A long non-coding RNA regulates triazole antifungal susceptibility and virulence in

Aspergillus fumigatus

Nava Raj Poudyal[1,2], Ryan T. Mehlem[2,3], Priyanka Doneparthi[1*], Tabitha Cady[1^], Sven D. Willger[4#], Maximiliano Ortiz[5], Rooksana E. Noorai[5], Jason E. Stajich[6] and Sourabh Dhingra[1,2,7]

[1]Department of Biological Sciences, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA
[2]Eukaryotic Pathogen Innovation Center, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA
[3]Department of Genetics and Biochemistry, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA
[4]Department of Immunology and Infectious Disease, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT 59717, USA
[5]Clemson University Genomics & Bioinformatics Facility, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA
[6]Department of Microbiology and Plant Pathology, University of California-Riverside, Riverside, CA 92521, USA

* Present address: Department of Oncology, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA, pd771@georgetown.edu

^ Present address: Biology Department, Morrissey College of Arts and Sciences, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA, tabithacady@gmail.com

Present address: Independent Researcher, Düsseldorf, Germany, sven.willger@gmail.com

[7]Address correspondence to: sdhingr@clemson.edu

Abstract:

Azole-resistant *Aspergillus* infections are a source of increasing concern with limited alternative therapeutic options. However, as most infections are still caused by azole-susceptible *Aspergillus* strains, there is a need to better understand fungal responses to azole antifungals. To this end, we discover that a long non-coding RNA, *afu-182,* is a major regulator of *cyp51*-independent azole recalcitrant colony growth (ARC). We observe that loss of *afu-182* leads to azole recalcitrant biofilms and poor treated disease outcomes in murine invasive pulmonary aspergillosis models. In contrast, overexpression of *afu-182* significantly reduces fungal burden in animals treated with azole drugs. Whole transcriptome analyses revealed that azole drug treatment leads to an increase in transcripts of genes encoding 7-transmembrane domain proteins of the RTA1 family, and these proteins are negatively regulated by *afu-182*. Two RTA1 family genes downstream of *afu-182* regulation have individual and combined effect in regulating fungal ARC. Taken together, our data show a trans-acting role of the long non-coding RNA *afu-182* in regulating *Aspergillus fumigatus* response to azole drugs both *in vitro* and *in vivo*. These data provide further support for investigating antifungal drug responses beyond minimum inhibitory concentration testing.

Introduction:

Aspergillus fumigatus causes a spectrum of infections termed as Aspergillosis, mainly in patients with compromised immune systems (1). The patient population most susceptible to infections is those who have acute neutropenia due to underlying conditions or immunotherapies, or patients on long-term steroid use (2, 3). Recent studies have shown that *A. fumigatus* is a significant cause of secondary infections, leading to increased morbidity and mortality in patients with viral infections, including COVID-19 and influenza A virus (4, 5). Importantly, *A. fumigatus* is increasingly a source of infection in tertiary care centers in patients with mild to no immune suppression, highlighting the prevalence of the infection and increase in the patient population that is susceptible to aspergillosis (6). The World Health Organization (WHO) classified *A. fumigatus* as a critical pathogen in 2023 (7).

Azoles, polyenes, and echinocandins are the current classes of antifungal drugs available for aspergillosis treatment; azoles are the most widely used (8). Clinically, voriconazole is the frontline therapy; however, posaconazole, itraconazole and isavuconazole are also used (8). Concerningly, azole drug resistance is on the rise (9). Azoles inhibit the sterol 14-α-demethylase gene, *cyp51* (*erg11* in yeast), which leads to accumulation of toxic sterols (10). Molecularly, resistance to azoles is primarily attributed to mutational hotspots in the *cyp51* gene sequence that affect drug-enzyme binding (11); with or without the replication of a 34 base pair or 46 base pair tandem repeat (TR) in the promoter region of the *cyp51a* gene (commonly referred to as TR_{34} and $TR_{46,}$ respectively) (12–14). TRs in promoter regions increase the binding site of transcription factor SrbA, which positively regulates *cyp51a* transcription (15). SrbA also regulates ergosterol biosynthesis by transcriptional regulation of *erg3*, *erg25* and *erg24* genes (16, 17). In addition, transcription factors *rttA* and *atrR* cooperate with SrbA for azole resistance (18, 19).

SrbA is a class of ER resident sterol regulator binding element protein (SREBP) that, in association with SREBP cleavage activating protein (Scap) and Insulin induced gene (INSIG), regulates cholesterol levels in mammalian cells (20, 21). In *A. fumigatus*, SrbA

plays a significant role in the hypoxia response, low iron response, virulence, and azole

susceptibility (20); however, a Scap homolog has not been identified in any Eurotiomycete

fungus to date, and the Insig homolog *insA* does not regulate SREBPs or subsequent

hypoxia response in these fungi (22). In the mammalian system, INSIG senses the

accumulation of sterol pathway intermediates and negatively regulates HMG-CoA

reductase, thus blocking the rate-limiting step in sterol biosynthesis (23). In *A. fumigatus,*

mutations in HMG-CoA reductase (HMG-CoA) have been recently identified in clinical

isolates (24–27), and these mutations, especially in the sterol-sensing domain (SSD), are

predicted to inhibit sterol intermediate sensing by changing HMG-CoA-Insig stochiometric

balance (28). Thus, *insA* provides a feedback mechanism that contributes to azole

resistance (28). Interestingly, overexpression (OE) of *insA* reverses the azole resistance in

OE HMG-CoA mutants but not in SSD mutants, highlighting the importance of sterol

sensing by HMG-CoA (28).

In a laboratory setting, drug resistance is defined as a change in minimum inhibitory

concentration (MIC) above the clinical cut-off value measured in standardized MIC testing

assays (29). Multiple methods are used to determine the MICs of the antifungal drugs in the

laboratory setting, including broth microdilution, disk diffusion assay and E-Test strips (29,

30), and strains are then classified as susceptible, resistant, tolerant, persistent or

exhibiting hetero-resistance (30) based on the ability of all cells or a sub-population of cells

to grow at or above MIC (30, 31). Interestingly, we observed that Δ*insA* strains have

increased growth in the presence of azoles on solid medium without a change in measured

MIC.

Here, we show that *afu-182* is an intergenic long non-coding RNA adjacent to *insA*

that negatively regulates fungal response to the azole drugs, which is different from

previously defined drug responses (30), and is termed here as azole recalcitrant colony

growth (ARC). In an animal model of IPA, the Δ*afu-182* strain causes azole recalcitrant

infections, whereas OE-182 strains show increased clearance from the lungs when treated

with the azole drug, posaconazole.

Collectively, we observed that *afu-182* regulates fungal ARC independent of *cyp51*

regulation and plays a significant role in azole treatment outcomes, especially in strains

classified as azole-susceptible. Thus, our study has uncovered a novel role of fungal ARC in

azole susceptibility both *in vitro* and *in vivo*.

Results:

***afu-182* contributes to *the insA-mediated* fungal response:**

The *Aspergillus fumigatus* INSIG homolog, *insA,* was recently shown to play a role in azole

drug susceptibility (28). Intriguingly, when grown on solid medium containing sub-MIC

voriconazole (0.3µg/ml), itraconazole (0.075µg/ml), or posaconazole (0.03µg/ml) levels of

contemporary azole antifungals, the Δ*insA* mutant had increased growth compared to the

WT strain (Figure 1). We complemented the Δ*insA* strain with the *insA* gene and 265nt 3'

UTR after the translational stop codon. Surprisingly, the complement strain did not revert to

the WT (p>0.05, shown in bold, Figure 1) but showed similar *insA* mRNA levels (Figure S1). A

careful examination of *insA* annotation revealed the presence of long non-coding RNA, *afu-*

182, as a possible intergenic or anti-sense lncRNA (32–34). Thus, we sought to define the

boundary of *insA* mRNA. We did 3' rapid amplification of cDNA ends (3'RACE) analysis(35)

and confirmed that *insA* mRNA ends 191 bp after the translational stop codon (Figure S2).

To test the functional complementation and the role of *afu-182*, we complemented the

Δ*insA* strain with a DNA fragment with *afu-182* (*insA* gene including 676bp after the

translational stop codon, resulting in both cis-acting and trans-acting *afu-182*).

Interestingly, the complement fragment with cis-acting *afu-182* reduced ARC and partially

reverted the strain to WT levels for voriconazole, posaconazole and itraconazole (p<0.05 for

Δ*insA* and comp-*insA* with cis-acting *afu-182*, One-Way ANOVA, Figure 1). Importantly, no

change in MIC was observed for voriconazole as detected by broth microdilution assay or

E-test strip (Figure S1). We defined this growth as azole recalcitrant colony growth (ARC),

i.e., an increase in fungal colony growth at 0.5x MIC level without a change in MIC. To

confirm the mRNA level of *insA* in the complement strains, we used quantitative reverse

transcriptase PCR and did not see a difference in the mRNA levels in both

complementation strains compared to WT (Figure S1). Additionally, to confirm that the

phenotype was not due to the overexpression of *afu-182*, we confirmed the RNA levels of

afu-182 in all strains and did not see significant differences (Figure S1). Taken together,

these data suggest that the fungal ARC is a distinct response, and lncRNA *afu-182* plays an

important role in azole-mediated ARC in the $\Delta insA$ strain.

afu-182 is sufficient to regulate fungal ARC

As *afu-182* is necessary to revert the *insA-mediated* ARC phenotype, we sought to define

the role of *afu-182* in fungal ARC. We made a Δafu-*182* strain and complemented the null

mutant back at its original genomic locus. We also overexpressed *afu-182* RNA using the

gpdA promoter by fusing the *afu-182* sequence at the transcription start site (TSS) of the

glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase, gpd(A), promoter (36), followed by the *trpC*

terminator sequence (T) from *A. nidulans*. We used qPCR to confirm the levels of *afu-182* in

the complement and OE strain and the absence of RNA in the Δafu-*182* strain. Our qPCR

data show the absence of *afu-182* transcript in the Δafu-*182* strain and WT level of

expression in the comp-182 strain (p=0.8014, One-Way ANOVA, Figure S3A). We observed a

4-fold overexpression in the OE-182 strain (p = 0.0002, One-Way ANOVA, Figure S3A). To

assess the role of *afu-182* in fungal ARC, we serially inoculated the strains (10^5-10^2 conidial

density) in the absence and presence of 0.25µg/ml voriconazole (0.5x MIC). The *afu-182*

null mutant strain showed increased fungal ARC (26% growth ratio increase, One-Way

ANOVA, p=0.0078), confirming that *afu-182* lncRNA is necessary to regulate fungal ARC in

response to voriconazole (Figures 2A and 2B). No change in the MIC was observed (Figure

S3B). The complement strain reverted fungal growth back to WT levels (p=0.7112, One-Way

ANOVA), while OE-182 showed decreased fungal ARC (24% decrease in growth ratio,

p=0.0131, One-Way ANOVA), suggesting a causal link between *afu-182 levels* and fungal

ARC (Figure 2B).

