Piezo-dependent surveillance of matrix stiffness

generates transient cells that repair the basement membrane

Aubrie M. Stricker[1], M. Shane Hutson[2], Andrea Page-McCaw[1,3]

[1]Department of Cell and Developmental Biology, Center for Matrix Biology, Program in

Developmental Biology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA

[2]Department of Physics and Astronomy, Department of Biological Sciences, Vanderbilt

University, Nashville, TN, USA

[3]Lead contact: andrea.page-mccaw@vanderbilt.edu

Summary

Basement membranes are extracellular matrix sheets separating tissue layers

and providing mechanical support, and Collagen IV (Col4) is their most abundant

protein. Although basement membranes are repaired after damage, little is known about

repair, including whether and how damage is detected, what cells repair the damage,

and how repair is controlled to avoid fibrosis. Using the intestinal basement membrane

of adult *Drosophila* as a model, we show that after basement membrane damage, there

is a sharp increase in enteroblasts transiently expressing Col4, or "matrix mender" cells.

Enteroblast-derived Col4 is specifically required for matrix repair. The increase in matrix

mender cells requires the mechanosensitive ion channel Piezo, expressed in intestinal

stem cells. Matrix menders are induced by the loss of matrix stiffness, as specifically

inhibiting Col4 crosslinking is sufficient for Piezo-dependent induction of matrix mender

cells. Our data suggest that epithelial stem cells control basement membrane integrity

by monitoring stiffness.

Keywords: Basement membrane, *Drosophila*, Collagen IV, midgut, Piezo, matrix,

tensional stiffness, intestinal stem cells, enteroblasts, repair

Introduction

Extracellular matrix (ECM) is an essential conserved component of all animal tissues. In addition to providing structural support, ECM influences cell adhesion, shape, signaling, and behaviors. When tissues are damaged, ECM needs to be repaired, and pathological ECM damage is a feature of many human diseases[1,2]. Despite the critical importance of ECM repair, little is known about the cellular processes and molecular signals that orchestrate repair. At the most fundamental level, it is unknown whether and how cells detect ECM damage. Moreover, ECM proteins, including collagens, are among the most stable proteins in the body, with the longest-lived exhibiting half-lives on the order of an animal's lifetime[3–6]. ECM longevity presents a challenge, as repairing with excess ECM causes fibrosis. In this study, we identify a mechanism that cells use to sense damaged matrix, and they respond by transiently producing matrix until repair is completed.

ECM can be subdivided into two types, stromal matrix and basement membrane, the focus of this study. Basement membranes are thin sheets that underlie epithelia and wrap around muscles and organs. Their most abundant protein is Collagen IV (Col4), a heterotrimer that self-assembles *in vitro* into networks and provides structural support[7]. Self-assembly raises questions about the nature of basement membrane repair. Is there a continuing self-assembly process for maintenance that also functions passively to repair damage? Or is repair an active process, with cells sensing damage and directing repair?

Basement membranes are ancient, arising along with multicellularity itself[8]. Given the evolutionary conservation, *Drosophila* offers an excellent model to address

questions of basement membrane homeostasis and repair. Flies have the same

basement membrane structure and composition as mammals, with all the main

components but fewer copies. There is only one type IV collagen (Col4) heterotrimer

composed of the two collagen subunits Col4a1 and Col4a2 (aka Viking, Vkg); there are

two laminin heterotrimers, one nidogen gene, and one perlecan gene[9]. Functional GFP-

tagged alleles of Vkg offer tremendously powerful reagents for imaging and genetics[10].

We use the *Drosophila* posterior midgut as a model to analyze basement membrane

repair. The fly gut is a monolayer epithelium derived from stem cells that generate two

lineages, enterocytes and enteroendocrine cells, with intermediates in between[11–13].

Between the epithelium and the surrounding peristalsis muscles there is basement

membrane, and it is continuous with the basement membrane enveloping the muscles

(Fig. 1A). We damage the basement membrane by feeding the flies dextran sodium

sulfate (DSS), which gets visibly lodged in the gut basement membrane, fractures its

structure, and reduces its stiffness[14]. After stopping DSS feeding, basement membrane

repair occurs within two days, providing a temporal window for analyzing repair[14].

In this study, we find that genes encoding all major basement membrane

components are required for both repair and maintenance. However, after damage, the

source of Col4 for the midgut changes: without damage, Col4 originates from the fat

body, but after damage, Col4 is transiently expressed locally by gut epithelial cells we

call "matrix menders," which are specialized short-lived enteroblasts. Knocking down

Col4 in enteroblasts specifically inhibits gut basement membrane repair. For damage to

induce matrix menders requires the mechanosensitive channel *Piezo*, expressed in

neighboring intestinal stem cells (ISCs). Indeed, specifically reducing basement

membrane stiffness by reducing Col4 crosslinking is sufficient to induce matrix-mender

cells in a Piezo-dependent manner. Our results suggest that epithelial stem cells surveil

basement membrane integrity by monitoring its stiffness, responding to defects by

generating short-lived repair cells.

Results

Basement membrane repair and maintenance require many of the same components.

DSS directly damages the posterior midgut basement membrane of *Drosophila*[14]. After ingestion, DSS is transported through enterocytes to accumulate in the adjacent basement membrane (Fig. 1A). This mechanism is different from mice, where DSS is excluded by the intact epithelium[14,15]. In flies, DSS damages basement membranes, making them visibly fractured as visualized by TEM, less dense as measured with fluorescence and super-resolution microscopy, and less stiff as measured in a tensile strain assay[14]. The basement membrane mechanical damage changes the shape of the gut peristalsis muscles, which are outlined by Col4 (Fig. 1A, right side). A similar muscle shape is observed in fly guts lacking the Col4 crosslinking enzyme Peroxidasin (Pxn)[14,16,17], and these basement membranes also have reduced tensile stiffness[14,17,18]. In both instances, gut muscles become dysmorphic when enveloped by weakened basement membrane, and thus we can infer basement membrane stiffness from gut muscle shape, measured as aspect ratio. Importantly, two days after removing DSS and feeding flies regular food, there is full restoration of basement membrane structure and the muscle shape[14].

