Title: I-KCKT allows dissection-free RNA profiling of adult *Drosophila*

intestinal progenitor cells

Authors: Kasun Buddika*, Jingjing Xu*, Ishara S. Ariyapala, and Nicholas S. Sokol

* Co-first authors.

Affiliation: Department of Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405,

USA

Correspondence: nsokol@indiana.edu (email)

15   812-856-6812 (phone)

19 **Keywords:** CLIP, eCLIP, PABP, FMRP, intestinal stem cell

22 **Running Title:** I-KCKT RNA profiling

Summary Statement

We report a dissection-free method to identify proximity-based RNA-protein interactions in an *in vivo* stem cell population, enabling molecular analysis of these cells at unprecedented speed and resolution.

<u>Abstract</u>

The adult Drosophila intestinal epithelium is a model system for stem cell biology,

but its utility is limited by current biochemical methods that lack cell type resolution.

Here, we describe a new proximity-based profiling method that relies upon a GAL4

driver, termed *intestinal-kickout-GAL4* (*I-KCKT-GAL4*), exclusively expressed in

intestinal progenitor cells. This method used UV cross-linked whole animal frozen

powder as its starting material to immunoprecipitate the RNA cargoes of transgenic

epitope-tagged RNA binding proteins driven by *I-KCKT-GAL4*. When applied to the

general mRNA-binder, poly(A)-binding protein, the RNA profile obtained by this method

identified 98.8% of transcripts found after progenitor cell sorting, and had low

background noise despite being derived from whole animal lysate. We also mapped the

targets of the more selective RNA binder, Fragile Mental Retardation Protein, using

enhanced CLIP, and report for the first time its binding motif in Drosophila cells. This

method will therefore enable the RNA profiling of wildtype and mutant intestinal

progenitor cells from intact flies exposed to normal and altered environments, as well as

the identification of RNA-protein interactions critical for stem cell function.

Introduction

The adult *Drosophila* intestine has become a premier model for understanding

the biology and behavior of resident stem cells in their native context (Li and Jasper,

2016). One key approach has been transcript profiling that characterizes the gene

expression signatures of cell types in both homeostatic and perturbed conditions (see,

for example, (Dutta et al., 2015; Hung et al., 2020)). This approach has relied on the

manual dissection of intestines. Manual dissection is not only laborious and time-

consuming, but also precludes certain types of analysis that require large amounts of

intact, non-degraded starting material, such as immunoprecipitation (IP). Methods that

rely upon the sequencing of immunoprecipitates associated with RNA-binding proteins

(RBPs) to analyze post-transcriptional control mechanisms (e.g. RiboTag) are not

currently feasible in adult Drosophila intestinal stem cells but have been critical for

characterizing identity and differentiation mechanisms in other stem cell lineages (Baser

et al., 2019; Sanz et al., 2009; Tahmasebi et al., 2018). There is therefore a need for

improved methods to profile this stem cell population in Drosophila.

Manual dissection of intestines has been required because of the lack of tools to

exclusively label and manipulate individual intestinal cell types. Such tools would enable

the use of the whole fly as starting material, allowing for the rapid production of large

amounts of starting material. GAL4 drivers are available that label the various individual

cell types in the intestinal stem cell lineage, including the intestinal stem cells (ISCs)

themselves as well as their transient progenitor cell daughters, termed enteroblasts

(EB), and two differentiated cell types, enterocytes (ECs) and enteroendocrine cells

(EEs) (Jiang and Edgar, 2009; Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006; Zeng et al., 2010). Such

GAL4 drivers can be used to express epitope-tagged transgenic proteins specifically in

these various intestinal cell types that can be immunopurified. However, these GAL4

drivers are either known or likely to be active elsewhere in the adult (Biteau et al.,

2010).

Here, we describe a method that uses a new intestinal progenitor GAL4 driver

that is not expressed outside the intestine to profile the general transcriptome as well as

specific RBP cargoes expressed in this cell type. We reasoned that an intersectional

approach could be used to design such a GAL4 driver. Intersectional methods limit

transgenic expression to cells in which two different enhancers are both active. In a

recombinase-mediated intersectional method, for example, the recombinase under the

control of one enhancer activates a GAL4 driver under the control of a second enhancer

via recombinase-mediated removal of an intervening stop cassette (Fig 1A). Such a

recombinase-based method involving a pan-intestinal enhancer and a progenitor

enhancer should limit expression to only intestinal progenitor cells. We designed our

transgenes with the KD recombinase (KDR), which was recently shown to mediate the

excision, or "kick-out", of sequences between KDR target (KDRT) sites in *Drosophila*

cells (Nern et al., 2011). We chose to use KDR so that the resulting system could be

used in tandem with other recombinases, like FLP, for additional manipulation of

intestinal cells. Because this system is designed for intestine-specific activation of a

"kick-out" transgene, we referred to it as Intestinal-KiCK-ouT, or I-KCKT.

Results

I-KCKT-GAL4 labels most intestinal progenitor cells

To build the transgenes needed for our system, we first searched for defined pan-intestinal and progenitor enhancer sequences. Progenitor enhancer sequences have previously been identified in the *miranda* (*mira*) gene locus (Bardin et al., 2010), but the availability of a defined pan-intestinal enhancer was less clear. Transgenes with regulatory sequences from some intestine-specific genes have been reported (e.g. *mex1-GAL4*, *npc1b-GAL4*, etc. (Phillips and Thomas, 2006; Voght et al., 2007)), but careful inspection found that these transgenes were either not expressed throughout the intestine or in all cell types. We therefore took a candidate gene approach to identify intestine-specific enhancers based on gene expression data reported in FlyAtlas 2 (Leader et al., 2018), testing DNA fragments from intestine-specific genes for intestinal activity. KDR transgenes containing putative enhancer sequences from *βTrypsin* (*βTr*y), *θTrypsin* (*θTry*), *κTrypsin* (*κTry*), *CG10116*, or *CG18404* were tested for intestinal activity in flies also harboring two additional transgenes, a *tubulin-KDRT-stop-KDRT-GAL4.p65* "kickout" transgene and a *UAS-6XGFP* responder (Shearin et al., 2014). GFP expression was monitored in both the larval and adult intestine for all resulting strains except for *θTry*; in its case, only larvae were analyzed because adults of the proper genotype failed to eclose. While all strains displayed some GFP expression in the larval intestine, most GFP patterns were patchy and non-uniform (Fig 1B-G). In the adult intestine, however, two KDR lines, *βTry-KDR* and *CG10116-KDR*, drove expression throughout the tissue (Fig 1H, M). Careful inspection of these two indicated that *CG10116-KDR* was expressed in most cells throughout the midgut, raising the

possibility that the associated enhancer fragment was pan-intestinal-specific and could

be used to exclusively label adult intestinal progenitor cells.

To test this possibility, we evaluated *CG10116-KDR* activity in the intestinal

progenitor cells of flies harboring a *mira*-containing stop cassette transgene as well as

UAS-stinger-GFP, a nuclear-localized GFP reporter (Barolo et al., 2000). For these

experiments, we analyzed strains containing two different *mira* transgenes, one

encoding an enhanced version of GAL4 with the p65 transcriptional activation domain

(*mira-KDRT-stop-KDRT-GAL4.p65*) and one with a non-modified version of GAL4 (*mira-*

KDRT-stop-KDRT-GAL4) that could be used in conjunction with the GAL80-dependent

temporal and regional gene expression targeting (TARGET) system for conditional

expression (McGuire et al., 2004). For brevity, we refer to the strains combining

CG10116-KDR with *mira-KDRT-stop-KDRT-GAL4.p65* or *mira-KDRT-stop-KDRT-GAL4*

as *I-KCKT-GAL4.p65* or *I-KCKT-GAL4*, respectively. To analyze *CG10116-KDR-*

mediated expression in these strains, we compared GFP expression with that of a

previously generated and validated progenitor reporter, *mira-His2A.mCherry.HA* (Miller

et al., 2020)*,* in each of the five intestinal regions (Fig 2A-J). Quantification of the

percentage of mCherry+ cells that were also GFP+ indicated that ~100% of progenitor

cells were labeled in most regions of both *I-KCKT* strains (Fig 2P, Q). The only two

exceptions to this trend were regions 1 and 3 of *I-KCKT-GAL4.p65* intestines, where

only 58.7±15.5% (n=5) and 64.4±17.0% (n=5) of progenitor cells were labeled,

respectively. Importantly, we also found that no GFP+ cells were mCherry- in either

strain, indicating that no non-progenitor cells were labeled in *I-KCKT* strains. To confirm

this analysis, we also compared GFP expression driven by *I-KCKT-GAL4* to a second,

validated progenitor reporter, *esg-LacZ* (Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006), and found

similarly that almost all LacZ+ cells were also GFP+ and that no GFP+ cells were LacZ-

(Fig S1). The only exception was region 3, where ~69.9±9.0% of LacZ+ cells were

GFP+. This discrepancy may reflect that *esg-LacZ* labels a small subset of EEs in this

midgut area (Hung et al., 2020) Collectively, this analysis indicated that almost all

progenitor cells, but few if any other cells, were labeled in the intestines of *I-KCKT*

strains.

I-KCKT-GAL4 is not detected in non-intestinal tissue

To determine whether intestinal progenitor cells were exclusively labeled in *I-*

KCKT adults, we performed two analyses. First, we crossed *I-KCKT* strains to *UAS-*

6XGFP and visually inspected adults for GFP expression. *I-KCKT* strains displayed

prominent 6XGFP fluorescence in the intestine but little, if any, elsewhere (Fig 3A, B).

