Innexin function dictates the spatial relationship between distal somatic cells in the

***Caenorhabditis elegans* gonad without impacting the germline stem cell pool**

Theadora Tolkin*[1], Ariz Mohammad*[2], Todd Starich[3], Ken C. Q. Nguyen[4], David H. Hall[4], Tim

Schedl[#,2], E. Jane Albert Hubbard[#,1,5,6], David Greenstein[#, 3]

[1] Kimmel Center for Biology and Medicine at the Skirball Institute, NYU Grossman School of

Medicine, New York, NY, United States

[2] Department of Genetics, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO, United

States

[3] Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis,

MN, United States

[4] Department of Neuroscience, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, NY 10461

[5] Department of Cell Biology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY, United States

[6] Department of Pathology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY, United States

*equal contribution

co-corresponding

<u>Abstract</u>

Gap-junctional signaling mediates myriad cellular interactions in metazoans. Yet, how gap

junctions control the positioning of cells in organs is not well understood. Innexins compose gap

junctions in invertebrates and affect organ architecture. Here, we investigate the roles of gap-

junctions in controlling distal somatic gonad architecture and its relationship to underlying

germline stem cells in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. We show that a reduction of soma–germline

gap-junctional activity causes displacement of distal sheath cells (Sh1) towards the distal end of

the gonad. We confirm, by live imaging, transmission electron microscopy, and antibody

staining, that bare regions—lacking somatic gonadal cell coverage of germ cells—are present

between the distal tip cell (DTC) and Sh1, and we show that an innexin fusion protein used in a

prior study encodes an antimorphic gap junction subunit that mispositions Sh1. We determine

that, contrary to the model put forth in the prior study based on this fusion protein, Sh1

mispositioning does not markedly alter the position of the borders of the stem cell pool nor of

the progenitor cell pool. Together, these results demonstrate that gap junctions can control the

position of Sh1, but that Sh1 position is neither relevant for GLP-1/Notch signaling nor for the

exit of germ cells from the stem cell pool.

<u>Introduction</u>

The relative positions of certain cells within larger organ structures are often important for

tissue function. Yet the mechanisms by which cells reach and maintain their precise relative

positions within organs are poorly defined. Gap junctions act as conduits for small molecules

passed between cells and/or as rivets to ensure adhesion between cells (reviewed by (Skerrett

and Williams, 2017)). They have also been implicated in cell morphology within organs

(reviewed by (Phelan, 2005)), however this latter role is less well characterized. Here we take

advantage of well-characterized and stereotypical morphology, interactions, and relationships

among cells in *Caenorhabditis elegans* to investigate the role gap junctions play in somatic

gonad architecture and its consequences, or lack thereof, for the underlying germline stem

cells.

The *C. elegans* hermaphrodite gonad provides a premier system for studying organogenesis and

stem cell behavior (reviewed by (Hubbard and Greenstein, 2000; Hubbard and Schedl, 2019)).

Two gonad arms, anterior or posterior of a central uterus and vulva, are each capped by a single

somatic cell, the distal tip cell (DTC), that establishes a stem cell niche. Germline stem cells and

their proliferative progeny, which together are referred to as progenitors, are maintained by

GLP-1/Notch-mediated signaling in the germ line in response to DSL family ligands LAG-2 and

APX-1 produced by the DTC (Austin and Kimble, 1987; Berry et al., 1997; Henderson et al.,

1994; Nadarajan et al., 2009; Yochem and Greenwald, 1989). Proximal to the DTC, five pairs of

sheath cells (named as pairs Sh1 to Sh5, distal to proximal) provide additional support to the

germ line. In particular, Sh1 is implicated in promoting germline progenitor cell proliferation

(Killian and Hubbard, 2005; McCarter et al., 1997). Although the molecular and cellular

mechanisms by which Sh1 promotes germline proliferation remain to be fully elucidated, it is

clear that one mechanism for the function of these cells involves the formation of gap junctions

with germ cells (Starich et al., 2014).

Invertebrate gap junctions are formed from octameric hemichannels of innexin proteins

(Oshima et al., 2016). In *C. elegans*, INX-8 and INX-9 associate to form hemichannels in the

hermaphrodite somatic gonad which couple to germline innexin hemichannels (INX-14 with

INX-21 or INX-22) to promote germline proliferation and inhibit meiotic maturation,

respectively (Figure 1A–B; (Starich et al., 2014)). Phenotypic analysis of reduction-of-function

mutants in *inx-8* recently led to the discovery of malonyl-CoA as a key cargo that traverses the

soma-germline junctions to ensure proper embryogenesis (Starich et al., 2020) .

In the distal gonad, the somatic gonadal hemichannel components INX-8 and INX-9 are required

redundantly for germ cell proliferation and differentiation. Loss of both components renders

the germ line devoid of all but a handful of germ cells, which fail to undergo gametogenesis.

Restoration of *inx-8* either to the DTC or to sheath cells rescues the severe germline

proliferation defect of the *inx-8(0) inx-9(0)* double mutant (Starich et al., 2014). In addition, a

reduction of *inx-8* and *inx-9* via hypomorphic alleles or by RNA interference limits expansion of

the pool of proliferative germ cells (Dalfo et al., 2020; Starich and Greenstein, 2020; Starich et

al., 2014). The mutant innexin allele combinations used in this study are proficient in promoting

germline proliferation; however, as this work shows, many of them affect the position of Sh1

with respect to the distal end of the gonad.

Several prior observations point to a role for innexins in overall somatic gonad architecture. In

young adult hermaphrodites, the DTC forms long extending processes reaching proximally

towards Sh1, while the distal border of Sh1 is more regular, with filopodia extending distally

towards the DTC. Extensive ultrastructural and both fixed and live image analysis demonstrated

the existence of "bare regions" in between the proximal-extending DTC processes and the

distal-extending filopodial extensions of Sh1 in the adult hermaphrodite gonad. In these

regions, germ cells are in contact with neither the DTC nor Sh1, but are covered only by a basal

lamina ((Hall et al., 1999); Figure 1C and D). Interestingly, the hypomorphic allele *inx-14(ag17)*

(Miyata et al., 2008) causes Sh1 to reach almost to the distal end of the gonad (Starich et al.,

2014) and to obliterate any bare region between the DTC and Sh1. Similarly, a loss of bare

regions was observed in *inx-8(0) inx-9(0)* double mutants in which germline proliferation was

largely restored through expression of an *inx-8::gfp* transgene in the DTC only (Starich et al.,

2014). This latter result suggested that if Sh1 cannot form gap junctions with germ cells, Sh1

becomes distally mispositioned. However, the consequences of this mispositioning and the

accompanying loss of the bare regions for germline stem cells has not been previously

explored.

The spatial relationship between the DTC, Sh1 and the germ line summarized above was

recently challenged, and an hypothesis put forth that Sh1 might guide an oriented and

asymmetric division of stem cells, such that a daughter cell in contact with Sh1 enters the

differentiation pathway while the other, in contact with the DTC, remains a stem cell (Gordon

et al., 2020). If oriented cell fate-determining germ cell divisions occur in this way, the

expectation would be that germ cells undergoing such a division should be in contact with both

the DTC and Sh1, and that closely spaced daughter germ cells that have recently undergone

such a division would be remain in contact with one or the other. The model predicts that there

should be few if any germ cells that contact neither the DTC nor Sh1. If Sh1 drives cell fate-

determining germ cell divisions, another expectation would be that altering the position of Sh1

in the distal–proximal direction should similarly alter the position of the germline stem cell fate

decision. However, given that much of the analysis was performed using an INX-8 fusion protein

marker that could conceivably alter the position of Sh1, and given that the precise relationship

between the position of Sh1 vis-à-vis the border of the stem cell pool was not investigated, we

wished to determine how hypomorphic innexin alleles alter the position of Sh1 and whether

the position of Sh1 influences the germline stem or progenitor pools.

In short, we characterize the natural variability of Sh1 position and confirm the presence of

bare regions in gonads of early adult wild-type hermaphrodites. We show that reducing soma–

germline gap-junction coupling causes Sh1 to be mispositioned distally. In addition, we show

that the fusion protein used in the previous study (Gordon et al., 2020) encodes a dominant

antimorphic allele of *inx-8* that also causes distal mispositioning of Sh1. Finally, we determine

that when bare regions are absent due to Sh1 distal mispositioning, the borders of the stem or

progenitor cell pools are not markedly altered. Together, these results demonstrate that while

innexin function can dramatically impact the position of the distal border of Sh1, this position of

Sh1 is not relevant for GLP-1/Notch signaling nor for germ cells to exit the stem cell pool.

<u>Results</u>

138 **There is natural variability in the position of the distal border of Sh1, but gonads of wild-type**

139 **hermaphrodites display bare regions where germ cells contact neither the DTC nor Sh1**

As detailed below, we found that Sh1 is somewhat variably positioned in wild-type young adult

hermaphrodites. We confirmed the existence of bare regions between Sh1 and the DTC,

characterized by germ cells that do not contact Sh1 or the DTC.

To better characterize the natural variability in the position of the distal border of Sh1 in the

wild type, and to facilitate comparisons among different genotypes and markers, we binned

gonads into one of three phenotypic classes based on the position of Sh1 (Figure 1C–F; Video

1–3; Figure 1—figure supplement 1). To avoid ambiguity that results from the analysis of

maximum projection images, we analyzed all gonads in 3 dimensions (based on 0.5 µm optical

Z-series slices). We designated as Class 1, those gonads in which >8 µm (a distance covered by 2

germ cell diameters) separated the DTC and Sh1. Class 2 includes those gonads in which Sh1

and DTC processes come within 8 µm or in which Sh1 extensions intercalate with DTC

processes, up to the position of the mean length of DTC processes. Class 3 gonads are those in

which the border of Sh1 is markedly shifted distally such that it lies between the distal end of

the gonad and the mean DTC process length.

Using *bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::GFP]* to visualize Sh1, a transgene that produces a CED-1::GFP

fusion protein that fully rescues the sheath cell function of CED-1 to engulf germ cell corpses

(Zhou et al., 2001), we found that a majority of gonads (70%) are in Class 1, confirming the

existence of bare regions. Indeed, in many cases the distance between the proximal-most DTC

measurement and the distal-most Sh1 measurement exceeds 25 µm (Figure 1G; Figure 1—

figure supplement 1 panel D). The remaining gonads are in Class 2.

Using three additional Sh1 markers (and one alternate DTC marker), we found that depending

on the markers used, 50–90% of gonads fall into Class 1, while Class 2 make up the remainder

(Figure 1—figure supplement 1). We note that both Class 1 and Class 2 gonads contain bare

regions with spacing of germ cell nuclei (as seen by differential interference contrast

microscopy) such that their surrounding cell boundaries are not plausibly in contact with the

DTC or Sh1. We did not observe Class 3 gonads in any wild-type worms examined.

We also analyzed serial distal-to-proximal transmission electron micrographs (TEM) of a gonad

from a wild-type, unmarked young adult worm fixed using high-pressure freezing and freeze-

substitution freezing methods (Figure 1—figure supplement 2; Videos 4 and 5; Materials and

Methods). Focusing on an 80 μm region from the distal end to the distal extensions of Sh1, we

followed DTC processes (and their fragments) and Sh1 filopodial extensions among the tightly

packed germ cells (see Materials and Methods). We observed germ cells that contact neither a

DTC process (nor fragment thereof) nor filopodial extensions of Sh1, and thus represent bare

regions. Therefore, this TEM analysis is consistent with the confocal analysis above using cell

type-specific markers in live worms, and it corroborates prior ultrastructural observations made

on chemically fixed TEM preparations (Hall et al., 1999).

Distal somatic gonad architecture is dictated by both somatic- and germline-expressed

innexins

Previously, in fixed preparations, we observed that the distal edge of Sh1 was shifted nearly to

the distal end of the gonad in worms bearing a hypomorphic mutation in the germline innexin

inx-14(ag17) (Starich et al., 2014). We further investigated the position of Sh1 in *inx-14(ag17)*

using live imaging of intact young adult hermaphrodites bearing contrasting markers for Sh1

and the DTC (see Materials and Methods for details on markers used).