Previously, we determined that repair after DSS damage requires synthesis of new basement membrane proteins, including *vkg*, *LamininB1*, and *Pxn*[14]. We asked whether other conserved basement membrane components were required for repair, targeting Perlecan (*trol*), Nidogen (*Ndg*), and the Col4 extracellular chaperone, *SPARC*. We used two different RNAi lines to knock them down everywhere with *TubP-Gal4*,

initiating knockdown in 6-day old adult females. After two days, flies were fed DSS for

two days, then repair was allowed for two days (6 days total knockdown). By analyzing

muscle shape (aspect ratio), we found *trol*, *Ndg*, and *SPARC* were all required for

basement membrane repair (Fig. S1A-F). The requirement for new basement

membrane proteins indicates that damaged basement membranes are replaced with

new matrix. These same proteins are required for basement membrane maintenance

without externally applied damage, as knocking down *trol*, *Ndg,* or *SPARC* for 10 days

in adults caused dysmorphic gut muscles (Fig. S1K-P), whereas knocking down non-

matrix extracellular proteins *Gbp1* or *Gbp2*[19] had no effect (Fig. S1G-J, Q-T). From this,

we conclude that although basement membrane is replaced during normal homeostatic

maintenance, it is replaced faster during repair.

Collagen IV is upregulated in matrix mender cells following damage.

Although basement membranes are maintained throughout the body, we expect

damage-triggered repair to be a localized process. The Col4 in many *Drosophila* tissues

originates from a distant organ, the fat body[20,21], and we found that was true for the

undamaged gut by expressing tissue-specific dsRNA against GFP in *vkg-GFP/vkg+*

heterozygotes. *vkg-GFP/vkg+* gut basement membranes fluoresce green, but when

dsRNA against GFP was expressed ubiquitously with *TubP-Gal4*, there was virtually no

gut fluorescence, demonstrating the effectiveness of heterozygous knockdown (Fig S2

A-D). Importantly, the knockdown animal is functionally equivalent to a *vkg*

heterozygote, viable and healthy[21], so we do not expect to trigger any compensatory

mechanisms. When GFP was knocked down specifically in the fat body with *c564-Gal4*,

gut fluorescence was also extremely low, similar to ubiquitous knockdown (Fig. 1B,C

and Fig. S2A-D; specificity of *c564-Gal4* shown in Fig. S2I,J), indicating most of the

midgut Col4 originates from the fat body, a distant source. However, when these

animals were fed DSS to damage the gut basement membrane, the gut fluorescence

level increased significantly, indicating that Col4 was coming from another source

besides the fat body during repair (Fig. 1C-E; see also Fig. SE-H). In cross-section, the

DSS-induced Vkg-GFP was deposited between the gut epithelium and peristalsis

muscles, suggesting a local source of Col4 specific for repair (Fig. 1F,G).

To identify a damage-specific local source of Col4, we used *Cg-Gal4*, a reporter

of Collagen IV gene expression in which Gal4 is under control of a collagen enhancer

that lies between the head-to-head promoters of the two collagen genes *Col4a1* and

vkg[22]. In control guts, only a few cells in the posterior midgut (R4) faintly expressed

Cg>GFP, but after 2 d of DSS damage the number and intensity of *Cg>GFP* cells in the

gut increased substantially, from 1.8% to 5.7% of gut epithelial cells (Fig. 1H-M, Fig.

S3A). Analyzing their numbers over time, we found that *Cg>GFP* cells increased after

only one day of DSS feeding, peaked after the second day of DSS, and then subsided

after DSS is removed. Interestingly, *Cg>GFP* expression was no longer observed 2

days after DSS removal, when the gut basement membrane was repaired (Fig. 1L). We

dubbed these *Cg>GFP* cells "matrix menders" because they express Col4 in response

to basement membrane damage but not after repair is complete. Analyzing other genes

required for basement membrane repair, we found that reporters for *Pxn* and *Laminin*

expression (*Pxn>GFP* and *LanB1>GFP*) were active in the gut without basement

membrane damage; the number of *Pxn*-expressing cells doubled after damage, but the

number of *LanB1*-expressing cells did not increase (Fig. S4).

Matrix menders arise in response to basement membrane damage rather than

epithelial damage.

In addition to damaging basement membranes, DSS also damages cells[23]. To

assess the damage profile that induces matrix menders, we tested two additional drugs

known to damage the fly gut. Bleomycin is a DNA-damaging agent that targets

enterocytes, causing tissue disorganization, cell loss, and a resulting increase in stem

cell divisions[23]. After feeding bleomycin for 2 days, DNA damage was evident by anti-

H2AvD staining and increased stem cell divisions were evident by anti-pH3 staining

(Fig. S3B,C), yet the basement membranes remained undamaged as determined by

muscle shape, and matrix mender cells were not evident (Fig. 1N-Q). Next we tested

paraquat, which damages the fly gut by inducing reactive oxygen species and

increasing stem cell divisions[24,25]. Feeding flies paraquat for 16 h, reported to maximize

damage without causing lethality[24], caused unexpected basement membrane damage,

evident by altered muscle shape, and it significantly induced matrix menders (Fig. 1R-

U), similar to the levels seen in response to DSS. These results indicate that matrix

mender cells arise specifically to basement membrane damage, rather than epithelial

damage.

Matrix menders are a subset of enteroblasts.

The cell types of the fly posterior midgut are well known (Fig. 2A) and can be

identified with established cell markers. In DSS-fed guts, the Cg>GFP matrix menders

did not express the intestinal stem cell marker Dl, but interestingly, about 75% of matrix

menders were adjacent to Dl+ stem cells (174/236), suggesting that matrix menders are

either enteroblasts or pre-enteroendocrine cells. Nearly all *Cg>GFP* labeled matrix

menders were positive for the enteroblast marker *Su(H)GBE-lacZ*, indicating that matrix

menders are enteroblasts (Fig. 2B,C). Not all enteroblasts are matrix menders,

however, as only 43% of the *Su(H)GBE*-positive enteroblasts were also positive for

Cg>GFP (Fig. 2C). In guts that were not damaged by DSS, *Cg*-expressing cells were

still enteroblasts (81%) but fewer enteroblasts expressed *Cg* (21%) (Fig. 2C). Thus,

some but not all enteroblasts are matrix menders. The number of enteroblasts is known

to increase in response to DSS[23], and we found that after 2 d of DSS, the number of

enteroblasts increased from an average of ~7/100 cells to ~11/100 cells (Fig. 2D and

Fig. S6A). Nearly all this increase in enteroblasts can be accounted for by the increase

in collagen-expressing matrix mender cells (Fig. 1L).

Collagen IV from enteroblasts is required for repair.

