α in the Bayesian clustering tree (*cf*. Figure 2, Tables S2 and S10).

Figure 15 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the domain of MAT1-2-1 protein ACV60399

(under the AlphaFold code D7F2H9) derived from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates SC-3 (*cf*. Table S2)

[Zhang *et al*. 2009], comparing with the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9)

derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 [Zhang *et al*. 2009]. Panel A shows substitutions of Y-to-H (aromatic

tyrosine to basic histidine; hydropathy indexes of -1.3 to -3.2 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]) and Q-to-R

(glutamine with polar neutral side chains to basic arginine; hydropathy indexes of -3.5 to -4.5), both of

which caused reduced hydrophobicity, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the

hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation sites

in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of mutant MAT1-2-1 protein ACV60399 [Zhang *et al.* 2009], as

illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-

sheets, β-turns, and coils. As shown in Panels G–H for 3D structures, the 2 replaced residues with reduced

hydrophobicity are located inside as well as outside of the hydrophobic core structure of the 3 α-helices that

destabilized and altered the core stereostructure of the domain [Baxevanis *et al.* 1995; Thapar 2015]. The

HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of the mutant protein ACV60399 under the AlphaFold code D7F2H9 was

clustered into Branch b1β in the Bayesian clustering tree (*cf.* Figure 2, Table S10).

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment
```
AEH27625 118 APPSPKDIKIPRPPNAYILYRKERHHYVKDANPGITNNEISQILGKAWNMESNDVRQKYK 177
ACV60399 118 -------------------------H-------------------------------- 177

AEH27625 178 DMSQQVKQALLEKHPDYQYKPRRPCERRR                               206
ACV60399 178 ----------------R-----------                               206
```

Figure 15. Correlation of the changes in the primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like
domains of MAT1-2-1 proteins: the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from
the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 and the mutant MAT1-2-1 protein ACV60399 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2H9) derived
from the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolate SC-3. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the HMG-
box_ROX1-like domain sequences of the MAT1-2-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red; the hyphens
indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show below the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel
B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining
the changes in topology and waveform of the plots. Each of Panels G–H show the 3D structures of the full-length
proteins on the left and the locally amplified structures at the sites of substitutions on the right. Model confidence for
the AlphaFold-predicted 3D structures: ▮ very high (pLDDT>90); ▮ high (90>pLDDT>70); ▯ low (70>pLDDT>50);
▯ very low (pLDDT<50).

Aggregating the data demonstrated in Section III-7, the 1−3 amino acid substitutions detected in the

HMG-box_ROX1-like domains (Panels A of Figures 12–15) subsequently caused the changes in topologies

and waveforms of ExPASy ProtScale plots shown in Panels B–F of Figures 12–15, indicating altered

hydrophobicity and secondary structures (α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) of the domains of the

mutant MAT1-2-1 proteins. These changes in the domains then resulted in the altered stereostructures of

the domains of the mutant proteins under different AlphaFold codes as illustrated in Panels H–O of Figures

12–15 and summarized in Table S10.

The altered stereostructures of the domains ultimately change the DNA binding specificities and

affinities and the functionalities of gene transcription regulations, which play key roles in the sexual

reproduction of *O. sinensis*. As summarized in Table S10, the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains with 1-3

amino acid substitutions were clustered into various clades in the Bayesian clustering tree (*cf.* Figure 2).

III-9 Diverse stereostructures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of C-terminally truncated MAT1-2-1 proteins derived from *O. sinensis* strains

In addition to the 69 full-length proteins, 5 other MAT1-2-1 proteins AGW27543, AGW27554,

AGW27548, AGW27555, and AGW27552 derived from various *O. sinensis* strains are truncated at the C-

termini of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains. Although the same pair of primers (forward *Mat1-2F* and

revere compliment *Mat1-2R* shown in Figure S2) were used to amplify MAT1-2-1 cDNA [Bushley *et al.*

2013], the truncated MAT1-2-1 proteins appeared to have variable lengths (Figure 16) with 69–74% query

coverage compared with the query sequence AEH27625 of the full-length proteins under the AlphaFold

UniProt code D7F2E9 [Zhang *et al.* 2013; Li *et al.* 2025].

847
Figure 16. Sequence distribution of the C-terminally truncated HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of 5 subject MAT1-
2-1 proteins derived from the listed *O. sinensis* strains aligned with the full-length HMG-box_ROX1-like domain
(127→197) of the query MAT1-2-1 protein AEH27625 of *H. sinensis* strain CS2.

The C-terminal truncations of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the 5 truncated proteins resulted

in 97.9–98.3% similarities to the domain sequence of the query protein AEH27625. In addition to the

truncation mutations, an additional Y-to-H substitution (aromatic tyrosine to basic histidine; hydropathy

indexes of -1.3 to -3.2 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]) occurred in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the 5 truncated MAT1-2-1 proteins. The truncation and point mutations caused reduced hydrophobicity and destabilized of the hydrophobic core structures of the domains, resulting in diverse stereostructures under 4 AlphaFold 3D structure codes (Figure 16).

Three (CS91-1291, CS71-1219, and CS68-2-1229) of the 5 *O. sinensis* strains were genetically homogenous shown in blue in Table S4 [Li *et al*. 2013], belonging to GC-biased Genotype #1 *H. sinensis*. However, the strain CS71-1220 shown in red in Table S4 was genetically heterogeneous, containing both GC-biased Genotype #1 and AT-biased Genotype #5 of *O. sinensis*. The GC- and AT-biased genotypes are genome independent, belonging to different fungi [Kinjo & Zang 2001; Stensrud *et al*. 2007; Xiao *et al*. 2009; Li *et al*. 2013, 2020b, 2022, 2023d, 2023e; Yao & Zhu 2016; Zhu & Li 2017]. The remaining strain CS68-5-1216 shown in black in Table S4 lacked ITS molecular genotyping evidence in the GenBank database. The 5 *O. sinensis* strains were isolated either from the fresh caterpillar bodies or the cultures of mono-ascospores (marked as TS or SS, respectively, in Table S4) of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungal complexes [Li *et al*. 2013].

III-10 Diverse primary and secondary structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 proteins encoded by the genome and transcriptome assemblies of *H. sinensis* and the metatranscriptome assembly of *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex

Figure 17 examined the hydrophobicity and structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein encoded by the genome assembly ANOV01000063 (9759→9851 & 9907→10,026, removed the intron section) derived from *H. sinensis* strain Co18 [Hu *et al*. 2013], comparing with the reference MAT1-2-1 protein AEH27625 derived from *H. sinensis* strain CS2 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) [Zhang *et al*. 2009]. Panel A shows a S-to-A substitution (serine with polar neutral side chains to aliphatic alanine; hydropathy indexes of -0.8 to 1.8 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]), which caused increased hydrophobicity surrounding the mutation site in the domain of MAT1-2-1 protein encoded by the genome assembly ANOV01000063 (9759→9851 & 9907→10,026) derived from *H. sinensis* strain Co18 [Hu *et al*. 2013], comparing with the reference MAT1-2-1 protein AEH27625, as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures (α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of the mutant MAT1-2-1 protein encoded by the genome assembly ANOV01000063, as illustrated in Panels C–F for ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils [Baxevanis *et al*. 1995; Thapar 2015]. The sequence changes might altered the tertiary structure of the domain of the genome-encoded protein and was clustered into Branch

886   a2 in the Bayesian clustering tree (*cf.* Figure 2; Table S11).

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AEH27625     118  APPSPKDIKIPRPPNAYILYRKERHHYVKDANPGITNNEISQILGKAWNMESNDVRQKYK 177
ANOV01000063 9732 -------------------------------------------A------------------ 9967
```

```
AEH27625     178  DMSQQVKQALLEKHPDYQYKPRRPCERRR                               206
ANOV01000063 9968 ----------------------------                               10,164
```

889
Figure 17. Correlation of the changes in the primary and secondary structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains
of the reference MAT1-2-1 protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from the *H. sinensis*
strain CS2 and the mutant MAT1-2-1 protein encoded by the genome assembly ANOV01000063 derived from the
H. sinensis strain Co18. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain
sequences of the MAT1-2-1 proteins with an amino acid substitution in red; the hyphens indicate identical amino
acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show below the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B) and 2D structures
(Panels C−F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining the changes in topology
and waveform of the plots.

Figure 18 examines the hydrophobicity and structures of HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-2-
1 proteins encoded by the genome assemblies LKHE01001605 (14,016←14,135 & 14,191←14,283),

LWBQ01000021 (14,016←14,135 & 14,191←14,283), and NGJJ01000619 (23,186←23,305 &
23,361←23,453) of the *H. sinensis* strains 1229, ZJB12195, and CC1406-20395, respectively, comparing
with the reference protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from the *H. sinensis*
strain CS2 [Zhang *et al*. 2009]. Panel A shows Y-to-H (aromatic tyrosine to basic histidine; hydropathy
indexes of -1.3 to -3.2 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]) and S-to-A substitutions (serine with polar neutral side
chains to aliphatic alanine; hydropathy indexes of -0.8 to 1.8) (Panel A), which caused changes in
hydrophobicity, as illustrated in Panel B for hydropathy plot. The altered hydrophobicity altered the
secondary structures surrounding mutation sites in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of mutant MAT1-2-
1 proteins encoded by the genome assemblies LKHE01001605, LWBQ01000021, and NGJJ01000619, as
illustrated in Panels C–F for ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils [Baxevanis
et al. 1995; Thapar 2015], subsequently altering the tertiary structures of the core stereostructures of the
domains. The HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the genome-encoded mutant proteins were clustered into
Branch b3 in the Bayesian clustering tree (*cf*. Figure 2, Table S11).

913
```
Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment
AEH27625       118     APPSPKDIKIPRPPNAYILYRKERHHYVKDANPGITNNEISQILGKAWNMESNDVRQKYK 177
LKHE01001605 14,310    ---------------H----------------------A------------------- 14,076
LWBQ01000021 239,323   ---------------H----------------------A------------------- 239,089
NGJJ01000619 23,480    ---------------H----------------------A------------------- 23,246

