Dynamic compartmentalization of the pro-invasive transcription factor NHR-67 reveals a role for Groucho in regulating a proliferative-invasive cellular switch in *C. elegans*

Authors: Taylor N. Medwig-Kinney[1†*], Brian A. Kinney[2†], Michael A. Q. Martinez[1], Callista Yee[3], Sydney S. Sirota[1‡], Angelina A. Mullarkey[1], Neha Somineni[1§], Justin Hippler[1,4#], Wan Zhang[1], Kang Shen[3], Christopher M. Hammell[2], Ariel M. Pani[5], and David Q. Matus[1¶*]

Affiliations:

1. Department of Biochemistry and Cell Biology, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794, United States.
2. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, NY 11724, United States.
3. Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, United States.
4. Science and Technology Research Program, Smithtown High School East, St. James, NY 11780, United States.
5. Departments of Biology and Cell Biology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904, United States.

*For correspondence: tmkinney@unc.edu; david.matus@stonybrook.edu

Present address: [†]Department of Biology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, United States; [‡]Touro College of Osteopathic Medicine, Middletown, NY 10940, United States; [§]Integra LifeSciences, Princeton, NJ 08540, United States; [#]Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, United States; [¶]Arcadia Science, Berkeley, CA 94704, United States.

Competing interest: David Q. Matus and Neha Somineni are paid employees of Arcadia Science and Integra LifeSciences, respectively.

Abstract

A growing body of evidence suggests that cell division and basement membrane invasion are mutually exclusive cellular behaviors. How cells switch between proliferative and invasive states is not well understood. Here, we investigated this dichotomy *in vivo* by examining two cell types in the developing *Caenorhabditis elegans* somatic gonad that derive from equipotent progenitors, but exhibit distinct cell behaviors: the post-mitotic, invasive anchor cell and the neighboring proliferative, non-invasive ventral uterine (VU) cells. We show that the fates of these cells post-specification are more plastic than previously appreciated and that levels of NHR-67 are important for discriminating between invasive and proliferative behavior. Transcription of *nhr-67* is downregulated following post-translational degradation of its direct upstream regulator, HLH-2 (E/Daughterless) in VU cells. In the nuclei of VU cells, residual NHR-67 protein is compartmentalized into discrete punctae that are dynamic over the cell cycle and exhibit liquid-like properties. By screening for proteins that colocalize with NHR-67 punctae, we identified new regulators of uterine cell fate maintenance: homologs of the transcriptional co-repressor Groucho (UNC-37 and LSY-22), as well as the TCF/LEF homolog POP-1. We propose a model in which association of NHR-67 with the Groucho/TCF complex suppresses the default invasive state in non-invasive cells, which complements transcriptional regulation to add robustness to the proliferative-invasive cellular switch *in vivo*.

Introduction

Cellular proliferation and invasion are key aspects of development (reviewed in Medwig & Matus, 2017), and are also two of the defining hallmarks of cancer (reviewed in Hanahan and Weinberg, 2000). A growing body of evidence suggests that cell cycle progression and invasion through a basement membrane are mutually exclusive cellular behaviors in both development and disease states (reviewed in Kohrman and Matus, 2017). Switching between invasive and proliferative phenotypes has been observed in melanoma and recently in breast cancer (Hoek et al., 2008; Mondal et al., 2021), but

how these cell states are regulated in the context of development is not well

understood. To investigate how this dichotomy in cellular behavior is controlled *in vivo*,

we used *C. elegans*, leveraging its highly stereotypical development (Sulston and

Horvitz, 1977), as well as its genetic and optical tractability. During development of the

hermaphroditic reproductive system, the proximal granddaughters of the Z1 and Z4

somatic gonad progenitors, Z1.pp and Z4.aa, give rise to four cells that will adopt one of

two cellular fates: a proliferative ventral uterine (VU) cell or the terminally differentiated,

invasive anchor cell (AC) (Figure 1A) (Kimble and Hirsh, 1979). The distal cells of this

competency group, Z1.ppa and Z4.aap, quickly lose their bipotentiality and become VU

cells (Seydoux et al., 1990). In contrast, the proximal cells, Z1.ppp and Z4.aaa, undergo

a stochastic Notch-mediated cell fate decision, giving rise to another VU cell and the

post-mitotic AC (Figure 1A,B) (Greenwald et al., 1983; Seydoux and Greenwald, 1989).

Following fate specification, the AC undergoes invasive differentiation and breaches the

underlying basement membrane, connecting the uterus to the vulval epithelium to

facilitate egg-laying (Figure 1B) (Sherwood and Sternberg, 2003). The AC is the default

cell fate of the somatic gonad, as disruption of Notch or Wnt signaling results in ectopic

AC specification (Phillips et al., 2007; Seydoux and Greenwald, 1989). Therefore, AC

fate must be actively repressed.

Our previous work has shown that AC invasion is dependent on G_0 cell cycle

arrest, which is coordinated by the pro-invasive transcription factor NHR-67

(NR2E1/TLX) (Figure 1–figure supplement 1A) (Matus et al., 2015). NHR-67 functions

within a gene regulatory network comprised of four conserved transcription factors

whose homologs have been implicated in several types of metastatic cancer (Liang and

Wang, 2020; Milde-Langosch, 2005; Nelson et al., 2021; Wang and Baker, 2015). We

previously reported that NHR-67 is regulated by a feed-forward loop formed by EGL-43

(Evi1) and HLH-2 (E/Daughterless), which functions largely in parallel to a cell cycle-

independent subcircuit controlled by FOS-1 (Fos) (Figure 1–figure supplement 1A)

(Medwig-Kinney et al., 2020). EGL-43, HLH-2, and NHR-67 are reiteratively used within

the Z lineage of the somatic gonad, in that they also function to independently regulate

LIN-12 (Notch) signaling during the initial AC/VU cell fate decision (Medwig-Kinney et

al., 2020). Despite its role in lateral inhibition between Z1.ppp and Z4.aaa, expression of

LIN-12 is not absolutely required for VU cell fate (Sallee et al., 2015). Cell cycle state

also cannot explain the difference between AC and VU cell fates, as arresting VU cells

in G_0 through ectopic expression of CKI-1 (p21/p27) does not make them invasive

(Smith et al., 2022). Thus, the mechanisms responsible for maintaining AC and VU

cellular identities following initial cell fate specification remain unclear.

Maintenance of differentiated cell identity is essential for ensuring tissue integrity

during development and homeostasis, and the inability to restrict phenotypic plasticity is

now being recognized as an integral part of cancer pathogenesis (Hanahan, 2022). *In*

vitro studies have identified several factors that safeguard differentiated cell identity

(reviewed in Brumbaugh et al., 2019). Despite its largely autonomous modality of

development, *C. elegans* has emerged as an ideal model system to study cell fate

maintenance *in vivo*. There have been several reports of cell fate transformations that

occur naturally, including two epithelial-to-neural transdifferentiation events (Jarriault et

al., 2008; Riva et al., 2022), or following fate challenges (reviewed in Rothman and

Jarriault, 2019). In such contexts, several epigenetic factors, including chromatin

remodelers and histone chaperones, have been identified for their roles in restricting

cell fate reprogramming (Hajduskova et al., 2019; Kagias et al., 2012; Kolundzic et al.,

2018; Patel et al., 2012; Rahe and Hobert, 2019; Zuryn et al., 2014). However, in some

cases, ectopic expression of a specific transcription factor is sufficient to overcome

these barriers, as was first shown through pioneering work in mouse embryonic

fibroblasts (Davis et al., 1987). Indeed, there are several examples in *C. elegans* where

ectopic expression of single lineage-specific transcription factors induces cell fate

transformations (Fukushige and Krause, 2005; Gilleard and McGhee, 2001; Horner et

al., 1998; Jin et al., 1994; Kiefer et al., 2007; Quintin et al., 2001; Richard et al., 2011;

Riddle et al., 2013; Tursun et al., 2011; Zhu et al., 1998). Moreover, *C. elegans* uterine

tissue may be particularly amenable to fate transformations, as ectopic expression of a

single GATA transcription factor, ELT-7, is sufficient to induce transorganogenesis of

the somatic gonad into gut by reprogramming the mesodermally-derived tissue into

endoderm (Riddle et al., 2016). Valuable insights have been made into how the function

of fate-specifying transcription factors can be tuned through means such as

autoregulation and dynamic heterodimerization (Leyva-Díaz and Hobert, 2019; Sallee et

al., 2017). We are just beginning to understand how an additional layer of control over

transcriptional regulators can be achieved through compartmentalization (Boija et al.,

2018; Lim and Levine, 2021).

Here, in our endeavor to understand how AC and VU cellular fates are

maintained, we identified two mechanisms that together modulate the invasive-

proliferative switch in *C. elegans*. We found that high levels of NHR-67 expression are

sufficient to drive invasive differentiation, and that *nhr-67* is transcriptionally

downregulated in the non-invasive VU cells following the post-translational degradation

of its direct upstream regulator, HLH-2. Additionally, we observed that remaining NHR-

67 protein in the VU cells compartmentalizes into punctae that exhibit liquid-like

properties including dynamic assembly, fusion, and dissolution over cell cycle as well as

rapid recovery kinetics after photobleaching. These NHR-67 punctae colocalize *in vivo*

with UNC-37 and LSY-22, homologs of the transcriptional co-repressor Groucho, as

well as with POP-1 (TCF/LEF), which is likely mediated through a direct interaction

between UNC-37 and the intrinsically disordered C-terminal region of NHR-67. Through

functional perturbations, we demonstrate that UNC-37, LSY-22, and POP-1 contribute

to repression of the default invasive state in VU cells. We propose a model in which

NHR-67 compartmentalizes through its interaction with Groucho, which, combined with

transcriptional downregulation of *nhr-67*, may suppress invasive differentiation.

<u>**Results**</u>

NHR-67 expression levels are important for distinguishing AC and VU cell identity

Despite arising from initially equipotent cells, the differentiated AC and VU cells

exhibit very distinct cellular behaviors. The AC terminally differentiates to invade the

underlying basement membrane while the VU cells remain proliferative, undergoing

several rounds of division before terminally differentiating. One potential explanation for

this difference in cell behavior is asymmetric expression of pro-invasive transcription

factors. To investigate this possibility, we examined endogenous expression levels of

four transcription factors that function in the gene regulatory network coordinating AC

invasion (EGL-43, FOS-1, HLH-2, and NHR-67) using GFP-tagged alleles (Medwig-

Kinney et al., 2020). While FOS-1 levels are enriched in the AC compared to the VU

cells (Figure 1–figure supplement 1B,C), FOS-1 has no known role in cell cycle

regulation, so we did not pursue this protein further (Medwig-Kinney et al., 2021). EGL-

43 was also not a promising candidate, as it is expressed in both cell types at

comparable levels, with VU cells exhibiting approximately 89% of AC expression (Figure

1–figure supplement 1B,C). In contrast, HLH-2 exhibits significant asymmetry in

expression, as VU cells express merely 17% of HLH-2 levels observed in the AC

(Figure 1C,D). Previous studies have shown that dimerization-driven degradation of

HLH-2 is responsible for its downregulation in the VU cells (Benavidez et al., 2022; Karp

and Greenwald, 2003; Sallee and Greenwald, 2015). NHR-67 exhibits a similar pattern

of expression with over three-fold enrichment in the AC, consistent with prior

observations of transgenic reporters (Figure 1C,D) (Verghese et al., 2011). Given the

known role of NHR-67 in regulating cell cycle and invasion, we hypothesized that its

differential expression between the AC and VU cells could contribute to their distinct

cellular behaviors.

To assess the potential role of NHR-67 in regulating uterine cell identities, we

manipulated its expression levels. We found that strong depletion of NHR-67 through

RNA interference (RNAi) treatment results in ACs adopting VU-like characteristics.