We wanted to determine if the Col4 from matrix-mender enteroblasts was

important for repair, but unfortunately knocking down Col4 with *Cg-Gal4* would target

collagen in other tissues, such as the fat body. Instead, we knocked down *Col4a1* in

specific cell types with different Gal4 drivers, including the enteroblast driver *Su(H)GBE-*

Gal4 (Fig. 2E). With collagen removed from each potential source, we compared gut

morphology in undamaged guts to those that were DSS-damaged and allowed to repair,

scoring samples blinded to identity or treatment. When *Col4a1* was knocked down in

the fat body with *c564-Gal4*, many guts had dysmorphic muscles even without damage,

and morphology was similar when treated with DSS and allowed to repair; these results

indicate that Col4 from the fat body is important for gut basement membrane

development or homeostasis as expected, but it is not specific for repair. We next

knocked down Col4a1 in enteroblasts with *Su(H)GBE-Gal4,* which includes matrix

menders; although *Su(H)GBE* is expressed in some larval tissues including wing and

tracheae[26], it is not expressed in known collagen source tissues (adult fat body,

Malpighian tubules, or ovary, Fig. S5D-G). Gut muscle morphology was normal without

DSS treatment, but repair was severely compromised, with 70% still damaged two days

after removing DSS. To confirm the specificity of RNAi-mediated knockdown, we

knocked down *vkg* (Col4a2) with *Su(H)GBE-Gal4*, and this also interfered specifically

with repair and not development (Fig. S5A,B). These results indicate that Col4 from the

matrix mender cells is required specifically for midgut basement membrane repair.

When *Col4a1* was knocked down with *Myo1a-Gal4* in enterocytes, the terminally

differentiated cell type arising from enteroblasts, guts appeared like no-knockdown

controls, normal both without damage and after repair; these results indicate that after

differentiation, enterocytes do not supply Col4 for development, homeostasis, or repair.

We also knocked down *Col4a1* in the intestinal stem cells and enteroendocrine cells

(Fig. S5C), and morphology appeared similar without damage and after repair. Only the

collagen from enteroblasts is specific for gut basement membrane repair.

Most matrix menders are removed from the gut epithelium after repair.

We were interested in what happened to the matrix mender cells after repair,

when they were no longer evident. Did they turn off collagen expression, did they

differentiate, or did they die? To address this question, we performed lineage tracing of

the *Cg-Gal4* expressing matrix menders using the G-TRACE system[27], in which cells

actively expressing Col4 were labeled with *nlsRFP* and cells that previously expressed

Col4 were permanently labeled with nlsGFP (Fig. 2F). We analyzed the number and

fate of collagen-expressing cells in the gut, and as expected, the RFP+ cells behaved

like the *Cg>GFP* matrix mender cells, except that their numbers peaked slightly higher

and two days later (compare Fig. 2G,H to Fig. 1L). Although the difference is explained

by nuclear RFP persisting longer than cytoplasmic GFP, it also indicates that matrix

menders persist after they turn off collagen expression. After the peak, the number of

RFP+ cells decreased rapidly. We expected that the RFP+ cells would transition into

GFP+ lineage cells, because enteroblasts can remain dormant for weeks before

differentiating into enterocytes in a healthy gut epithelium[28]. Contrary to our

expectations, however, as RFP+ cells disappeared, the corresponding pulse of GFP+

cells was much smaller (Fig. 2H). These results indicate that most matrix menders are

removed from the gut epithelium after repair is complete. Matrix menders are capable of

differentiating into enterocytes, however, as the enterocyte-specific antibody Pdm1

stained about 15% (50/340) of GFP+ lineage-expressing cells after 2 days recovery but

did not stain RFP+ collagen-expressing cells (Fig. S6F,G). Matrix menders never

became enteroendocrine cells, as no G-TRACE labeled cells were labeled with anti-

Prospero (Fig. S6E). To determine if some matrix menders were dying, we stained

Cg>G-TRACE flies with anti-Cleaved Caspase 3 (CC3). In vehicle-treated guts, we

found ~9% of RFP+ matrix mender cells were positive for the cell death marker (Fig.

S6H). In guts recovering from DSS damage, the percentage of dying matrix menders

increased over time: at 0 d post DSS, 5% were labeled as dying, but by 4 d post DSS

feeding (2 d recovery) 15% RFP+ cells were labeled as dying (Fig. 2I,J and Fig S6H).

Although kinetic analysis is limited in fixed samples, it appears that most matrix

menders do not differentiate into enterocytes and are short-lived, a property of

enteroblasts generally after DSS treatment (Fig. S6B). Taken together, these results

indicate that as repair is completed, matrix menders first turn off collagen, then a few

differentiate while most die.

Piezo is required for matrix menders to arise in response to damage.

How does the gut sense damage to turn on Col4? Using a quantitative tensile

strain assay, we previously demonstrated that DSS damage makes basement

membranes less stiff (reduced elastic modulus)[14], and we envision that most types of

matrix damage would result in reduced stiffness (increased flexibility). Thus, we

reasoned that basement membrane damage might be detected by a mechanosensitive

mechanism such as the ion channel Piezo, known to be active in the fly gut[11,29,30]. To

test Piezo's role in basement membrane repair, we analyzed *Piezo[KO]* null flies, which

are homozygous viable. After damaging with DSS, *Piezo[KO]* flies were unable to repair

basement membranes (Fig. 3A-C), but unlike other matrix repair genes (Fig. S1), *Piezo*

was not required for basement membrane maintenance (Fig. 3 D-F). Analysis of a

second independent mutation, *Piezo[MI04294]*, confirmed its unusual repair-specific

function (Fig. S7A-F). To determine if *Piezo* is required for detection of basement

membrane damage, we quantified Cg-expressing matrix mender cells in *Piezo^KO* versus

control midguts after DSS damage. Piezo was required for matrix mender induction: in

controls, 5.8% of epithelial cells were matrix menders, but in *Piezo^KO* only 1.9% were

and their *Cg* expression level was reduced (Fig. 3G-J). Thus, *Piezo* is required for

matrix menders to arise in response to damage.

Piezo is expressed in a subset of intestinal stem cells.

For Piezo to monitor basement membrane damage, it must be present prior to

damage. To localize Piezo, first we tried a functional GFP-Piezo fusion protein at the

endogenous locus reported to be extremely dim in neurons[31], but we were unable to

detect GFP in the gut. Next, we turned to a Gal4-based *Piezo>GFP* transcriptional

reporter, expressed outside the gut epithelium in tracheal cells that penetrate the gut

muscles (Fig. S7G,H) and in small cells within the gut epithelium. On regular food, 93%

of *Piezo>GFP* cells were positive for the intestinal stem cell marker Dl but only 36% of

Dl+ stem cells expressed Piezo (Fig. 2K-O). Our results are similar to a previous report

that *Piezo* is expressed in 40% of intestinal stem cells[11]. We found that stem cells are

often adjacent to matrix menders (Fig. 3P-Q), suggesting that stem cell divisions give

rise to matrix menders in a Piezo-dependent manner.

