**Evolutionary origin of terpenoid biosynthesis in termites**

Natan Horáček[1,2], Ondřej Lukšan[1], Zarley Rebholz[3], Karel Harant[1], Radek Pohl[1], Lana Mutabdžija-

Nedelcheva[1,4], Simon Hellemans[5], Daniel Jungwirth[1,6], Jan Křivánek[1], Anna Amirianová[1,7], Pavlína

Kyjaková[1], Thomas Bourguignon[5], Dorothea Tholl[8], Robert Hanus[1,*], Jitka Štáfková[1,*]

[1] Institute of Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech

Republic

[2] Department of Analytical Chemistry, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

[3] Department of Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

[4] Department of Genetics and Microbiology, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech

Republic

[5] Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University, Okinawa, Japan

[6] Department of Biochemistry, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

[7] Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology, University of Chemistry and Technology Prague,

Prague, Czech Republic

[8] Department of Biological Sciences, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA

* Corresponding authors: jitka.stafkova@uochb.cas.cz, robert.hanus@uochb.cas.cz

**Abstract**

Termites produce the most diverse array of terpenoids among metazoans, comprising over 200 structures. However, their biosynthesis has not yet been elucidated. Here, we identify a gene family which arose through the duplication of geranylgeranyl pyrophosphate synthase in the common ancestor of Neoisoptera, the terpene-producing termite lineage. We functionally characterized several proteins from this family as terpene synthases generating biologically relevant sesqui- and diterpenes. These include the queen pheromone (3*R*,6*E*)-nerolidol in *Embiratermes neotenicus* and the precursor of polycyclic defensive diterpenes (*E*,*E*,*E*)-neocembrene in *Nasutitermes takasagoensis*. We explore transposable element-mediated genomic mechanisms and selection pressures acting in the evolution of this gene family and report an amino acid site crucial for cyclization capacity as well as the enantiospecificity of the characterized enzymes. We conclude that we have identified an enzyme family underlying the remarkable richness of termite terpenoids, which likely contributed to the ecological success of Neoisoptera.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Termites hold the record among insects for the diversity of terpenoid secondary metabolites they produce, with over 200 different monoterpenes, sesquiterpenes and diterpenes identified to date [1,2]. The occurrence of terpenoids is restricted to the modern termite clade Neoisoptera and coincides with the emergence of the frontal gland, a unique exocrine organ and a synapomorphy of Neoisoptera. This gland is present in dispersing kings and queens, but most developed—and best studied—in soldiers, the caste specialized in colony defense [3,4].

The supposed ancestral function of termite terpenoids was to serve as defensive compounds, released in rich blends through the opening of the frontal gland on termite heads. Some of the defensive terpenoids were later co-opted for chemical communication, in line with the observations of pheromone evolution from defensive compounds in other insects [5]. Thus, terpenoids frequently act as alarm pheromones secreted from the frontal gland of irritated soldiers [6,7], but may also be synthesized in other exocrine organs and serve as sex pheromones and trail pheromones [8]. Finally, terpenoids may play the role of queen pheromones produced by reigning queens to signal their presence in the colony to the nestmates [9]. In contrast to the solid coverage of termite terpenoid diversity, their biosynthesis and its evolution remain to be elucidated. Because terpenoids have been recorded in the basal neoisopteran family Stylotermitidae [10] as well as in many other later diverging lineages, it is reasonable to hypothesize that their biosynthesis has a single origin in the common ancestor of Neoisoptera.

Terpenoid secondary metabolites usually originate from prenyl pyrophosphates, such as geranyl pyrophosphate ($C_{10}$, GPP), farnesyl pyrophosphate ($C_{15}$, FPP), or geranylgeranyl pyrophosphate ($C_{20}$, GGPP) giving rise to monoterpenes, sesquiterpenes, and diterpenes, respectively. The conversion of prenyl pyrophosphates into terpenes is catalyzed by terpene synthases (TPS), which cleave off the pyrophosphate and yield linear or cyclic terpene hydrocarbons, or the respective alcohols. Final terpenoid products may then arise through further modifications (oxygenations, cyclizations) by additional enzymes [11,12].

Like other animals, insects generally lack the "classical" TPS genes known from plants, bacteria, and

fungi [13] and rely on alternative mechanisms to obtain terpenoids. These include sequestering them

from the diet, acquiring them from microbial symbionts, using classical TPS genes gained through

horizontal gene transfer [14] or recruiting a completely unrelated enzyme family for TPS functions [15].

Nevertheless, the most common evolutionary route by which insects acquired the capacity for *de novo*

terpenoid biosynthesis is through duplication and neofunctionalization of isoprenyl diphosphate

synthase genes (IDS). This enzyme family is conserved in the primary metabolism across all domains of

life and catalyzes the elongation of prenyl pyrophosphates via the sequential condensation of shorter

pyrophosphates with isopentenyl pyrophosphate ($C_5$, IPP) [16,17]. Such origin of TPSs has so far been

documented in a handful of species across Coleoptera, Lepidoptera, Hemiptera, and Diptera, where

TPSs are paralogous either to farnesyl pyrophosphate synthases (FPPS [18–23]) or geranylgeranyl

pyrophosphate synthases (GGPPS [24,25]). Taken together, these findings indicate that TPSs originated

independently in multiple insect lineages through repeated IDS duplications and neofunctionalizations.

Here, we aim to elucidate the evolution of terpenoid biosynthesis in termites. Building on reports of

independent origins of TPSs from IDSs in several insect clades, as well as on the exclusive occurrence

of terpenoids in Neoisoptera, we hypothesize that terpenoid biosynthesis evolved in the common

ancestor of Neoisoptera through duplication/multiplication and neofunctionalization of IDSs. To

capture the structural and functional diversity of termite terpenoids, we selected two model species

from different subfamilies within Neoisoptera. Our primary model is the South American termite

*Embiratermes neotenicus* (Termitidae: Syntermitinae), in which we recently identified the

sesquiterpene alcohol (3*R*,6*E*)-nerolidol as the queen pheromone [9]. The second model is the

Japanese species *Nasutitermes takasagoensis* (Termitidae: Nasutitermitinae) belonging to a genus

whose soldiers produce a rich blend of monoterpenes and polycyclic oxygenated diterpenes derived

from the monocyclic precursor (3*E*,7*E*,11*E*)-neocembrene [1,2,26]. Previously, eight GGPPS homologs

have been reported as present and upregulated in the frontal gland of soldiers in this species. Although

GGPPS gene multiplicity has been tentatively linked to terpenoid production in termites [27,28], the

hypothesis has not been experimentally verified.

We report that GGPPS exists as a single-copy gene in basal termites, but its duplication or

multiplication is a ubiquitous feature of Neoisoptera, reaching up to fifteen paralogs in *E. neotenicus*.

This pervasive multiplicity strongly indicates that the initial duplication event occurred concurrently

with the frontal gland emergence in their common ancestor. We functionally characterize selected

GGPPS homologs from the two species and demonstrate that some of them act as TPS enzymes,

converting prenyl pyrophosphate substrates into terpenoids known from the respective species, or

biosynthetic precursors thereof. We conclude that we have identified a family of TPS enzymes

responsible for the remarkable diversity of terpenoid secondary metabolites in termites. Furthermore,

we bring evidence for possible involvement of transposable elements in shaping the GGPPS-like gene

family and outline how selection pressures may have shaped its evolutionary diversification. Finally,

we examine the structure-function relationship of termite TPS enzymes and identify an amino acid

crucial for their capacity of terpene cyclization and enantioselective biosynthesis.

**2. RESULTS**

**2.1 Terpenoid chemistry in *E. neotenicus* queens and *N. takasagoensis* soldiers**

To obtain a comprehensive image of the terpenoids produced by the two model termites, we first

analyzed body washes from selected castes of both species using gas chromatography coupled with

mass spectrometry (GC-MS). In *E. neotenicus*, substantial amounts of terpenes were only present in

neotenic queens; the dominant compound was (6*E*)-nerolidol, followed by (3*E*,7*E*,11*E*)-neocembrene,

along with minor or trace quantities of α- and β-farnesene, β-springene and two additional

unidentified diterpenes (Fig. 1A, Supplementary Fig. S1–S2).

In soldiers of *N. takasagoensis*, we detected a rich and abundant blend of terpenes comprising two

monoterpenes—(+)-α-pinene and (+)-limonene—and eight diterpenoids (Fig. 1B; Supplementary Figs.

S3–S5). Three of the most prominent diterpenoids, each bearing three or four oxygenated functional

groups, were fully characterized using nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) as 14α-acetoxy-3β,12β-

dipropionoxy-kampa-6(7),8(9)-diene,   3α,9β,13α-tripropionoxy-trinervita-11(12),15(17)-diene,   and

3α,9β,13α-tripropionoxy-11α(12β)-epoxy-trinervita-15(17)-ene   (Supplementary   Figs.   S6–S8),

following termite diterpene nomenclature [29].

**Fig. 1. Terpenoid chemistry of the two model termite species**. **A.** Comprehensive gas chromatography
(GC×GC) analysis showing terpenes identified in the body washes of neotenic queens of *E. neotenicus*
and compared to 4th stage female nymphs. Chromatograms of other castes are provided in
Supplementary Fig. S1, mass spectra of the identified terpenes in Supplementary Fig. S2. **B.** GC
chromatogram of terpenes identified in body washes of *N. takasagoensis* soldiers. Comparison with a
chromatogram of worker body wash is shown in Supplementary Fig. S3, mass and NMR spectra of the
detected terpenes are shown in Supplementary Figs S4–S8. All chromatograms (A and B) show the
responses to diagnostic ions for mono-, sesqui- and diterpenes ($m/z$ = 68 + 69 + 93 + 204 + 272).
128

**2.2 An FPPS gene duplication predates the occurrence of termites**

We did not retrieve any sequences similar to plant, fungal, or bacterial TPSs in the transcriptome

assemblies of *E. neotenicus* and *N. takasagoensis*, nor in the *E. neotenicus* genome, which we

assembled for this study (genome assembly statistics are provided in Supplementary Table S1). No

duplication was found in genes coding for subunits of decaprenyl diphosphate synthase, a long-chain

IDS. We then queried the datasets for short-chain IDS homologs. Our search confirmed the presence

of three previously reported FPPS sequences in *N. takasagoensis* transcriptome [27] and revealed an

FPPS tandem duplication in *E. neotenicus* genome. A phylogenetic analysis of FPPS homologs from

selected cockroach and termite species suggested that an FPPS gene duplication is present in all

Blattodea (Supplementary Fig. S9A). An inspection of amino acid sequence alignments showed that

the more conserved blattodean FPPS clade, containing one and two sequences of *E. neotenicus* and *N.*

*takasagoensis*, respectively, presents all main features typical of the ancestral FPPS enzymes, such as

the so-called first and second aspartate-rich motifs (FARM and SARM, sequence DDxxD) implicated in

binding of magnesium ions in the active site of the enzyme [30, 31]. We therefore designated this clade

as canonical FPPSs. By contrast, in the divergent clade which we refer to as FPPS-like, FARM and SARM

are disrupted (Supplementary Fig. S10). The distinction between FPPS and FPPS-like proteins was

confirmed by *in vitro* assays with recombinant EneoB from *E. neotenicus*, a member of the FPPS clade,

which presented activities typical of insect FPPS proteins. No IDS or TPS activity was detected with the

FPPS-like protein from the same species, EneoA (Supplementary Fig. S9B). The combination of

biochemical assays and phylogenetic analysis let us conclude that the FPPS-like homologs are not

relevant for terpenoid biosynthesis in termites.

**2.3 Neoisoptera possess an expanded family of GGPPS-like genes**

Next, we searched the *E. neotenicus* transcriptome and genome for GGPPS homologs and identified

multiple full-length GGPPS sequences. Interestingly, we also discovered numerous partial GGPPS

homologs lacking one or more exons and located in genomic regions extensively soft-masked by

RepeatMasker. An inspection of the unmasked genome revealed as many as 28 highly homologous

sequences with conserved gene organization (Fig. 2A–B, Supplementary Fig. S11), most of which were

expressed in one or more *E. neotenicus* castes (Fig. 2C). Based on gene integrity (six protein-coding

exons) and the presence of indels or nonsense mutations, we classified 15 of these GGPPS homologs

as genes and 13 as pseudogenes (Fig. 2A–B, Supplementary Fig. S11).

We then reconstructed the GGPPS nucleotide phylogeny in the context of publicly available sequences

from other insects, including two basal termites and three Neoisoptera (*Stylotermes halumicus*,

*E. neotenicus* and *N. takasagoensis*). GGPPS occurs as a single-copy gene in basal termites and other

insects, whereas multiple paralogs were found in Neoisoptera, including *S. halumicus* from the very

basal neoisopteran family Stylotermitidae (Fig. 2D). Neoisoptera possess one paralog clustering with

the single-copy genes of basal termites (denoted as clade I), presumably representing the canonical

GGPPS enzyme. The remaining paralogs form an expanded monophylum, further referred to as the

GGPPS-like gene family, comprising three sequences from *S. halumicus*, six from *N. takasagoensis* and

fourteen from *E. neotenicus*. The GGPPS-like clade resolves into three branches, denoted II–IV (Fig. 2B–

D).

**Fig. 2. Diversity, gene structure, expression and phylogeny of GGPPS homologs in termites. A.** GGPPs

homologs identified in the genome of *E. neotenicus* and their gene structure. Genes are marked with

black arrows, pseudogenes with grey arrows, regions masked by RepeatMasker at genome-wide scale

highlighted in pink. Sequences corresponding to CACTA TIR TE_00000081 element are represented by

green arrows also showing the TE orientation. **B.** Exon structure of GGPPS homologs. Alternative 5'

exons in EneoH and pgENC3949.2 located upstream of the canonical exon 1 are marked as "-1". **C.**

Expression profiles in *E. neotenicus* 4th stage female nymphs, queens, workers, and soldiers determined

by mRNA-seq based on TPM normalized read counts (sum of counts for head and thorax + abdomen

samples). **D.** Phylogenetic tree reconstructed from protein-coding nucleotide sequences showing the

GGPPS-like gene family expansion in Neoisoptera. The tree was generated using the Neighbor-Joining

method with 10,000 bootstrap replicates. Neoisopteran gene abbreviations are set in bold. Accession

numbers of the studied sequences are provided in Supplementary Tables S3–S4.

