1 **Title:** **Intestinal progenitor P-bodies maintain stem cell identity by suppressing**

2 **pro-differentiation factors.**

7 **Authors:** Kasun Buddika[1], Yi-Ting Huang[1], Alex Butrum-Griffith[*1], Sam A. Norrell[*1],

8 Alex M. O'Connor[*1], Viraj K. Patel[*1], Samuel A. Rector[*1], Mark Slovan[*1], Mallory

9 Sokolowski[*1], Yasuko Kato[2], Akira Nakamura[3], Nicholas S. Sokol[1]

Affiliation: [1]Department of Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405, USA,

[2]Advanced Insect Research Promotion Center, Kyoto Institute of Technology,

Matsugasaki, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, 606-8585, Japan, [3] Department of Germline

Development, Institute of Molecular Embryology and Genetics, Kumamoto University, 2-

2-1 Honjo, Kumamoto 860-0811, Japan

* denotes equal contribution

Correspondence: nsokol@indiana.edu (email)

24   812-856-6812 (phone)

28 **Running Title:** The structure and function of P-bodies in intestinal stem cells

Abstract

Post-transcriptional gene regulatory mechanisms allow cells to quickly respond to environmental variation without relying on nascent transcription. However, the role of these mechanisms in cell fate transitions in adult stem cell populations remain poorly understood. We address this question here by investigating the role of Processing bodies (P-bodies), a key site of post-transcriptional control, in adult *Drosophila* intestinal stem cells. We report that this cell type, but not surrounding differentiated cells, harbor P-bodies that contain *Drosophila* orthologs of mammalian P-body components DDX6, EDC3, EDC4 and LSM14A/B and are ultrastructurally organized in a "core-shell" structure. A targeted RNAi screen identified 100+ genes that affect normal P-body morphology including *patr-1*, which is required for mature P-body assembly. Using both verified *patr-1* RNAi strains and newly generated *patr-1* loss-of-function alleles, we show that P-body assembly defects correlate with loss of intestinal progenitors. RNA-seq analysis found that *patr-1* mutant progenitors inappropriately express enterocyte (EC)-specific genes, leading to precocious EC differentiation. We further demonstrate that this process is independent of well-known transcriptional repressor *escargot*, indicating P-body-dependent post-transcriptional regulation of pro-differentiation genes. Taken together, this work delineates the importance of post-transcriptional mechanisms in adult stem cell maintenance.

Introduction

In eukaryotic cells, translationally inactive messenger RNAs (mRNAs) can
assemble to form a distinct population of cytoplasmic messenger ribonucleoprotein
(mRNP) particles known as Processing bodies (P-bodies) (Anderson and Kedersha,
2006; Decker and Parker, 2012; Kedersha et al., 2005). Like stress granules, which are
another class of mRNPs that form in cells experiencing extracellular stresses, P-bodies:
[1] lack a limiting membrane and are visible via conventional microscopic techniques
(Anderson and Kedersha, 2006), [2] are enhanced or induced by blocking translation
initiation (Buchan and Parker, 2009; Chan et al., 2018; Franks and Lykke-Andersen,
2008; Kedersha et al., 2000; Teixeira et al., 2005), [3] are disassembled when treated
with cycloheximide, a chemical that traps mRNAs on ribosomes (Anderson and
Kedersha, 2009; Buchan and Parker, 2009; Kedersha et al., 2000; Mugler et al., 2016;
Teixeira et al., 2005), and [4] are conserved from yeast to humans (Martínez et al.,
2013; Protter and Parker, 2016). Unlike stress granules, however, P-bodies are
constitutive and are known to contain proteins involved in mRNA decay (Anderson and
Kedersha, 2006; Anderson and Kedersha, 2009; Buchan and Parker, 2009; Decker and
Parker, 2012; Eulalio et al., 2007b; Luo et al., 2018; Parker and Sheth, 2007; Sheth and
Parker, 2003; Youn et al., 2019). While recent studies have identified stress granules in
adult tissues (Anderson et al., 2018; Buddika et al., 2020b; Gareau et al., 2013; Jevtov
et al., 2015), whether P-bodies are also present in adult tissues and, if so, what
biological processes they might control is not very well understood.

Investigation of the localization of 5'-to-3' mRNA decay machinery proteins paved
the path to the discovery of P-bodies (Anderson and Kedersha, 2006; Bashkirov et al.,
1997; Dijk et al., 2003; Eystathioy et al., 2003; Ingelfinger et al., 2002; Luo et al., 2018;
Sheth and Parker, 2003; van Dijk et al., 2002). More recent fluorescent-activated
particle sorting (FAPS) followed by liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry
(LC-MS/MS) identified 125 proteins to be abundantly present in sorted P-bodies from
HEK293 cells (Hubstenberger et al., 2017). Identified P-body resident proteins include
translation repression and mRNA decay factors (4E-T, LSM14A, LSM14B and
IGF2BP2), microRNA pathway components (AGO1, AGO2 and MOV10), decapping
complex proteins (DCP1A, DCP1B, DCP2 and EDC4) and nonsense-mediated mRNA

decay (NMD) factors (UPF1) (Hubstenberger et al., 2017). Twenty-eight of these P-

body proteins were also identified in the proteome of stress granule cores

(Hubstenberger et al., 2017; Jain et al., 2016; Youn et al., 2019), showing that proteins

are redundantly localized to both types of cytoplasmic granules. However, a more

recent systematic BioID approach identified a set of 38 proteins to be uniquely present

in P-bodies (Youn et al., 2019). FAPS-based P-body purification also identified 6,168

transcripts to be significantly enriched in P-bodies and another 7,588 transcripts that

were significantly depleted (Hubstenberger et al., 2017). This clear bifurcation of

resident mRNAs indicated that the P-body transcriptome is large but specific

(Hubstenberger et al., 2017; Standart and Weil, 2018). While its protein composition

suggested that the primary function of P-bodies was mRNA degradation (Anderson and

Kedersha, 2006; Decker and Parker, 2012), recent studies have found that mRNAs

localized to P-bodies can return to the cytoplasm to re-enter translation (Bhattacharyya

et al., 2006; Brengues et al., 2005) and that P-bodies can be disrupted without affecting

mRNA decay (Eulalio et al., 2007b; Stoecklin et al., 2006). Therefore, current models

propose that P-bodies coordinate the storage of mRNA regulons leading to

stoichiometric protein production (Standart and Weil, 2018). However, further

experiments are necessary to better understand the role of P-bodies in eukaryotic cells.

Furthermore, while extensive super-resolution microscopy has revealed that stress

granules have a core-shell structure, where the core is stable and the more dynamic

shell allows mRNAs and proteins to shuttle between the granule and the cytoplasm

(Jain et al., 2016; Niewidok et al., 2018; Wheeler et al., 2016), similar super-resolution

characterizations are necessary to elucidate whether P-bodies also possess a specific

structural organization (Youn et al., 2019).

Recent findings suggest that post-transcriptional mechanisms are critical for

maintaining proper stem cell functions. Although post-transcriptional processes such as

alternative splicing, polyadenylation, and RNA modifications are extensively studied in

pluripotent stem cells such as embryonic stem cells (ESCs) (Batista et al., 2014; Bertero

et al., 2018; Brumbaugh et al., 2018; Conway et al., 2016; Guallar et al., 2018; Han et

al., 2013; Lackford et al., 2014; Lu et al., 2013; Wilbert et al., 2012; Yeo et al., 2009),

other RNA processes such as RNA decay, storage and translational control remain

poorly understood (Chen et al., 2015; Di Stefano et al., 2019; Luhur et al., 2017; Wang

et al., 2015). Interestingly, recent work suggests that the role of P-bodies in adult stem

cells is likely to be complex and dynamic: functional analysis of the P-body protein

DDX6 found that it promotes differentiation in some *in vitro* derived stem cell lineages

and represses it in others (Di Stefano et al., 2019). Thus, tissue-based stem cell models

will be critical for probing P-body function in an *in vivo* context. The intestinal epithelium

of adult *Drosophila* offers such a model to study post-transcriptional gene regulatory

mechanisms (Buddika et al., 2020b; Chen et al., 2015; Luhur et al., 2017). This actively

regenerating tissue hosts a population of progenitor cells, which is composed of two

main cell types: mitotic intestinal stem cells (ISCs) and their transient and non-mitotic

daughters, enteroblasts (EBs), that are primed for differentiation (Micchelli and

Perrimon, 2006; Ohlstein and Spradling, 2006). In this study, we find that *Drosophila*

orthologs of mammalian P-body components, DDX6, EDC3, EDC4 and LSM14A/B are

enriched and colocalized to form mature P-bodies in these intestinal progenitor cells.

Although P-bodies were readily detected in progenitor cells, similar structures were

absent in their neighboring terminally differentiated cells. By analyzing the function of

PATR-1, an evolutionary conserved RNA-binding protein that functions in both

translational repression and mRNA decay (Pilkington and Parker, 2008; Teixeira and

Parker, 2007) and is necessary for mature P-body assembly, we find that loss of P-

bodies leads to progressive progenitor cell loss due to enhanced ISC-to-EC

differentiation. Therefore, we propose that intestinal progenitor P-bodies are necessary

for stem cell maintenance by repressing the expression of pro-differentiation factors.

Results

P-body components are enriched in intestinal progenitor cells

Because intestinal progenitor cells contain a robust population of stress granules, (Buddika et al., 2020b), we investigated whether they also contain P-bodies, a second class of mRNPs that play vital roles in post-transcriptional gene regulation (Anderson and Kedersha, 2006; Eulalio et al., 2007a; Eulalio et al., 2007b; Sheth and Parker, 2003). To test this possibility, we stained intestines of wildtype, 7-day old, adult female *Drosophila* reared under standard conditions using a series of antibodies. This series included faithful P-body markers such as EDC3, GE-1 (known in metazoans as EDC4), Me31B (known in metazoans as DDX6), and TRAL (known in metazoans as LSM14A) (Anderson and Kedersha, 2006; Ayache et al., 2015; Eulalio et al., 2007b; Hubstenberger et al., 2017). We used previously published and verified antibodies (Barbee et al., 2006; Fan et al., 2011; Nakamura A, Amikura R, Hanyu K, 2001) to detect all of these proteins except for TRAL and EDC3, for which we generated and validated new antibodies (**Fig. S1A-B**). Similar to what we observed with stress granule proteins, these P-body proteins displayed elevated signal in intestinal progenitors (**Fig. 1A-D**), which are marked by horseradish peroxidase (HRP) (O'Brien et al., 2011). While being limited to the cytoplasm, confocal microscopy detected these proteins in clearly separated cytoplasmic granules (**Fig. 1A''-D''**). The staining pattern was similar in level and cytoplasmic organization in both ISCs and *3Xgbe-smGFP::V5::nls* positive EBs (**Fig. 1A''-D''**, compare staining of the cell marked with yellow * to the unmarked cell). We also co-stained intestines with TRAL and Me31B to evaluate their relative distribution and found that TRAL and Me31B granules perfectly overlapped, indicating colocalization of P-body components under standard growth conditions (**Fig. 1E-E'**). The apparent enrichment of P-body proteins in HRP+ intestinal progenitors relative to neighboring polyploid ECs indicated that these proteins were downregulated during EC differentiation (see **Fig. 1A-E** and **Fig. S2A-B**). To assess the expression of P-body protein in EEs, we stained dissected intestines with PROS, a marker for EEs (Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006) and either TRAL or Me31B. The majority of EEs showed very low to no detectable staining (**Fig. S2A-B**), suggesting P-body proteins were downregulated

in the EE lineage as well, although TRAL or Me31B levels were comparable to

progenitors in ~20% of EEs. Taken together, these data indicated the presence of a

population of cytoplasmic granules containing colocalized P-body components in

progenitor cells that were cleared during EC or EE differentiation.

P-bodies and stress granules are distinct mRNPs in progenitor cells

We previously showed that stress granule proteins form an intricate network of

stable mRNPs, which function as cores during the formation of mature intestinal

progenitor stress granules (IPSGs) in response to stress (Buddika et al., 2020b). To

rigorously compare the cytoplasmic locations of P-body proteins with IPSG proteins

under control and stressed conditions, we turned to structured illumination super-

resolution microscopy (SIM). We treated intestines *ex-vivo* with rapamycin prepared in

Krebs Ringer Bicarbonate Buffer (KRB) to induce stress and, in parallel, we treated

control intestines with only KRB for the same length of time. We first compared the size

distribution of stress granule component FMRP with P-body component TRAL.