For comparison, we similarly analyzed three other widely used drivers known to be

expressed in some or all intestinal progenitor cells: a *GawB* P-element insertion in the

escargot (*esg*) locus (*esg-GAL4*), a *GawB* P-element insertion in the *Delta* (*Dl*) locus

(*Dl-GAL4*), and a *Notch*-responsive GAL4 reporter that contains binding sites for the

Grainyhead and Suppressor of Hairless transcription factors (*gbe-GAL4*) (Micchelli and

Perrimon, 2006; Zeng et al., 2010). All three were detected in the intestine (Fig 3E-G);

Dl-GAL4 and *gbe-GAL4* also displayed prominent non-intestinal expression while *esg-*

GAL4 appeared more similar to the *I-KCKT* with regard to intestinal specificity. For a

more rigorous analysis, we also performed comparative Western Blot analysis for

6XGFP expression on three different protein extracts generated from each strain: whole

animal extract (total), extract from dissected gastrointestinal tracts that included the

malphigian tubules (intestine), and extract from all remaining non-intestinal tissue

(carcass) (Fig 3H). For both *I-KCKT* strains, GFP was detected in intestinal but not

carcass extract, and the amount in the intestine was roughly similar to the amount in the

total extract. In contrast, GFP was detected in both the intestine and carcass of the

three comparison strains, *esg-GAL4*, *Dl-GAL4*, and *gbe-GAL4*. We also tested the

conditional expression of *mira-KDRT-stop-KDRT-GAL4* by generating an *I-KCKT-*

GAL4^{TS} strain that harbored an ubiquitously expressed, temperature sensitive GAL80

transgene (*tub-GAL80^{TS}*) and then performing both analyses on flies that had been

incubated at the non-permissive (18°C) and permissive (30°C) temperatures (Fig 3H-J).

This analysis detected no GFP expression at the non-permissive temperature, and clear

expression at the permissive temperature. We noted that *I-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}*-driven GFP

signal can also be detected in the progenitor cells of the malphigian tubules

(arrowheads in Fig 3J), which are *esg^{+}* cells that are related to midgut progenitor cells

(Singh et al., 2007). We also note that, like *esg-GAL4* but to a lesser degree, *I-KCKT-*

GAL4^{TS} lost its progenitor-specificity in the intestinal tissue of aged animals (Fig S2).

Collectively, these results indicated that, unlike other commonly used progenitor drivers,

I-KCKT-GAL4-based expression could not be detected outside the intestine.

ISC-KCKT-GAL4 specifically labels adult intestinal stem cells

To further expand on the utility of the I-KCKT system, we investigated whether *I-*

KCKT-based GAL4 expression could be limited to either the ISC or EB subsets of

progenitor cells. To do so, we prepared strains in which the three *I-KCKT^{TS}* transgenes

were combined with a GAL4-silencing GAL80 transgene that contained either the EB-

specific *gbe* synthetic enhancer (*gbe-GAL80*) or a fragment from the *Delta* locus

reported to be active in ISCs (*GMR24H06-GAL80*) (Furriols and Bray, 2001; Guo et al.,

2013). We referred to these strains as *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* and *EB-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}*,

respectively. Like *I-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}*, both *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* and *EB-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}*

activity were intestine-specific based on visual and/or Western blot analysis (Fig 3C, D,

H). To evaluate the cell type specificity of this activity, we drove GFP expression in both

strains and compared it to a dual reporter combination that effectively distinguishes

ISCs and EBs (Fig S3). These dual reporters are the progenitor marker *mira-*

His2A.mCherry.HA (Miller et al., 2020) and the EB-specific marker *3Xgbe-*

smGFP.V5.nls (Buddika et al., 2020a). For this analysis, we scored mCherry+, V5- cells

as ISCs and mCherry+, V5+ cells as EBs. Most ISCs were specifically labeled in the

ISC-KCKT-GAL4^{TS} strain: 84.1±12.3% (n=5) of ISCs were labeled whereas 11.2±10.0%

(n=5) of EBs were labeled across all five regions of the intestine (Fig 2K-O, R, S). In

contrast, EB-specific labeling in *EB-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* was less effective: only 30.7±20.1%

(n=5) of EBs were labeled whereas 57±19.8% (n=5) of ISCs were labeled across all five

regions of the intestine (Fig S4). Various possibilities could explain this *EB-KCKT-*

GAL4^{TS} result, including that the GMR24H06 enhancer fragment was not active in most

ISCs and/or that GAL80 activity perdured in EB cells. Nevertheless, this analysis

indicated that *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* specifically labeled most ISCs.

CLIP-seq of PABP using *I-KCKT-GAL4* identifies progenitor expressed genes

We next investigated whether these *I-KCKT* strains could be used to streamline

current methods to molecularly profile progenitor cells. RNA-seq profiling methods that

rely on *esg-GAL4*, for example, require labor-intensive dissection of hundreds of

intestines followed by digestion of this tissue to release labeled progenitor cells for

fluorescent activated cell sorting (FACS) (Dutta et al., 2015; Fast et al., 2020; Korzelius

et al., 2019; Li et al., 2018) (Fig 4A, left). Because *I-KCKT-GAL4* activity was limited to

intestinal progenitor cells, we tested whether a cross-linking immunoprecipitation and

sequencing (CLIP-seq) analysis of *I-KCKT-GAL4*-driven, FLAG-tagged poly-A Binding

Protein (PABP) that used whole animal lysate as its starting material would recover

progenitor cell RNA (Fig 4A, right). PABP is a general mRNA-binding protein that has

been used to profile the mRNA transcriptomes of other cell types (Hwang et al., 2016;

Yang et al., 2005). We first verified that the FLAG-tagged version of PABP that had

previously been used to profile mRNAs in *Drosophila* photoreceptor cells was

expressed in progenitor cells when crossed to *I-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* (Fig S5) (Yang et al.,

2005). Then, we crushed frozen flies from this strain to generate a fine powder,

subjected this powder to UV crosslinking to covalently link protein and RNA complexes,

immunoprecipitated PABP using anti-FLAG beads, and recovered the associated

RNAs. Independent libraries were prepared from duplicate PABP immunoprecipitates

(PABP IPs). In parallel, two libraries were also prepared from RNA extracted from the

starting whole animal lysate, and we used these "input" libraries as our normalization

controls. Differential gene expression analysis found 1,661 transcripts enriched in the

PABP IP samples and 3,293 enriched in input (Fig. 4B, Table S1). Representative

examples of these respective classes included the progenitor-enriched *esg* transcript

and the ovary-enriched *oskar* transcript (*osk*) (Fig. 4C-D).

To evaluate whether the PABP IP-enriched transcripts included transcripts

known to be enriched in progenitor cells, it was cross-referenced to two published

datasets. First, we compared our results to transcriptome profiles obtained by Doupé,

who used a DamID based method to identify progenitor-enriched and EC-enriched

transcripts (Doupe et al., 2018). Twenty percent of the 1,661 were present in Doupé's

progenitor-enriched transcripts, whereas only 4% were present in the EC-enriched set

(Fig. 4E-F). In addition, we re-analyzed published RNA-seq datasets from FACS-

isolated progenitors, ECs, and EEs (Dutta et al., 2015), identified transcripts enriched in

progenitor cells when compared to either ECs or EEs and found that 31%-32% of these

enriched transcripts overlapped with transcripts enriched in the PABP IP (Fig. 4G-H,

Table S2). To benchmark these comparisons with the Doupé and Dutta datasets, we

performed analogous comparisons between them and an RNA-seq dataset of *esg*+

progenitor cells that we generated using FACS and the same library preparation kit as

for the PABP IP libraries (Buddika et al., 2020b), and found similar levels of overlap

(Fig. S6A-D). This analysis indicated, therefore, that the transcripts most highly

represented in the PABP IP relative to whole animal lysate included a substantial

number of genes previously shown to be enriched in progenitor cells.

We next focused on comparing the entire PABP-associated transcriptome to the

RNA-seq profile of FAC sorted progenitor cells, using four previously reported RNA-seq

datasets. These datasets were reported in (Buddika et al., 2020b; Dutta et al., 2015;

Fast et al., 2020; Korzelius et al., 2019), and we refer to them as Buddika, Datta, Fast,

and Korzelius, respectively. Read counts for the four FACS datasets as well as the

PABP IP dataset were normalized in parallel to facilitate direct comparison; a transcript

was considered to be expressed in a dataset if it had a normalized expression value

greater than 10 in each replicate. Only 61 genes found in all four FACS datasets were

not present in the PABP IP dataset, indicating that the PABP IP identified 98.8% (4,966

out of 5,027) of core progenitor transcripts common to all four distinct FACS datasets

(Fig 4I). An additional 1,839 transcripts were found in the PABP IP, and 76.2% of these

were also found in at least one other FACS dataset. Four hundred and thirty-seven

transcripts (6.4%) were unique to the PABP IP, a number in line with the numbers

unique to each FACS dataset and that likely reflected differences caused by the

technical approach. These could include normal deviations associated with distinct

experimental settings, as well as differences related to the preparation of flash frozen

versus mechanically disrupted samples. Altogether, these results indicated that the

PABP IP method effectively identified progenitor transcripts.

To evaluate the significance of the overlap between these five datasets,

Spearman correlation matrices were generated and visualized as correlograms. As a

negative control for this analysis, we also prepared a sixth dataset of head tissue data

from FlyAtlas 2 (Leader et al., 2018). As expected, the PABP IP correlated well with all

FACS based progenitor datasets while, furthermore, all five of these datasets showed a

similar, lower correlation with the non-intestinal dataset (Fig. 4J). We then used the

GeneOverlap R package to perform Fisher's exact test to evaluate the statistical

significance of the overlap between different datasets. The Fisher's exact test also

computes both an odds ratio and a Jaccard index, which represents the strength of

association and similarity between two datasets, respectively. The PABP IP scored

highly in both these indices when compared to each of the four FAC-sorted datasets

and significantly higher than either the total input or head tissue datasets, further

indicating the similarity between the PABP IP and FACS-based datasets (Fig. 4K).

274   Finally, we evaluated whether the PABP IP contained progenitor-enriched

transcripts that we identified from systematic re-analysis of the four FACS-based

datasets. For this re-analysis, differential expression analysis was used to select for

transcripts enriched in Buddika, Datta, Fast, and Korzelius compared to two sources of

whole animal data, total input from the PABP experiment or reanalyzed whole female

adult dataset from FlyAtlas 2. The PABP IP was then compared to each of these

computed progenitor enriched datasets. As expected, PABP IP enriched genes showed

significant low p-values and high odds ratio and Jaccard index scores, strengthening the

positive relationship of PABP and FACS-based datasets (Fig. S6E). Altogether, this

bioinformatic analysis supported the conclusion that the PABP IP dataset represented

the gene expression profiles of progenitor cells.