During AC/VU cell fate specification, LIN-12 (Notch) normally becomes restricted to the

VU cells while the Delta-like ligand LAG-2 (visualized by LAG-

2::P2A::H2B::mTurquoise2 (Medwig-Kinney et al., 2022)) accumulates in the AC

(Wilkinson et al., 1994). Here, we observe that NHR-67 deficient ACs not only

proliferated and failed to invade, as reported previously (Matus et al., 2015), but also

ectopically expressed membrane-localized Notch (visualized by LIN-12::mNeonGreen

(Pani et al., 2022)) (Figure 1E; Figure 1–figure supplement 2A,B). Notably, NHR-67-

deficient ACs expressed both LIN-12 and LAG-2, potentially indicating an intermediate

state between AC and VU cell fate (Figure 1E; Figure 1–figure supplement 2A,B). Next,

we ectopically expressed NHR-67 ubiquitously following AC/VU specification using a

heat shock inducible transgene (*hsp*::NHR-67::2x-BFP) (Medwig-Kinney et al., 2020)

and observed the presence of multiple invasive ACs at a low penetrance (approximately

5%, n > 50), denoted by ectopic expression of an AC marker (*cdh-*

3p::mCherry::moeABD) and expansion of the basement membrane gap (Figure 1F). As

previous work has demonstrated that proliferative ACs cannot invade (Matus et al.,

2015), we concluded that these invasive ectopic ACs most likely arose from fate

conversion of neighboring VU cells. Taken together, these pieces of evidence suggest

that high and low levels of NHR-67 correlate to properties of AC and VU cell identities,

respectively (Figure 1G).

NHR-67 is enriched in the AC through transcriptional regulation by HLH-2

Next, we investigated how NHR-67 expression levels become asymmetric

between the AC and VU cells. We and others have previously shown that HLH-2

positively regulates NHR-67 expression in the context of the AC (Figure 1–figure

supplement 1A) (Bodofsky et al., 2018; Medwig-Kinney et al., 2020). If this regulatory

interaction also exists in the context of the VU cells, it could explain why the relative

expression pattern of NHR-67 in the AC and VU cells mirrors that of HLH-2. In support

of this hypothesis, we found that initial onset of HLH-2, which has shown to be

asymmetric in Z1.pp and Z4.aa (Attner et al., 2019), correlates to that of NHR-67 onset

(Figure 2–figure supplement 1A). To test whether HLH-2 degradation is responsible for

NHR-67 downregulation in the VU, we drove ectopic expression of HLH-2 using a

transgene under the control of a heat shock inducible promoter (*hsp*::HLH-2::2x-BFP)

(Medwig-Kinney et al., 2020) and observed elevated NHR-67 expression in VU cells

(43% increase; n > 30) (Figure 2A,B). To control against potential dimerization-driven

degradation of HLH-2 in the VU cells, which the heat shock inducible transgene would

still be susceptible to, we disrupted UBA-1, an E1 ubiquitin-activating enzyme that has

recently been shown to be necessary for HLH-2 degradation in VU cells (Benavidez et

al., 2022). Following perturbation of UBA-1 through RNAi treatment, HLH-2 expression

in the VU cells increased more than four-fold and NHR-67 expression increased by

nearly 60% compared to the empty vector control (Figure 2–figure supplement 1B-D).

Both experiments suggest that *nhr-67* expression in the VU cells is at least partially

regulated by levels of HLH-2.

It has previously been proposed that the interaction between HLH-2 and *nhr*-67

is direct. This is based on the identification of E binding motifs within a 276 bp region of

the *nhr-67* promoter that is required for NHR-67 expression in the uterine tissue and

encompasses the location of several hypomorphic mutations (*pf2*, *pf88*, *pf159*) (Figure

2C) (Bodofsky et al., 2018; Verghese et al., 2011). We performed a yeast one-hybrid

assay by generating a bait strain containing this *nhr-67* promoter region and pairing it

with an HLH-2 Gal4-AD prey plasmid from an existing yeast one-hybrid library (Reece-

Hoyes et al., 2005). Yeast growth on the selective SC-HIS-TRP plates containing the

competitive inhibitor 3-aminotriazole (3-AT) suggests that HLH-2 is capable of binding

directly to this 276 bp region of the *nhr-67* promoter (Figure 2D). Together, these results

support that direct transcriptional regulation of *nhr-67* by HLH-2 contributes to the

asymmetry in NHR-67 expression between the AC and VU cells.

NHR-67 dynamically compartmentalizes in VU cell nuclei

Upon closer examination of GFP-tagged NHR-67, it became evident that the AC

and VU cells not only exhibit differences in overall NHR-67 levels, but also in

localization of the protein. While NHR-67 localization is fairly uniform throughout the AC

nucleus (excluding the nucleolus), we often observed discrete punctae throughout the

nuclei of VU cells (Figure 3A,B). These punctae were observed with NHR-67

endogenously tagged with several different fluorescent proteins, including GFP,

mNeonGreen, mScarlet-I, and TagRFP-T (Figure 3–figure supplement 1A,B) and in the

absence of tissue fixation methods that can cause artificial puncta (Irgen-Gioro et al.,

2022), suggesting that they are not an artifact of the fluorophore or sample preparation.

To characterize dynamics of these punctae during interphase states of the cell

cycle, we paired GFP-tagged NHR-67 with a CDK activity sensor. The CDK activity

sensor is comprised of a fragment of DNA Helicase B (DHB) fused to a fluorophore (2x-

mKate2), expressed under a ubiquitous promoter (Figure 3C) (Adikes et al., 2020). DHB

contains a strong nuclear localization signal (NLS), flanked by four serine sites, as well

as a weaker nuclear export signal (NES). As CDK activity increases over the cell cycle,

the CDK sensor is translocated from the nucleus to the cytoplasm, allowing for

correlation of its relative subcellular localization to cell cycle state (Figure 3C) (Adikes et

al., 2020; Spencer et al., 2013). Time-lapse microscopy revealed that the number of

NHR-67 punctae was dynamic over the course of the cell cycle, with punctae first

appearing shortly after mitotic exit in the G1 phase, and then reducing in number to two

large punctae prior to nuclear envelope breakdown before disappearing (Figure 3D,E).

We collected additional recordings with finer time resolution and captured fusion, or

condensation, of punctae prior to their dissolution (representative of 6 biological

replicates) (Figure 3F). These punctae also exhibit relatively rapid diffusion kinetics, as

observed by fluorescence recovery following photobleaching ($t_{1/2}$ = 46 seconds; n = 8)

at a rate within the same order of magnitude as P granule proteins PGL-1 and PGL-3

(Figure 3G,H) (Putnam et al., 2019).

Groucho homologs UNC-37 and LSY-22 associate with NHR-67 punctae and

contribute to VU cell fate

Next, we tested the extent to which NHR-67 punctae colocalize with homologs of

other proteins known to compartmentalize in nuclei by pairing GFP- and mScarlet-I-

tagged NHR-67 with other endogenously tagged alleles. As NHR-67 is a transcription

factor, we speculated that its punctae may represent clustering around sites of active

transcription, which would be consistent with data showing RNA Polymerase II and the

Mediator complex can compartmentalize with transcription factors (Cho et al., 2018). To

test this hypothesis, we co-visualized NHR-67 with a GFP-tagged allele of *ama-1*, the

amanitin-binding subunit of RNA polymerase II (Hills-Muckey et al., 2021) and failed to

observe significant colocalization between NHR-67 and AMA-1 punctae (Manders'

overlap coefficient, M = 0.066) compared to negative controls where a single channel

was compared to its 90-degree rotation (M = 0.108) (Figure 4A,B). Another possibility

considered is that NHR-67 punctae could correlate to chromatin organization, as

heterochromatin has been shown to be compartmentalized in the nucleus (Larson et al.,

2017; Strom et al., 2017). However, we did not observe significant colocalization of

NHR-67 with the endogenously tagged HP1 heterochromatin proteins (Patel and

Hobert, 2017) HPL-1 (M = 0.076) or HPL-2 (M = 0.083) (Figure 4A,B). We next tested if

NHR-67 colocalizes with the transcriptional co-repressor Groucho, as Groucho had

recently been shown to compartmentalize in the nuclei of cells in *Ciona* (Treen et al.,

2021). The *C. elegans* genome encodes one Groucho homolog, UNC-37, which we

acquired an mNeonGreen-tagged allele of (Ma et al., 2021), and a Groucho-like protein,

LSY-22, which we tagged with TagRFP-T (Figure 4–figure supplement 1). We observed significant colocalization of NHR-67 punctae with both LSY-22 (M = 0.686) and UNC-37 (M = 0.741), comparable to colocalization measures in heterozygous NHR-67::mScarlet-I/NHR-67::GFP animals (M = 0.651), which were used as positive controls (Figure 4A,B). This evidence suggests that NHR-67 punctae do not localize to sites of active transcription or chromatin compaction, but instead associate with transcriptional co-repressors.

Since the AC is the default state of the AC/VU cell fate decision (Seydoux and Greenwald, 1989), we hypothesized that the punctae including NHR-67, UNC-37, and LSY-22 may function in repressing invasive differentiation. To test this hypothesis, we depleted UNC-37 and LSY-22 utilizing the auxin inducible degron (AID) protein degradation system, in which a protein of interest is tagged with an AID that is recognized by TIR1 in the presence of auxin and ubiquitinated by the SCF E3 ubiquitin ligase complex (Figure 4C) (Martinez et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2015). We re-tagged LSY-22 with mNeonGreen::AID (Figure 4–figure supplement 1) and acquired a BFP::AID-tagged allele of *unc-37* (Kurashina et al., 2021). Each AID-tagged allele was paired with a transgene encoding *Arabidopsis thaliana* TIR1 ($_{At}$TIR1) that was co-expressed with a nuclear-localized mCherry::HIS-11. Following auxin treatment, we observed ectopic expression of an AC marker (*cdh-3p*::mCherry::moeABD) in 28% of LSY-22::AID animals and 59% of UNC-37::AID animals (n = 64 for both) (Figure 4D,E). These results are consistent with phenotypes we observed in genetic backgrounds with *unc-37* hypomorphic (*unc-37(e262wd26)*) and null (*unc-37(wd17wd22)*) mutant alleles (Figure 4–figure supplement 2). It is likely that dual depletion of UNC-37 and LSY-22 would result in a higher penetrance of ectopic ACs given their partial redundancy in function (Flowers et al., 2010), but animals possessing both AID-tagged alleles were not viable when paired with the $_{At}$TIR1 transgene.

TCF/LEF homolog POP-1 associates with NHR-67 punctae and contributes to VU cell fate post-specification

While UNC-37 and LSY-22 appear to be important for maintenance of normal uterine cell fates, both genes are broadly expressed and exhibit comparable levels

(<10% difference) between the AC and VU cells (Figure 5A,C; Figure 5–figure

supplement 1A,B); therefore, we hypothesized that another factor must be involved. It

had previously been reported that the sole TCF/LEF homolog in *C. elegans*, POP-1,

forms a repressive complex with UNC-37 in the early embryo to restrict expression of

the endoderm-determining gene, END-1 (Calvo et al., 2001). Additionally, POP-1 has a

known role in development of the somatic gonad, as perturbing its function results in

ectopic ACs (Siegfried and Kimble, 2002). Examination of an eGFP-tagged *pop-1* allele

(van der Horst et al., 2019), showed significant enrichment in the VU cells (>20%)

compared to the AC (Figure 5B,C; Figure 5–figure supplement 1A,B). We also observed

that endogenous POP-1 forms punctae in the nuclei of VU cells, which had previously

been observed during interphase in non-Wnt signaled embryonic cells (Maduro et al.,

2002). These POP-1 punctae colocalize with NHR-67 (M = 0.547), although to a lesser

degree than UNC-37 and LSY-22, likely because the strong POP-1 fluorescence

outside of punctae made them more difficult to segment (Figure 5D,E). Additionally, *nhr-*

67(RNAi) treatment resulted in a significant increase in AC expression of eGFP::POP-1

compared to empty vector controls (225%, n > 30), a pattern we observed following

depletion of other transcription factors (Medwig-Kinney et al., 2020) and chromatin

modifiers (Smith et al., 2022) required for AC arrest and invasion (Figure 5F,G; Figure

5–figure supplement 2A,B). This negative regulation of POP-1 by NHR-67 may explain

why the proteins have opposite patterns of enrichment.