Consistent with our previous report (Buddika et al., 2020b), the average area of FMRP

granules increased ~3.7-fold after rapamycin treatment (0.026 μm^2 [n=629 puncta, 8

cells] after KRB treatment; 0.097 μm^2 [n=657 puncta, 25 cells] after rapamycin

treatment) (**Fig. 2A, C**, **E**). In comparison, TRAL granules were ~1.8-fold larger than

FMRP mRNPs under control conditions, but grew to roughly the same size as FMRP+

IPSGs after rapamycin treatment (0.047 μm^2 [n=804 puncta, 14 cells] after KRB

treatment; 0.098 μm^2 [n=1215 puncta, 42 cells] after rapamycin treatment) (**Fig. 2B**, **D**

,**E**). Indeed, no statistical difference was observed between the average area of FMRP

IPSGs or TRAL granules following rapamycin treatment (**Fig 2E**). These quantitative

data indicated that TRAL+ P-bodies were distinct from FMRP+ mRNPs under non-

stressed conditions, and that stress led to the enlargement of these mRNPs into IPSGs.

To qualitatively compare P-body and IPSG markers, we used SIM to compare

the expression pattern of one IPSG component (HA-tagged RIN (RIN::HA)) and one P-

body component (TRAL) under both control and stressed conditions. For comparison,

we also analyzed the distribution of two IPSG components (FMRP and RIN::HA) relative

to one another, as well as two P-body components (TRAL and Me31B) relative to one

another under these same conditions. Consistent with previously published data

(Buddika et al., 2020b), the two IPSG proteins, FMRP and RIN::HA, showed distinct but

partially overlapping patterns of small dots (Pearson's r value 0.33) in progenitor

cytoplasm under control conditions (**Fig. 2F-F', G**). However, FMRP and RIN::HA

signals were almost entirely overlapping (Pearson's r value 0.84) after rapamycin

treatment (**Fig. 2H-H'**, **I**). A similar relationship was observed with TRAL and RIN::HA,

which displayed distinct though partially overlapping foci (Pearson's r value 0.17) in the

control, but almost entirely overlapping larger foci (Pearson's r value 0.71) after stress

(**Fig. 2J-J', L-L'**, **K, M**). Given that larger RIN::HA foci represent IPSGs after rapamycin

treatment (Buddika et al., 2020b), this result indicates that P-body proteins localized to

mature IPSGs due to acute stresses. Unlike IPSG proteins, the two P-body proteins,

TRAL and Me31B, overlapped equally well with one another under both control

(Pearson's r value 0.90) and stressed (Pearson's r value 0.89) conditions (**Fig. 2N-N',**

P-P', **O, Q**). Furthermore, while mature IPSGs can have irregular shapes, P-bodies tend

to have a regular spherical organization (compare **Fig. 2H', L', P'** granule appearance

to **J'-N'**). Based on this detailed quantitative and qualitative characterization, we

concluded that P-bodies are a second population of mRNPs in intestinal progenitors of

adult *Drosophila*.

Compared to stress granules, which contain a well-studied core-shell structure,

the structural organization of P-bodies is not well understood (Protter and Parker, 2016;

Wheeler et al., 2016; Youn et al., 2019). Therefore, we used the intestinal progenitor P-

body system to assess the ultrastructural organization within a mature P-body. First, we

stained dissected intestines with either Me31B, TRAL or EDC3 and then imaged the

cytoplasmic distribution of these proteins using SIM. Next, we used the FIJI package of

ImageJ to generate intensity maps of each protein. Close inspection of globular

granules revealed that the distribution of Me31B, TRAL or EDC3 was not uniform within

a granule (**Fig. 2R, T, V**). We noted that the pixel density was different along the length

of a granule and certain domains within the granule contained more protein

accumulation than the rest of the granule (**Fig. 2S, U, W**). Given that this non-uniform

protein organization within mature P-bodies is very similar to the core-shell organization

of a stress granule, we propose that P-bodies share the same structural organization.

Although significantly smaller, P-bodies are likely to have multiple cores similar to stress

granules (**Fig. 2R-W**). Taken together, these data identified the existence of a

structurally organized population of steady-state P-bodies in intestinal progenitors of

adult *Drosophila*.

Identification of genetic modifiers of progenitor P-bodies using a targeted screen

To begin to define the genetic framework governing P-body formation in

progenitor cells, we performed a targeted genetic screen to identify genes that altered

P-body morphology. We specifically focused on genes implicated in RNA-related

processes, since P-bodies are known to be involved in RNA regulation in a range of

species, from yeast to mammals (Anderson and Kedersha, 2006; Eulalio et al., 2007a;

Luo et al., 2018), and generated a list of 600 candidate genes by using the GO term

analysis function on Flybase (http://flybase.org/) (**Table S2**). We focused on the 485

genes with Bloomington *Drosophila* Stock Center (https://bdsc.indiana.edu/) RNAi

strains to conduct a primary screen, and used TRAL as the P-body marker to score for

P-body morphology (**Fig. 3A**). We screened a total of 735 RNAi strains that targeted

these 485 genes: 186 genes were targeted using two or more RNAi strains, and the

remainder were targeted by just one RNAi line. Individual RNAi strains were crossed to

a conditional version of *esg*-Gal4 (*esgTS*) (Micchelli and Perrimon, 2006), which

allowed us to specifically knock-down each gene in intestinal progenitors at the adult

stage, and dissected seven days post-RNAi. From this analysis, we identified 103

genes that affected TRAL granule morphology or expression. We classified these genes

into five phenotypic classes based on TRAL staining pattern: [1] large TRAL puncta

("Big"), [2] small TRAL puncta ("Small"), [3] dispersed TRAL puncta ("Diffuse), [4] both

dispersed and large TRAL puncta ("Diffuse + Big"), and [5] no TRAL staining ("No

TRAL") (**Fig. 3B**, representative images **Fig. 3E-J**, **Table S3-S4**). Consistent with P-

body function, the majority of positive genes were implicated in biological processes

such as mRNA catabolism and processing and were known components of cytoplasmic

ribonucleoprotein complexes, including P-bodies (**Fig. 3C-D**). For example, the

targeting of genes encoding P-body resident proteins EDC3 or PCM, the *Drosophila*

homolog of mammalian 5'-3' exonuclease XRN1, led to bigger TRAL granules.

Unexpectedly, a relatively large number of regulators of nuclear processes such as

RNA splicing and nuclear export as well as components of nuclear structures such as

the exon-exon junction complex (EJC) also impacted the morphology of cytoplasmic

TRAL granules (**Fig. 3C-D**, **Table S4**). To assess the specificity of these effects on P-

body morphology, a representative set of 25 positives -- 13 "big" genes, 3 "small" genes,

4 "diffuse" genes, 3 "diffuse + big" genes, and 2 "no TRAL" genes -- were also co-

stained with IPSG-makers FMRP and ROX8 (**Fig. 3K-P**, **Table S3**). While most had no

discernable effect, two genes, *fne* and CG13928, altered the expression profile of these

IPSG proteins and led to "big" or "diffuse and big" FMRP/ROX8 foci, respectively (**Table**

S3, **Fig. 3O**). Taken together, this targeted genetic screen identified a series of genes

that affected proper P-body organization or expression. Strikingly, 24% of these positive

genes displayed clear progenitor cell loss, suggesting that P-bodies facilitated

progenitor cell maintenance under standard growth conditions.

PATR-1 is a P-body resident protein that is necessary for their formation

Of the five phenotypic classes, we focused on the "diffuse" class because this

class interfered with TRAL granule assembly without apparently affecting TRAL protein

level. Among the six genes in this class, we focused on *patr-1*, which was previously

shown to act as a critical nucleator of P-bodies in yeast to mammalian cells (Coller and

Parker, 2005; Nissan et al., 2010; Pilkington and Parker, 2008; Pradhan et al., 2012;

Sachdev et al., 2019; V et al., 2011). First, to assess whether PATR-1 is expressed in

intestinal cells, we stained intestines of wildtype, 7-day old, adult female *Drosophila*

reared under standard conditions with a previously verified PATR-1 antibody (Pradhan

et al., 2012). Consistent with other P-body components (**Fig. 1**), PATR-1 antibody

displayed a clear elevated staining in HRP[+] intestinal progenitors (**Fig. 4A-B**).

Furthermore, similar to other progenitor P-body proteins, the progenitor staining was

almost exclusively detected in the cytoplasm and displayed a distinctive granular

organization (**Fig. 4B**). In contrast to TRAL and Me31B, PATR-1 also showed a strong

but less punctate expression in a subpopulation of EEs (compare **Fig. S2A-B** to **Fig.**

4A, C). To assess whether PATR-1 colocalized with progenitor P-bodies, we

simultaneously examined the cytoplasmic distribution of PATR-1 and TRAL or Me31B

using SIM. As expected, PATR-1 colocalized well with both progenitor P-body

components (**Fig. 4D-E** and quantified in **G-H**). Consistent with other P-body

components, PATR-1 did not colocalize with the IPSG protein FMRP (**Fig. 4F** and

quantified in **I**), and appeared to be in larger foci than FMRP granules (compare red and

green granule sizes in **Fig. 4F'**) under standard growth condition. In addition, we re-

screened the 103 genes that had altered TRAL expression or granule morphology for

effects on PATR-1 expression. We found that the effect on PATR-1 was analogous to

TRAL in all cases except for the "No TRAL" category, in which we observed smaller

than normal PATR-1 granules, suggesting that the identified genes altered overall P-

body morphology rather than specifically just TRAL staining (**Fig. 3Q-V**, **Table S3**).

Collectively, these data indicated that PATR-1 is a P-body component in intestinal

progenitor cells of adult *Drosophila*.

Since our screen indicated that TRAL granules failed to assemble in the absence

of PATR-1, we next asked whether knockdown of *patr-1* had a similar effect on other P-

body components. First, to evaluate the efficiency of the *patr-1* RNAi strain, we stained

control and *patr-1* RNAi intestines with the PATR-1 antibody. While PATR-1 granules

were detected in control intestinal progenitors, no signal was detected in progenitor cells

after *patr-1* RNAi induction, indicating that PATR-1 protein was eliminated from

intestinal progenitors by 7 days post RNAi (**Fig. 4J**). Next, control and *patr-1* RNAi

intestines were stained for progenitor P-body components EDC3, GE-1 and Me31B.

Similar to TRAL, all three of these proteins failed to localize to cytoplasmic foci after

patr-1 RNAi (**Fig. 4K-M**), indicating that the effect we observed with TRAL was a global

effect on P-body proteins. Finally, we used SIM to observe localization of EDC3 or

TRAL relative to Me31B. Consistent with prior observations, both EDC3 or TRAL

colocalized well with Me31B in wildtype intestinal progenitors (**Fig. 4N, P** and quantified

in **R, T**). However, this colocalization was lost in the absence of PATR-1 (**Fig. 4O, Q**

and quantified in **S, U**), indicating that the overlap of these proteins was dependent

upon their localization to P-bodies. Furthermore, compared to wildtype progenitor cells,

EDC3, Me31B and TRAL accumulated in much smaller cytoplasmic foci in progenitor

cells lacking PATR-1 (compare red and green foci in **Fig. 4N', P'** to **O', Q'**). Taken

together, these data indicated that PATR-1 is required for P-body assembly by

potentially functioning as a scaffold for these proteins to interact with each other in the

cytoplasm of adult *Drosophila* intestinal progenitor cells.

Loss of PATR-1 promotes progenitor cell loss

To investigate the role of P-bodies in progenitor cells, we more carefully analyzed

the effect of *patr-1* knockdown on progenitor cell biology. To do so, we crossed control

and *patr-1* RNAi strains to *esgTS*, and analyzed intestines at three different time points

after knock down (1, 7, and 15 days) for an effect on the total number of cells as well as

the number of either progenitors, EEs, and ECs (**Fig. 5A**). First, we noted that the

intestinal progenitor cell number in *patr-1* RNAi intestines gradually declined over time

and was almost completely absent after 15 days of RNAi (**Fig. 5B**). In contrast, EE cell

percentage remained unchanged at early time points and showed a slight increase at

15 days (**Fig. 5C**). In addition, we observed that the EC percentage increased over time

and showed ~30% increase at 15 days (**Fig. 5D**). However, the total number of cells per

field was significantly reduced at 15 days (**Fig. 5E**), at least in part reflecting the loss of

progenitor cells. Taken together, these data showed that intestinal progenitor cells were

lost and the epithelial integrity was compromised by the absence of PATR-1.

To verify these RNAi phenotypes, we generated *patr-1* null alleles to

independently analyze the consequences of PATR-1 loss in intestinal progenitors.

These CRISPR/cas9-induced mutations included four that introduced frameshifts and

resulting premature stop codons after the first ~100 amino acids (AAs) of the 968 AA-

long protein, as well as four that contained larger ~1kb deletions removing protein-

encoding portions of the gene as well as introduced premature stop codons (**Fig. 5F-G**).