In contrast to *inx-14(+)*, the distal border of Sh1 in *inx-14(ag17)* extends to the distal end of the

gonad, well distal to the average position of the DTC processes (Figure 1C–E). The vast majority

of *inx-14(ag17)* gonads fall into Class 3 (Figure 1), with consistent results from three different

markers of Sh1 (Figure 1—figure supplement 1 panels B–E). Although our classification scheme

references Sh1 relative to DTC position, we do not attribute this gross positional alteration of

Sh1 to a change in the DTC. Instead, within strains with similar markers, the change in the *inx-*

14 genotype does not significantly change average DTC mean process length or the length of

the longest DTC process, but it does have a significant effect on Sh1 distal border position

(Figure 1G; Figure 1—figure supplement 1 panel E).

Table 1 Brood sizes and embryonic lethality measurements for selected strains

Strain	Relevant Genotype[a]	Brood (n)[b]	%Lethality (n)[c]	Sh1 mispositioned[d]
N2	Wild type	298.6 ± 42.1 (24)	0.4 ±0.4 (7194)	no
DG5063	*inx-8(qy78)*[e]	221.6 ± 23.6 (25)	9.0 ±4.6 (6087)	yes
NK2571	*inx-8(qy78); cpIs122*	212.8 ± 27.5 (23)	6.2 ±3.0 (5217)	(yes[f])
DG5059	*inx-9(ok1502)*	322.7 ± 33.0 (25)	0.2 ±0.3 (8081)	(no[f])
DG5064	*inx-8(qy102) inx-9(ok1502)*[g]	211.1 ± 47.2 (25)	1.1 ±1.1 (5327)	(yes[f])
NK2576	*inx-8(qy102) inx-9(ok1502); cpIs122*	209.5 ± 52.7 (23)	2.3 ±1.2 (4928)	(yes[f])
DG5250	*inx-8(qy78tn2031)*[h]	260.0 ± 25.9 (25)	0.1 ±0.2 (6504)	(no[f])
DG5251	*inx-8(tn2034)*[h]	301.6 ± 37.8 (25)	0.4 ±0.4 (7570)	(no[f])
DG5270	*inx-14(ag17)*	253.2 ± 28.1 (25)	0.4 ±0.6 (6356)	(yes[f])
DG5070	*inx-14(ag17); inx-8(qy78)*	106.6 ± 19.4 (25)	23.7 ±8.0 (3510)	n.d.
DG5380	*bcIs39*	282.6 ± 34.2 (25)	0.4 ±0.5 (7091)	n.d.
DG5020	*naIs37; bcIs39*	237.5 ± 46.5 (24)	1.0 ±1.4 (5753)	no
DG5320	*fasn-1(av138::gfp) naIs37*	342.4 ± 30.3 (25)	0.4 ±0.4 (8591)	no
DG5367	*inx-14(ag17) fasn-1(av138::gfp) naIs37*	256.0 ± 26.6 (23)	0.2 ±0.2 (5897)	yes
DG5378	*fasn-1(av138::gfp) naIs37; inx-8(qy78)*	245.4 ± 43.7 (23)	5.3 ±3.2 (5947)	yes

[a]Full genotypes in Supplementary File 1; genotypes *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* and *inx-*
8(qy102[mKate2::inx-8]) are abbreviated as "*inx-8(qy78)*" and "*inx-8(qy102)*" and *fasn-1(av138[fasn-*
1::GFP]) as *fasn-1(av138::gfp).*
[b]Brood size ± SD, n = number of broods counted
[c]Percent lethality ± SD, n = number of embryos scored
[d]yes/no indication of distal shift in the position of Sh1; relevant measurements in Figure 1, Figure 2, and
their related supplements.
[e]Derived from NK2571 *inx-8(qy78); cpIs122 [lag-2p::mNeonGreen::plcdeltaPH]* (Gordon et al., 2020)*.*
[f]These particular strains were not scored for Sh1 position. However, where equivalent *inx* genotypes
were analyzed, the Sh1 phenotype is given in parenthesis; see Figure 1, Figure 2, and their related
supplements.
[g]Derived from NK2576 *inx-8(qy102) inx-9(ok1502); cpIs122* (Gordon et al., 2020).
[h]Equivalent *inx-8(null)* CRISPR-Cas9 deletions generated in *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* or in wild-type
genetic backgrounds.

To determine whether the position of Sh1 is shifted distally upon reduction of the somatic

innexins, we investigated the position of Sh1 relative to the distal end of the gonad in a well-

characterized compound reduction-of-function (rf) *inx-8* mutant ((Starich et al., 2020); Figure

1B–G). We found that Sh1 in worms bearing one partially functional somatic gonad innexin

encoded by *inx-8(tn1513tn1555)* in an otherwise null *inx-9(ok1502)* background (hereafter

referred to as "*inx-8(rf)*"; (Starich et al., 2020)) is also distally positioned, similar to *inx-14(ag17)*

(Figure 1C–E)*.* Thus, Sh1 is positioned distally as a result of reducing the function of either germ

line or somatic innexins in the distal gonad.

An mKate2::INX-8 fusion causes a distal shift in the border of Sh1

We extended our analysis to *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])*, an allele that encodes an N-terminal

fusion protein of mKate2 and INX-8 that was used to mark Sh1 in a prior study ((Gordon et al.,

2020); Figure 2A). As detailed below, we found that—like *inx-14(ag17)* and *inx-8(rf)*—*inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) caused a distal shift in the position of Sh1 (Figure 2B–F). We

documented this shift both by anti-INX-8 antibody (Starich et al., 2014) detection in otherwise

unmarked strains (Figure 2B–C), as well as in live imaging of marked strains (Figure 2D–F).

We used anti-INX-8 antibody staining to compare the distal border of Sh1 in the unmarked wild

type and in *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* gonads (N2 and DG5063, respectively; see

Supplementary File 1; Figure 2—figure supplement 1). The mean distal boundary of INX-8

staining in the wild type lies at ~80 μm from the distal end of the gonad, while the mean distal

boundary of INX-8 staining in worms carrying *inx-8(qy78[mKate::inx-8)]* lies at ~50 μm from the

distal end, and the difference between these means is significant (Figure 2B–C). Moreover, in

89% of wild-type gonads (n=28), the distal border of Sh1 is greater than 60 μm (~15-16 cell

diameters) from the distal end of the gonad, while in 79% of *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* gonads

(n=32) the distal border of Sh1 is less than 60 μm from the distal end (Figure 2B–C).

Similar results were obtained using live imaging. Using *bcIs39* to visualize Sh1, no Class 3 gonads

(n=27) are observed in the wild type, compared to 65% (n=26) in *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8)]*

(Figure 2D–E). The same mKate2::INX-8 fusion, independently generated in an *inx-9(ok1502)*

null mutant background (i.e., *inx-8(qy102[mKate2::inx-8])*, see Materials and Methods, Gordon

et al., 2020), was also observed to shift Sh1 distally in *inx-8(qy102[mKate2::inx-8]) inx-*

9(ok1502) double mutants. In contrast, loss of *inx-9* alone does not significantly affect Sh1

position (Figure 2—figure supplement 2). If mKate::INX-8 were innocuous, the *inx-*

8(qy102[mKate2::inx-8)] allele in the absence of *inx-9* (*inx-9(1502)*) should have had no effect

on Sh1 position.

To explain the observed distal Sh1 border shift of mKate2::INX-8 compared to previous

descriptions of distal gonad architecture, Gordon et al. (2020) postulated that widely-used

markers of Sh1 driven by the *lim-7* promoter may not mark the entirety of the cell, excluding

the distal-most areas from detection. Although anti-INX-8 antibody staining clearly indicates a

more proximal position of Sh1 in otherwise unmarked wild-type strains and an evident distal

Sh1 shift in mKate2::INX-8, we wished to further determine whether the distal shift of Sh1 we

observed in *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* and *inx-14(ag17)* backgrounds reflected a disparity

between the expression patterns of mKate2::INX-8 and *lim-7p*-driven markers. First, we

consistently observe a dramatic distal shift of Sh1 in *inx-14(ag17)* using *lim-7* promoter-driven

transgenes (*bcIs39* and *tnIs5*) as well as using a functional endogenously tagged allele of the

fatty acid synthase gene *fasn-1*, [*fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::GFP])*] (Figure 1D; Figure 1—figure

supplement 1). We next examined the overlap between the mKate2::INX-8 and *lim-7p*-driven

markers in strains expressing both *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* and GFP markers encoded by

tnIs6 [*lim-7p::gfp*] or *bcIs39* [*lim-7p::ced-1::gfp*]. In over 85% of gonad arms examined (n=20

and 26, respectively), the overlap between mKate2::INX-8 and GFP was complete (Figure 2—

figure supplement 3). In both *tnIs6* [*lim-7p::gfp*] or *bcIs39* [*lim-7p::ced-1::gfp*], the remaining

15% of gonads displayed either reduced Sh1 expression or expression in one, but not both, cells

of the Sh1 pair, which may result from stochastic transgene downregulation. Finally, we binned

these gonads into phenotypic Classes 1–3 based on measurements taken while observing either

mKate2 *or* GFP expression (Figure 2—Figure supplement 3 panel D). The number of Class 3

gonads is somewhat underestimated with the GFP markers. Nevertheless, we observe a marked

distal shift in the *inx-14* and *inx-8* mutants bearing these markers. In sum, if the GFP markers

were not marking the distal-most part of Sh1, we should not have been able to so readily detect

the abnormal distal displacement of Sh1 in *inx-14(ag17), inx-8(rf) or inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]*

strains bearing these markers.

We conclude that despite variability in the exact position of the Sh1 border, and despite minor

differences in transgene expression, bare regions between the Sh1 and the DTC are present in

the wild type, and they are greatly diminished due to a distal shift in the position of Sh1 in

worms bearing reduced *inx-14* or *inx-8* function or bearing the mKate2::INX-8 fusion.

An mKate2::INX-8 fusion behaves as a dominant dosage-sensitive antimorph

Based on our observations that *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8)])* gonads display a distally shifted

border of Sh1, we hypothesized that this allele might encode an INX-8 protein that poisons

innexin complexes thereby interfering with the channel and/or adhesion functions important

for Sh1 positioning. If this were due to a toxic effect of the mKate2::INX-8 fusion protein on gap

junctions, we would predict that the distal shift of Sh1 would be dependent on the presence of

the INX-8 coding region. To test this hypothesis, we used CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing to

generate *inx-8* null alleles in both the *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* and wild-type genetic

backgrounds. We generated deletions with identical breakpoints in the *inx-8* locus in both

genetic backgrounds [i.e., *inx-8(qy78tn2031)* and *inx-8(tn2034)*] starting 136 bp upstream of the

wild-type *inx-8* ATG start codon and extending 221 bp into *inx-8* exon 3 (Figure 2 and Figure 2—

figure supplement 2). In the *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* context, this deletion also removes the

mKate2 moiety. These deletions are expected to constitute *inx-8* null alleles because, in

addition to removing the start codon, they delete amino acids 1–349 (out of 382 amino acids),

including virtually all residues essential for spanning the plasma membrane and forming a

channel (Starich and Greenstein, 2020). Consistent with our hypothesis, the deletion mutant

inx-8(qy78tn2031) displays a significantly lower frequency of Class 3 gonads than the original

inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) allele. Sh1 in the *inx-8(qy78tn2031)* deletion mutant is positioned

more proximally, and therefore, like the wild type, exhibits bare regions that are lacking in *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) mutants (Figure 2D–F). In addition, *inx-8(qy78tn2031)* exhibits a nearly

normal brood size and suppresses the low-level embryonic lethality observed in the *inx-8(qy78)*

starting strain (Table 1). Likewise, the identical deletion generated in the wild-type genetic

background, *inx-8(tn2034)*, also exhibits the wild-type Sh1 position (Figure 2—figure

supplement 2), with a normal brood size and negligible embryonic lethality (Table 1). However,

the observation of a small percentage of Class 3 gonads in *inx-8(qy78tn2031)* and *inx-8(tn2034)*

animals but not in the wild type (Figure 2—figure supplement 2), suggests that the position of

Sh1 is sensitive to the dosage of somatic gap junction hemichannels. In fact, the *inx-*

8(qy78tn2031)/+ heterozygote reveals apparent haploinsufficiency for this phenotype (Figure

2—figure supplement 2).