Piezo detects decreased basement membrane stiffness to activate matrix

menders.

What aspect of basement membrane damage does Piezo detect? Piezo is a

transmembrane channel activated by mechanical stretch to the plasma membrane[32],

and the plasma membranes of intestinal stem cells are in direct contact with the

underlying basement membrane[33]. A damage-induced loss of tensile stiffness in the

basement membrane is expected to put more tension on neighboring plasma

membranes, resulting in membrane stretching and Piezo activation. Thus, we

hypothesized that Piezo detects basement membrane damage via its loss of stiffness.

As a test, we specifically reduced basement membrane stiffness in otherwise healthy

and undamaged animals, by inhibiting the Col4 crosslinking enzyme Peroxidasin.

Peroxidasin mouse mutant tissue has reduced basement membrane stiffness (Young's

modulus), measured as increased deformation (stretch) in response to tension[18]. Using

the same quantitative tensile strain assay, we recently reported that inhibiting

Peroxidasin in wild-type adult *Drosophila* by feeding 100 µM of the suicide substrate

phloroglucinol (PHG) for 5 days decreases basement membrane stiffness by about

half[17]. The PHG-induced decrease in basement membrane stiffness was evident in the

muscle aspect ratio, both at 100 µM and even more strongly at 5 mM, indicating a dose

response (Fig. 7A-D). Excitingly, 100 µM PHG alone without other damage induced

matrix menders (3.5% of gut epithelial cells), and 5 mM PHG induced even more matrix

menders (5.3%), at a level similar to DSS induction (Fig. 4E,F,H, compare to Fig. 1L).

Thus, the loss of stiffness specifically activated matrix mender cells. Further, the

mechanical induction of matrix menders required *Piezo*, as PHG-induced matrix

menders were completely suppressed in the *Piezo*[KO] background (Fig. 4G,H). These

results indicate that Piezo responds to the reduction in basement membrane stiffness to

give rise to collagen-expressing matrix mender cells, positioned adjacent to the

basement membrane (Fig. 4I,J) where they can effect repair.

Discussion

Using the basement membrane around the *Drosophila* posterior midgut as an

experimental model, we found that basement membrane damage gives rise to and is

repaired by a distinct set of local epithelial cells, matrix mender cells, defined by their

expression of the Collagen IV reporter *Cg-Gal4*. Matrix mender cells supply Col4

specifically required for repair: when Col4a1 or Vkg is knocked down in these cells,

undamaged guts appear normal, but guts with basement membrane damage cannot

repair. Most matrix menders are transient: after basement membrane repair is

completed, matrix menders turn off collagen expression and most of them die. In

contrast, Col4 is a long-lived molecule that is difficult to dispose of once deposited, and

too much leads to fibrosis. Perhaps it is important to limit the duration of collagen-

generating cells so they cannot cause fibrosis, thus making a long-lived molecule from a

short-lived cell.

The matrix mender cells are a subset of enteroblasts, daughters of intestinal

stem cells and progenitors of enterocytes. They are recognized by enteroblast marker

Su(H)GBE, most sit next to an intestinal stem cell, and ~15% differentiate into

enterocytes. Supporting data for enteroblasts expressing Col4 come from mining

published RNA sequencing data from single gut nuclei: transcripts for both Col4

subunits, *Cg25C* and *Vkg*, were identified almost exclusively in cells called progenitors

of enterocytes (proECs), defined as a subset of enteroblasts; further, after DSS

treatment, the number of proECs expressing the collagen transcripts doubled, results

similar to our findings but using very different methods to identify collagen expression

and cell identity[34,35]. Not all enteroblasts are matrix menders: in undamaged guts, only

21% of enteroblasts or 1.8% of epithelial cells express collagen, generally at low levels.

After basement membrane damage, the numbers increase: intestinal stem cell divisions

generate more total enteroblasts, and a greater percentage of them express collagen

(43%), with the result that about 6% of total epithelial cells express collagen, generally

at higher levels.

How is matrix damage detected to give rise to matrix menders? Matrix menders

arise in response to three independent challenges, DSS, paraquat, and PHG. All three

damage the basement membrane as assayed by gut morphology; in contrast, matrix

menders do not arise in response to the DNA damaging agent bleomycin, which does

not appear to damage the basement membrane although it damages the epithelial layer

and initiates stem-cell mediated repair[23,36]. Although DSS causes nonspecific damage

to both cells and matrix in the gut epithelium, PHG is highly specific, reducing the

number of head-to-head Col4 covalent sulfilimine crosslinks[16,37] and decreasing

basement membrane stiffness in a tensile strain assay, meaning that the basement

membrane will stretch more (increased strain) in response to a given pulling force or

tension[14,17]. The gut is a mechanically active environment, and increased basement

membrane stretching would cause increased stretching of neighboring plasma

membranes in the gut epithelial monolayer, activating mechanical stretch receptors.

Indeed, we found that the mechanosensitive transmembrane ion channel Piezo is

required specifically for basement membrane repair. Although many genes are required

for basement membrane repair, including those encoding basement membrane

components Nidogen, Perlecan, Laminin, Collagen IV, Peroxidasin, and the Collagen

chaperone protein SPARC, these genes are not specific to repair, as they are also

required for basement membrane maintenance. In contrast, the mechanosensitive ion

channel Piezo is required for repair only, not maintenance, confirmed with two

independent mutations. Our data strongly support a model that Piezo detects reductions

in basement membrane stiffness and signals for the generation of matrix menders.

Interestingly, even without induced damage, a few cells express collagen at low

levels in the midgut epithelium. We expect that low levels of basement membrane

damage are intrinsic to gut physiology given the proximity of the gut to an unpredictable

external environment and the mechanical wear and tear of peristalsis, and this low level

of damage would induce a weak matrix-mender response. Our various control data

show that in undamaged conditions the number of matrix menders is somewhat

variable, consistent with stochastic low levels of matrix damage.

<u>Simple model of basement membrane repair and its limitations</u>

We and others found Piezo expression in intestinal stem cells, so our data are

consistent with a simple stem-cell based model of basement membrane repair:

intestinal stem cells directly monitor basement membrane stiffness, with matrix damage

allowing greater cell stretching, activating Piezo. As a cation channel, Piezo activation

increases intracellular calcium levels, and sustained cytoplasmic calcium is known to be

sufficient to induce intestinal stem cell proliferation[38,39]. Thus, stem cells give rise to

matrix menders that express and secrete Col4 locally, restoring the structure of the

basement membrane. Their job complete, these cells turn off collagen expression and

most of them die. Although our data support this attractive model, it remains unclear

where Piezo detects basement membrane stiffness. Piezo is expressed in Dl+ intestinal

stem cells, but its function there has not been demonstrated as we have not had

success with Piezo conditional knockdown (i.e. ubiquitous knockdown does not

reproduce the mutant phenotype). Nevertheless, our data strongly support a two-part

model: (1) mechanical surveillance of basement membrane stiffness by Piezo, which

activates (2) repair mediated by local epithelial cells. Indeed, very recently it was shown

that stiffness regulates mouse intestinal stem cells via Piezo[40], and this may represent

part of the mechanism we show here. Our basement membrane repair model is likely to

be generalizable to other tissues and animals, as Piezo and basement membrane

components are all highly conserved as is the tissue architecture of basement

membranes in close contact with epithelial cells.