CLIP-seq of I-KCKT-GAL4-driven PABP has little background

287   Having established that the PABP IP dataset contained progenitor genes, we

also sought to evaluate how much non-specific background was represented in this

dataset. Such noise might come from the post-lysis association of transgenic PABP with

mRNAs from non-progenitor cells (Mili and Steitz, 2004). Hypothesizing that the most

abundant transcripts in the whole animal lysate might be most prone to associate with

PABP post-lysis, we first identified the top 10% of genes in the input based on the

normalized expression values and found 1049 genes. Only 207 of these genes were

also identified in the PABP IP enriched gene set, suggesting that transcripts abundantly

expressed in the starting lysate were not non-specifically recovered in the IP (Fig. 4L).

Supporting this observation, we identified 854 genes in the input that were expected not

to be present in the PABP IP (Fig. S6F) and confirmed that only 4 of these transcripts

were present in the PABP IP enriched gene list (Fig. 4M). Finally, we again used

reanalyzed FlyAtlas 2 data to identify genes enriched in fat body, head, ovary and testis

relative to midgut, and then compared those tissue-enriched genes to the genes either

enriched in or depleted from the PABP IP. We found that odds ratio and Jaccard index

scores were low for PABP-enriched genes, indicating minimal overlap, and significantly

higher for PABP-depleted genes (Fig. 4N). As a positive control for this analysis, we

performed the same comparisons with genes enriched in the Fly Atlas 2 midgut dataset

as well as genes enriched in the Buddika FACS dataset. As expected, PABP IP

enriched genes show highest association with genes enriched in FACS-isolated

progenitors, and significant overlap was also observed with the midgut enriched gene

list (Fig. 4N). Collectively, this analysis indicated that the PABP dataset contained

minimal background noise from other tissues, likely due to the stringency of the washes

after the crosslinking step.

***I-KCKT*-based eCLIP analysis identifies FMRP-bound mRNAs in the intestine**

To illustrate the breadth of its possible applications, we employed *I-KCKT-GAL4*

to identify the RNA cargo of a more selective RBP, Fragile X Mental Retardation Protein

(FMRP), specifically in progenitor cells using enhanced Crosslinking

Immunoprecipitation sequencing (eCLIP-seq). FMRP limits ISC expansion but its mRNA

targets in these cells are unknown (Luhur et al., 2017). The eCLIP method contains a

number of key modifications in comparison to other CLIP methods, including adapter

ligation steps that map the exact position of crosslinking and the preparation of a size-

matched input (SMI) control sample for stringent normalization (Van Nostrand et al.,

2016). We first verified that *UAS-FMRP.FLAG.GFP* in combination with *I-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}*

was detected in progenitor cells after two and ten days of induction and that it caused a

reduction in progenitor cell number when induced for ten but not two days (Fig S5). We

then prepared FMRP IP and SMI libraries from whole animals collected at the two-day

timepoint (Fig S7A-B). After removing rRNA reads, multimapping reads, and duplicated

reads, about 8% (8,438,543), 5% (2,487,118) and 7% (2,545,165) of total reads were

recovered as usable reads from the SMI and two IP samples, UV1 and UV2,

respectively (Fig S7C), consistent with the recovery rate from other eCLIP analyses

(Van Nostrand et al., 2016).

Peak calling analysis identified 13,297 reproducible FMRP binding sites across

1,829 genes (Table S3) and indicated that there was high correlation between replicates

(Fig S7D), demonstrating the robustness of our modified eCLIP method. Analysis of

peak distribution indicated that >85% of FMRP binding sites were in protein-coding

transcripts and, within these transcripts, the majority of sites were in coding sequences

(Fig 5A, B). Both of these results were consistent with previous characterizations of

FMRP distribution in multiple species, including from proximity-based analyses in mice

and human tissues as well as activity-based analysis in fly cells (Darnell et al., 2011; Li

et al., 2020; McMahon et al., 2016). In addition, we noted that this analysis identified

several confirmed direct targets of Drosophila FMRP found by genetic or targeted

biochemical means, including *CaMKII*, *chic*, *Dscam1, futsch, ninaE*, *rg* and *tral*

(Cvetkovska et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2013; Monzo et al., 2010; Reeve et al., 2005; Sears

et al., 2019; Sudhakaran et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2001). As the first

CLIP-based assay to characterize Drosophila FMRP, this analysis also identified

CAUUG(A/U) as its top binding motif (Fig 5C), consistent with prior identification of the

AUUG sequence in one of the top binding motifs of human FXR1 (Feng et al., 2019).

The FMRP mRNA cargo includes ~20% of the protein-coding transcripts

expressed in progenitor cells that were identified by the PABP IP analysis described

above (Fig 5D). These FMRP targets were significantly associated with processes

related to stem cell proliferation, stem cell maintenance, cell differentiation, and

translation repressor activity (Fig. S7E), consistent with the known roles of FMRP in

stem cell populations such as ISCs (Luhur et al., 2017). One representative example of

these FMRP targets was *esg* (Fig 5E), which plays critical roles in progenitor cells

where it is a known target of post-transcriptional control (Antonello et al., 2015;

Korzelius et al., 2014). We also noted that ~12% of the FMRP cargo are from genes not

identified in either PABP IP or progenitor cell RNA-seq (Fig 5D, S7F). This signal could

therefore represent post-lysis association of FMRP.FLAG.GFP with non-progenitor

mRNAs. However, none of 186 FMRP target genes that were not represented in the

PABP IP were among the 1049 most abundant transcripts present in the whole fly input

(Fig S7G). We therefore favor the hypothesis that these FMRP targets represent

weakly-expressed progenitor transcripts that were not recovered in the PABP IP

because of their low level of expression.

To verify these eCLIP-identified FMRP targets, we first performed qPCR on RNA

immunoprecipitated with endogenous FMRP from wildtype intestines (Fig S7H). We

chose seven target genes (*apt*, *Egfr*, *esg*, *Mes2*, *shg*, *Tet*, and *Unr*) as well as five

negative controls (*CG15784*, *CG5767*, *gapdh1*, *gapdh2*, and *Pyk*) for this analysis. As

expected, the FMRP target genes showed between 2- and 18-fold enrichment in FMRP

IP relative to whole intestine input, while the negative controls were either not

significantly enriched or significantly de-enriched in the FMRP IP (Fig 5F). In addition,

we found that the length distribution of the FMRP-bound mRNAs was significantly

longer than the other protein-coding transcripts expressed in progenitor cells (Fig 5G),

consistent with recent ribosome foot printing that showed that FMRP preferentially

regulates the translation of large proteins in Drosophila oocytes (Greenblatt and

Spradling, 2018). Altogether, these results indicated that applying eCLIP to whole

animal tissue that contained progenitor cells that expressed FLAG-tagged FMRP

effectively recovered the FMRP cargo from these cells.

Discussion

Here we describe a method to purify the RNA cargoes associated with intestinal progenitor RBPs using whole animal lysate as the starting material. Because it is GAL4-based, this method will have wide applicability for profiling the general PABP-bound transcriptome of wildtype and, when coupled with UAS-RNAi transgenes, mutant progenitor cells. In addition, it opens the possibility of molecularly characterizing the stem cell targets of selective RBPs, a growing number of which have been shown to play critical roles in progenitor cells (e.g. LIN28, FMRP, SPEN, TIS11 (Andriatsilavo et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2015; Luhur et al., 2017; McClelland et al., 2017)). Finally, this method can be used in conjunction with additional GAL4-based mRNA profiling methods, such as TU-tagging and ribosome profiling (Chen and Dickman, 2017; Hida et al., 2017), as well as methods that target other classes of RNAs, including microRNAs (Luhur et al., 2013). While the method is currently limited to progenitor cells, its applicability could be further expanded by generating kickout transgenes that drive expression in additional intestinal cell types such as EEs and ECs. Furthermore, while we focus on protein-RNA interactions in this study, we also expect that *I-KCKT-GAL4* in combination with mass-spectrometry can be used to identify protein-protein interactions and thereby characterize protein complexes in progenitor cells.

The I-KCKT method offers a number of advantages over current progenitor cell profiling methods, which typically involve the FAC sorting of progenitor cells from dissected and then mechanically disrupted intestines. The use of whole animals rather than dissected intestines as starting material greatly expedites sample preparation, enabling the analysis of larger numbers of samples that could be used to test additional

conditions and manipulations. In addition, because sample preparation is fast, this

approach may effectively capture labile RNA profiles. Along these lines, the elimination

of the FAC sorting step will also likely improve the accuracy of results, since FAC

sorting is known to affect gene expression profiles likely due to the time and mechanical

disruption associated with this step (Andra et al., 2020; Richardson et al., 2015). In

addition, this method could make molecular profiling of progenitors more accessible,

since cell sorting runs can be costly and the equipment is not always available.

While the conditional expression of transgenic PABP to retrieve bulk mRNA has

been used to approximate the transcriptomes of specific cell types in a variety of

species (Roy et al., 2002; Tenenbaum et al., 2000; Yang et al., 2005), some issues

regarding PABP should be considered when using this approach. PABP displays some

differential binding affinity to poly(A) RNAs that can introduce bias (Yang et al., 2005). In

addition, retrieval of RNAs with poly(A) tails misses deadenylated mRNAs as well as

some noncoding RNAs, thereby biasing resulting datasets towards actively translating

coding transcripts. Finally, the cell toxicity associated with transgenic expression of

PABP likely alters endogenous gene expression. Nevertheless, the cargo of PABP is

better reflective of cell transcriptomes than the cargos of other general RNA binders

and, furthermore, can be analyzed with paperCLIP to finely map 3'UTR ends and

uncover alternative polyadenylation sites in a cell type specific manner (Hwang et al.,

2016; Tenenbaum et al., 2000). It should also be noted that PABP IP results are well

suited for comparison with RNA-seq libraries that are generated via poly(A)-selection,

rather than rRNA depletion, since both methods select for polyadenylated transcripts.