AEH27625       178     DMSQQVKQALLEKHPDYQYKPRRPCERRR                             206
LKHE01001605 14,075    ----------------------------                             13,989
LWBQ01000021 239,088   ----------------------------                             239,002
NGJJ01000619 23,245    ----------------------------                             23,159
```

Figure 18. Correlation of the changes in the primary and secondary structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the reference MAT1-2-1 protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 and the mutant MAT1-2-1 proteins encoded by the genome assemblies LKHE01001605, LWBQ01000021, and NGJJ01000619 derived from the *H. sinensis* strains 1229, ZJB12195, and CC1406-20395, respectively. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain sequences of the MAT1-2-1 proteins with amino acid substitutions in red; the hyphens indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show below the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots.

The genome assemblies JAAVMX000000000 of the *H. sinensis* strain IOZ07 does not contain the gene encoding the MAT1-2-1 protein [Shu *et al*. 2020].

Figure 19 examines the hydrophobicity and structures of HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein that was encoded by the transcriptome assembly GCQL01020543 (553←765) of the *H. sinensis* strain L0106 [Liu *et al*. 2015]. Panel A shows a Y-to-H substitution of (aromatic tyrosine to basic histidine; hydropathy indexes of -1.3 to -3.2 [Kyte & Doolittle 1982]), which caused decreased hydrophobicity as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panel B for the hydropathy plot. These changes resulted in the altered secondary structures surrounding the mutation site in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein encoded by the transcriptome assembly GCQL01020543 [Liu *et al*. 2015], as illustrated by topology and waveform changes in Panels C–F for ExPASy ProtScale plots for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils. Similar to the mutant MAT1-2-1 proteins under various AlphaFold 3D structural models shown in Figure 14, the changes in the hydrophobicity, and primary and secondary structures would subsequently alter the tertiary structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of the transcriptome-encoded mutant protein. The domain of the transcriptome-encoded protein was clustered into Branch b1α in the Bayesian clustering tree (*cf*. Figure 2, Table S11).

Panel A: Amino acid sequence alignment

```
AEH27625      118 APPSPKDIKIPRPPNAYILYRKERHHYVKDANPGITNNEISQILGKAWNMESNDVRQKYK 177
GCQL01020543 792 ---------------H------------------------------------------- 613