We further verified the hypothesis that the GGPPS multiplication is specific to Neoisoptera by

phylogenetic analysis of GGPPS amino acid sequences including 7 basal species and 19 Neoisoptera

(Supplementary Fig. S12, Supplementary Table S5). The presumed canonical GGPPS branches

(paraphyletic clade I) comprised sequences from cockroaches, both basal termites, and Neoisoptera,

while the divergent GGPPS-like branch consisted exclusively of neoisopteran sequences and formed a

monophylum sister to neoisopteran GGPPSs. All Neoisoptera species were represented in the GGPPS-

like branch, subdivided into well-supported clades II–IV. Thus, the initial GGPPS duplication occurred

in the ancestor of Neoisoptera and was followed by subsequent duplication events.

Finally, we surveyed all publicly available sequences homologous to GGPPS across termites, including

partial TSA transcripts, and mapped them on a phylogenetic tree of termites together with the records

of terpenoid secondary metabolites in Neoisoptera (Fig. 3, Supplementary Table S6). We obtained a

clear picture of GGPPS evolution: while only GGPPS could be retrieved from the basal lineages

represented by 8 species from three families, at least some partial GGPPS-like sequences were

identified in all 46 included Neoisoptera from seven families and 12 subfamilies of Termitidae.

**Fig. 3. Evolution of terpenoid biosynthesis in termites.** Production of mono-, sesqui- and diterpenes, and their secondary derivatives (containing complex polycycles and oxygenated moieties), presence of GGPPS and GGPPS-like sequences, mapped on termite phylogeny of non-termitid families and termitid subfamilies. Phylogeny adopted and simplified from Hellemans et al. [100], Hodotermopsidae and Serritermitidae are excluded from the scheme due to the absence of relevant sequence data. Positive records of terpenes denote previous identifications of any terpenoid secondary metabolite in at least one species from the given (sub)family, based on [1,2], and the recent report of terpenes in Stylotermitidae as the most basal Neoisoptera [10]. The presence or absence of GGPPS and GGPPS-like sequences in individual termite species was determined based on GGPPS phylogeny and/or the presence of motifs previously identified as characteristic for insect GGPPSs. Numbers show the sampling size in each (sub)family. The termite species and relevant datasets are listed in Supplementary Table S6.

## 2.4 GGPPS and GGPPS-like genomic loci are rich in transposable elements (TE)

In *E. neotenicus*, the observed extensive duplication in GGPPS and GGPPS-like genes occurs alongside an increased frequency of low-complexity regions in the given loci, strongly indicating the involvement of transposition events. As all the paralogs retained an unspliced gene structure with fully conserved exon-intron boundaries, we focused on class II DNA TEs—elements that transpose directly as DNA without splicing [33]. Upon running RepeatModeler at the whole-genome level, we observed multiple DNA TE-like motifs in loci surrounding the GGPPS-like genes and pseudogenes, consistent with the increased occurrence of masked regions. To improve prediction accuracy, we restricted our analysis to 27 contigs harbouring sequences which showed >80% homology to previously identified GGPPS-like orthologs and at least two consecutive exons. An EDTA pipeline annotation revealed several TEs, one of which—TE_00000081, classified as class II transposon from the CACTA TIR family—was found in all but two loci. This TE was oriented in the opposite direction relative to the gene and was located in the region surrounding exon 6 (Fig. 2A, Supplementary Fig. S13). Different genomic patterns were observed in the FPPS locus which did not show any enrichment of low complexity regions or repeats. No fragments of FPPS-like genes could be found elsewhere in the genome.

**2.5 Identification of proteins with GGPPS activities in *E. neotenicus* and *N. takasagoensis***

First, we functionally characterized the proteins from clade I expected to act as GGPPS enzymes (EneoJ in *E. neotenicus* and NtGGPPS7 in *N. takasagoensis*). Indeed, both proteins showed IDS activity with IPP in combination with all allylic substrates tested: they produced GGPP from IPP and FPP; IPP and GPP generated both FPP and GGPP; upon incubation with IPP and DMAPP, only GPP was detected (Supplementary Fig. S14). No TPS activity was observed in EneoJ or NtGGPPS7 for any of the substrates tested (GPP, FPP, GGPP).

**2.6 Two *E. neotenicus* GGPPS-like proteins show TPS activity and generate queen terpenoids**

Among the fourteen *E. neotenicus* GGPPS-like paralogs, we selected EneoC and EneoE, highly expressed in neotenic queens according to RNA-Seq analysis shown in Fig. 2C. Upon incubation of EneoC with FPP, a single product was generated, identified by GC-MS and chiral GC as pure (3*R*,6*E*)-nerolidol (Fig. 4A). Additionally, EneoC presented IDS activity by generating FPP upon incubation with IPP and GPP (Fig. 4C). No other substrates were accepted by EneoC.

EneoE accepted FPP in TPS activity assays, generating racemic (6*E*)-nerolidol, and converted GGPP into (3*E*,7*E*,11*E*)-neocembrene (Fig. 4B). The enzyme showed no IDS activity. Both (3*R*,6*E*)-nerolidol and (3*E*,7*E*,11*E*)-neocembrene represent queen-specific terpenoids in *E. neotenicus* (Fig. 1A), the former being known as *E. neotenicus* queen pheromone [9]. Thus, we consider EneoC an enantiospecific nerolidol synthase and EneoE a neocembrene synthase.

Having identified EneoC as capable of producing *E. neotenicus* queen pheromone, we wanted to confirm its upregulation in queens compared to nymphs. Indeed, in differential gene expression analysis of RNA sequencing data from nymphs and queens, EneoC was by far the most upregulated of all GGPPS-like genes in queen samples from thorax and abdomen ($\log_2$ fold change queen vs. nymph = 9.9, padj = $1.8\times10^{-16}$) while also showing the highest transcript abundances (Supplementary Fig. S15, Supplementary Table S7). Importantly, EneoC transcript upregulation was clearly reflected by proteomic data. Among all detected IDS homologs, EneoC was present as the most abundant protein

and showed the strongest enrichment in queen abdomen and thorax compared to nymphs ($\log_2$ fold

change queen vs. nymph = 10.6; Supplementary Fig. S15, Supplementary Table S8). In summary, both

transcriptomic and proteomic analyses supported the biological relevance of EneoC for queen

pheromone biosynthesis.

**Fig. 4. Functional characterization of GGPPS-like enzymes from *E. neotenicus* and *N. takasagoensis*.**
**A.** GC chromatograms of SPME samples obtained from the headspace upon EneoC, EneoE and
NtGGPPS6 incubation with FPP. Left chromatograms show separation on a semi-nonpolar column,
right chromatograms depict chiral separation of (6*E*)-nerolidol on a chiral cyclodextrin. Enzymatic
assays shown in yellow, controls without enzymes in black, standards of (6*E*)-nerolidol enantiomers in
grey. **B.** GC chromatograms of SPME samples obtained from the headspace upon EneoC, EneoE and
NtGGPPS6 incubation with GGPP. Enzymatic assays shown in green, controls without enzymes in black.
**C.** HPLC chromatogram demonstrating the IDS activity of EneoC. The purified enzyme was incubated
with IPP in combination with DMAPP, GPP, or FPP. Only the substrate combination giving rise to prenyl
pyrophosphate product (FPP) is shown (blue), along with standards (black). The chromatogram
visualizes the selected m/z 245.00, 313.06, 381.12, and 449.19.
270

**2.7 *N. takasagoensis* GGPPS-like protein NtGGPPS6 is a neocembrene synthase**

All six GGPPS-like genes were reported as upregulated in *N. takasagoensis* soldier heads, the

biosynthetic site of terpenoid defensive compounds [27]. We expressed these in the *S. cerevisiae* strain

JWY501 which is specifically engineered to accumulate GGPP. In the NtGGPPS6-expressing strain, we

detected high amounts of (3*E*,7*E*,11*E*)-neocembrene, while no significant terpenoid production was

observed in any other strain (Supplementary Fig. S16). Subsequently, we expressed the six GGPPS-like

genes in *E. coli* and used the purified proteins in IDS and TPS assays. Only recombinant NtGGPPS6

showed any activity *in vitro*, producing a mixture of (3*R*,6*E*)- and (3*S*,6*E*)-nerolidol enantiomers from

FPP (Fig. 4A), and (3*E*,7*E*,11*E*)-neocembrene from GGPP (Fig. 4B). No IDS activity was observed. As only

monoterpenes and diterpenes are present in the soldier extract, we assume that *in vivo*, NtGGPPS6

does not generate nerolidol, and acts instead as a neocembrene synthase producing the precursor of

polycyclic diterpenes.

 **2.8 Sequence motifs within termite GGPPs gene family and selection analysis**

We examined whether the divergence of GGPPS-like genes involves substitutions within motifs typical

of GGPPS proteins. We defined such insect GGPPS motifs (IGMs) based on patterns generated for

canonical insect GGPPS sequences by MEME, and we combined them with the IPP-binding motif

prediction used in our earlier study [34]. We observed that only FARM and IGM 3 motifs are conserved

in termite GGPPS-like proteins (Supplementary Fig. S17).

To understand how selection pressures may have influenced the evolution of TPS function in

Neoisoptera, we performed selection analysis on a phylogeny of selected full-length termite GGPPS

and GGPPS-like coding sequences (Fig. 5A, Supplementary Table S9). The HyPhy RELAX analysis showed

that selection pressures have overall intensified along branches in the GGPPS-like clade containing the

neoisopteran TPSs ($k = 11.1$, $p < 10^{-4}$). The partitioned descriptive model fitted to each branch class

indicated an overall increase in the intensity of diversifying selection along GGPPS-like clade branches

compared to the canonical GGPPS reference branches (Supplementary Table S10, $\omega = 22.72$ vs. 3.58).

Additionally, a lower degree of constraint from purifying selection acting on the GGPPS-like vs.

canonical GGPPS clades can be inferred from the substantial decrease in the proportion of codons

under negative selection (Supplementary Table S10, 33.34% in GGPPS-like sequences vs. 97.06% in

canonical GGPPSs) and a concurrent emergence of a category of neutrally evolving codons in the test

branch class (Supplementary Table S10, 64.45% vs. 0).

**Fig. 5. Selection analysis of termite GGPPS homologs. A.** Maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree based
on codon alignment of sequences listed in Table S9, reconstructed using IQTree and substitution model
JTT+F+I+G4, ultrafast bootstrap values (1000 replicates) shown as node support. RELAX analysis was
performed with GGPPS sequences (clade I, reference branches) and GGPPS-like clades II–IV (yellow
highlighting, test branches) showing increased intensity of positive selection in GGPPS-like clades. The
arrows point to internal branches along which positive selection has likely occurred according to
aBSREL analysis. Ancestral sequences were reconstructed for nodes 1–3 (Supplementary Table S10).
Functionally characterized extant sequences relevant for the selection analysis are set in bold.
**B.** Structure model of ancestral sequence at node 2 with amino acid residues colored with respect to
Bayes Empirical Bayes posterior probabilities of the site having experienced positive selection (0.5–1,
sites with BEB values > 0.8 are labelled). Active site cavity is filled with grey mesh, $Mg^{2+}$ ions shown as
green spheres. **C.** Overlay of modelled structures of NtGGPPS6 (green) and ancestral sequence 2

(orange) focusing on the amino acid sites highlighted in B. **D.** Abridged alignment of amino acid
sequences of extant GGPPS and TPS sequences in target species and ancestral sequences 1–3 showing
residues at insect GGPPS motifs 1–6 (IGMs), FARM and SARM. Amino acids identical to GGPPS
sequences are shaded grey. BEB values at individual sites for the branch 2—3 are shown as in B, sites
in node 2 sequence with BEB values > 0.8 are shaded yellow.
320

We next tested all branches within the termite GGPPS-like clade for evidence of positive selection

affecting the diversification of the clade by applying the aBSREL (adaptive branch-site random effects

likelihood) procedure in HyPhy to our dataset. Three internal branches were significantly likely to have

experienced positive diversifying selection (Holm-Bonferroni-corrected p-values < 0.05). Two of these

occur within the GGPPS-like clade II containing EneoC and NtGGPPS6. We designated the internal

nodes delimiting these branches 1, 2, and 3 (Fig. 5A), and used PAML to reconstruct their ancestral

sequences (Supplementary Table S11). PAML was also employed to detect specific amino acid sites

affected by positive selection ($\omega > 1$) using the Bayes empirical Bayes (BEB) method. For the branch

connecting nodes 2 and 3, posterior probability higher than 0.9 was recorded in four sites

corresponding to the following putative amino acid changes: P23S, Q26G, S59G, N90S (Fig. 5C). Two

additional sites (Q21K, S60I) showed BEB values higher than 0.8. These sites were retained almost

completely in both NtGGPPS6 (K21, S23, G26, G59, G60, S90) and EneoC (K21, S23, G26, C59, I60, S90).

No site with a BEB value exceeding 0.9 was detected on the branch leading to node 2. A structure

model of ancestral sequence 2 was then generated using AlphaFold 3 and compared to NtGGPPS6

(Fig. 5B), showing that all listed sites are located near the active site cavity opening. Three of these

(Q21K, P23S, Q26G) lie on a loop adjacent to the opening, a region with greater conformational

flexibility compared to the prevailing α-helical secondary structure.

