α-Phenylalanyl tRNA synthetase competes with Notch signaling through its N-terminal domain

Manh Tin Ho[1], Jiongming Lu[2], Paula Vazquez-Pianzola[1], Beat Suter[1]

Affiliations:

[1]Institute of Cell Biology, University of Bern, Baltzerstrasse 4, Bern 3012, Switzerland.

[2]Present address: Max Planck Institute for Biology of Ageing, 50931 Köln, Germany.

Corresponding author: beat.suter@izb.unibe.ch

Keywords: aminoacyl tRNA synthetase, Su(H), Notch signaling, JAK/STAT signaling, stem cell, differentiation, proliferation, intestinal tumor

Author contributions: T.H., J.L., and B.S. conceived the ideas and designed the experiments. P.V.P and B.S. provided repeatedly input into the project development and they and J.L. performed and evaluated some experiments. T.H. conducted most experiments and performed the analysis of the results. T.H., J.L., and B.S. wrote the manuscript.

Abstract

The alpha subunit of the cytoplasmic Phenylalanyl tRNA synthetase (α-PheRS, FARSA in humans) displays cell growth and proliferation activities and its elevated levels can induce cell fate changes and tumor-like phenotypes that do neither dependent on the canonical function of charging tRNA^{Phe} with phenylalanine nor on stimulating general translation. In intestinal stem cells of *Drosophila* midguts, α-PheRS levels are naturally slightly elevated and human *FARSA* mRNA levels are elevated in multiple cancers. In the *Drosophila* midgut model, elevated α-PheRS levels caused the accumulation of many additional proliferating cells resembling intestinal stem cells (ISCs) and enteroblasts (EBs). This phenotype resembles partially the tumor-like phenotype described as *Notch* RNAi phenotype for the same cells. Genetic interactions between *α-PheRS* and *Notch* suggest that their activities neutralize each other and that elevated α-PheRS levels attenuate Notch signaling whether Notch induces differentiation into enterocytes, neuroblast stem cell proliferation, or transcription of a Notch reporter. These non-canonical functions all map to the N-terminal part of α-PheRS which accumulates naturally in the intestine. This truncated version of α-PheRS (α-S) also localizes to nuclei and displays weak sequence similarity to the Notch intracellular domain (NICD), suggesting that α-S might compete with the NICD for binding to a common target. Supporting this hypothesis, the tryptophan (W) residue reported to be key for the interaction between the NICD and the Su(H) BTD domain is not only conserved in α-PheRS and α-S, but also essential for attenuating Notch signaling.

Author **Summary**

Aminoacyl tRNA synthetases charge tRNAs with their cognate amino acid to ensure proper decoding of the genetic code during translation. Independent of its aminoacylation function, the alpha subunit of *Drosophila* cytoplasmic Phenylalanyl tRNA synthetase (α-PheRS, FARSA in humans) has an additional activity that promotes growth and proliferation (Ho et al., 2021). Here we describe that elevated α-PheRS levels also induce cell fate changes and tumorous phenotypes in *Drosophila* midguts. Excessive proliferating cells with stem and progenitor cell characteristics accumulate and the composition of the terminally differentiated cells changes, too. This phenotype together with observed genetic interactions between α-PheRS and Notch levels show that α-PheRS counteracts Notch signaling in many different tissues and developmental stages. This novel activity of α-PheRS maps to its N-terminal part, which is naturally produced. The fragment contains a DNA binding domain, translocates into nuclei, and displays essential similarities to a Notch domain that binds to the downstream transcription factor. This suggests that it might be competing with Notch for binding to a common target. Not only because Notch plays important roles in many tumors, but also because *FARSA* mRNA levels are considerably upregulated in many tumors, this novel activity deserves more attention for cancer research.

Introduction

Aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases (aaRSs) are essential enzymes that act by charging transfer RNAs (tRNAs) with their cognate amino acid, a key process for protein synthesis (Schimmel and Soll, 1979). Besides their well-known role in translation, aaRSs perform additional functions in the cytoplasm, the nucleus, and even outside of the cell (Guo and Schimmel, 2013; Nathanson and Deutscher, 2000; Smirnova et al., 2012) (Lee et al., 2004) (Casas-Tinto et al., 2015; Gomard-Mennesson et al., 2007; Greenberg et al., 2008; Otani et al., 2002; Zhou et al., 2014). Phenylalanyl-tRNA synthetase (PheRS, FARS, or FRS) displays elevated expression levels in many cancers compared to their healthy counterparts according to the database "Gene Expression across Normal and Tumor tissue" (GENT2; (Park et al., 2019)). Such a correlation had been reported already two decades earlier and it was suggested that an alternative activity of PheRS might contribute to the tumorigenic events (Sen et al., 1997) (Rodova et al., 1999). A moonlighting function of the α subunit of *Drosophila* PheRS has recently been found to promote growth and proliferation in different tissues (Ho et al., 2021). Despite this, a possible mechanism explaining the connection between elevated PheRS levels and tumor formation had so far not been reported and, to our knowledge, also not been studied.

Cytoplasmic PheRS is the most complex member of the aaRSs family, a heterotetrameric protein consisting of 2 alpha- (α) and 2 beta- (β) subunits responsible for charging tRNA^{Phe} for translation (Roy and Ibba, 2006). The α subunit includes the catalytic core of the tRNA synthetase and the β subunit has structural modules with a wide range of functions, including tRNA anticodon binding, hydrolyzing misactivated amino acids, and editing misaminoacylated tRNA^{Phe} species (Ling et al., 2007; Lu et al., 2014; Roy and Ibba, 2006). Importantly, both subunits are needed for aminoacylation of tRNA^{Phe}.

We set out to address the question of whether and how the elevated levels of α−PheRS

that induce growth and proliferation (Ho et al., 2021) might contribute to tumor formation. To

test for this activity, we studied the role of α−PheRS levels in the *Drosophila* model system,

in which dissecting the molecular mechanism of such a moonlighting role of *α−PheRS* seemed

feasible. Tissue growth and homeostasis play important roles in developing and outgrown

animals, and they require tight control of stem cell self-renewal and differentiation into

daughter cells. The *Drosophila* midgut is a powerful model to analyze these mechanisms and

their interplay. Adult intestinal stem cells (ISCs) and adult midgut progenitors (AMPs) in the

larval gut can either divide asymmetrically or symmetrically (Jiang and Edgar, 2011; Micchelli,

2012). Asymmetric divisions of ISCs give rise to a new ISC and a Su(H)GBE⁺ enteroblast (EB)

for the enterocyte (EC) lineage differentiation, or a pre-enteroendocrine cell (pre-EE) for the

enteroendocrine (EE) cell lineage differentiation (Furriols and Bray, 2001; Guo et al., 2016).

Differential Delta/Notch signaling between the ISC and its daughter causes the latter to either

differentiate into an absorptive EC lineage or a secretory EE lineage by distinct mechanisms

(Beehler-Evans and Micchelli, 2015; Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006; Ohlstein and Spradling,

2007; Zeng and Hou, 2015). EBs are intermediate differentiating cells that differentiate into

ECs in a Notch-dependent manner (Ohlstein and Spradling, 2006), while the production of EEs

has not been molecularly characterized. However, the pre-EEs require only low levels of Notch

signaling to differentiate into EEs (Guo *et al.*, 2016). Intestinal homeostasis is an interesting

system to elucidate the control of continuous replenishment of lost cells and the maintenance

of stem cells. Additionally, it turned out to be also a very dynamic process that can react to the

loss of large numbers of differentiated cells in response to injuries and bacterial infections.

We found that in different tissues and cell types, α-PheRS levels in stem and progenitor

cells regulate cell proliferation, cell differentiation, or both. Interestingly, a proteolytic α-

PheRS fragment that can neither interact with β-PheRS nor perform aminoacylation, promotes

these growth, proliferation, and differentiation functions. Although the consequences of altered

levels vary to some degree between tissues, we found that even in tissues with the most

divergent consequences, α-PheRS levels act by attenuating Notch signaling. Sequence

comparisons combined with genetic and biochemical tests, as well as the cellular localization

of this truncated α-PheRS (α-S) point to a mechanism whereby the N-terminal "DNA binding

domain" of α-PheRS might compete with the NICD for the binding to a common target.

Results

PheRS is enriched in *Drosophila* gut stem cells

PheRS promotes growth and proliferation in different tissues (Ho et al., 2021). In the *Drosophila* midgut, intestinal stem cells (ISCs) display very high proliferation rates (Nagy et al., 2018) due to a high turnover of the cells with a nutrient absorption mission. In addition, the GENT2 database also reports highly elevated PheRS levels in many malignant cells compared to normal tissues, and among these are also intestinal cancers (Park *et al.*, 2019). To investigate the role of PheRS in intestinal cells, we examined the PheRS expression levels in wild-type fly guts. ISCs and AMPs are ideal to study the novel PheRS activity because they can both undergo either symmetric or asymmetric divisions and differentiate to maintain the cell population in the fly gut. We observed that adult midguts express naturally elevated levels of α-PheRS in the diploid wild-type ISC/EB cells compared to the enterocytes in the same tissue (Fig 1 A-A", B). Similarly, a Myc-tagged α-PheRS under the normal genomic *α-PheRS* promoter is expressed at higher levels in AMPs than in enterocytes of larval guts (Fig 1 C-C", D). To compare the natural levels of α-PheRS in different cell types of the adult midgut, we used the *esg-Gal4*, *tub-Gal80^{ts}*, *UAS-2XeYFP* system (hereby we refer as esg[ts]) to label ISCs and EBs (Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006) and Prospero staining to label enteroendocrine cells (EEs). This setup revealed elevated expression of endogenous α-PheRS in YFP^{+} progenitor cells and EEs (Pros[+]) than in enterocytes (ECs; Fig 1E-F"").

Elevated α-PheRS levels promote ISC and EE accumulation and altered EB morphology

We previously constructed a mutant *α-PheRS* gene, that encodes an aminoacylation-dead subunit (*α-PheRS^{Cys}*) that still displays the non-canonical activity of promoting growth and proliferation (Ho et al., 2021). This mutant allows us to specifically study the activities of α-

PheRS that are not dependent on the aminoacyl tRNA synthetase activity of PheRS. To

investigate the effect of elevated levels of α-PheRS and α-PheRS^{Cys} (α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$) on adult

midgut ISCs and EBs, we used *α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$* under UAS control together with the esg^{ts} driver

system(Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006). Co-expression of *UAS-2XEYFP* allowed us to monitor

the activity of the *esg-Gal4* driver and to label ISCs and EBs. Upon controlled upregulation of

α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ levels, we observed two phenotypes in the intestines as early as 2 days after

induction and the phenotypes became more pronounced until day 5 (Fig S1). The first

phenotype resembled partially a *Notch* (*N*) knockdown-like phenotype with a 4.3 and 4.7-fold,

respectively, increase in the total numbers of YFP$^+$ cells upon additional expression of α-PheRS

and α-PheRS^{Cys}, respectively (Fig 2A-C''', G). The increase of these midgut progenitor cells

(ISCs and EBs) could be a consequence of increased proliferation and/or a differentiation

problem of ISCs (Lian et al., 2018; Mundorf et al., 2019). Indeed, we also observed an increase

in the proportion of EEs from 8% in the control to 12% in the posterior midguts with elevated

α-PheRS expression (Fig 2H), indicating that elevated expression of *α-PheRS* promotes ISC

proliferation and EE accumulation.

The controlled upregulation of *α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$* levels also led to a second phenotype, an

altered morphology of EBs. We observed a hyperaccumulation of YFP$^+$ polyploid cells that

resembled the ones that have been referred to in other studies as "differentiating" EBs (Loza-

Coll et al., 2014; Zhai et al., 2017). Because these cells display ISC/EB characteristics (YFP$^+$)

and EC characteristics (large polyploid nuclei) at the same time, it appears that they arrested

development between these two fates. Differentiating EBs were rarely observed in wild-type

midguts (3% of progenitor cells; Fig 2A-A''', I) and if they were present, they retained only

weak YFP signals. In midguts expressing elevated levels of α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$, we observed much

higher levels of "differentiating" EBs (20% and 22%, respectively, of the YFP$^+$ progenitor

cells), and these cells also displayed a strong YFP signal (Fig 2B-C''', I). We concluded that

the elevated levels of α-PheRS in the intestine induce hyperaccumulation of ISCs and EEs and

alterations in EB morphology.