It has previously been suggested that POP-1 may be functioning as an activator

in the VU precursors Z1.ppa and Z4.aap based on the relative expression of a POP-1

transgene (Sallee et al., 2015). This view is largely dependent on the notion that high

levels of POP-1 correlate to repressive function and low levels are conducive for

activator roles (Shetty et al., 2005). In contrast, we did not find evidence of

transcriptional activation by POP-1 in the AC/VU precursors nor their differentiated

descendants using an established POPTOP (POP-1 and TCF optimal promoter)

reporter, which contains seven copies of POP-1/TCF binding sites and the *pes-10*

minimal promoter (Figure 5H; Figure 5–figure supplement 3A,B) (Green et al., 2008).

The growing consensus regarding the Wnt/β-catenin asymmetry pathway is that relative

levels of POP-1 and β-catenin are more important than absolute protein levels of POP-1

(Phillips and Kimble, 2009). Our proposed model of POP-1 acting as a repressor in the

proximal gonad is consistent with the finding that SYS-1 (β-catenin) expression is

restricted to the distal gonad early in somatic gonad development and is not detectable

in the AC or VU cells (Figure 5–figure supplement 3C) (Phillips et al., 2007; Sallee et al.,

2015). It is also supported by recent evidence suggesting that UNC-37/LSY-22 mutant

alleles phenocopy *pop-1* knockdown, which produces ectopic distal tip cells (Bekas and

Phillips, 2022).

One aspect that makes studying the repressive role of POP-1 in cell fate

maintenance challenging is that its activator function is required for distal cell fate

specification in the somatic gonad earlier in development. Loss of either POP-1 and

SYS-1 results in a Sys (symmetrical sister cell) phenotype, where all somatic gonad

cells adopt the default proximal fate and thereby give rise to ectopic ACs (Siegfried and

Kimble, 2002; Siegfried et al., 2004). This likely occluded previous identification of the

potential repressive role of POP-1 in maintaining VU cell fates. To achieve temporal

control over POP-1 expression to tease apart its roles, we sought to use the AID

system, but insertion of the degron into the *pop-1* locus disrupted the protein's function.

Instead, we paired eGFP-tagged POP-1 with a uterine-specific anti-GFP nanobody

(Smith et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2017). The anti-GFP nanobody is fused to ZIF-1 and

serves as an adapter, recognizing GFP-tagged proteins and promoting their

ubiquitination by the Cullin2-based E3 ubiquitin ligase, which ultimately targets them for

degradation via the proteasome (Figure 6–figure supplement 1A) (Wang et al., 2017).

This anti-GFP nanobody, visualized by nuclear expression of mCherry, was not

detectable prior to or even shortly after the AC/VU cell fate decision, which allowed us

to bypass disruption of initial cell specification (Figure 6–figure supplement 1B). While

this method only produced a mild knockdown of POP-1 in the VU cells, we still observed

the ectopic AC phenotype at low penetrance (7%, n = 60) (Figure 6–figure supplement

1C). To achieve stronger depletion, we used RNAi for further POP-1 perturbations.

To interrogate the phenotypic consequences of POP-1 perturbation, we utilized a

strain expressing two markers of AC fate (*cdh-3p*::mCherry::moeABD and LAG-

2::P2A::H2B::mTurquoise2). Following treatment with *pop-1(RNAi)*, we observed

several animals with two or more bright *cdh-3/lag-2*+ ACs, consistent with known

phenotypes caused by cell fate misspecification in the somatic gonad (17%, n = 30)

(Figure 6A). We also observed animals with invasive cells that express AC markers at

different levels (53%, n = 30), suggesting that the cells did not adopt AC fate at the

same time (Figure 6A). To test whether the subset of dim *cdh-3/lag-2*+ ACs are the

result of VU-to-AC cell fate conversion, we visualized AC and VU fates simultaneously

using the AC markers previously described along with an mNeonGreen-tagged allele of

lag-1 (CSL), a protein downstream of Notch signaling whose expression becomes

restricted to the VU cells following AC/VU cell fate specification. Following treatment

with *pop-1(RNAi)*, we found that a subset of ectopic ACs co-express AC markers and

LAG-1, likely indicating an intermediate state between the two cell types (Figure 6–

figure supplement 2). To visualize this process live, we used time-lapse microscopy and

were able to capture ectopic ACs gradually upregulating LAG-2 (+51%, n = 3) and

downregulating LAG-1 (-16%, n = 3) over time (Figure 6B,C), consistent with VU-to-AC

cell fate conversion.

IDR of NHR-67 facilitates protein-protein interaction with UNC-37

Given that UNC-37, LSY-22, and POP-1 phenocopy each other with respect to

AC/VU fates and all three colocalize with NHR-67 punctae, we next sought to further

characterize the interactions among these proteins. Previous work has either directly

identified or predicted protein-protein interactions among POP-1, UNC-37, and LSY-22

(Boxem et al., 2008; Calvo et al., 2001; Flowers et al., 2010; Reece-Hoyes et al., 2005;

Simonis et al., 2009; Zhong and Sternberg, 2006). Using a yeast two-hybrid assay with

UNC-37 Gal4-AD prey, we confirmed that UNC-37 directly interacts with both POP-1

and LSY-22 after observing yeast growth on the selective SC-HIS-TRP-LEU plates

containing 3-AT (Figure 7–figure supplement 1). Using the same technique, we found

that NHR-67 binds directly to UNC-37, as previously predicted (Li et al., 2004; Simonis

et al., 2009), but found no evidence of it directly interacting with LSY-22 or POP-1

(Figure 7–figure supplement 1).

To further characterize the protein-protein interaction between NHR-67 and

UNC-37, we assessed the protein structure of NHR-67 using AlphaFold, an artificial

intelligence-based protein structure prediction tool (Jumper et al., 2021; Varadi et al.,

2022), and PONDR, a predictor of intrinsic disorder (Peng and Zhang, 2006). Both

identify an intrinsically disordered region (IDR) at the C-terminus of NHR-67 (Figure

7A,B). IDRs are low complexity domains that lack fixed three-dimensional structure and

have been shown to support dynamic protein-protein interactions (Chong et al., 2018).

To determine if the IDR of NHR-67 is important for facilitating its interaction with UNC-

37, we repeated the yeast two-hybrid experiment using UNC-37 Gal4-AD prey, pairing it

with different fragments of the NHR-67 protein: full-length, without its IDR (ΔIDR), and

its IDR alone (Figure 7C,D). Yeast growth on the selective SC-HIS-TRP-LEU plates

containing the competitive inhibitor 3-aminotriazole (3-AT) demonstrates that the 108

amino acid IDR sequence of NHR-67 is necessary and sufficient to bind with UNC-37

(Figure 7C,D).

Thus, we propose the following potential model of *C. elegans* uterine cell fate

maintenance based on the data presented here and known roles of Groucho and TCF

proteins in regulating transcription . First, transcription of *nhr-67* is directly regulated by

HLH-2, resulting in its enrichment in the AC compared to the VU cells. In the AC, where

NHR-67 levels are high and POP-1 is repressed, NHR-67 is free to activate genes

promoting invasive differentiation. In the VU cells, where NHR-67 levels are low and

POP-1 levels are high, POP-1 assembles with LSY-22, UNC-37, and NHR-67, either

directly repressing NHR-67 targets or sequestering NHR-67 away from its targets

(Figure 7E). It is possible that POP-1 negatively regulates NHR-67 at the transcriptional

level as well, as the *nhr-67* promoter contains 7 putative TCF binding sites (Zacharias et

al., 2015).

Discussion

In summary, here we provide evidence that activity of the pro-invasive

transcription factor, NHR-67, is simultaneously regulated by two distinct processes,

which together modulate the proliferative-invasive switch in *C. elegans*. We show that

NHR-67 is a potent fate-specifying transcription factor, in that its expression is sufficient

for invasive differentiation of ACs in the somatic gonad. The compartmentalization of

NHR-67 in the VU cells could serve as a potential mechanism to suppress its function in

activating the pro-invasive program. We also discovered that NHR-67 forms nuclear foci

in non-invasive cells, which exhibit liquid-like properties, indicated by observations of

their condensation, dissolution, and relatively rapid recovery from photobleaching,

similar to what has been described with P granules (Brangwynne et al., 2009). These

NHR-67 punctae associate with Groucho homologs, UNC-37 and LSY-22, likely through

a direct protein-protein interaction with UNC-37 mediated by the C-terminal IDR of

NHR-67. We postulate that this association leads to protein condensation, as has

recently been described in *Ciona* embryos (Treen et al., 2021). Furthermore, repression

of the default invasive state appears to be dependent on expression of the TCF/LEF

homolog POP-1, which clarifies our understanding of the dual roles this protein plays

during development of the somatic gonad. It is also interesting to note that the dynamic

punctae formed by POP-1 in non-Wnt signaled cells was first described 20 years ago

(Maduro et al., 2002), but their function are only now being appreciated in light of recent

advances in our understanding of the formation of higher order associations in the

nucleus.

With regard to protein compartmentalization in the nucleus, most research has

been through the lens of transcriptional activation through RNA Polymerase II and the

mediator complex (Boija et al., 2018; Cho et al., 2018; Sabari et al., 2018) or repression

through HP1 heterochromatin proteins (Larson et al., 2017; Strom et al., 2017). Here we

report the second observed case of compartmentalization of Groucho proteins (Treen et

al., 2021), which may suggest that Groucho proteins have evolutionarily conserved

roles that require this type of subnuclear organization.

Still, as this is one of the first studies into compartmentalization of transcriptional

repressors *in vivo*, there is much left to learn. For example, it is unknown whether DNA

binding is necessary for nuclear puncta formation. The interaction between UNC-37 and

NHR-67 does not appear to depend on DNA binding, as the C-terminal IDR region of

NHR-67 (excluding its zinc finger domains) was sufficient for binding with UNC-37 *in*

vitro, but it is possible that DNA binding is needed for oligomerization *in vivo*.

Furthermore, it remains unclear if suppression of invasive differentiation is achieved by

simply sequestering the pro-invasive transcription factor NHR-67 away from its

transcriptional targets or through direct repression of transcription. If the latter, another

465 question that arises is how the repressive complex gets recruited to specific genomic

466 sites, since POP-1 and NHR-67 are both capable of binding to DNA, and whether

467 repression is achieved through competition with transcriptional activators or recruitment

468 of histone deacetylases. Direct targets of NHR-67 have not yet been discovered, which

469 makes it difficult to investigate this specific aspect of the repressive mechanism at

470 present. We see this as a promising avenue of future study as technologies advance,

471 allowing for transcriptional profiling and target identification in specific tissues or cells

472 (Gómez-Saldivar et al., 2020; Katsanos and Barkoulas, 2022).

473   In this work, we have also identified several perturbations (i.e., increasing levels

474 of NHR-67, decreasing levels of UNC-37/LSY-22) that result in incompletely penetrant

475 transdifferentiation phenotypes and/or intermediate cell fates. We foresee these being

476 ideal cell fate challenge backgrounds in which to perform screens to identify regulators

477 of cellular plasticity, as has been done in other contexts (Rahe and Hobert, 2019).

478 Additionally, these induced fate transformations can be paired with tools to visualize and

479 manipulate cell cycle (Adikes et al., 2020) to determine if any cell cycle state is

480 particularly permissive for cell fate plasticity. While G1 arrest has been shown to

481 enhance conversion of human fibroblasts to dopaminergic neurons (Jiang et al., 2015),

482 mitosis is required for the natural K-to-DVB transdifferentiation event in *C. elegans* (Riva

483 et al., 2022). As control of proliferation and invasion, as well as maintenance of

484 differentiated cellular identities, are important for both homeostatic and disease states, it

485 is our hope that this work will shed light on how cells switch between these states in the

486 context of cancer growth and metastasis.

488 **Materials and methods**

490 *C. elegans* **strains, culture, and nomenclature**

491   Methods for *C. elegans* culture and genetics were followed as previously

492 described (Brenner, 1974). Developmental synchronization for experiments was

493 achieved through alkaline hypochlorite treatment of gravid adults to isolate eggs (Porta-

494 de-la-Riva et al., 2012). L1 stage animals were plated on nematode growth media

495 plates and subsequently cultured at 20°C or 25°C. Heat shock-inducible transgenes

were activated by incubating animals on plates sealed with Parafilm in a 33°C water

bath for 2-3 hours. In the text and in figures, promoter sequences are designated with a

"*p*" following the gene name and gene fusions are represented by a double-colon (::)

symbol.