**2.9 Structural features underlying cyclization capacity and enantioselectivity of termite TPS**

We modelled structures of proteins with known activity (EneoC, EneoE, EneoJ, NtGGPPS6, and

NtGGPPS7), and mapped the IGM motifs onto the structures. Overall, all protein structures aligned

very well as exemplified by EneoJ and EneoC models (Fig. 6A–C). Interestingly, a distinct pre-cyclization

GGPP substrate conformation was modelled with EneoE protein, contrasting with a rather linear GGPP

positioning in the active site of NtGGPPS6 (Fig. 6D). To evaluate the proximity and potential significance

of individual amino acid changes for protein enzymatic activities, we focused on the less divergent

clade II GGPPS-like TPS enzymes (EneoC, NtGGPPS6). Specifically, we searched for variable amino acids

located near the FARM and SARM motifs within the highly polar part of the active site where the

isoprenoid carbocation is formed and transferred to an IPP molecule in IDS enzymes, taking IGM motif

substitutions into account. We noticed an interesting site within IGM 4, a motif located in helix 6,

approximately 8 Å from FARM (Fig. 6C–D). Thr152 is conserved in NtGGPPS6 and all IDS enzymes as a

part of the KT motif (Fig. 6A), and replaced by isoleucine in EneoC. We hypothesized that Thr152 might

be important for carbocation stabilization which would aid GGPP cyclization into neocembrene by

NtGGPPS6. Indeed, the substitution of this amino acid in the T152I mutant of NtGGPPS6 abolished

neocembrene production from GGPP and instead lead to the formation of the linear diterpene alcohol

geranyllinalool, a $C_{20}$ homolog of nerolidol. In addition, upon incubation of T152I NtGGPPS6 with FPP,

we observed a significant shift in the enantioselectivity of (6$E$)-nerolidol biosynthesis. While the wild

type produced 65% of the $R$ enantiomer, this proportion increased to 91% in the mutant enzyme, thus

nearing the full enantioselectivity of EneoC (Fig. 6B, Supplementary Table S12).

**Fig. 6. Comparison of overall structures and active sites of termite GGPPS and GGPPS-like proteins.**
**A.** Location of insect GGPPS motifs (IGMs) and aspartate-rich motifs (FARM and SARM) in GGPPS and
GGPPS-like sequences; IGM 4 motif alignment in functionally characterized termite proteins and the
human HsGGPPS, position 152 highlighted. **B.** TPS activities of T152I NtGGPPS6 mutant and the native
protein (WT) documented by GC chromatograms of SPME samples. Left, (6$E$)-nerolidol generation
from FPP and the plot of (3$R$,6$E$)-nerolidol enantiomer proportion determined by chiral analysis (mean
values ± SD, source data in Supplementary Table S12). Right, (6$E$,10$E$)-geranyllinalool and ($E$,$E$,$E$)-
neocembrene generation from GGPP. **C.** Aligned structural models of EneoJ (GGPPS, green) and EneoC
(nerolidol synthase, orange). Colored regions correspond to IGM 1–3 and IGM 5 (light blue), IGM 4
(pink), FARM (yellow), and SARM (dark blue). Mg²⁺ ions are shown as green spheres. The active site
cavity is represented by a grey mesh. **D.** Active site cavity with fitted substrates in cyan (FPP in EneoC,
GGPP in NtGGPPS6 and EneoE) and amino acids close to the substrate in dark grey. Mg²⁺ ions are
shown as green spheres.

**3. DISCUSSION**

A novel biosynthetic capacity emerged in termites of the modern lineage Neoisoptera, enabling them to produce a remarkably broad scope of terpenoid secondary metabolites. The goal of this study was to unveil the evolutionary background of this innovation by identifying the responsible terpene synthases. We provide evidence that termite terpenoids are biosynthesized by a family of GGPPS-like enzymes, which evolved by a duplication of a GGPPS gene and a subsequent expansion accompanied by the gain of TPS function. The identification of termite TPS enzymes as members of a GGPPS-like gene family adds another instance to the list of independent acquisitions of TPS function via the duplication and neofunctionalization of ancestral IDS (FPPS or GGPPS) genes previously reported in several lineages of insects and in fungi [18–25,35]. In fact, the classical TPS gene family in plants and microorganisms has itself been hypothesized to have arisen from an IDS ancestor [13,36], possibly making its origin the most ancient of the recurring IDS neofunctionalization events.

Our data show that GGPPS-like family evolved in the common ancestor of Neoisoptera, suggesting its concurrent origin with the terpene-producing frontal gland, a key neoisopteran synapomorphy. A broader examination of published data shows that the evolutionary origin of terpene synthases in the ancestor of Neoisoptera aligns with the presence of terpenoid secondary metabolites across termite phylogeny, as both features are first recorded in the basal neoisopteran genus *Stylotermes* (Fig. 3). The GGPPS-like genes remained present in the genomes of all later branching clades over roughly 100 million years of their diversification (according to dating by Buček et al. [37]), even though in some extant lineages the terpenoids themselves seem to be missing. A trend toward higher terpenoid complexity is apparent in later branching lineages of Neoisoptera, presumably reflecting the involvement of additional modifying enzymes acting on TPS-derived skeletons (Fig. 3). For example, the oxygenated polycyclic diterpenes such as the three highly complex structures identified here in *N. takasagoensis* (Fig. 1B) are expected to arise via subsequent modifications of the TPS-produced (3*E*,7*E*,11*E*)-neocembrene [1,26]. The most intuitive candidates for further cyclizations and

oxygenations are cytochromes P450, some of which are reported as conspicuously upregulated in the

frontal glands of *Nasutitermes* soldiers [12,27].

In eusocial insects, a gene family expansion accompanied by a caste-biased expression pattern of newly

emerging paralogs, as observed here in the case of GGPPS, represents a feature often associated with

caste diversification [38–41]. Multiple examples have been accumulated showing that duplications and

neofunctionalizations of gene sets and their differential use in individual castes drive social insect

phenotypic plasticity, e.g., in genes involved in endocrine signalling, chemosensation, metabolism or

digestion [28,42–45].

The emergence of a gene family and its further expansion can be mediated by different mechanisms,

which are not necessarily shared in IDS-like gene families in individual insect lineages. For example, the

genomic organization of pan-Blattodean FPPS-like genes in termites is suggestive of origin by tandem

duplication, which also appears to have been a major driver of FPPS-like gene family expansion in stink

bugs [23]. Alternatively, gene duplication can be mediated by transposable elements [46], examples

including non-TPS genes involved in terpenoid biosynthetic pathways in roses [47]. We provide

indications for the involvement of transposable elements (TEs) in shaping the expansion of GGPPS-like

gene family in *E. neotenicus*. A single TE, TE_00000081, was consistently associated with focal loci in

*E. neotenicus*, and sequences homologous to this element are also present in GGPPS transcripts from

*N. takasagoensis* and in the *Reticulitermes speratus* GGPPS genomic locus (Supplementary Fig. S13).

We thus propose that GGPPS gene duplications in Neoisoptera were frequently concurrent with

transposition events. Transposable element-mediated gene duplication would also conform with the

observed presence or absence of mitochondrial targeting sequences (MTS) in termite GGPPS/GGPPS-

like proteins (Supplementary Fig. S13): the MTS might have been acquired during an early transposition

event of the GGPPS coding sequence, explaining its prevailing presence in GGPPS-like proteins and its

absence in GGPPSs.

We have identified three TPS enzymes which all produce (6*E*)-nerolidol from FPP *in vitro*. Out of these,

only EneoC is an enantiospecific TPS generating pure (3*R*,6*E*)-nerolidol, which acts as a queen

pheromone in *E. neotenicus*. *EneoC* gene has been found as highly upregulated in queens at transcript

and protein levels, both in an inter-caste comparison and relative to other GGPPS-like genes,

supporting its biological role in queen pheromone production. Interestingly, to our knowledge, EneoC

is the only known terpene synthase producing exclusively the *R* enantiomer of nerolidol. The only other

enzyme reported to generate enantiomerically pure (3*R*,6*E*)-nerolidol is a maize enzyme which,

however, also produces additional sesquiterpenes [48]. The other two TPSs which we functionally

characterized, NtGGPPS6 and EneoE, presumably act as (3*E*,7*E*,11*E*)-neocembrene synthases *in vivo*,

generating a precursor of defensive compounds in *N. takasagoensis* and a queen specific volatile in

*E. neotenicus*. In addition to TPSs, we have also identified canonical GGPPs in both *E. neotenicus* and

*N. takasagoensis* corresponding to typical insect class III GGPPS enzymes [49–51].

To obtain a comprehensive view of terpenoid biosynthesis in termites, it would be required to identify

the enzymes responsible for production of monoterpenes. Therefore, one of the selected models was

*N. takasagoensis*, whose defensive compounds are rich in pinene and limonene. To our dismay, none

of the recombinant *N. takasagoensis* enzymes showed monoterpene synthase activity. Recognizing

the abundance of GGPPS-like paralogs in Neoisoptera and the complexity of their correct annotation,

we propose that a successful TPS activity screen requires a high-quality candidate list based on

manually annotated genomic and transcriptomic sequence data.

Genetic novelty provides the substrate for evolutionary processes, and our analyses suggest that

selection has shaped the diversification of the Neoisopteran GGPPS-like gene family. We show that the

intensity of diversifying selection was higher along branches in the GGPPS-like clades compared to the

GGPPS clade and that the GGPPS-like clades are less constrained by purifying selection, both of which

facilitates specialized adaptation in general [38]. Furthermore, the basal branches within GGPPS-like

clade II, which contains TPS enzymes EneoC and NtGGPPS6, likely experienced episodic positive

diversifying selection. Positive selection-driven diversification of terpenoid biosynthesis has been

reported in plants [52–54] and we are presenting here an analogous phenomenon in termites. In an

early branch of the same clade II, we have identified six amino acids sites with evidence of positive

selection corresponding to the following substitutions along the branch: P23S, Q26G, S59G, N90S,

Q21K and S60I (Fig. 5B–D). Ser59 and Ser60 are associated with substrate and product chain-length

specificity in type III GGPPS [55,56]. In fungal GGPPS-like TPSs, the S60C mutation shifts product

specificity from the alcohol (*E*)-nerolidol to (*E*,*E*)-α-farnesene [35]. Gln21 typical for insect GGPPS

enzymes is changed in termite TPSs (Q21K) and retained in both TPSs of the butterfly *Heliconius*

*melpomene* [24]. At a corresponding position, fungal GGPPS sequences of *Melamspora* share Asn,

while an N21I change is present in GGPPS-like TPSs from the same species [35]. Thus, in two out of

three lineages with confirmed GGPPS-like TPS enzymes (termites, *Melamspora* fungi), the GGPPS-TPS

functional shift is accompanied by an amino acid change in this position.

We then focused on features linked to GGPP cyclization activity. The introduction of a T152I mutation

in the neocembrene synthase NtGGPPS6 lead to the formation of the linear diterpene alcohol

geranyllinalool from GGPP instead of the cyclic neocembrene. Thus, Thr152 is a core amino acid

involved in GGPP cyclization. Our results suggest that after the lysis of GGPP, the arising highly reactive

carbocation is stabilized by the hydroxyl group of Thr152 at C-1. This intermediate is then attacked by

the nucleophilic double bond at C-14, followed by proton elimination from C-16.

The NtGGPPS6 T152I mutant further let us identify the importance of Ile152 in shifting the ratio of

nerolidol enantiomers synthesized from FPP in favour of the *R* enantiomer. The farnesyl carbocation

backbone is stabilized by isoleucine in an orientation suitable for enantiospecific nucleophilic attack by

water at C-3. It appears that isoleucine found at a corresponding position in EneoC contributes to the

full enantioselectivity of this enzyme giving rise to pure (3*R*,6*E*)-nerolidol reported from queens [9,57].

Interestingly, EneoE, which also generates neocembrene, lacks Thr152. We suggest that in EneoE, the

substrate cyclization proceeds by a different mechanism. The active site is rich in aliphatic amino acids,

enabling GGPP pre-folding prior to pyrophosphate cleavage (see Fig. 6D). The fact that EneoE produces

a completely racemic mixture of nerolidol when supplied with FPP also points to distinct reaction

mechanisms in the two enzymes.

With this study, we outline the evolutionary background of terpenoid biosynthesis in termites, and our

findings invite further exploration of several related topics. Firstly, to gain mechanistic understanding

of the evolutionary transition from IDS to TPS enzymes, confirming our hypothesis based on AlphaFold

models using crystal structures is required, followed by a thorough mutational analysis of candidate

amino acids. Furthermore, we propose that the high diterpenoid diversity recorded in Neoisoptera is

due not only to terpene synthases, but also to other types of currently unidentified enzymes which

modify the basic terpene skeleton. The presence of monoterpenes in termites raises questions about

the identity of the monoterpene synthase involved. In addition, the characterization of the enzyme

responsible for producing the queen pheromone (3*R*,6*E*)-nerolidol in *E. neotenicus* queens opens

important questions about its regulation and localization at both tissue and subcellular levels, which

remain unknown [9].

**5. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**5.1 Origin of termites**

Colonies of *Nasutitermes takasagoensis* (Nawa, 1911) and *Embiratermes neotenicus* (Holmgren, 1906)

were used in this study. *N. takasagoensis* colony was collected at West beach, Ishigaki island, Okinawa

Prefecture, Japan (N24°25.886' E124°04.280') in September 2021 and kept thereafter at Okinawa

Institute of Science and Technology, Japan. Samples for chemical analyses were collected in January

2022 and processed at IOCB Prague.

Colonies of *E. neotenicus* were collected in French Guiana between 2022 and 2024 at two forest

localities along the Road to Petit Saut (N5°04.250' W52°58.770'–N5°04.650' W53°01.360') and one

locality 13 km south-west of Kourou (N5°06.440' W52°45.521').

**5.2 Chemical analyses**

**5.2.1 Chemical analyses of *N. takasagoensis***

Entire bodies of 500 *N. takasagoensis* soldiers were extracted overnight in 5 mL of hexane. 1 µL aliquot of soldier extract was analyzed using a TRACE 1310 gas chromatograph coupled to an ISQ LT quadrupole mass spectrometer. The instrument was equipped with an Rxi-5MS column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm). A split/splitless injector was operated in split mode with a 10:1 split ratio, and the injector temperature was set to 250 °C. The carrier gas flow rate was maintained at 1.5 mL×min$^{-1}$. The oven temperature program was as follows: the initial temperature was set to 50 °C and held for 1 min, followed by a ramp of 8 °C×min$^{-1}$ to a final temperature of 320 °C, which was held for 5 min. Mass spectra were acquired at an ionization energy of 70 eV, with a solvent delay of 4 min. The transfer line temperature was set to 260 °C.