We made several additional observations from a brood-size and embryonic-viability analysis

(Table 1). First, the marker transgenes do not have an appreciable effect on brood size or

embryonic lethality in our hands. Second, genetic interactions exist between *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8], inx-14(ag17) and the *inx-9(ok1502)* null mutation. Specifically, *inx-*

14(ag17) enhances both the reduced brood size and embryonic lethality of *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]; whereas *inx-9(ok1502)* weakly suppresses the embryonic lethality

defect (Table 1). Third, in the course of this analysis, we noted that strains bearing *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8] displayed highly variable population growth dynamics that we attribute

to stress. Although the relevant stressor has yet to be determined, we observed this effect over

multiple generations after starvation or transport. Given our previous finding that key

metabolites such as malonyl-CoA are transported through these junctions to support

embryonic growth, this finding deserves future scrutiny.

Finally, to assess more fully the nature of the *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]* allele with respect to

Sh1 position, we generated and imaged worms bearing this allele in heterozygous and

hemizygous configurations (Figure 2—figure supplement 2; we abbreviate *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8] to "*qy78*" and null to (0), below, to aid comparison between genotypes).

We infer loss-of-function behavior since other loss-of-function mutations affecting soma-

germline gap junctions, such as *inx-14(ag17),* also cause a distal shift in the Sh1 border.

Nevertheless, *inx-8(qy78)* is dominant: a substantial proportion of gonads in *qy78/+* are in Class

3, similar to *qy78/qy78,* but distinct from deletion heterozygotes [*inx-8(qy78tn2031/+*].

However, in a hemizygous configuration (*qy78/0*), the Sh1 distal displacement phenotype is

largely suppressed. Thus, *qy78* acts as a dosage-sensitive antimorph. We speculate that the

fusion protein produced by *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* can form dysfunctional junctions on its

own or with INX-8(+), but not when it is present below a certain abundance threshold. As also

mentioned above, the *inx-8* deletion allele *qy78tn2031*, while largely suppressing the Sh1 distal

mispositioning defect, displays a weak dominant haploinsufficient behavior consistent with

dosage sensitivity. Alternatively, this behavior could result from genetic positional effects that

impinge on nearby *inx-9* function and for which Sh1 position is particularly sensitive.

The distal position of Sh1 does not influence the position of the stem cell pool border

A recent model proposed that the position of the Sh1 border influences the stem/non-stem

decision in underlying germ cells (Gordon et al., 2020). However, because the previous study

did not examine the position of stem or progenitor cells, and because the model was based on

results using the antimorphic *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* allele, we investigated this

relationship.

In its simplest form, the model proposed by Gordon et al. (2020) predicts that when the distal

edge of Sh1 is positioned distally, the stem/non-stem border should similarly shift distally. The

SYGL-1 protein serves as a stem cell marker as *sygl-1* is a direct transcriptional target of GLP-

1/Notch in the germ line (Chen et al., 2020; Kershner et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2019; Lee et al.,

2016; Shin et al., 2017). We analyzed the proximal extent of the pool of SYGL-1-positive cells

bearing a well-characterized OLLAS epitope tag on SYGL-1 (Shin et al., 2017) and compared that

boundary relative to the distal Sh1 border (Figure 3 and Materials and Methods). In the case of

inx-14(ag17), though the distal border of Sh1 was shifted drastically and significantly, there was

no significant change in the position of the border of the SYGL-1-positive stem cell pool. In the

case of the *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* allele, the border of the SYGL-1-positive pool was

marginally shifted distally relative to the wild type, though not commensurate with the extent

to which Sh1 shifted distally in this background (Figure 3C). Furthermore, the marginal shift of

the border of the stem cell pool in *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* was suppressed when *inx-8* was

deleted in both *inx-8(qy78tn2031)* and *inx-8(tn2034)*. The marginal shift in the border of the

stem cell pool is not observed in *inx-14(ag17),* suggesting that such a defect in *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) is due to the altered function of mKate2::INX-8, rather than the position

of Sh1 *per se* (Figure 3A-C). To detect any subtle correlation between the proximal border of

the SYGL-1 pool and the distal border of Sh1, we plotted these against one another and

computed an R value (Figure 3D). By Pearson correlation, there is no significant relationship in

any genotype examined between the position of the Sh1 border and the position of the SYGL-1-

positive stem cell pool border. There is no significant relationship regardless of whether

measurements are made in microns (Figure 3) or cell diameters (CD; Figure 3 and Figure 3—

figure supplement 1).

The recent model also proposed that Sh1 controls spindle orientation at the stem/progenitor

border. However, we found that in the wild-type (marker-only) strain, the distal border of Sh1

was proximal to the proximal SYGL-1-positive border in 86% of the gonads (n=320), with a

distance between them of ≥5 CD in 67% of the gonads (Figure 3 and Figure 3—figure

supplement 1). As mentioned above, this 5 CD distance is inconsistent with the hypothesis that

Sh1 is controlling spindle orientation at the stem cell border as such control would be expected

to occur over a distance of only 1–2 cell diameters.

We conclude that (1) there is no correlation between the position of the distal border of Sh1

and the proximal border of the SYGL-1-positive stem cell pool, and (2) if spindle-oriented

divisions occur at the Sh1 border, they are not influencing stem cell fate.

The distal position of Sh1 does not influence the position of the progenitor pool border

Although we found no correlation between the stem cell pool border and Sh1 position, we

wondered whether altered Sh1 position might nevertheless influence the position of the border

between the progenitor zone (PZ) and the transition zone that marks overt meiotic entry. In the

wild type, consistent with our previous analysis in live worms, we found that the distal position

of Sh1 is somewhat variable and can be either distal or proximal of the PZ border, using the

length of the CYE-1-positive region to define the PZ border, following CYE-1 and pSUN-1(S8) co-

staining (Figure 4 and Materials and Methods; Mohammad et al., 2018). We found that

although there is a subtle shift in the PZ border in *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* and *inx-14(ag17)*,

it does not correlate with the dramatic shift in Sh1 position seen in these mutants (Figure 4).

Again, we saw no significant correlation between Sh1 position and the position of the PZ border

(Figure 4D). As with the SYGL-1 analysis, the relationships are similar when measurements are

made in microns (Figure 4) or in CD (Figure 4—figure supplement 1)*,* noting that differences

between genotypes are more apparent in the micron measurements since cells are slightly

larger more proximally in the PZ.

In sum, the border between the PZ and the transition zone is not markedly altered relative to

the dramatic distal displacement of the Sh1 border in *inx-14(ag17)* or in *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8], suggesting that the position of Sh1 has no bearing on the position of

meiotic entry.

Discussion

These studies show that impaired innexin function distally mispositions Sh1, but that this

displacement does not similarly shift the proximal border of the stem cell pool (Figure 5). We

show that bare regions of variable size normally exist between the DTC and Sh1, in which germ

cells lack contact with the DTC or Sh1, but that these bare regions are diminished or lost with

reduced innexin activity either in the soma or the germ line. These findings offer a unified

explanation for a previous observation of loss of bare regions between the DTC and Sh1 in

strains carrying an mKate2::INX-8 fusion marker that, we now determine, is interfering with

innexin function. We concur with the previous observation: bare regions are lost in strains

carrying this fusion. The previous interpretation was that the mKate2::INX-8 was marking a

distal-most part of Sh1 that was not detectable with other markers. This led to a model

whereby Sh1 influences the stem cell fate decision in the underlying germ cells. Instead, we

show that the mKate2::INX-8 fusion itself alters innexin function such that Sh1 is distally

mispositioned and this mispositioning obliterates the bare regions. Our interpretation is

consistent with results obtained by TEM analysis (Hall et al., 1999; this work), antibody staining

(Starich et al., 2014; this work), and live imaging in strains bearing different fluorescent proteins

expressed in Sh1, as well as our genetic analysis. The cautionary tale is that fusion proteins used

as markers, even when they are generated by CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing in the context of

the endogenous locus—and therefore are not likely mis-expressed or overexpressed—may

nevertheless generate proteins that are not benign. Here, the mKate2::INX-8 fusion protein

caused a distal shift in the Sh1 position due to its apparent antimorphic effect on gap junctions.

Because of the redundant function of INX-9, we were able to remove the mKate2::INX-8 protein

entirely and effectively restore the bare region.

Our finding that the germline response to signaling from the DTC, as measured by expression of

the GLP-1/Notch target, SYGL-1, is independent of germline interactions with distal sheath cells

(Sh1) is consistent with several other observations. For example, males, which lack sheath cells

altogether, exhibit stem cell pools similar to those in the hermaphrodite (Crittenden et al.,

2019). In addition, the stem cell and progenitor pools are present in larval stages prior DTC

process elaboration (Byrd et al., 2014), when Sh1 is positioned several CD from the DTC,

precluding the possibility of a DTC–Sh1 handoff at these stages (Killian and Hubbard 2005).

Here, we observed that the distal border of Sh1 relative to the proximal stem cell border in the

wild type is ≥5 CD in the majority of gonads we examined. Thus, the previous model that Sh1

orients divisions of stem cells to direct their fate is also called into question by our results.

Finally, using alleles that dramatically alter the position of Sh1, we found no evidence

supporting the prediction that the stem/non-stem border is coincident with the Sh1 border.

Together, these results indicate that Sh1 is not involved in the germline stem-progenitor fate

decision.

Our studies also provide evidence that innexin gap junctions not only serve as communication

and adhesion junctions, but that in the context of an organ system, they contribute to the

positioning of cells relative to each other. How might gap junctions influence the relative

position of the DTC and Sh1 in the distal gonad arm? The DTC also forms gap junctions with

germ cells, which must be disassembled as germ cells enter the bare region, only to be

reassembled again when in contact with Sh1 (and then again with more proximally located

sheath cells Sh2–5). A detailed TEM analysis of the gonad (Hall et al., 1999) led to the

consideration that a constant interplay of association and dissociation likely also occurs

between Sh1 and the underlying germ cells that move proximally along the arm: as germ cell

flux continually moves germ cells towards the proximal end of the gonad, the Sh1 cells

presumably extend their filopodia distally and form new gap junction connections with

incoming germ cells. Otherwise, the bare region would increase in length along the distal-

proximal axis.

Our observation that loss of the bare regions correlates with only a relatively modest effect on

brood size (Table 1) raises the question of what, if any, biological significance the bare regions

might have. Because the innexins have multiple functions in germline development (Starich et

al., 2014, 2020; Starich and Greenstein, 2020), we are unable to ascribe the observed brood-

size reduction in strains lacking bare regions to the absence of the bare regions *per se*. Thus,

any potential roles for the bare regions vis-à-vis brood size and germline development will

require additional study.

To complement the role of gap junctions in promoting robust proliferation, the kinetics of gap

junction coupling between the somatic gonad and germ cells may play a role in determining the

strength of the interactions between the two cell types. Unlike sheath–oocyte junctions, which

form large plaques containing many functional gap junctions, the gap junctions formed in the

distal arm appear to represent looser associations of a few gap-junction channels (Starich et al.,

2014). Nonetheless, these associations may be sufficient to maintain adhesion with the

underlying germline, functioning like regularly spaced rivets, albeit dynamic and removeable

ones.

Disentangling the adhesive and channel functions of gap junctions is a complex issue. The

mutants used in this study are competent to form soma–germline gap junctions—without

these, germ cells fail to proliferate. However, they may form such junctions less efficiently than

their wild-type counterparts. For example, the pattern of localization of gap junction puncta in

inx-8(rf) and *inx-14(ag17)* appears more diffuse than in the wild type (Starich et al., 2014;

Starich et al., 2020). Alternatively or additionally, the mutant innexins in this study may

assemble into hemichannels as readily as wild-type innexins, but the pairing or opening of gap

junction channels may be compromised. Studies of connexin gap-junction channels in paired

Xenopus oocytes strongly suggest that opening of hemichannels facilitates their assembly into

gap junctions. That study proposed hemichannel opening collapses the intermembrane space

between juxtaposed cells to allow the extracellular loops of connexins to dock into gap

junctions (Beahm and Hall, 2004). If a similar model applies to innexin-containing gap junctions,

then rivet and channel function would be coupled.