CRISPR/Cas9 injections

New alleles and single-copy transgenes were generated by homology directed

repair using CRISPR-based genome engineering. mScarlet::AID and mNeonGreen::AID

were inserted into the C-terminus of the *nhr-67* locus by injecting adult germlines with

Cas9 guide-RNA ribonucleoprotein complexes and short single-stranded

oligodeoxynucleotide donors, as previously described (Ghanta and Mello, 2020).

Successful integration was identified through screening for fluorescence and by PCR.

The *lsy-22* locus was edited by injecting a Cas9 guide RNA plasmid and repair template

plasmid containing a self-excising cassette with selectable markers to facilitate

screening (Dickinson et al., 2015; Dickinson and Goldstein, 2016; Huang et al., 2021).

Repair templates used to tag *lsy-22* with TagRFP-T::AID and mNeonGreen::AID were

generated by cloning ~750-850 bp homology arms into pTNM063 and pDD312,

respectively (Ashley et al., 2021; Dickinson et al., 2015). All guide and repair sequences

used can be found in Supplementary File 1.

Existing alleles

The GFP-tagged alleles of the pro-invasive transcription factors *(egl-43, fos-1,*

hlh-2, and *nhr-67)* and the TagRFP-T::AID-tagged *nhr-67* allele were generated in

preceding work (Medwig-Kinney et al., 2021, 2020). Recent micropublications describe

the P2A::H2B::mTurquoise2-tagged *lag-2* and mNeonGreen-tagged *lin-12* alleles used

in this study (Medwig-Kinney et al., 2022; Pani et al., 2022). The eGFP-tagged *pop-1*

allele and POPTOP reporter were previously published (Green et al., 2008; van der

Horst et al., 2019), as were the AID::BFP and mNeonGreen tagged alleles of *unc-37*

(Kurashina et al., 2021; Ma et al., 2021). GFP-tagged *ama-1* (Hills-Muckey et al., 2021)

as well as mKate2-tagged *hpl-1* and *hpl-2* (Patel and Hobert, 2017) were also

disseminated in prior publications. The single-copy transgenes expressing the CDK

sensor and TIR1 variants under ubiquitously expressed ribosomal promoters (*rps-27*

and *rpl-28*, respectively) as well as the tissue-specific GFP-targeting nanobody are

described in previous work (Adikes et al., 2020; Hills-Muckey et al., 2021; Smith et al.,

2022; Wang et al., 2017) and are located at neutral genomic sites, ttTi4348 or ttTi5605

(Frøkjær-Jensen et al., 2013). The same is true for the heat shock inducible constructs

for HLH-2 and NHR-67 (Medwig-Kinney et al., 2020). The cadherin *(cdh-3)* anchor cell

reporter and basement membrane (laminin) markers have already been characterized

(Keeley et al., 2020; Matus et al., 2010). The following mutant alleles were obtained

from the *Caenorhabditis* Genetics Center: *unc-37(e262wd26)* and *unc-37(wd17wd22)*

(Pflugrad et al., 1997), the latter of which was maintained using the chromosome I/III

balancer *hT2* (McKim et al., 1993). The genotypes of all strains used in this study can

be found within the Key Resources Table.

Auxin inducible protein degradation

The auxin inducible degron (AID) system was used for strong depletion of

proteins of interest (Zhang et al., 2015). AID-tagged alleles were paired with the

Arabidopsis thaliana F-box protein, transport inhibitor response 1 ($_{At}$TIR1), and treated

with the water-soluble auxin 1-Naphthaleneacetic acid (K-NAA) at 1 mM concentration

(Martinez et al., 2020). Auxin was added to nematode growth media plates according to

previously published protocols (Martinez and Matus, 2020), which were then seeded

with OP50 *E. coli*. To achieve robust depletion, synchronized L1 stage animals were

directly plated on auxin plates.

RNA interference

The RNAi clones targeting *pop-1* and *uba-1* and the corresponding empty vector

control (L4440) were obtained from the Vidal library (Rual et al., 2004). The RNAi

constructs targeting the pro-invasive transcription factors (*egl-43*, *fos-1*, *hlh-2*, and *nhr-*

67) and chromatin modifiers (*pbrm-1*, *swsn-4*, and *swsn-8*) are derived from the highly

efficient RNAi vector T444T (Sturm et al., 2018) and were generated in preceding work

(Medwig-Kinney et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2022). To avoid known AC/VU cell fate

specification defects caused by *hlh-2* perturbations, synchronized animals were grown

on OP50 until the L2 stage when they were then shifted to *hlh-2* RNAi plates.

Live-cell imaging

With the exception of the FRAP experiments shown in Figure 3, all micrographs

were collected on a Hamamatsu Orca EM-CCD camera mounted on an upright Zeiss

AxioImager A2 with a Borealis-modified CSU10 Yokagawa spinning disk scan head

(Nobska Imaging) using 405 nm, 440 nm, 488 nm, 514 nm, and 561 nm Vortran lasers

in a VersaLase merge and a Plan-Apochromat 100×/1.4 (NA) Oil DIC objective.

MetaMorph software (Molecular Devices) was used for microscopy automation. Several

experiments were scored using epifluorescence visualized on a Zeiss Axiocam MRM

camera, also mounted on an upright Zeiss AxioImager A2 and a Plan-Apochromat

100×/1.4 (NA) Oil DIC objective. For static imaging, animals were mounted into a drop

of M9 on a 5% Noble agar pad containing approximately 10 mM sodium azide

anesthetic and topped with a coverslip. For long-term time-lapse imaging, animals were

first anesthetized in 5 mM levamisole diluted in M9 for approximately 20 minutes, then

transferred to a 5% Noble agar pad and topped with a coverslip sealed with VALAP

(Kelley et al., 2017). For short-term time-lapse imaging, the pre-anesthetization step

was omitted, and animals were transferred directly into a drop of 5 mM levamisole

solution on the slide.

Fluorescence recovery after photobleaching

FRAP experiments were performed using an Acal BFi UV Optimicroscan

photostimulation device mounted on a spinning disk confocal system consisting of a

Nikon Ti2 inverted microscope with Yokogawa CSU-W1 SoRa spinning disk. Data were

acquired using a Hamamatsu ORCA Fusion camera, 60x 1.27 NA water immersion

objection, SoRa disk, and 2.8x SoRa magnifier. Single plane images were collected

every 1 second.

Yeast one-hybrid

The 276 bp fragment of the *nhr-67* promoter (Bodofsky et al., 2018) was cloned

into the pMW2 vector, linearized by BamHI digestion. Linearized plasmid was

transformed into the Y1H yeast strain (as described in Reece-Hoyes and Walhout,

2018). Transformed yeast was plated on SC-HIS plates for three days before being

transformed with the HLH-2 Gal4-AD plasmid. Three colonies from each transformation

plate were streaked onto SC-HIS-TRP +3-aminotriazole (3-AT) plates. Protein-DNA

interactions were determined by visible growth on 3-AT conditions with negative growth

in empty vector controls after three days. Plates were imaged on a Fotodyne

FOTO/Analyst Investigator/FX darkroom imaging station.

Yeast two-hybrid

Plasmids containing target proteins fused to GAL-4 DNA-binding-domain + LEU

and GAL-4 Activation Domain + TRP were co-transformed into the pJ69-4a Y2H yeast

strain as previously described (Reece-Hoyes and Walhout, 2018). Transformed yeast

was plated on SC-TRP-LEU plates for three days. Three colonies from each

transformation plate were streaked onto SC-HIS-TRP-LEU 3-AT plates. Protein

interactions were determined by visible growth on 3-AT conditions with negative growth

in empty vector controls after three days. Plates were imaged as described in the

previous section.

Quantification of protein expression and cell cycle state

Image quantification was performed in Fiji/ImageJ (Schindelin et al., 2012).

Protein expression was quantified by drawing a region of interest and measuring the

mean gray value, then manually subtracting the mean gray value of a background

region of similar area to account for camera noise. For nuclear-localized proteins, the

region of interest was drawn around the nucleus. Membrane expression of LIN-12 was

measured by drawing a line (1.5 pixel thickness) along a cell's basolateral surface, to

distinguish between LIN-12 expression from the cell of interest and its neighbors. CDH-

3 expression was measured by drawing a region of interest around the cell membrane

excluding the nucleus (as the nuclear-localized TIR1 transgene was expressed in the

same channel). The CDK sensor was quantified as previously described (Adikes et al.,

2020). Following rolling ball subtraction (50 pixels), mean gray value is measured in a

region of interest drawn within the cytoplasm and one around the nucleus excluding the

nucleolus. The cytoplasmic-to-nuclear ratio correlates to CDK activity and is used to

assess cell cycle state (Adikes et al., 2020; Spencer et al., 2013). Movies were collected

by acquiring z-stacks at 5-minute intervals. Samples were time-aligned relative to

anaphase. Cells that did not undergo anaphase during the acquisition period were

aligned based on their DHB ratios. Animals that arrested in development (i.e., did not

show evidence of progressing through the cell cycle) were excluded from analysis.

Colocalization analyses

For colocalization analyses, single plane images were collected to avoid z drift

during acquisition and prevent photobleaching, which was often non-uniform between

red and green fluorophores. Micrographs were subject to background subtraction

(rolling ball radius = 50) followed by thresholding to segment punctae. Manders' overlap

coefficients (M) were calculated by measuring the extent that segmented punctae of

NHR-67 overlapped with that of other proteins using Just Another Colocalization Plugin

(JACoP) in Fiji/ImageJ (Bolte and Cordelières, 2006; Schindelin et al., 2012).

Heterozygous animals for *nhr-67*::mScarlet and *nhr-67*::GFP were used as positive

controls. These images were then re-analyzed following 90-degree rotation of one of the

two channels being compared, resulting in random colocalization that served as a

negative control.

Data visualization and statistical analyses

Representative images were processed using Fiji/ImageJ (Schindelin et al.,

2012). Heat maps were generated using the Fire lookup table. A power analysis was

performed prior to data collection to determine sample sizes (Cohen, 1992). Tests to

determine statistical significance of data were conducted in RStudio and plots were

generated using the R package ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016). Error bars represent the

mean ± standard deviation. Schematics of gene loci were generated using sequences

from WormBase (Harris et al., 2020) and the Exon-Intron Graphic Maker

(http://wormweb.org/exonintron). Figures were assembled in Adobe Illustrator.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Dr. Derek Applewhite and Aidan Teran for advice on quantification of protein colocalization. Additionally, we thank Chris Zhao for constructive comments on the manuscript. Some strains were provided by the Caenorhabditis Genetics Center, which is funded by NIH Office of Research Infrastructure Programs (P40 OD010440).

Additional information

Data and materials availability

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in the manuscript and supporting files. New strains that have not been deposited with the *Caenorhabditis* Genetics Center will be made available upon request.

Author ORCIDs

Taylor N. Medwig-Kinney, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7989-3291

Brian A. Kinney, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5628-1436

Michael A. Q. Martinez, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1178-7139

Callista Yee, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2928-492X

Sydney S. Sirota, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9990-3266

Angelina A. Mullarkey, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5830-5347

Neha Somineni, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5702-1695

Kang Shen, https://orcid.org/ 0000-0003-4059-8249

Christopher M. Hammell, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5961-0976

Ariel M. Pani, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9338-9750

David Q. Matus, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1570-5025

Figure legends (supplementary figure legends are indented)

Figure 1: Invasive AC fate correlates to high levels of NHR-67. (A) Schematic of *C.*

elegans anchor cell (AC, magenta) and ventral uterine (VU, blue) cell fate specification

from the Z1 and Z4 somatic gonad precursor cell lineages (p, posterior daughter; a,

anterior daughter). (B) Micrographs depicting AC and VU cell differentiation over

developmental time. AC/VU precursors express LAG-2 (H2B::mTurquoise), which

eventually becomes restricted to the AC, whereas VU cells express LAG-1

(mNeonGreen) post-specification. The differentiated AC (*cdh-3p*::mCherry::moeABD)

then invades through the underlying basement membrane (LAM-2::mNeonGreen). (C-

D) Representative heat map micrographs (C) and quantification (D) of GFP-tagged

HLH-2 and NHR-67 expression in the AC and VU cells at the time of AC invasion. (E)

Expression of Notch (*lin-12*::mNeonGreen) and Delta (*lag-2*::P2A::H2B::mTurquoise2)

following RNAi-induced knockdown of *nhr-67* compared to empty vector control. (F)

Micrographs depicting the ectopic invasive ACs (*cdh-3p*::mCherry::moeABD,

arrowheads) and expanded basement membrane (*laminin*::GFP, arrows) gap observed

following heat shock induced expression of NHR-67 (*hsp*::NHR-67::2x-BFP) compared

to non-heat shocked controls. (G) Schematic summarizing AC and VU cell fates that

result from perturbations of NHR-67 levels. For all figures: asterisk (*), AC/VU

precursor; plus (+), VU precursor; solid arrowhead, AC; open arrowhead, VU cell;

arrows, basement membrane breach. Statistical significance determined by Student's t-

test (*$p > 0.05$, **$p > 0.01$, ***$p > 0.001$). Scale bars, 5 μm.