As the first CLIP-based analysis of Drosophila FMRP, this study reports both

novel mRNA targets as well as the binding motif of this protein in intestinal progenitor

cells. The set of FMRP targets identified here displays partial overlap with those

identified in two recent studies that used either ribosome profiling or a proximity-based

activity assay to identify FMRP targets in oocytes, cultured cells, or neurons (Greenblatt

and Spradling, 2018; McMahon et al., 2016). Differences in the targets reported by

these studies likely reflect not only their distinct technical approaches but also the

variety of cell types analyzed, since FMRP is known to display cell type binding

preferences in other species (Maurin et al., 2018). Because loss of FMRP leads to

Fragile X Syndrome (FXS), the leading form of human intellectual disability in humans,

analysis of FMRP has focused on its activity in differentiated neurons. However, FMRP

also functions in stem cell populations, and its dysregulation in these cells likely

contribute to understudied FXS symptoms including elevated brain size, accelerated

growth, and gastrointestinal problems (Luhur et al., 2017). Thus, future analysis of the

stem cell targets of FMRP identified here may characterize regulatory relationships that

are relevant to therapies designed to treat the entire repertoire of FXS symptoms.

A current key limitation of the I-KCKT method is its purification of epitope-tagged

UAS-based transgenic protein rather than endogenous protein. This raises the concern

that the transgenic protein might be expressed at higher-than-endogenous levels, which

might cause inappropriate interactions with non-target mRNAs. Because the TARGET

system controlling transgene expression is temperature sensitive, this concern can be

addressed by testing multiple temperatures in the permissive range to identify

conditions supporting physiological protein expression. As an alternative approach to

address this concern, our current effort is focused on modifying endogenous RBP loci to

contain FRT-flanked epitope tags. I-KCKT-based expression of FLP should then lead to

the production of epitope-tagged endogenous protein in progenitor cells that would be

available for eCLIP-based analysis. Thus, we expect that I-KCKT-based methods will

allow unprecedented analysis of RNA-based mechanisms of progenitor cells.

Materials and Methods

Drosophila strains and husbandry

All fly strains were cultured on standard Bloomington *Drosophila* stock center media (https://bdsc.indiana.edu/information/recipes/bloomfood.html). Flies were reared in 18°C, 25°C and 29°C incubators set for a 12hr light/dark schedule and 65% humidity. The genotypes of all strains used in this study are listed in Table S4. Transgenesis to create new strains was performed by Rainbow Transgenic Flies using plasmid DNA described below. Additional stocks were obtained from the Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center (*{20XUAS-6XGFP}attP2, P{UAS-Stinger}2, P{tubP-GAL80[ts]}20, P{UAS-dPF}D*), Steven Hou (*P{Su(H)GBE-GAL4, P{GawB}Dl$^{05151-G}$*), the Kyoto Drosophila Stock Center (*P{GawB}NP5130*), and Steve Stowers (*{20XUAS-DSCP-6XGFP}attP2*). For GAL80-dependent conditional expression experiments, flies were reared at 18°C, collected over 2 days, and then shifted to 30°C for up to 10 days before analysis. The following strains have been deposited at the Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center: (**i**) *I-KCKT-GAL4.p65* (BDSC #. Full genotype: *mira-KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-GAL4.p65}attP40 ; {CG10116-KD.PEST}attP2*), (**ii**) *I-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* (BDSC #. Full genotype: *{mira -KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-GAL4}attP40, P{tubP-GAL80[ts]}20 ; {CG10116-KD.PEST}attP2*), (**iii**) *ISC- KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* (BDSC #. Full genotype: *{gbe-GAL80}ZH-2A ; {mira -KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-GAL4}attP40, P{tubP-GAL80[ts]}20 ; {CG10116-KD.PEST}attP2*).

Transgenes

KD enhancer transgenes: PCR products containing enhancer fragments amplified from

genomic DNA were cloned into the HindIII and AatII sites of *pJFRC161* (*20XUAS-IVS-*

KD.PEST, a gift from Gerald Rubin, Addgene plasmid 32140) using HiFi DNA Assembly

Mix (New England Biolabs). Oligo pairs used to amplify enhancer fragments from *βTry*

(3437/3438), *θTry* (3439/3440), *κTry* (3446/3447), *CG18404* (3443/3444 for the 2.6 kb

fragment, 3445/3443 for the 0.5kb fragment), and *CG10116* (3441/3442) are shown in

parentheses, and oligo sequences are reported in Table S5. Junctions of resulting

plasmids were verified by sequencing prior to the preparation of plasmid DNA for

transgenesis. *KD* enhancer transgenes were inserted into the *attP2* landing site.

KDRT GAL4 transgenes: pJFRC164 (*21XUAS-KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-myr.RFP*, a gift

from Gerald Rubin, Addgene plasmid 32141) was used as a backbone for KDRT-

flanked stop cassette plasmids. Four-way HiFi DNA Assembly reactions were

performed with (i) 7.2kb HindIII/XbaI-digested *pJFRC164* plasmid backbone, (ii) 1.4kb

AatII/XhoI-digested *pJFRC164* KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT fragment, (iii) PCR-amplified

GAL4-containing fragments, and (iv) PCR amplified enhancer-containing fragments.

GAL4.p65 was amplified from *pBPGAL4.2.p65Uw* (a gift from Gerald Rubin, Addgene

plasmid 26229) with oligo pair 3433/3434, while GAL4 sequence was amplified from

pBPGAL4.1Uw (a gift from Gerald Rubin, Addgene plasmid # 26226) with oligo pair

4401/4402. Enhancer fragments include: (i) 2.6 kb *tubulin* fragment amplified with oligo

pair 3626/3627, (ii) 2.6 kb 5' and 1.6 kb 3' *miranda* fragments amplified with oligo pairs

3489/3490 and 3491/3492, respectively, and (iii) 3.4 kb *delta* fragment amplified with

oligo pair 3431/3432. Plasmid junctions and open reading frames were verified by

sequencing prior to the preparation of DNA for transgenesis. Oligo sequences are

reported in Table S5, and complete plasmid sequences are available upon request.

KDRT transgenes were inserted into the *attP40* landing site.

GAL80 transgenes: For *GMR24H06-GAL80*, the R24H06 enhancer fragment was PCR

amplified from genomic DNA and subcloned upstream of the GAL80 open reading

frame in a *pATTB*-containing transformation plasmid. *3xgbe-GAL80* was generated in a

similar manner except using oligos encoding three tandem copies of *gbe* sequence

(Furriols and Bray, 2001). Both of these *GAL80* transgenes were inserted into the *ZH-*

2A landing site.

Dissections and immunostaining

Adult female flies were dissected in ice cold 1xPBS and fixed in 4%

paraformaldehyde (Electron Microscopy Sciences) in PBS for 45 min. For all samples to

be stained with antibodies other than anti-Dl, tissue was then washed in 1xPBT (1xPBS,

0.1% Triton X-100) and then blocked (1xPBT, 0.5% Bovine Serum Albumin) for at least

45 min. Samples were incubated at 4°C overnight with primary antibodies, including

rabbit anti-RFP (Clontech, 1:1000), mouse anti-V5 (MCA1360GA, Bio-Rad, 1:250),

chicken anti-LacZ (ab9361, Abcam, 1:2000), mouse anti-FLAG (F1804, Sigma, 1:1000),

and rabbit anti-HA (3724S, Cell Signaling Technology, 1:1000). The following day,

samples were washed in 1xPBT and incubated for 2-3 hours with secondary antibodies,

including AlexaFluor-488 and -568-conjugated goat anti-rabbit, -mouse, -rat and -

chicken antibodies (Life Technologies, 1:1000). Finally, samples were washed in

1xPBT, including one wash with DAPI (1:1000), and mounted in Vectashield mounting

medium (Vector Laboratories).

For staining with anti-Dl antibodies, an alternative sample preparation scheme

adapted from (Lin et al., 2008) was followed. Briefly, intestines were dissected in ice-

cold Grace's Insect Medium (Lonza Bioscience) and fixed in a 1:1 (V/V) mixture of

heptane (Sigma) and 4% paraformaldehyde (Electron Microscopy Sciences) in water for

15 min. The bottom aqueous paraformaldehyde layer was removed, 500µl of ice-cold

methanol was added, and shook vigorously for 30 seconds. The methanol/heptane

mixture was removed and incubated with 1ml ice-cold methanol for 5 min. Next,

samples were gradually rehydrated with a series of 0.3% PBT (1xPBS, 0.3% Triton X-

100):Methanol (3:7, 1:1, 7:3) washes, washed with 0.3% PBT alone for another 5 min

and blocked (0.3% PBT, 0.5% Bovine Serum Albumin) for at least 45 min. The primary

antibody was mouse anti-Delta (C594.9B, Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank

[DSHB], 1:500), and secondary antibodies are described above. Samples were

mounted in ProLong Diamond mounting medium (Invitrogen).

Microscopy and image processing

Images of whole flies were collected on a Zeiss Axio Zoom microscope and

images of dissected intestines were collected on a Leica SP8 Scanning Confocal

microscope. Samples to be compared were collected under identical settings on the

same day, image files were adjusted simultaneously using Adobe Photoshop CC, and

figures were assembled using Adobe Illustrator CC.

Western blot analysis

Female *Drosophila* flies were used for protein isolation. Extract was prepared from either whole animals or separately from the intestines and remaining carcass tissue of dissected animals. Tissues were lysed in protein lysis buffer (25mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 150mM KCl, 5mM $MgCl_2$, 1% NP-40, 0.5mM DTT, 1x Complete protease inhibitor cocktail (Sigma)), protein extracts were resolved on a 4-20% gradient polyacrylamide gel (Bio-Rad), transferred to Immobilon-P membrane (Millipore) and probed with rabbit anti-GFP (ab290, Abcam, 1:10,000) or mouse anti-a-tubulin (12G10, Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank, 1:1000) antibodies. For IP verification, blots were stained with mouse anti-FLAG (F1804, Sigma, 1:3500) or mouse anti-FMRP (5A11, Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank, 1:500). Subsequently, blots were washed extensively with 1xTBST (1xTBS, 0.1% Tween-20) and incubated with anti-rabbit or -mouse conjugated HRP secondary antibodies. After extensive secondary washes with 1xTBST, blots were treated with ECL-detection reagents (Thermo Scientific) and finally exposed to chemiluminescence films (GE Healthcare).