It is possible that *afu-182* inhibits fungal germination and not the azole stress

response. Thus, we assessed the germination rates in the absence and presence of

voriconazole by measuring OD_{600} using a plate reader at 37°C. No significant differences

were observed in the germination rates between the strains in either the absence or the

presence of Voriconazole (Figures S3C and S3D, respectively). Next, we assessed the role

of *afu-182* in fungal ARC post-germination in a biofilm assay. We allowed all strains to

germinate and adhere to the abiotic surface (i.e., cell culture plates) for 12 hours. We then

washed the fungal biofilms with PBS and then grew the biofilms in the presence of

voriconazole (0.2µg/ml) for 8 hours. The final biofilms were washed, stained with crystal

violet and de-stained with ethanol as described previously (37). The binding of crystal violet

was measured as an indirect measure of fungal biomass. Importantly, the Δ*afu-182* strain

formed azole recalcitrant biofilms (41% increase compared to WT, p=0.0049), indicating

fungal ARC in biofilms, whereas the OE-182 mutant showed severe and significant

impairment in biofilm development after drug treatment (51% decrease compared to WT,

p=0.0011) (Figure 2C). No difference across strains was observed in initial biofilm

formation after 12 hours (data not shown). Additionally, to understand the role of growth

condition-specific role of *afu-182*, we grew AF as liquid submerged cultures in the presence

and absence of voriconazole for 48 hours and weighed dry fungal biomass. The Δ*afu-182*

strain showed significantly increased biomass (116% increase compared to WT, p=0.0017,

One-Way ANOVA), whereas the OE-182 strain showed significant impairment (76%

decrease compared to WT, p=0.0211, One-Way ANOVA) (Figure 2D). Thus, our data show

that *afu-182* influences fungal ARC in both planktonic and surface-attached cultures (38).

***afu-182* regulates pan-azole fungal ARC**

Voriconazole is the primary choice of drug to treat IPA; however, other azoles are

increasingly utilized (8). Given the long side chain of posaconazole, it binds differently to

the target enzyme Cyp51 compared to voriconazole (39). Environmental sampling has

recovered strains that are voriconazole-resistant but posaconazole and itraconazole-

susceptible due to the increased binding of their long sidechains to stabilize Cyp51

interactions (40). Thus, we aimed to determine if the fungal ARC response is only with

voriconazole or if this is a pan-azole response. To test this, we serially inoculated strains

($10^5 – 10^2$ conidial density) in the presence or absence of posaconazole ($0.03\mu g/ml$),

itraconazole ($0.075\mu g/ml$), and isavuconazole ($0.25\mu g/ml$). Our data show increased fungal

growth in the Δafu-182 mutant for all azoles tested; whereas OE-182 showed decreased

growth for all azoles ($p<0.05$, One-Way ANOVA, Figures 3A-3G), without a change in MIC

(Figures 3H and S1), suggesting afu-182 regulates pan-azole ARC. To assess the

recalcitrance, we inoculated our strains in the presence of $0.4\mu g/ml$ voriconazole, which

inhibited WT growth, while the Δafu-182 strain showed robust growth, indicating that fungal

ARC adaptation allows AF to grow at levels approaching MIC (Figure 3I); however, all strains

failed to grow at 2x MIC (data not shown).

Loss of afu-182 results in an azole recalcitrant infection in a murine model of invasive

pulmonary aspergillosis.

To test the role of afu-182 during infection, we used a corticosteroid model of invasive

pulmonary aspergillosis (41). We challenged mice with 2×10^6 spores of the respective

strains and monitored mice for 14 days for survival (Figure 4A, schematic). We did not see a

difference in survival rates across strains, indicating that afu-182 does not play a role in

virulence in this murine model (Figure 4B, log-rank test, p-value 0.1166). We did not see a

qualitative difference in fungal growth or histopathology as determined by GMS and H&E

staining, respectively (Figure 4C). We next assessed the impact of afu-182 loss on azole

treatment outcome. Posaconazole was selected due to its higher bioavailability in the

absence of grapefruit juice compared to voriconazole in mice (42, 43). Mice were

challenged as previously described (41) for a survival assay and were treated with sub-

therapeutic levels of posaconazole (5mg/kg) at 24, 48 and 72 hours of infection. Mice were

observed for 14 days for survival (Figure 4D, schematic). Mice challenged with Δafu-182

strains had significantly more adverse outcomes compared to WT (p = 0.0103, log-rank

test) (Figure 4E). Thus, the Δ*afu-182* strain that is as virulent as WT in the absence of drug,

is recalcitrant to treatment in the presence of the azole drugs. Importantly, treatment of all

strains with 20mg/kg posaconazole resulted in non-detectable levels of fungal burden for

all strains, indicating that the strain is not drug resistant *in vivo* (data not shown).

Additionally, we challenged and treated mice and harvested lungs after 72 hours (Figure 4F,

schematic). We measured the fungal DNA as previously described (42). Our data indicate a

significantly higher fungal burden in mice challenged with the Δ*afu-182* strain (p=0.0159,

Mann-Whitney U-test) and a significantly reduced fungal burden in mice challenged with

OE-182 strain (p=0.0159, Mann-Whitney U-test) upon azole treatment (Figure 4G); however,

survival of animals infected with OE-182 strain and treated with posaconazole was not

different compared to WT (p=0.4065, log-rank test, Figure 4E).

RNA levels of *afu-182* are negatively regulated by azole drugs, and Inherent *afu-182*

levels determine fungal ARC irrespective of genetic background.

To understand the role of *afu-182* in fungal ARC, we tested the RNA levels of *afu-182* in the

presence and absence of azoles. A significant reduction in levels of *afu-182* was observed

in strains grown in the presence of either voriconazole or posaconazole compared to GMM

(Figure 5A). Multiple strains of *A. fumigatus,* including A1163, CEA10 and Af293, are used

as laboratory WT strains (44). Additionally, multiple reports have shown significant strain

virulence heterogeneity, thus making it hard to establish a true WT strain (45); however, a

comprehensive study of azole response in ASAF strains is lacking. To further determine the

role of *afu-182* in regulating fungal ARC, we quantified the relative abundance of *afu-182*

RNA levels in CEA10, Af293 and an environmental isolate 47-57. Interestingly, *afu-182* RNA

levels negatively correlate with fungal ARC irrespective of MIC (Figures S3E-S3F). The Af293

strain is inherently more recalcitrant to voriconazole (Figure S3F). We made a Δ*afu-182*

mutant in the Af293.1 background, and the resulting strain showed increased fungal ARC at

0.4µg/ml (compared to 0.25µg/ml for CEA10) due to inherent differences in azole response

between strains (Figures 5B and 5D). Environmental isolate 47-57 has increased RNA levels

of *afu-182* compared to CEA10 and is more susceptible to voriconazole compared to

CEA10 (Figures S3E and S3F). Deletion of *afu-182* in the 47-57 background also resulted in

increased fungal ARC at 0.1μg/ml (Figures 5C and 5E). These two isolates with azole

sensitivity on either side of CEA10 showed increased fungal ARC upon *afu-182* loss,

highlighting the role of *afu-182* irrespective of the strain's background. To further

characterize the role of *afu-182* in fungal ARC, we identified the *afu-182* homolog in the

related species *A. nidulans*. The deletion of *an-182* (Δ*an-182*) in two distinct AN isolates

(A1145 and GR5) also leads to fungal ARC (Figures 5F and 5G), indicating roles of lncRNA

afu-182 homologs in multiple Aspergilli species.

afu-182 does not affect azole-regulating transcription factors *srbA*, *atrR* or azole target

gene *cyp51* (erg11a and erg11b)

To further test the role *of afu-182* in regulating ARC, we quantified the mRNA levels of azole

target genes *cyp51a* and *cyp51b,* both in the presence and absence of azoles and TFs *srbA*

and *atrR* in GMM. Importantly, we did not see a change in the transcript levels of *cyp51*

genes in the absence of azoles (Figures 6A and 6B). While in the presence of azoles, we

clearly see an upregulation of *cyp51a* based on drug response, no upregulation was seen

due to genotype (Two-Way ANOVA, interaction p-value = 0.3291, Figure 6A). We did see an

interaction between genotype and drug response for *cyp51b* (Two-way ANOVA, interaction

p value = 0.0045), but post-hoc analysis showed no difference between WT and Δ*afu-182*

strains in either condition (p = 0.2171 for GMM and p = 0.9163 for GMM + vori, Figure 6B).

We also did not see a change in mRNA levels of transcription factors, *srbA* and *atrR*, that

are mainly associated with *cyp51a/b* expression (Figures 6C and 6D). We also did not see a

change in *insA* mRNA levels (Figure 6E). Thus, *afu-182* and fungal ARC represent a distinct

mechanism of fungal response to azole drugs that is independent of azole target gene

transcript levels.

afu-182 regulates the RTA family of proteins:

To determine the role of *afu-182* in regulating fungal ARC, we used a global transcriptomic

approach. Interestingly, we determined that the transcript levels of the RTA1 family of

genes are increased in the presence of azoles in WT strains. The RTA1 family encodes a

diverse family of proteins with wide-ranging functions. In *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*,

members of this family are involved in <u>r</u>esistance <u>t</u>o 7-<u>a</u>minocholestrol (RTA), <u>r</u>esistance <u>t</u>o

<u>m</u>olasses (RTM), and lipid and heme transport (46). Previous reports have suggested that a

member of the RTA1 family is the most increased transcript in response to itraconazole in

clinical samples (47). In *A. fumigatus*, we identified 23 genes encoding RTA1 family

proteins. Interestingly, most of these genes are expressed at very low RNA levels (FPKM <5

for 17 genes in the glucose minimal medium conditions examined). We selected 12 genes

that showed significant increases in transcript levels and have an FPKM value >1 and

performed qPCR to compare their mRNA levels in the presence and absence of azoles. All

12 gene transcripts were increased in the presence of azoles (Figure 7).

To further understand the role of *afu-182* mediated ARC and its relationship to RTA1

family of proteins, we plotted volcano plots of significant genes (-2<$\log_2$>2) between WT

GMM vs WT azole, WT azole vs Δ*afu-182* azole, Δ*afu-182* GMM vs Δ*afu-182* azole, and WT

azole vs comp-182 azole (Figures 8 A-D). We observed that the transcripts of two genes

afub_000050 and afub_000060 were significantly increased in the presence of azoles in the

WT strain and the Δ*afu-182* strain (Figures 8A and 8B). Transcripts of both these genes were

further increased in the Δ*afu-182* strain compared to the WT in the presence of azoles,

hinting at negative regulation of these genes by *afu-182* (Figure 8C) and did not show

differential regulation in the comp-182 strain compared to the WT (Figure 8D). We

confirmed this expression pattern with qPCR (Figures 8E and 8F). Both *afub_000050* and

afub_000060 showed a significant interaction between genotype and azole response (Two-

Way Anova, $p<0.0001$). Of the 23 genes in the RTA1 class, these two are annotated as RTM1

proteins, a homolog of the *S. cerevisiae* gene providing resistance to molasses (48). We

termed them as *rtmA* and *rtmB,* respectively. These genes are present next to each other in

the genome and are divergently expressed.