AEH27625      178 DMSQQVKQALLEKHPDYQYKPRRPCERRR                                206
GCQL01020543 612 ----------------------------                                526
```

Figure 19. Correlation of the changes in the primary and secondary structures of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the reference MAT1-2-1 protein AEH27625 (under the AlphaFold code D7F2E9) derived from the *H. sinensis* strain CS2 and the mutant MAT1-2-1 protein encoded by the transcriptome assembly GCQL01020543 derived from the *H. sinensis* strain L0106. Panel A shows alignment of amino acid sequences of the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain sequences of the MAT1-2-1 proteins with an amino acid substitution in red; the hyphens indicate identical amino acid residues. The ExPASy ProtScale plots show the changes in hydrophobicity (Panel B) and 2D structures (Panels C–F for α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) with open rectangles in blue outlining the changes in topology and waveform of the plots.

No changes have been found in the amino acid sequence and the 2D structures (α-helices, β-sheets, β-turns, and coils) in the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein that was encoded by the

metatranscriptome assembly OSIN7649 (379→591) of the *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex, comparing with the reference MAT1-2-1 protein AEH27625 derived from the *H. sinensis* CS68-2-1229 (Figure S4, Table S11) [Zhang *et al.* 2009; Xia *et al.* 2017]. The HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of the OSIN7649-encoded MAT1-2-1 protein was clustered into Branch b1α in the Bayesian clustering tree (Figure 2, Table S11).

III-11 Heterogenous fungal sources of the MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins

Although wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates are often considered as impure *H. sinensis*, the analysis of mutant full-length mating proteins disclosed their heterogenous fungal sources (Table S3). Among the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates that were analyzed for the full-length MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins (*cf.* Figures 3−9 and 12−15), 34 isolates have ITS genotyping information in the GenBank database, which belonged to GC-biased Genotypes #1 and #3 of *O. sinensis* (Table S3). Although the ITS sequences in the 29 of 34 wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates appeared to show high homology (≥97%) to GC-biased Genotype #1 *H. sinensis*, the mutant MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins might not be necessarily derived from *H. sinensis*, because the *H. sinensis* ITS sequences were most easily amplified during regular PCR under the experimental settings, including the selection of primers, unless the PCR experiments included amplicon cloning with selection and sequencing of sufficient (usually 30−50) white colonies. In other words, there were still possibilities that mutant proteins were derived from unvalidated heterospecific or genotypic fungi, because of the impure nature of the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates.

Among the 20 *O. sinensis* strains analyzed for the truncated MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins (*cf.* Figures 10 and 16), 15 strains have ITS genotyping information in the GenBank database. Five (CS6-251, CS34-291, CS70-1208, CS71-1220, and CS68-2-1228) of the 15 strains are heterogenous, containing both GC-biased Genotype #1 and AT-biased Genotype #5 of *O. sinensis* (Tables S4−S6) [Bushley *et al.* 2013; Li *et al.* 2013]. Actually, as shown in Table S6, the AT-biased *O. sinensis* may be AT-biased Genotype #17 (homology 98.1%−98.3%), rather than Genotype #5 (less similarities of 97.2%−97.6%) [Zhu & Li 2017; Li *et al.* 2020b, 2022, 2023e]. In addition to the 15 *O. sinensis* strains, the taxonomy positions of the remaining 5 strains (CS26-277, CS36-1294, CS68-5-1216, CS70-1211, and CS70-1212) listed in Table S4, plus 4 other ascosporic strains (1210, 1213, 1223, and 1226) that were studied by Bushley *et al.* [2013], lacked the validated ITS molecular taxonomic evidence, not being listed in Tables S5−S6.

As shown in Figure 16, the truncated proteins AGW27548 and AGW27555 that derived from *O. sinensis* strains CS68-2-1229 and CS71-1220 are 9 and 10 amino acids shorter at the C-termini than the proteins AGW27554 and AGW27543 that derived from the *O. sinensis* strains CS71-1219 and CS91-1291, respectively. The *MAT1-2-1* genes (KC429550 and KC429557) in the *O. sinensis* strains CS68-2-1229 and

CS71-1220 are 31 nucleotides shorter at the 3' ends than the *MAT1-2-1* genes (KC429545 and KC429556)

in the strains CS71-1219 and CS91-1291. The 4 proteins were derived from cDNA that was amplified from

MAT1-2-1 genes using the same pair of primers, *Mat1-2F*/*Mat1-2R* according to Bushley *et al*. [2013].

Bushley *et al*. [2013] and Li *et al*. [2013] reported that the *O. sinensis* strain CS68-2-1229 is homogenous

containing only GC-biased Genotype #1 and the strain CS71-1220 is heterogeneous containing the

independent genomes of both GC-biased Genotype #1 and AT-biased Genotype #17 of *O. sinensis* (Figures

S5−S6). The sequences of the truncated proteins AGW27548 and AGW27555 are 100% identical. It then

needs to be further verified whether the strain CS68-2-1229 was heterogeneous similar to the strain CS71-

1220 cooccurring with the genomes of both GC-biased Genotype #1 and AT-biased Genotype #17 of *O.*

sinensis (*cf*. Table S4−S6) and whether both the truncated proteins AGW27548 and AGW27555 were

derived from mutant *MAT1-2-1* genes, because there are no repetitive copies of *MAT1-1-1* and *MAT1-2-1*

genes in the genomes of GC-biased Genotype #1 *H. sinensis* [Li *et al*. 2025] and the sequences of all 17

genotypes of *O. sinensis*, regardless of whether they are GC-biased or AT-biased, reside in independent

genomes, belonging to different fungi [Kinjo & Zang 2001; Stensrud *et al*. 2007; Xiao *et al*. 2009; Yao &

Zhu 2016; Zhu & Li 2017; Li *et al*. 2020b, 2022, 2023d, 2023e].

IV. Discussion

IV-1 Correlation of the hydrophobicity, primary, secondary, and tertiary structures of the DNA binding domains in the MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins

The MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein and the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-

2-1 protein are distinct DNA-binding domains critical for fungal mating-type regulation but differ in

evolutionary lineage, structural architecture, and functional roles [Jackson *et al*. 2013; Zheng *et al*. 2013;

Kim *et al*. 2015]. The HMG box domains in mating proteins are multifunctional motifs central to

transcriptional regulation of mating-related genes, *O. sinensis* sexual reproduction, and host adaptation in

C. sinensis insect-fungi complex. Our study presented in this paper demonstrated that the 1−3 amino acid

substitutions within the MATα_HMGbox and HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-

1 proteins, respectively, of wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates and *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes resulted in

changes in the hydrophobic properties and secondary and tertiary structures of the DNA binding domains

of the proteins (*cf*. Figures 3−9, 11−15, 17−19, and S5). The variable sequences of the DNA binding

domains were clustered into different clades in the Bayesian clustering trees (*cf*. Figures 1−2; Tables

S8−S11).

The MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein contains a core structure of 3 α helices, which

ensures the high affinity of sequence-preferent binding to AT-rich DNA motifs (*e.g.*, ATTTA) to facilitate transcriptional machinery assembly involving mating-type-specific genes, and activates gene transcription by inducing DNA conformational changes through physical bending or twisting the target DNA segments [Martin *et al.* 2010; Ait Benkhali *et al.* 2013; Rams *et al.* 2022]. The domain directly participates in promoter recognition of specific genes relating to the heterothallic reproductive process [Yamamoto *et al.* 1997].

Table S7 shows the hydropathy values for amino acids that are defined by their side chains according to Kyte & Doolittle [1982] provided by https://web.expasy.org/protscale/: the larger the value, the stronger the hydrophobicity; negative values indicate hydrophilicity [Kyte & Doolittle 1982; Baxevanis *et al.* 1995; Thapar 2015]. The core α-helical stereostructures of the domains are stabilized through a hydrophobic core that is composed of nonpolar amino acids, such as Isoleucine (Ile, I), Valine (Val, V), Leucine (Leu, L), Phenylalanine (Phe, F), Cysteine (Cys, C), Methionine (Met, M), and Alanine (Ala, A), which have hydropathy indexes of 4.5, 4.2, 3.8, 2.8, 2.5, 1.9, and 1.8 , respectively (*cf*. Table S7) [Kyte & Doolittle 1982].

The HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein also consists of asymmetrically arranged 3 α helices connected by flexible loops, forming a key hydrophobic core that is stabilized through nonpolar amino acids aforementioned (*cf*. Table S7). The domain of MAT1-2-1 protein regulates gene expression in a sequence-specific manner by binding ATTAAT or ATTGTT motifs [Jackson *et al.* 2013; Zheng *et al.* 2013; Kim *et al.* 2015]. This domain is implicated in chromatin remodeling and transcriptional repression by interacting with other co-repressors, similar to the repressor of oxygen-regulated genes 1 (ROX1) domain in yeast, through opposing pathways to the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein [Balasubramanian *et al.* 1993; Zitomer *et al.* 1997; Zheng *et al.* 2013]. ROX1 represses its own promoter, creating a feedback loop for hypoxic response regulation as a central hypoxia-responsive regulator playing roles in chromatin remodeling following DNA binding and integration of metabolic signals, etc. [Kastaniotis & Zitomer 2000].