177   The phenotype of elevated α-PheRS levels partially resembles the low Notch phenotype

Notch signaling is an important signaling pathway that coordinates ISC proliferation and

differentiation (Ohlstein and Spradling, 2006). We noted that the above-described changes

regarding ISCs and EEs partially overlapped with the low *N* activity phenotype that had been

reported in several studies (Guo and Ohlstein, 2015; Liu et al., 2010; Marianes and Spradling,

2013; Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006; Ohlstein and Spradling, 2007). To confirm this similarity,

we knocked down *N* with RNAi treatment with the same esg^{ts} system and this, indeed, led to a

typical phenotype in ISC proliferation and EE accumulation as reported in the studies

mentioned above (Fig 2D-D'''). This allowed us to compare the N^{RNAi} phenotype with the

phenotype of elevated *α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$* levels (Fig 2B-C'''). The increase in YFP$^+$ cells (290%;

from 27 to 104 cells) of N^{RNAi} treatment was in the same range as the one observed under

elevated *α-PheRS* expression (332%; from 27 to 115 cells), and with 12%, the proportion of

EEs was the same under the two conditions (Fig 2G, H). We also used the esg^{ts} driver to

upregulate Notch signaling by expressing the continuously active form of Notch, the Notch

intracellular domain (NICD). This caused ISCs to differentiate into ECs, thereby depleting 80%

of the ISC pool (Fig 2E-E''', G) and inhibiting EE differentiation (Fig 2E-E''', H) as it has been

reported in previous studies (Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006; Zhai *et al.*, 2017).

To test whether α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ interferes with Notch signaling, we simultaneously

elevated levels of *α-PheR*S$^{(Cys)}$ and NICD. This schema had a rescuing effect on both

phenotypes. On the one hand, it rescued the ISC pool and proportion of EEs depleted by NICD

expression even beyond the wild-type levels (Fig 2F-F''', G). On the other hand, the phenotype

caused by the additional expression of the NICD can also be interpreted as a partial rescue of

the phenotype caused by elevated α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ levels. The numbers of YFP$^+$ cells and

differentiating EBs dropped considerably, even though they remained still higher than in the

wild type (Fig 2D-F''', G, I). These results suggest that the two phenotypes observed when *α-*

PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ expression was elevated in ISCs and EBs arise because *α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$* and Notch

signaling counteract each other for the control of proliferation and differentiation.

We next tested whether α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ can downregulate *Notch* signaling in adult

midguts using the *Notch* reporter NRE-eGFP (Notch response element promoter driving the

expression of eGFP; (Saj et al., 2010). As seen in Fig 2J, the expression of α-PheRS and α-

PheRS^{Cys} clearly reduced the *N*-driven expression of the N-signaling reporter. We conclude

that elevated α-PheRS levels in midgut stem cells cause misregulation of gut homeostasis and

that this effect is not only the consequence of the proliferative role of α-PheRS but also caused

by downregulating Notch signaling and inhibiting the terminal differentiation of the progenitor

cells (EBs).

Elevated α-PheRS levels induce AMP proliferation and interfere with gut homeostasis

Larval *Drosophila* midguts possess AMPs as the temporary reserve for adult ISCs. AMPs go

through several divisions to form imaginal midgut islets that consist of AMPs enclosed by

peripheral cells (PC) (Mathur et al., 2010). Due to the transient period of the larval stage, larval

midguts do not require EC renewal under normal conditions (Lee and Lee, 2019). However,

larval guts can respond to certain damages and injuries by triggering a regenerative process

that compensates for depleted ECs in the epithelium and also allows reconstituting the AMP

pool (Houtz et al., 2019). We also investigated the effect of elevated *α-PheRS* levels on larval

AMPs by using the *esg-Gal4, UAS-2XEYFP* driver, which is specifically expressed in AMPs.

Co-expression of *UAS-2XEYFP* allowed us to monitor the activity of the *esg-Gal4* driver and

to label AMPs. The results demonstrated that elevated Myc::α-PheRS in the larval midgut

significantly increased the proportion of EE and PH3 positive cells (mitotic cells) in the

posterior midgut (Fig 3A-D, I-K, L, M). This increased EE proportion again pointed out the

similarity with the Notch knockdown-like phenotype in the adult gut. Driving the expression

of α-PheRS^{Cys} in AMPs also produced a higher mitotic index (Fig 3E-F, L), indicating that the

aminoacylation function is not required for this activity. Due to the lack of epithelial renewal

in normal larval guts, the cell density of larval midguts is usually stable (Lee and Lee, 2019;

Mathur *et al.*, 2010). It is therefore surprising that elevated α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ levels increase the cell

density in larval midguts (Fig 3N). Altogether, these results show that elevated α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$

levels cause AMPs to proliferate and to differentiate, producing additional larval midgut cells.

Strikingly, elevated α-PheRS^{Cys} levels induced tumor-like phenotypes in both anterior

and posterior areas of the larval midgut (outlined with white dashed lines, Fig 3E-F) while the

elevation of wild-type Myc::α-PheRS only gave rise to high numbers of AMPs in the posterior

larval midgut (Fig 3C,D). Elevated α-PheRS^{Cys} levels also caused the appearance of a more

severe tumor-like phenotype, where individual AMP islets could not be discerned anymore

(Fig 3E-F). Wild-type larval guts contain ECs with large nuclei and interspersed occasional

AMP islets with smaller nuclei (as seen in the YFP overexpression control, Fig 3A-B). In

contrast, we observed a phenotype where ECs and AMPs could not be distinguished based on

the size of their nuclei but emerged as a larger cell population with intermediate size nuclei

(Fig 3D). Many of these cells expressed the *esg*>YFP stem cell marker at high levels, but others

displayed only a very weak YFP signal. This result is comparable to the EB phenotype in adult

midguts where the progenitor cells remain in an intermediate differentiation state (Fig 2B''',

C'''). Notably, this phenotype was also observed when Notch was downregulated by RNAi

using the same induction system (Fig 3G-H). This points again to the possibility that

downregulation of Notch signaling is involved in producing this phenotype.

249   *α-PheRS* is a novel general repressor of Notch signaling

Developing larval brains contain neuroblasts (NBs), neuronal stem cells that divide

asymmetrically with one daughter keeping the stemness and the other differentiating into a

neuronal cell. Notch signaling plays a crucial role in this process (Ables et al., 2011; Giachino

and Taylor, 2014), but in contrast to the situation in the gut, loss of *Notch* prevents NB self-

renewal, whereas ectopic expression of activated Notch leads to tumor formation (de la Pompa

et al., 1997; Grandbarbe et al., 2003; Hatakeyama et al., 2004). This opposite role of *Notch*

makes the NB lineage an ideal complementary system to test whether α-PheRS is a general

component of the *Notch* pathway. Driving α-PheRS or the α-PheRS^{Cys} expression in NBs with

the *inscutable-Gal4 (incs-Gal4)* driver resulted in significantly smaller central brains (CB), the

region where the type I and II NBs are located (Fig 4A-C, G). In contrast, this treatment had

little or no effect on the size of the optic lobes (OL). Importantly, the phenotype was virtually

indistinguishable from the phenotype caused by *N* knock-down (Fig 4E), although the

phenotype of the latter might show slightly higher expressivity. Analogous to the situation in

the gut, co-expression of NICD together with *α-PheRS^{Cys}* in neuroblasts rescued the brains to

wild-type size (Fig 4D,G).

Type II neuroblasts are particularly suited to analyze effects on neuroblast

differentiation. Targeting specifically the eight type II neuroblasts in central brain lobes with

ectopic *α-PheRS* or *α-PheRS^{Cys}* expression, resulted in a strong reduction of the number of type

II neuroblasts (Fig 4H-M, N). Knocking down *Notch* in type II NBs with RNAi and the same

driver combination resulted in a similar phenotype, but with a higher expressivity (Fig 4K). On

the other hand, overexpression of α-PheRS in type II neuroblasts where Notch signaling was

also over-activated by the co-expression of NICD (Fig 4M) partially rescued the tumor

phenotype of type II neuroblasts to wild-type numbers and it restored the normal size of the

brain (Fig 4L). Because the genetic interaction with *Notch* shows that the two activities

counteract one another in guts and brains, two tissues where *Notch* has opposing functions on

cellular differentiation, it appears that the interaction between *α-PheRS* and *Notch* is not

mediated indirectly through a primary effect on division or differentiation but is likely to be a

more direct one. In any case, this interaction appears to modulate tissue homeostasis in different

organs.

To further address the role of *α-PheRS* on Notch signaling, we also studied its effect on

the larval wing disc and the adult wing. Using the *en-Gal4*, *tub-Gal80^{ts}* (referred to as en^{ts}

system) to elevate *α-PheRS* expression allowed us to specifically and conditionally activate *α-*

PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ expression in the posterior compartment of the wing disc by temperature-shift

control. Reduced Notch signaling in the posterior wing disc can cause the notched wing

phenotype at the distal end of the wing and the emergence of an ectopic partial vein in the

center of the posterior compartment. The additional expression of *α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$* in the posterior

compartment did not produce the distal phenotype and we will discuss possible reasons for this

in the Discussion. However, elevated *α-PheRS* or *α-PheRS^{Cys}* levels induced the central ectopic

vein phenotype also observed under low Notch signaling conditions (Fig S4A-D ; (Johannes

and Preiss, 2002). The new vein branches off from the connecting vein between the L4 and L5

vein (arrowhead, Fig S4B,C) and is indistinguishable from the one obtained by downregulating

Notch by RNAi treatment using the same expression system (Fig S4D). Again, these findings

suggest that *α-PheRS* might be a more general, novel regulator of Notch signaling.

To test directly for changes in *Notch* activity in response to altered levels of *α-*

PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ in imaginal wing discs, we monitored Notch activity with the NRE-eGFP reporter

and used the en[ts] system together with *UAS-mRFP* to conditionally express *α-PheRS^(Cys)* in the

posterior compartment. In this system, eGFP expression marks the cells with active Notch

signaling, which normally localize along the dorsal-ventral (D/V) boundary of the larval wing

disc (Fig 5A"), and it marks the posterior, en-Gal4^{+}, compartment of the wing disc with mRFP,

allowing us to assess *N* activity in this compartment (black arrowhead, Fig 5A"') while using

the anterior compartment as the internal control. In wild-type wing discs, the NRE-eGFP signal

is as strong in the posterior compartment as in the anterior one (Fig 5B-B"'). Knockdown of

Notch in the posterior compartment resulted in the exclusion of the NRE-eGFP signal from the

mRFP-marked posterior compartment (white arrow, Fig 5E-E"'). Importantly, elevated *α-*

PheRS^(Cys) levels also caused a loss of the eGFP signal in the mRFP-marked posterior

compartments (Fig 5C-C"', D-D"'). These observations demonstrate that elevated *α-PheRS*

levels downregulate *Notch* activity in larval wing discs and that this inhibition acts on Notch

signaling at or before the transcription of the reporter. Taken together, the results from midguts,

brains, and wing discs demonstrate that *α-PheRS* is a novel general repressor of *Notch*

signaling.