Lead contact

Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and

will be fulfilled by the lead contact, Andrea Page-McCaw (andrea.page-

mccaw@vanderbilt.edu)

Materials availability

Any requests for resources and reagents should be directed to the lead contact.

Data and code availability

All original code is publicly available: https://github.com/mshutson/cell-shape-analysis

Acknowledgements

We thank K. Elkie Peebles, Kimberly LaFever, Jordyn Sanner Barr, Leah Caplan, and Junmin Hua for technical help, Sergei Boudko and Patrick Page-McCaw for discussions, and Barry Denholm, Bruce Edgar, Yuh Nung Jan, BDSC, VDRC, and Kyoto DSC for fly stocks. CNA35 recombinant monomer protein was a gift from Sergei Boudko, and anti-Pdm1 was a gift from Yang Xiaohang. Work was supported by NIGMS (R01GM137595 to A.P-M., and F31GM148021 to A.S.)

Author Contributions

AS: Conceptualization, methodology, validation, formal analysis, investigation, resources, writing and editing, visualization. MSH: Methodology, software. APM: Conceptualization, methodology, writing and editing, visualization, supervision, project administration.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Supplemental Information

Document S1. Figures S1-S7

Figure Legends

Figure 1. "Matrix mender" gut cells upregulate Col4 after basement membrane

damage.

(A) Left: *Drosophila* midgut. The gut tube is covered with peristalsis muscles

(magenta) wrapped in basement membrane (green). Underneath the muscle layer, the

gut monolayer epithelium (blue nuclei/DAPI) comprises absorptive enterocytes (blue),

stem cells (brown), enteroblasts (gray), and enteroendocrine cells (red), all sitting on

basement membrane continuous with that of the muscles (green). Scale bars, 10 μm.

Right: DSS damage. DSS (orange dots) is ingested, transported through the

enterocytes, and deposited in the underlying basement membrane where it fractures the

basement membrane making it less stiff, resulting in visibly dysmorphic muscles

(described in Howard et al, 2019). Basement membranes and muscle shapes are fully

repaired 2 days after DSS is removed. Both repair and maintenance of the basement

membrane require basement membrane components and regulators (see Fig. S1 and

Howard et al, 2019, for data). Scale bars, 10 μm.

(B-G) Collagen IV (Vkg) in the gut basement membrane comes from the fat body in

undamaged conditions. B depicts the experiment knocking down GFP of Vkg-GFP

specifically in the fat body with *c564-Gal4*, data in C (*en face* view). After DSS damage,

some gut Vkg-GFP came from another source (D,E). Each dot in E represents a gut.

Cross-sections (F,G) show the new Vkg source deposits Vkg-GFP between the

epithelium and the muscles. Full data set for fat-body knockdown and the specificity of

the *c564-Gal4* driver shown in Fig. S2.

(H-K) Col4 reporter *Cg>GFP* identified unknown cells that respond to DSS in the gut.

Anterior (left), posterior (right). Posterior R4 midgut is the focus of this study. Scale bar,

100 µm in H,J, scale bar, 20 µm in I,K.

(L-M) Collagen-expressing cells ("matrix menders") increased in number during

basement membrane damage, then decreased during repair (L). Shaded regions

represent SEM. 5-21 guts analyzed per timepoint and treatment, see Fig. S3A for

dataset. Significance by *t*-test. In addition to number, expression level increased after

DSS (M), see arrowheads in I,K. Each dot represents a gut. Mean +/- SEM, significance

by *t*-test.

(N-Q) Feeding bleomycin did not damage the basement membrane, as indicated by

muscle shape (N-P), even though it did cause DNA damage and stem cell proliferation

(see Fig. S3B,C). Bleomycin did not induce *Cg>GFP+* matrix menders (Q). Mean +/-

SEM, significance by *t*-test. Scale bar, 10 µm.

(R-U) Feeding paraquat damaged the basement membrane, indicated by changes in

muscle shape aspect ratio (R-T). Paraquat induced *Cg>GFP+* matrix menders (U).

Mean +/- SEM, significance by *t*-test. Scale bar, 10 µm.

Figure 2. Matrix menders are a subset of enteroblasts that provide Col4

necessary for repair and are short-lived.

(A) Lineage of gut epithelial cell types.

(B) Matrix menders (*Cg>GFP*, green) expressed an enteroblast marker (*Su(H)GBE-*

lacZ, magenta). Scale bar, 10 µm.

(C) In both damaged and undamaged conditions, nearly all matrix menders were

enteroblasts expressing *Su(H)GBE-lacZ*, but not all enteroblasts were matrix menders

expressing *Cg>GFP*. After damage, more enteroblasts expressed *Cg>GFP*, evaluated

by Fisher's exact test. Number of cells scored is indicated.

(D) Total enteroblasts increased in response to DSS, SEM indicated. Each dot

represents 5-19 guts. Complete dataset in Fig. S6A.

(E) Repair required Col4 expressed from enteroblasts. *Col4a1* was knocked down in

different tissues, and adult gut muscle shape was compared in damaged-and-repaired

guts to unchallenged guts. When Col4a1 was fully expressed (first two columns), nearly

all guts had undamaged healthy basement membranes, both unchallenged and after

repair. Col4 from the fat body was required for development and/or homeostasis, as

guts appeared damaged even without challenge. Enteroblast Col4 was required

specifically for repair. Col4 was not required from enterocytes. Numbers of guts

evaluated is shown at column base. Guts were scored blinded to sample identity.

Knock-down in other gut cell types and knockdown of *vkg* confirmed that Col4 is

specifically required from enteroblasts for repair, see Fig. S5A-C. Significance evaluated

by Fisher's exact test.

(F-H) Dynamics of matrix mender cells during and after collagen expression determined

by G-TRACE. Overview (F) adapted from Evans et al., 2009. G, DSS increased the

number of real-time *Cg*-expressing cells (RFP+, magenta); after repair, *Cg*-expressing

RFP+ cells declined quickly, but most did not transition into lineage traced GFP+ cells

(green). Cells expressing both RFP+ and GFP+ were counted only as RFP+ (magenta)

to count each cell only once. Complete dataset in Fig. S6C,D.