No published studies to date directly address heterodimerization between the MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins of *O. sinensis*, although the heterodimer formation between the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 protein and HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1 protein is believed as a critical mechanism in fungal mating regulation, particularly in heterothallic ascomycetes [Kües & Casselton 1993; Asante-Owusu *et al.* 1996; Jacobsen *et al.* 2002]. However, the MATα_HMGbox and HMG-box_ROX1-like domains likely interact each other enabling synergistic cooperation of DNA binding through complementary electrostatic surfaces [Hancock *et al.* 2019]. The heteromorphic stereostructures of the domains of the mutant mating proteins derived from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates presented in this study likely alter the complementary cooperation of the mating proteins of the self-sterile *O. sinensis* under

1048 heterothallic or hybrid outcrossing and subsequent functionalities of activations or repressions of mating-
1049 related gene transcriptions [Li *et al*. 2023c, 2024b, 2025].

IV-2 Heterogenous fungal sources of the MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins

The analysis of mutant full-length mating proteins derived from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates (Figures
3–9 and 12–15) disclosed their heterogenous fungal sources (Table S3) [Zhang *et al*. 2009, 2011, 2012,
2013, 2014; Zhang & Zhang 2015]. A total of 34 wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates were examined for molecular
taxonomy ITS sequences that are available in GenBank, which are genomically independent GC-biased
Genotypes #1 and #3 of *O. sinensis* fungi. However, whether the impure wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates
cooccur with other heterospecific fungi remains to be mycologically and molecularly addressed and
outlined by using culture-dependent techniques or culture-independent PCR protocols using amplicon
cloning techniques with selecting and sequencing sufficient amount (usually ≥30) of white colonies.

The 5 *O. sinensis* strains (CS68-2-1229, CS68-5-1216, CS71-1219, CS71-1220, and CS91-1291; *cf*.
Figures 10 and 16) contain both truncated MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins shown in red in Table S4
[Bushley *et al*. 2013; Li *et al*. 2013]. However, 15 other *O. sinensis* strains CS6-251, CS34-291, CS68-2-
1228, CS70-1208, CS18-266, CS25-273, CS37-295, CS71-1218, CS76-1284, CS560-961, CS561-964,
CS26-277, CS36-1294, CS70-1211, and CS70-1212 contain the truncated MAT1-1-1 proteins (*cf*. Figures
10 and S1) but the full-length MAT1-2-1 proteins (*cf*. Figures 16 and S2; Table S2). The genotypic
information for the *O. sinensis* strains indicates heterogeneous fungal sources of the truncated MAT1-1-1
and MAT1-2-1 proteins, derived from GC-biased Genotype #1 and/or AT-biased Genotype #5 of *O. sinensis*,
which are genomically independent belonging to different fungi [Stensrud *et al*. 2007; Xiao *et al*. 2008;
Gao *et al*. 2012; Hu *et al*. 2013; Li *et al*. 2013, 2016a, 2020b, 2022, 2023d, 2023e; 2024a; Mao *et al*. 2013;
Zhu & Li 2017; Jin *et al*. 2020; Liu *et al*. 2020; Shu *et al*. 2020]. Other strains CS26-277, CS36-1294,
CS68-5-1216, CS70-1211, and CS70-1212 shown in black in Table S4, as well as 4 other strains (Clones
1210, 1213, 1223, and 1226 derived from the cultures of mono-ascospores of *C. sinensis* [Li *et al*. 2025])
previously reported by Bushley *et al*. [2013], lacked ITS molecular genotyping information and might be
derived from other genomically independent, heterospecific or genotypic fungi, which need to be addressed
publicly and updated in the GenBank database by researches of Bushley *et al*. [2013] and Li *et al*. [2013].

A contradiction was noted regarding Strain CS68-2-1229 (in dark green and underlined in Figures 10
and 16), which was isolated from a culture of mono-ascospores [Bushley *et al*. 2013; Li *et al*. 2013]. *C.*
sinensis ascospores have been demonstrated as fungal complexes containing genomically independent GC-
biased Genotypes #1 and #14, AT-biased Genotypes #5–6 and #16 of *O. sinensis*, and *Paecilomyces hepiali*
[Li *et al*. 2023d, 2023e]. Two MAT1-1-1 protein sequences with different GenBank accession numbers,

AGW27560 for a full-length protein and AGW27528 for an N-terminally truncated protein, were derived

from the *O. sinensis* Strain CS68-2-1229. The C-terminally truncated MAT1-2-1 protein AGW27548 was

also derived from this *O. sinensis* strain. All these 3 protein sequences were released by GenBank on the

same date (28-SEP-2013). The truncated AGW27528 and AGW27548 protein sequences were translated

from the cDNA sequences that were amplified using the pairs of primers, *i.e.*, *m1cDNAF3*/*m1cDNAR5* to

amplify *MAT1-1-1* cDNA and *Mat1-2F*/*Mat1-2R* to amplify *MAT1-2-1* cDNA (*cf*. Figures S1–S2) [Bushley

et al. 2013; Li *et al*. 2013]. Although the protein AGW27528 is among the 9 longest truncated MAT1-1-1

proteins (162 amino acids) shown in Figure 10, the protein AGW27548 (49 amino acids) is 10 residues

shorter than the longest truncated MAT1-2-1 protein AGW27543 (59 amino acids) shown in Figure 16. The

complex results indicate that the protein AGW27548 might be derived from a mutant *MAT1-2-1* gene. Li *et*

al. [2025] reported that no repetitive copies of *MAT1-1-1* and *MAT1-2-1* genes occurred in the genome

assemblies of the 5 *H. sinensis* strains. Thus, it remains to be examined whether the strain CS68-2-1229

was truly homogenous containing only Genotype #1 *H. sinensis* as reported by Bushley *et al*. [2013] and

Li *et al*. [2013], or heterogeneous containing 2 or more independent genotypical or heterospecific genomes,

similar to the heterogeneous strains (CS6-251, CS34-291, CS68-2-1228, CS70-1208, and CS71-1220) as

shown in Tables S4–S6 [Bushley *et al*. 2013; Li *et al*. 2013].

IV-3 The MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins involving in sexual reproduction of *O. sinensis*

The MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins coregulate mating compatibility and sexual development in the

sexual reproduction of *O. sinensis*, in which the MATα_HMGbox and HMG-box_ROX1-like domains play

the key roles. The self-fertilization hypothesis using homothallism or psuedohomothalism strategy has been

proposed for *O. sinensis* [Bushley *et al*. 2013; Hu *et al*. 2013] based on genetic research data. However,

Zhang and Zhang [2015] argued against the hypotheses and believed that *O. sinensis* uses facultative

hybridization for sexual reproduction on the basis of the findings of differential occurrence of *MAT1-1-1*

and *MAT1-2-1* genes in over 170 wild-type *O. sinensis* isolates derived from natural *C. sinensis* insect-

fungal complex specimens collected from different production areas on the Qinghai–Tibet Plateau.

Furthermore, Li *et al*. [2023c, 2024b, 2025] reported alternative slicing, differential occurrence, and

differential translation of *MAT1-1-1* and *MAT1-2-1* genes and the heteromorphic stereostructures of MAT1-

1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins of *O. sinensis* strains and the wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates. In addition, the

analysis of DNA binding domains presented in this study further demonstrated diverse stereostructures of

the MATα_HMGbox domain of MAT1-1-1 proteins and the HMG-box_ROX1-like domain of MAT1-2-1

proteins. It is clearly demonstrated that *O. sinensis* experiences self-sterility and uses a heterothallic or

hybrid strategy, even parasexuality, to accomplish sexual reproduction during the lifecycle of *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex [Kück 1993; Bennett & Johnson 2003; Sherwood & Bennett 2009; Seervai *et al*. 2013; Zhu & Li 2017; Nakamura *et al*. 2019; Samarasinghe *et al*. 2020; Steensels *et al*. 2021; Mishra *et al*. 2021; Kück *et al*. 2021; Li *et al*. 2023c, 2023e, 2024b, 2025].

Distinct from the homothallic reproduction, the heterothallic or hybrid reproduction of *O. sinensis* requires mating partners. Among the 17 genotypes of *O. sinensis* [Kinjo & Zang 2001; Chen *et al*. 2004, 2011; Stensrud *et al*. 2005, 2007; Xiao *et al*. 2008; Zhu *et al*. 2010; Barseghyan *et al*. 2011; Li *et al*. 2013, 2022; Mao *et al*. 2013; Zhu & Li 2017; Du *et al*. 2020; Hènault *et al*. 2020], GC-biased Genotype #1 *H. sinensis* has been proposed as the sole anamorph of *O. sinensis* [Wei *et al*. 2006]. Wei *et al*. [2016] reported the success of industrial cultivation of *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes, which, however, displayed a species contradiction between the anamorphic inoculants of 3 *H. sinensis* strains and the sole teleomorph of AT-biased Genotype #4 that was detected in the fruiting body of the cultivated *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes. The sequences of AT-biased Genotypes #4−6 and #15−17, as well as the sequences of GC-biased Genotypes #2−3 and #7−14 of *O. sinensis*, do not reside in the genome assemblies ANOV00000000, JAAVMX000000000, LKHE00000000, LWBQ00000000, and NGJJ00000000 of the *H. sinensis* strains Co18, IOZ07, 1229, ZJB12195, and CC1406-20395, respectively [Stensrud *et al*. 2007; Xiao *et al*. 2008; Gao *et al*. 2012; Hu *et al*. 2013; Li *et al*. 2013, 2016a, 2020b, 2022, 2023d, 2023e; 2024a; Mao *et al*. 2013; Zhu & Li 2017; Jin *et al*. 2020; Liu *et al*. 2020; Shu *et al*. 2020]. Li *et al*. [2024a] further demonstrated that the sequences of Genotypes #2−17 of *O. sinensis* were not the repetitive copies in the genome of Genotype #1 *H. sinensis*, invalidating the hypotheses of "RIP mutation" induced or generated "ITS pseudogene" and "rRNA pseudogenes" in the genome of *H. sinensis* raised by Li *et al*. [2013, 2017, 2020c]. These data indicate the 17 genotypes of *O. sinensis* are genome independent and belong to different fungi. In addition, the data demonstrated that the sole anamorph hypothesis for *H. sinensis* raised by Wei *et al*. [2006] has failed to pass the examination of Koch's postulates.