311 The N-terminal 200 amino acids of α-PheRS (α-S) are sufficient to induce the proliferative

312 phenotype and to repress Notch activity

Having shown that the growth and proliferation function and the counteracting of the Notch

signaling are independent of the aminoacylation activity of α-PheRS, we wanted to find out

whether this activity can be separated from the catalytic domain. As shown in Fig 6A,B, the C-

terminal catalytic domain is separated by a linker region from the N-terminal part. We,

therefore, cloned the first 200 codons of the α-PheRS ORF under UAS control and added a

Myc tag at the beginning of the open reading frame, giving rise to the *UAS-Myc::α-S (α-S)*

gene (Fig 6B). Expressing *α-S* with the en-Gal4 driver and staining wing discs for Myc,

revealed that this truncated version of α-PheRS was stably expressed in the posterior wing disc

compartment (Fig S3). To test whether this C-terminally truncated isoform was able to repress

Notch signaling, too, we expressed *α-S* with the esg^{ts} driver in larval and adult guts and found

that it produced an excessive number of Esg$^+$ cells (Fig 6C-C''', D-D'''), an increase in mitotic

cells (Fig 6F) and that it diverted ISC differentiation toward the EE fate (Fig 6E, E', G). The

truncated isoform α-S is capable of inducing the production of many cells with stem cell

characteristics and it directs their differentiation towards an EE fate, just like α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ does.

Similarly, expressing *α-S* in the posterior compartment of wing discs induced ectopic vein

formation between the L4 and L5 veins in the adult wing (Fig S4E-F) and the same loss of the

Notch reporter signal (NRE-eGFP) in the posterior compartments of wing discs as full-length

α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ did (Fig 6H-I'). These observations demonstrate that elevated *α-S* levels

downregulate *Notch,* mapping the inhibitory activity to the N-terminal 200 amino acids.

Expressing transgenic Myc::α-PheRS under the control of the *Tub-Gal4* driver revealed

beside the full-length α-PheRS isoform (55kDa) also one stable isoform around 40 KDa and

another around 25KDa (Fig 6J). To study the expression pattern of these isoforms, we dissected

different larval tissues and found that the 40 KDa isoform was present in larval heads and fat

bodies, while larval guts showed predominantly the 25 KDa isoform (Fig 6K). The 25 KDa

isoform might either arise if Myc::α-PheRS is cleaved in the linker domain or if the pre-mRNA

is processed in a different way to give rise to a shorter, but stable isoform. Because there is no

evidence for alternatively processed mRNAs of α-PheRS in wild-type animals (flybase.org

version FB2019_04; (Thurmond et al., 2019), we tested whether PheRS might get cleaved *in*

vivo to produce an isoform that resembles Myc::α-S. Myc-tagged isoforms were isolated from

total larvae by immunoprecipitation and gel purification, and their polypeptides were identified

by mass spectrometry (MS). The MS data shows the peptide coverage of the 25KDa isoform

according to the score of Peptide Spectrum Matches (PSM; Fig S2). The 25 KDa isoform

contains the peptides of the N-terminal 28% of the full-length α-PheRS. Even though we

identified two more C-terminal peptides, which could not be rejected based on the PSM

interpretations, these two peptides were likely recovered due to a "memory effect" of the

column. This indicates that the 25 KDa isoform is a C-terminally truncated version of α-PheRS

that strongly resembles the α-S that performs the non-canonical functions.

Mechanism of downregulating Notch signaling by α-S

Given the competitive interaction between *α-PheRS* and *Notch* and the effect of the α-S isoform

on downregulating N activity, we aligned the polypeptide sequence of α-S and Notch, and this

revealed similarities between α-S and the RAM domain (RBP-Jκ-associated molecule) of

Notch (Fig 7A). To transmit the Notch activity, the RAM domain of the NICD binds through

the tetra-peptide motif ΦWΦP to the beta-trefoil domain (BTD) of Suppressor of Hairless

(Su(H)), the *Drosophila* CSL/RBPJ. This allows the complex to interact with specific DNA

sequences in the promoter region of the target genes to activate transcription (Barrick and

Kopan, 2006; Borggrefe and Oswald, 2009; 2016; Gordon et al., 2008; Kovall, 2007).

Mammals can repress Notch activity with proteins containing the tetra-peptide motif ΦWΦP.

These compete with NICD to bind to CSL/RBPJ and form the Complex of Repressor (CoR)

that inhibits Notch target gene activation (Bray and Furriols, 2001; Fortini and Artavanis-

Tsakonas, 1994; Nagel et al., 2017; Praxenthaler et al., 2017). Even though the tetrapeptide is

only partially conserved in α-S, the similarities between α-S and the RAM domain of Notch,

and the presence of the tryptophan residue (W) flanked by Φ (Fig 7A) led us to hypothesize

that α-S and NICD might compete for a common target.

To test this hypothesis, we mutated the conserved "W" (tryptophane) codon in *α-S* to

give rise to *Myc::α-S^{W112A}* and analyzed the effect of this mutation on Notch signaling in vivo.

To test whether the mutation W112A does not affect the stability of the *α-S* polypeptide*,* we

used the en-Gal4 system to overexpress *Myc::α-S* and *Myc::α-S^{W112A}* and stained larval wing

discs with Myc antibodies. The mutant still showed a similar expression in the posterior

compartment of the wing discs as the wild-type α-S (Fig S3), confirming that the mutation does

not affect protein stability. In contrast to what was seen upon wild-type expression of α-PheRS

(Fig 2), expressing *Myc::α-S^{W112A}* with the esg^{ts} driver in adult guts did neither induce the

overproliferation phenotype (excessive numbers of Esg^{+} cells) nor the differentiation

phenotype (higher EE/EC ratio) (Fig 7B, C, G, H). These results could also be confirmed when

a full-length version of *α-PheRS* with the mutation W112A was expressed with the same driver

(Fig 7D, G, H). To further test whether α-PheRS with the W112A mutation lost its ability to

interfere with Notch signaling, we simultaneously elevated levels of Myc::α-S^{W112A} or α-

PheRS^{W112A} together with NICD levels. Indeed, the mutated Myc::α-S^{W112A} or α-PheRS^{W112A}

did not rescue the ISC pool or the EEs, the two cell types that are depleted by NICD over-

expression (Fig 7F-F"', G, H). Furthermore, because a genomic construct expressing this

mutant version of *α-PheRS^{W112A} (gα-PheRS^{W112A})* under its native promoter rescued the *α-*

PheRS null mutant, the W112A mutation does not prevent the canonical activity of *α-PheRS*

and produces sufficient protein that can perform the aminoacylation reaction. This also shows

again that this mutant protein is stable.

NICD is known to enter the nucleus the perform its function in transcriptional control.

To test whether α-S is also able to enter the nuclei, we use the esg^{ts} system to drive Myc::α-S

expression and stained guts for Myc. As shown in Fig 7I-I"' and K (compare to Fig 1B,D), we

found high levels of Myc::α-S signal in nuclei of progenitor cells (YFP^{+} cells), revealing that

α-S can translocate to nuclei. Similarly, the Myc::α-S^{W112A} signal was also present in nuclei of

YFP^{+} cells (Fig 7J-J"',L), indicating that the W112A mutation neither affects stability nor

translocation into nuclei. These results, therefore, show that W^{112} in α-PheRS plays an

important role in counteracting Notch signaling in ISCs and EBs.

Discussion

Notch signaling regulates diverse cellular behaviors during tissue growth in a context-dependent manner. Most prominently, these are proliferation and differentiation (Henrique and Schweisguth, 2019; Hori et al., 2013). In this study, we presented the effect of α-PheRS on downregulating Notch signaling activity in different tissues where Notch induces diverse outcomes. In the larval brain, Notch signaling promotes NB self-renewal, and ectopic expression of NICD leads to tumor formation (de la Pompa *et al.*, 1997; Grandbarbe *et al.*, 2003; Hatakeyama *et al.*, 2004). Here, elevated α-PheRS showed an inhibitory effect on Notch signaling, preventing NB self-renewal and thereby reducing the size of the brain lobe (Fig 4A-A",B). Accordingly, elevated α-PheRS in this situation also rescued the tumor phenotype caused by the expression of the activated form of Notch, NICD (Fig 3 G,H). Also in this situation, expressing only the N-terminal part of α-PheRS, the region that does not contain any catalytic domains and that does not interact with the β-PheRS subunit (Fig 6C; (Finarov et al., 2010) was just as effective in producing the same phenotypes as α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$.

In the intestine, the regulation of Notch is crucial for ISC fate decisions. Any interference with this signaling pathway alters the composition of the gut cell population. We found that even modest elevation of the levels of the essential cellular household enzyme α-PheRS drastically changed the composition of the intestinal cell population. Aside from hyperaccumulation of ISCs, EE cells and "differentiating EBs" become more abundant. This phenotype has also been reported in the studies by Korzelius and colleagues (Korzelius et al., 2019; Korzelius et al., 2014). They reported that the WT1-like transcription factor Klumpfuss (Klu) is regulated by Notch signaling and maintains the lineage commitment of enterocyte progenitors in the *Drosophila* intestine. Similar as elevated α-PheRS levels, loss of *klu* function also leads to blockage of EC differentiation, causing the "differentiating EB" phenotype and

diverting EBs into EE differentiation. Because Notch signaling has been reported to regulate

klu, it appears that α-PheRS levels also act upstream of *klu*.

Elevated levels of α-PheRS reproduced the "vein formation" phenotype in the adult

wings caused by loss-of-Notch (Fig 6A-A''') (Johannes and Preiss, 2002), and these increased

levels also prevented the transcription of the Notch transcriptional reporter NRE-eGFP at the

D/V boundary of larval wing discs (Fig 6D-E'''). This inhibition of Notch signaling must

therefore happen at or before the transcription of the reporter. Reminiscent of its function in

neuroblasts, Notch signaling at the D/V boundary region of the wing disc promotes

proliferation (de Celis et al., 1996). Upon additional expression of α-PheRS in this region, not

only Notch activity (Fig 5), but also PH3$^+$ cells became absent from this region (Ho et al.,

2021). Interestingly, however, in regions of the posterior wing disc compartment where there

is no Notch activity, elevated α-PheRS caused the appearance of additional pH3$^+$ cells (Ho et

al., 2021). Because knockdown of *N* causes the notched wing phenotype but increased α-

PheRS levels do not (Fig 6A), it would be interesting to find out whether the proliferation of

these additional pH3$^+$ cells that reside outside of the region with *Notch* activity can compensate

for the cells along the D/V boundary that depend on Notch signaling to be mitotically active.

We do not know yet how elevated α-PheRS levels induce this cell proliferation, but an effect

on the organ size control pathway Hippo signaling might be a candidate. On the other hand,

the complexity of the Notch signaling at the D/V boundary, where downregulation or

overactivation of Su(H) can cause indistinguishable phenotypes (Furriols and Bray, 2000)

makes conclusions difficult. Furthermore, cell proliferation in the distal wing margin is

regulated also by epidermal growth factor (EGF) or decapentaplegic (Dpp)/bone

morphogenetic protein (BMP) signaling (Biehs et al., 1998; Teleman and Cohen, 2000)

(Shimmi et al., 2014), suggesting that interactions with other signaling mechanisms might be

involved, too. In any case, we conclude that even in the wing, α-PheRS represses Notch

signaling, but different regions of the wing disc respond differently to α-PheRS levels, making the wing disc a more complex system to study the responses to elevated α-PheRS levels.

In ovarian follicle cells, the elevated levels of α-PheRS led to an increase in clone size with more cells per clone (Ho et al., 2021). This could possibly also be caused by an inhibitory effect of α-PheRS on Notch signaling because Notch is required for the follicle cells to exit the mitotic cycle and switch to the endocycle (Lopez-Schier and St Johnston, 2001) and loss of Notch signaling prevents the epithelial cells from switching from the mitotic cell cycle to the endocycle, leading to over-proliferation of follicle cells (Deng et al., 2001; Shcherbata et al., 2004). Similarly, in adult midguts, elevated α-PheRS interfered with normal homeostasis of ISCs by inducing a typical low Notch signaling phenotype with many more ISCs, EBs, and EEs (Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006; Ohlstein and Spradling, 2007; Zhai et al., 2015). Because α-PheRS levels attenuate Notch signaling in different situations where Notch causes diverse effects, α-PheRS (or a part of it) seems to be a general component of the *Drosophila* Notch signaling pathway.