I,J) *Cg>GTRACE* real-time expressing cells (RFP+, magenta) underwent cell death,
expressing Cleaved Caspase 3. Cell death of Cg-expressing cells was also observed
without DSS, see Fig. S6G. Shading represents SEM in G,H,J.

Figure 3. Piezo is required for basement membrane repair and for matrix menders to arise and is expressed in the intestinal stem cells.

(A-F) *Piezo* was required for basement membrane repair but not maintenance in adult guts. See Fig. S7A-F for confirmation with another allele. Mean +/-SEM. Significance by *t-test*. Scale bar in B for A-E, 10 μm.

(G-J) *Piezo* was required for *Cg>GFP* matrix mender cells to arise in response to DSS damage. Both the number and expression level of *Cg>GFP* cells were significantly reduced in *Piezo^{KO}* flies. Each dot represents a gut (I,J). Mean +/-SEM. Significance by ANOVA (I) and *t*-test (J). Scale bar, 20 μm.

(K-O) Piezo-transcriptional reporter (*Piezo^{KI}-Gal4*, green) was expressed in Dl+ intestinal stem cells (magenta), flies fed normal food. Almost all Piezo+ cells were Delta+ intestinal stem cells, yet only 36% of Dl+ intestinal stem cells express Piezo. For Venn diagram, the circle size and amount of overlap are representative. Scale bars, 10 μm in K, 5 μm in L.

(P-Q) *Cg>GFP* matrix mender cells (green) were adjacent to intestinal stem cells (anti-Delta, magenta). Scale bar, 10 μm. The number of cells analyzed is reported at column base for M,N,Q.

Figure 4. Piezo detects decreases in basement membrane stiffness to activate

matrix menders.

(A) PHG inhibits collagen IV crosslinking enzyme Pxn.

(B-D) Feeding PHG reduced basement membrane stiffness in a dose-dependent

manner, evidenced by muscle aspect ratio. Quantitative tensile stiffness measurements

were reported in Peebles et. al., (2024). Significance evaluated by ANOVA. Mean +/-

SEM. Scale bar, 10 μm.

(E-F) Reducing collagen crosslinking induced matrix mender cells. Scale bar, 20 μm.

(G-H) Piezo was required for matrix mender cells to arise in response to reduced

collagen crosslinking. Each data point represents an individual gut. Mean +/-SEM.

Significance by ANOVA.

(I-J) Matrix mender cells have extensive contact with basement membrane, both with

and without DSS (no recovery), positioning them well to repair it. Collagen is labeled

with the triple-helix binding protein, CNA35 (green). Scale bar, 10 μm.

534 Materials and Methods

535 Key resources table

REAGENT or RESOURCE	SOURCE	IDENTIFIER
Antibodies		
Mouse anti-β gal	Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank	Cat# 40-1a; RRID:AB_528100
Rabbit anti-Cleaved Caspase 3	Cell Signaling Technology	Cat# 9661; RRID:AB_2341188
Mouse anti-Delta	Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank	Cat# SA4; RRID:AB_2056641
Rabbit anti-H2AvD	Rockland	Cat# 600-401-914; RRID:AB_828383
Rabbit anti-pH3	Millipore	Cat# 06-570; RRID:AB_310177
Mouse anti-Prospero	Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank	Cat# MR1A; RRID:AB_528440
Rabbit anti-Pdm1	Yang Xiaohang	n/a
Cy3 goat anti-mouse IgG1	Jackson ImmunoResearch Labs	Cat# 115-165-205; RRID:AB_2338694
Cy3 donkey anti-rabbit IgG	Jackson ImmunoResearch Labs	Cat# 711-165-152; RRID:AB_2307443
Cy5 goat anti-mouse IgG	Jackson ImmunoResearch Labs	Cat# 115-175-205; RRID:AB_2338715
Cy5 donkey anti-rabbit	Jackson ImmunoResearch Labs	Cat# 711-175-152; RRID:AB_2340607
Experimental models: Organisms/strains		
D. melanogaster: VkgGFP[791]: y w; vkgP{GFP791, w+}	Carnegie Protein trap library via Sally Horne-Badovinac	CC00791
UAS-GFP[RNAi]: w[1118]; P{w[+mC]=UAS-GFP.RNAi.R}142	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	9330
VkgGFP, UAS-GFP[RNAi]/CyO, mCh	this study	n/a
Cg-Gal4: w[1118]; P{w[+mC]=Cg-GAL4.A}2	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	7011
UAS-GFP: w[*]; P{w[+mC]=UAS-GFP.S65T}eg[T10]	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	1522
Su(H)GBE-lacZ: w[*]; l(2)*[*]/CyO, P{ry[+t7.2]=en1}wg[en11]; P{ry[+t7.2]=Ddc.E(spl)m8-HLH-lacZ.Gbe}3	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	83352
Su(H)GBE-Gal4, UAS-mCD8GFP: w[*]; P{w[+mC]=Su(H)GBE-GAL4}2, P{w[+mC]=UAS-mCD8::GFP.L}LL5, P{UAS-mCD8::GFP.L}2/CyO	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	83377