Figure 1–figure supplement 1: Expression of pro-invasive transcription

factors EGL-43 and FOS-1 in the somatic gonad. (A) Schematic of the AC

pro-invasive gene regulatory network comprised of four transcription factors:

EGL-43, FOS-1, HLH-2, and NHR-67. (B-C) Representative heat-map

micrographs (B) and quantification (C) of GFP-tagged EGL-43 and FOS-1

expression in the AC and VU cells.

Figure 1–figure supplement 2: NHR-67-deficient ACs express both Notch

and Delta. Quantification of Notch (LIN-12::mNeonGreen) (A) and Delta (LAG-

2::P2A::H2B::mTurquoise2) (B) expression in *nhr-67(RNAi)* treated ACs

compared to empty vector control AC and VU cells.

Figure 2: NHR-67 expression is downregulated in VU cells through direct transcriptional regulation by HLH-2. (A-B) Representative heat map micrographs (A) and quantification (B) of NHR-67::GFP expression in VU cells following heat shock induced expression of HLH-2 (2x-BFP) compared to non-heat shocked controls. (C) Schematic of a 276 bp putative regulatory element within the promoter of *nhr-67* (Bodofsky et al., 2018), annotated with the location of three hypomorphic mutations (*pf2*, pf88, and *pf159*). (D) Yeast one-hybrid experiment pairing HLH-2 Gal4-AD prey with the 276 bp fragment of the *nhr-67* promoter as bait on SC-HIS-TRP plates with and without competitive inhibitor 3-AT (175 mM).

Figure 2–figure supplement 1: Onset of expression and regulatory interaction between NHR-67 and HLH-2 in the somatic gonad. (A) Micrographs depicting onset of GFP-tagged HLH-2 and a wCherry-labeled NHR-67 transgene (inverted to aid visualization) in Z1.pp and Z4.aa cells at early (top) and late (bottom) stages. (B-D) Representative micrographs (B) and quantification (C-D) of GFP-tagged HLH-2 and TagRFP-T-tagged NHR-67 in AC (C) and VU cells (D) following *uba-1(RNAi)* compared to control. Insets depict different z planes of the same image.

Figure 3: NHR-67 dynamically compartmentalizes in nuclei of VU cells. (A) Heat-map maximum intensity projection of NHR-67::GFP showing protein localization in the AC and VU cells. (B) Spatial color coded projection of NHR-67::GFP punctae in VU, with nuclear border indicated with a dotted line. (C) Schematic of DNA Helicase B (DHB) based CDK sensor and its dynamic localization over the cell cycle. (D) Graphs depicting CDK activity levels and corresponding cell cycle state (top), and percentage of cells exhibiting NHR-67::GFP punctae (bottom) over time, aligned to anaphase. (E) Representative time-lapse of NHR-67::GFP over the course of a cell cycle, with cell membranes indicated with dotted lines. (F) Time-lapse depicting NHR-67::GFP punctae fusion prior to cell division. Bottom panels are pseudo-colored. (G-H) Quantification (G) and representative images (H) depicting fluorescence recovery of NHR-67::GFP

following photobleaching of individual punctae (arrow).

Figure 3–figure supplement 1: Knock-in alleles of *nhr-67*. (A) Representative

images of VU cells exhibiting punctae formed by NHR-67 tagged with GFP,

mNeonGreen, mScarlet-I, and TagRFP-T. (B) Schematics of the new

endogenously tagged loci generated in this paper for *nhr-67*. Scale bar, 100 base

pairs (bp).

Figure 4: Groucho homologs LSY-22 an UNC-37 colocalize with NHR-67 punctae

and contribute to maintenance of VU cell fate. (A) Co-visualization of NHR-67 with

RNA Polymerase II (GFP::AMA-1), HP1 heterochromatin proteins (HPL-1::mKate2 and

HPL-2::mKate2), and Groucho homologs (TagRFP-T::LSY-22 and mNeonGreen::UNC-

37) in VU cells using endogenously tagged alleles. (B) Quantification of colocalization,

with plot reporting Manders' overlap coefficients compared to negative controls (90

degree rotation of one channel) and positive controls. (C) Schematic of the auxin

inducible degron (AID) system, where $_{At}$TIR1 mediates proteasomal degradation of AID-

tagged proteins in the presence of auxin. (D) Representative images of phenotypes

observed following individual AID-depletion of UNC-37 and LSY-22 compared to control

animals without AID-tagged alleles. All animals compared here are expressing TIR1

ubiquitously (*rpl-28p*::$_{At}$TIR1::T2A::mCherry::HIS-11) and an AC marker (*cdh-*

3p::mCherry::moeABD). Insets depict different z planes of the same image. (E)

Quantification of AC marker (*cdh-3p*::mCherry::moeABD) expression in ectopic ACs

resulting from AID-depletion of UNC-37 and LSY-22 compared to control AC and VU

cells.

Figure 4–figure supplement 1: Knock-in alleles of *lsy-22*. Schematics of the

new endogenously tagged loci generated in this paper for *lsy-22*. Scale bar, 100

base pairs (bp).

Figure 4–figure supplement 2: UNC-37 mutants show ectopic expression of

AC markers. Ectopic expression of AC marker (*cdh-3p*::mCherry::moeABD) in

hypomorphic (*unc-37(e262wd26)*) and null (*unc-37(wd17wd22)*) alleles of *unc-37*

compared to wild-type *unc-37*. Insets depict different z planes of the same image.

Figure 5: POP-1 is enriched in VU cells and colocalizes with NHR-67 punctae. (A-

B) Expression of mNeonGreen::UNC-37 and mNeonGreen::LSY-22 (A) and

eGFP::POP-1 (B) in the AC/VU precursors pre-specification (left), as well as in the AC

and VU cells post-specification (right). (C) Quantification of UNC-37, LSY-22, and POP-

1 expression at the time of AC invasion. (D) Co-visualization of NHR-67::mScarlet-I and

eGFP::POP-1 in the VU. (E) Quantification of POP-1 and NHR-67 colocalization, with

plot reporting Manders' overlap coefficient compared to negative and positive controls.

(F) Representative micrographs showing expression of POPTOP, a synthetic *pop-1-*

activated reporter construct, in wild-type ACs, VU cells, and their precursors. Insets

depict different z planes of the same image. (G-H) Micrographs (G) and quantification

(H) of eGFP-tagged POP-1 expression in proliferative ACs following RNAi depletion of

nhr-67 compared to empty vector control.

Figure 5–figure supplement 1: Expression of LSY-22, UNC-37, and POP-1

over developmental time. (A-B) Developmental series (A) and quantified

expression (B) of mNeonGreen::UNC-37, mNeonGreen::LSY-22, and

eGFP::POP-1 expression in the AC/VU precursors, AC, and VU cells over time.

Following AC/VU cell specification, animals are staged by the division of the

underlying primary vulval precursor cells (1° VPCs).

Figure 5–figure supplement 2: POP-1 function in VU cells is distinct from

activating role in distal somatic gonad. (A) Schematics representing the dual

functions of POP-1. In the presence of Wnt signaling, POP-1 binds to its co-

activator β-catenin (e.g., SYS-1) and activates transcription of its target genes. In

the absence of Wnt signaling, POP-1 binds to its co-repressor Groucho (UNC-

37) and represses transcription of its target genes. (B) Representative

micrographs of eGFP::POP-1 and POPTOP (*pes-10*::7x-TCF::mCherry)

expression in the AC, dorsal uterine cells (DU), spermatheca/sheath cells (SS),

and VU cells. (C) Schematic of SYS-1 (β-catenin) expression in the Z1/Z4

lineage (based on Philips et al., 2007).

Figure 5–figure supplement 3: POP-1 expression is regulated by the cell

cycle-dependent pro-invasion pathway. (A-B) Representative micrographs of

eGFP::POP-1 and POPTOP (*pes-10*::7x-TCF::mCherry) following RNAi-induced

knockdown of pro-invasive transcription factors and chromatin modifiers

compared to control AC and VU cells. (B) Quantification of eGFP::POP-1

expression in ACs following RNAi treatments. Here, the presence of multiple ACs

are the result of failure of the AC to exit the cell cycle.

Figure 6: Ectopic ACs arise through VU-to-AC cell fate transformation. (A)

Representative images of ectopic AC (*cdh-3p*::mCherry::moeABD; LAG-

2::P2A::H2B::mTurquoise2) phenotypes observed following RNAi depletion of POP-1.

Schematics (right) depict potential explanations for observed phenotypes. (B)

Expression of AC markers and a VU cell marker (LAG-1::mNeonGreen, inverted to aid

visualization) in *pop-1(RNAi)* treated animals over time. (C) Quantification of LAG-2

(magenta) and LAG-1 (blue) expression in transdifferentiating cells produced by *pop-*

1(RNAi) over time.

Figure 6–figure supplement 1: POP-1 functions to regulate AC/VU cell fates

post-specification. (A) Schematic of the anti-GFP nanobody protein

degradation system (based on Wang et al., 2017). (B) Micrographs

demonstrating that the anti-GFP nanobody (driven under the *egl-43L* promoter) is

not expressed pre-specification or even shortly after when the presumptive AC

begins to express its differentiated cell reporter (*cdh-3*). (C) With decreased

levels of *pop-1*, a low penetrance (~7%) of multi-AC phenotypes were observed.

Figure 6–figure supplement 2: Ectopic ACs resulting from *pop-1*

perturbation express VU cell markers. Expression of AC markers (*cdh-*

3p::mCherry::moeABD; LAG-2::P2A::H2B::mTurquoise2) and VU marker (LAG-

1::mNeonGreen) in *pop-1(RNAi)* treated animals compared to empty vector

control.

Figure 7: NHR-67 binds to UNC-37 through IDR-mediated protein-protein

interaction. (A) Predicted structure of NHR-67 generated by AlphaFold. (B) Measure of

intrinsic disorder of NHR-67 using the PONDR VSL2 prediction algorithm. (C)

Schematic of NHR-67 protein coding sequences used for Yeast two-hybrid experiments

with reference to its intrinsically disordered region (IDR, magenta), DNA binding domain

(DBD, green), and ligand binding domain (LBD, cyan). Scale bar, 10 amino acids. (D)

Yeast two-hybrid experiment shows pairing of UNC-37 with either full-length NHR-67 or

the IDR alone allows for yeast growth in the presence of competitive inhibitor 3-AT (20

mM). (E) Possible models of the roles of NHR-67, UNC-37, LSY-22, and POP-1 in

maintenance of AC and VU cell fate. In the ventral uterine cells, the association of NHR-

67 with the Groucho/TCF complex may result in repression of NHR-67 targets (top) or

sequestration of NHR-67 away from its targets (bottom).

Figure 7–figure supplement 1. NHR-67 exhibits protein-protein interaction

with UNC-37. Yeast two-hybrid experiment pairing UNC-37 and NHR-67 Gal4-

AD prey with LSY-22, NHR-67, and POP-1 Gal4-DBD bait on SC-HIS-TRP-LEU

plates with and without competitive inhibitor 3-AT (20 mM).