Repression of Notch signaling through competition with the NICD has been described in different systems and has recently been reviewed (Maier, 2019; Oswald and Kovall, 2018). Best studied is probably the competition involving the factors binding to the C-terminal domain (CTD) of Su(H) (CSL in vertebrates and RBPJ in mammals) that lead to the formation of the Complex of Repressor (CoR) that inhibits Notch target gene activation. A less well-studied group of competitors compete directly with the binding of the RAM domain of the NICD to the BTD of the Su(H) ortholog CSL/RBPJ (Maier, 2019; Oswald and Kovall, 2018). This competition involves the 20 N-terminal amino acids of the RAM domain, which contain the hydrophobic tetrapeptide with the key tryptophane residue (ΦWΦP). So far, this competition was only seen in mammals and, therefore, considered to be specific for vertebrate Notch

signaling. Known competitors are Epstein-Barr nuclear antigen 2 (EBNA2), mouse

KyoT2/FHL1, and human RITA (RBPJ interacting and tubulin associated) (Collins et al., 2014;

Johnson et al., 2010; Tabaja et al., 2017; Taniguchi et al., 1998; Wacker et al., 2011; Zimber-

Strobl and Strobl, 2001). Based on our results, a naturally occurring fragment of the α-PheRS

household protein might function through this mechanism to modulate or attenuate Notch

signaling if this invariant W is present. The immediately adjacent hydrophobic residues are

also present in the α-S tetrapeptide sequence. However, the residue in position four, a proline,

is substituted by another hydrophobic residue, leucine. Interestingly, even in mammals, this

residue is less conserved than the W in position two (Maier, 2019). Two additional elements

have been discussed to affect the affinity of the interaction between the RAM domain and the

transcription factor (CSL, RBPJ, or Su(H)) (Oswald and Kovall, 2018). The dipeptides -HG–

and –GF–. Interestingly, both dipeptides are also present in the N-terminal 20 amino acids of

the RAM domain of *Drosophila* Notch, α-PheRS, and α-S even though they are found in

different positions (Fig 7A). Their contribution to the binding affinity would therefore have to

be further evaluated. Additionally, the α-S polypeptide also contains a KKRK sequence

element that might function as a nuclear localization sequence (NLS). It could therefore allow

α-S to actively enter the nucleus to bind to a partner (Fig 7I-I'''). Notably, α-PheRS[(Cys)] is a

cytoplasmic protein for which we did not observe clear nuclear localization (Fig 1B,D). This

might suggest that processing or truncation of α-PheRS[(Cys)] facilities the translocation of its

signaling domain α-S into nuclei, a process that might even play an important role in fine-

tuning of this novel α-PheRS activity. This model is also consistent with the result that α-PheRS

and α-S act on Notch signaling at or before the transcription from the Nre element of the Nre-

eGFP reporter and, finally, an α-S activity in transcriptional control could also shed light on

the puzzling question of why a cytoplasmic aaRS contains a DNA binding domain (Abul et al.,

2001, Na Wei et al., 2014). However, at least until *in vivo* binding of α-S to Su(H) is

demonstrated, other competitions with Notch still need to be considered. Furthermore, because

α-S also displays proliferative activities that seem not to be mediated by its effect on Notch

signaling, we expect that α-S or its downstream targets act also on components of other

signaling pathways, like for instance the organ size control pathway.

A correlation between elevated levels of α-PheRS/FARSA and tumor formation has

been noted some time ago (Sen *et al.*, 1997) and is also suggested by the data published in the

GENT2 database (Park *et al.*, 2019). Not the least because colon cancers are among the ones

that express higher levels of α-PheRS in the tumor tissue than in the healthy counterpart,

modeling the effect of elevated α-PheRS levels in *Drosophila* ISCs and EBs might reveal

mechanisms contributing to tumor development. In the gut tissue, elevated α-PheRS and α-

PheRS^{Cys} levels produced 12-14 times as many tumors and these showed mostly a more severe

phenotype (Fig 3H). Such tumors were composed of ISCs and differentiating EBs. Similarly,

guts also contained 5-8 times as many mitotic cells when α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ levels were elevated

(Fig 3E). Together, these results strongly suggest that higher levels of α-PheRS can induce

strong cell proliferation. Additionally, because these over-proliferation cells display stem cell

characteristics and changes in cell fate, elevated α-PheRS levels might be a risk factor for

tumor formation.

The hyperaccumulation of cells with stem cell characteristics is mediated by high α-

PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ or α-S repressing Notch signaling and possibly affecting also another signaling

pathway. In mammals, Notch signaling is essential for maintaining the homeostasis of cell

proliferation and differentiation (Qiao and Wong, 2009) similar to the function of Notch

signaling in the *Drosophila* gut that is needed to prevent the induction of tumors in the adult

midgut (Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006; Ohlstein and Spradling, 2007). In humans,

misregulation of Notch signaling in these processes has been suggested to trigger the

development of colon cancer, and *Notch* has been proposed as a molecular target for cancer therapy (Yin et al., 2010). Furthermore, several other tumors contain low Notch levels and elevated α-PheRS/FARSA levels (Park *et al.*, 2019). Amongst them are for instance skin, head and neck, soft tissue, muscle, and tongue tumors. In these cases, it would be interesting to find out whether elevated FARSA levels cause the downregulation of Notch. Notch signaling has been found inactivated in different squamous cell carcinoma, including cutaneous, head and neck, and esophageal squamous cell carcinoma, and also in small-cell lung cancers (ScLc) (Katho and Katho, 2020). However, Notch signaling in tumors is more complex because Notch acts intrinsically both tumor suppressive and oncogenic. The latter has been observed in some subtypes of gastric and esophageal cancers, colorectal cancer, uterine corpus endometrial cancer, breast cancer, and non-small-cell-lung cancer (Katho and Katho, 2020). A more in-depth analysis of the relationship between FARSA levels and Notch activity should therefore also consider that elevated levels of FARSA might reflect a reaction of the cell to counteract excessive Notch activity. The results presented here provide new and unexpected insights into the regulation of Notch signaling in the context of gut tumorigenesis and they suggest new opportunities to target these mechanisms.

Materials and Methods

535 **Key Resources Table**

Reagent or Resource	Sources	Identifier	Additional information
Antibodies			
Anti phospho-Histone H3-rabbit	Cell signaling	9701S	1:200 v/v
Anti phospho-Histone H3-mouse	Cell signaling	9706S	1:200 v/v
Anti *α-PheRS*	Genescript	4668	Customized product (1:200 v/v)
Anti *α-PheRS*	Genescript	4669	Customized product (1:200 v/v)
Anti Myc-mouse	Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank (DSHB)	9E10	Supernatant (1:3 v/v)
Anti Puromycin	DSHB	PMY-2A4	1:100 v/v
Anti Prospero	DSHB	MR1A	1:200 v/v
Anti Delta	DSHB	C594.9B	1:10 v/v
Anti V5 tag-rabbit	Cell signaling	13202	1:200 v/v
Anti Cy3 rabbit	Jackson Immuno Research	115-165-146	1:200 v/v
Anti-rabbit Alexa Flour 488	Molecular Probes	A-11008	1:200 v/v
Anti-rabbit Alexa Flour 488	Molecular Probes	A-11034	1:200 v/v
Anti-mouse Alexa Flour 488	Molecular Probes	A-11029	1:200 v/v
Anti-rabbit Alexa Flour 488	Life technology	A-21206	1:200 v/v
Anti-rabbit Alexa Flour 594	Invitrogen	A-11037	1:200 v/v
Anti-mouse Alexa Flour 594	Molecular Probes	A-11032	1:200 v/v
Anti-mouse Alexa Flour 568	Life technology	A-10037	1:200 v/v
Anti α-tubulin	Abcam	Ab18251	1:1,000 v/v
Anti GFP	ImmunoKontact	042704	1:1,000 v/v
Anti Myc-rabbit	Santa Cruz	Sc-789	A-12 (1:1,000 v/v)
HRP anti-rabbit IgG antibody (Peroxidase)	Vector	PI-1000	1:10,000 v/v
HRP anti-rabbit IgG antibody (Peroxidase)	Vector	PI-2000	1:10,000 v/v

Fly stocks and genetics			
α-PheRS^{G2060}/FM6	Bloomington *Drosophila* Stock Center (BDSC)	26625	
gα-PheRS^{Cys}			Transgenic construct
UAS-α-PheRS^{Cys}			Transgenic construct
hspFLP; Act-Gal4/CyO; neoFRT82B, tub-Gal80/TM3, Sb			
w; If/CyO; neoFRT82B, UAS-α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$			
engrailed-Gal4	BDSC	30564	
engrailed-Gal4, NRE-EGFP, UAS-myrRFP	BDSC	30730	
UAS-GFP	BDSC	6658	
w; UAS-Myc::MYC	BDSC	9674	
hspFLP/y; +; UAS-Myc::MYC	BDSC	9675	
hspFLP/y; UAS-NICD /CyO; MKRS/TM2	BDSC	52008	
NRE-EGFP	BDSC	30727	
UAS-N RNAi	BDSC	7078	
neoFRT82B Sb1/TM6	BDSC	2051	
NRE-eGFP	BDSC	30728	
UAS-Dl	BDSC	5614	
tub-Gal4/TM3, Sb	BDSC	5138	
w*, Insc-Gal4	BDSC	8751	
w*, UAS-Dicer2; wor-Gal4, ase-Gal80; UAS-mCD8::GFP	IMBA		A gift from Juergen A. Knoblich, IMBA
y w att2A[vas-φ]; +; attP-86F	ETH Zurich		A gift from Hugo Stocker, ETH
esg-Gal4, UAS-2XEYFP; MKRS/TM6B, Tb	ETH Zurich		A gift from Hugo Stocker, ETH
esg-Gal4, UAS-2XEYFP; tub-Gal80^{ts}/TM3, Sb	ETH Zurich		A gift from Hugo Stocker, ETH
yw; esg-Gal4, UAS-GFP/TM6B, Tb, Hu	ETH Zurich	2400	A gift from Hugo Stocker, ETH
NP1-Gal4 (Myo31DF or Myo1A-Gal4)/CyO, y+	ETH Zurich	2398	A gift from Hugo Stocker, ETH
esg-Gal4, UAS-mCherry-CD8, tub-gal80^{ts}/CyO			A gift from Péter Nagy, Cornell University
yw;UAS-cyto-gars-myc/CyO			A gift from Albena Jordanova, VIB-U Antwerp Center for Molecular Neurology

Bacteria strains and vectors		
XL1 blue	Aligent	200249
Rosetta – Novagen	Merck milipore	70954
pET-28a – Novagen	Merck milipore	69864
pET LIC (2A-T)	Addgene	29665
pUASattB	*Drosophila* Genomics Resource Center	1419
pw+SNattB	(Koch et al., 2009)	
Commercial assay or kit		
Pierce Silver Stain kit	Thermo Scientific	24612
Pierce BCA Protein Assay kit	Thermo Scientific	23227
ReliaPrep DNA CleanUp and Concentration System	Promega	A2893
GeneElute HP Plasmid miniprep kit	Sigma	NA0160
Qiagen Plasmid Plus Midi kit	Qiagen	12943
Ni-NTA affinity resin	Qiagen	30210
ECL Prime Western Blotting System	GE Healthcare	RPN2232
RNAMaxx High Yield Transcription Kit	Agilent	200339
Software, algorithm		
Leica Application Suite X (LAS X)	Leica	https://www.leica-microsystems.com/products/microscope-software/p/leica-las-x-ls/
FIJI	ImageJ	https://fiji.sc/
GraphPad Prism	GraphPad	https://www.graphpad.com/scientific-software/prism/
FlowJo	BD Biosciences	https://www.flowjo.com/
Microsoft Excel	Microsoft	https://products.office.com/en-us/excel

 Buffers

Lysis buffer for *Drosophila* tissue	Lysis buffer for bacteria
20 mM Tris HCl pH7.4	20 mM Tris HCl pH7.4
150uM NaCl	150uM NaCl
2 mM EDTA	2 mM EDTA
50 mM NaF	50 mM NaF
10% Glycerol	10% Glycerol
1% Triton X100	1% Triton X100
1 Protease inhibitor cocktail tablet (Roche-4693159001)	4mM Imidazole 1M
	0.6% Lysozyme
1 mM phenylmethylsulphonyl fluoride	1 Protease inhibitor cocktail tablet
	1 mM phenylmethylsulphonyl fluoride
4% PFA	**1X PBST**
1X PBST	0.2 % (v/v) Tween 20
4% (w/v) Paraformaldehyde	1X PBS
Blocking buffer	**Fly food recipe**