These new alleles were homozygous lethal, died as third instar larvae, and displayed

the same lethal phase when in *trans* to a deficiency. We further verified the absence of

PATR-1 protein in mutant third instar larvae by Western blot and, as a positive control,

included the *patr-1^{EY10289}* P-element insertion, which inserts UAS sites into the *patr-1*

locus and therefore, in conjunction with a ubiquitous Gal4 driver, led to PATR-1

overexpression (**Fig. 5H**). We then chose a representative member of each allele type,

patr-1^{P105Δ} and *patr-1^{R107FS1}*, to recombine onto an FRT chromosome and analyze in

adult progenitors using the Mosaic Analysis with a Repressible Cell Marker (MARCM)

technique (Lee and Luo, 1999). Seven days after animals were subjected to clone

induction, their intestines were dissected and either stained for PATR-1 or scored for P-

body morphology based on Me31B and EDC3 distribution. To rigorously assay for P-

body defects, we compared GFP+, HRP+ homozygous mutant progenitor cells with

surrounding, heterozygous progenitor cells identified based on HRP staining (compare

neighboring ' and " panels in **Fig. 5I-Q**). Consistent with the larval Western blot analysis

(**Fig. 5H**), PATR-1 staining was not detected in either *patr-1^{P105Δ}* or *patr-1^{R107FS1}*

homozygous mutant cells (**Fig. 5I-J**). Moreover, a previously verified rescue transgene,

P21M20 (Pradhan et al., 2012), restored the PATR-1 staining in *patr-1^{P105Δ}*

homozygous mutant progenitors (**Fig. 5K**). Similar to *patr-1* RNAi, the P-body

localization of Me31B and EDC3 was completely disrupted in *patr-1^{P105Δ}* and *patr-*

1^{R107FS1} mutant clones (**Fig. 5L-M** and **5O-P**), and these defects were rescued entirely

by the *P21M20* transgene (**Fig. 5N** and **5Q**). These data further verified that PATR-1

was a necessary component for P-body assembly in adult *Drosophila* intestinal

progenitors.

We next employed the MARCM technique to induce and track single *patr-1*

mutant ISC lineages in heterozygous adults. MARCM clones were analyzed in three

ways, all at 7 days after induction. First, the total number of cells per clone was

quantified by counting the total number of GFP+ cells per clone. In control intestines,

77% of the clones contained greater than 5 cells per clone (**Fig. 5R, V**). By contrast, the

two *patr-1* mutants, *patr-1^{P105Δ}* and *patr-1^{R107FS1}* contained only 45% and 31% clones

with greater than 5 cells per clone, respectively (**Fig. 5S, U-V**). Therefore, compared to

control, *patr-1* mutant clones contained a smaller number of total cells per clone.

Notably, these cell number defects were rescued entirely by the *P21M20* transgene

(**Fig. 5T, V**). Second, the number of Delta+ ISCs per clone were counted. Whereas the

average number of ISCs per control clone was 1.03±0.92 (n=75), ISC number in *patr-*

1^{P105Δ} or *patr-1^{R107FS1}* mutant clones decreased to 0.79±1.16 (n=100) or 0.64±0.77

(n=122), respectively (**Fig. 5R-S, U, W**). Compared to 32% of control clones, 53% or

48% of *patr-1^{P105Δ}* or *patr-1^{R107FS1}* mutant clones contained no ISCs (**Fig. 5R-S, U, W**).

Furthermore, the average number of ISCs per clone was entirely restored to 1.01±1.02

(n=79) by the *P21M20* transgene (**Fig. 5T, W**). Third, we directly quantified the number

of PROS+ EE number per clone. Although many clones in all genetic backgrounds

lacked EEs, loss of PATR-1 led to a slight reduction in EE-containing clones from 21%

in control to 13% or 14% in *patr-1^{P105Δ}* or *patr-1^{R107FS1}* mutant clones, respectively (**Fig.**

5X). In combination, both *patr-1* RNAi and *patr-1* loss of function clones suggested that

ISCs were lost due to the inability of P-body assembly.

387   To further validate the ISC loss in the absence of PATR-1, we performed one

additional experiment. We fed control and flies expressing *patr-1* RNAi (14 days) for 1

day with bleomycin, a chemical that induces rapid ISC proliferation due to EC damage

and quantified ISC proliferation by staining for phosphorylated-histone 3 (pH3), a highly

specific marker for condensed chromosomes (Amcheslavsky et al., 2009). Consistent

with ISC loss, we observed significantly low pH3 positive cells in intestines expressing

patr-1 RNAi for 15 days (**Fig. 5Y**). Taken together, *patr-1* RNAi cell number

quantification and our detailed clonal analysis showed that ISCs were gradually lost in

patr-1 mutants and the resupply of PATR-1 could reverse these defects.

PATR-1 knock-down upregulates pro-differentiation genes in intestinal

progenitors

399   To investigate the underlying molecular basis of the progressive loss of

progenitor cells caused by the disassembly of P-bodies, we performed transcriptomic

profiling (RNA-seq) of FACS (fluorescent activated cell sorting) isolated *patr-1 RNAi* and

control intestinal progenitor cells (**Fig. 6A**). Knocking-down *patr-1* in intestinal

progenitors significantly altered the expression of 1,226 genes (**Fig. 6B**, **Table S5**). We

found that 703 of these genes were significantly upregulated (FDR < 0.05; Log$_2$ Fold

Change > 1) and in contrast 523 genes were significantly downregulated (FDR < 0.05;

Log$_2$ Fold Change < -1) in the absence of PATR-1 (**Fig. 6B-C**, **Table S5**). Importantly

we found that, *patr-1* mRNA was the most significantly downregulated gene compared

to control, further confirming the efficacy of the RNAi strain we used (**Fig. 6B-D**). We

then analyzed this dataset for hallmarks that might explain the loss of progenitor cells.

Gene Ontology (GO) analysis of upregulated genes showed significant enrichment of

processes including cell differentiation, cell projection morphogenesis, septate junction

assembly and cell migration (FDR < 0.05; Fisher's Exact Test). In contrast, GO terms of

significantly downregulated genes were associated with biological processes such as

biosynthetic processes and certain cell junction assembly processes (FDR < 0.05;

Fisher's Exact Test) (**Fig. 6E**, **Table S6**). Although this analysis suggested that ectopic

differentiation might be the cause of ISC loss, we also investigated it for other

suggestive hallmarks, including inappropriate cell death. To do so, we curated

transcriptomic data to assess the expression level of 9 key apoptotic genes: *HtrA2*, *skl*,

Jafrac2, *rpr*, *hid*, *grim*, *Dronc*, *Drice* and *Dcp-1* (Xu et al., 2009). The transcript level of

none of these key cell death effectors was significantly upregulated (**Fig. S3A**, **Table**

S5), suggesting that the underlying cause of cell loss was independent of apoptotic cell

death. Thus, we hypothesized that *patr-1* mutant progenitor cells may have been lost

due to elevated differentiation.

Consistent with this possibility, we noted that *nub* (*nubbin*, also known as POU-

domain protein 1 or *Pdm1*), a key transcription factor that is expressed in ECs and is

known to promote their differentiation (Khaminets et al., 2020; Korzelius et al., 2014;

Lee et al., 2009), was significantly upregulated in the absence of *patr-1* (**Fig. 6D**, **Table**

S5). The expression of *nub* in intestinal progenitors is transcriptionally repressed by the

Snail family transcription factor, *esg* (*escargot*), which is critical for intestinal progenitor

maintenance (Antonello et al., 2015; Khaminets et al., 2020; Korzelius et al., 2014; Li et

al., 2017; Loza-Coll et al., 2014). Therefore, the loss of either *esg* itself or of genes that

are required for Esg recruitment to target genes, including *vtd* (or *Drosophila* Rad21),

promote progenitor cell loss via premature ISC-to-EC differentiation (Khaminets et al.,

2020; Korzelius et al., 2014). As with *patr-1*, knockdown of either *esg* or *vtd* also

upregulated *nub* expression (Khaminets et al., 2020; Korzelius et al., 2014). To more

comprehensively compare the molecular consequences of *patr-1* loss with *esg* and *vtd*

loss, we reanalyzed transcriptomic data of *esg* and *vtd* RNAi using an in-house analysis

pipeline and cross referenced the significantly upregulated genes in each genetic

background to those upregulated after *patr-1* RNAi. We found 22% (92/410 genes) of

the significantly upregulated genes in *esg*-RNAi and 18% (80/454 genes) of the

significantly upregulated genes in *vtd*-RNAi overlapped with *patr-1* RNAi upregulated

genes (**Fig. 6F-G**, **Table S7**). Notably, other EC markers that were upregulated in the

esg dataset, including *Myo61F* as well as *bbg* (Korzelius et al., 2014), were also

upregulated in the *patr-1* dataset (**Fig. 6C, Table S5**). An additional similarity between

the *esg* and *patr-1* datasets was the significant upregulation of genes involved in

septate junction formation (Korzelius et al., 2014). Septate junction formation is an early

step of EC differentiation and its disruption is known to block ISC-EC differentiation

(Izumi et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2019). Interestingly, key septate junction genes such as

Tsp2A, *mesh* and *ssk* (FDR < 0.05; Log_2 Fold Change = 0.84 for PATR-1 RNAi) were

noticeably upregulated in both genetic backgrounds (**Fig. S3B**, **Table S5**). However,

other septate junction proteins, including *sinu*, *cold, pasi2 and Mcr*, were markedly

downregulated in both *patr-1* and *esg* deficient progenitors (**Table S5**). These

similarities to *esg* along with GO analysis results of upregulated genes (**Fig. 6E**)

suggested that the underlying cause of progenitor loss observed after *patr-1* RNAi could

potentially be due to premature ISC-EC differentiation.

In addition to these similarities, the *esg* and *patr-1* datasets also displayed some

notable differences. For example, while many progenitor cell-specific genes including

mira, *egfr*, its ligand *spi*, and JAK/STAT receptor *dome* were significantly downregulated

in the absence of *esg* (Korzelius et al., 2014), these factors, as well as *esg* itself,

showed normal transcript levels in the absence of mature P-bodies (**Fig. 6D**, **S3C**,

Table S5). In addition, the expression level of *vtd* was unchanged in the absence of

PATR-1 (**Fig. S3D**, **Table S5**), suggesting that Esg protein targeting was not

compromised by P-body loss. To more comprehensively address whether Esg

transcriptional output was disrupted in *patr-1* mutant cells, we evaluated the expression

of 76 high confidence *esg* target genes that Korzelius et al., 2014 identified with *esg*

DamID and that were highly expressed in *esg* mutant intestinal cells. 24% (18/76) of

these were significantly upregulated after *patr-1* knockdown; most were unchanged and

approximately 5% (4/76) were significantly downregulated (**Table S7**). Korzelius et al.,

2014 also noted that EE marker genes including *prospero* (*pros*), *tachykinin* (*Tk*),

asense (*ase*) and *Rab3* (Bardin et al., 2010) are upregulated in the absence of *esg*.

Interestingly, the transcript level of none of these key factors showed significant

changes after *patr-1* loss (**Fig. S3E**, **Table S5**). However, we noted that the expression

level of *scute* (*sc*), a well characterized progenitor specific transcription factor (Bardin et

al., 2010; Doupé et al., 2018) that promotes EE fate (Li et al., 2017) was significantly

upregulated in the absence of PATR-1 (**Fig. S3F**, **Table S5**). Recent studies have

shown that both *esg* and *sc* share common binding sites on the *pros* promoter and the

binding of one antagonizes the other to alter *pros* expression (Li et al., 2017). Since,

pros transcript level was not significantly affected in the *patr-1* RNAi background, it was

unlikely that the upregulated *sc* drove ISC-to-EE differentiation. Altogether, these

observation suggest that PATR-1 promotes progenitor cell maintenance by mediating

the post-transcriptional regulation of a subset of *esg* target genes including *nub.*

To further evaluate whether *patr-1* loss led to premature ISC-EC differentiation,

we compared the transcriptional profiles of *patr-1* deficient intestinal progenitors and

ECs using publicly available datasets. We compared significantly upregulated and

downregulated genes in *patr-1* RNAi to two different sources. First, we reanalyzed RNA-

seq data from FACS-isolated progenitor cells and ECs (Dutta et al., 2015) and

performed differential gene expression analysis to identify 478 genes enriched in ECs

compared to intestinal progenitors (**Table S8**). Of these enriched genes, 66 genes

(14%) genes overlapped with upregulated genes in *patr-1* RNAi (**Fig. S3G**, **Table S8**).

In contrast, only 31 (6%) of the 529 genes that were significantly enriched in intestinal

progenitors compared to ECs (**Table S8**) overlapped with downregulated genes in *patr-*

1 RNAi (**Fig. S3H**, **Table S8**). Therefore, the *patr-1* RNAi dataset contains more

upregulated EC genes than downregulated progenitor genes. Second, we cross-

referenced the *patr-1* dataset to a recent cell type specific targeted DamID that

identified 965 EC-specific and 1,546 intestinal progenitor-specific protein coding genes

(Doupé et al., 2018). Seventy nine (8%) of the EC-specific genes were upregulated in

patr-1 mutant progenitors and, furthermore, 88 (6%) of the progenitor-enriched genes

were significantly downregulated in the *patr-1* mutant progenitors (**Fig. 6H-I**, **Table S9**).