How could impaired innexin function cause Sh1 to creep distally? One hypothesis is that when

fewer junctions are made, Sh1 cannot adhere as well to germ cells. This scenario would be

consistent with the observation that Sh1 is distally mispositioned when *inx-8* and *inx-9* are

missing from Sh1 but *inx-8(+)* is present in the DTC by virtue of heterologous expression of *inx-*

8(+) in the DTC in an *inx-8(0) inx-9(0)* double mutant (Starich et al., 2014). It is also possible that

the DTC and Sh1 engage in an active repellent or a passive space-excluding interaction that

somehow involves gap junction function. Another possibility is that a deficit in gap-junction

function might trigger Sh1 spreading as a means to increase the surface area over which

junctions may form to supply sufficient active biomolecules that transit through these

junctions. Nevertheless, our studies show that the position of germline stem cells is

independent of the position of Sh1.

Acknowledgements

We thank Gabriela Huelgas-Morales for discussions and constructive suggestions during the

course of this work, Swathi Arur for the affinity purified anti-GFP antibody, Verena Jantsch for

anti-pSUN-1 antibody, Edward Kipreos for anti-CYE-1 antibody. We thank Michael Cammer and

the NYU Langone Microscopy Core for experimental and technical support; the NYU Langone

Microscopy Laboratory is partially supported by the Cancer Center Support Grant P30CA016087

at the Laura and Isaac Perlmutter Cancer Center. We thank WormBase. We thank Kacy Gordon

and the CGC (which is funded by NIH Office of Research Infrastructure Programs P40

OD010440), for strains. NIH P30HD071593 and 1S10OD016214-01A1 supports electron

microscopy in DHH laboratory.

References

Arribere, J.A., Bell, R.T., Fu, B.X., Artiles, K.L., Hartman, P.S., Fire, A.Z., 2014. Efficient marker-

free recovery of custom genetic modifications with CRISPR/Cas9 in Caenorhabditis elegans.

Genetics 198, 837-846.

Austin, J., Kimble, J., 1987. glp-1 is required in the germ line for regulation of the decision

between mitosis and meiosis in C. elegans. Cell 51, 589-599.

Beahm, D.L., Hall, J.E., 2004. Opening hemichannels in nonjunctional membrane stimulates gap

junction formation. Biophys J 86, 781-796.

Berry, L.W., Westlund, B., Schedl, T., 1997. Germ-line tumor formation caused by activation of

glp-1, a Caenorhabditis elegans member of the Notch family of receptors. Development

(Cambridge, England) 124, 925-936.

Brodigan, T.M., Liu, J., Park, M., Kipreos, E.T., Krause, M., 2003. Cyclin E expression during

development in Caenorhabditis elegans. Dev Biol 254, 102-115.

Byrd, D.T., Knobel, K., Affeldt, K., Crittenden, S.L., Kimble, J., 2014. A DTC niche plexus

surrounds the germline stem cell pool in Caenorhabditis elegans. PLoS One 9, e88372.

Chen, J., Mohammad, A., Pazdernik, N., Huang, H., Bowman, B., Tycksen, E., Schedl, T., 2020.

GLP-1 Notch-LAG-1 CSL control of the germline stem cell fate is mediated by transcriptional

targets lst-1 and sygl-1. PLoS Genet 16, e1008650.

Cardona, A., Saalfeld, S., Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, I., Preibisch, S., Longair, M.,

Tomancak, P., Hartenstein, V., Douglas, R. J., 2012. TrakEM2 software for neural circuit

reconstruction. PLoS One 7(6):e38011. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0038011.

Crittenden, S.L., Lee, C., Mohanty, I., Battula, S., Knobel, K., Kimble, J., 2019. Sexual dimorphism

of niche architecture and regulation of the Caenorhabditis elegans germline stem cell pool. Mol

Biol Cell 30, 1757-1769.

Dalfo, D., Ding, Y., Liang, Q., Fong, A., Cipriani, P.G., Piano, F., Zheng, J.C., Qin, Z., Hubbard,

E.J.A., 2020. A Genome-Wide RNAi Screen for Enhancers of a Germline Tumor Phenotype

Caused by Elevated GLP-1/Notch Signaling in Caenorhabditis elegans. G3 (Bethesda) 10, 4323-

4334.

Dejima, K., Hori, S., Iwata, S., Suehiro, Y., Yoshina, S., Motohashi, T., Mitani, S., 2018. An

Aneuploidy-Free and Structurally Defined Balancer Chromosome Toolkit for Caenorhabditis

elegans. Cell Rep 22, 232-241.

Dickinson, D.J., Ward, J.D., Reiner, D.J., Goldstein, B., 2013. Engineering the Caenorhabditis

elegans genome using Cas9-triggered homologous recombination. Nat Methods 10, 1028-1034.

Gordon, K.L., Zussman, J.W., Li, X., Miller, C., Sherwood, D.R., 2020. Stem cell niche exit in C.

elegans via orientation and segregation of daughter cells by a cryptic cell outside the niche. Elife

9.

Govindan, J.A., Nadarajan, S., Kim, S., Starich, T.A., Greenstein, D., 2009. Somatic cAMP

signaling regulates MSP-dependent oocyte growth and meiotic maturation in C. elegans.

Development 136, 2211-2221.

Hall, D.H., Hartwieg, E., Nguyen, K. C. Q, 2012. Modern Electron Microscopy Methods for *C.*

elegans. Methods in Cell Biol 107, 94-147.

Hall, D.H., Winfrey, V.P., Blaeuer, G., Hoffman, L.H., Furuta, T., Rose, K.L., Hobert, O.,

Greenstein, D., 1999. Ultrastructural features of the adult hermaphrodite gonad of

Caenorhabditis elegans: relations between the germ line and soma. Dev Biol 212, 101-123.

Henderson, S.T., Gao, D., Lambie, E.J., Kimble, J., 1994. lag-2 may encode a signaling ligand for

the GLP-1 and LIN-12 receptors of C. elegans. Development 120, 2913-2924.

Huang, L.S., Sternberg, P.W., 1995. Genetic dissection of developmental pathways. Methods

Cell Biol 48, 97-122.

Hubbard, E.J., Greenstein, D., 2000. The Caenorhabditis elegans gonad: a test tube for cell and

developmental biology. Dev Dyn 218, 2-22.

Hubbard, E.J.A., Schedl, T., 2019. Biology of the Caenorhabditis elegans Germline Stem Cell

System. Genetics 213, 1145-1188.

Kershner, A.M., Shin, H., Hansen, T.J., Kimble, J., 2014. Discovery of two GLP-1/Notch target

genes that account for the role of GLP-1/Notch signaling in stem cell maintenance. Proceedings

of the National Academy of Sciences.

Killian, D.J., Hubbard, E.J., 2005. Caenorhabditis elegans germline patterning requires

coordinated development of the somatic gonadal sheath and the germ line. Dev Biol 279, 322-

335.

Kocsisova, Z., Kornfeld, K., Schedl, T., 2019. Rapid population-wide declines in stem cell number

and activity during reproductive aging in C. elegans. Development 146.

Lee, C., Shin, H., Kimble, J., 2019. Dynamics of Notch-Dependent Transcriptional Bursting in Its

Native Context. Dev Cell 50, 426-435 e424.

Lee, C., Sorensen, E.B., Lynch, T.R., Kimble, J., 2016. C. elegans GLP-1/Notch activates

transcription in a probability gradient across the germline stem cell pool. eLife 5.

Lopez, A.L., Chen, J., Joo, H-J., Drake, M., Shidate, M., Kseib, C., Arur, S., 2013. DAF-2 and ERK

couple nutrient availability to meiotic progression during Caenorhabditis elegans oogenesis.

Dev Cell 27, 227-240.

McCarter, J., Bartlett, B., Dang, T., Schedl, T., 1997. Soma-germ cell interactions in

Caenorhabditis elegans: multiple events of hermaphrodite germline development require the

somatic sheath and spermathecal lineages. Developmental Biology 181, 121-143.

Miyata, S., Begun, J., Troemel, E.R., Ausubel, F.M., 2008. DAF-16-dependent suppression of

immunity during reproduction in Caenorhabditis elegans. Genetics 178, 903-918.

Mohammad, A., Vanden Broek, K., Wang, C., Daryabeigi, A., Jantsch, V., Hansen, D., Schedl, T.,

2018. Initiation of Meiotic Development Is Controlled by Three Post-transcriptional Pathways in

Caenorhabditis elegans. Genetics 209, 1197-1224.

Nadarajan, S., Govindan, J.A., McGovern, M., Hubbard, E.J., Greenstein, D., 2009. MSP and GLP-

1/Notch signaling coordinately regulate actomyosin-dependent cytoplasmic streaming and

oocyte growth in C. elegans. Development 136, 2223-2234.

Oshima, A., Tani, K., Fujiyoshi, Y., 2016. Atomic structure of the innexin-6 gap junction channel

determined by cryo-EM. Nat Commun 7, 13681.

Pekar, O., Ow, M.C., Hui, K.Y., Noyes, M.B., Hall, S.E., Hubbard, E.J.A., 2017. Linking the

environment, DAF-7/TGFbeta signaling and LAG-2/DSL ligand expression in the germline stem

cell niche. Development 144, 2896-2906.

Penkner, A.M., Fridkin, A., Gloggnitzer, J., Baudrimont, A., Machacek, T., Woglar, A., Csaszar, E.,

Pasierbek, P., Ammerer, G., Gruenbaum, Y., Jantsch, V., 2009. Meiotic chromosome homology

search involves modifications of the nuclear envelope protein Matefin/SUN-1. Cell 139, 920-

933.

Phelan, P., 2005. Innexins: members of an evolutionarily conserved family of gap-junction

proteins. Biochim Biophys Acta 1711, 225-245.

Shin, H., Haupt, K.A., Kershner, A.M., Kroll-Conner, P., Wickens, M., Kimble, J., 2017. SYGL-1 and

LST-1 link niche signaling to PUF RNA repression for stem cell maintenance in Caenorhabditis

elegans. PLoS Genet 13, e1007121.

Skerrett, I.M., Williams, J.B., 2017. A structural and functional comparison of gap junction

channels composed of connexins and innexins. Dev Neurobiol 77, 522-547.

Starich, T., Greenstein, D., 2020. A Limited and Diverse Set of Suppressor Mutations Restore

Function to INX-8 Mutant Hemichannels in the Caenorhabditis elegans Somatic Gonad.

Biomolecules 10.

Starich, T.A., Bai, X., Greenstein, D., 2020. Gap junctions deliver malonyl-CoA from soma to

germline to support embryogenesis in Caenorhabditis elegans. Elife 9.

Starich, T.A., Hall, D.H., Greenstein, D., 2014. Two classes of gap junction channels mediate

soma-germline interactions essential for germline proliferation and gametogenesis in

Caenorhabditis elegans. Genetics 198, 1127-1153.

Yochem, J., Greenwald, I., 1989. glp-1 and lin-12, genes implicated in distinct cell-cell

interactions in C. elegans, encode similar transmembrane proteins. Cell 58, 553-563.

Zhou, Z., Hartwieg, E., Horvitz, H.R., 2001. CED-1 is a transmembrane receptor that mediates

cell corpse engulfment in C. elegans. Cell 104, 43-56.

Materials and Methods

Live imaging and image analysis of live samples

Live specimens were grown at 20°C, and staged by picking mid-L4 larvae, then allowing them to

grow at 20°C until imaging them 24 hours later. Animals were immobilized using 10mM

Levamisole (Sigma T1512) in M9 buffer. Imaging was carried out on a Nikon W1 spinning disk

confocal microscope. We define a biological replicate as any set of individuals collected,

processed and imaged together. Numbers of individuals included in each analysis is indicated in

the figure legends.