5% (w/v) non-fat dry milk 0.1% (v/v) Triton X100	20.4 l H$_2$0 1,680 g Maize flour 720 g Yeast
10X PBS pH 7.4	1,800 g Syrup 192 g Potassium sodium tartrate tetrahydrate
10.6 mM KH$_2$PO$_4$ 1.5 M NaCl 30 mM Na$_2$PO$_{4.}$7H$_2$0	36 g Nipagin 120 ml Propionic acid
10X SDS running buffer	**10X Transfer buffer**
30 g Tris base 144 g Glycine 10 g SDS dH$_2$O to 1 L	30 g Tris base 144 g Glycine dH$_2$O to 1 L
10X TBS pH to 7.6	**1X TBST**
24 g of Tris Base 88 g of NaCl dH$_2$O to 1 L	100 mL 10X TBS 900 mL dH$_2$O 0.1% (v/v) Tween 20

542 **Primers**

Name	Sequence (5' to 3')	Application
rc2263f	CGCGGATCCATCCGGCGAGAGAGTGTCTTTG	Genomic genomic
rc2263r	CGGGGTACCTATGCCTGGCGATAATCGTG	construct of α- PheRS
Tyr412Cys & Phe438Cys-F	TCAAGCCGGCGTACAATCCGTGTACCGAGCCCAG	Construct of α- PheRS^{Cys} mutation
Tyr412Cys & Phe438Cys-R	CTCCGGCCGACAGACGCCCGAGTTGCCC	
seq r6	GCTCCCATTCATCAGTTCC	Sequencing
seqA r1	CATTTCCACCGTGAGATCCGTC	Sequencing
seqA r2	AACTCTTGTGGGTGACCGTTTC	Sequencing
seqA f1	GTTCTCGAAGTGAATGTTCTGG	Sequencing
seqA f2	TTTAGCCACCGTCGTCGTTTC	Sequencing
seqA r3	TCCAGCGACGATGACGAATTTG	Sequencing
seqA f3	CAAATGGATTGTGGGACCAGC	Sequencing
seqA r4	GCCCTCCTCCACCATCTTTAG	Sequencing

Fly genetics and husbandry

All *Drosophila melanogaster* fly stocks were kept for long-term storage at 18ºC in glass or plastic vials on standard food with day/night (12h/12h) light cycles. All experiments were performed at 25ºC unless specifically mentioned. A UAS-GFP element was added in experiments that tested for rescue and involved Gal4-mediated expression of the rescue gene. This construct served to even out the number of UAS sites in each Gal4 expressing cell. Origins of all stocks are noted in the *Key Resource Table*.

DNA cloning and generation of transgenic flies

Sequence information was obtained from Flybase. All mutations and the addition of the Myc-tag to the N-terminus of *α-PheRS* were made by following the procedure of the QuickChange Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (Stratagene). The genomic *α-PheRS* rescue construct (*Myc::α-PheRS*) codes for the entire coding region and an additional Myc tag at the N-terminal end. In addition, it contains ~1kb of up-stream and down-stream sequences and it was cloned into the *pw⁺SNattB* transformation vector (Koch *et al.*, 2009; Lu *et al.*, 2014). The *α-PheRS* and *β-PheRS* cDNAs were obtained by RT-PCR from mRNA isolated from 4-8 days old *OreR* flies (Lu *et al.*, 2014). Transgenic flies were generated by applying the ϕ C31-based integration system with the stock (*y w att2A[vas-ϕ]; +; attP-86F*) (Bischof et al., 2007).

Western blotting

Protein was extracted from tissues, whole larvae, or flies using lysis buffer. 25 guts were analyzed for each genotype. Protein lysates were separated by SDS-PAGE and transferred onto PVDF membranes (Milipore, US). The blocking was performed for 1h at room temperature

(RT) with non-fat dry milk (5%) in TBST solution. Blots were probed first with primary

antibodies (diluted in blocking buffer) overnight at 4°C and then with secondary antibodies

(diluted in TBST) 1h at RT. The signal of the secondary antibody was detected by using the

detect solution mixture (1:1) (ECL Prime Western Blotting System, GE Healthcare Life

Science) and a luminescent detector (Amersham Imager 600, GE Healthcare Life Science).

Origins and recipes of all buffers and reagents are noted in the *Key Resource Table*.

Immunofluorescent staining and confocal microscopy

Adult midguts were dissected from each female fly after 5 days at 29°C (unless stated

otherwise) or at different time points after 2, 3, 4 days of heat treatment for the time-course

experiment. A total of 10 guts were analyzed for each genotype. In the larval experiments, the

animals were mated at 25°C on fresh, rich diet food and set up for egg-laying during a 2-hour

window. 120 hours after egg-laying, larval midguts were dissected from wandering third instar

larvae and a total of 10 guts were analyzed for each genotype. Dissections were performed in

1X PBS on ice and tissues were collected within a maximum of one hour. Fixation with 4%

PFA in PBS-T 0.2% at RT was done for different durations depending on the different tissues:

two hours (guts), 40 minutes (brains), 30 minutes (wing discs, ovaries). Then the samples were

blocked overnight with a blocking buffer at 4°C. Primary antibodies (diluted in blocking buffer)

were incubated with the samples for 8h at RT. The samples were rinsed 3 times and washed 3

times (20 minutes/wash) with PBST. Secondary antibodies (diluted in PBST) were incubated

overnight at 4°C. The samples were then rinsed 3 times and washed 2 times (20 minutes/wash)

with PBST. Hoechst 33258 (2.5 μg/ml) was added in PBST before the third and last washing

step and the samples were mounted with Aqua/Poly Mount solution (Polysciences Inc., US).

For the anti-Delta labeling, the samples were blocked for 3h at RT with a blocking buffer. The

primary anti-Delta antibody (1:10 v/v) was incubated with the samples overnight at 4°C and

then the secondary antibody was incubated overnight at 4°C. Origins and diluted concentrations

of all buffers and antibodies are noted in the *Key Resource Table*.

Image acquisition and processing

Imaging was carried out with a Leica SP8 confocal laser scanning microscope equipped with

a 405 nm diode laser, a 458, 476, 488, 496, and 514 nm Argon laser, a 561 nm diode-pumped

solid-state laser, and a 633 nm HeNe laser. Images were obtained with 20x dry and 63x oil-

immersion objectives and 1024x1024 pixel format. Images were acquired using LAS X

software. The images of the entire gut were obtained by imaging at the standard size and then

merging maximal projections of Z-stacks with the Tiles Scan tool. Fluorescent intensity was

determined from FIJI software.

Quantification of cell numbers per posterior midgut

Z stack images through the width of the posterior midgut were acquired along the length of the

posterior midgut from the R4a compartment to the midgut-hindgut junction. Maximum

projections of each Z stack were obtained, and the total numbers of each cell type were counted

manually and exported to Microsoft Excel and GraphPad Prism for further statistical analysis.

Quantification and statistical analysis

For quantifications of all experiments, *n* represents the number of independent biological

samples analyzed (the number of guts, the number of wing discs, the number of twin spots),

error bars represent standard deviation (SD). Statistical significance was determined using the

t-test or ANOVA as noted in the figure legends. They were expressed as P values. (*) denotes

$p < 0.05$, (**) denotes $p < 0.01$, (***) denotes $p < 0.001$, (****) denotes $p < 0.0001$. (*ns*)

denotes values whose difference was not significant.

Acknowledgments

We thank Peter Nagy, Hugo Stocker, Albena Jordanova, Erik Storkebaum, and the

Bloomington Stock Center for fly stocks. We are also grateful to Rohan Chippalkatti for

sharing his knowledge about the larval brain.

Financial Disclosure statement

This work was supported by a grant from the Novartis Foundation for Medical-Biological

Research (#18A050) and by the project grants 31003A_173188 and 310030_205075 from the

Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF) to B.S. Equipment support was by an equipment

grant from SNF (316030_150824) and by the University of Bern. Additional salary and

material support was received from the University of Bern to B.S. The funders had no role in

study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

References

Ables, J.L., Breunig, J.J., Eisch, A.J., and Rakic, P. (2011). Not(ch) just development: Notch
signalling in the adult brain. Nature reviews. Neuroscience *12*, 269-283. 10.1038/nrn3024.

Barrick, D., and Kopan, R. (2006). The Notch transcription activation complex makes its
move. Cell *124*, 883-885. 10.1016/j.cell.2006.02.028.

Beehler-Evans, R., and Micchelli, C.A. (2015). Generation of enteroendocrine cell diversity
in midgut stem cell lineages. Development *142*, 654-664. 10.1242/dev.114959.

Biehs, B., Sturtevant, M.A., and Bier, E. (1998). Boundaries in the Drosophila wing imaginal
disc organize vein-specific genetic programs. Development *125*, 4245-4257.

Bischof, J., Maeda, R.K., Hediger, M., Karch, F., and Basler, K. (2007). An optimized
transgenesis system for Drosophila using germ-line-specific phiC31 integrases. Proceedings
of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America *104*, 3312-3317.
10.1073/pnas.0611511104.

Borggrefe, T., and Oswald, F. (2009). The Notch signaling pathway: transcriptional
regulation at Notch target genes. Cellular and molecular life sciences : CMLS *66*, 1631-1646.
10.1007/s00018-009-8668-7.

Borggrefe, T., and Oswald, F. (2016). Setting the Stage for Notch: The Drosophila Su(H)-
Hairless Repressor Complex. PLoS biology *14*, e1002524. 10.1371/journal.pbio.1002524.

Bray, S., and Furriols, M. (2001). Notch pathway: making sense of suppressor of hairless.
Current biology : CB *11*, R217-221. 10.1016/s0960-9822(01)00109-9.

Casas-Tinto, S., Lolo, F.N., and Moreno, E. (2015). Active JNK-dependent secretion of
Drosophila Tyrosyl-tRNA synthetase by loser cells recruits haemocytes during cell
competition. Nature communications *6*, 10022. 10.1038/ncomms10022.

Collins, K.J., Yuan, Z., and Kovall, R.A. (2014). Structure and function of the CSL-KyoT2
corepressor complex: a negative regulator of Notch signaling. Structure *22*, 70-81.
10.1016/j.str.2013.10.010.

de Celis, J.F., de Celis, J., Ligoxygakis, P., Preiss, A., Delidakis, C., and Bray, S. (1996).
Functional relationships between Notch, Su(H) and the bHLH genes of the E(spl) complex:
the E(spl) genes mediate only a subset of Notch activities during imaginal development.
Development *122*, 2719-2728.

de la Pompa, J.L., Wakeham, A., Correia, K.M., Samper, E., Brown, S., Aguilera, R.J.,
Nakano, T., Honjo, T., Mak, T.W., Rossant, J., and Conlon, R.A. (1997). Conservation of the
Notch signalling pathway in mammalian neurogenesis. Development *124*, 1139-1148.

Deng, W.M., Althauser, C., and Ruohola-Baker, H. (2001). Notch-Delta signaling induces a
transition from mitotic cell cycle to endocycle in Drosophila follicle cells. Development *128*,
4737-4746.

Finarov, I., Moor, N., Kessler, N., Klipcan, L., and Safro, M.G. (2010). Structure of human
cytosolic phenylalanyl-tRNA synthetase: evidence for kingdom-specific design of the active
sites and tRNA binding patterns. Structure *18*, 343-353. 10.1016/j.str.2010.01.002.

Fortini, M.E., and Artavanis-Tsakonas, S. (1994). The suppressor of hairless protein
participates in notch receptor signaling. Cell *79*, 273-282. 10.1016/0092-8674(94)90196-1.

Furriols, M., and Bray, S. (2001). A model Notch response element detects Suppressor of
Hairless-dependent molecular switch. Current biology : CB *11*, 60-64. 10.1016/s0960-
9822(00)00044-0.