These data showed that the loss of PATR-1 led to the expression of EC-genes that

were ordinarily not expressed in intestinal progenitors. Taken together, data provided

here supported a model where P-bodies prevent progenitor differentiation independent

of *esg*, and defects in functional P-body assembly could drive progenitor cell loss due to

enhanced ISC-EC differentiation.

Loss of P-body assembly promotes ISC-EC differentiation

The transcriptomic data of *patr-1* mutant progenitors suggested that enhanced
premature ISC-to-EC differentiation was the cause of progenitor cell loss. We performed
three additional experiments to experimentally investigate this possibility. First, we
quantified the average cell and nuclear area of control and *patr-1* RNAi intestinal
progenitors 7 days after RNAi induction, the time point where we observed the onset of
cell loss (**Fig. 5B**). Compared to control, both cell and nuclear area of intestinal
progenitors were significantly elevated in the absence of PATR-1 (**Fig. 7A-B**). Given
that ECs are polyploid and larger than intestinal progenitors, these observations
supported the ISC-to-EC differentiation model. Similar results were observed when
genes such as *esg* and *vtd*, which are known to promote ISC-to-EC differentiation when
knocked down, were eliminated using RNAi (Khaminets et al., 2020; Korzelius et al.,
2014). Next, to directly test whether ISC-to-EC differentiation was enhanced, we
immunostained control and *patr-1* RNAi intestines for Pdm1 (Khaminets et al., 2020;
Korzelius et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2009). Notably, we observed a significant
enhancement of GFP+ Pdm1+ cells in intestines lacking *patr-1* (**Fig. 7C-E**). A similar
increase in GFP+ Pdm1+ cells were also observed when genes such as *esg*, *vtd*,
Nipped-B and *polo* were knocked-down (Khaminets et al., 2020; Korzelius et al., 2014).
Consistent with transcriptomic data, we observed no increase in GFP+ PROS+ cells,
indicating that ISC-to-EE differentiation was not upregulated in the absence of mature
P-bodies (**Fig. 7F-G**). Moreover, we experimentally validated that the apoptotic cell
death was not enhanced in the absence of PATR-1 (data not shown). Taken together,
these observations supported that the cause of progenitor cell loss was enhanced
premature ISC-to-EC differentiation. Mechanistically, P-bodies may limit the expression
of pro-differentiation genes such as *nub* in intestinal progenitors to maintain the
stemness of these cells.
531
532

Discussion

In this study, we characterized a novel population of cytoplasmic mRNPs in *Drosophila* intestinal progenitor cells. We propose these mRNPs are P-bodies based on three main observations: (i) all proteins under investigation are known components of P-bodies in mammalian and yeast cells and show colocalization with each other, (ii) these mRNP granules are significantly larger and show no colocalization with IPSG foci under controlled conditions, and (iii) acute stresses increase the size of these mRNPs and promotes colocalization with IPSGs. Furthermore, our targeted genetic screen identified 103 genes that can influence P-body morphology. Of these, we characterized the P-body and cellular effects of *patr-1* loss in intestinal progenitors in detail. PATR-1 is an evolutionary conserved protein with both translational repression and mRNA decay functions (Coller and Parker, 2005; Eulalio et al., 2007a; Scheller et al., 2007; Sheth and Parker, 2003; Teixeira and Parker, 2007). Consistent with its function in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Pilkington and Parker, 2008; Sachdev et al., 2019), this extensive characterization confirmed that PATR-1 is necessary for proper P-body assembly in *Drosophila* intestinal progenitors in a cell-autonomous manner. Loss of P-bodies upregulated the expression of pro-differentiation genes such as *nubbin* and drove premature ISC-to-EC differentiation (**Fig. 8**, right side). Although P-bodies are present in intestinal progenitors, such structures were absent in neighboring differentiated cells. This suggest that P-bodies are disassembled as progenitor cell differentiation proceeds. Collectively, we propose that mature P-bodies are necessary for stem cell maintenance by post-transcriptionally regulating the expression of genes that promote differentiation (**Fig. 8**, left side). Mechanistically, differentiation signals dissolve P-bodies, derepress expression of target differentiation genes, and drive differentiation.

As noted previously, a detailed ultrastructural organization of P-bodies at super-resolution has been lacking (Youn et al., 2019). Therefore, we utilized an extensive quantitative super-resolution microscopy-based characterization to show substructures present within mature P-bodies. Consistent with the proposed "core-shell" structure of stress granules (Jain et al., 2016; Niewidok et al., 2018; Wheeler et al., 2016; Youn et al., 2019), P-bodies exhibit "cores" with high protein concentrations and "shells" with low

protein concentration (**Fig. 2R-W** and **Fig. 8**). Notably, P-bodies found in intestinal

progenitors are considerably smaller than those in mammalian cells such as HEK293

cells, with a ~125 nm compared to ~500 nm average diameter (Hubstenberger et al.,

2017). Moreover, intestinal progenitors contain ~35-45 mature P-bodies while

mammalian cells contain only ~4-7 granules per cell (Hubstenberger et al., 2017). This

indicates that the size and the number of mature P-bodies depend on the cell type.

The exact molecular function of P-bodies is a matter of current debate (Sachdev

et al., 2019). Earlier models proposed that the primary function of P-bodies is mRNA

degradation due to the accumulation of mRNA decay factors (Anderson and Kedersha,

2006; Decker and Parker, 2012). However, more recent findings propose that P-bodies

function as sites of mRNA storage. By sequestering transcripts from translational

machinery, P-bodies control the translatome of a cell (Standart and Weil, 2018).

Importantly, the transcriptomic approach we took would not be able to identify

transcripts that are localized to P-bodies for storage, since no change in the transcript

level of such mRNAs would be expected. Other techniques to identify translationally

regulated mRNAs, such as polysome profiling, ribosome profiling, RiboTag and

translating ribosome affinity purification (TRAP), are not currently feasible in adult

Drosophila intestinal progenitor cells (Baser et al., 2019; Chassé et al., 2016; Heiman et

al., 2014; Ingolia, 2016; King and Gerber, 2014; Tahmasebi et al., 2019). To address

this limitation, we are currently developing new tools and techniques to assess changes

in translating mRNAs in the presence and absence of mature P-bodies. These new

intestinal progenitor profiling techniques will also enable the direct identification of P-

body-bound mRNAs using techniques such as enhanced-CLIP (eCLIP) (Van Nostrand

et al., 2016) as well as the identification of progenitor-specific microRNAs (Luhur et al.,

2013).

A recent study documented the presence of P-bodies in cultured embryonic stem

cells and suggested their presence in adult stem cells (Di Stefano et al., 2019). In this

study, Di Stefano et al. showed that DDX6, the ortholog of *Drosophila* Me31B, mediated

P-body assembly and was critical for context-dependent cell fate determination. For

example, in some cell types, including endodermally derived progenitors such as Lgr5^{+}

ISCs or ectodermally derived progenitors such as neural progenitor cells (NPCs), loss of

DDX6 led to a clear expansion of the progenitor cell population, while in other stem cell

types, such as mesodermally derived progenitors, loss of DDX6 promoted their

differentiation (Di Stefano et al., 2019). Notably, our extensive microscopic

characterization and the discovery of P-bodies in *Drosophila* intestinal progenitors verify

the presence of mature P-bodies in adult progenitor populations otherwise suggested by

Di Stefano et al. However, the loss of P-bodies in *Drosophila* intestinal progenitors

promoted the differentiation process (**Fig. 7**) rather than increasing their proliferation, as

in Lgr5$^+$ ISCs (Di Stefano et al., 2019). There are a few possible explanations that could

explain these results. Most simply, it is possible that *Drosophila* intestinal progenitors

behave more like mesodermally derived mammalian progenitors rather than endo- or

ectodermally derived mammalian progenitors. Alternatively, the stem cell function of

DDX6 might be affected by its roles in surrounding cells, since DDX6 was targeted in

cells throughout the mouse intestinal organoid whereas PATR-1 was specifically

targeted only in progenitor cells in our study. Finally, DDX6-mediated P-body function

might be modulated by signaling that might not be fully recapitulated in *in vitro*-derived

stem cell models.

Consistent with the currently accepted model, P-bodies influence the translation

of transcripts encoding fate-instructive transcription and chromatin factors in cultured

embryonic and *in vitro*-derived adult stem cells (Di Stefano et al., 2019) . There is also

evidence suggesting that P-bodes might affect mRNA stability in stem cells: DDX6

together with the mRNA decay factor EDC3 are known to destabilize differentiation-

inducing mRNAs such as KLF4 in human epidermal progenitor cells, although it is

important to note that P-bodies have not been reported in these cells (Wang et al.,

2015). Thus, in adult Drosophila progenitor cells, it is possible that P-body proteins can

function to repress translation as well as to degrade certain messages to maintain the

behavior of these cells. Interestingly, loss of *patr-1*, which leads to P-body disassembly,

significantly upregulated the expression of the EC-fate determinant, *nub*. Therefore, one

possibility is that the *nub* mRNA is a P-body-targeted transcript that is subjected to

active degradation during stem cell maintenance. If so, differentiation cues that

disassemble P-bodies would stabilize the *nub* transcript and its subsequent translation

would drive EC differentiation. Despite the appeal of this model, it is still possible that

nub is transcriptionally upregulated as an indirect effect of P-body disassembly.

The transcriptional repression of differentiation genes by the transcription factor

esg is a key regulatory step of intestinal stem cell maintenance (Antonello et al., 2015;

Khaminets et al., 2020; Korzelius et al., 2014; Li et al., 2017; Liu and Jin, 2017; Loza-

Coll et al., 2014). For instance, the loss of Esg protein activity promotes ISC-to-EE

differentiation through modulation of Notch activity via upregulating Amun, an inhibitor of

Notch (Loza-Coll et al., 2014). In contrast, the loss of *esg* gene expression or inability to

localize the Esg protein to target genes promote progenitor cell loss via premature ISC-

to-EC differentiation (Khaminets et al., 2020; Korzelius et al., 2014). Similar to PATR-1

RNAi, knocking down *esg* itself as well as either *vtd*, *Nipped-B* or *polo*, all of which are

necessary for recruiting Esg to target promoters, markedly upregulated the expression

of Pdm1, the protein product of *nub*, in intestinal progenitors (Khaminets et al., 2020;

Korzelius et al., 2014). Notably, our transcriptomic profiling showed that the transcript

level of neither *esg* nor any of the Esg-targeting proteins, *vtd*, *Nipped-B* or *polo*, was

changed in the absence of mature P-bodies. These observations suggest that Esg

protein level and its proper promoter targeting are not affected by the loss of PATR-1.

Therefore, we propose that P-bodies post-transcriptionally regulate the expression of

EC-fate determinants, independent of Esg-mediated transcriptional regulation. This

additional layer of regulation may keep progenitor cells in a primed state where

differentiation program can be initiated rapidly and independent of transcription of

differentiation genes (Liu et al., 2016; Tahmasebi et al., 2019). This also suggest that

the Esg-mediated repression of differentiation genes such as *nub* is not complete and,

in anticipation of differentiation, progenitor cells transcribe these genes at basal rates.

Our targeted RNAi screen has identified a set of genes that can affect the proper

P-body formation in *Drosophila* intestinal progenitor cells. Understanding the

mechanisms involved in proper P-body formation is critical for assessing biological

functions of these vital cytoplasmic entities (Sachdev et al., 2019). The work presented

here showcases the importance of underappreciated post-transcriptional mechanisms

to maintain intestinal progenitor function. Future work directed at using recently

developed progenitor profiling techniques, such as I-KCKT (Buddika et al., 2020a), to

profile mRNA and protein components of progenitor P-bodies will further expand our

understanding of P-body function in stem cells within their native tissue contexts.

Materials and Methods

Drosophila strains and husbandry:

Age matched female flies were used in all experiments. Fly strains were cultured on standard Bloomington *Drosophila* stock center media (https://bdsc.indiana.edu/information/recipes/bloomfood.html) and reared in 18°C, 25°C and 29°C incubators set for a 12hr light/dark schedule and 65% humidity. Flies were cultured in groups of 15-20 (typically 5 males and up to 15 females). All strains used in this study are listed in **Table S1**.

Temperature:

For temporal and regional gene expression-targeting (TARGET) experiments, flies were grown at 18°C, collected over 2 days, and reared in 29°C for up to 20 days before being dissected. For clonal analysis using mosaic analysis with repressible cell marker (MARCM) method, animals were reared at 25°C until eclosion, collected over 2 days and heat-shocked immediately at 37°C for 45 min in a Lauda circulating water bath. Subsequently, flies were reared at 25°C for 7-15 days.