***rtmA* and *rtmB* are sufficient in driving fungal ARC:**

To ascertain the role of *rtmA* and *rtmB* in fungal ARC, we deleted them in the CEA10

background. Additionally, we made a double null mutant Δ*rtmA*Δ*rtmB* strains. We also

ectopically complemented *rtmA* and *rtmB* single mutants. Both the Δ*rtmA* (31% decrease

in growth ratio, p=0.0012 One-Way ANOVA) and Δ*rtmB* (42% decrease in growth ratio,

p<0.0001, One-Way ANOVA) strain showed reduced fungal ARC in response to azole drugs

(Figure 9A-B, and 9C-D), whereas the Δ*rtmA*Δ*rtmB* strain also showed significant growth

attenuation in presence of azoles (46% decrease in growth ratio p<0.001, One-Way

ANOVA), indicating a combined role of these genes in regulating fungal azole response,

where *rtmB* is the major driver of the ARC phenotype (9E and 9F). The complement strains

reverted to the WT levels, indicating a causal role of these genes in fungal ARC (Figures 9A-

9D, inset – macro lens images). Our RNA analysis revealed that comp strains have 4-6-fold

increases in *rtmA* and *rtmB* expression in these strains compared to WT in the presence of

azoles (Figures S4A-B). As the FPKM values are <5 for these genes in GMM, we chose to test

the RNA levels under stress conditions. Further studies are needed to determine the

functional redundancy of other genes in this family; however, recently, an RTA1 family

protein, *rtaA,* was shown to play no role in azole response (49). The functions of these

genes appear to be diverse.

Discussion:

329   While increasing azole resistance in *A. fumigatus* is a major concern, azole-

susceptible strains (ASAF) still cause most infections. Crucially, the inherent rise of drug

resistance in 43% of patients could not be attributed to changes in the *cyp51A* sequence

(50), the major driver of fungal resistance caused by agricultural use of azoles (51). This

hints at a broader response to AF drugs, especially in ASAF, during infections. Here, we

show that the long non-coding RNA *afu-182* negatively regulates fungal response to azole

drugs in ASAF isolates (Figures 2 and 3). Importantly, deletion of *afu-182* is not associated

with a change in MIC (Figure S3B); however, the Δ*afu-182* strain grows more in the presence

of sub-MIC levels of azole drugs, a phenomenon we term here as fungal ARC (Figures 2 and

3). Fungal response to drugs has been characterized based on changes in genetic

sequence (i.e., resistance) or non-genetic mechanisms (tolerance, persistence, and

hetero-resistance) (29, 30). For bacterial populations, tolerance is defined as increased

survival in the presence of antibiotic concentrations above MIC without a change in MIC

(52). For molds, tolerance is defined as the ability of the fungal strain to grow in the

presence of anti-fungal drugs above the MIC, and the definition is further refined to

tolerance as a property against fungistatic drugs (30, 31). Here, we showed that deletion of

afu-182 did not change the MIC for azoles. Azoles have been shown to induce cell wall

carbohydrate patches to kill AF (53). As alluded to before, *Aspergillus* strains differ in their

stress responses and virulence (45), and because drug MICs also differ amongst strains, it

is hard to predict if azoles are killing AF (i.e., fungicidal) at the MIC or above the MIC. For

example, cell wall patches, a sign of fungicidal activity, were induced in the AfS35 strain

(53) using drug concentrations above MIC (53, 54). Similarly, azole persistence was shown

as cells growing in the zone of inhibition in a disk-diffusion assay (31) and defined as the

ability of a small fraction of cells to grow at drug concentrations above the MIC of fungicidal

drugs (30). However, we did not see the presence of persister colonies in Δ*afu-182* strains

in the E-test assay (Figure 3H) and did not see fungal growth at 2x MIC. Thus, we defined the

Δ*afu-182*-mediated phenotype as ARC, a distinct response from tolerance and persistence.

Furthermore, we showed that the Δ*afu-182*-mediated ARC phenotype is independent of the

strain's background and is conserved in *A. nidulans* and is a fungal response measured at

0.5x MIC azole concentration.

We also showed the azole recalcitrance of surface-attached AF, classically defined

as biofilms (55). Drug resistance is a classical feature of the biofilms (56), and even though

we saw increased attached fungal biomass for the Δ*afu-182* strain upon azole treatment

(Figure 2C), it is possible that different mechanisms are playing roles in this distinct growth

conditions. For example, metabolic adaptation, drug binding to the ECM, and oxygen

gradients have all been shown to play a role in biofilm mediated drug resistance.

Additionally, biofilms can lead to persister cells (57). Further research will uncover the role

of fungal ARC in surface biofilm (as on agar plate) vs. submerged biofilms.

The intergenic lncRNA *afu-182* is located next to the *insA* gene, which was recently

shown to regulate the fungal response to azole drugs. The INSIG homolog, *insA*, regulates

HMG-CoA as the basis of azole resistance (28), but we did not see a change in the mRNA

levels of *insA* in the Δ*afu-182* strains (Figure 6). Trans-acting over-expression of the *afu-182*

(OE-182) also resulted in decreased fungal growth in the presence of azoles, suggesting an

insA transcription-independent mechanism (Figures 2 and 3); however, post-

transcriptional or translation regulation of *insA* is still possible and might play a role in ARC.

Future research will uncover the basis of *afu-182* regulation.

Different AF isolates show differential *afu-182* regulation, implying that *afu-182*

might be involved in fungal adaptation to stress, though in our murine model, it was not

required for virulence (Figure 4 and S3E). Thus, the evolutionary significance of *afu-182* in

AF is currently unclear. Importantly, the Δ*afu-182* strain shows fungal ARC only in response

to azole stress and does not play a role in response to the polyene and echinocandin

classes of drugs (data not shown). Over 90% of infections are still caused by ASAF, with

treatment failure rates approaching 50-90% (58, 59). It is imperative to better understand

the fungal response to azole drugs. To understand the role of *afu-182* in fungal response *in*

vivo, we used a steroid model of IPA. In the absence of azole drugs, the Δ*afu-182* strain is

pathogenic and equally virulent as WT (Figure 4B); however, in the presence of 5mg/kg of

posaconazole, our data show increased virulence in the Δ*afu-182* strain as measured by

survival analysis and fungal burden analysis (Figure 4E and 4H). The overexpression strain

did not show a change in survival compared to WT when treated with azole drugs (Figure

4E); however, it showed a 90% reduction in fungal burden, highlighting the role of *afu-182* in

virulence (Figure 4H). In a steroid model of invasive aspergillosis, deaths due to

exacerbated immune response have been reported (59), and it is plausible that this is the

case in OE-182-infected azole-treated animals. In vitro, we see that *afu-182* regulates pan-

azole ARC, including to posaconazole (Figure 3D).

Different isolates of *A. fumigatus* have been previously shown to differ in virulence.

Some of the factors attributed to this difference are nutrient plasticity and response to light

and oxygen (60–62); however, how different azole-susceptible isolates respond to azole

drugs and their virulence potential in relation to azole treatment requires further research.

afu-182 regulates fungal ARC in ASAF irrespective of the strain's background, as indicated

by deletion of *afu-182* in the laboratory isolates CEA10 and Af293 backgrounds (44).

Additionally, deletion of *afu-182* in the environmental isolate 47-57 also leads to ARC

(Figure 5B and 5C) (60).

The emergence of new strains provides a unique challenge in studying *Aspergillus*

pathogenicity, but *afu-182* appears to play a role irrespective of the strain's background.

One possible reason for this might be the mechanisms by which ncRNA functions. LncRNA

may provide stress adaptation in the absence of evolution that is associated with genomic

changes (63). A rapid adaptation will increase the likelihood of fungal survival during stress,

leading to DNA change. A recent study identified 1089 novel long non-coding RNAs; eleven

of which negatively regulate fungal response to azole drugs; however, *afu-182* fell below the

size threshold identified in this study (64). How *afu-182* regulates fungal ARC is not yet

clear. As the RNA levels of transcription factors involved in azole resistance, viz., *srbA*, *atrR*

and azole target genes *cyp51a* and *cyp51b,* are not impacted by *afu-182* (Figure 6), *afu-182*

regulates fungal ARC through a novel mechanism.

As long non-coding RNAs function in diverse ways, we used a transcriptomic

approach to identify the genes directly or indirectly regulated by *afu-182* at the RNA levels.

In the presence of azoles, we see the RTA1 family of proteins upregulated in WT (Figure 7).

This is a 7-transmembrane domain family of proteins and has been associated with lipid

and heme export and resistance to 7-amonicholesterol in *S. cerevisiae* and *Cryptococcus*

neoformans (46, 65) and consists of 23 members in *A. fumigatus*. Recently, *rtaA*

(Afu3g12830, CEA10 homolog - *afub_036340*) was shown to play a role in response to the

polyene class of drug, amphotericin B and not azoles (49). Here, we identified *rtmA* and

rtmB (Figure 8A-C), two divergent genes downstream of *afu-182*, situated next to each other

to regulate fungal ARC (Figure 9). Both *rtmA* and *rtmB* are negatively regulated by *afu-182*

(Figures 8 B and C); however, *rtmB* mutations might be epistatic to mutations in *rtmA,* as

the double deletion strains show nearly the same inhibition as Δ*rtmB* (Figures 9 D and F).

As both these genes are next to each other, it is not clear whether *afu-182*, by itself or in

coordination with other complex members, if any, regulates the promoter region of these

genes. It is also possible that these genes evolved due to a duplication event to maintain

tight regulation for xenobiotic stress. If *afu-182* regulates fungal ARC via direct regulation of

RTM/RTA1 domain-containing proteins is an active and ongoing area of research in the

laboratory. Importantly, *rtmA* and *rtmB* belong to the accessory genome of AF and were

detected in only 7 of the 300 genomes analyzed (66). In *S. cerevisiae,* RTM1p was also

absent from laboratory strains (48). Given that there are twenty-three members of the same

class of proteins, it is possible that gene duplication added more members in some strains

of AF. The functional redundancy in other strains would still allow *afu-182*-mediated RTA1-

dependent fungal ARC morphology. This genetic diversity and gene duplications in AF

strains have been previously reported (67). More research will uncover the function of this

family of proteins in the future.

Long non-coding RNAs mainly function through their secondary structure and are

difficult to predict based on the nucleotide sequence alone (68). Here, using synteny, we

identified *afu-182* homolog in related fungal species *A. nidulans*. Deletion of *afu-182*

homolog, *an-182,* also leads to fungal ARC in *A. nidulans,* showing its role in regulating

azole response in multiple Aspergilli (Figures 5F and 5G). Whether *afu-182* homologs play a

role in the phytopathogens *A. flavus* and *A. parasiticus* is unknown and needs more

research; complex approaches are needed to identify the homologs of *afu-182* in other

fungal pathogens. However, our data clearly show that long non-coding RNA, *afu-182,*

regulates fungal ARC in AF and AN irrespective of the strain's background.