Li *et al*. [2020a, 2023b] revised the inoculant information for the industrial cultivation project and reported that the cultivation project used the cultures of the *C. sinensis* ascospores as the inoculants, rather than pure *H. sinensis* strains as previously disclosed by Wei *et al*. [2016]. However, Li *et al*. [2023d, 2023e] reported detections of GC-biased Genotypes #1 and #14 and AT-biased Genotypes #5−6 and #16, as well as *Paecilomyces hepiali* in the ascospores of the natural *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes through a culture-independent approach using a PCR amplicon cloning technique with selecting and sequencing of ≥30 white colonies. Slightly differently, Li *et al*. [2013] used a culture-dependent protocol and reported detection of GC-biased Genotype #1 and AT-biased Genotype #5 in the 8 cultures of mono-ascospores.

Furthermore, Li *et al*. [2020b, 2022, 2023d, 2023e] and Gao *et al*. [2012] reported that AT-biased Genotype #4 of *O. sinensis* occurred in the stromata during the entire course of *C. sinensis* maturation and stromal fertile portion (SFP) containing numerous ascocarps of *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex; the abundance of Genotype #4 was high in immature stromata and was largely declined in mature stromata and SFP but, unfortunately, was absent from the *C. sinensis* ascospores. Thus, although Wei *et al*. [2016] reported the detection of the sole teleomorphic AT-biased Genotype #4 in the cultivated *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex and Li *et al*. [2020a, 2023b] revised the inoculant information, the fungal source for the sole teleomorph, AT-biased Genotype #4 of *O. sinensis* remains scientifically uncertain in artificial cultivation of *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complex.

In addition to the formal reports of unsuccessful studies in artificial cultivation of the fruiting bodies of *C. sinensis* [Holliday *et al*. 2008; Stone 2010; Hu *et al*. 2013], Zhang *et al*. [2013] summarized the 40-year history of cultivation failures of insect-fungal complex using "pure" mycological strategy in the academic research-oriented settings. In contrast, Wei *et al*. [2016] reported the cultivation success in the industrial product-oriented settings, which was likely attributed to the application of a "mycologically impure" cultivation strategy. This cultivation strategy has become the key factor to industrial success, based on the following reports:

(1) using the cultures of mycologically impure ascospores of natural *C. sinensis* as the inoculants [Li *et al*. 2020a, 2023b], which most likely combined with the cocultures of *C. sinensis* stroma and/or stromal fertile portion (SFP) containing numerous ascocarps that, most importantly, contain AT-biased Genotype #4 of *O. sinensis*, consistent with the discovery of the sole teleomorphic *O. sinensis* genotype [Wei *et al*. 2016]; and

(2) adding the soil that was collected from the natural *C. sinensis* production areas on the Qinghai–Tibet Plateau into the industrial cultivation system as disclosed by Wei *et al*. [2016].

Unfortunately, purification and genome sequencing of GC- and AT-biased Genotypes #2−17 of *O. sinensis* have not been reported to date. Thus, genomic and transcriptomic information is lacking regarding mutations of the *MAT1-1-1* and *MAT1-2-1* genes, especially the DNA binding domains of MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins.

Regardless of whether MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins form heterodimer or interactively involve complementary electrostatic surfaces and enabling cooperative DNA binding, the synergy of the mating proteins of *O. sinensis* constitutes the core mechanism regulating mating type recognition, triggering the downstream nuclear fusion signaling pathways, and fruiting body development [Debuchy *et al*. 2006; Jones & Bennett 2011; Zheng & Wang 2013; Wilson *et al*. 2015; Sun *et al*. 2019]. The alternative splicing, differential occurrence, and differential transcription of mating-type and pheromone receptor genes in

Hirsutella sinensis and *C. sinensis* isolates invalidated the self-fertilization hypothesis at the genomic and transcriptomic levels but suggested self-sterility for *O. sinensis* under heterothallic or hybrid reproduction [Hu *et al*. 2013; Bushley *et al*. 2013; Zhou *et al*. 2013; Wei *et al*. 2006; Li *et al*. 2019, 2023c, 2024b, 2025]. Furthermore at the protein level, the discoveries of a good number of mutant mating proteins reported by Li *et al*. [2025], which have mutant MATα_HMGbox and HMG-box_ROX1-like domains in MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins, respectively, detected in *O. sinensis* strains, wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates, and insect-fungal complex demonstrated in this study, may indicate heterogeneous fungal sources of the mating proteins to accomplish coordinated heterothallic or hybrid reproduction of *O. sinensis* in the lifecycle of *C. sinensis* insect-fungi complexes.

Conclusions

The analysis of the DNA binding domains of mating proteins in the 173 *O. sinensis* strains and wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates revealed heteromorphic stereostructures of the MATα_HMGbox and HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins, respectively. A few amino acid substitutions at various mutation sites in the DNA binding domains were demonstrated in numerous mutant mating proteins derived from wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates and correlated with the changes in hydrophobic properties and secondary and tertiary structures under different AlphaFold 3D structural cords, which were clustered into various Bayesian clustering clades. The diversity of heteromorphic MATα_HMGbox and HMG-box_ROX1-like domains of the mating proteins discovered in wild-type *C. sinensis* isolates may lead to stereostructure-related functional alterations of the mating process. The stereostructure variants of the DNA binding domains of mutant MAT1-1-1 and MAT1-2-1 proteins suggest diverse sources of the mating proteins produced by cooccurring *O. sinensis* genotypes or heterospecific fungi coexisting in natural *C. sinensis* that have been identified in mycobiota, molecular, metagenomic, and metatranscriptomic studies, regardless of whether culture-dependent or independent research strategies were used.

Acknowledgments

[REFERENCES]

1. Abramson J, Adler J, Dunger J, Evans R, Green T, Pritzel A, Ronneberger O, Willmore L, Ballard AJ, Bambrick J, Bodenstein SW, Evans DA, Hung CC, O'Neill M, Reiman D, Tunyasuvunakool K, Wu Z, Žemgulytė A, Arvaniti E, Beattie C, Bertolli O, Bridgland A, Cherepanov A, Congreve M, Cowen-Rivers AI, Cowie A, Figurnov M, Fuchs FB, Gladman H, Jain R, Khan YA, Low CMR, Perlin K, Potapenko A, Savy P, Singh S, Stecula A, Thillaisundaram A, Tong C, Yakneen S, Zhong ED, Zielinski M, Žídek A, Bapst V, Kohli P, Jaderberg M, Hassabis D, Jumper JM. Accurate structure prediction of biomolecular interactions with AlphaFold 3. Nature. 2024; 630(8016): 493−500. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-07487-w

2. Asante-Owusu RN, Banham AH, Böhnert HU, Mellor EJC, Casselton LA. Heterodimerization between two classes of homeodomain proteins in the mushroom *Coprinus cinereus* brings together potential DNA-binding and activation domains. Gene 1996; 172(1): 25−31. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1119(96)00177-1

3. Balasubramanian B, Lowry CV, Zitomer RS. The Rox1 repressor of the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* hypoxic genes is a specific DNA-binding protein with a high-mobility-group motif. Mol Cell Biol. 1993; 13(10): 6071−6078. doi: 10.1128/mcb.13.10.6071-6078.1993

4. Barseghyan GS, Holliday JC, Price TC, Madison LM, Wasser SP. Growth and cultural-morphological characteristics of vegetative mycelia of medicinal caterpillar fungus *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* G.H. Sung *et al*. (Ascomycetes) Isolates from Tibetan Plateau (P. R. China). Intl. J. Med. Mushrooms. 2011; 13(6): 565−581. DOI: 10.1615/intjmedmushr.v13.i6.90

5. Baxevanis AD, Bryant SH, Landsman D. Homology model building of the HMG-1 box structural domain. Nucleic Acids Research 1995; 23(6): 1019−1029. DOI: 10.1093/nar/23.6.1019

6. Ait Benkhali J, Coppin E, Brun S, Peraza-Reyes L, Martin T, Dixelius C, Lazar N, van Tilbeurgh H, Debuchy R. A Network of HMG-box Transcription Factors Regulates Sexual Cycle in the Fungus Podospora anserina. PLoS Genet 2013; 9(7): e1003642. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1003642

7. Bennett RJ, Johnson AD. Completion of a parasexual cycle in *Candida albicans* by induced chromosome loss in tetraploid strains. EMBO J. 2003; 22(10): 2505−2515. DOI: 10.1093/emboj/cdg235