**5.2.2 Chemical analyses of *E. neotenicus***

In *E. neotenicus*, we sampled 3 neotenic queens, 10 workers, 10 soldiers, and 10 female nymphs (4$^{th}$ stage), and extracted them with 300 µL of hexane for 10 min. One primary king was extracted with 100 µL of hexane for 10 min. A 1 µL aliquot of each extract from individual castes was analyzed using comprehensive gas chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry (GC×GC-MS). The analysis was performed on an Agilent gas chromatograph equipped with a secondary oven, quad-jet thermal modulator, and a Gerstel multipurpose sampler used as an autosampler. A LECO Pegasus BT 4D time-of-flight mass spectrometer was used as the detector. The injection was carried out using a split/splitless injector operated in splitless mode, with the injector temperature set to 250 °C. The chromatographic setup consisted of two columns: in the first dimension, an Rxi-5MS column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm) and in the second dimension, an Rxi-17Sil column (1.5 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm) was used. The oven temperature program was as follows: the initial temperature was set to 50 °C and held for 1 min, followed by a ramp of 8 °C×min$^{-1}$ to a final temperature of 320 °C, which was held for 5 min. The modulation period was set to 3 seconds, and the transfer line temperature was maintained

at 250 °C. A 15 °C offset was used for the secondary oven and a 15 °C offset relative to the secondary

oven was used for the modulator.

**5.2.3 Preparative gas chromatography and NMR**

Unknown polycyclic diterpenes from soldier extracts of *N. takasagoensis* were identified using a

combination of preparative gas chromatography (prep-GC) and NMR spectroscopy. The prep-GC

system consisted of an Agilent GC connected to a Gerstel preparative fraction collector (PFC) and

equipped with a Gerstel program temperature vaporization (PTV) inlet. A 5 µL aliquot of the sample

was injected onto an Rxi-5MS column (30 m × 0.53 mm × 1.50 µm). PTV temperature was set to 250 °C

for 0.1 min, then ramped at 700 °C×min$^{-1}$ to 320 °C held for 4 min; then the inlet was cooled down at

100 °C×min$^{-1}$ back to 250 °C. Column flow was set to 1.4 mL×min$^{-1}$. After 1.5 min the inlet pure flow

was increased to 50 mL×min$^{-1}$ and held for 3 min. The GC temperature program was set as follows: the

starting temperature was set to 200 °C and held for 1 min, then ramped to 320 °C by 15 °C×min$^{-1}$ and

held for 3 min. The PFC temperature was set to 320 °C. Fraction collection was performed using coiled

glass traps (1 µL capacity) cooled to 0 °C with liquid nitrogen. Each trap was washed with 500 µL of

dichloromethane. The collected samples were then evaporated under a stream of nitrogen and re-

diluted with deuterated dichloromethane. Six traps were connected to the effluent splitter; however,

only three fractions were collected with sufficient purity and quantity for subsequent NMR analysis.

NMR spectra were measured on Bruker Avance III HD 600 MHz (600.1 MHz for $^1$H spectra and 150.9

MHz for $^{13}$C spectra) equipped with 1.7 mm TCI MicroCryoProbe. Identification was based on H,H-

COSY, H,C-HSQC, H,C-HMBC, and H,H-NOESY 2D spectra.

**5.2.4 Chiral chromatography**

For the chiral separation of pinene, a 1 µL aliquot of *N. takasagoensis* soldier extract was analyzed

using an HP 6850 gas chromatograph equipped with a flame ionization detector (FID) and an HP-Chiral

20β GC column (30 m, 0.25 mm, 0.25 µm) with helium as the carrier gas. The split/splitless injector was

operated in splitless mode, and the injector temperature was set to 230 °C. The carrier gas flow rate

was maintained at 1.5 mL×min⁻¹. The detector temperature was set to 220 °C, with an H₂ flow of

40 mL×min⁻¹ and an air flow of 400 mL×min⁻¹. The temperature program was as follows: an initial

temperature of 40 °C held for 20 min, followed by a ramp of 1 °C×min⁻¹ to 100 °C, then a secondary

ramp of 30 °C×min⁻¹ to 240 °C, which was held for 10 min. The same setup was used for chiral analysis

of limonene, differing only in the temperature program which was set as follows: starting temperature

was held for 1 min and then ramped 3 C°/min to 130 °C followed by second temperature ramp

30°C/min to 240 which was held for 10 min. Standards of (+)- and (−)-α-pinene and (+)- and (−)-

limonene were used for identification.

For nerolidol analysis, the headspace in the vial from the TPS assay was sampled using a

polydimethylsiloxane-coated solid-phase microextraction (SPME) fiber (red fiber, 100 μm; Supelco) for

the duration of incubation, followed by desorption in a split/splitless injector operated in splitless

mode. The instrument setup for this analysis was the same as for the monoterpene analysis, except

for the temperature program: 80 °C held for 1 min, followed by a ramp of 2 °C×min⁻¹ to 200 °C, which

was then held for 10 min. For quantitation of nerolidol enantiomers in WT and T152I mutant

NtGGPPS6, the peak area of (3*R*,6*E*)-nerolidol was divided by sum of peak areas of both enantiomers.

The difference in resulting ratios in wild type and mutant enzymes was tested by a two-tailed t-test.

Each experiment was done in triplicate.

**5.3 DNA and RNA isolation, library preparation, sequencing**

**5.3.1 DNA isolation and sequencing of *E. neotenicus***

High molecular weight DNA for Oxford Nanopore sequencing was isolated by organic extraction from

4 male and 8 female nymphs (whole bodies without digestive tube) of *E. neotenicus*. Deep-frozen tissue

samples were homogenized in 600 μL of lysis buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl, 400 mM NaCl, 100 mM EDTA,

1% SDS and 1 mg×mL⁻¹ Proteinase K, pH 8.0) with a PTFE pestle. After overnight incubation at 37 °C,

DNA was extracted from aqueous phase by two consecutive extractions with 650 μL

phenol:chloroform:isoamyl alcohol (25:24:1) and a reextraction with 600 µL chloroform:isoamyl

alcohol (24:1). Phases were separated by centrifugation (5 min, 14,000 g, 4 °C). The DNA was then

precipitated by addition of NaCl and ethanol to final concentration of 0.2 M and 70% respectively,

incubated for 1 hour at 4 °C, washed with 70% ethanol and resuspended in nuclease-free water. The

purity and quantity of isolated DNA was assessed with Nanodrop ND-1000 spectrophotometer and

Qubit 4 fluorometer using the dsDNA BR Assay Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific), the integrity was checked

on 0.5% agarose gel in TAE buffer. The samples were used for Oxford Nanopore sequencing analysis

on one PromethION flowcell at Novogene UK.

**5.3.2 RNA isolation and sequencing**

*E. neotenicus* kings, neotenic queens, soldiers, workers and female nymphs were sampled for RNA

isolation. Collected individuals were cold-anesthetized and dissected to remove the digestive tube and,

when appropriate, to sample distinct tissues (heads and thorax + abdomen). Samples were stored in

RNA later (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Samples were homogenized in TRI Reagent (Sigma-Aldrich) with

a PTFE pestle following the manufacturer's protocol. The precipitated RNA was resuspended in DEPC-

treated ddH$_2$O. RNA quality and quantity were inspected on Nanodrop ND-1000 UV/VIS

spectrophotometer, Qubit 4 fluorometer with the RNA HS Assay Kit (all Thermo Fisher Scientific), and

Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer using the RNA 6000 Nano Kit (Agilent Technologies). The samples were

shipped to Novogene UK, where non-stranded poly(A)-selected RNA library preparations and

sequencing analysis on Illumina NovaSeq platform with output of 20 million of 2×150 bp paired-end

reads were conducted.

**5.4 Bioinformatics and protein structure prediction**

**5.4.1 *E. neotenicus* draft genome assembly and annotation**

The quality of Oxford Nanopore sequencing data was evaluated using fastQC v0.12.1 and NanoPlot

v1.30.1, and residual sequencing adapters were removed using Porechop v0.2.4. Draft *E. neotenicus*

genome was assembled using Flye v2.9.4 [58] with 5 subsequent polishing iterations, and the

estimated genome size was 0.9 Gb, based on an in-house draft genome assembly of a related termite

species *Prorhinotermes simplex* [59]. High-quality Illumina RNA data were mapped to the newly

assembled draft genome with Segemehl aligner v0.3.4 [60] and used for an additional round of

assembly polishing with Pilon algorithm v1.24 [61]. In a final step, all contigs shorter than 1 kb were

removed, and assembly quality was evaluated with Quast v5.0.2 [62], BUSCO v5.4.4 using the

insecta_odb10 HMM library [63], and Merqury using Meryl v1.3 [64]. The final draft genome with a

total size of 1.38 Gb consisted of 4,512 polished scaffolds with an N50 of 3.2 Mb, and covered 99.4%

(97.4% single-copy, 2.0% duplicated, 0.4% fragmented, 0.2% missing) from a total of 1,367

benchmarking universal single-copy orthologs (BUSCO) [63] of insecta_odb10 lineage. The

identification of low-complexity genomic regions was performed using the EDTA pipeline v2.2.0 [65]

incorporating both RepeatModeler TE prediction and RepeatMasker for genome masking. The masked

genome was then used for annotation with BRAKER v3.0.8 gene prediction tool [66] using full RNA-seq

data from caste-specific transcriptomic analysis mapped with Segemehl and annotated genes from

published isopteran assemblies of *Zootermopsis nevadensis*, *Cryptotermes secundus*, and

*Reticulitermes speratus*. Gene annotation provided in total 26,292 gene models covering 92.8% insect

BUSCOs. The genome assembly statistics are summarized in Supplementary Table S1.

**5.4.2 Transcriptome assembly**

The *E. neotenicus* transcriptome was assembled *de novo* with RNA-seq data representing heads and

body cavities from kings, queens, workers, soldiers and female nymphs. The data were stripped of

artefacts using rCorrector [67] and Trimmomatic v0.32 [68], reads corresponding to ribosomal RNA

were filtered out based on mapping to the blacklist from SILVA database [69] using bowtie2 v2.3.4.1

algorithm [70]. The transcriptome was assembled using rnaSPAdes algorithm [71] and the assembly

quality was evaluated using rnaQUAST [72] and BUSCO [63]. Open reading frames (ORFs) with at least

100 amino acid residues in size were predicted using Transdecoder

(https://github.com/TransDecoder). The SPAdes assembly provided roughly 500,000 unfiltered

contigs, covering 98.3% of 1,367 insect BUSCO genes (28.4% single-copy, 69.9% duplicated, and 0.8%

fragmented). A similar approach was applied for the *de novo* assembly of *S. halumicus* transcriptome

from SRX6715957 data downloaded from NCBI SRA archive and for *de novo* assemblies of

transcriptomes of *Spinitermes trispinosus* and *Inquilinitermes inquilinus* from our in-house data

deposited at NCBI as SRA within the BioProject PRJNA918850.

**5.4.3 IDS gene discovery**

The prediction of *E. neotenicus* FPPS- and GGPPS-like sequences was carried out in a series of BLAST

searches [73] against transcriptome assembly and predicted ORFs using orthologous sequences of

three related species (*Z. nevadensis*, *C. secundus*, and *N. takasagoensis*) available in public

repositories. The same approach was used for *S. halumicus*, *S. trispinosus*, and *I. inquilinus*. Candidate

*E. neotenicus* transcript sequences were used for another round of BLAST searches in BRAKER-

annotated gene models. Manual annotation of GGPPS-like sequences was performed by a combination

of multiple local alignments in unmasked genome including transcripts that were found in

transcriptome assembly but not recognized in predicted gene models, and a detailed inspection of

exon junctions in RNA-seq data mapped on unmasked genome using IGV genomic viewer [74].

**5.4.4 *E. neotenicus* expression analysis**

Trimmed RNA-seq data from the heads and thoraces + abdomens of *E. neotenicus* nymphs and

neotenic queens were mapped to the annotated genome using STAR v2.7.10b aligner [75]. Read-count

matrices were generated with the featureCounts algorithm from rSubread package [76] and

normalized according to the TPM (Transcripts Per Kilobase Million) method. Differential gene

expression was inspected in pairwise analyses comparing castes and body parts using R packages

DESeq2 and edgeR [77,78].

**5.4.5 Transposable elements prediction in the genome of *E. neotenicus***

The prediction of low-complexity genomic regions and annotation of suspect transposable elements (TE) in GGPPS-like loci was performed using the EDTA pipeline first on a genome-wide level, later on a subset of 27 genomic contigs selected based on local alignments of protein-coding sequences of GGPPS-like genes and pseudogenes. Only contigs with full or partial overlaps showing homology over 80% and containing at least 2 consecutive exon-like regions were selected in the panel and used for a focused prediction of transposable elements in the second round of the EDTA pipeline.

**5.4.6 Phylogenetic analyses and prediction tools**

Publicly available sequences of FPPS and GGPPS homologs were retrieved from NCBI. Online blastp and tblastn searches of nr (non-redundant protein sequences) and TSA databases limited to Blattodea were run with *Z. nevadensis* FPPS and GGPPS amino acid sequences as queries (XP_021942300, XP_021933767). The same searches were also run with *Z. nevadensis* decaprenyl-diphosphate synthase subunit 1 as query (XP_021928794). Local blastp and tblastn searches were used for searching *R. speratus* datasets deposited at figshare [28], our in-house datasets from *E. neotenicus*, *S. trispinosus*, and *I. inquilinus*, and the in-house assembled transcriptome from *S. halumicus*. For phylogenetic analyses, amino acid sequences with a minimum length of 150 amino acids and comprising both FARM and SARM motifs were selected. Unless otherwise stated, sequence alignment was performed using Clustal Omega [79] run from SeaView (v4.7) [80], and the resulting alignments were inspected and trimmed manually in AliView [81]. Phylogenetic trees were reconstructed with IQ-TREE 2 [82] using the ModelFinder option and setting the bootstrap replicate number to 1,000 unless stated otherwise.

We used MEME [83] (v5.5.7) to detect insect-specific GGPPS motifs (IGMs) in a dataset comprising functionally characterized insect GGPPSs, several single-copy GGPPSs from a diverse selection of insect lineages, and Blattodean sequences from the ancestral GGPPS clade. Regular expressions were generated for the motifs and their boundaries were set as defined for IPP-binding motifs (IBM) by

Rebholz et al. [34]. The presence or absence of GGPPS and GGPPS-like sequences in individual termite

species was determined based on a phylogeny for sequences ≥ 150 amino acids that included FARM

and SARM motifs. In species with shorter sequences and/or not comprising FARM and SARM motifs,

we used the motifs previously identified as characteristic for insect GGPPSs to distinguish between

GGPPS and GGPPS-like sequences.