Giachino, C., and Taylor, V. (2014). Notching up neural stem cell homogeneity in
homeostasis and disease. Frontiers in neuroscience *8*, 32. 10.3389/fnins.2014.00032.

Gomard-Mennesson, E., Fabien, N., Cordier, J.F., Ninet, J., Tebib, J., and Rousset, H. (2007).
Clinical significance of anti-histidyl-tRNA synthetase (Jo1) autoantibodies. Annals of the
New York Academy of Sciences *1109*, 414-420. 10.1196/annals.1398.047.

Gordon, W.R., Arnett, K.L., and Blacklow, S.C. (2008). The molecular logic of Notch
signaling--a structural and biochemical perspective. Journal of cell science *121*, 3109-3119.
10.1242/jcs.035683.

Grandbarbe, L., Bouissac, J., Rand, M., Hrabe de Angelis, M., Artavanis-Tsakonas, S., and
Mohier, E. (2003). Delta-Notch signaling controls the generation of neurons/glia from neural
stem cells in a stepwise process. Development *130*, 1391-1402.

Greenberg, Y., King, M., Kiosses, W.B., Ewalt, K., Yang, X., Schimmel, P., Reader, J.S., and
Tzima, E. (2008). The novel fragment of tyrosyl tRNA synthetase, mini-TyrRS, is secreted to
induce an angiogenic response in endothelial cells. FASEB journal : official publication of
the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology *22*, 1597-1605.
10.1096/fj.07-9973com.

Guo, M., and Schimmel, P. (2013). Essential nontranslational functions of tRNA synthetases.
Nature chemical biology *9*, 145-153. 10.1038/nchembio.1158.

Guo, Z., Lucchetta, E., Rafel, N., and Ohlstein, B. (2016). Maintenance of the adult
Drosophila intestine: all roads lead to homeostasis. Current opinion in genetics &
development *40*, 81-86. 10.1016/j.gde.2016.06.009.

Guo, Z., and Ohlstein, B. (2015). Stem cell regulation. Bidirectional Notch signaling
regulates Drosophila intestinal stem cell multipotency. Science *350*.
10.1126/science.aab0988.

Hatakeyama, J., Bessho, Y., Katoh, K., Ookawara, S., Fujioka, M., Guillemot, F., and
Kageyama, R. (2004). Hes genes regulate size, shape and histogenesis of the nervous system
by control of the timing of neural stem cell differentiation. Development *131*, 5539-5550.
10.1242/dev.01436.

Henrique, D., and Schweisguth, F. (2019). Mechanisms of Notch signaling: a simple logic
deployed in time and space. Development *146*. 10.1242/dev.172148.

Ho, M.T., Lu, J., Dominique Brunßen and Suter, B. (2021). A translation-independent
function of PheRS activates growth and proliferation in Drosophila. Disease Models &
Mechanisms 14, dmm048132. doi:10.1242/dmm.048132.

Hori, K., Sen, A., and Artavanis-Tsakonas, S. (2013). Notch signaling at a glance. Journal of
cell science *126*, 2135-2140. 10.1242/jcs.127308.

Houtz, P., Bonfini, A., Bing, X., and Buchon, N. (2019). Recruitment of Adult Precursor
Cells Underlies Limited Repair of the Infected Larval Midgut in Drosophila. Cell host &
microbe *26*, 412-425 e415. 10.1016/j.chom.2019.08.006.

Jiang, H., and Edgar, B.A. (2011). Intestinal stem cells in the adult Drosophila midgut.
Experimental cell research *317*, 2780-2788. 10.1016/j.yexcr.2011.07.020.

Johannes, B., and Preiss, A. (2002). Wing vein formation in Drosophila melanogaster:
hairless is involved in the cross-talk between Notch and EGF signaling pathways.
Mechanisms of development *115*, 3-14. 10.1016/s0925-4773(02)00083-7.

Johnson, S.E., Ilagan, M.X., Kopan, R., and Barrick, D. (2010). Thermodynamic analysis of
the CSL x Notch interaction: distribution of binding energy of the Notch RAM region to the
CSL beta-trefoil domain and the mode of competition with the viral transactivator EBNA2. J
Biol Chem *285*, 6681-6692. 10.1074/jbc.M109.019968.

Koch, R., Ledermann, R., Urwyler, O., Heller, M., and Suter, B. (2009). Systematic
functional analysis of Bicaudal-D serine phosphorylation and intragenic suppression of a
female sterile allele of BicD. PloS one *4*, e4552. 10.1371/journal.pone.0004552.

Korzelius, J., Azami, S., Ronnen-Oron, T., Koch, P., Baldauf, M., Meier, E., Rodriguez-
Fernandez, I.A., Groth, M., Sousa-Victor, P., and Jasper, H. (2019). The WT1-like
transcription factor Klumpfuss maintains lineage commitment of enterocyte progenitors in
the Drosophila intestine. Nat Commun *10*, 4123. 10.1038/s41467-019-12003-0.

Korzelius, J., Naumann, S.K., Loza-Coll, M.A., Chan, J.S., Dutta, D., Oberheim, J., Glasser,
C., Southall, T.D., Brand, A.H., Jones, D.L., and Edgar, B.A. (2014). Escargot maintains
stemness and suppresses differentiation in Drosophila intestinal stem cells. EMBO J *33*,
2967-2982. 10.15252/embj.201489072.

Kovall, R.A. (2007). Structures of CSL, Notch and Mastermind proteins: piecing together an
active transcription complex. Current opinion in structural biology *17*, 117-127.
10.1016/j.sbi.2006.11.004.

Lee, J.H., and Lee, W.J. (2019). Stealing from the Future: Injured Larvae Spend Stem Cell
Deposits. Cell host & microbe *26*, 301-303. 10.1016/j.chom.2019.08.013.

Lee, S.W., Cho, B.H., Park, S.G., and Kim, S. (2004). Aminoacyl-tRNA synthetase
complexes: beyond translation. Journal of cell science *117*, 3725-3734. 10.1242/jcs.01342.

Lian, T., Wu, Q., Hodge, B.A., Wilson, K.A., Yu, G., and Yang, M. (2018). Drosophila Gut-
A Nexus Between Dietary Restriction and Lifespan. International journal of molecular
sciences *19*. 10.3390/ijms19123810.

Ling, J., Yadavalli, S.S., and Ibba, M. (2007). Phenylalanyl-tRNA synthetase editing defects
result in efficient mistranslation of phenylalanine codons as tyrosine. RNA *13*, 1881-1886.
10.1261/rna.684107.

Liu, J., Sato, C., Cerletti, M., and Wagers, A. (2010). Notch signaling in the regulation of
stem cell self-renewal and differentiation. Current topics in developmental biology *92*, 367-
409. 10.1016/S0070-2153(10)92012-7.

Lopez-Schier, H., and St Johnston, D. (2001). Delta signaling from the germ line controls the
proliferation and differentiation of the somatic follicle cells during Drosophila oogenesis.
Genes & development *15*, 1393-1405. 10.1101/gad.200901.

Loza-Coll, M.A., Southall, T.D., Sandall, S.L., Brand, A.H., and Jones, D.L. (2014).
Regulation of Drosophila intestinal stem cell maintenance and differentiation by the
transcription factor Escargot. The EMBO journal *33*, 2983-2996. 10.15252/embj.201489050.

Lu, J., Bergert, M., Walther, A., and Suter, B. (2014). Double-sieving-defective aminoacyl-
tRNA synthetase causes protein mistranslation and affects cellular physiology and
development. Nature communications *5*, 5650. 10.1038/ncomms6650.

Maier, D. (2019). The evolution of transcriptional repressors in the Notch signaling pathway:
a computational analysis. Hereditas *156*, 5. 10.1186/s41065-019-0081-0.

Marianes, A., and Spradling, A.C. (2013). Physiological and stem cell compartmentalization
within the Drosophila midgut. eLife *2*, e00886. 10.7554/eLife.00886.

Mathur, D., Bost, A., Driver, I., and Ohlstein, B. (2010). A transient niche regulates the
specification of Drosophila intestinal stem cells. Science *327*, 210-213.
10.1126/science.1181958.

Micchelli, C.A. (2012). The origin of intestinal stem cells in Drosophila. Developmental
dynamics *241*, 85-91. 10.1002/dvdy.22759.

Micchelli, C.A., and Perrimon, N. (2006). Evidence that stem cells reside in the adult
Drosophila midgut epithelium. Nature *439*, 475-479. 10.1038/nature04371.

Mundorf, J., Donohoe, C.D., McClure, C.D., Southall, T.D., and Uhlirova, M. (2019). Ets21c
Governs Tissue Renewal, Stress Tolerance, and Aging in the Drosophila Intestine. Cell
reports *27*, 3019-3033 e3015. 10.1016/j.celrep.2019.05.025.

Nagel, A.C., Auer, J.S., Schulz, A., Pfannstiel, J., Yuan, Z., Collins, C.E., Kovall, R.A., and
Preiss, A. (2017). Phosphorylation of Suppressor of Hairless impedes its DNA-binding
activity. Scientific reports *7*, 11820. 10.1038/s41598-017-11952-0.

Nagy, P., Sandor, G.O., and Juhasz, G. (2018). Autophagy maintains stem cells and intestinal
homeostasis in Drosophila. Scientific reports *8*, 4644. 10.1038/s41598-018-23065-3.

Nathanson, L., and Deutscher, M.P. (2000). Active aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases are present
in nuclei as a high molecular weight multienzyme complex. The Journal of biological
chemistry *275*, 31559-31562. 10.1074/jbc.C000385200.

Ohlstein, B., and Spradling, A. (2006). The adult Drosophila posterior midgut is maintained
by pluripotent stem cells. Nature *439*, 470-474. 10.1038/nature04333.

Ohlstein, B., and Spradling, A. (2007). Multipotent Drosophila intestinal stem cells specify
daughter cell fates by differential notch signaling. Science *315*, 988-992.
10.1126/science.1136606.

Oswald, F., and Kovall, R.A. (2018). CSL-Associated Corepressor and Coactivator
Complexes. Adv Exp Med Biol *1066*, 279-295. 10.1007/978-3-319-89512-3_14.

Otani, A., Slike, B.M., Dorrell, M.I., Hood, J., Kinder, K., Ewalt, K.L., Cheresh, D.,
Schimmel, P., and Friedlander, M. (2002). A fragment of human TrpRS as a potent
antagonist of ocular angiogenesis. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the
United States of America *99*, 178-183. 10.1073/pnas.012601899.

Park, S.J., Yoon, B.H., Kim, S.K., and Kim, S.Y. (2019). GENT2: an updated gene
expression database for normal and tumor tissues. BMC medical genomics *12*, 101.
10.1186/s12920-019-0514-7.

Praxenthaler, H., Nagel, A.C., Schulz, A., Zimmermann, M., Meier, M., Schmid, H., Preiss,
A., and Maier, D. (2017). Hairless-binding deficient Suppressor of Hairless alleles reveal
Su(H) protein levels are dependent on complex formation with Hairless. PLoS genetics *13*,
e1006774. 10.1371/journal.pgen.1006774.

Qiao, L., and Wong, B.C. (2009). Role of Notch signaling in colorectal cancer.
Carcinogenesis *30*, 1979-1986. 10.1093/carcin/bgp236.

Rodova, M., Ankilova, V., and Safro, M.G. (1999). Human phenylalanyl-tRNA synthetase:
cloning, characterization of the deduced amino acid sequences in terms of the structural
domains and coordinately regulated expression of the alpha and beta subunits in chronic
myeloid leukemia cells. Biochemical and biophysical research communications *255*, 765-
773. 10.1006/bbrc.1999.0141.

Roy, H., and Ibba, M. (2006). Phenylalanyl-tRNA synthetase contains a dispensable RNA-
binding domain that contributes to the editing of noncognate aminoacyl-tRNA. Biochemistry
45, 9156-9162. 10.1021/bi060549w.