8. Bushley KE, Li Y, Wang W-J, Wang X-L, Jiao L, Spatafora JW, Yao Y-J. Isolation of the MAT1-1 mating type idiomorph and evidence for selfing in the Chinese medicinal fungus *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Fungal Biol. 2013; 117(9): 599−610. DOI: 10.1016/j.funbio.2013.06.001

9. Chen C-S, Hseu R-S, Huang C-T. Quality control of *Cordyceps sinensis* teleomorph, anamorph, and Its products. Chapter 12, in (Shoyama, Y., Ed.) Quality Control of Herbal Medicines and Related Areas. InTech, Rijeka, Croatia (2011). pp. 223–238. www.intechopen.com

10. Chen Y-Q, Hu B, Xu F, Zhang W, Zhou H, Qu L-H. Genetic variation of *Cordyceps sinensis*, a fruit-body-producing entomopathogenic species from different geographical regions in China. FEMS Microbiol Lett. 2004; 230: 153–158. Doi: 10.1016/S0378-1097(03)00889-9 (accessed on 30 January 2025).

11. China Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs. Announcement (No. 15 of 2021) of National Forestry and Grassland Administration: List of National Key Protected Wild Plants. September 7, 2021. Available online: https://m.163.com/dy/article/HHCVOJPU055360T7.html (accessed on 3 May 2025).

12. Dai R-Q, Lan J-L, Chen W-H, Li X-M, Chen Q-T, Shen C-Y. Discovery of a new fungus *Paecilomyces hepiali* Chen & Dai. Acta Agricult. Univ. Pekin. 1989; 15(2): 221−224.

13. David A, Islam S, Tankhilevich E, Sternberg MJE. The AlphaFold Database of Protein Structures: A Biologist's Guide. J Mol Biol. 2022; 434(2): 167336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2021.167336

14. Debuchy R, Turgeo BG. Mating-Type Structure, Evolution, and Function in Euascomycetes. In (eds. Kües U. & Fischer, R.) Growth, Differentiation and Sexuality. Springer (2006). pp. 293–323.

15. Deleage G, Roux B. An algorithm for protein secondary structure prediction based on class prediction. Protein Engineering, Design and Selection 1987; 1: 289–294. https://doi.org/10.1093/protein/1.4.289

16. Du X-H, Wu D-M, Kang H, Wang H-C, Xu N, Li T-T, Chen K-L. Heterothallism and potential hybridization events inferred for twenty-two yellow morel species. IMA Fungus. 2020; 11: 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43008-020-0027-1

17. Gao L, Li X-H, Zhao J-Q, Lu J-H, Zhao J-G, Zhu J-S. Maturation of *Cordyceps sinensis* associates with alterations of fungal expressions of multiple *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* mutants with transition and transversion point mutations in stroma of *Cordyceps sinensis*. Beijing Da Xue Xue Bao. 2012; 44(3): 454–463. doi:

10.3969/j.issn.1671-167X.2012.03.025

18. Gasteiger E, Hoogland C, Gattiker A, Duvaud S, Wilkins MR, Appel RD, Bairoch A. Protein Identification and Analysis Tools on the ExPASy Server. Chapter 52 (In) John M. Walker (ed): The Proteomics Protocols Handbook, Humana Press (2005). pp. 571–607.

19. Guo M-Y, Liu Y, Gao Y-H, Jin T, Zhang H-B, Zhou X-W. Identification and bioactive potential of endogenetic fungi isolated from medicinal caterpillar fungus *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* from Tibetan Plateau. Int J Agric Biol. 2017; 19: 307–313. DOI: 10.17957/IJAB/15.0281

20. Hancock SP, Cascio D, Johnson RC. Cooperative DNA binding by proteins through DNA shape complementarity. Nucleic Acids Res. 2019; 47(16):8874–8887. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkz642

21. Hawksworth DL, Crous PW, Redhead SA, Reynolds DR, Samson RA, Seifert KA, and 82 other authors. The Amsterdam declaration on fungal nomenclature. IMA Fungus. 2011; 2: 105−112. DOI: 10.5598/imafungus.2011.02.01.14

22. Hénault M, Marsit S, Charron G, Landry CR. The effect of hybridization on transposable element accumulation in an undomesticated fungal species. eLife. 2020; 9: e60474. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.60474

23. Holliday J, Cleaver M. Medicinal value of the caterpillar fungi species of the genus Cordyceps (Fr.) Link (Ascomycetes). A review. Int. J. Med. Mushrooms. 2008; 10: 219–234. DOI: 10.1615/IntJMedMushr.v10.i3.30

24. Hu X, Zhang Y-J, Xiao G-H, Zheng P, Xia Y-L, Zhang X-Y, St Leger RJ, Liu X-Z, Wang C-S. Genome survey uncovers the secrets of sex and lifestyle in caterpillar fungus. Chin. Sci. Bull. 2013; 58: 2846–2854. doi: 10.1007/s11434-013-5929-5

25. Huelsenbeck JP, Ronquist F. MRBAYES: Bayesian inference of phylogeny. Bioinformat. 2001; 17: 754−755. DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/17.8.754

26. Jackson D, Lawson T, Villafane R, Gary L. Modeling the structure of yeast MATα1: An HMG-Box motif with a C-terminal helical extension. Open J Biophysics, 2013, 3: 1−12. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojbiphy.2013.31001

27. Jacobsen S, Wittig M, Pöggeler S. Interaction Between Mating-Type Proteins From the Homothallic Fungus Sordaria macrospora. Curr. Genet. 2002; 41: 150–158. doi: 10.1007/s00294-002-0276-0

28. Jiang Y, Yao Y-J. A review for the debating studies on the anamorph of *Cordyceps sinensis*. Mycosistema. 2003; 22(1): 161–176.

29. Jin L-Q, Xu Z-W, Zhang B, Yi M, Weng C-Y, Lin S, Wu H, Qin X-T, Xu F, Teng Y, Yuan S-J, Liu Z-Q, Zheng Y-G. Genome sequencing and analysis of fungus *Hirsutella sinensis* isolated from *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. AMB Expr. 2020; 10: 105. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13568-020-01039-x

30. Jones SK, Bennett RJ. Fungal mating pheromones: choreographing the dating game. Fungal Genet. Biol. 2011; 48(7): 668–676. doi: 10.1016/j.fgb.2011.04.001

31. Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, Tunyasuvunakool K, Bates R, Žídek A, Potapenko A, Bridgland A, Meyer C, Kohl SAA, Ballard AJ, Cowie A, Romera-Paredes B, Nikolov S, Jain R, Adler J, Back T, Petersen S, Reiman D, Clancy E, Zielinski M, Steinegger M, Pacholska M, Berghammer T, Bodenstein S, Silver D, Vinyals O, Senior AW, Kavukcuoglu K, Kohli P, Hassabis D. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. Nature 2021; 596: 583–589. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03819-2

32. Kang Q, Zhang J, Chen F, Dong C, Qin Q, Li X, Wang H, Zhang H and Meng Q. Unveiling mycoviral diversity in *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* through transcriptome analyses. Front. Microbiol. 2024; 15: 1493365. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2024.1493365

33. Kastaniotis AJ, Zitomer RS. Rox1 mediated repression. Oxygen dependent repression in yeast. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2000; 475: 185–195. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10849660/

34. Kim H-K, Jo S-M, Kim G-Y, Kim D-W, Kim Y-K, Yun S-H. A large-scale functional analysis of putative target

1294   genes of mating-type loci provides insight into the regulation of sexual development of the cereal pathogen
1295   *Fusarium graminearum*. PLoS Genet 2015; 11(9): e1005486. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1005486

35. Kinjo N, Zang M. Morphological and phylogenetic studies on *Cordyceps sinensis* distributed in southwestern China. Mycoscience. 2001; 42: 567–574. DOI: 10.1007/BF02460956

36. Kück U, Bennett RJ, Wang L and Dyer PS. Editorial: Sexual and Parasexual Reproduction of Human Fungal Pathogens. Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. 2022; 12: 934267. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2022.934267

37. Kües U, Casselton LA. The origin of multiple mating types in mushrooms. J Cell Sci 1993; 104 (2): 227–230. https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.104.2.227

38. Kyte J, Doolittle RF. A simple method for displaying the hydropathic character of a protein. J Mol Biol 1982; 157(1): 105−132. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2836(82)90515-0

39. Leung P-H, Zhang Q-X, Wu J-Y. Mycelium cultivation, chemical composition and antitumour activity of a *Tolypocladium* sp. fungus isolated from wild *Cordyceps sinensis*. J. Appl. Microbiol. 2006; 101: 275−283. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2672.2006.02930.x

40. Li C-L. A study of *Tolypocladium sinense* C.L. Li. sp. nov. and cyclosporin production. Acta Mycol. Sinica. 1988; 7: 93−98.

41. Li M-M, Zhang J-H, Qin Q-L, Zhang H, Li X, Wang H-T, Meng Q. Transcriptome and Metabolome Analyses of Thitarodes xiaojinensis in Response to *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* Infection. Microorganisms 2023a; 11: 2361. https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms11092361

42. Li W-J, Xia J-M, Li Q-P, Zhang Z-Y, Zhang W-W, Dong C-H, Wei J-C, Liu X-Z. Developmental recording of the ghost-moth larvae after ex situ infection by *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Sci China Life Sci 2020a; 63, 1093–1095. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11427-020-1686-7

43. Li W-J, Xia J-M, Li Q-P, Zhang Z-Y, Zhang W-W, Dong C-H, Wei J-C, Liu X-Z. Erratum to: Developmental recording of the ghost-moth larvae after *ex situ* infection by *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Sci China Life Sci 2023b; 66, 892. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11427-022-2232-5

44. Li X, Wang F, Liu Q, Li Q-P, Qian Z-M, Zhang X-L, Li K, Li W-J, Dong C-H. Developmental transcriptomics of Chinese cordyceps reveals gene regulatory network and expression profiles of sexual development-related genes. BMC Genomics. 2019; 20: 337. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-019-5708-z

45. Li X-Z, Li Y-L, Wang Y-N, Zhu J-S. Translations of mutant repetitive genomic sequences in *Hirsutella sinensis* and changes in secondary structures and functional specifications of the encoded proteins. International J Mol Sci 2024a; 25(20), 11178; https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms252011178