Image analysis was carried out on 2-dimensional maximum-projection Z-stack images of 3D

confocal data. The distance from the distal end of the gonad to the end of each DTC process

was measured along a line drawn from the end of each process parallel to the distal-proximal

axis to a line drawn tangent to the distal end, orthogonal to the distal-proximal axis line (Figure

1—figure supplement 1). The distance between the distal end of the gonad and the most distal

extent of Sh1 was measured in the same way. All data points were recorded for each sample

and used to calculate the mean values presented in Figures 1 and 2 and related figure

supplements.

Sh1 visualization in live worms: *bcIs39* [*lim-7p*::CED-1::GFP] (Zhou et al., 2001) encodes a

functional membrane-localized fusion to CED-1. *tnIs5* and *tnIs6* encode an identical non-

functional fusion to the first 61 amino acids of LIM-7 (*tnIs5* or *tnIs6*) denoted here as "*lim-*

7p::GFP" that includes 2.23 kb upstream, the first two exons, and the first intron of *lim-7* fused

to GFP (Hall et al., 1999). *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* is an N-terminal fusion of mKate2 to INX-8

generated by CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing (Gordon et al., 2020*). fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp])* was

generated by fusing GFP to the C-terminus of FASN-1 using CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing

(Starich et al., 2020). *tnEX42[acy-4::gfp + rol-6(su1006)]* contains GFP fused to the ACY-4 C-

terminus by recombineering in the fosmid WRM061bE10 (Govindan et al., 2009). ACY-4::GFP

rescues the sterility of *acy-4(ok1806)* null mutants via its function in the gonadal sheath cells.

DTC visualization in live worms: *naIs37*[*lag-2p*::mCherry-PH] encodes mCherry fused to the PH

domain of rat phospholipase C delta (Pekar et al., 2017) and *qIs154*[*lag-2p*::MYR-tdTomato]

encodes a src kinase myristoylation sequence fused to tdTomato (Byrd et al., 2014).

Imaris rendering of confocal images

3D rendering of confocal stacks for Videos 1–3 was done using Imaris (Oxford Instruments, plc.

Abingdon, UK) according to the following algorithm for batch processing. For the Sh1 channel

(green): Enable Smooth = true; Surface Grain Size = 0.433 µm; Enable Eliminate Background =

false; Diameter Of Largest Sphere = 1.63 µm; Enable Automatic Threshold = false; Manual

Threshold Value = 650; Active Threshold = true; Enable Automatic Threshold B = true; Manual

Threshold Value B = 31622.8. For the DTC channel (red): Enable Smooth = true; Surface Grain

Size = 0.433 µm; Enable Eliminate Background = false; Diameter Of Largest Sphere = 1.63 µm;

Enable Automatic Threshold = false; Manual Threshold Value = 710; Active Threshold = true;

Enable Automatic Threshold B = true; Manual Threshold Value B = 14988.5.

Strains

C. elegans strains (Supplementary File 1) were grown on standard NGM media with OP50 as a

food source (Brenner 1974) for all figures in this work. Strain constructions employed a

modified NGM medium [containing 6.25 µg/ml Nystatin and 12.5 mM potassium phosphate pH

6.0 (added after autoclaving) and 200 mg/ml streptomycin sulphate (added before

autoclaving)] with *E. coli* strain OP50-1 as food source. Strains were grown at 20°C. In addition

to the wild-type strain N2, the following alleles, described in WormBase (www.wormbase.org)

or in the cited references, were used:

Chr. I—*dpy-5(e61)* (Brenner 1974), *inx-14(ag17)* (Miyata et al., 2008; Starich et al., 2014), *unc-*

13(e51) (Brenner 1974), *fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp])* (Starich et al. 2020), *sygl-*

1(q983[3xOLLAS::sygl-1]) (Shin et al., 2017), *unc-54(e190)* (Brenner 1974).

Chr. IV—*inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* (Gordon et al., 2020) , *inx-8(qy78 tn2031)* (this work), *inx-*

8(tn2034) (this work), *inx-8(tn2075)* (this allele was generated on the *tmC5* balancer

chromosome, this work), *inx-9(ok1502), inx-8(qy102[mKate2::inx-8)] inx-9(ok1502)* (Gordon et

al., 2020), *inx-8(tn1513tn1553) inx-9(ok1502)* (Starich and Greenstein, 2020), *inx-*

8(tn1513tn1555) inx-9(ok1502) (Starich et al., 2020), *dpy-20(e1282)* (Hosono et al. 1982).

Chr. V—*acy-4(ok1806)* (Govindan et al. 2009).

Balancer chromosomes (Dejima et al., 2018) used included: *tmC18 [dpy-5(tmIs1236)]* I,

tmC27[tmIs1239] I, *tmC5[tmIs1220]* IV.

Integrated transgenes included: *naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::plcdeltaPH + unc-119(+)]* I (Pekar et

al., 2017), *mIs11[myo-2p::gfp + pes-10p::gfp + gut promoter::gfp]* IV, *bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp +*

lin-15(+)] V (Zhou *et al*., 2001), *qIs154[lag-2p::MYR::tdTomato +ttx-3p::gfp]* V (Byrd et al., 2014),

tnIs5[lim-7p::gfp + rol-6(su1006)] X*, tnIs6[lim-7p::gfp + rol-6(su1006)]* X (Hall et al., 1999),

cpIs122[lag-2p::mNeonGreen::plcdeltaPH] (Gordon et al., 2020).

Extrachromosomal arrays used included: *tnEx42[acy-4::gfp + rol-6(su1006)]* (Govindan et al.,

2009).

Strain constructions

Multiply mutant strains were constructed in a straightforward manner (Huang and Sternberg,

1995). *tmC18* was used as a balancer chromosome for *inx-14(ag17)*. *tmC27* was used as a

balancer chromosome for *sygl-1(q983)*. *tmC5* (or the derivatives described) or *mIs11* were used

as balancer chromosomes for *inx-8* and *inx-9* mutant alleles. The presence of *inx-14(ag17)* in

strains was verified by PCR and DNA sequencing. The *ag17* allele was originally described as an

Arg to His change in the second extracellular loop of INX-14, but the exact residue position was

not specified (Miyata et al., 2008). A 1.2-kb PCR fragment covering this region was amplified

with primers inx-14delF and inx-14delR (see Supplementary File 2 for the sequence of

oligonucleotides used in this study). The PCR fragment was sequenced with the inx-14delR

primer. No sequence changes were found in Arg residues predicted to occupy the second

extracellular loop. However, a CGT to CAT (R326H) change was identified at a residue position

predicted to lie near the cytoplasmic end of the fourth transmembrane domain, and we

surmise that this change represents the original *ag17* mutation. The presence of the *sygl-*

1(q983[3xOLLAS::sygl-1]) mutation in strains was verified by PCR with primers sygl1-F and sygl1-

R, which produce a 216 bp product in the wild type and a 348 bp product in *sygl-1(q983)* and by

anti-OLLAS staining. The presence of *inx-8(qy78tn2031)* and *inx-8(tn2034)* in strains was verified

by PCR with oligonucleotide primers inx8_delta.F and inx8_delta.R. To construct DG5367 *inx-*

14(ag17) fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) naIs37 I, fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) naIs37/dpy-5(e61) unc-

13(e51) heterozygotes were generated and Dpy non-Unc recombinants were sought, which

resulted in the isolation of a *dpy-5(e61) fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) naIs37 I* intermediate strain*.*

From, *inx-14(ag17)/dpy-5(e61) fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) naIs37* heterozygote*s*, recombinants

of genotype *inx-14(ag17) fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) naIs37/dpy-5(e61) fasn-1(av138[fasn-*

1::gfp]) naIs37 were identified by virtue of their increased GFP signal using a fluorescence

dissecting microscope. The presence of *inx-14(ag17)* in the desired recombinants was verified

by DNA sequencing. *naIs37* was shown to be tightly linked to *unc-54(e190)* on the right end of

LGI as follows. From *dpy-5(e61) fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) naIs37/unc-54(e190)* heterozygotes,

of 15 *unc-54(e190)* homozygotes, none contained the *naIs37* marker (4 were recombinants

expressing *fasn-1::gfp*). Of 38 wild-type segregants of the aforementioned parental

heterozygous strain, all expressed the *naIs37* marker (11 were recombinants lacking *fasn-1::gfp*

expression). DG5380 was derived from DG5020 by crossing to N2 males and segregating away

naIs37; the *bcIs39* source was MD701, available from the CGC.

Electron microscopy methods and analysis

Wild-type N2 young adults were analyzed using high-pressure freezing/freeze-substitution

freezing (HPF/FS; Hall et al., 2012). Four animals from chemical immersion and four animals

from HPF/FS were collected in serial sections on slot grids, ranging from 80 nm–100 nm

thickness on an RMC PowerTome XL ultramicrotome (Eden Instruments, Valence, France).

Sections were post-stained in 2% uranyl acetate in H_2O for 20 min and in Reynold's lead for 3

min. Sections from each animal were viewed in the gonad region using Digital Micrograph

software (Gatan, Pleasanton, CA) for the JEOL JEM-1400Plus M (Jeol USA, Peabody, MA), using

a Gatan Orius SC1000B digital camera.

We selected the most optimally positioned and resolved HPF/FS-fixed animal (2% osmium

tetroxide, 0.1% uranyl acetate, and 2% H_2O in acetone) to collect high-resolution montages of

the gonad arm from every third section covering 80 µm, including the DTC and sheath filopodia

of a posterior distal gonad arm. This series was collected from the tail to the vulva region to

encompass the whole posterior gonad arm, but we did not collect full images closer to the

gonad reflection in order to save effort and expense. The pixel size for the images was 3.23 nm.

The images were aligned with TrakEM2 software (Cardona et al., 2012) and traced on a Wacom

DTZ 2100D tablet (Wacom, Portland, OR) to build the 3D model.

We followed the DTC processes and their fragments and the filopodial extensions of Sh1 due to

their increased translucency compared with the germ cells and by the fact that these somatic

cellular extensions contained many small mitochondria (Video 4). We observed what we infer

to be shed pieces of the DTC beginning at approximately 30 µm from the distal end, as has been

observed using light microscopic methods (Byrd et al., 2014). However, some DTC and Sh1

processes may appear discontinuous due to the fact that micrographs of every third section

were used to generate the reconstructed model (Video 5). Regardless of the effect that this

sampling technique has on our ability to resolve contiguous versus shed bits of somatic gonadal

cells, this TEM analysis is in agreement with our light microscopic observations that a large

subset of distal germ cell progenitors are not in contact either with the DTC or Sh1.

Brood counts and embryonic lethality measurements

Because *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* brood counts and embryonic lethality were highly variable,

we used a single batch of NGM media with OP50 food source for all brood count measurements

reported in Table 1. To prevent mold formation, the medium contained 6.25 µg/ml Nystatin. L4-

stage hermaphrodites were cultured individually on 35 mm Petri plates and transferred

approximately every 24 hours until they stopped producing embryos (4–6 days). Worms that

crawled off the media and died were redacted (varied from 0–10% depending on the

experiment). Embryos that failed to hatch after 24–36 hours were counted and scored as dead.

In the majority of cases, these embryos exhibited morphological abnormalities. Control

experiments demonstrated that these embryos were not simply delayed and never hatched.

Embryos that hatched were counted and scored as viable.