In conclusion, the lncRNA *afu-182* regulates fungal response to azole drugs in both

ASAF and the related fungal species AN. This effect, in ASAF, is at least partially driven via

negative regulation of *rtmA* and *rtmB*. As MIC is a poor predictor of azole treatment

outcomes in ASAF strains, further characterization of *afu-182* levels will help us determine

the fungal response to azole drugs *in vivo*. Given advancements in RNA biology, *afu-182*

also presents a target to augment the efficacy of current azole drugs.

Materials and Methods

Fungal strains

Aspergillus fumigatus (AF) strain CEA10 or CEA17 was used as the host strain to generate

subsequent strains. For *A. nidulans*, A1145 (FGSC) and GR5 (FGSC) were used as the host

strains to generate subsequent strains. For *A. nidulans*, the strains were supplemented

with Uridine (1.26g/L), Uracil (0.56g/L), pyridoxine (0.05μg/ml), p-amino-benzoic acid

(PABA) (5μM) and riboflavin (0.1μg/ml). All experiments with stationary fungal growth were

performed at 37°C in the presence of 5% CO_2. Liquid biomass and germination assay were

performed in the absence of supplied CO_2. All strains were stored as 30% glycerol stocks in

-70°C for long-term storage. The list of strains used and generated is listed in Supplemental

Table 1.

Δ*insA* strain construction:

The *insA* deletion strain was created using homologous recombination. Fusion PCR was

used to create the DNA deletion cassette. Briefly, the 5' and 3' fragments of *insA* were

amplified with primers RAC 815 and RAC 816, and RAC819 and RAC820, respectively. A

gene encoding for *pyrG* was amplified from pJW24 (69) using primers RAC817 and RAC818.

The three fragments were fused together using primers RAC 821 and RAC 822. The resulting

DNA fragment was transformed into the CEA17 strain via PPEG-mediated transformation of

protoplast (70). Strains were checked with PCR, Southern blot for single integration and

qPCR for lack of detectable RNA. This strain does express *afu-182* at the native locus.

Complementation plasmid construction: A plasmid encoding for *pyrithiamine*

resistance, BS309, was created as follows. Two oligo fragments (SD37 and SD38) encoding

for 5' SacI overhang-AscI-BglII-MluI-Pac1-SacII-3' overhang were ordered from IDT and

were allowed to anneal in the thermocycler. The resulting dsDNA fragment with SacI-SacII

overhangs was ligated into pBS KS (+) plasmid previously digested with SacI and SacII,

resulting in plasmid BS309 intermediate. A DNA fragment encoding for pyrithiamine

resistance was amplified from pSD51 with primers RAC3280 and RAC3154 expressing an

XhoI restriction site (71). The DNA fragment was digested with XhoI and ligated into BS309

intermediate previously digested with SalI, resulting in the plasmid BS309.

Plasmid construction for Comp-*insA* with cis acting *afu-182*: A DNA fragment consisting

of ~1kb 5' region of *insA* along with *insA* and 485bp after the transcription end site (as

determined by RACE) expressing AscI and PacI restriction sites at the 5' and 3' ends,

respectively, was amplified with primers RAC3589 and RAC3591 using Takara Prime Star

HS polymerase per manufacturer's recommendation. The resulting DNA fragment was

digested with AscI-Pac1 and was ligated into BS309, resulting in comp-cis *insA* plasmid.

Plasmid Construction for Comp-*insA* without cis-acting *afu-182*: A DNA fragment

consisting of 5' region of *insA* along with *insA* and 74bp after the transcription end site

(without ncRNA *afu-182*) expressing AscI and PacI restriction sites at 5' and 3' ends

respectively, was amplified with primers RAC3589 and RAC3590 using Takara Prime Star

HS polymerase per manufacturer's recommendation. The resulting DNA fragment was

digested with AscI-Pac1 and was ligated into BS309, resulting in comp-without cis-182 *insA*

plasmid.

The resulting plasmids were transformed into the Δ*insA* strain using PEG-mediated

transformation of protoplast as previously described (70).

Δ*afu-182* strain construction: *afu-182* was deleted from the strain CEA17 (*pyrG-*) using

CRISPR-Cas9 as previously described (72). A homology-directed repair cassette was

amplified from plasmid pSD38.1 using primers SD149_182 homology F and SD150_182

homology. Briefly, 5μl of 100mM crRNAs (on either side of *afu-182*) were combined with 5μl

of 100mM tracrRNA and 5 μl of nuclease-free duplex buffer (IDT), heated to 95°C for 5 min

and allowed to cool to room temperature, yielding 33mM gRNA complex. Then, 1.5 μl of

each guide RNA complex on either side of *afu-182* were combined with 1.5μl of Cas9

(1mg/ml) and 22μl of Cas9 working buffer as previously described (72). The samples were

allowed to combine at RT for 5 min to allow the assembly of the RNP complex. RNP

complex and repair cassette were transformed via PEG-mediated transformation of the

CEA17 strain as previously described (70, 72). The same gRNAs and HDR were also used to

delete *afu-182* in the Af293.1 strain and 47-7 strain (60). The sequence of crRNAs and

primers used is provided in Tables S2 and S3.

Comp-182 strain construction: *afu-182* was put back at its genomic location using

CRISPR-Cas9. Briefly, the *afu-182* fragment was amplified with primers SD76 and 164 using

CEA10 gDNA as template. A gene encoding for pyrithiamine resistance was amplified from

plasmid pSD51.1 (71) using primers SD23 and SD165. Both fragments were fused using

primers SD183 and SD166, generating the HDR cassette. A single gRNA (gRNA 13 SD 1)

targeting the linker sequence in the *pyrG* gene was used for double-strand break, and HDR

was used to insert *afu-182* back at the locus.

OE *afu-182*pyrG plasmid construction. The *A. nidulans gpdA* promoter was amplified

from strain FGSC A4 (FGSC) using primers SD134 and SD103. The *afu-182* fragment was

amplified from CEA10 gDNA using primers SD104 and SD105. Subsequently, these

fragments were fused using primers SD135_EcoRI and SD139_NotI and digested with

EcoRI and NotI. The resulting fragment ligated into plasmid pSD21 previously digested with

EcoR1 and Not1, yielding plasmid OE*afu-182*pyrG. The *afu-182* RNA expression starts at the

+1 transcription start site (TSS).

CEA10 OE *afu-182* strain construction: CRISPR-Cas9 was used to target the OE *afu-182*

pyrG HDR cassette to the safe-haven *atf4* locus (73) as previously described (64). The HDR

was amplified from plasmid OE *afu-182pyrG* using primers SD162_OE_homology-F and

SD163_OE_homology-R. gRNA was assembled as described above for the Δ*afu-182* strain.

A single guide (atf4_gRNA7) was used to initiate a double-stranded break targeting the *atf4*

locus (73).

Polyethylene glycol-mediated fungal transformation was done as described above. All

resulting transformants were checked with PCR and confirmed with Southern blot and

qPCR for gene expression.

Aspergillus nidulans Δ182 (Δan-182) construction.

A DNA sequence homologous to *afu-182* was identified 240bp after the translational stop

site of the *insA* homolog gene AN4465 (34). The resulting 200bp sequence was deleted

from the *A. nidulans* genome using CRISPR-Cas9 in the A1145 strain using the *pyrG* marker

or the GR5 strain using the *pyroA* marker as previously described (72). The HDR cassette for

A1145 was amplified using primers SD181 and SD182 that amplified the sequence of

orotidine 5'-phosphate decarboxylase (74) gene from *A. parasiticus* using plasmid pSD38.1

(75) as template. The HDR cassette for GR5 was amplified with SD 352 and SD 353, which

amplified the pyridoxine biosynthesis gene (76) from *A. fumigatus* using CEA10 as the DNA

template.

Δ*rtmA*, Δ*rtmB* and Δ*rtmA*Δ*rtmB* strains construction:

Δ*rtmA* and Δ*rtmB* strains were constructed using the CRISPR-Cas9 protocol as previously

described for the Δ*afu-182 strain* (64). The HDR cassette primers and crRNA sequences are

provided in Table S1. Δ*rtmA* and Δ*rtmB* strains were constructed in the CEA10 background

using the pyrithiamine resistance marker, *ptrA* from pSD51.1. For Δ*rtmA*, crRNA 50L and

50R were used, for Δ*rtmB*, crRNA 60L and 60R were used. For double deletion strains,

crRNAs 60R and 50R were used. HDRs were amplified using primers SD151 and SD152 for

Δ*rtmA* deletion; SD153 and SD154 for Δ*rtmB* deletion and primers SD152 and SD153 for

double deletion.

Complement *rtmA* and complement *rtmB* strain construction:

Hygromycin resistance gene expressing plasmid: Hyg resistance gene was amplified using

the primers RAC2939 and RAC2940 from the plasmid pBC Hygro (FGSC) and was ligated

into pJET1.2 (Thermo Fisher). The fragment was digested using XhoI-XbaI and was ligated

into the plasmid BS309 (see above), previously digested with XhoI and XbaI, resulting in

plasmid BS311.

Plasmid construction for Comp *rtmA* strain: The *rtmA* fragment, along with the promoter

and terminator region, was amplified (CEA10 gDNA template) using the primers SD738 and

SD739 with Asc1 and Pac1 restriction sites, respectively, using NEB Q5 hot start

polymerase per manufacturer's recommendation. The resulting DNA fragment was

digested with AscI and PacI and was ligated into the plasmid BS311 previously digested

with AscI and PacI, resulting in the Comp-*rtmA* plasmid.

Plasmid construction for comp-*rtmB* strain: The *rtmB* fragment, along with the promoter

and terminator regions, was amplified (CEA10 gDNA template) using the primers SD740

and SD741 with Asc1 and Pac1 sites, respectively, using NEB Q5 hot start polymerase per

manufacturer's recommendation. The resulting DNA fragment was digested with AscI and

PacI and was ligated into BS311 previously digested with AscI and PacI, resulting in the

Comp-*rtmB* plasmid.

Comp-*rtmA* and comp-*rtmB* plasmids were transformed into Δ*rtmA* and Δ*rtmB* strains,

respectively, as described above.

Spot assays:

Plates containing solid GMM were spot inoculated with serially diluted AF spores (10^5-10^2

spores) and grown at 37°C as indicated. Azole drugs were used at the indicated

concentrations for MIC assays and 0.5 X MIC for ARC assays. The radial diameter of the

colonies was measured and reported as the growth ratio, dividing the colony radial

diameter in the presence of azole by the colony radial diameter in GMM. All experiments

were done at least in triplicate and were repeated three times. Statistical analyses (t-test or

one-way ANOVA) were done to determine the significant differences using GraphPad

Prism.