RNA immunoprecipitation, library construction, and sequencing

Whole flies were collected and immediately snap frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C until sample preparation. Two hundred flies (100 male and 100 female) of each sample were ground into a fine powder using a pre-cooled mortar and pestle on dry ice. The powder was irradiated three times at 120 mJ per cm2 in a UV cross-linker (Stratagene), with mixing between each irradiation cycle to maximize surface exposure. The fly powder was transferred to a 2ml tube containing 1ml lysis buffer (150mM NaCl,

50mM Tris-HCl, pH7.5, 1mM EDTA, 1% Triton X-100, 1% Sodium Deoxycholate, 0.1%

SDS, 5X Complete Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Sigma, 11836145001), 4U/ml RNase

Inhibitor Murine (BioLabs, M0314L) using a cold spatula, and the remaining fly powder

was washed off the spatula with an additional 1ml lysis buffer. Tubes were incubated on

ice for 15-30 min, with mixing every 5 min. Epitope-tagged proteins were

immunoprecipitated with either anti-Flag- or anti-HA-coated magnetic beads (Sigma and

Pierce, respectively, M8823 and 88836) following the manufacturer's instructions. RNA

was eluted from the beads with Proteinase K (Sigma, AM2546) and TRIzol LS Reagent

(Ambion, 10296028) was used to isolate immunoprecipitated RNA. The Ovation SoLo

RNA-Seq System (Tecan Genomics, S02240) was used to make PABP library. eCLIP

libraries were generated by following the protocol in Nostrand et al., 2016 (Van

Nostrand et al., 2016), with a minor modification that 8U of RNAse I (Ambion, AM2295)

was used per sample. Purified PABP CLIP libraries were submitted for paired-end 75bp

sequencing on the Illumina NextSeq platform at the Center for Genomics and

Bioinformatics (CGB) in Indiana University, Bloomington. eCLIP libraries were submitted

for paired-end 75bp sequencing on the Illumina NextSeq platform at the CGB in Indiana

University, Bloomington or paired-end 100bp sequencing on the DNBseq platform at the

BGI Genomics in China.

RNA-seq and PABP CLIP-seq data analysis

RNA-seq datasets were obtained from the following references and are referred

to in the text by the surname of the first author: (Doupe et al., 2018; Dutta et al., 2015;

Fast et al., 2020; Korzelius et al., 2014; Leader et al., 2018; Li et al., 2018). Both RNA-

seq and PABP CLIP-seq read files were processed and aligned to the Berkeley

Drosophila Genome Project (BDGP) assembly release 6.28 (Ensembl release 99)

reference genome using a python based in house pipeline

(https://github.com/jkkbuddika/RNA-Seq-Data-Analyzer v1.0). Briefly, the quality of raw

sequencing files was assessed using FastQC (Andrews, 2010) version 0.11.9, low

quality reads were removed using Cutadapt (Martin, 2011) version 2.9, reads aligning to

rRNAs were removed using TagDust2 (Lassmann, 2015) version 2.2, remaining reads

were mapped to the Berkeley *Drosophila* Genome Project (BDGP) assembly release

6.28 (Ensembl release 99) reference genome using STAR (Dobin et al., 2013) genome

aligner version 2.7.3a and deduplicated using SAMtools (Li et al., 2009) version 1.10.

Subsequently, the aligned reads were counted to the nearest overlapping feature suing

the Subread (Liao et al., 2019) version 2.0.0 function *featureCounts*. Finally, bigWig files

representing RNA-seq coverage were generated using deepTools (Ramirez et al.,

2016) version 3.4.2 with the settings --normalizeUsing CPM --binSize 1. All programs,

versions and dependencies required to execute the RNA-seq data analyzer are

described in the user guide and can be installed using miniconda. The TMM-normalized

expression values were computed using the Bioconductor package edgeR (Robinson et

al., 2010) version 3.28.1. Genes with TMM-normalized expression value greater than 10

in all replicates were considered as a moderately expressed gene during transcriptome

comparisons. Differential gene expression analysis was performed with the

Bioconductor package DESeq2 (Love et al., 2014) version 1.26.0 using FDR < 0.05 and

$\log_2$ fold change > 1, unless otherwise noted. For both edgeR-based transcriptome

analysis and DESeq2-based differential gene expression analysis only protein coding

genes were used. All data visualization steps were performed using custom scripts

written in R.

Enhanced-CLIP (eCLIP) data analysis

The eCLIP read file processing, alignment and processing was done using an

easy to use python based in house analysis pipeline, eCLIP data analyzer

(https://github.com/jkkbuddika/eCLIP-Data-Analyzer). While the eCLIP data analyzer

pipeline permits analysis in both paired and single-end modes, we performed all our

analyzes using the single-end mode, which uses only R2 read for analysis. The eCLIP

data analyzer pipeline performs the following steps: (1) read quality assessment using

FastQC (Andrews, 2010), (2) trimming of universal eCLIP adaptors using Cutadapt

(Martin, 2011), (3) addition of UMI sequence (5'-NNNNNNNNNN in the R2 read) using

UMI-tools (Smith et al., 2017) to read name to facilitate PCR duplicate removal, (4)

removal of reads aligning to rRNAs using Tagdust2 (Lassmann, 2015), (5) alignment of

remaining reads to the provided genome (i.e., BDGP assembly release 6.28, Ensembl

release 100) using STAR (Dobin et al., 2013), (6) coordinating sort and index alignment

outputs using SAMtools (Li et al., 2009), (7) removal of PCR duplicates using UMI-tools

(Smith et al., 2017), (8) generation of bigwig files representing RNA-seq coverage

tracks using deepTools (Ramirez et al., 2016), (9) quantification of nearest overlapping

features using Subread (Liao et al., 2019) function *featureCounts*, and (10) peak calling

using PureCLIP (Krakau et al., 2017). All programs, versions and dependencies

required to execute the eCLIP data analyzer are described in the user guide and can be

installed using miniconda. Input normalized peak calling output files were processed as

described in (Busch et al., 2020). Subsequently, significantly enriched *de novo* binding

motifs were identified using DREME (Bailey, 2011). Protein coding FMRP target genes

were used to identify enriched Gene Ontology (GO) terms using gProfiler. A selected

significantly enriched GO categories were plotted using R. Unless otherwise noted, all

data visualization steps were performed using custom scripts written in R.

CLIP-qPCR

Intestine were dissected from 100 w^{1118} females, and FMRP was precipitated

with anti-FMRP antibody (5A11, DSHB) using the same method described above. RNA

was isolated from either the starting intestinal lysate or from the IP with Trizol LS

(Ambion, 10296028). Resulting RNA was treated with Turbo DNase(ThermoFisher ,

AM2239) and ~200ng of input RNA and all the RNA derived from IP sample was used

for cDNA synthesis with Superscript III (ThermoFisher, 56575). qPCR was performed

using the PowerUp SYBR Green Master Mix (ThermoFisher, A25742) on a

StepOnePlus machine (ThermoFisher). Primers for all targets detected are listed in

Table S5. Transcript levels were quantified in duplicate and normalized to *CG10116*.

Fold enrichment was calculated as the ratio of transcript in IP versus input.

Statistical analysis:

Statistical analyses were performed using Prism (GraphPad, Version 7.0). Datasets

were tested for normality using D'Agostino-Pearson test. Comparisons of two datasets

was performed with an unpaired t-test while qPCR samples were analyzed with a paired

t-test. The statistical significance of overlaps in Venn Diagrams was calculated using a

hypergeometric test on R. When multiple pairwise comparisons were needed, the R

package GeneOverlap was used to perform Fischer's exact test which yields the

statistical significance, odds ratio and Jaccard indices for each pairwise comparison.

Significance is indicated as follows: n.s., not significant; $*p < 0.05$; $**p < 0.01$; $***p <$

0.001; $****p < 0.0001$.

Data availability:

The PABP CLIP-seq and FMRP eCLIP-seq datasets from this study have been

submitted to the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus under accession number XXXX (to

be added later).

Acknowledgements

We thank Steven Hou, Gerald Rubin, Steve Stowers, the Kyoto Drosophila Stock Center, the Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center (supported by grant NIHP4OOD018537), the Drosophila Genome Resource Center (supported by grant NIH2P40OD010949), and the Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank for reagents; the Light Microscopy Imaging Center (supported by grant NIH1S10OD024988-01) for access to the SP8 confocal; and the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (Award R01GM124220) for financial support. The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Competing Interests

No competing interest declared.

References:

Andra, I., Ulrich, H., Durr, S., Soll, D., Henkel, L., Angerpointner, C., Ritter, J., Przibilla, S., Stadler, H., Effenberger, M*., et al.* (2020). An Evaluation of T-Cell Functionality After Flow Cytometry Sorting Revealed p38 MAPK Activation. Cytometry A *97*, 171-183.

Andrews, S. (2010). FastQC: A quality control tool for high throughput sequence data. http://wwwbioinformaticsbabrahamacuk/projects/fastqc.

Andriatsilavo, M., Stefanutti, M., Siudeja, K., Perdigoto, C.N., Boumard, B., Gervais, L., Gillet-Markowska, A., Al Zouabi, L., Schweisguth, F., and Bardin, A.J. (2018). Spen limits intestinal stem cell self-renewal. PLoS genetics *14*, e1007773.

Antonello, Z.A., Reiff, T., Ballesta-Illan, E., and Dominguez, M. (2015). Robust intestinal homeostasis relies on cellular plasticity in enteroblasts mediated by miR-8-Escargot switch. The EMBO journal *34*, 2025-2041.

Bailey, T.L. (2011). DREME: motif discovery in transcription factor ChIP-seq data. Bioinformatics *27*, 1653-1659.

Bardin, A.J., Perdigoto, C.N., Southall, T.D., Brand, A.H., and Schweisguth, F. (2010). Transcriptional control of stem cell maintenance in the Drosophila intestine. Development *137*, 705-714.