Construction of new strains:

CRISPR/cas9 mediated generation of Patr-1 alleles

New *Patr-1* alleles were generated by co-injection of two guide RNA (gRNA) plasmids. The gRNA plasmids were generated by subcloning annealed oligos encoding gRNA 5'-catgttgaacatgttatacatgg-3' as well as annealed encoding gRNA 5'-tgtgacgagactgtcggaagggg-3' into the BbsI site of *pU6-BbsI-chiRNA* (Gratz et al 2013). The two resulting plasmids were sequence-verified, amplified, mixed, and co-injected into strain $y^1 sc^* v^1 sev^{21}$; *P{nos-Cas9}attP2* (BL#78782) by Rainbow Genetics (Camarillo CA). Stocks of F_1 progeny were generated, and strains containing new *Patr-1* alleles were selected based on non-complementation of the lethality associated with *P{EPgy2}Patr-1^{EY10289}* (BL#19805). New *Patr-1* alleles were molecularly defined by sequencing PCR products generated from genomic DNA obtained from homozygous mutant larvae with oligos flanking the gRNA locations. Two new *Patr-1* alleles as well as

P{EPgy2}Patr-1^EY10289 were recombined onto P{FRT}^82B-containing chromosomes using

standard meiotic methods.

<u>UAS-PATR-1 Transgenes</u>

New transgenes were generated by Gibson Assembly using NEBuilder HiFI DNA

Assembly Master Mix (New England Biolabs, Catalog E2621), digested plasmids, and

PCR products. PCR products containing the PATR-1 open reading frame were

amplified from plasmid UFO12408 (Drosophila Genome Resource Center, stock

1648643) and combined with homemade attB-plasmids containing either a 3XFLAG or

3XFLAG-TEV-GFP cassette. Resulting plasmids were sequence-verified, amplified, and

sent to Rainbow Transgenic Flies (Camarillo, CA) for injection into the attP40 site on the

second chromosome.

Antibody generation:

Anti-TRAL antibodies were generated in rats (Cocalico Biologicals, Reamstown PA)

against a 6XHIS-tagged version of an N-terminal portion of TRAL that was expressed

and purified according to standard methods. The TRAL-encoding plasmid was

generated by PCR amplifying a 477bp fragment that encodes the first 160 amino acids

of TRAL from cDNA GH08269 (DGRC stock 4838) with high-fidelity Q5 polymerase

(NEB), subcloning the resulting PCR product into the NcoI and EcoRI sites of

pHIS.parallel using HiFi DNA Assembly Master Mix (NEB), and sequence-verifying the

resulting plasmid to confirm the absence of any PCR-induced errors.

Anti-EDC3 antibodies were generated in rabbits and rats (MBL, Japan) against a

6XHIS-tagged version of an N-terminal portion of EDC3. The *edc3* coding sequence

(corresponding to amino acid 1-440) was PCR-amplified from an ovarian cDNA library

using Q5 DNA polymerase (NEB), with primers 5´-

GGGAATTCATGGGTCCGACGGATCAAGA-3´ and 5´-

GGGGCGGCCGCTCACTTATCGGCACTTATCTCGA-3´. The fragment was digested

by *Eco*RI and *Not*I, and cloned into the pProEX HTa vector (Life Technologies). The

6×His-tagged Edc3 (1-440) protein was expressed in *E. coli* BL21 cells by IPTG

induction, and purified using Ni-NTA agarose resin (Qiagen) under denaturing

conditions. The protein was further purified by disc preparative SDS-PAGE using the

NA-1800 apparatus (Nihon Eido, Japan). Purified protein fractions were concentrated

with Vivaspan-2 (10,000 MWCO PES; Sartorius), dialyzed against PBS containing 4M

urea followed by PBS/2M urea. Polyclonal antibodies were affinity-purified with the

same antigen immobilized on HiTrap NHS columns (GE Healthcare).

Dissections and immunostaining:

Gastrointestinal (GI) tracts of adult female flies were dissected in ice-cold 1xPBS and

fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Cat. No. 15714) in PBS

for 45 min. These samples were washed with 1xPBT (1xPBS, 0.1% Triton X-100) and

then blocked (1xPBT, 0.5% Bovine Serum Albumin) for at least 45 min. Subsequently,

samples were incubated at 4°C overnight with primary antibodies, including rabbit anti-

GFP (A11122, Life Technologies, 1:1000), mouse anti-V5 (MCA1360GA, Bio-Rad,

1:250), mouse anti-FLAG (F3165, Sigma, 1:1000), rabbit anti-HA (3724S, Cell Signaling

Technology, 1:1000), mouse anti-FMR1 (5A11, Developmental Studies Hybridoma

Bank, 1:100), mouse anti-Prospero (MR1A, Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank,

1:100), mouse anti-Delta (C594.9B, Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank, 1:500),

rat anti-TRAL (this study, 1:1500), rabbit anti-Me31B (Nakamura A, Amikura R, Hanyu

K, 2001) (1:2000), mouse anti-Me31B (Barbee et al., 2006) (1:1500), rabbit anti-Ge-1

(Fan et al., 2011) (1:500), rat anti-EDC3 (this study, 1:1500), rabbit anti-EDC3 (this

study, 1:2000) and rabbit anti-Pdm1 (a gift from Xiaohang Yang) (1:1500). Samples

were washed and incubated for 2-3 hours with secondary antibodies, including

AlexaFluor-488 and -568-conjugated goat anti-rabbit, -mouse and -rat antibodies (Life

Technologies, 1:1000). AlexaFluor-647 conjugated goat-HRP antibodies were used in

the secondary antibody solution whenever required. Samples were washed and treated

with DAPI (1:10000) and mounted in Vectashield (Vecta Laboratories). An alternative

staining protocol was used for Delta staining as described in Buddika et al., 2020a.

Microscopy and image processing:

Images were collected on either a Leica SP8 Scanning Confocal microscope (Leica

DMi8 inverted microscope platform; equipped with WLL 470-670 nm, 405 nm and 440

nm lasers, Huygens deconvolution software; controlled by Leica LAS-X software; image

acquisition using Leica HC PL APO CS2 63x/1.40 or Leica HC PL APO CS2 40x/1.40

lens with Leica Type F Immersion Liquid (N = 1.518)) or an OMX 3D-SIM Super-

Resolution microscope (DeltaVision OMX system; equipped with 405, 488, 561, 642 nm

lasers; controlled by AquireSR software; image processing by SoftWorx imaging

software; image acquisition using an Olympus PL APO N 60x/1.42 lens with Applied

Precision Immersion Oil (N = 1.518)) available at the Light Microscopy Imaging Center,

Indiana University, Bloomington. Whenever possible, 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. ImageJ FIJI (https://fiji.sc/) Analyze Particles plugin was used to quantify

the average area of granules using $0.01\mu m^2$ as the lower cut off of puncta size. The

ImageJ FIJI Plot Profile plugin was used to generate line plots.

Ex-vivo treatments:

All *ex-vivo* treatments were performed as described in Buddika et al., JCS, 2020.

Briefly, intestines from females aged 8-10 days on normal diet were incubated in Krebs-

Ringer media/KRB (Alfa Aesar, Cat. No. J67591) or KRB supplemented with 1mM

rapamycin (LC Laboratories, Cat. No. r-5000) for 60 min and then fixed.

Protein isolation and western blot analysis:

Wandering L3 larvae or adult female flies were used for protein isolation. Collected

larvae or adult flies were lysed in I-RIPA protein lysis buffer (150mM NaCl, 50mM Tris-

HCl pH 7.5, 1mM EDTA, 1% Triton X-100, 1% Na Deoxycholic Acid, 1xprotease

inhibitor cocktail), protein extracts were resolved on a 4-20% gradient polyacrylamide

gel (Bio-Rad, Cat. No. 456-1093), transferred to Immobilon®-P membrane (Millipore,

Cat. No. IPVH00010) and probed with rat anti-TRAL (1:2000, this study), rat anti-PATR1

(Pradhan et al., 2012) (1:2000) or mouse anti-a-tubulin (12G10, Developmental Studies

Hybridoma Bank, 1:1000) antibodies. Subsequently, blots were washed extensively with

1xTBST (1xTBS, 0.1% Tween-20) and incubated with anti-rat or -mouse conjugated

HRP secondary antibodies. After extensive secondary washes with 1xTBST, blots were

treated with ECL-detection reagent 1 and 2 (Thermo Scientific, Cat. No. 1859701 and

1859698) and finally exposed to chemiluminescence films (GE Healthcare, Cat. No.

28906839) and developed the signal.

FACS isolation of progenitor cells and RNA-seq library preparation:

Gastrointestinal (GI) tracts of 100 adult female flies (per replicate) were dissected in ice-

cold 1xPBS. Then cells were dissociated by treating intestines with 1mg/ml elastase at

$27^{o}C$ for 1 hour with agitation. Subsequently, ~30,000-50,000 GFP^{+} intestinal progenitor

cells were sorted using a BD FACSAria^{TM} II flow cytometer equipped with a 100µm

nozzle at the IUB Flow Cytometry Core Facility. Total RNA was prepared using the

TRIzol® LS reagent (cat.no.) and rRNA-depleted libraries were prepared using the

Ovation® SoLo RNA-seq system (Part No. 0502 including Parts 0407 and S02240)

following manufacturer's instructions. The quality and quantity of final libraries were

assessed using Agilent 2200 TapeStation and KAPA Library Quantification Kit,

respectively.

RNA-seq data analysis:

Transcriptomic data analysis was performed as described in Buddika et al., 2020a using

a python based in-house pipeline (https://github.com/jkkbuddika/RNA-Seq-Data-

Analyzer). Briefly, the quality of raw sequencing files was assessed using FastQC

(Andrews, 2010) version 0.11.9, low quality reads were eliminated using Cutadapt

(Martin, 2011) version 2.9, and reads mapping to rRNAs were removed using TagDust2

(Lassmann, 2015) version 2.2. Next, the remaining reads were mapped to the Berkeley

Drosophila Genome Project (BDGP) assembly release 6.28 (Ensembl release 100)

reference genome using STAR genome aligner (Dobin et al., 2013) version 2.7.3a and

duplicated reads were removed using SAMtools (Li et al., 2009) version 1.10.

Subsequently, the Subread (Liao et al., 2019) version 2.0.0 function *featureCounts* was

used to count the number of aligned reads to the nearest overlapping feature. Finally,

bigWig files representing RNA-seq coverage were generated using deepTools (Ramírez

et al., 2016) version 3.4.2 with the settings --normalizeUsing CPM --binSize 1.

Differential gene expression analysis was performed with the Bioconductor package

DESeq2 (https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/bioc/html/DESeq2.html) (Love et

al., 2014) version 1.26.0. Unless otherwise noted, significantly upregulated and

downregulated genes were defined as FDR < 0.05; Log_2 fold change > 1 and FDR <

0.05; Log_2 fold change < -1, respectively and were used to identify enriched Gene

Ontology (GO) terms using PANTHER overrepresentation analysis on GO Consortium

(http://geneontology.org/). A selected significantly enriched GO categories were plotted.

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

Statistical analysis:

GraphPad Prism, Version 7.0 was used for all statistical analyses. First, the normality of

datasets was tested using D'Agostino-Pearson test. For comparisons involved in two

datasets, if datasets follow [1] a parametric distribution, an Unpaired t-test or [2] a non-

parametric distribution, a Mann-Whitney test was performed. Three or more datasets

following a parametric distribution were analyzed using an ordinary one-way ANOVA

test. Multiple comparisons of three or more datasets following a non-parametric

distribution were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis test. Unless otherwise noted,

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

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

<u>Acknowledgements</u>

We thank Scott Barbee, Anne Ephrussi, Xiaohang Yang, the Bloomington *Drosophila*

Stock Center (supported by grant NIHP4OOD018537), the *Drosophila* Genome

Resource Center (supported by grant NIH2P40OD010949), and the Developmental

Studies Hybridoma Bank (created by the NICHD of the NIH) for reagents; Robert

Policastro for bioinformatics expertise; the Light Microscopy Imaging Center (supported

by grant NIH1S10OD024988-01) for access to the SP8 confocal and OMX super-

resolution microscopes; the Flow Cytometry Core Facility at Indiana University,

Bloomington for access to the BD FACSAria™ II flow cytometer.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (Award R01GM124220).

References

Amcheslavsky, A., Jiang, J. and Ip, Y. T. (2009). Tissue damage-induced intestinal stem cell division in Drosophila. *Cell Stem Cell* **4**, 49–61.

Anderson, P. and Kedersha, N. (2006). RNA granules. *J. Cell Biol.* **172**, 803–808.

Anderson, P. and Kedersha, N. (2009). Stress granules. *Curr. Biol.* **19**, R397-8.

Anderson, E. N., Gochenaur, L., Singh, A., Grant, R., Patel, K., Watkins, S., Wu, J. Y. and Pandey, U. B. (2018). Traumatic injury induces stress granule formation and enhances motor dysfunctions in ALS/FTD models. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* **27**, 1366–1381.