Biomass assay:

Spores were grown in 50 ml liquid GMM (1 x 10^6 spores/ml) at 37°C for 24 hours in the

presence or absence of 0.2 µg/ml voriconazole with continuous shaking at 250rpm.

Mycelium collected after 24 hours was lyophilized, and the biomass was weighed.

Statistical difference between means was assessed with One-way ANOVA followed by

Tukey's post hoc analysis to compare individual groups using GraphPad Prism.

Biofilm formation assay:

AF spore suspension (1.5 x 10^5 spores/ml) in liquid GMM was inoculated in three biological

replicates in a 12-well plate. The plates were centrifuged at 250g for 10 min to settle the

conidia at the bottom of the wells and incubated at 37°C for 12 hours. Then, the wells were

washed twice with PBS to remove planktonic cells. The biofilms at the bottom of the wells

were further allowed to grow in the presence of 0.2 µg/ml Voriconazole for 8 hours before

the crystal violet assay was performed as previously described (37). Absorbance was

measured using a plate reader (Multiscan Sky, Thermo Scientific) at 600 nm. All

experiments were done in triplicate, and three independent experiments were performed.

Statistical significance was determined with One-way ANOVA using GraphPad Prism.

Germination assay:

AF spores ($2x10^4$/ml) collected from 48-hour-old colonies grown in GMM were inoculated in

a 96-well plate (six replicates per strain) in liquid GMM (no drug) and GMM containing 0.2

μg/ml voriconazole. Absorbance (OD_{600}) was measured in a plate reader every 15 minutes

at 37°C for 12 hours. The experiment was repeated three times. Statistical significance was

determined with one-way ANOVA using GraphPad Prism.

E-test assay:

Five milliliters of GMM top-agar (0.75%) containing AF spores ($1x 10^5$/5 ml) were spread on

GMM plates and allowed to solidify. A voriconazole E-test strip (Biomerieux) was carefully

laid in the center of the plate per the manufacturer's recommendation. The plates were

incubated at 37°C for 48 hours, and the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) was

recorded. The experiment was done in triplicate for each strain and repeated three times.

Broth Microdilution assay:

AF spores ($5 x 10^4$) collected from a 48-hour-old colony were inoculated in liquid GMM in a

96-well plate containing voriconazole (16μg/ml – 0.015μg/ml) and incubated at 37°C for 48

hours. The visible growth of AF strains was observed in each of the wells, and the lowest

concentration of azoles showing no growth for an AF strain was recorded as MIC. The

experiment was repeated three times.

Murine model of pulmonary aspergillosis, lung histopathology, and fungal burden:

Outbred female CD-1 mice (Charles River Laboratories) with body weights of 18-21 g were

housed (5 per cage) in micro-isolator cages. The mice were kept in a soft-lit, well-ventilated

cubicle with a 12h:12h light/dark cycle. Mice were immunosuppressed with a single

subcutaneous injection of 40 mg/kg body weight of Triamcinolone acetonide (Kenalog-10,

Bristol-Myers Squibb) on day -1. Mice were briefly anesthetized with isoflurane and infected

by intranasal instillation of 2 x 10^6 spores in 40μL PBS. Ten mice were infected per AF strain

for survival analysis, whereas five mice per strain were used for fungal burden analysis. The

mice were observed for 14 days for their survival. For azole treatment, 5 mg/kg

Posaconazole (Noxafil, oral suspension, Merck) diluted in PBS was used.

For fungal burden analyses, mice were treated with 5 mg/kg Posaconazole on day +1 and

day +2, and their lungs were harvested on day +3. The mouse lungs were lyophilized

overnight, homogenized with 2.3 zirconia beads, and lysed with LETS buffer (0.1M LiCl,

10mM EDTA pH 8.0, 10mM Tris-Cl pH 8.0, 0.5% SDS). Total DNA was extracted in an

aqueous phase using phenol: chloroform: isoamyl alcohol and precipitated with

isopropanol. Fungal burden was determined by calculating the levels of 18s rRNA encoding

gene against a standard curve using iTaq universal probe mix and hydrolysis probe as

previously described (42). The statistical significance of survival analysis was determined

using log-rank analysis, and fungal burden analysis was done using a non-parametric

Mann-Whitney U Test.

For histological analysis, lungs were harvested from untreated mice on day +3 and were

fixed in 10% formalin for 48 hours before microdissection at the Clemson Light Imaging

Facility (CLIF) at Clemson University. Adjacent slides obtained from microdissection were

stained with Grocott's Methenamine Silver and Hematoxylin and Eosin stains as previously

described (41). The stained slides were pictured with the Leica Laser Microdissection

Microscopy System at CLIF.

RNA extraction:

For RNA sequencing, total RNA was extracted from AF strains CEA10, Δ*afu-182*, comp-182,

and OE-182 strains. Briefly, 1 x 10^4 spores were spot inoculated and incubated at 37°C for

48 hours on solid GMM plates in the absence or presence of voriconazole (0.15 μg/ml). The

whole colonies from samples were excised with a clean scalpel and flash frozen in liquid

N$_2$. The frozen samples were homogenized with 2.3 mm zirconia beads in acid guanidinium

thiocyanate phenol, and RNA was extracted using the acid guanidinium thiocyanate phenol

chloroform (AGPC) method as described with some modifications (77). Briefly, the

aqueous phase was mixed with ethanol to a final concentration of 35%. The resulting mix

was passed through RNA-binding columns (Epoch Life Sciences), washed twice with 70%

Ethanol and eluted in nuclease-free water. The RNA was treated with Turbo DNase (Thermo

Fisher) per the manufacturer's recommendation and purified using magnetic beads

(Beckman Coulter). RNA quantity and quality were estimated using the AccuBlue Broad

Range RNA Quantitation Kit (Biotium) and the Quantum Fluorometer (Promega), and via gel

electrophoresis, respectively, before submission of the samples to LC Sciences.

Sample quality was checked by Agilent Technologies 2100 Bioanalyzer at LC Sciences. The

poly(A) RNA sequencing library was prepared following Illumina's TruSeq-stranded-mRNA

sample preparation protocol. Poly(A) tail-containing mRNAs were purified using oligo-(dT)

magnetic beads with two rounds of purification. After purification, poly(A) RNA was

fragmented using a divalent cation buffer at elevated temperature. Quality control analysis

and quantification of the sequencing library were performed using Agilent Technologies

2100 Bioanalyzer High Sensitivity DNA Chip. Paired-end sequencing was performed on

Illumina's NovaSeq 6000 sequencing system.

RNA-seq analyses

Transcript expression was determined by first aligning RNA-Seq reads to the *A. fumigatus*

A1163 genome obtained from FungiDB v68 (34) with the splice-aware aligner STAR

v2.7.11a (78). The resulting SAM file for each experimental replicate was processed with

samtools v1.19.2 (79) and featureCount v2.0.6 (80) to produce a table of read counts per

annotated gene locus. The read counts were analyzed with DESeq v1.46.0 (81) and plotted

with EnhancedVolcano v1.24.0 (82) in the R v4.4.2 statistical environment(83). The pipeline

for analyzing these is archived in a GitHub repository

(https://github.com/stajichlab/DhingraLab_ncRNA_Afumigatus) and Zenodo (84)

Assessment of gene expression by RT-qPCR

For qPCR, 48-hour-old AF colonies grown at 37°C in solid GMM plates with or without voriconazole (0.15µg/ml) were extracted as described above. RNA samples were then treated with Turbo DNase per the manufacturer's recommendations. Equal amounts of DNase-treated RNA were used for first-strand cDNA synthesis using MMLV reverse transcriptase (Promega) per the manufacturer's recommendation. Quantitative PCR (CFX real-time PCR system - Bio-Rad) was done using the sso Advanced universal SYBR green supermix (Bio-Rad). Histone H4 was used as the reference gene for normalization. All primers used in the study are listed in Supplementary Table 2.

Data Availability:

The RNA-seq sequencing data and per-gene read counts are available from Sequence Read Archive associated to BioProject PRJNA1334547 and in Gene Expression Omnibus under accession GSE309441.

Statistical analyses

GraphPad Prism 10 for macOS was used to perform all statistical analyses.

References:

References:

1. Morrissey CO, Kim HY, Duong T-MN, Moran E, Alastruey-Izquierdo A, Denning DW,

Perfect JR, Nucci M, Chakrabarti A, Rickerts V, Chiller TM, Wahyuningsih R, Hamers

RL, Cassini A, Gigante V, Sati H, Alffenaar J-W, Beardsley J. 2024. Aspergillus

fumigatus—a systematic review to inform the World Health Organization priority list of

fungal pathogens. Med Mycol 62:myad129.

2. Baddley JW. 2011. Clinical risk factors for invasive aspergillosis. Med Mycol 49 Suppl

1:S7–S12.

3. Latgé J-P, Chamilos G. 2019. Aspergillus fumigatus and Aspergillosis in 2019. Clin

Microbiol Rev 33:e00140-18.

4. Liu K-W, Grau MS, Jones JT, Wang X, Vesely EM, James MR, Gutierrez-Perez C, Cramer

RA, Obar JJ. 2022. Postinfluenza Environment Reduces Aspergillus fumigatus

Conidium Clearance and Facilitates Invasive Aspergillosis In Vivo. mBio 13:e02854-

22.

5. Sarden N, Sinha S, Potts KG, Pernet E, Hiroki CH, Hassanabad MF, Nguyen AP, Lou Y,

Farias R, Winston BW, Bromley A, Snarr BD, Zucoloto AZ, Andonegui G, Muruve DA,

McDonald B, Sheppard DC, Mahoney DJ, Divangahi M, Rosin N, Biernaskie J, Yipp BG.

2022. A B1a–natural IgG–neutrophil axis is impaired in viral- and steroid-associated

aspergillosis. Science Translational Medicine 14:eabq6682.

6.   Tio SY, Chen SC-A, Hamilton K, Heath CH, Pradhan A, Morris AJ, Korman TM, Morrissey

O, Halliday CL, Kidd S, Spelman T, Brell N, McMullan B, Clark JE, Mitsakos K, Hardiman

RP, Williams P, Campbell AJ, Beardsley J, Van Hal S, Yong MK, Worth LJ, Slavin MA.

2023. Invasive aspergillosis in adult patients in Australia and New Zealand: 2017–

2020. The Lancet Regional Health - Western Pacific 40:100888.

7.   WHO fungal priority pathogens list to guide research, development and public health

action. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240060241. Retrieved 19

September 2025.

8.   Patterson TF, Thompson GR, Denning DW, Fishman JA, Hadley S, Herbrecht R,

Kontoyiannis DP, Marr KA, Morrison VA, Nguyen MH, Segal BH, Steinbach WJ, Stevens

DA, Walsh TJ, Wingard JR, Young J-AH, Bennett JE. 2016. Practice Guidelines for the

Diagnosis and Management of Aspergillosis: 2016 Update by the Infectious Diseases

Society of America. Clin Infect Dis 63:e1–e60.