Genome editing

CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing was used to generate *inx-8* null alleles in both the *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) and wild-type genetic backgrounds. The approach taken generated

identical 1525 bp deletions within the *inx-8* locus in both genetic backgrounds starting 136 bp

upstream of the wild-type *inx-8* ATG start codon and extending 221 bp into *inx-8* exon 3. In the

inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) context, this edit removes both the mKate2 moiety and *inx-8*. The

deletions are expected to constitute *inx-8* null alleles because, in addition to removing the start

codon, they delete amino acids 1–349 (out of 382 amino acids), including virtually all residues

essential for spanning the plasma membrane and forming a channel (Starich and Greenstein,

2020). The approach used pRB1017 to express two single guide RNAs (sgRNAs) under control of

the *C. elegans* U6 promoter (Arribere et al., 2014). Oligonucleotides inx8_us_sgRNA1.F and

inx8_us_sgRNA1.R were annealed and used to generate the plasmid inx8_us_sgRNA1 to direct

Cas9 cleavage 136 bp upstream of the ATG initiator codon (Supplementary File 2 lists all

oligonucleotides used in this study). Oligonucleotides inx8_sgRNA1.F and inx8_sgRNA1.R were

annealed and used to generate the plasmid inx8_sgRNA1 to direct Cas9 cleavage in exon 3. To

generate sgRNA clones, annealed oligonucleotides were ligated to *Bsa*I-digested pRB1017

plasmid vector, and the resulting plasmids were verified by Sanger sequencing. pDD162 served

as the source of Cas9 expressed under control of the *eef-1A.1/eft-3* promoter (Dickinson et al.,

2013). The repair template oligonucleotide used was inx8_rpr. Genome editing employed the

dpy-10 co-conversion method (Arribere et al., 2014). The injection mix contained pJA58 (7.5

ng/µl), AF-ZF-827 (500 nM), inx8_us sgRNA1 (25 ng/µl), inx8_sgRNA1 (25 ng/µl), inx8_rpr (500

nM), and pDD162 (50 ng/µl) and was injected into adult hermaphrodites from strains DG5131

naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-

1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V and DG5020 *naIs37[plag-2::mCherryPH + unc-119(+)] I; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-*

1::gfp + lin-15(+)]V. Correct targeting was verified by conducting PCR with primer pairs

inx8_delta.F and inx8_delta.R followed by DNA sequencing. Three deletion alleles were

recovered from the injections into DG5131 *(qy78tn2031, qy78tn2032,* and *qy78tn2033)*, and

two deletion alleles were recovered from the injections into DG5020 *(tn2034* and *tn2035)*. The

deletion alleles were outcrossed to *naIs37[lag-2p::mCherryPH +unc-119(+)]/+ I;*

tmC5(tmIs1220[myo-2p::Venus])/+ IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)/+ V males to

generate DG5229 and DG5232. Homozygous strains were analyzed by confocal microscopy. To

introduce an *inx-8* null allele onto the *tmC5[tmIs1220]* IV balancer chromosome, the same

injection mix of CRISPR reagents as described above was injected into *dpy-*

20(e1282)/tmC5[tmIs1220] IV heterozygotes. The *inx-8(tn2075)* null allele was generated on

the balancer chromosome, which resulted from a 1526 bp deletion that differed from the other

CRISPR-generated *inx-8* null alleles by the removal of an extra base at the cut site.

Immunostaining and image analysis of fixed samples

Immunostaining was carried out as described (Mohammad et al., 2018). Briefly, synchronized

adult hermaphrodites, 24-hr past mid-L4, were dissected in PBST (PBS with 0.1% Tween 20),

with 0.2 mM levamisole to extrude the gonads. The gonads were fixed in 3% paraformaldehyde

solution for 10 min and then post-fixed in −20° chilled methanol for 10 min. After 3x 10-min

washes with PBST, they were blocked in 30% goat serum for 30 min at RT. The gonads were

then incubated with the desired primary antibodies diluted (see below) in 30% goat serum at 4°

overnight. The next day, after 3x 10-min PBST washes, the gonads were further incubated with

appropriate secondary antibodies, diluted in 30% goat serum, at 4° overnight. The gonads were

washed 3 times with PBST, then incubated with 0.1 g/ml DAPI in PBST for 30 min. After removal

of excess liquid, the gonads were mixed with anti-fading agent (Vectashield) and transferred to

an agarose pad on a slide. Hyperstack images were captured using a spinning disk confocal

microscope (PerkinElmer-Cetus, Norwalk, CT). Two overlapping hyperstack images were

captured for each gonad arm to obtain coverage of >50 cell diameters from the distal end of

the gonad. Images were further processed in Fiji, and DAPI stained nuclei were used to mark

the number of cell diameters from the distal end. Employing pixel to micron ratio, specific to

the images captured, cell diameters were converted into microns where required.

SYGL-1-positive zone length assessment: OLLAS staining was used to assess 3xOLLAS::SYGL-1

accumulation (Shin et al., 2017). In wild-type young adults, SYGL-1 accumulates at the distal end

of the germline and is downregulated around 10 cell diameters from the distal tip (Kocsisova et

al., 2019; Shin et al., 2017). Cell diameters were counted from the distal end of the germline up

to the row where SYGL-1 is no longer visible by eye. OLLAS staining in the wild-type worms

without OLLAS tag was used to differentiate staining from the background. To confirm the

accuracy of our visual assessment, we quantified the intensity of SYGL-1 accumulation in the

distal germline, employing methods similar to Chen et al., 2020 in the same set of germlines

where the SYGL-1 zone was visually evaluated. We found that the cell diameter position called

as the end of the SYGL-1 zone consistently corresponded to 6–9% of peak SYGL-1 intensity, for

each genotype (Figure 3—figure supplement 2). These results indicate that the SYGL-1 zone

length visual assessment was reproducible and consistent.

Progenitor zone length assessment: The gonads were stained with a progenitor zone marker,

anti-CYE-1, and an early meiotic prophase marker, pSUN-1, (anti-SUN-1 S8-Pi) (Mohammad et

al., 2018). For assessing the progenitor zone length, cell diameters (rows) were counted from

the distal end of the germline, where all cells are CYE-1-positive, until the point after which the

majority of the cells in a row have switched from staining for CYE-1 to pSUN-1. Note that pSUN-

1 staining is not shown in the figures though it was used to assess the PZ border.

Assessment of distal position of Sh1: anti-GFP antibody staining was used to visualize the

sheath, where cell diameters were counted from distal end to the point where GFP staining

became prominent.

To quantify the distance from the distal end to the border of expression of any protein, we have

used either ~30 gonads for single-replicate experiments and ~20 gonads for multi-replicate

experiments. We define a biological replicate as independently dissected and stained, along

with the controls in the same tube, and images acquired with the same settings. During these

experiments, no outliers were encountered. In rare cases, acquired images, which either failed

to stitch by Fiji or had poor staining, were discarded.

Primary antibodies used: mouse anti-CYE-1 (1:100; (Brodigan et al., 2003)); guinea pig anti-SUN-

1 S8-Pi (1:1000; (Penkner et al., 2009)); rat anti-OLLAS (1:2000; Novus Biological); rabbit anti-

GFP (1:200; from Swathi Arur, MD Anderson Cancer Center; Lopez et al., 2013); and rabbit anti-

INX-8 (1:25; Starich et al., 2014)

Secondary antibodies used: Alexa Fluor 647 goat anti-mouse (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA);

Alexa Fluor 594 goat anti-guinea pig (Invitrogen, Waltham, MA), Alexa Fluor 594 donkey anti-rat

(Invitrogen); and Alexa Fluor 488 goat anti-rabbit (Invitrogen).

Funding

ACS grant PF-19-231-01-CSM to TT

NIH R35GM134876 and R01AG065672 to EJAH

R01 GM100756 to T. Schedl

NIH R01GM57173 and R35GM144029 to DG

NIH Office of the Director R24OD010943 to DHH

Competing interests

E.J.A.H. holds US patent 6,087,153.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Germline and somatic gonad innexins are required for proper somatic gonad

architecture. A. Schematic of paired somatic and germline octameric hemichannels. B.

Schematic diagram of the *inx-8 inx-9* locus and the *inx-14* locus, with relevant mutations

indicated in red. C. Fluorescent confocal maximum projection images of distal gonads in live

worms. Distal tip cell (DTC) marked in magenta (*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry-PH]*) and sheath pair 1

(Sh1) marked in green (*bcIs39[lim-7p::CED-1::GFP]*). Top: strain bearing markers only, denoted

"wild-type", representative of phenotypic Classes 1 and 2. D. *inx-14(ag17)* and *inx-*

8(tn1513tn1555) inx-9(ok1502), denoted "*inx-8(rf)*" after Starich et al. (2020), representative of

Class 3. E. Diagram of DTC–Sh1 relationship in distal end of a typical wild-type gonad (DTC

magenta, Sh1 green) for phenotypic Classes 1–3. Class 1: greater than 8 µm (two cell diameters)

separates the proximal most extent of the DTC (vertical line topped with magenta dot) and the

distal most border of Sh1 (vertical line topped with green dot) as measured in slice-by-slice

analysis of Z series; Class 2: ≤8 µm separates DTC and Sh1 extensions or interdigitation of DTC

and Sh1 is seen up to the position of the average DTC process length (vertical line topped with

blue dot); Class 3: distal position of Sh1 is distal to the average DTC process length. A diagram of

all measurements taken for live fluorescent images is shown in Figure 1—figure supplement 1.

F. The proportion of gonads examined that fall into the phenotypic classes indicated. G. Plot

showing the distance between the average DTC process length (blue dots), the longest DTC

process (magenta dots) and the distal-most border of Sh1 (green dots); each trio of dots joined

by a dark blue line represents the data for a single gonad, analyzed as a confocal maximum

projection. Scale bars are 10 µm. Strains used are DG5020, DG5026 and DG5029. See

Supplementary File 1 for complete genotypes.

Video 1. Confocal stack and 3D rendering of representative Class 1 gonad. Strain DG5020.

Video 2. Confocal stack and 3D rendering of representative Class 2 gonad. Strain DG5020.

Video 3. Confocal stack and 3D rendering of representative Class 3 gonad. Strain DG5026.

Figure 1—figure supplement 1. Consistent trends in Sh1 and DTC positions are observed with

multiple markers.

A. Schematic diagram of DTC and Sh1 parameters measured. Each black dot represents a point

in a maximum projection Z-stack for which the distance from the distal end was measured in

microns. B. Fluorescent micrographs of gonads in live worms bearing indicated markers that

label DTC (magenta lettering) or Sh1 (green lettering), in wild-type and *inx-14(ag17)* mutant

backgrounds, as indicated: *naIs37*, *bcIs39*, *qIs154*, and *tnIs5* are integrated transgenes; *tnEx42*

carries a rescuing *acy-4p*::*gfp* fusion on an extrachromosomal array; and *fasn-1(av138[fasn-*

1::gfp]) was tagged at the endogenous locus using CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing (see

Supplementary File 1 for full genotypes). The *fasn-1* and *acy-4* fusions also drive expression in

non-gonadal tissues. C. The proportion of gonads examined that fall into the phenotypic classes

indicated. D. Plot showing the distance between the average DTC process length (blue dots),

the longest DTC process (magenta dots) and the distal-most border of Sh1 (green dots); each

trio of dots joined by a dark blue line represents the data for a single gonad. E. Plots showing

quantitative measurement of parameters diagrammed in (A). Although the behavior of the

DTCs marked by different markers is variable, and DTCs marked with *qIs154* show significantly

longer DTC processes, the behavior of Sh1 in the presence of either marker shows significantly

consistent changes across mutant genotypes. All *P* values result from Student's *t*-test. Scale

bars are 10 µm. Strains used were DG5020, DG4959, DG4977, DG5026, DG5320, DG5367,

DG5310. See Supplementary File 1 for complete genotypes.

1007

1008

1009 **Figure 1—figure supplement 2.** Snapshot of transmission electron micrograph (TEM)

1010 reconstruction and guide to Videos 4 and 5.

1011

Video 4. Serial thin section movie of every third section from the DTC to the distal extensions of

Sh1 in a young adult hermaphrodite posterior gonad arm. Germ cell nuclei are marked in yellow

if the corresponding germ cells receive direct contact from a DTC or Sh1 process, or in salmon if

they do not. The soma and processes of the DTC are filled in pink. Filopodial extensions of the

somatic sheath are filled in green. Individual images are composed from multi-panel montages

(mostly 3 x 4 montages). Scale bar is 3 μm. Video 4 is available at

https://datadryad.org/stash/share/CgAYZh4cDADyskEuMQwsWj_3f93PSl9_ETgna-uVRYI

or at https://s3.msi.umn.edu/greenste/Video4_R1.avi

1020

Video 5. Model of the distal gonad. The DTC, its processes and fragments are in pink. Nearest

sheath cell bodies lie out of frame proximally, but their filopodial extensions are shown in

green, extending towards the DTC. Germ cell nuclei are modelled as spheres; the nuclei of

those germ cells that do not come in contact with either DTC or Sh1 are colored in salmon,

while germ cells with direct contact are shown in yellow. The true volume of each germ cell is

larger than is shown here because each sphere is centered only on the cell nucleus. Scale bar is

5 μm.