Barolo, S., Carver, L.A., and Posakony, J.W. (2000). GFP and beta-galactosidase

transformation vectors for promoter/enhancer analysis in Drosophila. Biotechniques *29*,

726, 728, 730, 732.

Baser, A., Skabkin, M., Kleber, S., Dang, Y., Gulculer Balta, G.S., Kalamakis, G.,

Gopferich, M., Ibanez, D.C., Schefzik, R., Lopez, A.S*., et al.* (2019). Onset of

differentiation is post-transcriptionally controlled in adult neural stem cells. Nature *566*,

100-104.

Biteau, B., Karpac, J., Supoyo, S., Degennaro, M., Lehmann, R., and Jasper, H. (2010).

Lifespan extension by preserving proliferative homeostasis in Drosophila. PLoS

genetics *6*, e1001159.

Buddika, K., Ariyapala, I.S., Hazuga, M.A., Riffert, D., and Sokol, N.S. (2020a).

Canonical nucleators are dispensable for stress granule assembly in Drosophila

intestinal progenitors. Journal of cell science *133*.

Buddika, K., Huan, Y., Butrum-Griffith, A., Norrell, S., O'Connor, A., Patel, V., Rector,

S., Slovan, M., Sokolowsky, M., Kato, Y*., et al.* (2020b). Intestinal progenitor P-bodies

maintain stem cell identity by suppressing pro-differentiation factors.

BioRxiv/2020/175398.

Busch, A., Bruggemann, M., Ebersberger, S., and Zarnack, K. (2020). iCLIP data

analysis: A complete pipeline from sequencing reads to RBP binding sites. Methods

178, 49-62.

Chen, C.H., Luhur, A., and Sokol, N. (2015). Lin-28 promotes symmetric stem cell

division and drives adaptive growth in the adult Drosophila intestine. Development *142*,

3478-3487.

Chen, X., and Dickman, D. (2017). Development of a tissue-specific ribosome profiling

approach in Drosophila enables genome-wide evaluation of translational adaptations.

PLoS genetics *13*, e1007117.

Cvetkovska, V., Hibbert, A.D., Emran, F., and Chen, B.E. (2013). Overexpression of

Down syndrome cell adhesion molecule impairs precise synaptic targeting. Nature

neuroscience *16*, 677-682.

Darnell, J.C., Van Driesche, S.J., Zhang, C., Hung, K.Y., Mele, A., Fraser, C.E., Stone,

E.F., Chen, C., Fak, J.J., Chi, S.W.*, et al.* (2011). FMRP stalls ribosomal translocation

on mRNAs linked to synaptic function and autism. Cell *146*, 247-261.

Dobin, A., Davis, C.A., Schlesinger, F., Drenkow, J., Zaleski, C., Jha, S., Batut, P.,

Chaisson, M., and Gingeras, T.R. (2013). STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner.

Bioinformatics *29*, 15-21.

Doupe, D.P., Marshall, O.J., Dayton, H., Brand, A.H., and Perrimon, N. (2018).

Drosophila intestinal stem and progenitor cells are major sources and regulators of

homeostatic niche signals. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the

United States of America *115*, 12218-12223.

Dutta, D., Dobson, A.J., Houtz, P.L., Glasser, C., Revah, J., Korzelius, J., Patel, P.H.,

Edgar, B.A., and Buchon, N. (2015). Regional Cell-Specific Transcriptome Mapping

Reveals Regulatory Complexity in the Adult Drosophila Midgut. Cell reports *12*, 346-

358.

Fast, D., Petkau, K., Ferguson, M., Shin, M., Galenza, A., Kostiuk, B., Pukatzki, S., and

Foley, E. (2020). Vibrio cholerae-Symbiont Interactions Inhibit Intestinal Repair in

Drosophila. Cell reports *30*, 1088-1100 e1085.

Feng, H., Bao, S., Rahman, M.A., Weyn-Vanhentenryck, S.M., Khan, A., Wong, J.,

Shah, A., Flynn, E.D., Krainer, A.R., and Zhang, C. (2019). Modeling RNA-Binding

Protein Specificity In Vivo by Precisely Registering Protein-RNA Crosslink Sites.

Molecular cell *74*, 1189-1204 e1186.

Furriols, M., and Bray, S. (2001). A model Notch response element detects Suppressor

of Hairless-dependent molecular switch. Current biology : CB *11*, 60-64.

Greenblatt, E.J., and Spradling, A.C. (2018). Fragile X mental retardation 1 gene

enhances the translation of large autism-related proteins. Science *361*, 709-712.

Guo, Z., Driver, I., and Ohlstein, B. (2013). Injury-induced BMP signaling negatively

regulates Drosophila midgut homeostasis. The Journal of cell biology *201*, 945-961.

Hida, N., Aboukilila, M.Y., Burow, D.A., Paul, R., Greenberg, M.M., Fazio, M., Beasley,

S., Spitale, R.C., and Cleary, M.D. (2017). EC-tagging allows cell type-specific RNA

analysis. Nucleic acids research *45*, e138.

Hung, R.J., Hu, Y., Kirchner, R., Liu, Y., Xu, C., Comjean, A., Tattikota, S.G., Li, F.,

Song, W., Ho Sui, S.*, et al.* (2020). A cell atlas of the adult Drosophila midgut.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America *117*,

1514-1523.

Hwang, H.W., Park, C.Y., Goodarzi, H., Fak, J.J., Mele, A., Moore, M.J., Saito, Y., and

Darnell, R.B. (2016). PAPERCLIP Identifies MicroRNA Targets and a Role of

CstF64/64tau in Promoting Non-canonical poly(A) Site Usage. Cell reports *15*, 423-435.

Jiang, H., and Edgar, B.A. (2009). EGFR signaling regulates the proliferation of

Drosophila adult midgut progenitors. Development *136*, 483-493.

Kim, J.H., Wang, X., Coolon, R., and Ye, B. (2013). Dscam expression levels determine

presynaptic arbor sizes in Drosophila sensory neurons. Neuron *78*, 827-838.

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.

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.*, et al.* (2014). Escargot maintains

stemness and suppresses differentiation in Drosophila intestinal stem cells. The EMBO

journal *33*, 2967-2982.

Krakau, S., Richard, H., and Marsico, A. (2017). PureCLIP: capturing target-specific

protein-RNA interaction footprints from single-nucleotide CLIP-seq data. Genome Biol

18, 240.

Lassmann, T. (2015). TagDust2: a generic method to extract reads from sequencing

data. BMC Bioinformatics *16*, 24.

Leader, D.P., Krause, S.A., Pandit, A., Davies, S.A., and Dow, J.A.T. (2018). FlyAtlas 2:

a new version of the Drosophila melanogaster expression atlas with RNA-Seq, miRNA-

Seq and sex-specific data. Nucleic acids research *46*, D809-D815.

Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G.,

Abecasis, G., Durbin, R., and Genome Project Data Processing, S. (2009). The

Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics *25*, 2078-2079.

Li, H., and Jasper, H. (2016). Gastrointestinal stem cells in health and disease: from

flies to humans. Disease models & mechanisms *9*, 487-499.

Li, M., Shin, J., Risgaard, R.D., Parries, M.J., Wang, J., Chasman, D., Liu, S., Roy, S.,

Bhattacharyya, A., and Zhao, X. (2020). Identification of FMR1-regulated molecular

networks in human neurodevelopment. Genome research *30*, 361-374.

Li, Q., Nirala, N.K., Nie, Y., Chen, H.J., Ostroff, G., Mao, J., Wang, Q., Xu, L., and Ip,

Y.T. (2018). Ingestion of Food Particles Regulates the Mechanosensing Misshapen-

Yorkie Pathway in Drosophila Intestinal Growth. Developmental cell *45*, 433-449 e436.

Liao, Y., Smyth, G.K., and Shi, W. (2019). The R package Rsubread is easier, faster,

cheaper and better for alignment and quantification of RNA sequencing reads. Nucleic

acids research *47*, e47.

Lin, G., Xu, N., and Xi, R. (2008). Paracrine Wingless signalling controls self-renewal of

Drosophila intestinal stem cells. Nature *455*, 1119-1123.

Love, M.I., Huber, W., and Anders, S. (2014). Moderated estimation of fold change and

dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol *15*, 550.

Luhur, A., Buddika, K., Ariyapala, I.S., Chen, S., and Sokol, N.S. (2017). Opposing

Post-transcriptional Control of InR by FMRP and LIN-28 Adjusts Stem Cell-Based

Tissue Growth. Cell reports *21*, 2671-2677.

Luhur, A., Chawla, G., and Sokol, N.S. (2013). MicroRNAs as components of systemic

signaling pathways in Drosophila melanogaster. Current topics in developmental biology

105, 97-123.

Martin, M. (2011). Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput

sequencing reads. 2011 *17*, 3.

Maurin, T., Lebrigand, K., Castagnola, S., Paquet, A., Jarjat, M., Popa, A., Grossi, M.,

Rage, F., and Bardoni, B. (2018). HITS-CLIP in various brain areas reveals new targets

and new modalities of RNA binding by fragile X mental retardation protein. Nucleic acids

research *46*, 6344-6355.

McClelland, L., Jasper, H., and Biteau, B. (2017). Tis11 mediated mRNA decay

promotes the reacquisition of Drosophila intestinal stem cell quiescence. Developmental

biology *426*, 8-16.

McGuire, S.E., Mao, Z., and Davis, R.L. (2004). Spatiotemporal gene expression

targeting with the TARGET and gene-switch systems in Drosophila. Science's STKE :

signal transduction knowledge environment *2004*, pl6.

McMahon, A.C., Rahman, R., Jin, H., Shen, J.L., Fieldsend, A., Luo, W., and Rosbash,

M. (2016). TRIBE: Hijacking an RNA-Editing Enzyme to Identify Cell-Specific Targets of

RNA-Binding Proteins. Cell *165*, 742-753.

Micchelli, C.A., and Perrimon, N. (2006). Evidence that stem cells reside in the adult

Drosophila midgut epithelium. Nature *439*, 475-479.