Source data

Figure 1–source data 1. Raw data of GFP-tagged transcription factor expression in the

AC and VU cells, as reported in Figure 1C,D and Figure 1–figure supplement 1B,C. In

all source files: ROI, region of interest; BG, background; BS, background-subtracted.

Figure 1–source data 2. Raw data of LAG-2::P2A::H2B::mTurquoise2 and LIN-

12::mNeonGreen expression in NHR-67-deficient ACs compared to control AC and VU

cells, as reported in Figure 1E and Figure 1–figure supplement 2A,B.

Figure 2–source data 1. Raw data of NHR-67::GFP expression in the AC and VU cells following heat-shock inducible expression of HLH-2, as reported in Figure 2A,B.

Figure 2–source data 2. Raw data of GFP::HLH-2 and NHR-67::TagRFP-T expression in the AC and VU cells following *uba-1* RNAi treatment compared to empty vector controls, as reported in Figure 2–figure supplement 1B-D.

Figure 3–source data 1. Raw data of CDK sensor (DHB) ratios in VU cells over time, as reported in Figure 3D,E.

Figure 3–source data 2. Raw data of NHR-67::GFP puncta expression following photobleaching overtime, as reported in Figure 3G,H.

Figure 4–source data 1. Raw data of protein colocalization in VU cells, as reported in Figure 4A,B and Figure 5D,E.

Figure 4–source data 2. Raw data of CDH-3 expression in the ectopic ACs resulting from auxin-mediated depletion of AID-tagged LSY-22 or UNC-37, as reported Figure 4D,E.

Figure 5–source data 1. Raw data of mNG::UNC-37, mNG::LSY-22, and eGFP::POP-1 expression in the AC/VU precursors, the AC, and VU cells, as reported in Figure 5A-C and Figure 5–figure supplement 1A,B.

Figure 5–source data 2. Raw data of eGFP::POP-1 expression in ACs resulting from RNAi knockdown of transcription factors and chromatin modifiers compared to empty vector controls, reported in Figure 5F,G and Figure 5–figure supplement 2A,B.

Figure 6–source data 1. Raw data of LAG-2::P2A::H2B::mT2 and LAG-1::mNG expression during VU-to-AC transdifferentiation, as reported in Figure 6B,C.

References

Adikes RC, Kohrman AQ, Martinez MAQ, Palmisano NJ, Smith JJ, Medwig-Kinney TN,
Min M, Sallee MD, Ahmed OB, Kim N, Liu S, Morabito RD, Weeks N, Zhao Q,
Zhang W, Feldman JL, Barkoulas M, Pani AM, Spencer SL, Martin BL, Matus DQ.
2020. Visualizing the metazoan proliferation-quiescence decision in vivo. *Elife* **9**:1–
74. doi:10.7554/eLife.63265
Ashley G, Duong T, Levenson MT, Martinez MAQ, Johnsen LC, Hibshman JD, Saeger
HN, Palmisano NJ, Doonan R, Martinez-Mendez R, Davidson B, Zhang W, Ragle
JM, Medwig-Kinney TN, Sirota SS, Goldstein B, Matus DQ, Dickinson DJ, Reiner
DJ, Ward JD. 2021. An expanded auxin-inducible degron toolkit for Caenorhabditis
elegans . *Genetics*. doi:10.1093/genetics/iyab006
Attner MA, Keil W, Benavidez JM, Greenwald I. 2019. HLH-2/E2A Expression Links
Stochastic and Deterministic Elements of a Cell Fate Decision during C. elegans
Gonadogenesis. *Curr Biol* **29**:1–7. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2019.07.062
Bekas KN, Phillips BT. 2022. unc-37/Groucho and lsy-22/AES repress Wnt target genes
in C. elegans asymmetric cell divisions. *bioRxiv*.
Benavidez JM, Kim JH, Greenwald I. 2022. Influences of HLH-2 stability on anchor cell
fate specification during Caenorhabditis elegans gonadogenesis. *G3:*
Genes|Genomes|Genetics.
Bodofsky S, Liberatore K, Pioppo L, Lapadula D, Thompson L, Birnbaum S, McClung G,
Kartik A, Clever S, Wightman B. 2018. A tissue-specific enhancer of the C. elegans
nhr-67/tailless gene drives coordinated expression in uterine stem cells and the
differentiated anchor cell. *Gene Expr Patterns* **30**:71–81.
doi:10.1016/j.gep.2018.10.003
Boija A, Klein IA, Sabari BR, Dall'Agnese A, Coffey EL, Zamudio A V., Li CH, Shrinivas
K, Manteiga JC, Hannett NM, Abraham BJ, Afeyan LK, Guo YE, Rimel JK, Fant
CB, Schuijers J, Lee TI, Taatjes DJ, Young RA. 2018. Transcription Factors
Activate Genes through the Phase-Separation Capacity of Their Activation
Domains. *Cell* **175**:1842-1855.e16. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2018.10.042
Bolte S, Cordelières FP. 2006. A guided tour into subcellular colocalization analysis in
light microscopy. *J Microsc* **224**:213–232. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2818.2006.01706.x
Boxem M, Maliga Z, Klitgord N, Li N, Lemmens I, Mana M, de Lichtervelde L, Mul JD,
van de Peut D, Devos M, Simonis N, Yildirim MA, Cokol M, Kao HL, de Smet AS,
Wang H, Schlaitz AL, Hao T, Milstein S, Fan C, Tipsword M, Drew K, Galli M,
Rhrissorrakrai K, Drechsel D, Koller D, Roth FP, Iakoucheva LM, Dunker AK,
Bonneau R, Gunsalus KC, Hill DE, Piano F, Tavernier J, van den Heuvel S, Hyman
AA, Vidal M. 2008. A Protein Domain-Based Interactome Network for C. elegans
Early Embryogenesis. *Cell* **134**:534–545. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2008.07.009
Brangwynne CP, Eckmann CR, Courson DS, Rybarska A, Hoege C, Gharakhani J,
Jülicher F, Hyman AA. 2009. Germline P Granules Are Liquid Droplets That
Localize by Controlled Dissolution/Condensation. *Science (80-)* **324**:1729–1732.
Brenner S. 1974. The genetics of *Caenorabditis elegans*. *Genetics* **77**:71–94.
doi:10.1016/S0047-2484(78)80101-8
Brumbaugh J, Stefano B Di, Hochedlinger K. 2019. Reprogramming : identifying the
mechanisms that safeguard cell identity. *Development* **146**:1–17.
doi:10.1242/dev.182170

Calvo D, Victor M, Gay F, Sui G, Po-Shan Luke M, Dufourcq P, Wen G, Maduro M, Rothman J, Shi Y. 2001. A POP-1 repressor complex restricts inappropriate cell type-specific gene transcription during Caenorhabditis elegans embryogenesis. *EMBO J* **20**:7197–7208. doi:10.1093/emboj/20.24.7197

Cho WK, Spille JH, Hecht M, Lee C, Li C, Grube V, Cisse II. 2018. Mediator and RNA polymerase II clusters associate in transcription-dependent condensates. *Science (80-)* **361**:412–415. doi:10.1126/science.aar4199

Chong S, Dugast-Darzacq C, Liu Z, Dong P, Dailey GM, Cattoglio C, Heckert A, Banala S, Lavis L, Darzacq X, Tjian R. 2018. Imaging dynamic and selective low-complexity domain interactions that control gene transcription. *Science (80-)* **361**. doi:10.1126/science.aar2555

Cohen J. 1992. A Power Primer. *Psychol Bull* **112**:155–159. doi:10.1038/141613a0

Davis RL, Weintraub H, Lassar AB. 1987. Expression of a single transfected cDNA converts fibroblasts to myoblasts. *Cell* **51**:987–1000. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(87)90585-X

Dickinson DJ, Goldstein B. 2016. CRISPR-based methods for caenorhabditis elegans genome engineering. *Genetics* **202**:885–901. doi:10.1534/genetics.115.182162

Dickinson DJ, Pani AM, Heppert JK, Higgins CD, Goldstein B. 2015. Streamlined genome engineering with a self-excising drug selection cassette. *Genetics* **200**:1035–1049. doi:10.1534/genetics.115.178335

Flowers EB, Poole RJ, Tursun B, Bashllari E, Pe'er I, Hobert O. 2010. The Groucho ortholog UNC-37 interacts with the short Groucho-like protein LSY-22 to control developmental decisions in C. elegans. *Development* **137**:1799–1805. doi:10.1242/dev.046219

Frøkjær-Jensen C, Davis MW, Ailion M, Jorgensen EM. 2013. Improved Mos1-mediated transgenesis in C. elegans. *Nat Meth* **9**:117–118. doi:10.1038/mp.2011.182.doi

Fukushige T, Krause M. 2005. The myogenic potency of HLH-1 reveals wide-spread developmental plasticity in early C. elegans embryos. *Development* **132**:1795–1805. doi:10.1242/dev.01774

Ghanta KS, Mello CC. 2020. Melting dsDNA donor molecules greatly improves precision genome editing in caenorhabditis elegans. *Genetics* **216**:643–650. doi:10.1534/genetics.120.303564

Gilleard JS, McGhee JD. 2001. Activation of Hypodermal Differentiation in the Caenorhabditis elegans Embryo by GATA Transcription Factors ELT-1 and ELT-3 . *Mol Cell Biol* **21**:2533–2544. doi:10.1128/mcb.21.7.2533-2544.2001

Gómez-Saldivar G, Osuna-Luque J, Semple JI, Glauser DA, Jarriault S, Meister P. 2020. Tissue-Specific Transcription Footprinting Using RNA. *Genetics* **216**:931–945.

Green JL, Inoue T, Sternberg PW. 2008. Opposing Wnt pathways orient cell polarity during organogenesis. *Cell* **134**:646–656. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2008.06.026.Opposing

Greenwald IS, Sternberg PW, Robert Horvitz H. 1983. The lin-12 locus specifies cell fates in Caenorhabditis elegans. *Cell* **34**:435–444. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(83)90377-X

Hajduskova M, Baytek G, Kolundzic E, Gosdschan A. 2019. MRG-1 / MRG15 Is a Barrier for Germ Cell to Neuron reprogramming. *Genetics* **211**:121–139.

Hanahan D. 2022. Hallmarks of Cancer: New Dimensions. *Cancer Discov* 31–47.

doi:10.1158/2159-8290.CD-21-1059

Hanahan D, Weinberg RA. 2000. The hallmarks of cancer. *Cell* **100**:57–70.
doi:10.1007/s00262-010-0968-0

Harris TW, Arnaboldi V, Cain S, Chan J, Chen WJ, Cho J, Davis P, Gao S, Grove CA,
Kishore R, Lee RYN, Muller HM, Nakamura C, Nuin P, Paulini M, Raciti D, Rodgers
FH, Russell M, Schindelman G, Auken K V., Wang Q, Williams G, Wright AJ, Yook
K, Howe KL, Schedl T, Stein L, Sternberg PW. 2020. WormBase: A Modern Model
Organism Information Resource. *Nucleic Acids Res* **48**:D762–D767.
doi:10.1093/nar/gkz920

Hills-Muckey K, Martinez MAQ, Stec N, Hebbar S, Saldanha J, Medwig-Kinney TN,
Moore FEQ, Ivanova M, Moraro A, Jordan D, Moss EG, Ercan S, Zinovyeva AY,
Matus DQ, Christopher M. 2021. An engineered, orthogonal auxin
analog/AtTIR1(F79G) pairing improves both specificity and efficacy of the auxin
degradation system in Caenorhabditis elegans. *Genetics* iyab174.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/iyab174

Hoek KS, Eichhoff OM, Schlegel NC, Döbbeling U, Kobert N, Schaerer L, Hemmi S,
Dummer R. 2008. In vivo switching of human melanoma cells between proliferative
and invasive states. *Cancer Res* **68**:650–656. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-07-
2491

Horner MA, Quintin S, Domeier ME, Kimble J, Labouesse M, Mango SE. 1998. pha-4,
an HNF-3 homolog, specifies pharyngeal organ identity in Caenorhabditis elegans.
Genes Dev **12**:1947–1952. doi:10.1101/gad.12.13.1947

Huang G, Jesus B De, Koh A, Blanco S, Rettmann A, Demott E, Sylvester M, Meng C,
Waterland S, Rhodes A, Alicea P, Flynn A, Dickinson DJ. 2021. Improved CRISPR
/ Cas9 knock-in efficiency via the self-excising cassette (SEC) selection method in
C . elegans. *Micropublication Biol*.