Putative MTSs were predicted with MitoFates [84] in newly reported genes from *E. neotenicus*. In

addition, we checked the completeness of annotated ORFs in publicly available *N. takasagoensis*

GGPPS and GGPPS-like mRNA sequences. In two cases (NtGGPPS1B, NtGGPPS3B), we applied MTS

predictions to putative proteins coded by ORFs starting with upstream ATG codons not considered in

the published annotation. In two other cases (NtGGPPS2B, NtGGPPS4), the ORF was found to be

positioned at the very beginning of the transcript. Therefore, it was impossible to assess the

completeness of these ORFs and to consider MTS prediction relevant for these proteins.

All modelled sequences were trimmed based on alignment with *Homo sapiens* GGPPS sequence

(UniProt accession O95749) and were modelled as a single subunit with three $Mg^{2+}$ ions, although it

can be assumed that *in vivo*, the enzymes exist as dimers or hexamers [85]. Structure models for EneoC,

EneoE, NtGGPPS6, and for the ancestral sequence at node 2 were generated using Alphafold 3.0

provided by e-INFRA project. The GGPP substrate was included in models of NtGGPPS6, EneoE, and

the node 2, the FPP substrate in case of EneoC. NtGGPPS7 and EneoJ were modelled by homology-

based modelling using modeller 10.6 software [86] with structure of *Homo sapiens* GGPPS (PDB Entry

2Q80) as a template. The active site cavity was identified and highlighted using KVfinder-web [87]

implementing parKVFinder v 1.2.0 [88]. We probed whole structures with probe size in 1.4 Å and probe

size out 4 Å. Structures were aligned and processed using UCSF ChimeraX 1.6.1 [89].

**5.5 Quantitative proteomics**

Heads and thoraces + abdomens (with digestive tubes removed) from four nymphs and four neotenic

queens of *E. neotenicus* were subjected to label-free quantitative (LFQ) mass spectrometry (MS)

analysis. Each sample was homogenized in 500 μL of homogenization buffer consisting of 100 mM

triethylammonium bicarbonate buffer (TEAB; Sigma-Aldrich) and 2% sodium deoxycholate (SDC;

Sigma-Aldrich) in a 1.5-mL Eppendorf tube using FastPrep-24 homogenizer (MP Biomedicals). The

homogenate was centrifuged to remove cell debris and the supernatant was used for analysis. Further

sample processing and MS analysis were performed as previously described [90]. Briefly, protein

concentration was determined using a BCA protein assay kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Cysteines were

reduced with Tris(2-carboxyethyl) phosphine hydrochloride and blocked with methyl

methanethiosulfonate. The samples were digested with porcine trypsin. Then, the samples were

acidified with trifluoroacetic acid to a final concentration of 1%. SDC was removed by extraction with

ethylacetate and subsequently with hexane. Peptides were desalted using a Michrom C18 column.

Dried peptides were resuspended in 25 μL of water containing 2% acetonitrile and 0.1% trifluoroacetic

acid. Peptides were separated by nanoliquid chromatography (nanoLC) on a Dionex Ultimate 3000

system and analyzed on an Orbitrap Fusion Tribrid mass spectrometer (both Thermo Fisher Scientific).

The data were evaluated with MaxQuant version 2.2.0.0 using LFQ algorithms [91,92] and the

Andromeda search engine [93]. The key criteria used in the data analysis were a false discovery rate

(FDR) of 0.01 for proteins and peptides, a minimum length of seven amino acids, a fixed modification

(methylthio), and variable modifications of N-terminal protein acetylation and methionine oxidation.

The data were locally evaluated against selected databases of nonredundant protein sequences that

were downloaded from NCBI on February 13, 2023. The in-house database of *E. neotenicus* protein

sequences was based on protein models generated by BRAKER (see *E. neotenicus* draft genome

assembly and annotation) complemented by a set of manually annotated IDS genes. The local database

is available along with the raw data and result files in the PRIDE repository of the ProteomeXchange

Consortium (see Data availability). The data were processed in Perseus version 2.0.7.0 [94]. Results

representing standard contaminants, reverse sequences (decoys), and sequences identified only with

modified peptides were discarded. The dataset containing proteins with at least two valid LFQ values

in at least one experimental group was further analyzed. The dataset was $\log_2$ transformed. Missing

LFQ values were replaced from the normal distribution (width 0.3; downshift 1.8) and histograms

before and after the data imputation were examined. A heatmap with hierarchical clustering was used

to check the uniformity of the sample proteomes between the two subgroups. Significant differences

were determined by a permutation-based two-sided t-test with an error-corrected p-value (FDR = 0.05;

S0 = 0.1). The number of randomizations in the analysis was 1,000.

**5.6 Heterologous expression**

Coding sequences of candidate TPS and IDS proteins were codon-optimized for expression in

*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, synthesized, and cloned into MCS-1 of pESC-URA by Genscript. The resulting

plasmids coded for recombinant proteins with N-terminal FLAG-tag and were used for expression in

*S. cerevisiae*. For expression of recombinant proteins with N-terminal hexahistidine tag in *Escherichia*

*coli*, the coding sequences were recloned in MCS-1 of pRSFDuet-1 (Novagen). Proteins in which

mitochondrial targeting peptides were predicted by MitoFates were expressed in the presumed

cleaved form. Amino acid sequences of all expressed proteins are listed in Supplementary Table S13.

**5.6.1 Expression in *S. cerevisiae* and metabolite detection**

The JWY501 strain of *S. cerevisiae* was used for all yeast experiments [95]. Prior to transformation, the

JWY501 strain was grown in a complete medium (YPD) containing 20 g×L$^{-1}$ Tryptone, 10 g×L$^{-1}$ Yeast

Extract (both from Duchefa Biochemie), and 20 g×L$^{-1}$ glucose. Selective media (SCE) used for cultivation

of transformed JWY501 contained 1.92 g×L$^{-1}$ Yeast Synthetic Drop-out Medium Supplements without

Uracil, 6.7 g×L$^{-1}$ Yeast Nitrogen Base without amino acids (both from Sigma-Aldrich), and 20 g×L$^{-1}$

glucose. Selective media used for expression had the same composition as SCE, except that 20 g×L$^{-1}$

galactose was used instead of glucose to induce expression of the gene of interest.

Yeast transformations were performed using the lithium acetate PEG method [96]. Shortly, cells were

pre-cultured overnight in YPD medium at 30 °C with shaking at 200 rpm. The following day, the

overnight culture was diluted to an optical density (OD600) of 0.1 in fresh YPD medium and grown at

30 °C with shaking at 200 rpm until reaching an OD600 of approximately 0.5. Cells were harvested by

centrifugation at 3,000g for 5 min, washed twice in 25 mL of sterile $H_2O$, and pelleted again under the

same conditions. The resulting cell pellet was resuspended in 1 mL of sterile water, centrifuged at

13,000g for 30 seconds, and resuspended in 1 mL of sterile water. For each transformation, 100 µL of

resuspended cells were mixed with 240 µL of 50% (w/v) PEG 3350, 36 µL of 1 M LiAc, 100 ng of plasmid

DNA, and 100 µg of denatured salmon sperm DNA (all from Sigma-Aldrich) resulting in a final volume

of 460 µL. The transformation mixture was gently mixed, incubated at 42 °C for 40 min, and centrifuged

at 13,000g for 30 s. Cells were washed with sterile water, plated onto a selective agar medium, and

incubated at 30 °C for 3–5 days to allow for colony formation.

Cells carrying the plasmid of interest were pre-cultured in a selective medium (YNB - URA + 2% glucose)

for 1 day at 30 °C with shaking at 200 rpm. The following day, the culture was diluted to an initial

optical density (OD600) of 0.3 in fresh selective medium and grown at 30 °C with shaking until the

OD600 reached approximately 1. At this point, cells were harvested by centrifugation, resuspended in

YNB - URA + 2% galactose, and incubated to induce expression of the gene of interest. Cultures were

sampled and extracted with hexane either on day 1 after induction (1 mL sample + 1 mL hexane) or on

day 7 after induction (100 µL sample + 1 mL hexane). The organic phase was analyzed by GC×GC-MS.

A 1 µL aliquot of hexane yeast extract was analyzed using an Agilent comprehensive gas

chromatograph equipped with a secondary oven and a quad-jet thermal modulator, coupled with a

LECO Pegasus 4D Time-of-Flight (TOF) mass spectrometer. The injection was performed using a

split/splitless injector in splitless mode, with the injector temperature set to 250 °C. A 10 °C offset was

used for the secondary oven and a  10 °C offset relative to the secondary oven was used for the

modulator. The primary column used was ZB-5MS (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm), and the secondary

column was Rxi-17Sil (1.980 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm). Helium was used as the carrier gas, with a flow

rate of 1 mL×min$^{-1}$. The temperature program started at 50 °C, held for 1 min, then ramped at 8 °C×min$^{-1}$

to 320 °C and was held for 5 min. The transfer line temperature was set to 260 °C. The electron

ionization (EI) ion source operated at 70 eV, with the ion source temperature maintained at 220 °C. A

solvent delay of 400 s was applied.

**5.6.2 Expression in *E. coli* and protein purification**

For protein purification, pRSFDuet-1 plasmids were used for transformation of *E. coli* Lemo21(DE3).

Bacteria were grown in 2.5 L Tunair baffled shake flasks (IBI Scientific) filled with 0.4 L auto-induction

medium, composed of 15 g×L$^{-1}$ yeast extract, 10 g×L$^{-1}$ peptone, 10 g×L$^{-1}$ glycerol, 2 g×L$^{-1}$ D-lactose,

0.5 g×L$^{-1}$ D-glucose, 100 mM KH$_2$PO$_4$, pH 7.5, 50 mM NaCl, 25 mM (NH$_4$)$_2$SO$_4$ and 3 mM MgSO$_4$. The

culture (starting OD600 ~ 0.01, total culture volume 2–2.4 L) was supplemented with 30 mg×L$^{-1}$

kanamycin, 30 mg×L$^{-1}$ chloramphenicol and 0.1 mM L-rhamnose, and a drop of Antifoam A concentrate

(Merck) was added to each flask. Cultures were shaken for 6 hours at 37 °C, 250 RPM (capped with

aluminium foil lids), and further for 16–20 hours at 17 °C (capped with cellulose paper tissues). The

cells were harvested by centrifugation and stored at -80 °C.

After thawing, the cells were suspended with 10 volumes of lysis buffer (100 g×L$^{-1}$ glycerol, 0.3 M NaCl,

50 mM KH$_2$PO$_4$, pH 6.7, 10 mM imidazole, 2 mM MgSO$_4$) using a tissue homogenizer. The suspension

was supplemented with 0.5 mg×mL$^{-1}$ chicken egg lysozyme, 2,000 KU×L$^{-1}$ DNase I (Merck), and 1 mM

PMSF and incubated while rolling. After 1 hour, 10 mM β-mercaptoethanol (ME) was added and

incubation while rolling continued for another 2 hours at 4 °C. Cells were broken by four passages

through Avestin Emulsiflex C3 and the resulting crude lysate was clarified by consecutive

centrifugations (30,000g, 5 and 10 min). The supernatant was filtered through 0.6 μm pore glass filter

and pump-loaded at 5 mL×min$^{-1}$ onto HisTrap Fast Flow 5 mL column (Cytiva) using ÄKTA start or ÄKTA

pure chromatograph (Cytiva). The column was subsequently washed with 250 mL of lysis buffer with

5 mM ME and the protein was eluted by a four-step gradient of 10% elution buffer (EB; i.e. lysis buffer

with 5 mM ME and 500 mM imidazole), 20% EB, 30% EB, and 100% EB. Protein concentration was

estimated using a calculated extinction coefficient at 280 nm.

**5.7 TPS and IDS *in vitro* assays**

For enzyme activity assays, the reaction mixture in a 2 mL glass vial consisted of 50 µM substrate and roughly 5 µM recombinant protein in 10 mM 3-(N-morpholino)propanesulfonic acid (MOPS), 5 mM $MgCl_2$, 1 mM dithiothreitol, 10% glycerol, pH 7.0, in a final volume of 100 µL. The substrates used in TPS assays were GPP, (*E,E*)-FPP, or (*E,E,E*)-GGPP (Merck or Cayman Chemicals). For IDS assays, the substrates included a mixture of 50 µM IPP with 50 µM DMAPP, GPP, or (*E,E*)-FPP (Merck or Cayman Chemicals). The reactions were incubated at 30 °C for 1 hour. In TPS assays, the headspace in the vial was sampled by a polydimethylsiloxane-coated SPME fiber for the duration of incubation (red fiber, 100 µm; Supelco).

The fiber containing the sample was desorbed and analyzed using a TRACE 1310 gas chromatograph coupled to an ISQ LT quadrupole mass spectrometer. An SPME liner was used in the inlet, with the desorption temperature set to 250 °C. The fiber was desorbed in the inlet for 5 min to ensure complete sample desorption. The GC and MS methods were identical to those described previously.

Isoprenoid pyrophosphates were analyzed using a Vanquish Horizon HPLC system coupled with an Orbitrap ID-X mass spectrometer. The separation was performed on an ACCUCORE VANQUISH C18+ column (1.5 µm, 150 × 2.1 mm). As mobile phase A, 10 mM ammonium bicarbonate with 0.1% ammonium hydroxide was used. Acetonitrile with 0.1% ammonium hydroxide was used as mobile phase B. The column flow rate was set to 0.35 mL×min$^{-1}$. The system was equilibrated with 95% mobile phase A and 5% mobile phase B before the chromatographic run. The gradient was programmed as follows: 5% B for the first 5 min, ramp to 100% B over 5.5 min, 100% B held for 7.3 min. The column temperature was maintained at 40 °C throughout the analysis. Electrospray ionization (ESI) in negative mode was used with an ionization voltage of -3,000 V applied from 0.2 min. The gas settings were as follows: Sheath gas, 50 Arb; Auxiliary gas, 10 Arb; Sweep gas, 1 Arb. Additional parameters included an ion transfer tube temperature of 325 °C and a vaporizer temperature of 350 °C.