9.   mcdermott A Drug resistant fungi on the rise - Google Search.

https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2217948119. Retrieved 19 September 2025.

10. Lee Y, Robbins N, Cowen LE. 2023. Molecular mechanisms governing antifungal drug

resistance. npj Antimicrob Resist 1:5.

11. Warrilow AGS, Parker JE, Price CL, Nes WD, Kelly SL, Kelly DE. 2015. In Vitro

Biochemical Study of CYP51-Mediated Azole Resistance in Aspergillus fumigatus.

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy 59:7771–7778.

12. Verweij PE, Lucas JA, Arendrup MC, Bowyer P, Brinkmann AJF, Denning DW, Dyer PS,

Fisher MC, Geenen PL, Gisi U, Hermann D, Hoogendijk A, Kiers E, Lagrou K, Melchers

WJG, Rhodes J, Rietveld AG, Schoustra SE, Stenzel K, Zwaan BJ, Fraaije BA. 2020. The

one health problem of azole resistance in Aspergillus fumigatus: current insights and

future research agenda. Fungal Biology Reviews 34:202–214.

13. Mellado E, Garcia-Effron G, Alcázar-Fuoli L, Melchers WJG, Verweij PE, Cuenca-Estrella

M, Rodríguez-Tudela JL. 2007. A new Aspergillus fumigatus resistance mechanism

conferring in vitro cross-resistance to azole antifungals involves a combination of

cyp51A alterations. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 51:1897–1904.

14. Chowdhary A, Sharma C, Meis JF. 2017. Azole-Resistant Aspergillosis: Epidemiology,

Molecular Mechanisms, and Treatment. J Infect Dis 216:S436–S444.

15. Gsaller F, Hortschansky P, Furukawa T, Carr PD, Rash B, Capilla J, Müller C, Bracher F,

Bowyer P, Haas H, Brakhage AA, Bromley MJ. 2016. Sterol Biosynthesis and Azole

Tolerance Is Governed by the Opposing Actions of SrbA and the CCAAT Binding

Complex. PLOS Pathogens 12:e1005775.

16. Blosser SJ, Cramer RA. 2012. SREBP-Dependent Triazole Susceptibility in Aspergillus

fumigatus Is Mediated through Direct Transcriptional Regulation of erg11A (cyp51A).

Antimicrob Agents Chemother 56:248–257.

17. Blatzer M, Barker BM, Willger SD, Beckmann N, Blosser SJ, Cornish EJ, Mazurie A, Grahl

N, Haas H, Cramer RA. 2011. SREBP coordinates iron and ergosterol homeostasis to

mediate triazole drug and hypoxia responses in the human fungal pathogen

Aspergillus fumigatus. PLoS Genet 7:e1002374.

18. Paul S, Stamnes M, Thomas GH, Liu H, Hagiwara D, Gomi K, Filler SG, Moye-Rowley

WS. 2019. AtrR Is an Essential Determinant of Azole Resistance in Aspergillus

fumigatus. mBio 10:10.1128/mbio.02563-18.

19. Birštonas L, Hortschansky P, Bauer I, Alcanzo EM, Kühbacher A, Mertens B, Müller C,

Brakhage AA, Gsaller F. 2025. The transcription factor RttA contributes to sterol

regulation and azole resistance in Aspergillus fumigatus. mBio.

20. Willger SD, Puttikamonkul S, Kim K-H, Burritt JB, Grahl N, Metzler LJ, Barbuch R, Bard M,

Lawrence CB, Jr RAC. 2008. A Sterol-Regulatory Element Binding Protein Is Required

for Cell Polarity, Hypoxia Adaptation, Azole Drug Resistance, and Virulence in

Aspergillus fumigatus. PLOS Pathogens 4:e1000200.

21. Yan R, Cao P, Song W, Li Y, Wang T, Qian H, Yan C, Yan N. 2021. Structural basis for

sterol sensing by Scap and Insig. Cell Rep 35:109299.

22. Butler G. 2013. Hypoxia and Gene Expression in Eukaryotic Microbes. Annu Rev

Microbiol 67:291–312.

23. Sever N, Yang T, Brown MS, Goldstein JL, DeBose-Boyd RA. 2003. Accelerated

degradation of HMG CoA reductase mediated by binding of insig-1 to its sterol-sensing

domain. Mol Cell 11:25–33.

24. Rybak JM, Ge W, Wiederhold NP, Parker JE, Kelly SL, Rogers PD, Fortwendel JR. 2019.

Mutations in hmg1, Challenging the Paradigm of Clinical Triazole Resistance in

Aspergillus fumigatus. mBio 10:10.1128/mbio.00437-19.

25. Hagiwara D, Arai T, Takahashi H, Kusuya Y, Watanabe A, Kamei K. 2018. Non-cyp51A

Azole-Resistant Aspergillus fumigatus Isolates with Mutation in HMG-CoA Reductase.

Emerg Infect Dis 24:1889–1897.

26. Gonzalez-Jimenez I, Lucio J, Roldan A, Alcazar-Fuoli L, Mellado E. 2021. Are Point

Mutations in HMG-CoA Reductases (Hmg1 and Hmg2) a Step towards Azole

Resistance in Aspergillus fumigatus? Molecules 26:5975.

27. Souza ACO, Ge W, Wiederhold NP, Rybak JM, Fortwendel JR, Rogers PD. 2023. hapE and

hmg1 Mutations Are Drivers of cyp51A-Independent Pan-Triazole Resistance in an

Aspergillus fumigatus Clinical Isolate. Microbiology Spectrum 11:e05188-22.

28. Rybak JM, Xie J, Martin-Vicente A, Guruceaga X, Thorn HI, Nywening AV, Ge W, Souza

ACO, Shetty AC, McCracken C, Bruno VM, Parker JE, Kelly SL, Snell HM, Cuomo CA,

Rogers PD, Fortwendel JR. 2024. A secondary mechanism of action for triazole

antifungals in Aspergillus fumigatus mediated by hmg1. Nat Commun 15:3642.

29. Berman J, Krysan DJ. 2020. Drug resistance and tolerance in fungi. Nat Rev Microbiol

18:319–331.

30. Scott J, Valero C, Mato-López Á, Donaldson IJ, Roldán A, Chown H, Rhijn NV, Lobo-Vega

R, Gago S, Furukawa T, Morogovsky A, Ami RB, Bowyer P, Osherov N, Fontaine T,

Goldman GH, Mellado E, Bromley M, Amich J. 2022. Aspergillus fumigatus can display

persistence to the fungicidal drug voriconazole. bioRxiv

https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.16.491816.

31. Scott J, Valero C, Mato-López Á, Donaldson IJ, Roldán A, Chown H, Rhijn NV, Lobo-Vega

R, Gago S, Furukawa T, Morogovsky A, Ami RB, Bowyer P, Osherov N, Fontaine T,

Goldman GH, Mellado E, Bromley M, Amich J. 2023. Aspergillus fumigatus Can

Display Persistence to the Fungicidal Drug Voriconazole. Microbiology Spectrum

https://doi.org/10.1128/spectrum.04770-22.

32. Jöchl C, Rederstorff M, Hertel J, Stadler PF, Hofacker IL, Schrettl M, Haas H,

Hüttenhofer A. 2008. Small ncRNA transcriptome analysis from Aspergillus fumigatus

suggests a novel mechanism for regulation of protein synthesis. Nucleic Acids Res

36:2677–2689.

33. Losada L, Barker BM, Pakala S, Pakala S, Joardar V, Zafar N, Mounaud S, Fedorova N,

Nierman WC, Cramer RA. 2014. Large-scale transcriptional response to hypoxia in

Aspergillus fumigatus observed using RNAseq identifies a novel hypoxia regulated

ncRNA. Mycopathologia 178:331–339.

34. Basenko EY, Shanmugasundram A, Böhme U, Starns D, Wilkinson PA, Davison HR,

Crouch K, Maslen G, Harb OS, Amos B, McDowell MA, Kissinger JC, Roos DS, Jones A.

2024. What is new in FungiDB: a web-based bioinformatics platform for omics-scale

data analysis for fungal and oomycete species. Genetics 227:iyae035.

35. Scotto–Lavino E, Du G, Frohman MA. 2006. 3' End cDNA amplification using classic

RACE. Nat Protoc 1:2742–2745.

36. Punt PJ, Dingemanse MA, Kuyvenhoven A, Soede RDM, Pouwels PH, van den Hondel

CAMJJ. 1990. Functional elements in the promoter region of the *Aspergillus nidulans*

gpdA gene encoding glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase. Gene 93:101–109.

37. Snarr BD, Baker P, Bamford NC, Sato Y, Liu H, Lehoux M, Gravelat FN, Ostapska H,

Baistrocchi SR, Cerone RP, Filler EE, Parsek MR, Filler SG, Howell PL, Sheppard DC.

2017. Microbial glycoside hydrolases as antibiofilm agents with cross-kingdom

activity. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 114:7124–7129.

38. Morelli KA, Kerkaert JD, Cramer RA. 2021. Aspergillus fumigatus biofilms: Toward

understanding how growth as a multicellular network increases antifungal resistance

and disease progression. PLoS Pathog 17:e1009794.

39. Langner S, Staber PB, Neumeister P. 2008. Posaconazole in the management of

refractory invasive fungal infections. Ther Clin Risk Manag 4:747–758.

40. Xiao L, Madison V, Chau AS, Loebenberg D, Palermo RE, McNicholas PM. 2004. Three-

Dimensional Models of Wild-Type and Mutated Forms of Cytochrome P450 14α-Sterol

Demethylases from Aspergillus fumigatus and Candida albicans Provide Insights into

Posaconazole Binding. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 48:568–574.

41. Dhingra S, Kowalski CH, Thammahong A, Beattie SR, Bultman KM, Cramer RA. 2016.

RbdB, a Rhomboid Protease Critical for SREBP Activation and Virulence in Aspergillus

fumigatus. mSphere 1:e00035-16.

42. Dhingra S, Buckey JC, Cramer RA. 2018. Hyperbaric Oxygen Reduces Aspergillus

fumigatus Proliferation In Vitro and Influences In Vivo Disease Outcomes. Antimicrob

Agents Chemother 62:e01953-17.

43. Graybill JR, Najvar LK, Gonzalez GM, Hernandez S, Bocanegra R. 2003. Improving the

mouse model for studying the efficacy of voriconazole. J Antimicrob Chemother

51:1373–1376.

44. Bertuzzi M, van Rhijn N, Krappmann S, Bowyer P, Bromley MJ, Bignell EM. 2020. On the

lineage of Aspergillus fumigatus isolates in common laboratory use. Med Mycol 59:7–

13.

45. Keller NP. 2017. Heterogeneity Confounds Establishment of "a" Model Microbial Strain.

mBio 8:10.1128/mbio.00135-17.