46. Li X-Z, Li Y-L, Yao Y-S, Xie W-D, Zhu J-S. Further discussion with Li *et al*. (2013, 2019) regarding the "ITS pseudogene hypothesis" for *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 2020b; 146: 106728. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2019.106728

47. Li X-Z, Li Y-L, Zhu J-S. Differential transcription of mating-type genes during sexual reproduction of natural *Cordyceps sinensis*. Chin. J. Chin. Materia Medica. 2023c; 48(10): 2829–2840. DOI: 10.19540/j.cnki.cjcmm.20230213.102

48. Li X-Z, Li Y-L, Zhu J-S. Three-dimensional structural heteromorphs of mating-type proteins in *Hirsutella sinensis* and the natural *Cordyceps sinensis* insect-fungal complex. J Fungi. 2025; 11(4): 244. https://doi.org/10.3390/ jof11040244

49. Li X-Z, Xiao M-J, Li Y-L, Gao L, Zhu J-S. Mutations and differential transcription of mating-type and pheromone receptor genes in *Hirsutella sinensis* and the natural *Cordyceps sinensis* insect–fungi complex. Biol. (Basel) 2024b; 13(8): 632. https://doi.org/10.3390/biology13080632

50. Li Y, Hsiang T, Yang R-H, Hu X-D, Wang K, Wang W-J, Wang X-L, Jiao L, Yao Y-J. Comparison of different

sequencing and assembly strategies for a repeat-rich fungal genome, *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. J. Microbiol. Methods. 2016a; 128: 1−6. DOI: 10.1016/j.mimet.2016.06.025

51. Li Y, Jiang L, Wang K, Wu H-J, Yang R-H, Yan Y-J, Bushley KE, Hawksworth DL, Wu Z-J, Yao Y-J. RIP mutated ITS genes in populations of *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* and their implications for molecular systematics. IMA Fungus. 2020c; 11: 18. DOI:10.1016/j.mimet.2016.06.025

52. Li Y, Jiao L, Yao Y-J. Non-concerted ITS evolution in fungi, as revealed from the important medicinal fungus *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 2013; 68: 373−379. doi: 10.1016/j.ympev.2013.04.010

53. Li Y, Yang R-H, Jiang L, Hu X-D, Wu Z-J, Yao Y-J. rRNA Pseudogenes in Filamentous Ascomycetes as Revealed by Genome Data. G3 (Bethesda) 2017; 7(8): 2695−2703. doi: 10.1534/g3.117.044016

54. Li Y-L, Gao L, Yao Y-S, Wu Z-M, Lou Z-Q, Xie W-D, Wu J-Y, Zhu J-S. Altered GC- and AT-biased genotypes of *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* in the stromal fertile portions and ascospores of natural *Cordyceps sinensis*. PLoS ONE. 2023d; 18(6): e0286865. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0286865

55. Li Y-L, Li X-Z, Yao Y-S, Wu Z-M, Gao L, Tan N-Z, Lou Z-Q, Xie W-D, Wu J-Y, Zhu J-S. Differential cooccurrence of multiple genotypes of *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* in the stromata, stromal fertile portion (ascocarps) and ascospores of natural *Cordyceps sinensis*. PLoS ONE. 2023e; 18(3): e0270776. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0270776

56. Li Y-L, Li X-Z, Yao Y-S, Xie W-D, Zhu J-S. Molecular identification of *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* genotypes and the indiscriminate use of the Latin name for the multiple genotypes and the natural insect-fungi complex. Am J BioMed Sci. 2022; 14(3): 115–135. doi: 10.5099/aj220300115

57. Li Y-L, Yao Y-S, Zhang Z-H, Xu H-F, Liu X, Ma S-L, Wu Z-M, Zhu J-S. Synergy of fungal complexes isolated from the intestines of *Hepialus lagii* larvae in increasing infection potency. J. Fungal Res. 2016b; 14: 96−112.

58. Liu J, Guo L-N, Li Z-W, Zhou Z, Li Z, Li Q, Bo X-C, Wang S-Q, Wang J-L, Ma S-C, Zheng J, Yang Y. Genomic analyses reveal evolutionary and geologic context for the plateau fungus *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Clin. Med. 2020; 15: 107–119. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13020-020-00365-3

59. Liu Z-Q, Lin S, Baker PJ, Wu L-F, Wang X-R, Wu H, Xu F, Wang H-Y, Brathwaite ME, Zheng Y-G. Transcriptome sequencing and analysis of the entomopathogenic fungus *Hirsutella sinensis* isolated from *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. BMC Genomics. 2015; 16: 106–123. DOI: 10.1186/s12864-015-1269-y

60. Lu H-L, St Leger RJ. Chapter Seven - Insect Immunity to Entomopathogenic Fungi, Editors: Lovett B, St. Leger RJ. Advanc Genet, Academic Press, 2016. Vol. 94; pp. 251–85.

61. Mao X-M, Zhao S-M, Cao L, Yan X, Han R-C. The morphology observation of *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* from different origins. J. Environ. Entomol. 2013; 35(3): 343–353.

62. Mariani V, Biasini M, Barbato A, Schwede T. lDDT: a local superposition-free score for comparing protein structures and models using distance difference tests. Bioinformatics. 2013; 29(21): 2722–2728. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btt473

63. Martin T, Lu S-W, van Tilbeurgh H, Ripoll DR, Dixelius C, Dixelius C, Turgeon BG, Debuchy R. Tracing the Origin of the Fungal a1 Domain Places Its Ancestor in the HMG-Box Superfamily: Implication for Fungal Mating-Type Evolution. PLoS ONE 2010; 5(12): e15199. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0015199

64. Meng Q, Yu H-Y, Zhang H, Zhu W, Wang M-L, Zhang J-H, Zhou G-L, Li X, Qin Q-L, Hu S-N, Zou Z. Transcriptomic insight into the immune defenses in the ghost moth, *Hepialus xiaojinensis*, during an *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* fungal infection. Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol. 2015; 64: 1−15. DOI: 10.1016/j.ibmb.2015.06.014

65. Metin B, Findley K, Heitman J. The mating type locus (MAT) and sexual reproduction of *Cryptococcus heveanensis*: insights into the evolution of sex and sex-determining chromosomal regions in fungi. PLoS Genet

1380   2010; 6(5): e1000961. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000961

66. Mishra A, Forche A and Anderson MZ. Parasexuality of Candida Species. Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. 2021; 11: 796929. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2021.796929

67. Monzon V, Haft DH, Bateman A. Folding the unfoldable: using AlphaFold to explore spurious proteins. Bioinformatics Advances, 2022; 1(2): vbab043. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioadv/vbab043

68. Nakamura N, Tanaka C, Takeuchi-Kaneko Y. Transmission of antibiotic-resistance markers by hyphal fusion suggests partial presence of parasexuality in the root endophytic fungus Glutinomyces brunneus. Mycol. Progress 2019; 18: 453–462. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11557-018-1455-9

69. Peters C, Elofsson A. Why is the biological hydrophobicity scale more accurate than earlier experimental hydrophobicity scales? Proteins. 2014; 82(9): 2190–2198. doi: 10.1002/prot.24582

70. Rams B, Kück U. The *Penicillium chrysogenum* tom1 gene a major target of transcription factor MAT1-1-1 encodes a nuclear protein involved in sporulation. Front. Fungal Bio. 2022; 3: 937023. doi: 10.3389/ffunb.2022.937023

71. Ren Y, Wan D-G, Lu X-M, Guo J-L. The study of scientific name discussion for TCM Cordyceps. LisShenzhen Med. Material Medica Res. 2013; 24(9): 2211−2212.

72. Rettie SA, Campbell KV, Bera AK, Kang A, Kozlov S, De La Cruz J, Adebomi V, Zhou G, DiMaio F, Ovchinnikov S, Bhardwaj G. Cyclic peptide structure prediction and design using AlphaFold. bioRxiv [Preprint]. 2023; 26:2023.02.25.529956. doi: 10.1101/2023.02.25.529956

73. Ronquist F, Teslenko M, van der Mark P, Ayres DL, Darling A, Höhna S, Larget B, Liu L, Suchard MA, Huelsenbeck JP. MrBayes 3.2: Efficient Bayesian Phylogenetic Inference and Model Choice Across a Large Model Space, Systematic Biology, 2012; 61(3): 539–542. https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/sys029

74. Samarasinghe H, You M, Jenkinson TS, Xu J-P, James TY. Hybridization Facilitates Adaptive Evolution in Two Major Fungal Pathogens. Genes. 2020; 11: 101. doi:10.3390/genes11010101

75. Seervai RNH, Jones SK, Hirakawa MP, Porman AM, Bennett RJ. Parasexuality and ploidy change in *Candida tropicalis*. Eukaryotic Cell. 2013; 12(12): 1629–1640. DOI: 10.1128/EC.00128-13

76. Sherwood RK, Bennett RJ. Fungal meiosis and parasexual reproduction--lessons from pathogenic yeast. Current Opinion Microbiol. 2009; 12(6): 599–607. DOI: 10.1016/j.mib.2009.09.005

77. Shu R-H, Zhang J-H, Meng Q, Zhang H, Zhou G-L, Li M-M, Wu P-P, Zhao Y-N, Chen C, Qin Q-L. A new high-quality draft genome assembly of the Chinese cordyceps *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Genome Biol. Evol. 2020; 12(7): 1074−1079. DOI: 10.1093/gbe/evaa112

78. Simm S, Einloft J, Mirus O, Schleiff E. 50 years of amino acid hydrophobicity scales: revisiting the capacity for peptide classification. Biol. Res. 2016; 49(1): 31. doi: 10.1186/s40659-016-0092-5

79. Steensels J, Gallone B, Verstrepen KJ. Interspecific hybridization as a driver of fungal evolution and Adaptation. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 2021; 19: 485–500.

80. Stensrud Ø, Hywel-Jones NL, Schumacher T. Towards a phylogenetic classification of Cordyceps: ITS nrDNA sequence data confirm divergent lineages and paraphyly. Mycol. Res. 2005; 109: 41−56. DOI: 10.1017/s095375620400139x

81. Stensrud Ø, Schumacher T, Shalchian-Tabrizi K, Svegardenib IB, Kauserud H. Accelerated nrDNA evolution and profound AT bias in the medicinal fungus *Cordyceps sinensis*. Mycol. Res. 2007; 111: 409–415. DOI: 10.1016/j.mycres.2007.01.015

82. Stone R. Improbable partners aim to bring biotechnology to a Himalayan kingdom. Sci. 2010; 327: 940–941. DOI: 10.1126/science.327.5968.940

83. 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; 53:4 17-444. doi: 10.1146/annurev-genet-120116-024755