Saj, A., Arziman, Z., Stempfle, D., van Belle, W., Sauder, U., Horn, T., Durrenberger, M.,
Paro, R., Boutros, M., and Merdes, G. (2010). A combined ex vivo and in vivo RNAi screen
for notch regulators in Drosophila reveals an extensive notch interaction network.
Developmental cell *18*, 862-876. 10.1016/j.devcel.2010.03.013.

Schimmel, P.R., and Soll, D. (1979). Aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases: general features and
recognition of transfer RNAs. Annual review of biochemistry *48*, 601-648.
10.1146/annurev.bi.48.070179.003125.

Sen, S., Zhou, H., Ripmaster, T., Hittelman, W.N., Schimmel, P., and White, R.A. (1997).
Expression of a gene encoding a tRNA synthetase-like protein is enhanced in tumorigenic
human myeloid leukemia cells and is cell cycle stage- and differentiation-dependent.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America *94*, 6164-
6169.

Shcherbata, H.R., Althauser, C., Findley, S.D., and Ruohola-Baker, H. (2004). The mitotic-
to-endocycle switch in Drosophila follicle cells is executed by Notch-dependent regulation of
G1/S, G2/M and M/G1 cell-cycle transitions. Development *131*, 3169-3181.
10.1242/dev.01172.

Shimmi, O., Matsuda, S., and Hatakeyama, M. (2014). Insights into the molecular
mechanisms underlying diversified wing venation among insects. Proceedings. Biological
sciences *281*, 20140264. 10.1098/rspb.2014.0264.

Smirnova, E.V., Lakunina, V.A., Tarassov, I., Krasheninnikov, I.A., and Kamenski, P.A.
(2012). Noncanonical functions of aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases. Biochemistry. Biokhimiia
77, 15-25. 10.1134/S0006297912010026.

Tabaja, N., Yuan, Z., Oswald, F., and Kovall, R.A. (2017). Structure-function analysis of
RBP-J-interacting and tubulin-associated (RITA) reveals regions critical for repression of
Notch target genes. J Biol Chem *292*, 10549-10563. 10.1074/jbc.M117.791707.

Taniguchi, Y., Furukawa, T., Tun, T., Han, H., and Honjo, T. (1998). LIM protein KyoT2
negatively regulates transcription by association with the RBP-J DNA-binding protein. Mol
Cell Biol *18*, 644-654. 10.1128/MCB.18.1.644.

Teleman, A.A., and Cohen, S.M. (2000). Dpp gradient formation in the Drosophila wing
imaginal disc. Cell *103*, 971-980. 10.1016/s0092-8674(00)00199-9.

Thurmond, J., Goodman, J.L., Strelets, V.B., Attrill, H., Gramates, L.S., Marygold, S.J.,
Matthews, B.B., Millburn, G., Antonazzo, G., Trovisco, V., et al. (2019). FlyBase 2.0: the
next generation. Nucleic acids research *47*, D759-D765. 10.1093/nar/gky1003.

Wacker, S.A., Alvarado, C., von Wichert, G., Knippschild, U., Wiedenmann, J., Clauss, K.,
Nienhaus, G.U., Hameister, H., Baumann, B., Borggrefe, T., et al. (2011). RITA, a novel
modulator of Notch signalling, acts via nuclear export of RBP-J. EMBO J *30*, 43-56.
10.1038/emboj.2010.289.

Yin, L., Velazquez, O.C., and Liu, Z.J. (2010). Notch signaling: emerging molecular targets
for cancer therapy. Biochemical pharmacology *80*, 690-701. 10.1016/j.bcp.2010.03.026.

Zeng, X., and Hou, S.X. (2015). Enteroendocrine cells are generated from stem cells through
a distinct progenitor in the adult Drosophila posterior midgut. Development *142*, 644-653.
10.1242/dev.113357.

Zhai, Z., Boquete, J.P., and Lemaitre, B. (2017). A genetic framework controlling the
differentiation of intestinal stem cells during regeneration in Drosophila. PLoS genetics *13*,
e1006854. 10.1371/journal.pgen.1006854.

Zhai, Z., Kondo, S., Ha, N., Boquete, J.P., Brunner, M., Ueda, R., and Lemaitre, B. (2015).
Accumulation of differentiating intestinal stem cell progenies drives tumorigenesis. Nature
communications *6*, 10219. 10.1038/ncomms10219.

Zhou, J.J., Wang, F., Xu, Z., Lo, W.S., Lau, C.F., Chiang, K.P., Nangle, L.A., Ashlock,
M.A., Mendlein, J.D., Yang, X.L., et al. (2014). Secreted histidyl-tRNA synthetase splice
variants elaborate major epitopes for autoantibodies in inflammatory myositis. The Journal of
biological chemistry *289*, 19269-19275. 10.1074/jbc.C114.571026.

Zimber-Strobl, U., and Strobl, L.J. (2001). EBNA2 and Notch signalling in Epstein-Barr
virus mediated immortalization of B lymphocytes. Semin Cancer Biol *11*, 423-434.
10.1006/scbi.2001.0409.

Figure legends:

Figure 1: α-PheRS is enriched in *Drosophila* progenitor and enteroendocrine cells.

(A-A", B, C-C", D) Endogenous α-PheRS accumulation is higher in small, diploid progenitor cells in wild-type adult and larval midguts. Signal intensity values in the graphs (right column) were measured from left to right along the lines in B and D. (E-F"") The *esg-Gal4,UAS-2XEYFP;tub-Gal80^{ts}* (=esg^{ts}) system and Prospero staining, respectively, were used to label progenitor and enteroendocrine cells, respectively. Animals were mated at 18°C and adults of the required genotypes were collected and shifted to 29°C to inactivate Gal80^{ts}. Adult midguts were dissected from female flies after 5 days of induction.

Figure 2: Elevated α-PheRS levels affect gut homeostasis, leading to additional progenitor cells, EEs, and differentiating EBs.

(A-C"') Elevated α-PheRS or α-PheRS^{Cys} levels induced by the esg^{ts} system (see Fig 1E for details) led to additional YFP-positive cells and also to the accumulation of EEs *(esg^{ts}/+;UAS-α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$/+)*. (D-D"') RNAi knockdown of *Notch (N)* with the same esg^{ts} system led to a similar phenotype as elevation of α-PheRS levels *(UAS-N^{RNAi}/+; esg^{ts}/+)*. (E-F"') Elevation of α-PheRS levels rescued the depleted ISC pool caused by Notch over-activation (induced by expressing the NICD under esg^{ts} control). (G) Quantification of YFP$^+$ cell numbers. (H) Proportional contribution of EEs to the total number of gut cells in the intestinal region analyzed. (I) Percentage of differentiating EBs among YFP$^+$ cells. In all experiments, EEs were visualized with the anti-Prospero antibody, YFP$^-$/Hoechst$^+$ polyploid cells were counted as ECs. Animals were mated at 18°C, and adults of the required genotypes were collected and shifted to 29°C to inactivate Gal80^{ts}. Adult midguts were dissected from female flies after 5 days of induction at 29°C. At least 10 guts were analyzed for each genotype. n=10, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p<0.0001 in ANOVA tests. (J) The Notch activity reporter (NRE-eGFP) expresses GFP under the control of a Notch response element. Its levels drastically decreased upon elevated expression of *α-PheRS* or *α-PheRS^{Cys}* in adult midgut ISCs *(esg-Gal4,UAS-2XEYFP/+;tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$,NRE-eGFP)*. Female flies were collected 3 days after eclosure and cultured at 29°C for 5 days before dissecting and harvesting their midguts.

Figure 3: The phenotype of elevated α-PheRS levels resembles partially a *Notch*-like phenotype in larval guts.

(A-H) Whole gut images and high-power micrographs of the posterior midgut area marked with a white square in the overview picture. The expression of the different genes indicated was driven with the *esg-Gal4,UAS-2XEYFP* system. The YFP signal displayed in green marks AMPs and EBs, Hoechst (blue) marks the nuclear DNA. (C) Elevated *α-PheRS^{Cys}* expression gave rise to tumor-like areas in both the anterior and the posterior midgut (outlined with dashed

lines) (*esg-Gal4,UAS-2XEYFP/+;UAS-α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$/+*). (E-E", F) Mitotic cells were identified
with anti-phospho-Histone H3 (PH3) antibodies (red channel) and the PH3+ cells are counted
and normalized to the total cell number per intestinal region. n=10, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 in
t-tests. (G) Total cells per intestinal region (total cells per frame of 63x objective of confocal
microscope with 1024x1024 pixels) were measured by counting Hoechst 33258 labeled cells
manually. n=10, **p<0.01,****p<0.0001.

Figure 4: *α-PheRS* counteracts *Notch* activity in neuroblast proliferation.

(A-F) Additional expression of *α-PheRS* or *α-PheRS^{Cys}* in neuroblasts reduced the ratio of
central brain (CB) size to optic lobe (OL) size. The *insc-Gal4,UAS-GFP* system was used to
drive the expression of the test genes in neuroblasts (NBs) (*w*, Insc-Gal4/UAS-GFP;UAS-α-*
PheRS$^{(Cys)}$/+). NBs were labeled by GFP expression. CBs are shown on the right side (area
with GFP$^+$ NBs and outlined by white dashed lines) and the OL area on the left. (G) Effect of
increased expression of *α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$*and *NICD,* and of *N* knockdown on the CB/OL size ratio.
n=20, ***p<0.001, *ns*: not significant. (H-M, N) Elevated α-PheRS or α-PheRS^{Cys} levels
reduced the number of Type II NBs per brain lobe, and less than half of the lobes contained the
normal 7-8 NBs. *Notch* RNAi caused the same phenotype with higher expressivity. Additional
expression of *α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$* rescued the tumor phenotype caused by ectopic Notch activation in
NB to normal wild-type levels. The larval brains were dissected from third instar larvae, and
at least 20 brains were analyzed for each genotype (*w*,UAS-Dicer2/+;wor-Gal4,ase-*
Gal80/+;UAS-mCD8::GFP/UAS-α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$). Each brain lobe was classified according to
the number of Type II NBs per brain lobe. n = 25.

Figure 5: Elevated α-PheRS levels repress Notch signaling in wing discs.

Schematic illustration of wild-type wing imaginal discs showing the position of the different
compartments (A), the expression domain of en^{ts}>mRFP (A'), and the expression domain of
NRE-eGFP (A") along the dorsal/ventral (D/V) boundary. (A'") *en-Gal4,NRE-eGFP,UAS-*
mRFP;tub-Gal80^{ts} was used to drive transgene expression in the posterior compartment of
developing wing discs and to evaluate the Notch activity with the reporter *NRE-eGFP* (black
arrowhead) *(w,UAS-Dcr2/+;en-Gal4,UAS-mRFP,NRE-eGFP/+;tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-α-*
PheRS$^{(Cys)}$). (B-E'") Elevated α-PheRS or α-PheRS^{Cys} led to the loss of NRE-eGFP expression
in the posterior compartment, similar to the phenotype of *Notch* knockdown *(w,UAS-*
Dcr2/UAS-N^{RNAi};en-Gal4,UAS-mRFP,NRE-eGFP/+;tub-Gal80^{ts}/+). After egg-laying and
incubation at 18°C for 6 days, the animals were shifted to 29°C for 1 day to inactivate Gal80^{ts}
and to enable expression of α-PheRS, α-PheRS^{Cys}, or *N*^{RNAi}.

Figure 6: The N-term of α-PheRS (α-S) is sufficient to induce the proliferative phenotype and repress Notch activity.