**5.8 Selection analysis and ancestral sequence reconstruction**

To investigate the role of selection pressures in the evolution of terpene synthase genes in termites from canonical GGPPS progenitors, we utilized the packages HyPhy (v2.5.29) and PAML (v4.10.7) to perform selection analysis [97,98]. Full-length GGPPS and GGPPS-like coding sequences from termites were selected from both terpene-releasing Neoisoptera and early branching termite clades without terpenoid production. To generate a tree for a selection analysis and ancestral sequence reconstruction, translated coding sequences were first aligned using ClustalOmega (v1.2.3) [79] under default parameters and trimmed using Trimal (v1.5) with a gap threshold of 0.5. The alignment was used to infer a maximum likelihood protein phylogeny with IQTree2 (UFboot x1000) using the substitution model JTT+F+I+G4 selected by ModelFinder and the singleton GGPPS of the cockroach *Blatella germanica* as an outgroup. To generate a codon alignment, nucleotide coding sequences were aligned using ClustalOmega (v1.2.3) implemented in the Translation Align function of Geneious software. To test for clade-wide differences in the selection regimes acting on canonical GGPPS and the expanded GGPPS-like gene family, an analysis was conducted using HyPhy RELAX [99]. Termite canonical GGPPS clades were designated as the reference branches and the GGPPS-like clade containing TPSs characterized in this study as the test branches. dN/dS ratios ($\omega$) of specific branches were estimated and changes in selection between test and reference branches were tested by fitting a selection intensity parameter (k) to the data. Statistical evidence for a change in selection intensity in the test branches was then detected by comparison of the likelihood of the fitted k to the that of a null model in which no change in selection intensity has occurred (k = 1). To test for evidence of episodic diversifying selection in the evolution of the termite GGPPS-like gene family, an analysis was conducted using HyPhy aBSREL [100] implemented in the HyPhy package testing all branches in the GGPPS-like clade. Branches predicted to be under positive diversifying selection using HyPhy aBSREL were again tested for positive selection using branch-site tests implemented using the CODEML program from PAML [98], where the likelihoods of three-ratio foreground models (allowing positive selection on a proportion of sites on the foreground branches) were tested against the likelihood of

tree-wide two-ratio null models (no positive selection). The Bayes Empirical Bayes method was also

employed in branch-site tests to predict codons under positive selection pressure on different

foreground branches. Significance for all selection analysis was assessed using Holm-Bonferroni

corrected p-values with a significance threshold of 0.05.

Ancestral termite TPS sequences were reconstructed in PAML, using the above phylogeny and codon

alignment as input. A stretch of 7 amino acids (LLNQTDI) was found to be present in all ancestral

sequences across the tree, obviously reflecting an EneoO-specific insertion which did not occur in any

other extant sequence. Therefore, we omitted these amino acids from ancestral sequences which are

presented in Supplementary Table S11. Accordingly, the ancestral sequence B used for modelling the

protein structure lacks this insertion.

**6. Data availability**

*E. neotenicus* genomic data (draft genome assembly fasta, *in silico* annotated gene and protein models,

annotation files) are deposited in the ASEP repository of the Czech Academy of Sciences (dataset ID

0640983, https://doi.org/10.57680/asep.0640983). Full gene sequences of *E. neotenicus* FPPSs and

GGPPSs are available in NCBI GenBank records PX512703-19. The transcriptomes of *I. inquilinus* and

*S. trispinosus* are provided as NCBI TSA files under GenBank IDs GKIC00000000.1 and GLKH00000000.1.

Caste-specific RNA-seq data used for differential gene expression analysis and GGPPS expression

profiling in *E. neotenicus* are available as NCBI SRR archives (Biosamples SAMN53173298-

SAMN53173329). The MS proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium

via the PRIDE partner repository (dataset PXD070647). Supplementary tables list, among others,

sequences used in phylogenetic analyses and sequences of expressed proteins. Complete

chromatographic data are available on request from the corresponding authors.

**7. Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank the Keasling lab (Joint BioEnergy Institute, University of California, Berkeley) for providing the *S. cerevisiae* strain JWY501. We are grateful to Esra Kaymak (Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology, Japan) for assistance with samples of *N. takasagoensis*, and to former IOCB interns Nanyun Zhang and Guillame Masson for participation in experiments.

**8. Conflict of interests**

The authors declare no competing interests.

**9. References**

1. Gössinger E. Chemistry of the secondary metabolites of termites. Prog Chem Org Nat Prod. 2019; 109: 1-384.

2. Šobotník J, Jirošová A, Hanus R. Chemical warfare in termites. J Insect Physiol., 2010; 56: 1012-1021.

3. Noirot, CH. Glands and secretions. In Krishna K, Weesner FM, editors. Biology of termites. New York: Academic Press; 1969. pp 89-123.

4. Costa-Leonardo AM, da Silva IB, Laranjo LT. Termite exocrine systems: a review of current knowledge. Entomol Exp Appl. 2023; 171: 325-342.

5. Stökl J, Steiger S. Evolutionary origin of insect pheromones. Curr Opin Insect Sci. 2017; 24: 36-42.

6. Dolejšová K, Krasulová J, Kutalová K, Hanus R. Chemical alarm in the termite *Termitogeton planus* (Rhinotermitidae). J Chem Ecol. 2014; 40: 1269-1276.

7. Šobotník J, Hanus R, Kalinová B, Piskorski R, Cvačka J, Bourguignon T, Roisin Y. (*E*,*E*)-α-farnesene, an alarm pheromone of the *termite Prorhinotermes canalifrons*. J Chem Ecol. 2008; 34: 478-486.

8. Bordereau C, Pasteels JM. Pheromones and chemical ecology of dispersal and foraging in termites. In: Bignell D, Roisin Y, Lo N, editors. Biology of termites: A modern synthesis. Dordrecht: Springer; 2010. pp. 279-320.

9. Dolejšová K, Křivánek J, Štáfková J, Horáček N, Havlíčková J, Roy V., et al. Identification of a queen primer pheromone in higher termites. Commun Biol. 2022; 5: 1165.

10. Thakur H , Agarwal S, Buček A, Hradecký J, Sehadová H, Mathur V, et al. Defensive glands in Stylotermitidae (Blattodea, Isoptera). Arthropod Struct Dev. 2024; 79: 101346.

11. Ashour M, Wink M, Gershenzon J. Biochemistry of terpenoids: Monoterpenes, sesquiterpenes
and diterpenes. In: Wink M, editor. Biochemistry of plant secondary metabolism. Wiley Blackwell;
2010. pp. 258-303.

12. Weitzel C, Simonsen HT. Cytochrome P450-enzymes involved in the biosynthesis of mono- and
sesquiterpenes. Phytochem Rev. 2015; 14: 7-24.

13. Jiang SY, Jin J, Sarojam R, Ramachandran S. A comprehensive survey on the terpene synthase gene
family provides new insight into its evolutionary patterns. Genome Biol Evol. 2019; 11: 2078-2098.

14. Chen X, Urban JM, Wurlitzer J, Wei X, Han J, O'Connor SE, et al. Canonical terpene synthases in
arthropods: Intraphylum gene transfer. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2024; 121: e2413007121.

15. Köllner TG, David A, Luck K, Beran F, Kunert G, Zhou JJ, et al. Biosynthesis of iridoid sex
pheromones in aphids. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA, 2022; 119: e2211254119.

16. Ludwiczuk A, Skalicka-Woźniak K, Georgiev MI. Pharmacognosy: Fundamentals, applications and
strategy. In: Heinrich M, Sticher O, editors. Pharmacognosy: Fundamentals, applications and
strategy. Amsterdam: Elsevier Inc.; 2017. pp. 233-266.

17. Tholl D, Rebholz Z, Morozov AV, O'Maille PE. Terpene synthases and pathways in animals:
enzymology and structural evolution in the biosynthesis of volatile infochemicals. Nat Prod Rep.
2023; 40: 766793.

18. Beran F, Rahfeld P, Luck K, Nagel R, Vogel H, Wielsch N, et al. Novel family of terpene synthases
evolved from trans-isoprenyl diphosphate synthases in a flea beetle. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2016;
113: 2922-2927.

19. Ducker C, Baines C, Guy J, Euzébio Goulart Santana A, Pickett JA, Oldham NJ, et al. A diterpene
synthase from the sandfly *Lutzomyia longipalpis* produces the pheromone sobralene. Proc Natl
Acad Sci USA. 2024; 121: e2322453121.

20. Gilg AB, Tittiger C., Blomquist GJ. Unique animal prenyltransferase with monoterpene synthase
activity. Naturwissenschaften. 2009; 96: 731-735.

21. Lancaster J, Lehner B, Khrimian A, Muchlinski A, Luck K, Köllner TG, et al. An IDS-Type
sesquiterpene synthase produces the pheromone precursor (*Z*)-α-bisabolene in *Nezara viridula*. J
Chem Ecol. 2019; 45: 187-197.

22. Lancaster J, Khrimian A, Young S, Lehner B, Luck K, Wallingford A, et al. De novo formation of an
aggregation pheromone precursor by an isoprenyl diphosphate synthase-related terpene
synthase in the harlequin bug. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2018; 115: E8634-E8641.

23. Rebholz Z, Lancaster J, Larose H, Khrimian A, Luck K, Sparks ME, *et al.* Ancient origin and conserved
gene function in terpene pheromone and defense evolution of stink bugs and hemipteran insects.
Insect Biochem Mol Biol. 2022; 32: 103879.

24. Darragh K, Orteu A, Black D, Byers KJRP, Szczerbowski D, Warren IA, et al. A novel terpene
synthase controls differences in anti-aphrodisiac pheromone production between closely related
*Heliconius* butterflies. PLoS Biol. 2021; 19: e3001022.

25. Zhou Y, Liu X, Yang Z. Characterization of terpene synthase from tea green leafhopper being
involved in formation of geraniol in tea (*Camellia sinensis*) leaves and potential effect of geraniol
on insect-derived endobacteria. Biomolecules. 2019; 9: 808.

26.   Prestwich GD, Jones RW, Collins MS. Terpene biosynthesis by nasute termite soldiers (Isoptera:
Nasutitermitinae). Insect Biochem. 1981; 11: 331-336.

27.   Hojo M, Shigenobu S, Maekawa K, Miura T, Tokuda G. Duplication and soldier-specific expression
of geranylgeranyl diphosphate synthase genes in a nasute termite *Nasutitermes takasagoensis*.
Insect Biochem Mol Biol. 2019; 111: 103177.

28.   Shigenobu S, Hayashi Y, Watanabe D, Tokuda G, Hojo MY, Toga K, et al. Genomic and
transcriptomic analyses of the subterranean termite *Reticulitermes speratus*: Gene duplication
facilitates social evolution. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2022; 119: e2110361119.

29.   Prestwich GD, Vrkoč J. Standard nomenclature for termite diterpenes. Sociobiology. 1979; 4: 139-
140.

30.   Ashby MN, Edwards PA. Elucidation of the deficiency in two yeast coenzyme Q mutants.
Characterization of the structural gene encoding hexaprenyl pyrophosphate synthetase. J Biol
Chem. 1990; 265: 13157-13164.

31.   Tarshis LC, Sacchettini JC, Yan M, Poulter CD. Crystal structure of recombinant farnesyl
diphosphate synthase at 2.6-Å resolution. Biochemistry. 1994; 33: 10871-10877.

32.   Hellemans S, Rocha MM, Wang ML, Arias JR, Aanen DK, Bagneres AG, et al. Genomic data provide
insights into the classification of extant termites. Nat Commun. 2024; 15: 6724.

33.   Wells JN, Feschotte C. A field guide to eukaryotic transposable elements. Annu Rev Genet. 2020;
54: 539-561.

34.   Rebholz Z, Shewade L, Kaler K, Larose H, Schubot F, Tholl D, et al. Emergence of terpene chemical
communication in insects: Evolutionary recruitment of isoprenoid metabolism. Protein Sci. 2023;
32: e4634.

35.   Wei G, Eberl F, Chen X, Zhang C, Unsicker SB, Köllner TG, et al. Evolution of isoprenyl diphosphate
synthase-like terpene synthases in fungi. Sci Rep. 2020; 10: 14944.

36.   Lesburg CA, Zhai G, Cane DE, Christianson DW. Crystal structure of pentalenene synthase:
Mechanistic insights on terpenoid cyclization reactions in biology. Science. 1997; 277: 1820-1824.

37.   Buček A, Šobotník J, He S, Shi M, McMahon DP, Holmes EC, et al. Evolution of termite symbiosis
informed by transcriptome-based phylogenies. Curr Biol. 2019; 29: 3728-3734.e4.

38.   Gadagkar R. The evolution of caste polymorphism in social insects genetic release followed by
diversifying evolution. J Genet. 1997; 76: 167-179.

39.   Korb J. Genes underlying reproductive division of labor in termites, with comparisons to social
Hymenoptera. Front Ecol Evol. 2016; 4: 182024.

40.   Chau LM, Goodisman MAD. Gene duplication and the evolution of phenotypic diversity in insect
societies. Evolution. 2017; 71: 2871-2884.

41.   Fujiwara K, Oka T, Ashihara R, Miyazaki S, Toyoda A, Lo N, et al. Genomic features underlying the
origin of sociality and the diversification of caste systems in termites. Mol Biol Evol. 2025; 42:
msaf284.

42. Corona M, Libbrecht R, Wurm Y, Riba-Grognuz O, Studer RA, Keller L. Vitellogenin underwent
subfunctionalization to acquire caste and behavioral specific expression in the Harvester Ant
*Pogonomyrmex barbatus*. PLoS Genet. 2013; 9: e1003730.

43. Zhou X, Rokas A, Berger SL, Liebig J, Ray A, Zwiebel LJ. Chemoreceptor evolution in Hymenoptera
and its implications for the evolution of eusociality. Genome Biol Evol. 2015; 7: 2407-2416.

44. McKenzie SK, Fetter-Pruneda I, Ruta V., Kronauer DJC. Transcriptomics and neuroanatomy of the
clonal raider ant implicate an expanded clade of odorant receptors in chemical communication.
Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2016; 113: 14091-14096.

45. Smýkal V, Pivarči M, Provazník J, Bazalová O, Jedlička P, Lukšan O, et al. Complex evolution of
insect insulin receptors and homologous decoy receptors, and functional significance of their
multiplicity. Mol Biol Evol. 2020; 37: 1775-1789.