46. Manente M, Ghislain M. 2009. The lipid-translocating exporter family and membrane

phospholipid homeostasis in yeast. FEMS Yeast Res 9:673–687.

47. Hokken MWJ, Zoll J, Coolen JPM, Zwaan BJ, Verweij PE, Melchers WJG. 2019.

Phenotypic plasticity and the evolution of azole resistance in Aspergillus fumigatus;

an expression profile of clinical isolates upon exposure to itraconazole. BMC

Genomics 20:28.

48. Ness F, Aigle M. 1995. Rtm1: A Member of a New Family of Telomeric Repeated Genes

in Yeast. Genetics 140:945–956.

49. Abou-Kandil A, Tröger-Görler S, Pschibul A, Krüger T, Rosin M, Schmidt F,

Akbarimoghaddam P, Sarkar A, Cseresnyés Z, Shadkchan Y, Heinekamp T, Gräler MH,

Barber AE, Walther G, Figge MT, Brakhage AA, Osherov N, Kniemeyer O. 2025. The

proteomic response of Aspergillus fumigatus to amphotericin B (AmB) reveals the

involvement of the RTA-like protein RtaA in AmB resistance. microLife 6:uqae024.

50. Bueid A, Howard SJ, Moore CB, Richardson MD, Harrison E, Bowyer P, Denning DW.

2010. Azole antifungal resistance in Aspergillus fumigatus: 2008 and 2009. J

Antimicrob Chemother 65:2116–2118.

51. Burks C, Darby A, Londoño LG, Momany M, Brewer MT. 2021. Azole-resistant

Aspergillus fumigatus in the environment: Identifying key reservoirs and hotspots of

antifungal resistance. PLOS Pathogens 17:e1009711.

52. Brauner A, Fridman O, Gefen O, Balaban NQ. 2016. Distinguishing between resistance,

tolerance and persistence to antibiotic treatment. Nat Rev Microbiol 14:320–330.

53. Geißel B, Loiko V, Klugherz I, Zhu Z, Wagener N, Kurzai O, van den Hondel CAMJJ,

Wagener J. 2018. Azole-induced cell wall carbohydrate patches kill Aspergillus

fumigatus. Nat Commun 9:3098.

54. Umeyama T, Hayashi Y, Shimosaka H, Inukai T, Yamagoe S, Takatsuka S, Hoshino Y,

Nagi M, Nakamura S, Kamei K, Ogawa K, Miyazaki Y. 2018. CRISPR/Cas9 Genome

Editing To Demonstrate the Contribution of Cyp51A Gly138Ser to Azole Resistance in

Aspergillus fumigatus. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy

https://doi.org/10.1128/aac.00894-18.

55. Mowat E, Butcher J, Lang S, Williams C, Ramage G. 2007. Development of a simple

model for studying the effects of antifungal agents on multicellular communities of

Aspergillus fumigatus. Journal of Medical Microbiology 56:1205–1212.

56. Liu S, Le Mauff F, Sheppard DC, Zhang S. 2022. Filamentous fungal biofilms: Conserved

and unique aspects of extracellular matrix composition, mechanisms of drug

resistance and regulatory networks in Aspergillus fumigatus. npj Biofilms

Microbiomes 8:83.

57. Wuyts J, Van Dijck P, Holtappels M. 2018. Fungal persister cells: The basis for

recalcitrant infections? PLoS Pathog 14:e1007301.

58. De Francesco MA. 2023. Drug-Resistant Aspergillus spp.: A Literature Review of Its

Resistance Mechanisms and Its Prevalence in Europe. Pathogens 12:1305.

59. Dagenais TRT, Keller NP. 2009. Pathogenesis of Aspergillus fumigatus in Invasive

Aspergillosis. Clin Microbiol Rev 22:447–465.

60. Kowalski CH, Beattie SR, Fuller KK, McGurk EA, Tang Y-W, Hohl TM, Obar JJ, Cramer RA.

2016. Heterogeneity among Isolates Reveals that Fitness in Low Oxygen Correlates

with Aspergillus fumigatus Virulence. mBio 7:10.1128/mbio.01515-16.

61. Caffrey-Carr AK, Kowalski CH, Beattie SR, Blaseg NA, Upshaw CR, Thammahong A,

Lust HE, Tang Y-W, Hohl TM, Cramer RA, Obar JJ. 2017. Interleukin 1α Is Critical for

Resistance against Highly Virulent Aspergillus fumigatus Isolates. Infect Immun

85:e00661-17.

62. Fuller KK, Cramer RA, Zegans ME, Dunlap JC, Loros JJ. 2016. Aspergillus fumigatus

Photobiology Illuminates the Marked Heterogeneity between Isolates. mBio 7:e01517-

16.

63. Traubenik S, Charon C, Blein T. 2024. From environmental responses to adaptation: the

roles of plant lncRNAs. Plant Physiol 195:232–244.

64. Bowyer P, Weaver D, Qi T, Chown H, Fraczek M, Lebedinec R, Dineen L, Valero C, Rhijn

N van, Furukawa T, Bromley M, Delneri D. 2025. Genome-wide discovery and

phenotyping of non-coding transcripts in A. fumigatus reveals lncRNAs with a role in

antifungal drug sensitivity. Research Square https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-

6048166/v1.

65. Smith-Peavler ES, Patel R, Onumajuru AM, Bowring BG, Miller JL, Brunel JM, Djordjevic

JT, Prabu MM, McClelland EE. 2022. RTA1 Is Involved in Resistance to 7-

Aminocholesterol and Secretion of Fungal Proteins in Cryptococcus neoformans.

Pathogens 11:1239.

66. Barber AE, Sae-Ong T, Kang K, Seelbinder B, Li J, Walther G, Panagiotou G, Kurzai O.

2021. Aspergillus fumigatus pan-genome analysis identifies genetic variants

associated with human infection. Nat Microbiol 6:1526–1536.

67. Kowalski CH, Morelli KA, Stajich JE, Nadell CD, Cramer RA. A Heterogeneously

Expressed Gene Family Modulates the Biofilm Architecture and Hypoxic Growth of

Aspergillus fumigatus. mBio 12:e03579-20.

68. Mercer TR, Dinger ME, Mattick JS. 2009. Long non-coding RNAs: insights into functions.

Nat Rev Genet 10:155–159.

69. Thammahong A, Caffrey-Card AK, Dhingra S, Obar JJ, Cramer RA. 2017. Aspergillus

fumigatus Trehalose-Regulatory Subunit Homolog Moonlights To Mediate Cell Wall

Homeostasis through Modulation of Chitin Synthase Activity. mBio 8:e00056-17.

70. Szewczyk E, Nayak T, Oakley CE, Edgerton H, Xiong Y, Taheri-Talesh N, Osmani SA,

Oakley BR. 2006. Fusion PCR and gene targeting in Aspergillus nidulans. Nat Protoc

1:3111–3120.

71. Thammahong A, Dhingra S, Bultman KM, Kerkaert JD, Cramer RA. 2019. An Ssd1

Homolog Impacts Trehalose and Chitin Biosynthesis and Contributes to Virulence in

Aspergillus fumigatus. mSphere 4:e00244-19.

72. Al Abdallah Q, Ge W, Fortwendel JR. 2017. A Simple and Universal System for Gene

Manipulation in Aspergillus fumigatus: In Vitro-Assembled Cas9-Guide RNA

Ribonucleoproteins Coupled with Microhomology Repair Templates. mSphere

2:e00446-17.

73. Furukawa T, van Rhijn N, Chown H, Rhodes J, Alfuraji N, Fortune-Grant R, Bignell E,

Fisher MC, Bromley M. 2022. Exploring a novel genomic safe-haven site in the human

pathogenic mould Aspergillus fumigatus. Fungal Genet Biol 161:103702.

74. Oakley BR, Rinehart JE, Mitchell BL, Oakley CE, Carmona C, Gray GL, May GS. 1987.

Cloning, mapping and molecular analysis of the pyrG (orotidine-5'-phosphate

decarboxylase) gene of Aspergillus nidulans. Gene 61:385–399.

75. Dhingra S, Lind AL, Lin H-C, Tang Y, Rokas A, Calvo AM. 2013. The fumagillin gene

cluster, an example of hundreds of genes under veA control in Aspergillus fumigatus.

PLoS One 8:e77147.

76. Osmani AH, May GS, Osmani SA. 1999. The extremely conserved pyroA gene of

Aspergillus nidulans is required for pyridoxine synthesis and is required indirectly for

resistance to photosensitizers. J Biol Chem 274:23565–23569.

77. Zepeda B, Verdonk JC. 2022. RNA Extraction from Plant Tissue with Homemade Acid

Guanidinium Thiocyanate Phenol Chloroform (AGPC). Current Protocols 2:e351.

78. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner | Bioinformatics | Oxford Academic.

https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/29/1/15/272537. Retrieved 9

September 2025.

79. Danecek P, Bonfield JK, Liddle J, Marshall J, Ohan V, Pollard MO, Whitwham A, Keane T,

McCarthy SA, Davies RM, Li H. 2021. Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools.

Gigascience 10:giab008.

80. Liao Y, Smyth GK, Shi W. 2014. featureCounts: an efficient general purpose program for

assigning sequence reads to genomic features. Bioinformatics 30:923–930.

81. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. 2014. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion

for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol 15:550.

82. Blighe K, Rana S, Lewis M. EnhancedVolcano: Publication-ready volcano plots with

enhanced colouring and labeling https://doi.org/10.18129/B9.bioc.EnhancedVolcano.

83. R Core Team (2024). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing (version

3.5.1). R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/. Retrieved

9 September 2025.

84. Stajich J. 2025. stajichlab/DhingraLab_ncRNA_Afumigatus: Archive of Analysis and

Data archive for publication (v0.1). Zenodo.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to acknowledge members of Dhingra laboratory and Eukaryotic Pathogen

innovation center for discussions surrounding the experiments in the manuscript. The

research in Dhingra lab is supported by start-up funds from the Department of Biological

Science at Clemson University and National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS)

award (P20GM146584) (James Morris, Principal Investigator). We thank Dr. Robert Cramer

at the Dartmouth Geisel School of Medicine (NIAID/NIH grants R01AI181215 and

2R0AI130128) for providing resources and critical reading of the manuscript. The Clemson

University Genomics and Bioinformatics Facility is supported by the College of Science and

Grants P20GM146584 and P20GM139769 Institutional Development Awards (IDeA) from

the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health. This

work was supported, in part, by equipment housed in the Clemson Light Imaging Facility.

We utilized a Leica Laser Microdissection system for brightfield imaging, and a Leica Pearl

Automatic Tissue Processor and a Leica Histocore Biocut Rotary Microtome for histology

preparation. Thank you to Mr. Avery Herren for assistance with histology. The Clemson Light

Imaging Facility is supported by the Division of Research and EPIC COBRE P20GM146584.

We thank Dr. Jarrod Fortwendel for the Fdel262 strain, and Dr. James Morris for the critical

reading of the manuscript. The funding sources had no role in the study design, data

collection and interpretation, preparation of this manuscript or the decision to submit the

manuscript.