Mili, S., and Steitz, J.A. (2004). Evidence for reassociation of RNA-binding proteins after

cell lysis: implications for the interpretation of immunoprecipitation analyses. Rna *10*,

1692-1694.

Miller, E.D., Kahsai, L., Buddika, K., Dixon, M.J., Kim, B.Y., Calvi, B.R., Sokol, N.S.,

Hawley, R.S., and Cook, K.R. (2020). Identification and characterization of breakpoints

and mutations on Drosophila melanogaster balancer chromosomes. G3 (Submitted).

Monzo, K., Dowd, S.R., Minden, J.S., and Sisson, J.C. (2010). Proteomic analysis

reveals CCT is a target of Fragile X mental retardation protein regulation in Drosophila.

Developmental biology *340*, 408-418.

Nern, A., Pfeiffer, B.D., Svoboda, K., and Rubin, G.M. (2011). Multiple new site-specific

recombinases for use in manipulating animal genomes. Proceedings of the National

Academy of Sciences of the United States of America *108*, 14198-14203.

Phillips, M.D., and Thomas, G.H. (2006). Brush border spectrin is required for early

endosome recycling in Drosophila. Journal of cell science *119*, 1361-1370.

Ramirez, F., Ryan, D.P., Gruning, B., Bhardwaj, V., Kilpert, F., Richter, A.S., Heyne, S.,

Dundar, F., and Manke, T. (2016). deepTools2: a next generation web server for deep-

sequencing data analysis. Nucleic acids research *44*, W160-165.

Reeve, S.P., Bassetto, L., Genova, G.K., Kleyner, Y., Leyssen, M., Jackson, F.R., and

Hassan, B.A. (2005). The Drosophila fragile X mental retardation protein controls actin

dynamics by directly regulating profilin in the brain. Current biology : CB *15*, 1156-1163.

Richardson, G.M., Lannigan, J., and Macara, I.G. (2015). Does FACS perturb gene

expression? Cytometry A *87*, 166-175.

Robinson, M.D., McCarthy, D.J., and Smyth, G.K. (2010). edgeR: a Bioconductor

package for differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data.

Bioinformatics *26*, 139-140.

Roy, P.J., Stuart, J.M., Lund, J., and Kim, S.K. (2002). Chromosomal clustering of

muscle-expressed genes in Caenorhabditis elegans. Nature *418*, 975-979.

Sanz, E., Yang, L., Su, T., Morris, D.R., McKnight, G.S., and Amieux, P.S. (2009). Cell-

type-specific isolation of ribosome-associated mRNA from complex tissues.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America *106*,

13939-13944.

Sears, J.C., Choi, W.J., and Broadie, K. (2019). Fragile X Mental Retardation Protein

positively regulates PKA anchor Rugose and PKA activity to control actin assembly in

learning/memory circuitry. Neurobiol Dis *127*, 53-64.

Shearin, H.K., Macdonald, I.S., Spector, L.P., and Stowers, R.S. (2014). Hexameric

GFP and mCherry reporters for the Drosophila GAL4, Q, and LexA transcription

systems. Genetics *196*, 951-960.

Singh, S.R., Liu, W., and Hou, S.X. (2007). The adult Drosophila malpighian tubules are

maintained by multipotent stem cells. Cell stem cell *1*, 191-203.

Smith, T., Heger, A., and Sudbery, I. (2017). UMI-tools: modeling sequencing errors in

Unique Molecular Identifiers to improve quantification accuracy. Genome research *27*,

491-499.

Sudhakaran, I.P., Hillebrand, J., Dervan, A., Das, S., Holohan, E.E., Hulsmeier, J.,

Sarov, M., Parker, R., VijayRaghavan, K., and Ramaswami, M. (2014). FMRP and

Ataxin-2 function together in long-term olfactory habituation and neuronal translational

control. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of

America *111*, E99-E108.

Tahmasebi, S., Amiri, M., and Sonenberg, N. (2018). Translational Control in Stem

Cells. Front Genet *9*, 709.

Tenenbaum, S.A., Carson, C.C., Lager, P.J., and Keene, J.D. (2000). Identifying mRNA

subsets in messenger ribonucleoprotein complexes by using cDNA arrays. Proceedings

of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America *97*, 14085-14090.

Van Nostrand, E.L., Pratt, G.A., Shishkin, A.A., Gelboin-Burkhart, C., Fang, M.Y.,

Sundararaman, B., Blue, S.M., Nguyen, T.B., Surka, C., Elkins, K.*, et al.* (2016). Robust

transcriptome-wide discovery of RNA-binding protein binding sites with enhanced CLIP

(eCLIP). Nature methods *13*, 508-514.

Voght, S.P., Fluegel, M.L., Andrews, L.A., and Pallanck, L.J. (2007). Drosophila NPC1b

promotes an early step in sterol absorption from the midgut epithelium. Cell metabolism

5, 195-205.

Wang, X., Mu, Y., Sun, M., and Han, J. (2017). Bidirectional regulation of fragile X

mental retardation protein phosphorylation controls rhodopsin homoeostasis. J Mol Cell

Biol *9*, 104-116.

Yang, Z., Edenberg, H.J., and Davis, R.L. (2005). Isolation of mRNA from specific

tissues of Drosophila by mRNA tagging. Nucleic acids research *33*, e148.

Zeng, X., Chauhan, C., and Hou, S.X. (2010). Characterization of midgut stem cell- and

enteroblast-specific Gal4 lines in drosophila. Genesis *48*, 607-611.

Zhang, Y.Q., Bailey, A.M., Matthies, H.J., Renden, R.B., Smith, M.A., Speese, S.D.,

Rubin, G.M., and Broadie, K. (2001). Drosophila fragile X-related gene regulates the

MAP1B homolog Futsch to control synaptic structure and function. Cell *107*, 591-603.

Figures and Legends:

A

INTESTINAL Enhancer | KD

PROGENITOR Enhancer | KDRT | STOP | KDRT | GAL4

UAS | GFP

Larval Intestine | Adult Intestine

βTry 3.4kb — DAPI GFP — **B** | **H**

θTry 1.6kb — DAPI GFP — **C** | **I**

κTRY 0.6kb — DAPI GFP — **D** | **J**

CG18404 2.6kb — DAPI GFP — **E** | **K**

CG18404 0.5kb — DAPI GFP — **F** | **L**

CG10116 1kb — DAPI GFP — **G** | **M**

500µm | 500µm

Figure 1: *KD* driver analysis identifies a pan-intestinal enhancer in adults. (A)
Schematic of the I-KCKT system, which involves three transgenes: (i) a KD-expressing
transgene under the control of an intestinal enhancer, (ii) a transgene in which a KDRT-
flanked stop-cassette separates GAL4 from a progenitor enhancer, and (iii) a UAS
responder, in this case, controlling GFP expression. (B-M) KD recombinase-mediated
labeling of (B-G) larval and (H-M) adult intestinal cells. KD lines contain (B,H) 3.4kb
βTry, (C, I) 1.6kb *θTry*, (D, J) 0.6kb *κTry*, (E, K) 2.6kb *CG18404*, (F, L) 0.5kb *CG18404*,
or (G, M) 1kb *CG10116* enhancer sequences. KD expression pattern was detected

978   based on KDRT-mediated activation of a *tubulin*-based *GAL4.p65* driver in combination

979   with a *UAS-6XGFP* responder. Full genotypes are listed in Table S4.

Figure 2: *I-KCKT-GAL4.p65* and *I-KCKT-GAL4* label most intestinal progenitor

cells and *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^TS* labels most ISCs. (A-O) Micrographs of five intestinal

regions (R1-R5) stained for *stinger-GFP* in green, the intestinal progenitor marker *mira-*

His2A.mCherry.HA in red, and the DAPI DNA marker in blue. GFP expression is driven

by either (A-E) *I-KCKT-GAL4.p65*, (F-J) *I-KCKT-GAL4*, or (K-O) *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^TS*. (P-

986 Q) Histograms showing percentage of *mira-His2A.mCherry.HA*-labeled intestinal

987 progenitor (IP) cells per intestinal region (R1-R5) that are labeled with *stinger-GFP*

988 driven by either (A-E) *I-KCKT-GAL4.p65* or (F-J) *I-KCKT-GAL4*. (R-S) Histograms

989 showing the percentage of (R) ISCs and (S) EBs labeled with *stinger-GFP* driven by (K-

990 O) *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}*. Full genotypes are listed in Table S4.

Figure 3: *I-KCKT-GAL4* drivers are intestine-specific. (A-G) Pictures of adult females showing *6XGFP* expression patterns driven by (A) *I-KCKT-GAL4.p65*, (B) *I-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}*, (C) *EB-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}*, (D) *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}*, (E) *esg^{P{GawB}NP5130}-GAL4*, (F) *Dl^{05151-G}-GAL4*, or (G) *Su(H)GBE-GAL4*. Insets are enlargements of abdominal regions displaying intestinal GFP expression. (H) Western blot analysis of tissue extracts from total animals (T), dissected intestines (I), or dissected carcasses (C) probed with either anti-GFP (top) or anti-Tubulin (bottom) antibodies. Lysates were generated from adults harboring *UAS-6XGFP* driven by *I-KCKT-GAL4.p65*, I-*KCKT-GAL4*, I-*KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* at 18°C, I-*KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* at 30°C, *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* at 30°C, *esg^{P{GawB}NP5130}-GAL4*, *Dl^{05151-G}-GAL4*, or *Su(H)GBE-GAL4*. (I, J) Micrographs of intestines showing *6XGFP* expression patterns driven by *I-KCKT-GAL4^{TS}* from adults kept either at (I) 18°C or (J) 30°C and counterstained for the DAPI DNA marker in blue. Yellow arrowheads indicate

GFP expression at the base of the malphigian tubules. Full genotypes are listed in

Table S4.