Irgen-Gioro S, Yoshida S, Walling V, Chong S. 2022. Fixation can change the
appearance of phase separation in living cells. *Elife* **11**. doi:10.7554/eLife.79903

Jarriault S, Schwab Y, Greenwald I. 2008. A Caenorhabditis elegans model for
epithelial-neuronal transdifferentiation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* **105**:3790–3795.
doi:10.1073/pnas.0712159105

Jiang H, Xu Z, Zhong P, Ren Y, Liang G, Schilling HA, Hu Z, Zhang Y, Wang X, Chen
S, Yan Z, Feng J. 2015. Cell cycle and p53 gate the direct conversion of human
fibroblasts to dopaminergic neurons. *Nat Commun* **6**. doi:10.1038/ncomms10100

Jin Y, Hoskins R, Horvitz HR. 1994. Control of type-D GABAergic neuron differentiation
by C. elegans UNC-30 homeodomain protein. *Nature* **372**:780–783.
doi:10.1038/372780a0

Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, Tunyasuvunakool
K, Bates R, Žídek A, Potapenko A, Bridgland A, Meyer C, Kohl SAA, Ballard AJ,
Cowie A, Romera-Paredes B, Nikolov S, Jain R, Adler J, Back T, Petersen S,
Reiman D, Clancy E, Zielinski M, Steinegger M, Pacholska M, Berghammer T,
Bodenstein S, Silver D, Vinyals O, Senior AW, Kavukcuoglu K, Kohli P, Hassabis
D. 2021. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature*
596:583–589. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03819-2

Kagias K, Ahier A, Fischer N, Jarriault S. 2012. Members of the NODE (Nanog and
Oct4-associated deacetylase) complex and SOX-2 promote the initiation of a

natural cellular reprogramming event in vivo. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **109**:6596–6601. doi:10.1073/pnas.1117031109

Karp X, Greenwald I. 2003. Post-transcriptional regulation of the E/Daughterless ortholog HLH-2, negative feedback, and birth order bias during the AC/VU decision in C. elegans. *Genes Dev* **17**:3100–3111. doi:10.1101/gad.1160803

Katsanos D, Barkoulas M. 2022. Targeted DamID in C . elegans reveals a direct role for LIN-22 and NHR-25 in antagonizing the epidermal stem cell fate. *Sci Adv* **8**:eabk3141.

Keeley DP, Hastie E, Jayadev R, Kelley LC, Chi Q, Payne SG, Jeger JL, Hoffman BD, Sherwood DR. 2020. Comprehensive Endogenous Tagging of Basement Membrane Components Reveals Dynamic Movement within the Matrix Scaffolding. *Dev Cell* **54**:60-74.e7. doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2020.05.022

Kelley LC, Wang Z, Hagedorn EJ, Wang L, Shen W, Lei S, Johnson SA, Sherwood DR. 2017. Live-cell confocal microscopy and quantitative 4D image analysis of anchor-cell invasion through the basement membrane in Caenorhabditis elegans. *Nat Protoc* **12**:2081–2096. doi:10.1038/nprot.2017.093

Kiefer JC, Smith PA, Mango SE. 2007. PHA-4/FoxA cooperates with TAM-1/TRIM to regulate cell fate restriction in the C. elegans foregut. *Dev Biol* **303**:611–624. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2006.11.042

Kimble J, Hirsh D. 1979. The postembryonic cell lineages of the hermaphrodite and male gonads in Caenorhabditis elegans. *Dev Biol* **70**:396–417. doi:10.1016/0012-1606(79)90035-6

Kohrman AQ, Matus DQ. 2017. Divide or Conquer: Cell Cycle Regulation of Invasive Behavior. *Trends Cell Biol*. doi:10.1016/j.tcb.2016.08.003

Kolundzic E, Ofenbauer A, Bulut SI, Uyar B, Baytek G, Sommermeier A, Seelk S, He M, Hirsekorn A, Vucicevic D, Akalin A, Diecke S, Lacadie SA, Tursun B. 2018. FACT Sets a Barrier for Cell Fate Reprogramming in Caenorhabditis elegans and Human Cells. *Dev Cell* **46**:611-626.e12. doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2018.07.006

Kurashina M, Wang J, Lin J, Lee KK, Johal A, Mizumoto K. 2021. Sustained expression of unc-4 homeobox gene and unc-37/groucho in postmitotic neurons specifies the spatial organization of the cholinergic synapses in c. Elegans. *Elife* **10**:1–26. doi:10.7554/eLife.66011

Larson AG, Elnatan D, Keenen MM, Trnka MJ, Johnston JB, Burlingame AL, Agard DA, Redding S, Narlikar GJ. 2017. Liquid droplet formation by HP1α suggests a role for phase separation in heterochromatin. *Nature* **547**:236–240. doi:10.1038/nature22822

Leyva-Díaz E, Hobert O. 2019. Transcription factor autoregulation is required for acquisition and maintenance of neuronal identity. *Development* **146**. doi:10.1242/dev.177378

Li S, Armstrong CM, Bertin N, Ge H, Milstein S, Boxem M, Vidalain PO, Han JDJ, Chesneau A, Hao T, Goldberg DS, Li N, Martinez M, Rual JF, Lamesch P, Xu L, Tewari M, Wong SL, Zhang L V., Berriz GF, Jacotot L, Vaglio P, Reboul J, Hirozane-Kishikawa T, Li Q, Gabel HW, Elewa A, Baumgartner B, Rose DJ, Yu H, Bosak S, Sequerra R, Fraser A, Mango SE, Saxton WM, Strome S, Van Den Heuvel S v., Piano F, Vandenhaute J, Sardet C, Gerstein M, Doucette-Stamm L, Gunsalus KC, Harper JW, Cusick ME, Roth FP, Hill DE, Vidal M. 2004. A Map of

the Interactome Network of the Metazoan C. elegans. *Science (80-)* **303**:540–543.
doi:10.1126/science.1091403

Liang B, Wang J. 2020. EVI1 in leukemia and solid tumors. *Cancers (Basel)* **12**:1–17.
doi:10.3390/cancers12092667

Lim B, Levine MS. 2021. Enhancer-promoter communication: hubs or loops? *Curr Opin*
Genet Dev **67**:5–9. doi:10.1016/j.gde.2020.10.001

Ma X, Zhao Z, Xiao L, Xu W, Kou Y, Zhang Y, Wu G, Wang Y, Du Z. 2021. A 4D single-
cell protein atlas of transcription factors delineates spatiotemporal patterning during
embryogenesis. *Nat Methods* **18**:893–902. doi:10.1038/s41592-021-01216-1

Maduro MF, Lin R, Rothman JH. 2002. Dynamics of a developmental switch: Recursive
intracellular and intranuclear redistribution of Caenorhabditis elegans POP-1
parallels Wnt-inhibited transcriptional repression. *Dev Biol* **248**:128–142.
doi:10.1006/dbio.2002.0721

Martinez M, Matus D. 2020. Auxin-mediated Protein Degradation in Caenorhabditis
elegans. *Bio-Protocol* **10**:1–13. doi:10.21769/bioprotoc.3589

Martinez MAQ, Kinney BA, Medwig-Kinney TN, Ashley G, Ragle JM, Johnson L,
Aguilera J, Hammell CM, Ward JD, Matus DQ. 2020. Rapid Degradation of
Caenorhabditis elegans Proteins at Single-Cell Resolution with a Synthetic Auxin.
G3 Genes, Genomes, Genet **10**:267–280. doi:10.1534/g3.119.400781

Matus DQ, Li X-Y, Durbin S, Agarwal D, Chi Q, Weiss SJ, Sherwood DR. 2010. In vivo
identification of regulators of cell invasion across basement membranes. *Sci Signal*
3:ra35. doi:10.1126/scisignal.2000654

Matus DQ, Lohmer LL, Kelley LC, Schindler AJ, Kohrman AQ, Barkoulas M, Zhang W,
Chi Q, Sherwood DR. 2015. Invasive Cell Fate Requires G1 Cell-Cycle Arrest and
Histone Deacetylase-Mediated Changes in Gene Expression. *Dev Cell* **35**:162–
174. doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2015.10.002

McKim KS, Peters K, Rose AM. 1993. Two Types of Sites Required for Meiotic
Chromosome Pairing in Caenorhabditis elegans. *Genetics* **134**:749–768.

Medwig-Kinney TN, Palmisano NJ, Matus DQ. 2021. Deletion of a putative HDA-1
binding site in the hlh-2 promoter eliminates expression in C. elegans dorsal uterine
cells. *Micropublication Biol* **1**.

Medwig-Kinney TN, Sirota SS, Gibney T V., Pani AM, Matus DQ. 2022. An in vivo
toolkit to visualize endogenous LAG-2/Delta and LIN-12/Notch signaling in C.
elegans. *microPublication Biol*.

Medwig-Kinney TN, Smith JJ, Palmisano NJ, Tank S, Zhang W, Matus DQ. 2020. A
developmental gene regulatory network for C. elegans anchor cell invasion.
Development **147**:dev185850. doi:https://doi.org/10.1101/691337

Medwig TN, Matus DQ. 2017. Breaking down barriers: the evolution of cell invasion.
Curr Opin Genet Dev **47**:33–40. doi:10.1016/j.gde.2017.08.003

Milde-Langosch K. 2005. The Fos family of transcription factors and their role in
tumourigenesis. *Eur J Cancer* **41**:2449–2461. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2005.08.008

Mondal C, Gacha-Garay MJ, Larkin K, Adikes R, Di Martino J, Chien C-C, Fraser M,
Eni-aganga I, Agullo-Pascual E, Ozbek U, Naba A, Gaitas A, Fu T-M, Upadhyayula
S, Betzig E, Matus D, Martin BL, Bravo-Cordero JJ. 2021. A Proliferative to
Invasive Switch is Mediated by srGAP1 Downregulation Through the Activation of
TGFβ2 Signaling. *SSRN Electron J* **40**:111358.

doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2022.111358 ll

Nelson AT, Wang Y, Nelson ER. 2021. TLX, an Orphan Nuclear Receptor with
Emerging Roles in Physiology and Disease. *Endocrinol (United States)* **162**:1–13.
doi:10.1210/endocr/bqab184

Pani AM, Gibney T V., Medwig-Kinney TN, Matus DQ, Goldstein B. 2022. A new toolkit
to visualize and perturb endogenous LIN-12/Notch signaling. *Micropublication Biol*.

Patel T, Hobert O. 2017. Coordinated control of terminal differentiation and restriction of
cellular plasticity. *Elife* **6**:1–26. doi:10.7554/elife.24100

Patel T, Tursun B, Rahe DP, Hobert O. 2012. Removal of Polycomb Repressive
Complex 2 Makes C. elegans Germ Cells Susceptible to Direct Conversion into
Specific Somatic Cell Types. *Cell Rep* **2**:1178–1186.
doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2012.09.020

Peng QY, Zhang QF. 2006. Precise positions of Phoebe determined with CCD image-
overlapping calibration. *Mon Not R Astron Soc* **366**:208–212. doi:10.1186/1471-
2105-7-208

Pflugrad A, Meir JYJ, Barnes TM, Miller DM. 1997. The Groucho-like transcription factor
UNC-37 functions with the neural specificity gene unc-4 to govern motor neuron
identity in C. elegans. *Development* **124**:1699–1709. doi:10.1242/dev.124.9.1699

Phillips BT, Kidd AR, King R, Hardin J, Kimble J. 2007. Reciprocal asymmetry of SYS-
1/β-catenin and POP-1/TCF controls asymmetric divisions in Caenorhabditis
elegans. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **104**:3231–3236. doi:10.1073/pnas.0611507104

Phillips BT, Kimble J. 2009. A New Look at TCF and β-Catenin through the Lens of a
Divergent C. elegans Wnt Pathway. *Dev Cell* **17**:27–34.
doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2009.07.002

Porta-de-la-Riva M, Fontrodona L, Villanueva A, Cerón J. 2012. Basic Caenorhabditis
elegans Methods: Synchronization and Observation. *J Vis Exp* 1–9.
doi:10.3791/4019

Putnam A, Cassani M, Smith J, Seydoux G. 2019. A gel phase promotes condensation
of liquid P granules in Caenorhabditis elegans embryos. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **26**.