Andrews, S. (2010). FastQC: A quality control tool for high throughput sequence data.

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. *EMBO J.* **34**, 2025–2041.

Ayache, J., Bénard, M., Ernoult-Lange, M., Minshall, N., Standart, N., Kress, M. and Weil, D. (2015). P-body assembly requires DDX6 repression complexes rather than decay or Ataxin2/2L complexes. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **26**, 2579–95.

Barbee, S. A., Estes, P. S., Cziko, A.-M., Hillebrand, J., Luedeman, R. A., Coller, J. M., Johnson, N., Howlett, I. C., Geng, C., Ueda, R., et al. (2006). Staufen- and FMRP-containing neuronal RNPs are structurally and functionally related to somatic P bodies. *Neuron* **52**, 997–1009.

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**, 705–14.

Baser, A., Skabkin, M., Kleber, S., Dang, Y., Gülcüler Balta, G. S., Kalamakis, G., Göpferich, M., Ibañez, 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.

Bashkirov, V. I., Scherthan, H., Solinger, J. A., Buerstedde, J.-M. and Heyer, W.-D. (1997). A Mouse Cytoplasmic Exoribonuclease (mXRN1p) with Preference for G4 Tetraplex Substrates. *J. Cell Biol.* **136**, 761–773.

Batista, P. J., Molinie, B., Wang, J., Qu, K., Zhang, J., Li, L., Bouley, D. M., Lujan,

E., Haddad, B., Daneshvar, K., et al. (2014). m6A RNA Modification Controls Cell
Fate Transition in Mammalian Embryonic Stem Cells. *Cell Stem Cell* **15**, 707–719.

Bertero, A., Brown, S., Madrigal, P., Osnato, A., Ortmann, D., Yiangou, L.,
Kadiwala, J., Hubner, N. C., de los Mozos, I. R., Sadée, C., et al. (2018). The
SMAD2/3 interactome reveals that TGFβ controls m6A mRNA methylation in
pluripotency. *Nature* **555**, 256–259.

Bhattacharyya, S. N., Habermacher, R., Martine, U., Closs, E. I. and Filipowicz, W.
(2006). Relief of microRNA-Mediated Translational Repression in Human Cells
Subjected to Stress. *Cell* **125**, 1111–1124.

Brengues, M., Teixeira, D. and Parker, R. (2005). Decapping and Decay of
Messenger RNA Occur in Cytoplasmic Processing Bodies. *Science (80-.).* **300**,
805–808.

Brumbaugh, J., Stefano, B. Di, Wang, X., Borkent, M., Forouzmand, E., Clowers, K.
J., Ji, F., Schwarz, B. A., Kalocsay, M., Elledge, S. J., et al. (2018). Nudt21
Controls Cell Fate by Connecting Alternative Polyadenylation to Chromatin
Signaling. *Cell* **172**, 106-120.e21.

Buchan, J. R. and Parker, R. (2009). Eukaryotic Stress Granules: The Ins and Outs of
Translation. *Mol. Cell* **36**, 932–941.

Buddika, K., Xu, J., Ariyapala, I. S. and Sokol, N. S. (2020a). I-KCKT allows
dissection-free RNA profiling of adult Drosophila intestinal progenitor cells. *bioRxiv*.

Buddika, K., Ariyapala, I. S., Hazuga, M. A., Riffert, D. and Sokol, N. S. (2020b).
Canonical nucleators are dispensable for stress granule assembly in Drosophila
intestinal progenitors. *J. Cell Sci.* **133**,.

Chan, L. Y., Mugler, C. F., Heinrich, S., Vallotton, P. and Weis, K. (2018). Non-
invasive measurement of mRNA decay reveals translation initiation as the major
determinant of mRNA stability. *Elife* **7**,.

Chassé, H., Boulben, S., Costache, V., Cormier, P. and Morales, J. (2016). Analysis
of translation using polysome profiling. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **45**, gkw907.

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, 3478–87.

Coller, J. and Parker, R. (2005). General translational repression by activators of
mRNA decapping. *Cell* **122**, 875–86.

Conway, A. E., Van Nostrand, E. L., Pratt, G. A., Aigner, S., Wilbert, M. L.,
Sundararaman, B., Freese, P., Lambert, N. J., Sathe, S., Liang, T. Y., et al.
(2016). Enhanced CLIP Uncovers IMP Protein-RNA Targets in Human Pluripotent
Stem Cells Important for Cell Adhesion and Survival. *Cell Rep.* **15**, 666–679.

Decker, C. J. and Parker, R. (2012). P-Bodies and Stress Granules: Possible Roles in
the Control of Translation and mRNA Degradation. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect.*
Biol. **4**, a012286.

Di Stefano, B., Luo, E.-C., Haggerty, C., Aigner, S., Charlton, J., Brumbaugh, J., Ji,
F., Rabano Jiménez, I., Clowers, K. J., Huebner, A. J., et al. (2019). The RNA
Helicase DDX6 Controls Cellular Plasticity by Modulating P-Body Homeostasis.
Cell Stem Cell **25**, 622-638.e13.

Dijk, E. van, Hir, H. Le and Séraphin, B. (2003). DcpS can act in the 5′–3′ mRNA
decay pathway in addition to the 3′–5′ pathway. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **100**, 12081–
12086.

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.

Doupé, 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. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **115**, 12218–12223.

Dutta, D., Dobson, A. J., Houtz, P. L., Gläßer, 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 Rep.*
12, 346–358.

Eulalio, A., Behm-Ansmant, I. and Izaurralde, E. (2007a). P bodies: at the crossroads
of post-transcriptional pathways. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **8**, 9–22.

Eulalio, A., Behm-Ansmant, I., Schweizer, D. and Izaurralde, E. (2007b). P-body
formation is a consequence, not the cause, of RNA-mediated gene silencing. *Mol.*
Cell. Biol. **27**, 3970–81.

Eystathioy, T., Jakymiw, A., Chan, E. K. L., Seraphin, B., Cougot, N. and Fritzler,
M. J. (2003). The GW182 protein colocalizes with mRNA degradation associated
proteins hDcp1 and hLSm4 in cytoplasmic GW bodies. *RNA* **9**, 1171–1173.

Fan, S.-J., Marchand, V. and Ephrussi, A. (2011). Drosophila Ge-1 Promotes P Body
Formation and oskar mRNA Localization. *PLoS One* **6**, e20612.

Franks, T. M. and Lykke-Andersen, J. (2008). The Control of mRNA Decapping and
P-Body Formation. *Mol. Cell* **32**, 605–615.

Gareau, C., Houssin, E., Martel, D., Coudert, L., Mellaoui, S., Huot, M.-E., Laprise,
P. and Mazroui, R. (2013). Characterization of Fragile X Mental Retardation
Protein Recruitment and Dynamics in Drosophila Stress Granules. *PLoS One* **8**,
e55342.

Guallar, D., Bi, X., Pardavila, J. A., Huang, X., Saenz, C., Shi, X., Zhou, H., Faiola,
F., Ding, J., Haruehanroengra, P., et al. (2018). RNA-dependent chromatin
targeting of TET2 for endogenous retrovirus control in pluripotent stem cells. *Nat.*
Genet. **50**, 443–451.

Han, H., Irimia, M., Ross, P. J., Sung, H.-K., Alipanahi, B., David, L., Golipour, A.,
Gabut, M., Michael, I. P., Nachman, E. N., et al. (2013). MBNL proteins repress
ES-cell-specific alternative splicing and reprogramming. *Nature* **498**, 241–245.

Heiman, M., Kulicke, R., Fenster, R. J., Greengard, P. and Heintz, N. (2014). Cell
type–specific mRNA purification by translating ribosome affinity purification (TRAP).
Nat. Protoc. **9**, 1282–1291.

Hubstenberger, A., Courel, M., Bénard, M., Souquere, S., Ernoult-Lange, M.,
Chouaib, R., Yi, Z., Morlot, J.-B., Munier, A., Fradet, M., et al. (2017). P-Body
Purification Reveals the Condensation of Repressed mRNA Regulons. *Mol. Cell*
68, 144-157.e5.

Ingelfinger, D., Arndt-Jovin, D. J., Lührmann, R. and Achsel, T. (2002). The human
LSm1-7 proteins colocalize with the mRNA-degrading enzymes Dcp1/2 and Xrnl in
distinct cytoplasmic foci. *RNA* **8**, 1489–1501.

Ingolia, N. T. (2016). Ribosome Footprint Profiling of Translation throughout the
Genome. *Cell* **165**, 22–33.

Izumi, Y., Yanagihashi, Y. and Furuse, M. (2012). A novel protein complex, Mesh-

Ssk, is required for septate junction formation in the Drosophila midgut. *J. Cell Sci.*
125, 4923–33.

Jain, S., Wheeler, J. R., Walters, R. W., Agrawal, A., Barsic, A. and Parker, R.
(2016). ATPase-Modulated Stress Granules Contain a Diverse Proteome and
Substructure. *Cell* **164**, 487–498.

Jevtov, I., Zacharogianni, M., van Oorschot, M. M., van Zadelhoff, G., Aguilera-
Gomez, A., Vuillez, I., Braakman, I., Hafen, E., Stocker, H. and Rabouille, C.
(2015). TORC2 mediates the heat stress response in Drosophila by promoting the
formation of stress granules. *J. Cell Sci.* **128**, 2497–508.

Kedersha, N., Cho, M. R., Li, W., Yacono, P. W., Chen, S., Gilks, N., Golan, D. E.
and Anderson, P. (2000). Dynamic Shuttling of Tia-1 Accompanies the
Recruitment of mRNA to Mammalian Stress Granules. *J. Cell Biol.* **151**, 1257–
1268.

Kedersha, N., Stoecklin, G., Ayodele, M., Yacono, P., Lykke-Andersen, J., Fritzler,
M. J., Scheuner, D., Kaufman, R. J., Golan, D. E. and Anderson, P. (2005).
Stress granules and processing bodies are dynamically linked sites of mRNP
remodeling. *J. Cell Biol.* **169**, 871–884.

Khaminets, A., Ronnen-Oron, T., Baldauf, M., Meier, E. and Jasper, H. (2020).
Cohesin controls intestinal stem cell identity by maintaining association of Escargot
with target promoters. *Elife* **9**,.

King, H. A. and Gerber, A. P. (2014). Translatome profiling: methods for genome-scale
analysis of mRNA translation. *Brief. Funct. Genomics* **15**, 22–31.

Korzelius, J., Naumann, S. K., Loza-Coll, M. A., Chan, J. S., Dutta, D., Oberheim,
J., Gläßer, C., Southall, T. D., Brand, A. H., Jones, D. L., et al. (2014). *Escargot*
maintains stemness and suppresses differentiation in *Drosophila* intestinal stem
cells. *EMBO J.* **33**, 2967–2982.

Lackford, B., Yao, C., Charles, G. M., Weng, L., Zheng, X., Choi, E.-A., Xie, X., Wan,
J., Xing, Y., Freudenberg, J. M., et al. (2014). Fip1 regulates mRNA alternative
polyadenylation to promote stem cell self-renewal. *EMBO J.* **33**, 878–889.

Lassmann, T. (2015). TagDust2: a generic method to extract reads from sequencing
data. *BMC Bioinformatics* **16**, 24.

Lee, T. and Luo, L. (1999). Mosaic Analysis with a Repressible Cell Marker for Studies of Gene Function in Neuronal Morphogenesis. *Neuron* **22**, 451–461.

Lee, W.-C., Beebe, K., Sudmeier, L. and Micchelli, C. A. (2009). Adenomatous polyposis coli regulates Drosophila intestinal stem cell proliferation. *Development* **136**, 2255–64.

Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis, G., Durbin, R. and 1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup (2009). The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 2078–9.

Li, Y., Pang, Z., Huang, H., Wang, C., Cai, T. and Xi, R. (2017). Transcription Factor Antagonism Controls Enteroendocrine Cell Specification from Intestinal Stem Cells. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 988.

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 Res.* **47**, e47.

Liu, Q. and Jin, L. H. (2017). Tissue-resident stem cell activity: a view from the adult Drosophila gastrointestinal tract. *Cell Commun. Signal.* **15**, 33.

Liu, Y., Beyer, A. and Aebersold, R. (2016). On the Dependency of Cellular Protein Levels on mRNA Abundance. *Cell* **165**, 535–50.

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.

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. *EMBO J.* **33**, 2983–96.

Lu, X., Göke, J., Sachs, F., Jacques, P.-É., Liang, H., Feng, B., Bourque, G., Bubulya, P. A. and Ng, H.-H. (2013). SON connects the splicing-regulatory network with pluripotency in human embryonic stem cells. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **15**, 1141–1152.

Luhur, A., Chawla, G. and Sokol, N. S. (2013). MicroRNAs as Components of Systemic Signaling Pathways in Drosophila melanogaster. *Curr. Top. Dev. Biol.* **105**, 97–123.