Figure 4: CLIP-seq of PABP driven by *I-KCKT-GAL4* identifies progenitor

expressed genes. (A) Schematic representation of conventional FACS (left) and *I-*

KCKT-based (right) intestinal progenitor RNA-sequencing. (B) Volcano plot of

differentially expressed genes in PABP IP versus total input. Each dot represents a

single gene. Yellow indicates a false discovery rate adjusted p-value (FDR) < 0.05 and

a Log_2 fold change < 1 or > -1. Green indicates Log_2 fold change > 1 or < -1 and an

FDR >= 0.05. Red indicates an FDR < 0.05 and log_2 fold change > 1 or < -1. A selected

set of significantly changed genes have been labeled in blue. (C-D) Genome browser

tracks of normalized total input and PABP IP at the (C) *esg* or (D) *osk* loci. Note that the

two replicates of the total input (green and yellow) and the two replicates of the PABP IP

(red and blue) have been overlayed. (E-H) Venn diagrams showing genes significantly

enriched in PABP-CLIP that overlap with Doupe's progenitor enriched (E) genes, (F)

Doupe's EC enriched genes, (G) Dutta's progenitor enriched genes as compared to EC

genes, or (H) Dutta's progenitor enriched genes as compared to EE genes. (I) Upset

plot showing the overlap of moderately expressed genes identified by PABP CLIP-seq

versus RNA-seq of FACS-isolated progenitor cells reported in Korzelius, Dutta, Buddika

and Fast. Numbers above each bar shows the size of each intersection. (J)

Correlogram of Spearman's *rho* values for pairwise comparisons of progenitor

expressed genes in PABP CLIP-seq, progenitor RNA-seq reported in Buddika, Dutta,

Fast, or Korzelius, or RNA-seq from *Drosophila* female head. (K) Heatmaps of odds

ratio (in green) and Jaccard index (in orange) values for pairwise comparisons of PABP

IP CLIP-seq, RNA-seq of total input, or RNA-seq of dissected female heads against

FACS-based progenitor RNA-seq. Numbers on each colored box show the p-value for

each overlap based on Fisher's exact test. (L-M) Venn diagrams showing genes

significantly enriched in PABP-CLIP that overlap with (L) the top 10% of input genes

based on normalized expression values, or (M) genes present in input but not in any of

the FACS-based RNA-seq gene lists. (N) Heatmaps of odds ratio (in blue) and Jaccard

index (in green) values of pairwise comparisons of PABP IP enriched or PABP IP

depleted genes to six other gene sets. These sets include fat body, head, ovary or testis

enriched genes (identified relative to midgut genes) as well as midgut or progenitor

enriched genes from Buddika (identified relative to whole animal input). Numbers on

each colored box show the p-value for each overlap based on Fisher's exact test.

1039

1040

Figure 5: eCLIP of FMRP driven by *I-KCKT-GAL4* identifies intestinal target

mRNAs. (A-B) Pie chart representing the percentage of (A) target gene types and (B)

binding site distribution in mRNAs identified in FMRP eCLIP. (C) The top FMRP binding

motif identified using DREME. (D) Venn diagram showing overlap between FMRP target

genes with the progenitor transcriptome (identified by PABP IP). (E) Genome browser

tracks of normalized SMI and FMRP IP at the *esg* locus of the *Drosophila* genome. Note

that the two replicates of FMRP IP were merged prior to genome browser visualization.

Locations of four FMRP binding regions are shown with grey bars. (F) Bar plot showing

fold enrichment of twelve mRNAs in FMRP IP compared to whole intestinal input as

determined by qPCR. Negative controls are separated from the other genes by a dotted

line. (G) Bar plot showing the mean transcript length of FMRP-bound versus non-bound

transcripts that are expressed in intestinal progenitors. Note that the longest transcript

isoform was used for this analysis whenever a gene had multiple transcript isoforms. *p

< 0.05; ****p < 0.0001.

1055

1056 **Supplementary Figure Legends:**

1057

1058

1059 **Figure S1: *I-KCKT-GAL4* and *esg-LacZ* label the same cells**. (A-E) Micrographs of

1060 five intestinal regions (R1-R5) stained for *I-KCKT-GAL4*-driven *stinger-GFP* in green,

1061 the intestinal progenitor marker *esg-LacZ* in red, and the DAPI DNA marker in blue. (F)

1062 Histogram of the percentage of *esg-LacZ*-positive cells that also *-stinger-GFP* in each

1063 region.

1064

Figure S2: Comparison of *I-KCKT-GAL4* and *esg-GAL4* expression in aged flies.

Representative micrographs of the five intestinal regions (R1-R5) of young (5 day) and

older (30-day) females showing *UAS-stinger-GFP* driven by either *esg-GAL4* (top) or *I-*

KCKT-GAL4.p65 (bottom) and counterstained for the DAPI DNA marker in blue.

Figure S3: Verification that dual reporters *mira-His2A.mCherry.HA* and *3Xgbe-smGFP.V5.nls* distinguish ISCs and EBs. (A-E) Representative micrographs of the five regions (R1-R5) from the intestines of 5-day old females stained for ISCs (anti-Delta, green cytoplasmic staining), EEs (anti-Prospero, green nuclear staining), *mira-His2A.mCherry.HA* (red), *3Xgbe-smGFP.V5.nls (white),* and the DAPI DNA marker (blue). (F) Quantification of the percent of ISCs and EBs labeled by the dual reporters *mira-His2A.mCherry.HA* and *3Xgbe-smGFP.V5.nls* in each of the five intestinal regions. ISCs were defined as the number of Delta+ cells per field of view. EBs were defined as the number of Delta-, mCherry+ cells per field of view. For quantification, field of view images were taken and quantified from defined portions of each intestinal region in 6-7 intestines. We note that we detected a few (1-5) cells that were both Delta+ and *3Xgbe-*

1083 *smGFP.V5.nls+* in regions of most intestines. These were not scored as either ISCs or

1084 EBs, and could represent cells transitioning between these two cell fates.

Figure S4: *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^TS* labels many ISCs. (A-E) Representative micrographs of

the five regions (R1-R5) from the intestines of 5-day old females stained for *ISC-KCKT-*

GAL4^TS-driven *UAS-stinger-GFP* in green, *mira-His2A.mCherry.HA* in red, *3Xgbe-*

smGFP.V5.nls in white, and the DAPI DNA marker in blue. ISCs were scored as cells

positive for *mira-His2A.mCherry.HA* and negative for *3Xgbe-smGFP.V5.nls*, while EBs

were scored as cells positive for both markers. (F) Histogram of the percentage of EBs

that expressed *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^TS*-driven *UAS-stinger-GFP* in each region. (G)

Histogram of the percentage of ISCs that expressed *ISC-KCKT-GAL4^TS*-driven *UAS-*

stinger-GFP in each region.

Figure S5: *I-KCKT-GAL4^TS*-dependent expression of tagged RBPs in intestinal

progenitor cells. (A-J) Micrographs of intestines showing *I-KCKT-GAL4^TS*-dependent

expression of *UAS-GFP.FLAG* (A, D), *UAS-PABP.FLAG* (B,E), and *UAS-*

FMR1.GFP.FLAG (C,F) after two (A-C) and ten (D-F) days at the permissive

temperature. Expressed proteins were detected with either anti-FLAG or -HA antibodies

(shown in red) and intestines were counterstained with the DAPI DNA marker in blue.

Full genotypes are listed in Table S4. (I, J) Histograms of the percentage of progenitor

cells after two and ten days of *I-KCKT-GAL4^TS*-dependent expression, based on

quantification of the numbers of HA+ or FLAG+ and DAPI+ cells.

1106

Figure S6: I-KCKT based RIPs identifies genes expressed in intestinal

progenitors. (A-D) Venn diagrams showing genes significantly enriched in FACS-

isolated intestinal progenitor data from Buddika that overlap with Doupe's progenitor

enriched genes (A), Doupe's EC enriched genes (B), Dutta's progenitor enriched genes

as compared to EC genes (C), or Dutta's progenitor enriched genes as compared to EE

genes (D). (E) Heatmaps of odds ratio (in blue) and Jaccard index (in green) values for

pairwise comparisons of PABP IP enriched or PABP IP depleted genes against input

normalized FACS-based progenitor RNA-seq. Two sources of input data have been

used for FACS data normalization: total input of the PABP experiment, or the female

whole animal dataset from Leader. Numbers on each colored box show the p-value for

1117   each overlap based on Fisher's exact test. N.S.: Not significant. (F) Upset plot showing

1118   the overlap of moderately expressed genes identified by FACS based methods and total

1119   PABP IP input. Only a select set of meaningful overlaps are shown. The number above

1120   each bar shows the precise size of each intersection. Note that 854 genes were

1121   uniquely present in the input, but not in any of the FACS based datasets

1122

Figure S7: FMRP eCLIP using *l-KCKT* identifies target transcripts. (A) Schematic

representation of the eCLIP methodology. (B) Western blot of input and FLAG IP

samples (UV1 and UV2) prepared from whole animal extract and probed with anti-FLAG

antibodies. (C) Grouped bar plot showing the percentage of sequencing read

distribution. (D) Venn diagram showing the overlap of eCLIP peaks identified in UV

replicate 1 and 2. (E) Bar plot showing a selected set of significantly enriched biological

process Gene Ontology (GO) terms for FMRP target genes. (F) Venn diagram of FMRP

target genes and intestinal progenitor transcriptome identified by RNA-seq of Buddika.

(G) Venn diagram of top 10% genes with highest TMM normalized expression values

from Fig. 4L and FMRP target genes that are absent in the progenitor transcriptome

1133   (186 genes from Fig. 5D). Note that the 186 genes are unlikely to be contaminants as

1134   they do not overlap with most highly abundant genes in the preparation. (H) Western

1135   blot of input and FMRP IP samples prepared from dissected intestines probed with anti-

1136   FMRP antibodies.

1137

1138 **<u>Supplementary Tables</u>**

1139

1140 Descriptions of the five supplementary Tables, supplied as excel files, are included

1141 below.

1142

Table S1: List of genes differentially expressed in PABP IP versus whole animal Input.

Table S2: List of genes common to either PABP IP or FACS-isolated progenitors

(Buddika 2020b) and DamID-identified progenitor or EC specific genes (Doupe et al.,

2018).

Table S3: List of genes genes identified by FMRP eCLIP.

Table S4. List of fly genotypes in figures.

Table S5. List of DNA primers.