UAS-Cg25c^{RNAi} *w1118; P{GD12784}v28369*	Vienna Drosophila Resource Center	28369
VkgRNAi (RNAi #1): *P{KK111668}VIE-260B*	Vienna Drosophila Resource Center	106812
VkgRNAi (RNAi #2): *y[1] v[1]; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMC02400}attP2*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	50895
c564-Gal4: *w[1118]; P{w[+mW.hs]=GawB}c564*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	6982
Myo1a-Gal4: *w*; P{w+mW.hs=GawB}NP0001 / CyO, P{w-=UAS-lacZ.UW14}UW14*	Drosophila Genomics Resource Center	112001
UAS-GTRACE: *w[*]; P{w[+mC]=UAS-RedStinger}6, P{w[+mC]=UAS-FLP.Exel}3, P{w[+mC]=Ubi-p63E(FRT.STOP)Stinger}15F2*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	28281
Piezo^{KO}: *w[*]; PBac{w[+mC]=RB5.WH5}Piezo[KO]*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	58770
Piezo^{KO}, VkgGFP^{791}	this study	n/a
Piezo^{KO}, Cg-Gal4/CyO	this study	n/a
Piezo^{KO}; UAS-GFP/TM3	this study	n/a
Piezo^{KI}-Gal4: *w[*]; TI{GAL4}Piezo[KI]*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	78335
UAS-myr-RFP: *w[*]; P{w[+mC]=Cg-GAL4.A}2, P{w[+mC]=UAS-myr-mRFP}1/CyO; P{w[+mC]=UAS-GFP.RNAi.R}142*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	63147
VkgGFP^{791}; tubGal4, tubGal80^{ts}/S-T	this study	n/a
UAS-Perlecan^{RNAi} (RNAi #1): *P{KK110494}VIE-260B*	Vienna Drosophila Resource Center	108157
UAS-Perlecan^{RNAi} (RNAi #2): *y[1] v[1]; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.GL01153}attP2*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	42783
UAS-Nidogen^{RNAi} (RNAi #1): *y[1] v[1]; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMJ24142}attP40/CyO*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	62902
UAS-Nidogen^{RNAi} (RNAi #2): *P{KK109625}VIE-260B*	Vienna Drosophila Resource Center	102310
UAS-SPARC^{RNAi} (RNAi #1): *P{KK100566}VIE-260B*	Vienna Drosophila Resource Center	103707
UAS-SPARC^{RNAi} (RNAi #2): *y[1] v[1]; P{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS02133}attP40*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	40885
UAS-Gbp1^{RNAi}: *P{KK110262}VIE-260B*	Vienna Drosophila Resource Center	108755
UAS-Gbp2^{RNAi}: *w[1118]; P{GD4931}v16696*	Vienna Drosophila Resource Center	16696
Pxn-Gal4/TM3: *y[1] w[67c23]; Mi{GFP[E.3xP3]=ET1}Pxn[MB00459]*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	22805
LanB1-Gal4/CyO: *w[1118]; PBac{w[+mC]=IT.GAL4}LanB1[0987-G4]/CyO*	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	63941

Tubulin-Gal4: y[1] w[*]; P{w[+mC]=tubP-GAL4}LL7/TM3, Sb[1] Ser[1]	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	5138
Prospero-Gal4: w[*]; P{w[+mC]=GAL4-pros.MG}3	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	80572
Btl-Gal4	Greg Beitel	FBti0148919
TubGal80ts/CyO; DlGal4/TM6B	Bruce Edgar	FBal0256627
Piezo^{MI0429}: y[1] w[*]; Mi{y[+mDint2]=MIC}Piezo[MI04294]	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	37433
Oligonucleotides		
PCR Piezo^{KO} F: GAGTGAGCTGATACCGCTCGC	this study	n/a
PCR Piezo^{KO} R: CAGCGACGGATTCGCGC	this study	n/a
Software and algorithms		
ImageJ 1.53v	National Institutes of Health	https://imagej.net/software/fiji/
Graphpad Prism 9.5		https://www.graphpad.com/
Seedwater Segmenter	Mashburn et al. 2012	n/a
Mathematica	Wolfram Inc.	https://github.com/mshutson/cell-shape-analysis

Fly husbandry

Flies were maintained on cornmeal-molasses food at 25 °C unless otherwise

specified. Adult-onset RNAi-based gene knockdown was done under $Gal80^{ts}$ control,

with flies maintained at 18 °C until they eclosed. Female flies were then aged at 18 °C

until they were 6-day adults (mated) before moving them to 29 °C to activate Gal4. Each

experiment contains data from at least two independent crosses. For the list of fly

stocks, please refer to Key Resource Table.

Confirming Piezo^{KO} using PCR

Because Piezo^{KO} flies have no obvious phenotype, we verified the presence of

the deletion by PCR in the starting stock and in recombinants. Primers were designed

and optimized against the Piggybac insertion PBac{WH}CG8486-f02291 in Piezo^{KO}

animals to confirm the loss of Piezo using the following primers – F:

GAGTGAGCTGATACCGCTCGC, R: CAGCGACGGATTCGCGC. OneTaq2x Master

Mix with standard buffer was used. The following PCR conditions were used – Initial

Denaturation: 94 °C, 30 sec; denaturation: 94 °C, 30 sec; annealing: 65 °C, 60 sec;

extension: 68 °C, 45 sec (30x cycles); final extension: 68 °C, 5 minutes.

DSS feeding

All DSS feeding experiments used mated female flies aged 3-5 d after eclosion

before feeding DSS. Flies utilizing the *Gal80*^{ts} system were moved to 29 °C for 2 days to

ensure the Gal4 was active prior to starting DSS feeding treatments. Flies not utilizing

the Gal80^{ts} system were aged 3-5 days at 25 °C prior to starting DSS feeding

treatments. DSS was administered as described in Amcheslavsky et al. (2009) and

Howard et al. (2019): a 2.5 cm x 3 cm piece of chromatography paper (Whatman 3030-

861, Grade 3 MM CHR) was placed in an empty vial. 500 µl of a 5% sucrose solution

with or without 3% 36-50 kDa DSS (dextran sulfate sodium salt colitis grade, MP

Biomedicals, CAS number 9011-18-1, 36,000 – 50,000 MW) was added to the paper in

the vial. Female flies were anesthetized and carefully placed in the vial. Flies were

added to new vials with fresh media each day for 2 days. For recovery experiments,

flies were transferred to a vial containing standard cornmeal-molasses food for 2 days.

For imaging in 3 dimensions (Z-stacks), flies on standard cornmeal-molasses food were

fed 5% sucrose for 4 hours before dissection to reduce gut autofluorescence from the

food.

Phloroglucinol feeding

PHG was fed to flies by dissolving it in food prepared without any cornmeal,

freshly made with or without 100 µM or 5 mM Phloroglucinol (PHG) (Sigma-Aldrich,

CAS number 108-73-6) and solidified in a vial overnight. 20 aged female flies and 5

male flies were added to the vials with or without PHG. Flies were kept at 25 °C for 5

days. Prior to dissection, flies were fed 5% sucrose for 4 hours before dissection to

reduce gut autofluorescence from the food.

Bleomycin feeding

Bleomycin (Sigma, 9041-93-4) was dissolved in water at a final concentration of

25 µg/mL and 5% sucrose, or 5% sucrose as a control. 500 µl of bleomycin or control

solution were added to a 2.5 cm x 3 cm piece of chromatography paper at the bottom of

an empty food vial. Flies were fed bleomycin for 2 days, changing the filter paper and

vial daily.

Paraquat feeding

A 10 mM paraquat (Sigma, 75365-73-0) solution was made in water with 5%

sucrose, or 5% sucrose alone as the control. Flies were starved in an empty vial for 4

hours before transferring them to a vial with a 2.5 cm x 3 cm piece of chromatography

paper soaked with either 500 µl of paraquat or control solution. Flies were fed for 16

hours prior to dissection.