46. Cerbin S, Jiang N. Duplication of host genes by transposable elements. Curr Opin Genet Dev. 2018;
49: 63-69.

47. Conart C, Saclier N, Foucher F, Goubert C, Rius-Bony A, Paramita SN, et al. Duplication and
specialization of NUDX1 in Rosaceae led to geraniol production in rose petals. Mol Biol Evol. 2022;
39: msac002.

48. Schnee C, Köllner TG, Gershenzon J, Degenhardt J. The maize gene terpene synthase 1 encodes a
sesquiterpene synthase catalyzing the formation of (*E*)-β-farnesene, (*E*)-nerolidol, and (*E*,*E*)-
farnesol after herbivore damage. Plant Physiol. 2002; 130: 2049-2060.

49. Barbar A, Couture M, Sen SE, Béliveau C, Nisole A, Bipfubusa M, et al. Cloning, expression and
characterization of an insect geranylgeranyl diphosphate synthase from *Choristoneura*
*fumiferana*. Insect Biochem Mol Biol. 2013; 43: 947-958.

50. Frick S, Nagel R, Schmidt A, Bodemann RR, Rahfeld P, Pauls G, et al. Metal ions control product
specificity of isoprenyl diphosphate synthases in the insect terpenoid pathway. Proc Natl Acad Sci
USA. 2013; 110: 4194-4199.

51. Ducker C, French S, Pathak M, Taylor H, Sainter A, Askem W, et al. Characterisation of
geranylgeranyl diphosphate synthase from the sandfly *Lutzomyia longipalpis*. Insect Biochem Mol
Biol. 2023; 161: 104001.

52. Chen H, Li G, Köllner TG, Jia Q, Gershenzon J, Chen F. Positive Darwinian selection is a driving force
for the diversification of terpenoid biosynthesis in the genus *Oryza*. BMC Plant Biol. 2014; 14: 1-
12.

53. Chaw SM, Liu YC, Wu YW, Wang HY, Lin CYI, Wu CS, et al. Stout camphor tree genome fills gaps in
understanding of flowering plant genome evolution. Nat Plants. 2019; 5: 63-73.

54. Han X, Zhang J, Han S, Chong SL, Meng G, Song M, et al. The chromosome-scale genome of *Phoebe*
*bournei* reveals contrasting fates of terpene synthase (TPS)-a and TPS-b subfamilies. Plant
Commun. 2022; 3: 100410.

55. Ohnuma SI, Hirooka K, Ohto C, Nishino T. Conversion from archaeal geranylgeranyl diphosphate
synthase to farnesyl diphosphate synthase: Two amino acids before the first aspartate-rich motif
solely determine eukaryotic farnesyl diphosphate synthase activity. J Biol Chem. 1997; 272: 5192-
5198.

56. Zhang H, Li Z-X. A type-III insect geranylgeranyl diphosphate synthase with a novel catalytic
property. Protein Pept Lett. 2014; 21: 615-623.

57. Havlíčková J, Dolejšová K, Tichý M, Vrkoslav V, Kalinová B, Kyjaková P, Hanus R. (3$R$,6$E$)-nerolidol,
a fertility-related volatile secreted by the queens of higher termites (Termitidae: Syntermitinae).
Z Naturforsch C J Biosci. 2019; 74: 251-264.

58. Kolmogorov M, Yuan J, Lin Y, Pevzner PA. Assembly of long, error-prone reads using repeat graphs.
Nat Biotechnol. 2019; 37: 540-546.

59. Koubová J, Pangrácová M, Jankásek M, Lukšan O, Jehlík T, Brabcová J, et al. Long-lived termite
kings and queens activate telomerase in somatic organs. Proc Biol Sci. 2021; 288: 20210511.

60. Otto C, Stadler PF, Hoffmann S. Lacking alignments? The next-generation sequencing mapper
segemehl revisited. Bioinformatics. 2014; 30: 1837-1843.

61. Walker BJ, Abeel T, Shea T, Priest M, Abouelliel A, Sakthikumar S, et al. Pilon: An integrated tool
for comprehensive microbial variant detection and genome assembly improvement. PLoS One.
2014; 9: e112963.

62. Gurevich A, Saveliev V, Vyahhi N, Tesler, G. QUAST: Quality assessment tool for genome
assemblies. Bioinformatics. 2013; 29: 1072-1075.

63. Seppey M, Manni M, Zdobnov EM. BUSCO: Assessing genome assembly and annotation
completeness. Methods Mol Biol.2019; 1962: 227-245.

64. Rhie A, Walenz BP, Koren S, Phillippy AM. Merqury: Reference-free quality, completeness, and
phasing assessment for genome assemblies. Genome Biol. 2020; 21: 245.

65. Su W, Ou S, Hufford MB, Peterson T. A tutorial of EDTA: Extensive de novo TE annotator. Methods
Mol Biol. 2021; 2250: 55-67.

66. Hoff KJ, Lomsadze A, Borodovsky M, Stanke M. Whole-Genome Annotation with BRAKER.
Methods Mol Biol. 2019; 1962: 65-95.

67. Song L, Florea L. Rcorrector: Efficient and accurate error correction for Illumina RNA-seq reads.
Gigascience. 2015; 4: 48.

68. Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Genome analysis Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
sequence data. Bioinformatics. 2014; 30: 2114-2120.

69. Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, et al. The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene
database project: Improved data processing and web-based tools. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013; 41:
D590-D596.

70. Langmead B, Salzberg SL. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. Nat Methods. 2012; 9: 357-
359.

71. Bushmanova E, Antipov D, Lapidus A, Prjibelski AD. RnaSPAdes: A de novo transcriptome
assembler and its application to RNA-Seq data. Gigascience. 2019; 8: giz100.

72. Bushmanova E, Antipov D, Lapidus A, Suvorov V, Prjibelski AD. rnaQUAST: A quality assessment
tool for de novo transcriptome assemblies. Bioinformatics. 2016; 32: 2210-2212.

73. Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. BLAST+:
Architecture and applications. BMC Bioinform. 2009; 10: 421.

74.  Robinson JT, Thorvaldsdóttir H, Winckler W, Guttman M, Lander ES, Getz G, Mesirov JP.
Integrative genomics viewer. Nat Biotechnol. 201; 29: 24-26.

75.  Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, et al. STAR: Ultrafast universal RNA-
seq aligner. Bioinformatics. 2013; 29: 15-21.

76.  Liao Y, Smyth GK, Shi W. The R package Rsubread is easier, faster, cheaper and better for
alignment and quantification of RNA sequencing reads. Nucleic Acids Res. 2019; 47: e47.

77.  Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK. edgeR: A Bioconductor package for differential expression
analysis of digital gene expression data. Bioinformatics. 2009; 26: 139-140.

78.  Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq
data with DESeq2. Genome Biol. 2014; 15: 550.

79.  Sievers F, Higgins DG. Clustal Omega for making accurate alignments of many protein sequences.
Prot Sci. 2018; 27: 135-145.

80.  Gouy M, Guindon S, Gascuel O. Sea view version 4: A multiplatform graphical user interface for
sequence alignment and phylogenetic tree building. Mol Biol Evol. 2010; 27: 221-224.

81.  Larsson A. AliView: a fast and lightweight alignment viewer and editor for large datasets.
Bioinformatics. 2014; 30: 3276-3278.

82.  Minh BQ, Schmidt HA, Chernomor O, Schrempf D, Woodhams MD, Von Haeseler A, et al. IQ-TREE
2: New models and efficient methods for phylogenetic inference in the genomic era. Mol Biol Evol.
2020; 37: 1530-1534.

83.  Bailey TL, Johnson J, Grant CE, Noble WS. The MEME Suite. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015; 43: W39-W49.

84.  Fukasawa Y, Tsuji J, Fu SC, Tomii K, Horton P, Imai K. MitoFates: Improved prediction of
mitochondrial targeting sequences and their cleavage sites. Mol Cell Proteom. 2015; 14: 1113-
1126.

85.  Kavanagh KL, Dunford JE, Bunkoczi G, Russell RGG, Oppermann U. The crystal structure of human
geranylgeranyl pyrophosphate synthase reveals a novel hexameric arrangement and inhibitory
product binding. J Biol Chem. 2006; 281: 22004-22012.

86.  Šali A, Blundell TL. Comparative protein modelling by satisfaction of spatial restraints. J Mol Biol.
1993; 234: 779-815.

87.  Guerra JVS, Ribeiro-Filho HV, Pereira JGC, Lopes-de-Oliveira PS. KVFinder-web: a web-based
application for detecting and characterizing biomolecular cavities. Nucleic Acids Res. 2023; 51:
W289-W297.

88.  Guerra JVS, Ribeiro Filho HV, Bortot LO, Honorato RV, de Carvalho Pereira JG, Lopes-de-Oliveira
PS. ParKVFinder: A thread-level parallel approach in biomolecular cavity detection. SoftwareX.
2020; 12: W289-W297.

89.  Meng EC, Goddard TD, Pettersen EF, Couch GS, Pearson ZJ, Morris JH, Ferrin TE. UCSF ChimeraX:
Tools for structure building and analysis. Protein Sci. 2023; 32: e4792.

90.  Štáfková J, Rada P, Meloni D, Žárský V, Smutná T, Zimmann N, et al. Dynamic secretome of
*Trichomonas vaginalis*: Case study of β-amylases. Mol Cell Proteom. 2018; 17: 304-320.

91. Cox J, Mann M. MaxQuant enables high peptide identification rates, individualized p.p.b.-range
mass accuracies and proteome-wide protein quantification. Nat Biotechnol. 2008; 26: 1367-1372.

92. Cox J, Hein MY, Luber CA, Paron I, Nagaraj N, Mann M. Accurate proteome-wide label-free
quantification by delayed normalization and maximal peptide ratio extraction, termed MaxLFQ.
Mol Cell Proteom. 2014; 13: 2513-2526.

93. Cox J, Neuhauser N, Michalski A, Scheltema RA, Olsen JV, Mann M. Andromeda: A peptide search
engine integrated into the MaxQuant environment. J Proteome Res. 2011; 10: 1794-1805.

94. Tyanova S, Temu T, Sinitcyn P, Carlson A, Hein MY, Geiger T, et al. The Perseus computational
platform for comprehensive analysis of (prote)omics data. Nat Methods. 2016; 13: 731-740.

95. Wong J, de Rond T, D'Espaux L, van der Horst C, Dev I, Rios-Solis L, et al. High-titer production of
lathyrane diterpenoids from sugar by engineered *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Metab Eng. 2018; 45:
142-148.

96. Gietz RD, Schiestl RH. High-efficiency yeast transformation using the LiAc/SS carrier DNA/PEG
method. Nat Protoc. 2007; 2: 31-34.

97. Kosakovsky Pond SL., Poon AFY, Velazquez R, Weaver S, Hepler NL, Murrell B, et al. HyPhy 2.5 - A
customizable platform for evolutionary hypothesis testing using phylogenies. Mol Biol Evol. 2020;
37: 295.

98. Álvarez-Carretero S, Kapli P, Yang Z. Beginner's guide on the use of PAML to detect positive
selection. Mol Biol Evol. 2023; 40: msad041.

99. Wertheim JO, Murrell B, Smith MD, Pond SLK, Scheffler K. RELAX: Detecting relaxed selection in a
phylogenetic framework. Mol Biol Evol. 2015; 32: 820-832.

100. Smith MD, Wertheim JO, Weaver S, Murrell B, Scheffler K, Kosakovsky Pond SL. Less is more: An
adaptive branch-site random effects model for efficient detection of episodic diversifying
selection. Mol Biol Evol.2015; 32: 1342-1353.

1140

1141

**Supplementary Fig. S1. Representative GC×GC chromatograms of body washes from**
**different *E. neotenicus* castes.** The chromatograms show a retention window where terpenoids
were detected. 1, β-farnesene; 2, α-farnesene; 3, (6*E*)-nerolidol; 4, unidentified diterpene; 5, β-
springene; 6, (*E,E,E*)-neocemberene, 7, unidentified diterpene. The chromatogram visualizes the
responses to diagnostic ions for mono-, sesqui- and diterpenes ($m/z = 68 + 69 + 93 + 204 + 272$).
Mass spectra of the identified terpenes are shown below in Supplementary Fig. S2.

1148

1149 **Supplementary Fig. S2. Mass spectra of the terpenes identified in the body washes of**
1150 **different *E. neotenicus* castes.** Compound numbering refers to that in Fig. 1 and Supplementary Fig.
1151 S1. For compound 7 (unidentified diterpene), we could not obtain a reliable mass spectrum.

1152

1153 **Supplementary Fig. S3. Representative GC chromatogram of body washes from**
1154 ***N. takasagoensis* soldiers and workers.** The chromatogram visualizes the responses to diagnostic

1155 ions for mono-, sesqui- and diterpenes ($m/z = 68 + 69 + 93 + 204 + 272$). Mass spectra and NMR
1156 spectra of the identified terpenes are shown below in Supplementary Figs S4–S8.

1157

**Supplementary Fig. S4. Identification of compound a from *N. takasagoensis* soldiers as**
**(+)-α-pinene**. **A.** Chiral chromatogram comparing the retention of compound **a** with standards of (-
) and (+)-α-pinene. GC-FID was equipped with cyclodextrin chiral column (HP CHIRAL β, 30m,
0.25mm, 0.25μm, 19091G-B233E). One μL of sample was injected in splitless mode following this
temperature program: 40 °C held for 20 minutes, ramped 1 °C/min to 100 °C, ramp at 30 °C/min to
240 °C, held for 20 minutes. **B.** Mass spectrum of compound **a**.

1164

1165 **Supplementary Fig. S5. Mass spectrum and chiral analysis of compound b from**
1166 ***N. takasagoensis* soldiers identified as (+)-limonene**.

1167

**Supplementary Fig. S6, part I. Identification of compound c from *N. takasagoensis* soldiers**
**as 14a-acetoxy-3b,12b-dipropionoxy-kampa-6(7),8(9)-diene. A.** Mass spectrum. **B.** Assigned
¹H and ¹³C NMR spectra.

**Supplementary Fig. S6, part II. Identification of compound c from *N. takasagoensis***
**soldiers as 14a-acetoxy-3b,12b-dipropionoxy-kampa-6(7),8(9)-diene. C.** ¹H NMR spectra. **D.**
APT NMR spectrum.