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 Rep.* **21**, 2671–2677.

Luo, Y., Na, Z. and Slavoff, S. A. (2018). P-Bodies: Composition, Properties, and
Functions. *Biochemistry* **57**, 2424–2431.

Martin, M. (2011). Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput
sequencing reads. *EMBnet.journal* **17**, 10.

Martínez, J. P., Pérez-Vilaró, G., Muthukumar, Y., Scheller, N., Hirsch, T., Diestel,
R., Steinmetz, H., Jansen, R., Frank, R., Sasse, F., et al. (2013). Screening of
small molecules affecting mammalian P-body assembly uncovers links with diverse
intracellular processes and organelle physiology. *RNA Biol.* **10**, 1661–9.

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

Mugler, C. F., Hondele, M., Heinrich, S., Sachdev, R., Vallotton, P., Koek, A. Y.,
Chan, L. Y. and Weis, K. (2016). ATPase activity of the DEAD-box protein Dhh1
controls processing body formation. *Elife* **5**,.

Nakamura A, Amikura R, Hanyu K, K. S. (2001). Me31B silences translation of
oocyte-localizing RNAs through the formation of cytoplasmic RNP complex during
Drosophila oogenesis. *Development* **128**, 3233–3242.

Niewidok, B., Igaev, M., Pereira da Graca, A., Strassner, A., Lenzen, C., Richter, C.
P., Piehler, J., Kurre, R. and Brandt, R. (2018). Single-molecule imaging reveals
dynamic biphasic partition of RNA-binding proteins in stress granules. *J. Cell Biol.*
217, 1303–1318.

Nissan, T., Rajyaguru, P., She, M., Song, H. and Parker, R. (2010). Decapping
activators in Saccharomyces cerevisiae act by multiple mechanisms. *Mol. Cell* **39**,
773–83.

O'Brien, L. E., Soliman, S. S., Li, X. and Bilder, D. (2011). Altered Modes of Stem
Cell Division Drive Adaptive Intestinal Growth. *Cell* **147**, 603–614.

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

Parker, R. and Sheth, U. (2007). P Bodies and the Control of mRNA Translation and

Degradation. *Mol. Cell* **25**, 635–646.

Pilkington, G. R. and Parker, R. (2008). Pat1 contains distinct functional domains that

promote P-body assembly and activation of decapping. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **28**, 1298–

312.

Pradhan, S. J., Nesler, K. R., Rosen, S. F., Kato, Y., Nakamura, A., Ramaswami, M.

and Barbee, S. A. (2012). The conserved P body component HPat/Pat1 negatively

regulates synaptic terminal growth at the larval Drosophila neuromuscular junction.

J. Cell Sci. **125**, 6105–16.

Protter, D. S. W. and Parker, R. (2016). Principles and Properties of Stress Granules.

Trends Cell Biol. **26**, 668–679.

Ramírez, F., Ryan, D. P., Grüning, B., Bhardwaj, V., Kilpert, F., Richter, A. S.,

Heyne, S., Dündar, F. and Manke, T. (2016). deepTools2: a next generation web

server for deep-sequencing data analysis. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, W160–W165.

Sachdev, R., Hondele, M., Linsenmeier, M., Vallotton, P., Mugler, C. F., Arosio, P.

and Weis, K. (2019). Pat1 promotes processing body assembly by enhancing the

phase separation of the DEAD-box ATPase Dhh1 and RNA. *Elife* **8**,.

Scheller, N., Resa-Infante, P., de la Luna, S., Galao, R. P., Albrecht, M., Kaestner,

L., Lipp, P., Lengauer, T., Meyerhans, A. and Díez, J. (2007). Identification of

PatL1, a human homolog to yeast P body component Pat1. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*

- Mol. Cell Res. **1773**, 1786–1792.

Sheth, U. and Parker, R. (2003). Decapping and Decay of Messenger RNA Occur in

Cytoplasmic Processing Bodies. *Science (80-.).* **300**, 805–808.

Standart, N. and Weil, D. (2018). P-Bodies: Cytosolic Droplets for Coordinated mRNA

Storage. *Trends Genet.* **34**, 612–626.

Stoecklin, G., Mayo, T. and Anderson, P. (2006). ARE-mRNA degradation requires

the 5′–3′ decay pathway. *EMBO Rep.* **7**, 72–77.

Tahmasebi, S., Amiri, M. and Sonenberg, N. (2019). Translational Control in Stem

Cells. *Front. Genet.* **9**, 709.

Teixeira, D. and Parker, R. (2007). Analysis of P-Body Assembly in *Saccharomyces*

cerevisiae. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **18**, 2274–2287.

Teixeira, D., Sheth, U., Valencia-Sanchez, M. A., Brengues, M. and Parker, R.

(2005). Processing bodies require RNA for assembly and contain nontranslating

mRNAs. *RNA* **11**, 371–382.

V, R., KH, S. and PK, H. (2011). The cAMP-dependent Protein Kinase Signaling

Pathway Is a Key Regulator of P Body Foci Formation. *Mol. Cell* **43**,.

van Dijk, E., Cougot, N., Meyer, S., Babajko, S., Wahle, E. and Séraphin, B. (2002).

Human Dcp2: a catalytically active mRNA decapping enzyme located in specific

cytoplasmic structures. *EMBO J.* **21**, 6915–6924.

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). *Nat. Methods* **13**, 508–514.

Wang, Y., Arribas-Layton, M., Chen, Y., Lykke-Andersen, J. and Sen, G. L. (2015).

DDX6 Orchestrates Mammalian Progenitor Function through the mRNA

Degradation and Translation Pathways. *Mol. Cell* **60**, 118–130.

Wheeler, J. R., Matheny, T., Jain, S., Abrisch, R. and Parker, R. (2016). Distinct

stages in stress granule assembly and disassembly. *Elife* **5**,.

Wilbert, M. L., Huelga, S. C., Kapeli, K., Stark, T. J., Liang, T. Y., Chen, S. X., Yan,

B. Y., Nathanson, J. L., Hutt, K. R., Lovci, M. T., et al. (2012). LIN28 Binds

Messenger RNAs at GGAGA Motifs and Regulates Splicing Factor Abundance.

Mol. Cell **48**, 195–206.

Xu, D., Woodfield, S. E., Lee, T. V., Fan, Y., Antonio, C. and Bergmann, A. (2009).

Genetic control of programmed cell death (apoptosis) in Drosophila. *Fly (Austin).* **3**,

78–90.

Xu, C., Tang, H.-W., Hung, R.-J., Hu, Y., Ni, X., Housden, B. E. and Perrimon, N.

(2019). The Septate Junction Protein Tsp2A Restricts Intestinal Stem Cell Activity

via Endocytic Regulation of aPKC and Hippo Signaling. *Cell Rep.* **26**, 670-688.e6.

Yeo, G. W., Coufal, N. G., Liang, T. Y., Peng, G. E., Fu, X.-D. and Gage, F. H. (2009).

An RNA code for the FOX2 splicing regulator revealed by mapping RNA-protein

interactions in stem cells. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **16**, 130–137.

Youn, J.-Y., Dyakov, B. J. A., Zhang, J., Knight, J. D. R., Vernon, R. M., Forman-

Kay, J. D. and Gingras, A.-C. (2019). Properties of Stress Granule and P-Body

Proteomes. *Mol. Cell* **76**, 286–294.

1133

Figure Legends

Figure 1: P-body proteins are enriched and co-localized in adult intestinal progenitor cells. (A-D) Confocal micrographs of adult posterior midguts stained for (A) EDC3, (B) GE-1, (C) Me31B and (D) TRAL. *3Xgbe-smGFP::V5::nls* (white) labels EBs, HRP (green) labels both EBs and ISCs, and the DNA-dye DAPI (blue) labels all cells. Gray-scale image of each stained protein is also shown in A'-D'. A"-D" show progenitor cells marked with yellow dotted outlines in A-D at a higher magnification. Cells labeled with a yellow asterisk (*) in A"-J" are *gbe*+, HRP+ EBs while neighboring *gbe*-, HRP+ cells are ISCs. (E-E') Fluorescent confocal micrographs of adult posterior midguts stained for TRAL (red), Me31B (green) and DAPI (blue). E' shows progenitor cells marked with the white dotted outline on E, at a higher magnification.

Figure 2: P-bodies are a novel population of progenitor mRNPs and localize to IPSGs

following stress. (A-D) Super-resolution micrographs of progenitor cells either treated

with (A-B) KRB (control) or (C-D) 1mM rapamycin in KRB, and stained for (A, C) FMRP

(red) or (B, D) TRAL (red) and DAPI (blue). (E) Scatter dot plots of FMRP or TRAL

puncta area in progenitor cells treated with control or 1mM rapamycin in KRB. Graph

shows mean±s.d. *****P*<0.0001; n.s., not significant (Kruskal-Wallis test). (F, H, J, L, N,

P) Super-resolution micrographs of progenitor cells either treated with (F, J, N) KRB or

(H, L, P) 1mM rapamycin in KRB and stained for (F, H) FMRP (red), RIN::HA (green) or

(J, L) TRAL (red), RIN::HA (green) or (N, P) TRAL (red), Me31B (green) and DAPI (blue

in F, H, J, L, N, P). Figures labeled with a ' show a magnified view of the region marked

with white dotted outline in F, H, J, L, N, P. (G, I, K, M, O, Q) Line plots of fluorescent

intensity profiles of (G, I) FMRP (red), RIN::HA (green) or (K, M) TRAL (red), RIN::HA

(green) or (O, Q) TRAL (red), Me31B (green). The plot shows the pixel-by-pixel gray

value of each channel along white lines shown on F', H', J', L', N' or P'. Computed

Pearson's r value and the statistical significance of the correlation are given above each

plot. (R, T, V) Super-resolution micrographs of progenitor cells that are stained for (R)

Me31B, (T) TRAL or (V) EDC3. The ImageJ color lookup table (LUT) "Fire" was used to

visualize protein accumulation within granules. Intensity scale represents gray scale

intensity of each protein. Insets are enlarged views of boxed regions in the main panels.

(S, U, W) Line plots showing fluorescent intensity profiles of (S) Me31B, (U) TRAL or

(W) EDC3. The plot shows the pixel-by-pixel gray value of insets shown in R, T and V.

1168

Figure 3: A targeted genetic screen identifies genes affecting P-body morphology. (A)
Pie chart showing the number of genes with and without Bloomington *Drosophila* Stock

Center (BDSC) RNAi strains. Note that only genes with BDSC RNAi strains were

analyzed in the screen. (B) Pie chart summarizing phenotypic classes identified during

the primary screen using TRAL as a P-body marker. (C-D) Bar plots visualizing

significantly enriched (C) biological process or (D) cellular component Gene Ontology

(GO) terms (FDR < 0.05) for positive genes. The y-axis represents significantly enriched

GO term and the x-axis represent gene count for each GO term. Color of each bar

represent the FDR. (E-J) Confocal micrographs of intestinal progenitors from (E, K, Q)

control, (F, L, R) *CG18259* RNAi, (G, M, S) *srl* RNAi, (H, N, T) *patr-1* RNAi, (I, O, U)

CG13928 RNAi or (J, P, V) *me31b* RNAi posterior midguts and stained for (E-J) TRAL

(red), GFP (green) or (K-P) ROX8 (red), FMRP (green) or (Q-V) TRAL (red), PATR-1

(green) and DAPI (blue in E-V). Gray-scale extracts of TRAL staining in panels E-J are

shown in E'-J'. Gray-scale extracts of TRAL and PATR-1 in panels Q-V are shown

below the respective panel.

1184

Figure 4: PATR-1 is an integral component of P-bodies and required for P-body assembly in intestinal progenitors. (A-C) Confocal micrographs of posterior midguts stained for PROS (red), PATR-1 (green), HRP (white) and DAPI (blue). Cells marked with orange and yellow dotted outlines are shown at a higher magnification in B and C respectively. Note that gray-scale images of PROS and PATR-1 channels are shown in A'-C' and A''-C'' respectively. (D-F) Super-resolution micrographs of intestinal progenitors stained for (D-D') TRAL (red), PATR-1 (green) or (E-E') Me31B (red), PATR-1 (green) or (F-F') FMRP (red), PATR-1 (green) and DAPI (blue in D-F and D'-F'). (G-I) Line plots showing fluorescent intensity profiles of (G) TRAL (red) or (H) Me31B (red) or (I) FMRP (red) and PATR-1 (green). The plot shows the normalized pixel-by-pixel gray value of each channel along white lines shown on D'-F'. Computed Pearson's r values and the statistical significance of the correlation are given above each plot. (J-M) Gray-scale confocal images of control (left) or *patr-1* RNAi (right) progenitor cells that are stained for (J) PATR-1, (K) EDC3, (L) GE-1 or (M) Me31B. (N-Q) Super-resolution micrographs of (N, P) control or (O, Q) *patr-1* RNAi intestinal progenitors that are stained for (N-O, N'-O') TRAL (red), Me31B (green) or (P-Q, P'-Q') EDC3 (red), Me31B (green) and DAPI (blue in N-Q, N'-Q'). (R-U) Line plots showing fluorescent intensity profiles of (R-S) TRAL (red), Me31B (green) or (T-U) EDC3 (red), Me31B (green). The plot shows the normalized pixel-by-pixel gray value of each channel along white lines shown on N'-Q'. Computed Pearson's r values and the statistical significance of the correlation are given above each plot.