Figure 1:

A

| | 10⁵ 10⁴ 10³ 10² | 10⁵ 10⁴ 10³ 10² | 10⁵ 10⁴ 10³ 10² | 10⁵ 10⁴ 10³ 10² |

CEA10
Δ*insA*
Comp with
cis *afu-182*
Comp w/o
cis *afu-182*

GMM   Vori (0.3 μg/ml)   Itra (0.075 μg/ml)   Posa (0.03 μg/ml)

B

<u>Figure 2:</u>

<u>Figure 3:</u>

Figure 4:

Figure 5:

Figure 6:

Figure 7:

Figure 9:

Figure Legends:

Figure 1. *afu-182* plays a part in *insA*-mediated fungal azole response. (A) AF strains were serially inoculated ($10^5 – 10^2$) on GMM in the absence and presence of azole drugs as indicated. As previously reported, the $\Delta insA$ strain showed increased growth in the presence of azole drugs; however, complementation of *insA* without cis-acting *afu-182* does not revert the phenotype back to WT, whereas complementation of *insA* with cis-acting *afu-182* reverts the phenotype back to WT levels. (B) Graphical representation showing growth ratio calculated by dividing the fungal colony diameter in the presence of the drug by the colony diameter on GMM alone. One-way ANOVA was used to assess the difference in the mean, followed by Tukey's post-hoc analysis to determine pairwise differences. All pairwise comparisons are shown (numbers represent p-values between groups). Bold p-values show no difference between $\Delta afu-182$ and comp-*insA* without cis-acting *afu-182*.

Figure 2. *afu-182* is sufficient to generate fungal ARC in response to voriconazole. (A) Serially diluted spores (10^5-10^2) were spot inoculated on GMM or GMM + voriconazole (0.25μg/ml, 0.5x MIC) and grown for 48 hours at 37°C. The $\Delta afu-182$ strain showed increased fungal ARC in the presence of the drug, whereas the OE-182 strain is more inhibited compared to the WT strain. (B) Growth ratio. Colony diameters were measured for colonies as grown in A (for 10^4 spore density) and represented as growth ratio (Drug/no drug). (C) *afu-182* plays a role in fungal biofilm response to azole drugs. AF strains were allowed to adhere to cell culture plates, and biofilms were treated with voriconazole and stained with crystal violet. The OD_{600} values are represented. $\Delta afu-182$ formed azole recalcitrant biofilms (p=0.0049), whereas OE-182 showed a significant decrease in biofilm formation (p=0.0011) when treated with voriconazole. (D) AF strains were grown in liquid submerged culture with continuous shaking in the presence or absence of 0.2μg/ml voriconazole. After 48 hours, fungal biomass was collected and lyophilized. Dry weight ratio (Drug/no drug) is represented. One-way ANOVA was used to assess the differences in

mean; p-values are listed for all samples compared to WT (One-Way ANOVA followed by Tukey post-hoc analysis). a.u. – arbitrary units.

Figure 3. *afu-182* mediates pan-azole fungal ARC. Serially diluted AF spores (10^5-10^2) of indicated strains were plated on (A) GMM, (B) GMM + itraconazole, (D) GMM + posaconazole, and (F) GMM + isavuconazole. All plates were incubated at 37°C for 48 hours and photographed. Colony diameters were measured and represented as growth ratio between drug and no drug control for (C) itraconazole, (E) posaconazole, and (G) Isavuconazole. One-way ANOVA was used to assess the differences in mean; p-values are listed for all samples compared to WT (Tukey post-hoc analysis). (H) Fungal ARC is not associated with changes in MIC value. GMM plates were inoculated with AF strains as the top agar. Upon agar solidification, E-test strips were laid in the center, and plates were incubated for 48 hours at 37°C. MIC values were determined at the point where the zone of inhibition intersects with the test strip. No MIC above the clinical resistance cutoff was observed; a smaller zone of inhibition (ZOI) was observed in the Δ*afu-182* strain (fungal growth inside the ellipse). (I) Δ*afu-182* can grow at increased drug concentrations. AF strains were inoculated on GMM and GMM + 0.4 µg/ml voriconazole. The drug concentration almost completely inhibited the growth of WT and comp-182 strains; however, the Δ*afu-182* strain showed robust growth.

Figure 4. *afu-182* is dispensable for fungal pathogenesis, but the Δ*afu-182* strain is more virulent upon azole treatment in a corticosteroid murine model of IPA. (A) Schematic showing experimental details for animal infection. (B) Kaplan-Meier plot of animal survival probability for animals infected as in A. No significant difference was observed ($p>0.05$, log-rank test). (C) Histopathological analysis of murine lungs harvested as described in A. No qualitative differences were seen. (D) Schematic showing experimental details for animal infection and azole treatment. (E) Kaplan-Meier plot of animal survival probability for animals infected as in D. A significantly higher mortality (90% vs 55%) was observed in animals infected with the Δ*afu-182* strain compared to animals

infected with the WT strain (p=0.0103, log-rank test). No difference was observed in the mice infected with the OE-182 strain compared to WT (40% mortality vs 50% mortality, p=0.4065). (F) Schematic showing experimental details for infection and treatment. (G) Mice were infected and treated as in F. Fungal DNA was quantified as described in Methods. Significantly more fungal DNA was recovered from animals infected with the Δ*afu-182* strains (p = 0.0159, Mann-Whitney U-test), and significantly less DNA was recovered from animals infected with the OE-182 strain (p = 0.0159, Mann-Whitney U-test) after posaconazole treatment. No difference was observed in fungal DNA isolated from animals infected with WT or comp *afu-182* strains (p=0.6905).

Fig 5. *afu-182* RNA levels are negatively regulated by azoles, and *afu-182* regulates fungal ARC irrespective of the strain's background in multiple Aspergilli. (A) Quantitative reverse transcriptase PCR was used to determine the *afu-182* RNA levels in the WT strain grown in the absence and presence of azoles. Significant downregulation of *afu-182* was observed in the presence of voriconazole (p=0.0145, One-Way ANOVA) and posaconazole (p=0.0330, One-Way ANOVA). *afu-182* was deleted from laboratory reference strain Af293.1 and environmental isolate 47-57. WT and corresponding deletion strains of (B) Af293 and (D) 47-57 were serially inoculated on GMM in the absence and presence of drug, showing fungal ARC irrespective of the strains' background. Growth ratio represented as the ratio of colony diameter in the presence of drug over no drug is represented for (C) Af293 and (E) 47-57. Significantly more growth was observed in Δ*afu-182* strains (two-tailed t-test, p =0.0038 and 0.0019, respectively). *afu-182* homolog (*an-182*) was identified in the related fungal species *Aspergillus nidulans*. *an-182* was deleted in A1145 or GR5 strains of AN. (F and G) 10^4 spores of the indicated strains were spot inoculated on GMM with supplements (see methods) in the absence and presence of voriconazole. Increased fungal ARC was observed in both AN strains (orange arrows).

Figure 6. *afu-182* regulates fungal ARC independent of *cyp51* transcriptional regulation. Quantitative reverse transcriptase was used to determine the mRNA levels of

(A) *cyp51a* and (B) *cyp51b* in the presence or absence of azole drugs. No significant difference due to genotype was observed for *cyp51a* (interaction p=0.3291, Two-Way ANOVA), and an interaction was observed between drug and genotype factors for *cyp51b* (interaction p=0.0045, Two-Way ANOVA). mRNA levels of (C) *srbA*, (D) *atrR*, and (F) *insA* were similarly quantified in GMM. No significant difference was observed between WT and Δ*afu-182* strains (One-Way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post hoc analysis). P-values for pairwise comparison are shown.

Fig 7. Genes encoding RTA1 domain proteins are upregulated in response to voriconazole. Quantitative reverse transcription PCR was used to determine the mRNA levels of RTA1 genes in the presence and absence of azoles. Out of 23, we selected 12 genes that have an FPKM value >1. Eleven of the 12 genes showed significant upregulation in the presence of azoles (p<0.05, two-tailed Student's t-test). Importantly, *rtaA,* which plays a role in polyene response but not azole response, showed the lowest upregulation (1.6 fold, p=0.0193, two-tailed student's t-test). Numbers in orange represent the FPKM values from the RNAseq data set.

Figure 8. *afu-182* negatively regulates genes encoding for RTM1 proteins. Volcano plots showing the 2-log_2 fold change (4-fold upregulated or downregulated). (A) Comparison between CEA10 GMM and CEA10 azole. Of the 23 genes encoding RTA1 domain proteins and 11 showing significant change compared to GMM, global analysis revealed genes encoding RTM1 domain proteins *rtmA* (*afub_000050,* orange arrow) and *rtmB* (*afub_000060,* purple arrow) are significantly upregulated. (B) Comparison between Δ*afu-182* GMM and Δ*afu-182* azoles. *rtmA* (orange arrow) and *rtmB* (purple arrow) genes are significantly upregulated in the presence of azoles in the Δ*afu-182* strain compared to the GMM control. (C) Comparison between CEA10 azole and Δ*afu-182* azole. *rtmA* (orange arrow) and *rtmB* (purple arrow) are significantly upregulated in Δ*afu-182* samples compared to WT in the presence of voriconazole. (D) Comparison between the WT azole and comp-182 azole group. No significant difference in *rtmA* or *rtmB* was observed.

Quantitative reverse transcriptase PCR to assess the mRNA levels of (E) *rtmA* and (F) *rtmB*. Significant upregulation of *rtmA* (3-fold compared to WT, $p<0.0001$, One-Way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post-hoc analysis) and *rtmB* (4.6-fold compared to WT, $p<0.0001$, One-Way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post-hoc analysis) was observed in Δ*afu-182* strains compared to WT in the presence of voriconazole. No significant difference in *rtmA* and *rtmB* expression was observed in the absence of azoles. Groups showing significant differences are marked with p values on the graph (one-way ANOVA, Tukey's post-hoc analysis). Orange arrow – *afub_000050* (*rtmA*) and purple arrow – *afub_000060* (*rtmB*). ns – Not significant

Figure 9. *rtmA* and *rtmB* play a role in fungal azole response. AF strains (A) Δ*rtmA* and comp-*rtmA*, (C) Δ*rtmB* and comp-*rtmB* and (E) Δ*rtmA* Δ*rtmB* were point inoculated in the absence or presence of 0.25 μg/ml of voriconazole. The plates were incubated at 37°C for 48 hours and photographed. The inset shows images taken with a macro lens. After 48 hours, colony diameter was measured and growth ratio of drug over no drug for (B) Δ*rtmA* and comp-*rtmA*, (E) Δ*rtmB* and comp-*rtmB* and (H) Δ*rtmA*Δ*rtmB* (three independent deletion strains) were plotted. One-way ANOVA was used to assess the difference in the mean. Numerical p-values are represented based on Tukey's post-hoc analysis to compare the means of all groups.