1028

1029

Figure 2. N-terminal fusion of mKate2 to INX-8 generates an INX-8 protein that alters somatic

gonad morphology. A. Schematic diagram showing the genetic manipulations used in this

section. *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* was created by placing mKate2 in-frame with the N-

terminus of INX-8 (Gordon et al., 2020). *inx-8(qy78tn2031)* was created by deleting the *inx-8*

coding region and mKate2 moiety in the *inx-8(qy78)* background. B. Representative distal

gonads stained with anti-INX-8 antibody; Top: N2 wild-type, Bottom: DG5063 *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]). C. Dot plot with overlaid quantile box plots showing the distance from

the distal end of the gonad to the Sh1 distal border for each genotype. Each dot represents a

single gonad of that genotype. *P* value was calculated using Student's *t*-test. D. Fluorescent

micrographs of live animals with the DTC marked by *naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry-PH]* and Sh1

marked by *bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp]*. Top: wild-type with markers only. Middle: *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]). Bottom: *inx-8(qy78tn2031).* E. Quantitative dot-plots as in Figure 1;

data for wild-type (marker only) strain in E is the same as in Figure 1. Each pair of dots

connected by a line represents data from a single gonad. Scale bar 10µm. Strains used were N2,

DG5063, DG5020, DG5131, DG5229, DG5320, DG5378. See Supplementary File 1 for complete

genotypes.

1046

1047   **Figure 2—figure supplement 1.** Detection of INX-8 antibody overlaps with mKate2 fluorescence

1048   in *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8)]*. Representative image of dissected distal gonad stained with

1049   anti-INX-8 antibody (top, green), mKate2 fluorescence (middle, red) and merged (bottom,

1050   yellow) in DG5063 *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::INX-8])*. The distal end of the gonad is on the left. In all

1051   gonads examined (n=32), overlap was complete. Scale bars are 10 µm.

1052

Figure 2—figure supplement 2. The *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8)* allele behaves as a dosage-

sensitive antimorph. A. Schematic diagram showing additional relevant alleles at the *inx-8* and

inx-9 loci. B–E. Relevant genotypes are given for *inx-8* and *inx-9* only. All strains also contain

naIs37 to mark the DTC and *bcIs39* to mark Sh1. *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* and *inx-*

8(qy102[mKate2::inx-8]) are abbreviated as *inx-8(qy78)* and *inx-8(qy102)* to aid comparisons

between genotypes. B. Representative fluorescent micrographs of live worms carrying each

relevant allele, as indicated (images for *inx-8(+), inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* and *inx-*

8(qy102tn2031) are the same as in Fig. 2B, included here for comparison). C. Stacked histogram

showing the frequency of each of the phenotypic classes described in Fig. 1, for each genotype,

as indicated. D. Table showing frequency of Class 3 gonads for each genotype, with indicated

pairwise significance levels derived from a Fisher's Exact Test. E. Quantitative plots showing

changes to DTC morphology and Sh1 position. All *P* values result from Student's *t*-test. Scale

bars are 10 µm. Strains used were DG5020, DG5131, DG5229, DG5232, DG5027, DG5133,

DG5346, DG5347, DG5366. See Supplementary File 1 for complete genotypes.

1067

Figure 2—figure supplement 3. Direct comparison of *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]* and *lim-7p-*

driven transgenes as markers for Sh1. A. Individual gonads carrying different Sh1 markers in

addition to *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])*. Left, top to bottom: Individual channels and merged

image of a single worm co-expressing the DTC marker *cpIs122[lag-2p::gfp], inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) and the sheath cell marker *tnIs5[lim-7p::gfp]*. Right, top to bottom:

Individual channels and merged image of a single worm co-expressing the DTC marker

naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry-PH], *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* and the sheath cell marker *bcIs39[lim-*

7p::ced-1::gfp]. B. Two individual gonads of the same genotypes as in (A), showing incomplete

overlap between mKate2::INX-8 and the respective GFP sheath cell markers. White arrowheads

mark the most distal extent of each marker in the single-channel panels. C and D: *inx-*

8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8] is abbreviated as "*inx-8(qy78)*". C. Frequency of overlap. Of 46 gonads

examined, 39 showed perfect overlap as shown in these images. D. Proportion of gonads in

phenotypic Classes 1–3 as scored by mKate2 or as scored by GFP expression, as indicated by

bold in the genotype. Scale bars are 10 μm. Strains used were DG5020, DG5131, KLG006. See

Supplementary File 1 for complete genotypes.

1083

1084

Figure 3. The position of the proximal border of the SYGL-1-positive stem cell pool does not

correlate with the position of Sh1. A. Fluorescence confocal maximum projection of surface

images (~7 μm depth) of fixed, dissected gonads showing the SYGL-1-positive stem cell pool

marked in magenta and the sheath cell marked in green. Magenta caret represents the location

of the proximal border of the SYGL-1-positive stem cell pool. Green caret represents the distal

edge of Sh1. B. Quantitative graph with magenta dots representing the proximal border of

SYGL-1::OLLAS expression and green dots representing the distal reach of Sh1. Each pair of dots

connected by a line represents the data for a single gonad. C. Dot plot with overlaid box plots

showing the distance and quantiles of the SYGL-1-positive stem cell pool and distal extent of

Sh1 for each genotype. Each dot represents a single specimen of that genotype. *P* values were

calculated using Student's *t*-test. D. Scatterplot showing lack of correlation between the

proximal extent of SYGL-1 expression and the distal reach of Sh1. Scale bars are 10 μm. Strains

used are DG5136, DG5150, DG5181, DG5248, and DG5249. See Supplementary File 1 for

complete genotypes.

1099

Figure 3—figure supplement 1. The position of the proximal border of the SYGL-1-positive

stem cell pool does not correlate with the position of Sh1 when data are shown in cell

diameters. A. Quantitative graph with magenta dots representing the proximal extent of SYGL-

1::OLLAS expression and green dots representing the distal reach of Sh1. Each pair of magenta

and green dots connected by a line represents the data for a single gonad. B. Dot plot with

overlaid box plots showing the distance and quantiles of the SYGL-1-positive stem cell pool and

distal extent of Sh1 for each genotype, in cell diameters from the distal end. Each dot

represents a single specimen of that genotype. *P* values were calculated using Student's *t*-test.

C. Scatterplot showing lack of correlation between the proximal extent of SYGL-1 expression

and the distal reach of Sh1. CD: cell diameters. Strains used are listed in Figure 3.

1110

Figure 3—figure supplement 2. Proximal end of the SYGL-1 zone assessed visually and from

protein levels. SYGL-1 (3xOLLAS::SYGL-1) levels were measured from the distal tip of the gonad

to (A) 25 CD and (B) 100 microns proximal, in dissected and stained gonads from 1-day adults

of the indicated genotypes. The visually assessed SYGL-1 border and the distal extent of Sh1

are marked. SYGL-1 protein levels from fluorescence-intensity measurements are normalized

by setting the peak levels in wild type to 100. The SYGL-1 quantitation of the indicated

genotype is carried out for the gonads in Fig. 3B. The small differences observed in SYGL-1 peak

levels between wild type and *inx-14(ag17)* or *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])* are not statistically

significant (Student's *t*-test). Triangle, distal most position (start) of Sh1; circle, proximal

position of SYGL-1 staining; blue, wild type; red *inx-14(ag17)*; black *inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])*.

Curved plot lines, mean; vertical bars, mean ± SD. All three strains have *sygl-1(q983) naIs37 I;*

bcIs39 V in the background along with the indicate *inx-x* genotype. Strains used are DG5136,

DG5150, and DG5181. See Supplementary File 1 for complete genotypes.

1124

1125

Figure 4. The position of the proximal border of the progenitor zone does not correlate with the

position of Sh1. A. Fluorescence confocal maximum projection of surface images (~7 μm depth)

of fixed, dissected gonads showing the progenitor pool marked in magenta and the sheath cell

marked in green. All measurements were made by examining optical sections through the

entire depth of the gonad. Magenta caret represents the location of the proximal border of the

CYE-1-positive, pSUN-1-negative progenitor pool (pSUN-1 staining not shown; see Materials

and Methods). Green caret represents the distal edge of Sh1. B. Quantitative graph with

magenta dots representing the proximal extent of the CYE-1 staining and green dots

representing the distal reach of Sh1. Each pair of magenta and green dots connected by a line

represents the data for a single gonad. C. Dot plot with overlaid box plots showing the distance

and quantiles of the progenitor pool and distal extent of Sh1 for each genotype. Each dot

represents a single specimen of that genotype. *P* values were calculated using Student's *t*-test.

D. Scatterplot showing lack of correlation between the proximal PZ border and Sh1 position.

Scale bars are 10 µm. Strains used are DG5136, DG5150, DG5181, DG5248, and DG5249. See

Supplementary File 1 for complete genotypes.

1141

Figure 4–figure supplement 1. The position of the proximal border of the progenitor zone does

not correlate with the position of Sh1 when data are shown in cell diameters. A. Quantitative

graph with magenta dots representing the location of the proximal border of the CYE-1-

positive, pSUN-1-negative progenitor pool and green dots representing the proximal extent of

and green dots representing the distal reach of Sh1. Each pair of magenta and green dots

connected by a line represents the data for a single gonad. B. Dot plot with overlaid box plots

showing the distance and quantiles of the CYE-1-positive progenitor pool and distal extent of

Sh1 for each genotype, in cell diameters from the distal end. Each dot represents a single

specimen of that genotype. *P* values were calculated using Student's *t*-test. C. Scatterplot

showing lack of correlation between the proximal extent of progenitor zone and the distal

reach of Sh1. CD: cell diameters. Strains used are listed in Figure 4.

1153

1154   **Figure 5.** Reduced innexin function shifts Sh1 distally, eliminating the bare regions between the

1155   DTC and Sh1, but this shift does not alter the border of the stem cell pool.

1156

1157   **Supplementary File 1.** Strains used in this study.

1158

1159 **Supplementary File 2.** Oligonucleotides used in this study.

1160

Table 1—Source data 1. Brood size and embryonic lethality data for Table 1.

Figure 1—Source data 1. Source data for Figure 1C–D and Figure 1F–G

Figure 1—figure supplement 1—Source data 1. Source data for Figure 1—figure supplement 1

panels B–E.

Figure 2—Source data 1. Source data for Figure 2B and C

Figure 2—Source data 2. Source data for Figure 2D–F.

Figure 2—figure supplement 2—Source data 1. Source data for Figure 2—figure supplement 2

panels B–E.

Figure 2—figure supplement 3—Source data 1. Source data for Figure 2—figure supplement 3.

Figure 3—Source data 1. Source data for Figure 3 and Figure 3—figure supplement 1.

Figure 4—Source data 1. Source data for Figure 4 and Figure 4—figure supplement 1.

1172
1173

Figure 1

Figure 1—figure supplement 1

Direction of stack movement

Orientation
of slices

Slice thickness = 80-100nm
Reconstruction based on
every 3rd slice.