Figure 5: Loss of PATR-1 leads to intestinal progenitor cell loss. (A) Schematic representation of the intestinal cell types and cell-type specific markers. (B-D) Line plots showing the normalized (B) intestinal progenitor cell percentage or (C) EE cell percentage or (D) EC percentage of control (pink) and *patr-1* RNAi (blue) 1, 7 and 15 days after shifting to 29°C. (E) Dot-plot showing total number of cells per field of view at 15 days after shifting to 29°C. (F, G) Schematics of the *patr-1* locus (F) and PATR-1 protein, including the location of gRNAs (arrowhead) used to generate new alleles. F also shows the nucleotide changes associated with the eight newly generated *patr-1* alleles. (H) Western blot of whole larval extracts derived from w^{1118} (control), the new *patr-1* alleles, the previously described hypomorphic *patr1^{EY10289}* allele, and *patr1^{EY10289}* crossed to tub-Gal4 and probed with PATR-1 (top panel) or Tubulin (bottom panel) antibodies. The two alleles used in the paper are marked in red. Note that the * shows a prominent background band detected by the PATR-1 antibody. (I-Q) Confocal micrographs of intestinal sections harboring (I, L, O) *patr-1^{P105Δ}*, (J, M, P) *patr-1^{R107FS1}*, or (K, N, Q) rescued *patr-1^{P105Δ}* heterozygous (left and labeled with +/-) and homozygous mutant (right, labeled with -/- and GFP+) progenitor cells stained for (I-K) PATR-1 (red) or (L-N) Me31B (red) or (O-Q) EDC3 (red), (I-Q) GFP (green) and (I-Q) DAPI (blue). (R-U) Representative confocal images of *tub-Gal4, UAS-GFP*-labeled (R) control, (S) *patr-1^{P105Δ}*, (T) rescued *patr-1^{P105Δ}*, or (U) *patr-1^{R107FS1}* homozygous clones stained for DI (red), PROS (red), GFP (green) and DAPI (blue). The size of the clone is marked by the white dotted line and ISCs in clones are denoted by the yellow asterisks (*). (V-X) Binned bar plots showing the quantification of (V) total cell, (W) DI+ ISC or (X) PROS+ EE cell numbers in *tub-Gal4, UAS-GFP*-labeled control, *patr-1^{P105Δ}*, rescued *patr-1^{P105Δ}*, or *patr-1^{R107FS1}* homozygous clones analyzed 7 days after clone induction (ACI). Note that n indicates the total number of clones analyzed for each genotype. (Y) Dot-plot showing the total number of pH3+ mitotic cells per posterior midgut (PMG) of control or *patr-1* RNAi flies fed with bleomycin for 24 hours. Rescued (res) strains harbor the *patr-1* rescuing transgene, *P21M20*.

Figure 6: PATR-1 knock-down ectopically upregulates pro-differentiation genes in intestinal progenitors. (A) Schematic representation of the transcriptomic profiling (RNA-seq) of FACS (Fluorescent Activated Cell Sorting) isolated intestinal progenitors of adult female *Drosophila*. (B) Volcano plot of differentially expressed genes from comparison of *patr-1* RNAi with control. Each dot represents a single gene. Blue indicates a false

1243 discovery rate adjusted p-value (FDR) < 0.05 and a Log2 fold change < 1 or > -1. Green

1244 indicates Log_2 fold change > 1 or < -1 and an FDR >= 0.05. Red indicates an FDR <

1245 0.05 and Log_2 fold change > 1 or < -1. (C) Heatmap showing differentially expressed

1246 genes (FDR < 0.05; Log_2 fold change > 1 or < -1) in *patr-1* RNAi compared to control.

1247 Note that gene names of a selected set of upregulated or downregulated genes are

1248 shown. (D) Genome browser tracks of CPM-normalized control and *patr-1* RNAi at the

1249 *patr-1, nub* or *esg* locus of the *Drosophila* genome. Note the three replicates of the

1250 control (yellow, light green and dark green) and the three replicates of the *patr-1* RNAi

1251 (blue, pink and red), have been overlayed for simplicity. (E) Bar plot showing a selected

1252 set of significantly enriched (FDR < 0.05; Fisher's Exact test) Gene Ontology (GO)

1253 terms for genes that are significantly downregulated (FDR < 0.05; Log_2 fold change < -

1254 1) or upregulated (FDR < 0.05; Log_2 fold change > 1) in *patr-1* RNAi compared to

1255 control. (F-I) Venn diagrams showing the overlap of (F) significantly upregulated (FDR <

1256 0.05; Log_2 fold change > 1) genes in *patr-1* RNAi and *esg* RNAi (Korzelius et al., 2014)

1257 or (G) significantly upregulated (FDR < 0.05; Log_2 fold change > 1) genes in *patr-1*

1258 RNAi and *vtd* RNAi (Khaminets et al., 2020) or (H) significantly upregulated (FDR <

1259 0.05; Log_2 fold change > 1) genes in *patr-1* RNAi and EC-enriched genes based on EC

1260 DamID (Doupé et al., 2018) or (I) significantly downregulated (FDR < 0.05; Log_2 fold

1261 change < -1) genes in *patr-1* RNAi and progenitor-enriched genes based on intestinal

1262 progenitor DamID (Doupé et al., 2018).

1263

Figure 7: Loss of PATR-1 promotes premature ISC-to-EC-differentiation. (A-B) Dot-plot

showing (A) cell area or (B) nuclei area of control and *patr-1* RNAi intestinal progenitors

7 days after shifting to 29°C. (C-D) Confocal micrographs of intestinal sections from (C)

control or (D) *patr-1* RNAi and stained for Pdm1 (red), GFP (green) and DAPI (blue). (E)

Dot-plot showing the percentage of GFP+ Pdm1+ cells in control and *patr-1* RNAi 7

days after shifting to 29°C. (F-G) Confocal micrographs of intestinal sections from (F)

control or (G) *patr-1* RNAi and stained for PROS (red), GFP (green) and DAPI (blue).

Figure 8: Proposed model of P-body mediated intestinal stem cell maintenance.

Figure S1: Verification of the TRAL antibody. (A) Western blot of *w1118* (control) and transheterozygous *tral* mutant (*tral^e3082^/Df(3L)sex204*) whole animal extracts probed with TRAL (top panel) or Tubulin (bottom panel) antibodies. (B-C) Confocal micrographs of epithelial sections from (B) wildtype (*w1118*) or (C) transheterozygous *tral* mutant (*tral^e3082^/Df(3L)sex204*) intestines stained for HRP (red), TRAL (green in B-C, white in B'-C') and DAPI (blue). Note that *tral* mutant intestinal progenitors have no detectable TRAL staining.

1283 **Figure S2:** P-bodies are enriched in intestinal progenitors, but rarely observed in some

1284 EEs. (A-B) Confocal micrographs of intestinal sections stained for (A) TRAL (red) or (B)

1285 Me31B (red), (A-B) prospero (green), (A-B) HRP (white) and (A-B) DAPI. While TRAL

1286 and Me31B granules are readily observed in HRP+ intestinal progenitors only some

1287 prospero+ EEs have detectable TRAL or Me31B expression.

1288

Figure S3: Gene expression changes associated with *patr-1* RNAi. (A-F) Genome browser tracks of CPM-normalized control and *patr-1* RNAi at the (A) *hid,* (B) *mesh,* (C) *mira,* (D) *vtd,* (E) *pros* or (F) *sc* locus of the *Drosophila* genome. Note the three replicates of the control (yellow, light green and dark green) and the three replicates of the PATR-1 RNAi (blue, pink and red), have been overlayed for simplicity. (G-H) Venn diagrams showing the overlap of (G) significantly upregulated (FDR < 0.05; Log$_2$ fold change > 1) genes in *patr-1* RNAi and EC-enriched genes or (H) significantly downregulated (FDR < 0.05; Log$_2$ fold change < -1) genes in *patr-1* RNAi and progenitor enriched genes based on Dutta et al. 2015.

 Supplementary Tables

 Table S1: Fly strains used in this study

Figure	Panels	Genotypes of flies used in each panel
Fig. 1	A-D	*gbe-smGFP::V5::nls / +*
	E	*w1118*
Fig. 2	A-E, R-W	*w1118*
	F-P	*HA::rin / +*
Fig. 3	E	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / +*
	F	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMJ22374}attP40 (BL58288)*
	G	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS00857}attP2 (BL33914) / +*
	H	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS01144}attP2/TM3, Sb[1] (BL34667) / +*
	I	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.JF03061}attP2 (BL28646) / +*
	J	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HM05052}attP2 (BL28566) / +*
	K, Q	*{mira -KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-Gal4^{1438}}attP40, P{tubP-Gal80[ts]}20 / + ; {CG10116-KD::PEST^{1107}}attP2 / +*
	L, R	*{mira -KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-Gal4^{1438}}attP40, P{tubP-Gal80[ts]}20 / P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMJ22374}attP40 (BL58288) ; {CG10116-KD::PEST^{1107}}attP2 / +*
	M, S	*{mira -KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-Gal4^{1438}}attP40, P{tubP-Gal80[ts]}20 / + ; {CG10116-KD::PEST^{1107}}attP2 / P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS00857}attP2 (BL33914)*
	N, T	*{mira -KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-Gal4^{1438}}attP40, P{tubP-Gal80[ts]}20 / + ; {CG10116-KD::PEST^{1107}}attP2 / P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS01144}attP2 (BL34667)*
	O, U	*{mira -KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-Gal4^{1438}}attP40, P{tubP-Gal80[ts]}20 / + ; {CG10116-KD::PEST^{1107}}attP2 / P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.JF03061}attP2 (BL28646)*
	P, V	*{mira -KDRT>-dSTOP-KDRT>-Gal4^{1438}}attP40, P{tubP-Gal80[ts]}20 / + ; {CG10116-KD::PEST^{1107}}attP2 / P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HM05052}attP2 (BL28566)*
Fig. 4	A-I	*w1118*
	J-M	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / +*
	J-M	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS01144}attP2 (BL34667) / +*
	N, P, R, T	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / +*
	O, Q, S, U	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS01144}attP2 (BL34667) / +*
Fig. 5	B-E, Y	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / +*
	B-E, Y	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS01144}attP2 (BL34667) / +*
	H	*w1118*
	H	*patr-1^{P105FS1}*
	H	*patr-1^{P105FS2}*
	H	*patr-1^{P106FS1}*
	H	*patr-1^{P107FS1}*

	H	*patr-1^{P104Δ}*
	H	*patr-1^{P105Δ}*
	H	*patr-1^{EY10289}*
	H	*patr-1^{EY10289} ; tub-Gal4 / +*
	I, L, O, S, V-X	*hsFLP^{12} , tubGAL4, UAS-GFP / + ; P{lin-28 13kb::mCherry}attP40 / + ; FRT^{82B} tubP-GAL80^{LL3}/ FRT82B patr-1^{P105Δ}*
	J, M, P, U-X	*hsFLP^{12} , tubGAL4, UAS-GFP / + ; P{lin-28 13kb::mCherry}attP40 / + ; FRT^{82B} tubP-GAL80^{LL3}/ FRT82B patr-1^{R107FS1}*
	K, N, Q, T, V-X	*hsFLP^{12} , tubGAL4, UAS-GFP / + ; P{lin-28 13kb::mCherry}attP40 / P21M20 ; FRT^{82B} tubP-GAL80^{LL3}/ FRT82B Patr-1^{P105Δ}*
	R, V-X	*hsFLP^{12} , tubGAL4, UAS-GFP / + ; P{lin-28 13kb::mCherry}attP40 / + ; FRT^{82B} tubP-GAL80^{LL3}/ FRT82B iso1*
Fig. 6	A-I	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / +*
	A-I	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS01144}attP2/ (BL34667) / +*
Fig. 7	A-G	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / +*
	A-G	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS01144}attP2/ (BL34667) / +*
Fig. S1	A-C	*w1118*
	A-C	*tral^{e3082} / Df(3L)sex204 (BL9337)*
Fig. S2	A-B	*w1118*
Fig. S3	A-H	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / +*
	A-H	*esg-Gal4 UAS-GFP tubGal80^{ts} / + ; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS01144}attP2/ (BL34667) / +*

1315

1316