84. Sung G-H, Hywel-Jones NL, Sung J-M, Luangsa-ard JJ, Shrestha B, Spatafora JW. Phylogenetic classification of *Cordyceps* and the clavicipitaceous fungi. Stud. Mycol. 2007; 57: 5−59. DOI: 10.3114/sim.2007.57.01

85. Thapar R. Structure-specific nucleic acid recognition by L-motifs and their diverse roles in expression and regulation of the genome. Biochim Biophys Acta 2015; 1849(6): 677–687. doi: 10.1016/j.bbagrm.2015.02.006

86. Tunyasuvunakool, K., Adler, J., Wu, Z, Green T, Zielinski M, Žídek A, Bridgland A, Cowie A, Meyer C, Laydon A, Velankar S, Kleywegt GJ, Bateman A, Evans R, Pritzel A, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, Bates R, Kohl SAA, Potapenko A, Ballard AJ, Romera-Paredes B, Nikolov S, Jain R, Clancy E, Reiman D, Petersen S, Senior AW, Kavukcuoglu K, Birney E, Kohli P, Jumper J, Hassabis D. Highly accurate protein structure prediction for the human proteome. Nature 2021; 596: 590–596. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03828-1

87. Turgeon BG, Yoder OC. Proposed nomenclature for mating type genes of filamentous ascomycetes. Fungal Genet. Biol. 2000; 31: 1–5. DOI: 10.1006/fgbi.2000.1227

88. Varadi M, Bertoni D, Magana P, Paramval U, Pidruchna I, Radhakrishnan M, Tsenkov M, Nair S, Mirdita M, Yeo J, Kovalevskiy O, Tunyasuvunakool K, Laydon A, Žídek A, Tomlinson H, Hariharan D, Abrahamson J, Green T, Jumper J, Birney E, Steinegger M, Hassabis D, Velankar S. AlphaFold Protein Structure Database in 2024: providing structure coverage for over 214 million protein sequences. Nucleic Acids Res. 2024; 52(D1): D368–D375. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkad1011

89. Wang Y, Stata M, Wang W, Stajich JE, White MM, Moncalvo JM. Comparative genomics reveals the core gene toolbox for the fungus-insect symbiosis. mBio. 2018; 9: e00636-18. DOI: 10.1128/mBio.00636-18

90. Wei J-C, Wei X-L, Zheng W-F, Guo W, Liu R-D. Species identification and component detection of *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* cultivated by modern industry. Mycosystema. 2016; 35(4): 404–410.

91. Wei X-L, Yin X-C, Guo Y-L, Shen N-Y, Wei, J.-C. Analyses of molecular systematics on *Cordyceps sinensis* and its related taxa. Mycosystema. 2006; 25(2): 192–202.

92. Wilson AM, Wilken PM, van der Nest MA, Steenkamp ET, Wingfield MJ, Wingfield BD. Homothallism: an umbrella term for describing diverse sexual behaviors. IMA Fungus. 2015; 6(1): 207–214. DOI: 10.5598/imafungus.2015.06.01.13

93. Wroblewski K, Kmiecik S. Integrating AlphaFold pLDDT Scores into CABS-flex for enhanced protein flexibility simulations. Comput Struct Biotechnol J. 2024; 30(23): 4350–4356. doi: 10.1016/j.csbj.2024.11.047

94. Xia E-H, Yang D-R, Jiang J-J, Zhang Q-J, Liu Y, Liu Y-L, Zhang Y, Zhang H-B, Shi C, Tong Y, Kim C-H, Chen H, Peng Y-Q, Yu Y, Zhang W, Eichler EE, Gao L-Z. The caterpillar fungus, *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*, genome provides insights into highland adaptation of fungal pathogenicity. Sci. Rep. 2017; 7: 1806. DOI:10.1038/s41598-017-01869-z

95. Xia F, Liu Y, Shen G-L, Guo L-X, Zhou X-W. Investigation and analysis of microbiological communities in natural *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Can. J. Microbiol. 2015; 61: 104–111. DOI: 10.1139/cjm-2014-0610

96. Xiang L, Li Y, Zhu Y, Luo H, Li C, Xu X, Sun C, Song J-Y, Shi L-H, He L, Sun W, Chen S-L. Transcriptome analysis of the *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* fruiting body reveals putative genes involved in fruiting body development and cordycepin biosynthesis. Genomics. 2014; 103: 154−159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygeno.2014.01.002

97. Xiao W, Yang J-P, Zhu P, Cheng K-D, He H-X, Zhu H-X, Wang Q. Non-support of species complex hypothesis of *Cordyceps sinensis* by targeted rDNA-ITS sequence analysis. Mycosystema. 2009; 28(6): 724–730.

98. Xu T, Xu Q, Li J-Y. Toward the appropriate interpretation of Alphafold2. Front Artif Intell. 2023; 6: 1149748.

doi: 10.3389/frai.2023.1149748

99. Yamamoto A, Ando Y, Yoshioka K, Saito K, Tanabe T, Shirakawa H, Yoshida M. Difference in affinity for DNA
between HMG proteins 1 and 2 determined by surface plasmon resonance measurements. J Biochem.
1997;122(3): 586–594. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.jbchem.a021793. PMID: 9348088

100. Yang J-L, Xiao W, He H-X, Zhu H-X, Wang S-F, Cheng -KD, Zhu P. Molecular phylogenetic analysis of
Paecilomyces hepiali and *Cordyceps sinensis*. Acta Pharmaceut. Sinica 2008; 43(4): 421–426.

101. Yang J-Y, Tong X-X, He C-Y, Bai J, Wang F, Guo J-L. Comparison of endogenetic microbial community
diversity between wild *Cordyceps sinensis*, artificial *C. sinensis* and habitat soil. Chin. J. Chin. Materia Medica.
2021; 46(12): 3106–3115.

102. Yao Y-S, Zhu J-S. Indiscriminate use of the Latin name for natural *Cordyceps sinensis* and *Ophiocordyceps*
sinensis fungi. Chin. J. Chin. Mater. Med. 2016; 41(7): 1316–1366.

103. Zhang S; Zhang Y-J. Molecular evolution of three protein-coding genes in the Chinese caterpillar fungus
Ophiocordyceps sinensis. Microbiol. China. 2015; 42(8): 1549−1560.

104. Zhang S, Zhang Y-J, Liu X-Z, Wen H-A, Wang M, Liu D-S. Cloning and analysis of the MAT1-2-1 gene from
the traditional Chinese medicinal fungus *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*. Fungal Biol. 2011; 115: 708−714.

105. Zhang S, Zhang Y-J, Shrestha B, Xu J-P, Wang C-S, Liu X-Z. *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* and *Cordyceps militaris*:
research advances, issues and perspectives. Mycosystema. 2013; 32: 577−597.

106. Zhang S-W, Cen K, Liu Y, Zhou X-W, Wang C-S. Metatranscriptomics analysis of the fruiting caterpillar fungus
collected from the Qinghai-Tibetan plateau. Sci. Sinica Vitae. 2018; 48(5): 562−570.

107. Zhang Y-J, Li E-W, Wang C-S, Li Y-L, Liu X-Z. *Ophiocordyceps sinensis*, the flagship fungus of China:
terminology, life strategy and ecology. Mycol. 2012; 3(1): 2–10.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21501203.2011.654354

108. Zhang Y-J, Sun B-D, Zhang S, Wàngmŭ, Liu X-Z, Gong W-F. Mycobiotal investigation of natural
Ophiocordyceps sinensis based on culture-dependent investigation. Mycosistema. 2010; 29(4): 518–527.

109. Zhang Y-J, Xu L-L, Zhang S, Liu X-Z, An Z-Q, Wàngmŭ, Guo Y-L. Genetic diversity of *Ophiocordyceps*
sinensis, a medicinal fungus endemic to the Tibetan Plateau: implications for its evolution and conservation.
BMC Evol. Biol. 2009; 9: 290. doi:10.1186/1471-2148-9-290

110. Zhang Y-J, Zhang S, Li Y-L, Ma S-L, Wang C-S, Xiang M-C, Liu X, An Z-Q, Xu J-P, Liu X-Z. Phylogeography
and evolution of a fungal–insect association on the Tibetan Plateau. Mol. Ecol. 2014; 23: 5337−5355. DOI:
10.1111/mec.12940

111. Zheng, P.; Wang, C.-S. Sexuality Control and Sex Evolution in Fungi. Sci. Sin. Vitae 2013, 43, 1090–1097.

112. Zheng Q, Hou R, Zhang J-Y, Ma J, Ma J-W, Wu Z-S, Wang G-H, Wang C-F, Xu J-R. The MAT locus genes play
different roles in sexual reproduction and pathogenesis in *Fusarium graminearum*. PLoS ONE 2013; 8(6):
e66980. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066980

113. Zhong X, Gu L, Wang H-Z, Lian D-H, Zheng Y-M, Zhou S, Zhou W, Gu J, Zhang G, Liu X. Profile of
Ophiocordyceps sinensis transcriptome and differentially expressed genes in three different mycelia, sclerotium
and fruiting body developmental stages. Fungal Biol. 2018; 122: 943–951. DOI: 10.1016/j.funbio.2018.05.011

114. Zhou XW, Li LJ, Tian EW. Advances in research of the artificial cultivation of *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* in China.
Critical Rev Biotechnol 2013; *34*(3), 233–243. https://doi.org/10.3109/07388551.2013.791245

115. Zhu J-S, Gao L, Li X-H, Yao Y-S, Zhou Y-J, Zhao J-Q, Zhou Y-J. Maturational alterations of oppositely
orientated rDNA and differential proliferations of CG:AT-biased genotypes of *Cordyceps sinensis* fungi and
Paecilomyces hepiali in natural *C. sinensis*. Am. J. Biomed. Sci. 2010; 2(3): 217–238. doi: 10.5099/aj100300217

116. Zhu J-S, Guo Y-L, Yao Y-S, Zhou Y-J, Lu J-H, Qi Y, Chen W, Zheng T-Y, Zhang L, Wu Z-M, Zhang L-J, Liu X-

J, Yin W-T. Maturation of *Cordyceps sinensis* associates with co-existence of *Hirsutella sinensis* and *Paecilomyces hepiali* DNA and dynamic changes in fungal competitive proliferation predominance and chemical profiles. J. Fungal Res. 2007; 5(4): 214–224.

117. Zhu J-S, Halpern GM, Jones K. The scientific rediscovery of a precious ancient Chinese herbal regimen: *Cordyceps sinensis*: Part I. J. Altern. Complem. Med. 1998a; 4(3): 289–303. DOI: 10.1089/acm.1998.4.3-289

118. Zhu J-S, Halpern GM, Jones K. The scientific rediscovery of an ancient Chinese herbal medicine: *Cordyceps sinensis*: Part II. J. Altern. Complem. Med. 1998b; 4(4): 429–457. DOI: 10.1089/acm.1998.4.429

119. Zhu J-S, Li C-L, Tan N-Z, Berger JL, Prolla TA. Combined use of whole-gene expression profiling technology and mouse lifespan test in anti-aging herbal product study. Proc. 2011 New TCM Products Innovation and Industrial Development Summit, Hangzhou, China (Nov 27, 2011). pp. 443–448. Available online: https://xueshu.baidu.com/usercenter/paper/show?paperid=08341c17fa58c8f85584b92572b90f75&site=xueshu_se (accessed on 30 January 2025)

120. Zhu J-S, Li Y-L. A Precious Transitional Chinese Medicine, *Cordyceps sinensis*: Multiple heterogeneous *Ophiocordyceps sinensis* in the insect-fungi complex. Lambert Academic Publishing, Saarbrüchen. Germany, 2017.

121. Zitomer RS, Limbach MP, Rodriguez-Torres AM, Balasubramanian B, Deckert J, Snow PM. Approaches to the study of Rox1 repression of the hypoxic genes in the yeast Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Methods. 1997; 11(3): 279–288. doi: 10.1006/meth.1996.0422