1174

**Supplementary Fig. S7, part I. Identification of compound d from *N. takasagoensis* soldiers**
**as 3α,9β,13α-tripropionoxy-trinervita-11(12),15(17)-diene**. **A.** Mass spectrum. **B.** Assigned ¹H
and ¹³C NMR spectra.

**Supplementary Fig. S7, part II. Identification of compound d from *N. takasagoensis***
**soldiers as 3α,9β,13α-tripropionoxy-trinervita-11(12),15(17)-diene**. **C.** ¹H NMR spectra. **D.**
APT NMR spectrum.

1181

**Supplementary Fig. S8, part I. Identification of compound e from *N. takasagoensis* soldiers**
**as 3α, 9β,13α-tripropionoxy-11α(12β)-epoxy-trinervita-15(17)-ene**. **A.** Mass spectrum. **B.**
Assigned ¹H and ¹³C NMR spectra.

**Supplementary Fig. S8, part II. Identification of compound e from *N. takasagoensis***
**soldiers as 3α, 9β,13α-tripropionoxy-11α(12β)-epoxy-trinervita-15(17)-ene**. **C.** ¹H NMR
spectra. **D.** APT NMR spectrum.

1188

**Supplementary Fig. S9. Phylogeny and function of FPPS homologs in termites**. **A.**
Phylogenetic tree inferred from amino acid sequences of FPPS homologs identified in Blattodea (five
termite and two cockroach species) and two other polyneopteran orders, Orthoptera and
Phasmatodea. The maximum likelihood tree was reconstructed with IQ-TREE 2 using JTT+G4 model;
bootstrap values (500 replicates) greater than 50 are shown as node support. Arrow marks the FPPS
duplication predating the diversification of Blattodea. Asterisks highlight the two paralogous sequences
EneoA and EneoB from *Embiratermes neotenicus* studied with respect to their function. Accession
numbers are provided in Supplementary Table S2. **B.** HPLC chromatogram demonstrating the IDS

activity of EneoB. The purified enzyme was incubated with isopentenyl pyrophosphate (IPP) and dimethylallyl pyrophosphate (DMAPP), IPP and geranyl pyrophosphate (GPP), or IPP and farnesyl pyrophosphate (FPP). Only the substrate combinations giving rise to any prenyl pyrophosphate products are shown. The chromatograms visualize the selected m/z 245.00, 313.06, 381.12, and 449.19. No TPS activity was recorded in EneoB and no TPS or IDS activity was observed in EneoA.

**Supplementary Fig. S10. Alignment of IDS catalytic motifs in FPPS and FPPS-like amino acid sequences.** Motif boundaries and sequence regular expressions are displayed as defined by Rebholz et al. (2023) for insect IDS sequences. Residues in consensus with the regular expression are shaded blue. Termite species are displayed in bold text. IBM, IPP-binding motif. FARM, first aspartate-rich motif. SARM, second aspartate-rich motif.

**Supplementary Fig. S11. Genomic landscape surrounding the *E. neotenicus* GGPPS-like genes and pseudogenes.** The figure shows gene organization of full or partial genomic contigs (boldfaced, starting with prefix ENC and contig size in brackets) represented by horizontal line with position coordinates at both sides. Exons are numbered and shown as black (genes), grey (pseudogenes) or red boxes (chimeric duplicates), regions corresponding to genes and pseudogenes are marked with black or grey arrows while regions masked by RepeatMasker at genome-wide scale are shown as pink boxes. Sequences homologous to CACTA TIR TE_00000081 DNA transposon predicted with the EDTA pipeline are marked with green arrows. Blue scale bar represents 5 kb.

**Supplementary Fig. S12. Maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree inferred from alignment of Blattodea GGPPS amino acid sequences.** The tree was reconstructed using IQ-TREE with the JTT+F+R4 substitution model; bootstrap values (1,000 replicates) greater than 50 are shown as node support. The tree was rooted with a dragonfly GGPPS sequence (*Ischnura elegans*). See Supplementary Table S5 for source sequences.

**Supplementary Fig. S13. Sequence conservation of the CACTA TIR DNA transposable element likely involved in GGPS-like gene multiplication in Neoisoptera. A.** Sequences corresponding to CACTA TIR TE_00000081 predicted with RepeatModeler (green) and homologous sequences found in the proximity of GGPPS-like genes and pseudogenes in *E. neotenicus* (yellow) are shown as arrows, conserved regions are represented by dark color. Red triangles above sequence diagrams represent indels relative to the CACTA TIR TE_00000081 reference. Orthologs from related species *N. takasagoensis* (Ntak) and *R. speratus* (Rspe) found by BLAST search against the complete NCBI nucleotide collection restricted to Blattodea are included. **B.** The sequence of CACTA TIR TE_00000081 predicted with RepeatModeler, latin numbers I-III are used to specify three regions with various levels of conservation.

**Supplementary Fig. S14. HPLC chromatograms demonstrating the IDS activity in canonical GGPPSs EneoJ (yellow) and NtGGPPS7 (green).** The purified enzymes were incubated with IPP and DMAPP, IPP and GPP, or IPP and FPP. The chromatograms visualize the selected m/z 245.00, 313.06, 381.12, and 449.19. The products resulting from IDS activity are underlined with black lines.

**Supplementary Fig. S15. Expression of IDS and IDS-like genes in *E. neotenicus* queens and nymphs at the level of transcript (A) and protein (B). A.** Differential expression analysis comparing transcript abundances of IDS and IDS-like genes in heads or thoraces and abdomens of neotenic queens and queen-destined 4$^{th}$ stage female nymphs. Mean log$_2$ TPM values represent three biological replicates, colors of connecting lines correspond to log$_2$ fold changes between the two castes. Only genes which showed significant regulation between the two castes in DESEq analysis are presented (padj < 0.05). Expression data for all IDS/IDS-like genes are listed in Supplementary Table S7. **B.** Quantitative proteomic analysis of IDS/IDS-like proteins in thoraces and abdomens of queen-destined 4$^{th}$ stage female nymphs and neotenic queens. Mean log$_2$ intensity values represent four biological replicates. Colors correspond to log$_2$ fold changes between the two castes. Only proteins which conform to the permutation-based FDR 0.05 are shown; points with no connecting lines represent proteins which were only detected in samples from queen thoraces and abdomens. Results of proteomic analysis for all IDS/IDS-like proteins from all tissues are listed in Supplementary Table S8.

**Supplementary Fig. S16. Screening of enzymatic activity of GGPPS-like enzymes from *N. takasagoensis*.** Sequences were expressed in *S. cerevisiae* strain JWY501. One mL of culture was extracted with 1mL of hexane and 1 μL aliquot of hexane extract was measured by comprehensive gas chromatography mass spectrometry. No specific products were detected in any of the strains apart from neocembrene (a) in the NtGGPPS6-expressing strain.

**Supplementary Fig. S17. Alignment of IDS catalytic motifs in GGPPS and GGPPS-like protein sequences.** Boundaries of motifs are displayed as defined by Rebholz et al. (2023). Insect GGPPS-specific regular expression for each motif was generated based on the canonical insect GGPPS sequences displayed in the alignment using MEME (v5.5.7). Residues in consensus with the regular expression are shaded blue. Termite species are printed in bold text, amino acid residues for confirmed TPS proteins are set in bold. MTS, presence or absence of a mitochondrial targeting peptide as predicted by MitoFates (v1.2). IGM, insect GGPPS motif. FARM, first aspartate-rich motif. SARM, second aspartate-rich motif.

**Table S1. General statistics of *E. neotenicus* draft genome assembly and in silico annotated gene models.**

**Table S2. Source of FPPS and FPPS-like sequences identified in Blattodea and polyneopteran outgroups.** Related to Fig. S9.

**Table S3. Source of GGPPS and GGPPS-like nucleotide sequences in selected termites and non-termite hexapod outgroups.** Related to Fig. 2.

**Table S4. *Stylotermes halumicus* GGPPS and GGPPS-like nucleotide sequences assembled de novo from the SRA data deposited as SRX6715957.** Related to Fig. 2.

**Table S5. Source of GGPPS and GGPPS-like sequences in selected termites and non-termite outgroups used for protein phylogeny.** Related to Supplementary Fig. 12.

**Table S6. Source of GGPPS and GGPPS-like sequences identified in 56 species of termites.** Related to Fig. 3.

**Table S7. Differential expression analysis on IDS and IDS-like genes in female nymphs and queens of *E. neotenicus*.** Related to Fig. S15.

**Table S8. Quantitative proteomics analysis on IDS and IDS-like proteins in female nymphs and queens of *E. neotenicus*.** Related to Fig. S15.

**Table S9. Source of GGPPS and GGPPS-like sequences used for the selection analysis.** Related to Fig. 5.

**Table S10. RELAX analysis of selection intensity in GGPPS and GGPPS-like clades.**

**Table S11. Reconstructed ancestral amino acid sequences at nodes 1, 2, and 3.** Related to Fig. 5.

**Table S12. Proportion of *R* and *S* enantiomers of (*6E*)-nerolidol upon incubation of wild type NtGGPPS6 and T152I mutant with FPP.** Related to Fig. 6.

**Table S13. Amino acid sequences of recombinant proteins.**

*Embiratermes neotenicus*

*Nasutitermes takasagoensis*

**A**

| | queen | king | nymph | soldier | worker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** β-farnesene | + | | | | |
| **2** α-farnesene | tr | | | | |
| **3** (3R,6E)-nerolidol | +++ | | | | |
| **4** unidentified diterpene | tr | | | | |
| **5** β-springene | tr | tr | tr | tr | tr |
| **6** (E,E,E)-neocembrene | ++ | tr | | | |
| **7** unidentified diterpene | tr | tr | tr | tr | tr |

**B**

| | soldier |
|---|---|
| **a** (+)-α-pinene | +++ |
| **b** limonene | + |
| **c** 14α-acetoxy-3β,12β-dipropionoxy-kampa-6(7),8(9)-diene | ++ |
| **d** 3α,9β,13α-tripropionoxy-trinervita-11(12),15(17)-diene | +++ |
| **e** 3α, 9β,13α-tripropionoxy-11α(12β)-epoxy-trinervita-15(17)-ene | ++ |

Scale: +++, >60%; ++, 30–60%; +, 1–30%; tr, <1% (relative to max. peak)

Figure 2

Figure 5

A

**I**

- B. germanica
- P. quadricollis — 96
- Z. nevadensis
- E. kempae
- C. secundus — 100
- K. flavicollis — 91
- N. castaneus — 94
- G. parvulus — 85
- R. speratus — 99
- A. banksi — 100
- Anoplotermes sp. — 100
- **EneoJ**
- Amitermes sp. — 84
- Hospitalitermes sp. — 81
- **NtGGPPS7** — 100

**II**

57 · 100 · 78 · 71 · 76 · 81 · 96 · 90 · 100 · 95 · 96 · 85 · 100 · 97 · 100 · 100 · 72 · 83 · 97

- R. speratus
- R. speratus
- R. speratus
- R. speratus
- R. speratus (2)
- R. speratus (3)
- R. speratus
- R. speratus
- R. speratus
- Hospitalitermes sp.
- Hospitalitermes sp.
- Amitermes sp.
- C. cavifrons
- **NtGGPPS6**
- **EneoC**
- S. trispinosus
- C. tuberosus
- (1)

**III**

86 · 95 · 100 · 99 · 80 · 94 · 100 · 90 · 100 · 99

- R. speratus
- Aparatermes sp.
- Aparatermes sp.
- S. trispinosus
- S. trispinosus
- NtGGPPS5
- EneoL
- EneoI4
- EneoH
- EneoI3
- EneoI2
- EneoI1

**IV**

100 · 100 · 100 · 100 · 100 · 100 · 97 · 87 · 94 · 80 · 88 · 99 · 95 · 60 · 95 · 100

- R. speratus
- A. banksi
- A. banksi
- NtGGPPS3
- NtGGPPS2
- C. cavifrons
- C. cavifrons
- C. cavifrons
- NtGGPPS4
- NtGGPPS1
- EneoQ
- EneoP
- C. pugnax
- EneoO
- EneoE
- EneoK
- EneoN
- EneoM

0.1

B

BEB scale
0.5 — 1

Q26, S59, S60, N90, P23, Q21

C

node 2 · NtGGPPS6

Q26/G26, G59, G60, S23, S59, S60, K21, N90/S90, Q21, P23

D

| | Protein | 21 | | IGM-1 | 24 | | 29 | | IGM-2 | 54 | | 61 | FARM | 64 | | 68 | IGM-3 | 70 | | 75 | | 90 | IGM-4 | 151 | | 157 | SARM | 184 | | 192 | IGM-5 | 200 | | 207 | IGM-6 | 291 | | 296 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **IDS** | EneoJ | Q V P | G K Q I R A | Q M L H N S S L | D D I E D | S I L R R G | N | K T G G L F M | F Q I R D D Y C N | E N K S Y C E D | L L S W K R |
| | NtGGPPS7 | Q V P | G K Q I R A | Q M L H N S S L | D D I Q D | S I L R R G | N | K T G G L F M | F Q I R D D Y C N | E N K S Y C E D | L L S W K R |
| | node 1 | Q V P | G K Q I R A | Q M L H N S S L | D D I Q D | S I L R R G | N | K T G A L F M | F Q I R D D Y C N | E D K G Y C E D | L L N W K R |
| | node 2 | Q V P | G K Q I R A | K M L H N S S L | D D I Q D | S I L R R G | N | K T G A A F M | F Q I R D D Y C N | Q D K S Y C E D | L L N W K K |
| | node 3 | K A S | G K G I R A | K M L H N G L | D D I Q D | S I L R R G | S | K T G A A F M | F Q I R D D Y C N | Q D K S Y C E D | L L N W K K |
| **TPS** | EneoC | K G S | T K G F R A | Q M I H V C I I | D D I Q D | S S L R R G | S | K I T G P I M | Y Q I R D D Y C N | Q K K G Y G E D | M L N W K R |
| | NtGGPPS6 | K A S | C V G I A | E I Y H V G G L | D D I Q D | S F M R R G | S | K T A G G F K | F Q I R D D Y C S | Q K K G Y L E D | M L N W K N |
| | BEB scale | | | | | | | | | | |