(A) 3D model of the α-PheRS structure (suggested by SWISS MODEL tool https://swissmodel.expasy.org/) also shows that the catalytic module and the winged DBDs are separated from each other by a linker strand. (B) Schematic illustration of the α-PheRS polypeptide with its ATP and phenylalanine binding residues. α-PheRS has the catalytic domains located in the C-terminal part and the DNA binding domains (DBD-1,2,3) located in the N-terminal region. The Myc tagged α-S construct lacks all core domains of α-PheRS but encodes the first 200 codons of the α-PheRS ORF under UAS control. (C,D) *Myc::α-S* was expressed using the esg^{ts} system in adult and larval midguts and this led to similar phenotypes as elevated expression of α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ in the same system *(esg^{ts}/UAS-Myc::α-S)*. (E-E',F,G) Quantification of PH3$^+$ cell numbers (F) and the proportion of EE per total cell number (G) in the intestinal region analyzed. In all experiments, EEs were visualized with the anti-Prospero antibody, YFP$^-$/Hoechst$^+$ polyploid cells were counted as ECs. Animals were mated at 18°C, and adults of the required genotypes were collected and shifted to 29°C to inactivate Gal80^{ts}. Adult midguts were dissected from female flies after 5 days of induction at 29°C. At least 10 guts were analyzed for each genotype. n=10, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p<0.0001 in ANOVA tests. (H, H') The ectopic wing venation phenotype resulting from elevated levels of Myc::α-S was similar to the phenotype of elevated α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$ (shown in Fig 5A). An ectopic vein branches from the connecting vein between the L4 and L5 veins (arrowhead). The same system and experimental settings were used as in Fig 5A *(en^{ts}/+;UAS-Myc::α-S/+)*. (I-J') Elevated Myc::α-S leads to the loss of NRE-eGFP expression in the posterior compartments, similar to the effect of α-PheRS$^{(Cys)}$. The same system and experimental setups were used as in Fig 5B-F *(w,UAS-Dcr2/+;en-Gal4,UAS-mRFP,NRE-eGFP/+;tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-Myc::α-S)*. (K, L) Besides the full-length α-PheRS isoform (55kDa), one stable Myc-tag containing isoform around 40 KDa and another around 25KDa appear when expressing transgenic Myc::α-PheRS under the control of the *Tub-Gal4* driver *(w; +/+; Tub-Gal4/UAS-Myc::α-PheRS)*. The 40 KDa isoform was present in larval heads and fat bodies, while the 25 KDa isoform was predominantly expressed in larval guts.

Figure 7: Possible mechanism of the competition between N^{ICD} and the α-S activity.

(A) The alignment of Notch and α-PheRS shows that moderately conserved motives are present in the RAM domain (1766-1896 aa) and the N-terminal sequence of α-PheRS (1-180 aa). The DNA binding domain (DBD) is shown shaded in green. The alignment task was conducted by the Alignment Tool of the Uniprot website (https://www.uniprot.org/) with two FASTA polypeptide sequences of *Drosophila* Notch and *Drosophila* α-PheRS. * (asterisk) indicates positions that have a single, fully conserved residue. ":" (colon) indicates conservation between groups of strongly similar properties - scoring > 0.5 in the Gonnet PAM 250 matrix. A "." (period) indicates conservation between groups of weakly similar properties - scoring =< 0.5 in the Gonnet PAM 250 matrix. (B-D''') Elevated YFP (control), Myc::α-S^{W112A} or α-PheRS^{W112A} levels induced by the esg^{ts} system (see Fig 1E for details) did not lead to additional YFP-positive cells and also not to the hyper-accumulation of EEs. (E- F''') Neither elevated Myc::α-S^{W112A} nor α-PheRS^{W112A} levels rescued the depleted ISC pool caused by Notch over-activation (induced by expressing the NICD under the same control). Note that F shows only 2 Pros$^+$ cells, the weaker signals are caused by autofluorescence from some fibers. (G) Quantification of YFP$^+$ cell numbers and (H) Proportional contribution of EEs to the total number of gut cells in the intestinal region analyzed (visualized with the 63x objective and Leica SP8). Animals were mated at 18°C, and adults of the required genotypes were collected and shifted to 29°C to inactivate Gal80^{ts}. Adult midguts were dissected from female flies after 5 days of induction at 29°C. At least 10 guts were analyzed for each genotype. n=10, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$, ****$p<0.0001$ in ANOVA tests. (I-J''') The anti Myc staining revealed the presence of both Myc::α-S and Myc::α-S^{W112A} in nuclei. Signal intensity values in the graphs (L) and (K) were measured from left to right along the lines in I''' and J''', respectively.

Figure 1

Adult midgut

Larval midgut

Figure 2

	DNA	YFP	Pros	Overlay

YFP — A, A', A'', A'''

α-PheRS — B, B', B'', B'''

α-PheRS^{Cys} — C, C', C'', C'''

N^{RNAi} — D, D', D'', D'''

NICD — E, E', E'', E'''

α-PheRS + NICD — F, F', F'', F'''

esg^{ts}>

G

YFP⁺ cells

**** **** **** **** ****

YFP α-PheRS α-PheRS^{Cys} N^{RNAi} N^{ICD} α-PheRS+N^{ICD}

H

Percentage of EE/total cells per region(%)

*** * *** **** ****

YFP α-PheRS α-PheRS^{Cys} N^{RNAi} N^{ICD} α-PheRS+N^{ICD}

I

Percentage of differentiating EBs per total cells per region

**** ****

YFP α-PheRS α-PheRS^{Cys} N^{RNAi} N^{ICD} α-PheRS+N^{ICD}

J

Tub>

Control α-PheRS α-PheRS Cys

NRE-eGFP

α-PheRS

α-Tubulin

Figure 3

A esg>YFP
anterior / posterior

B DNA / esg>YFP

C esg>Myc::α-PheRS
anterior / posterior

D DNA / esg>YFP

E esg>α-PheRS^{Cys}
anterior / posterior

F DNA / esg>YFP

G esg>N^{RNAi}
anterior / posterior

H DNA / Esg>YFP

I YFP   J α-PheRS   K α-PheRS^{Cys}
DNA/YFP/PH3

L

Mitotic index normalized to total cell number

***
**

Control   α-PheRS   α-PheRS^{Cys}

M

Percentage of EE / total cells per region(%)

***
****

Control   α-PheRS   α-PheRS^{Cys}

N

Total cells per intestinal region analyzed

**
****

Control   α-PheRS   α-PheRS^{Cys}

Figure 4

Ratio CB/OL

N

Number of type II neuroblasts per lobe

Figure 5

Figure 6

A N-terminal part
DBDs
Linker region
Catalytic domain
C-terminal part

B N-terminal
Myc tag
Full length α-PheRS
Y412 F438 A456
R358 F370 R463
C-terminal

Myc tag
α-S isoform
200aa

▼ : Phenylalanine binding site
▲ : ATP binding site

5' DBD1 DBD2 DBD3 DBD2 DBD1 Linker region CATALYTIC DOMAIN 3'

esgᵗˢ>Myc::α-S

DNA | YFP | Myc | Overlay

C Larval gut | **C'** | **C''** | **C'''**
D Adult gut | **D'** | **D''** | **D'''**

Control | *Esgᵗˢ>Myc::α-S*

E DNA/YFP/Pros | **E'** DNA/YFP/Pros
32 μm | 32 μm

F PH3⁺ cells per posterior midgut
**** **** ns
Control α-PheRS Myc::α-S

G Percentage of EE / total cells per region(%)
**** **** ns
Control α-PheRS Myc::α-S

NRE-eGFP | DNA / NRE-eGFP / mRFP

Control **H** | **H'**
enᵗˢ>Myc::α-S **I** | **I'**

J *Tub-Gal4* | myc::α-PheRS | β-PheRS::myc
Myc::α-PheRS
— 80 KDa
— 60 KDa
— 50 KDa
— 40 KDa
— 30 KDa
— 25 KDa
— 20 KDa
— 15 KDa

K whole larvae | head | salivary gland | fat body | gut
Myc::α-PheRS
— 60 KDa
— 50 KDa
* — 40 KDa
— 30 KDa
* — 25 KDa
— 20 KDa
— 15 KDa

Figure 7

```
P07207 NOTCH_DROME    1681 GIQIYLEIDNRKCTECFTHAVEAAEFLAATAAKHQLRNDFQIHSVRGIKNPGDE--DNGE 1738
Q9W3J5 SYFA_DROME       25 --AALFAEDHQKIVGSLKSIQAHGELVTAE---------TVTHKSLGLTDEGRAVVENGS 73
                             :    *::*  . .:.  *.:::*        *.  *.*.:   *   :**
                                                              RAM
P07207 NOTCH_DROME    1739 PPANVKYVI--TGIILVIIALAFFGMVLSTQRKRAHGVIWFTPEGFRAPAAVMSRRRRDPH 1796
Q9W3J5 SYFA_DROME       74 HEALVYDLVPPEGIAQAA-LMAAGGANAKVGFSKAMSHGWILVDKSVTPP-LVRRKVDTI 131
                             * *   ::    **    . :*  *   .. .  :*. *  .  :  **: *
                                                    RAM
P07207 NOTCH_DROME    1797 GQEMRNLNKQVAMQSQGVGQPGAHWSDDESDMPLPKRQRSDPVSGVGLGNNGGYASDHTM 1856
Q9W3J5 SYFA_DROME      132 TDVVRNQLQQVALGK-GDQLPAKEVAD---FKKRKLLQETTTKSFVLARGPEFATTLTK 186
                             :  ** :*** :  *.  * .  :*     * :.  .... *..  :*: *
                             RAM
P07207 NOTCH_DROME    1857 ---VSEYEEADQRVWSQAHLDVVDVRAIMTPPAHQDGGKHDVDARGPCGLTPLMIAAVRG 1913
Q9W3J5 SYFA_DROME      187 LETDLTVEMLANGLWDQLKFKAYNFDALGAPPTRGH-------------LHPLLK----- 228
                             *     : :*.* .::.. :. .*  :  :**::  .     * **:
```

RAM domain: 1766-1896; N-terminal of α-PheRS: 1-180

Figure S1

Figure S1: *α-PheRS* or *α-PheRS^Cys* were overexpressed using the *esg-Gal4,UAS-2XEYFP;tub-Gal80^ts* (=esg^ts) system that allowed us to control the expression time to study the kinetics of the appearance of the phenotypes. The kinetics of the *Notch* knockdown resembled partially the one of *PheRS^(Cys)* expression (esg^ts / *UAS-α-PheRS^(Cys)*). Animals were mated at 18°C, and adults of the required genotypes were collected and shifted to 29°C to inactivate Gal80^ts. Adult midguts were dissected from female flies after the indicated induction times.

Figure S2

	DNA	YFP	Myc	Overlay

en^(ts)> *Myc::α-S* *Myc::α-S^(W112A)*

Figure S2: Staining wing discs for Myc::α-S showed the stable expression of both truncated alleles *Myc::α-S* and *Myc::α-S^(W112A)*. The *en-Gal4,UAS-EGFP;tub-Gal80^(ts)* (en^(ts)) system was used to drive transgene expression in the posterior compartment of developing wing discs *(*en^(ts)/UAS-Myc::α-S or Myc::α-S^(W112A)*)* and Hoechst staining to label nuclei. Animals were initially kept at 18°C for 3 days and then shifted to 29°C to inactivate Gal80^(ts) until adult flies hatched, enabling expression of Myc::α-S or Myc::α-S^(W112A).

Figure S3

Figure S3: The Myc-tagged isoforms from whole larvae were purified by immunoprecipitation and gel purification. The tryptic peptide fragments of the 25kDa band were subsequently analyzed by mass spectrometry (MS). The MS data analysis revealed the peptide coverage of the 25KDa isoform according to the score of Peptide Spectrum Matches (PSM). The 25 KDa isoform contains the peptides of the N-terminal 28% of the full-length α-PheRS.

Figure S4

Figure S4: The ectopic wing venation phenotype resulting from elevated levels of α-PheRS(Cys) and α-S is similar to the phenotype of *N*RNAi treatment. An ectopic vein branches from the connecting vein between the L4 and L5 vein (arrowhead in B-F). D) Knockdown of *Notch* shows this phenotype and the classical notched phenotype in the distal region of L3, L4, and near the L5 vein. The *en-Gal4,tub-Gal80ts* (en^{ts}) system was used to drive transgene expression in the posterior compartment of developing wing discs *(en^{ts}/UAS-α-PheRS(Cys))*. Animals were initially kept at 18°C for 3 days and then shifted to 29°C to inactivate Gal80^{ts} until adult flies hatched, enabling expression of α-PheRS, α-PheRS^{Cys}, α-S, or *N*RNAi.