Quintin S, Michaux G, McMahon L, Gansmuller A, Labouesse M. 2001. The
Caenorhabditis elegans gene lin-26 can trigger epithelial differentiation without
conferring tissue specificity. *Dev Biol* **235**:410–421. doi:10.1006/dbio.2001.0294

Rahe DP, Hobert O. 2019. Restriction of Cellular Plasticity of Differentiated Cells
Mediated by Chromatin Modifiers, Transcription Factors and Protein Kinases.
G3: Genes|Genomes|Genetics **9**:2287–2302.
doi:10.1534/g3.119.400328

Reece-Hoyes JS, Deplancke B, Shingles J, Grove CA, Hope IA, Walhout AJM. 2005. A
compendium of Caenorhabditis elegans regulatory transcription factors: A resource
for mapping transcription regulatory networks. *Genome Biol* **6**. doi:10.1186/gb-
2005-6-13-r110

Reece-Hoyes JS, Walhout AJM. 2018. High-efficiency yeast transformation. *Cold
Spring Harb Protoc* **2018**:563–568. doi:10.1101/pdb.prot094995

Richard JP, Zuryn S, Fischer N, Pavet V, Vaucamps N, Jarriault S. 2011. Direct in vivo
cellular reprogramming involves transition through discrete, non-pluripotent steps. *J
Cell Sci* **124**:e1–e1. doi:10.1242/jcs.090043

Riddle MR, Spickard EA, Jevince A, Nguyen KCQ, Hall DH, Joshi PM, Rothman JH.

2016. Transorganogenesis and transdifferentiation in C. elegans are dependent on
differentiated cell identity. *Dev Biol* **420**:136–147. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2016.09.020
Riddle MR, Weintraub A, Nguyen KCQ, Hall DH, Rothman JH. 2013.
Transdifferentiation and remodeling of post-embryonic C. elegans cells by a single
transcription factor. *Development* **140**:4844–4849. doi:10.1242/dev.103010
Riva C, Hajduskova M, Gally C, Suman SK, Ahier A, Jarriault S. 2022. A natural
transdifferentiation event involving mitosis is empowered by integrating signaling
inputs with conserved plasticity factors. *Cell Rep* **40**:111365.
doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2022.111365
Rothman J, Jarriault S. 2019. Developmental Plasticity and Cellular Reprogramming.
Genetics **213**:723–757.
Rual JF, Ceron J, Koreth J, Hao T, Nicot AS, Hirozane-Kishikawa T, Vandenhaute J,
Orkin SH, Hill DE, van den Heuvel S, Vidal M. 2004. Toward improving
Caenorhabditis elegans phenome mapping with an ORFeome-based RNAi library.
Genome Res **14**:2162–2168. doi:10.1101/gr.2505604
Sabari BR, Dall'Agnese A, Boija A, Klein IA, Coffey EL, Shrinivas K, Abraham BJ,
Hannett NM, Zamudio A V., Manteiga JC, Li CH, Guo YE, Day DS, Schuijers J,
Vasile E, Malik S, Hnisz D, Lee TI, Cisse II, Roeder RG, Sharp PA, Chakraborty
AK, Young RA. 2018. Coactivator condensation at super-enhancers links phase
separation and gene control. *Science (80-)* **361**. doi:10.1126/science.aar3958
Sallee MD, Aydin T, Greenwald I. 2015. Influences of LIN-12/Notch and POP-1/TCF on
the Robustness of Ventral Uterine Cell Fate Specification in Caenorhabditis
elegans Gonadogenesis. *G3: Genes|Genomes|Genetics* **5**:2775–2782.
doi:10.1534/g3.115.022608
Sallee MD, Greenwald I. 2015. Dimerization-driven degradation of C. elegans and
human E proteins. *Genes Dev* **29**:1356–1361. doi:10.1101/gad.261917.115
Sallee MD, Littleford HE, Greenwald I. 2017. A bHLH Code for Sexually Dimorphic
Form and Function of the C. elegans Somatic Gonad. *Curr Biol* **27**:1853-1860.e5.
doi:10.1016/j.cub.2017.05.059
Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E, Kaynig V, Longair M, Pietzsch T, Preibisch S,
Rueden C, Saalfeld S, Schmid B, Tinevez J-Y, White DJ, Hartenstein V, Eliceiri K,
Tomancak P, Cardona A. 2012. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image
analysis. *Nat Methods* **9**:676–82. doi:10.1038/nmeth.2019
Seydoux G, Greenwald I. 1989. Cell autonomy of lin-12 function in a cell fate decision in
C. elegans. *Cell* **57**:1237–1245. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(89)90060-3
Seydoux G, Schedl T, Greenwald I. 1990. Cell-cell interactions prevent a potential
inductive interaction between soma and germline in C. elegans. *Cell* **61**:939–951.
doi:10.1016/0092-8674(90)90060-R
Sherwood DR, Sternberg PW. 2003. Anchor cell invasion into the vulval epithelium in C.
elegans. *Dev Cell* **5**:21–31. doi:10.1016/S1534-5807(03)00168-0
Shetty P, Lo MC, Robertson SM, Lin R. 2005. C. elegans TCF protein, POP-1, converts
from repressor to activator as a result of Wnt-induced lowering of nuclear levels.
Dev Biol **285**:584–592. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2005.07.008
Siegfried K, Kimble J. 2002. POP-1 controls axis formation during early gonadogenesis
in C. elegans. *Development* **453**:443–453.
Siegfried KR, Kidd AR, Chesney MA, Kimble J. 2004. The sys-1 and sys-3 Genes

Cooperate with Wnt Signaling to Establish the Proximal-Distal Axis of the
Caenorhabditis elegans Gonad. *Genetics* **166**:171–186.
doi:10.1534/genetics.166.1.171
Simonis N, Rual JF, Carvunis AR, Tasan M, Lemmens I, Hirozane-Kishikawa T, Hao T,
Sahalie JM, Venkatesan K, Gebreab F, Cevik S, Klitgord N, Fan C, Braun P, Li N,
Ayivi-Guedehoussou N, Dann E, Bertin N, Szeto D, Dricot A, Yildirim MA, Lin C, de
Smet AS, Kao HL, Simon C, Smolyar A, Ahn JS, Tewari M, Boxem M, Milstein S,
Yu H, Dreze M, Vandenhaute J, Gunsalus KC, Cusick ME, Hill DE, Tavernier J,
Roth FP, Vidal M. 2009. Empirically controlled mapping of the Caenorhabditis
elegans protein-protein interactome network. *Nat Methods* **6**:47–54.
doi:10.1038/nmeth.1279
Smith JJ, Xiao Y, Parsan N, Medwig-Kinney TN, Martinez MAQ, Moore FEQ, Palmisano
NJ, Kohrman AQ, Chandhok Delos Reyes M, Adikes RC, Liu S, Bracht SA, Zhang
W, Wen K, Kratsios P, Matus DQ. 2022. The SWI/SNF chromatin remodeling
assemblies BAF and PBAF differentially regulate cell cycle exit and cellular
invasion in vivo, PLOS Genetics. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1009981
Spencer SL, Cappell SD, Tsai FC, Overton KW, Wang CL, Meyer T. 2013. The
proliferation-quiescence decision is controlled by a bifurcation in CDK2 activity at
mitotic exit. *Cell* **155**:369–383. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2013.08.062
Strom AR, Emelyanov A V., Mir M, Fyodorov D V., Darzacq X, Karpen GH. 2017. Phase
separation drives heterochromatin domain formation. *Nature* **547**:241–245.
doi:10.1038/nature22989
Sturm Á, Saskoi É, Tibor K, Weinhardt N, Vellai T. 2018. Highly efficient RNAi and
Cas9-based auto-cloning systems for C. elegans research. *Nucleic Acids Res*
46:e105. doi:10.1093/nar/gky516
Sulston JE, Horvitz HR. 1977. Post-embryonic cell lineages of the nematode,
Caenorhabditis elegans. *Dev Biol* **56**:110–156. doi:10.1016/0012-1606(77)90158-0
Treen N, Shimobayashi SF, Eeftens J, Brangwynne CP, Levine M. 2021. Properties of
repression condensates in living Ciona embryos. *Nat Commun* **12**:1–9.
doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21606-5
Tursun B, Patel T, Kratsios P, Hobert O. 2011. Direct Conversion of C. elegans Germ
Cells into Specific Neuron Types. *Science (80-)* **331**:304–309.
van der Horst SEM, Cravo J, Woollard A, Teapal J, Van den Heuvel S. 2019. C .
elegans Runx / CBFβ suppresses POP-1 (TCF) to convert asymmetric to
proliferative division of stem cell-like seam cells. *Development* **146**:1–34.
doi:10.1242/dev.180034
Varadi M, Anyango S, Deshpande M, Nair S, Natassia C, Yordanova G, Yuan D, Stroe
O, Wood G, Laydon A, Žídek A, Green T, Tunyasuvunakool K, Petersen S, Jumper
J, Clancy E, Green R, Vora A, Lutfi M, Figurnov M, Cowie A, Hobbs N, Kohli P,
Kleywegt G, Birney E, Hassabis D, Velankar S. 2022. AlphaFold Protein Structure
Database: massively expanding the structural coverage of protein-sequence space
with high-accuracy models. *Nucleic Acids Res* **50**:D439–D444.
doi:10.1093/nar/gkab1061
Verghese E, Schocken J, Jacob S, Wimer AM, Royce R, Nesmith JE, Baer GM, Clever
S, McCain E, Lakowski B, Wightman B. 2011. The tailless ortholog nhr-67 functions
in the development of the C. elegans ventral uterus. *Dev Biol* **356**:516–528.

doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2011.06.007
Wang LH, Baker NE. 2015. E Proteins and ID Proteins: Helix-Loop-Helix Partners in
Development and Disease. *Dev Cell* **35**:269–280. doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2015.10.019
Wang S, Tang NH, Lara-Gonzalez P, Zhao Z, Cheerambathur DK, Prevo B, Chisholm
AD, Desai A, Oegema K. 2017. A toolkit for GFP-mediated tissue-specific protein
degradation in C. elegans. *Development* **144**:2694–2701. doi:10.1242/dev.150094
Wickham H. 2016. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag New
York.
Wilkinson HA, Fitzgerald K, Greenwald I. 1994. Reciprocal changes in expression of the
receptor lin-12 and its ligand lag-2 prior to commitment in a C. elegans cell fate
decision. *Cell* **79**:1187–1198. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(94)90010-8
Zacharias AL, Walton T, Preston E, Murray JI. 2015. Quantitative Differences in Nuclear
β-catenin and TCF Pattern Embryonic Cells in C. elegans. *PLoS Genet* **11**.
doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1005585
Zhang L, Ward JD, Cheng Z, Dernburg AF. 2015. The auxin-inducible degradation (AID)
system enables versatile conditional protein depletion in C. elegans. *Development*
142:4374–4384. doi:10.1242/dev.129635
Zhong W, Sternberg PW. 2006. Genome-Wide Prediction of C. elegans Genetic
Interactions. *Science (80-)* **311**:1481–1484.
Zhu J, Fukushige T, McGhee JD, Rothman JH. 1998. Reprogramming of early
embryonic blastomeres into endodermal progenitors by a Caenorhabditis elegans
GATA factor. *Genes Dev* **12**:3809–3814. doi:10.1101/gad.12.24.3809
Zuryn S, Ahier A, Portoso M, White ER, Morin MC, Margueron R, Jarriault S. 2014.
Sequential histone-modifying activities determine the robustness of
transdifferentiation. *Science (80-)* **345**:826–829. doi:10.1126/science.1255885
1290

A

B

C

A LIN−12::mNG expression

B LAG−2::P2A::H2B::mT2 expression

Figure 3

A

B

C

Figure 7–figure supplement 1