5 µm

A

1kb

inx-8

inx-9

qy78

qy78 tn2031

B

anti-INX-8

inx-8(+)

inx-8(qy78)

C

Distal border of anti-INX-8 staining

inx-8(+)

inx-8(qy78)

p = 2.3e-11

Distance from distal end (μm)

D

DTC (naIs37)   Sh1 (bcIs39)   DTC (naIs37)   Sh1 (fasn-1(av138))

inx-8(+)   inx-8(+)

inx-8(qy78)   inx-8(qy78)

inx-8(qy78tn2031)

E

Proportion of Gonads

Class 1
Class 2
Class 3

n = 27   n = 26   n = 11   n = 21   n = 6

inx-8(+)   inx-8(qy78)   inx-8(qy78tn2031)   inx-8(+)   inx-8(qy78)

bcIs39   fasn-1(av138)

F

naIs37; bcIs39   naIs37; fasn-1(av138)

inx-8(+)

inx-8(qy78)

inx-8
(qy78tn2031)

Distance from distal end (μM)   Distance from distal end (μM)

● Position of Sh1 distal-most border
● Positon of mean DTC process length
● Position of proximal-most DTC process

Figure 2

DG5063(inx-8(qy78[mKate::inx-8])

A

B

C

D

Relevant Genotype	%Class 3	p-value
inx-8(+) inx-9(+)	0%	
inx-8(qy78)	65%	
inx-8(qy78tn2031)	9%	
inx-8(tn2034)	25%	
inx-9(ok1502)	0%	
inx-8(qy102) inx-9(ok1502)	60%	
inx-8(qy78)/inx-8(+)	44%	
inx-8(qy78tn2031)/inx-8(+)	10%	
inx-8(qy78)/inx-8(0)	4%	

*P ≤ 0.01 ** P ≤ 0.001 ***P ≤ 0.0001

E

A Complete overlap > 80%

cpIs122[lag-2p::GFP];
inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]);
tnIs5[lim-7p::GFP]

naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry];
inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]);
bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp]

B Incomplete overlap < 20%

cpIs122[lag-2p::GFP];
inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]);
tnIs5[lim-7p::gfp]

naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry];
inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]);
bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp]

C

Frequency of overlap between
inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])   and
lim-7p-based markers

Overlap
■ Incomplete
■ Complete

D

□ Class 1
■ Class 2
■ Class 3

A

SYGL-1   Sh1

markers only

inx-14(ag17)

inx-8(qy78)

inx-8(qy78tn2031)

inx-8(tn2034)

B

Relative positions of SYGL-1(+) border and
distal extent of Sh1

Distance from distal end (μm)

C

Proximal border of
SYGL-1(+) stem cell pool

Distal extent of Sh1

Wild-type

inx-14(ag17)

inx-8(qy78)

inx-8(qy78tn2031)

inx-8(tn2034)

p = 5.85e-14

p = 1.66e-05

p = 1.39e-07

p = 3.29e-38

p = 6.51e-14

p = 3.36e-09

p = 1.99e-11

Distance from distal end (μm)

D

Correlation between SYGL-1(+) border and Sh1

Proximal border of SYGL-1(+) pool (μm from distal end)

Distal extent of Sh1 (μm from distal end)

inx-8(tn2034)   (R = -0.004,   p = 0.97)
inx-8(qy78tn2031) (R = 0.12,   p = 0.26)
inx-8(qy78) (R = 0.22,   p = 0.04)
inx-14(ag17) (R = 0.01,   p = 0.9)
wild-type (R = 0.15,   p = 0.007)

A

Relative positions of SYGL-1(+) border and distal extent of Sh1

Distance from distal end (CD)

B

C

Correlation between SYGL-1(+) border and Sh1

A

CYE-1(PZ) | Sh1

markers only

inx-14(ag17)

inx-8(qy78)

inx-8(qy78tn2031)

inx-8(tn2034)

B

Relative positions of proximal border of
proliferative zone and distal extent of Sh1

Distance from distal end (μm)

C

Proximal border of
Proliferative Zone

Distal Extent of Sh1

Wild-type

inx-14(ag17)

inx-8(qy78)

inx-8(qy78tn2031)

inx-8(tn2034)

P = 0.36E-14
P = 0.0010
P = 4.38e-6

Distance from distal end (μm)

p = 2.97e-29
p = 2.86e-16
p = 1.57e-06
p = 2.39e-06

Distance from Distal End (μm)

D

Correlation between PZ and Sh1

Proximal border of PZ (μm from distal end)

inx-8(tn2034) (R = 0.39, p = 0.03)
inx-8(qy78tn2031) (R = 0.15, p = 0.42)
inx-8(qy78) (R = 0.19, p = 0.17)
inz-14(ag17) (R = 0.07, p = 0.72)
Markers Only (R = 0.24, p = 0.05)

Distal extent of Sh1 (μm from distal end)

A

Relative positions of proximal border of
proliferative zone and distal extent of Sh1

Markers Only

inx-14(ag17)

inx-8(qy78)

inx-8(qy78tn2031)

inx-8(tn2034)

Distance from Distal End (CD)

Figure 4–figure
supplement 1

B

Proximal border of
Proliferative Zone

Distal Extent of Sh1

Wild-type

inx-14(ag17)

inx-8(qy78)

inx-8(qy78tn2031)

inx-8(tn2034)

p = 3.95e-15

p = 1.94e-06

p = 2.99e-08

p = 2.97e-29

p = 2.86e-16

p = 1.57e-06

p = 2.39e-06

Distance from distal end (CD)

Distance from distal end (CD)

C

Proximal border of proliferative zone
(CD from distal end)

Distal extent of Sh1 (CD from distal end)

inx-8(tn2034) R =0.44, p=0.013
inx-8(qy78tn2031) R =0.14, p=0.47
inx-8(qy78) R =0.29, p=0.04
inx-14(ag17) R =0.0013, p=0.99
wild-type R =0.17, p=0.16

Full innexin function

Reduced innexin function

average SYGL-1(+) stem cell pool border

variable "bare regions"

average CYE-1(+)/pSUN-1(-) proliferative zone border

no "bare regions"

Reagent type (species) or resource	Designation	Source or reference	Identifiers	Additional information
Antibody	mouse monoclonal anti-CYE-1	Brodigan et al., 2003		(1:100)
Antibody	rat monoclonal anti-OLLAS	Shin et al., 2017		(1:2000)
Antibody	guinea pig polyclonal anti-SUN-1 S8-Pi	Mohammad et al., 2018		(1:1000)
Antibody	rabbit polyclonal anti-GFP	from Swathi Arur, MD Anderson Cancer Center; Lopez et al., 2013		(1:200)
Antibody	rabbit polyclonal anti-INX-8	Starich et al., 2014		(1:25)
sequence-based reagent	AF-ZF-827	Arribere et al., 2014		CACTTGAACTTCAATA CGGCAAGATGAGAAT GACTGGAAACCGT ACCGCATGCGGTG CCTATGGTAGCGGA GCTTCACATGGCTTCAG ACCAACAGCCTAT Contact DG for more information
sequence-based reagent	inx8_delta.F	this work		CCTTCGACCTGATTT CCCCTTCTTCTAATG Contact DG for more information

sequence-based reagent	inx8_delta.R	this work		CTATTGCTTTCCGTT CTTCAAGATGTTGTTG Contact DG for more information
sequence-based reagent	inx8_RPR	this work		GGTGGCCAATAAA AATGCTTTTCTTTT T GCTTTTCTCTATCT A CTTCCGTTCCGCCC C GGAGGTTGCCGTG G AGATGTACAGCGA C TTTTTAGTAAGTCT T TTCAAC Contact DG for more information
sequence-based reagent	inx8_sgRNA1.F	this work		TCTTGAGTGACTTG G TAGCATCGG Contact DG for more information
sequence-based reagent	inx8_sgRNA1.R	this work		AAACCCGATGCTA CC AAGTCACTC Contact DG for more information
Recombinant DNA reagent (plasmid)	inx8_us_sgRN A1	this work		available upon request Contact DG for more information
sequence-based reagent	inx8_us_sgRN A1.F	this work		TCTTGTGGAAAAC AG AGGAATGGG Contact DG for more information

sequence-based reagent	inx8_us_sgRNA1.R	this work		AAACCCCATTCCTCT GTTTTCCAC Contact DG for more information
sequence-based reagent	inx-14delF	this work		GATACGACGTGAGCA ATGGAACGTC Contact DG for more information
sequence-based reagent	inx-14delR	this work		CTTGGACTTGAAGT GAGAGTTGGAG Contact DG for more information
sequence-based reagent	sygl1-F	this work		ATCATCGAACCA TTGTCATCACGC Contact DG for more information
sequence-based reagent	sygl1-R	this work		TTTGCCTTGATCTC CAAGTGTTGC Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**AG400**	(Starich et al. 2020)	*fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) I*	
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**CB190**	(Brenner 1974)	*unc-54(e190) I*	
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**CB1282**	(Hosono et al. 1982)	*dpy-20(e1282) IV*	
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG2506**	(Govindan et al. 2009)	*acy-4(ok1806) V; tnEx42[acy-4::gfp + rol-6(su1006)]*	
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG4959**	(this work)	*qIs154[lag-2p::MYR::tdTomato + ttx-3p::gfp] V; tnIs5[lim-7p::gfp + rol-6(su1006)] X*	Contact DG for more information

Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG4977**	(this work)	*inx-14(ag17) I; qIs154[lag-2p::MYR::tdTomato + ttx-3p::gfp] V; tnIs5[lim-7p::gfp + rol-6(su1006)] X*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5020**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5026**	(this work)	*inx-14(ag17) naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5027**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-9(ok1502) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5029**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(tn1513tn1555) inx-9(ok1502) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5059**	(this work)	*inx-9(ok1502) IV*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5063**	(this work)	*inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) IV*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5064**	(this work)	*inx-8(qy102(mKate2::inx-8)) inx-9(ok1502) IV*	Contact DG for more information

Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5070**	(this work)	*inx-14(ag17) I; inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) IV*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5131**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I;inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V;*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5133**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(qy102(mKate2::inx-8)) inx-9(ok1502) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5136**	(this work)	*sygl-1(q983[3xOLLAS::sygl-1]) naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5150**	(this work)	*inx-14(ag17) sygl-1(q983[3xOLLAS::sygl-1]) naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information

Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5181**	(this work)	*sygl-1(q983[3xOLLAS::sygl-1]) naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5229**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(qy78tn2031) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5232**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(tn2034) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5248**	(this work)	*sygl-1(q983[3xOLLAS::sygl-1]) naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(qy78tn2031) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5249**	(this work)	*sygl-1(q983[3xOLLAS::sygl-1]) naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(tn2034) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5250**	(this work)	*inx-8(qy78tn2031) IV*	Contact DG for more information

Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5251**	(this work)	*inx-8(tn2034) IV*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5270**	(this work)	*inx-14(ag17) I*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5310**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; acy-4(ok1806) V; tnEx42[acy-4::gfp + rol-6(su1006)]*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5320**	(this work)	*fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5346**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])/tmC5[tmIs1220] IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5347**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(qy78tn2031)/tmC5[tmIs1220] IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5357**	(this work)	*tmC5[tmIs1220] inx-8(tn2075) IV*	Contact DG for more information

Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5366**	(this work)	*naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8])/tmC5[tmIs1220] inx-8(tn2075) IV; bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5367**	(this work)	*inx-14(ag17) fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5378**	(this work)	*fasn-1(av138[fasn-1::gfp]) naIs37[lag-2p::mCherry::PH + unc-119(+)] I; inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) IV*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**DG5380**	(this work)	*bcIs39[lim-7p::ced-1::gfp + lin-15(+)] V*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**FX30140**	(Dejima et al. 2018)	*tmC5[tmIs1220] IV*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**JK1466**	(Francis et al. 1995)	*gld-1(q485)/dpy-5(e61) unc-32(e51) I*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**KLG006**	(Gordon et al., 2020)	*inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]) IV; tnIs6[plim-7::gfp + rol-6(su1006)] X; cpIs122(lag-2p::mNeonGreen::plcdeltaPH)*	Contact DG for more information

Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**NK2571**	(Gordon et al., 2020)	*inx-8(qy78[mKate2::inx-8]); cpIs122 [lag-2p::mNeonGreen::plcdeltaPH]*	Contact DG for more information
Genetic reagent (*C. elegans*)	**NK2576**	(Gordon et al., 2020)	*inx-8(qy102(mKate2::inx-8)) inx-9(ok1502); cpIs122(lag-2p::mNeonGreen::plcdeltaPH)*	Contact DG for more information

1