Gut dissections and preparations

Adult females were placed in cold Grace's media and pinched between the

abdomen and thorax using sharp #5 dissecting forceps (Dumont). The abdomen was

separated from the thorax, and the integument surrounding the abdomen was peeled

away, exposing the gut and Malpighian tubules, being careful not to pinch or stretch the

gut. The Grace's media was removed using a Pasteur pipette, followed by one quick

wash with 1x PBS (137 mM NaCl, 2.7 mM KCl, 10 mM Na_2HPO_4, and 1.8 mM KH_2PO_4).

The guts were fixed with 8% paraformaldehyde (Ted Pella, Paraformaldehyde 16%,

Product #18505) in PBS for 60 minutes at room temperature, followed by 3 quick

washes in PBS, and 4 x 15 min washes with PBS or PBT.

For immunofluorescence experiments, blocking buffer was added to fixed guts

for 2 hours at room temperature or overnight at 4 °C then incubated in primary antibody

and 0.2 µM SiRActin (Spirochrome Cat# SC001) in PBS or PBT overnight at 4 °C,

followed by 4 x 30 min washes with 1x PBS. Secondary antibodies were added for 2

hours at room temperature, followed by 4 x 30 min washes. Guts were then mounted in

DAPI-containing mounting media (Vectashield, Vector Laboratories, H1200). Antibodies

used were mouse anti-β gal (1:50), rabbit anti-Cleaved Caspase 3 (1:200), mouse anti-Delta

(1:50), rabbit anti-H2AvD (1:1000), rabbit anti-pH3 (1:1000), mouse anti-Prospero (1:50), and

rabbit anti-Pdm1 (1:1000). The following secondary antibodies were used at 1:200 Cy3 goat

anti-mouse IgG1, Cy3 donkey anti-rabbit IgG, Cy5 goat anti-mouse IgG, and Cy5 donkey anti-

rabbit.

CNA35 staining

Immediately after gut dissections, CNA35 recombinant monomer protein labeled

with Alexa488 (1 mg/ml in PBS) was diluted to 1:100 in PBS and added to guts for 2

hours, followed by 1 quick wash in PBS and fixed for 1 hour with 8% PFA.

Light Microscopy

Single optical sections of the posterior midgut (R4) were imaged using a Zeiss

Apotome mounted to an Axio Image M2 with a 63x/1.4 oil Plan-Apochromat objective.

Z-stacks were acquired using a 40x/1.3 oil Plan-Apochromat objective at a 0.75 µm step

size taken through the top half of the gut tube (lumen through the top of the muscle

layer). Images were taken using an AxioCam MRm camera (Zeiss), X-Cite 120Q light

source (Excelitas Technologies), and AxioVision 4.8 software. FIJI ImageJ (version

1.53v, National Institutes of Health) 16-bit, ZVI files were used for analysis and figures

for images.

For Fig 1C,D and Fig S2A-H, the fluorescence intensity of the basement

membrane was determined by taking single optical slices *en face* through the middle of

the circumferential muscles to ensure the same plane of the basement membrane was

imaged, and the exposures were kept the same. The fluorescence intensity of the

basement membrane was measured in ImageJ using the "box" tool to measure the

average intensity of 3 representative regions of the gut basement membrane. Similarly,

the background intensity was determined by subtracting the average of 3 boxes outside

of the gut region. An AVOVA test was performed (GraphPad Prism 9.5).

Fluorescence intensity measurements of gut cells to be compared were acquired

at the same exposure from at least 3 experiments done on different days. Maximum

intensity projections were created using FIJI ImageJ and the line tool was used to draw

through the center of the 3 brightest nuclei in the GFP channel and the fluorescence

intensity was measured and averaged. Background fluorescence was subtracted by

taking the average intensity of 3 lines within the gut region that did not overlap with GFP

nuclei. An unpaired *t-test* was performed.

Measurement of muscle shape

Using single-slice cross section images of the gut basement membrane,

individual muscle cells were identified and segmented using the software Seedwater

Segmenter (Mashburn et al. 2012). Custom code in Mathematica (Wolfram Inc.,

Champaign, IL) was then used to analyze the segmented images and determine the

aspect ratio of each muscle cell (code available at https://github.com/mshutson/cell-

shape-analysis). Specifically, to quantify the aspect ratio of gut muscle cells, we first fit a

4th-order polynomial to all the segmented cells to estimate a tangent line along the gut's

long axis. We then calculated the two-dimensional moment-of-inertia tensor, J, for each

cell relative to the local tangent line, and calculated each cell's aspect ratio as

Sqrt[J11/J22]. This aspect ratio is thus the cell's height normal to the gut's long axis

divided by the cell's length along the gut's long axis.

Quantifying number of cells

GFP+ cells were manually quantified by creating a maximum intensity projection

of the Z-stack images of the top half of the gut and confirmed by the presence of a

nucleus. The total number of nuclei in the posterior midgut was quantified by creating a

maximum intensity projection and setting a threshold to select the DAPI-stained nuclei.

Images were "despeckled," and a watershed was applied to the image. Using the

ImageJ "analyze particle" feature, the number of particles larger than 5 μm^2 was

quantified. The areas where nuclei were fused together or unable to be accurately

quantified by ImageJ were manually quantified. The total number of GFP+ cells

captured in each image was divided by the total number of nuclei in the image and

multiplied by 100 to report the #GFP cells/100.

Statistical reporting

All statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism 9.5. ns indicates P >

0.05, * indicates P ≤ 0.05, ** indicates P ≤ 0.01, *** indicates P ≤ 0.001, **** indicates P

≤ 0.0001.

References

References

1. Iozzo, R.V., and Gubbiotti, M.A. (2018). Extracellular matrix: The driving force of
mammalian diseases. Matrix Biology *71–72*, 1–9.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matbio.2018.03.023.

2. Bonnans, C., Chou, J., and Werb, Z. (2014). Remodelling the extracellular matrix in
development and disease. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol *15*, 786–801.
https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm3904.

3. Liu, P., Xie, X., and Jin, J. (2020). Isotopic Nitrogen-15 Labeling of Mice Identified
Long-lived Proteins of the Renal Basement Membranes. Scientific Reports *10*, 1–7.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-62348-6.

4. Verzijl, N., DeGroot, J., Thorpe, S.R., Bank, R.A., Shaw, J.N., Lyons, T.J., Bijlsma,
J.W.J., Lafeber, F.P.J.G., Baynes, J.W., and TeKoppele, J.M. (2000). Effect of
Collagen Turnover on the Accumulation of Advanced Glycation End Products.
Journal of Biological Chemistry *275*, 39027–39031.
https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M006700200.

5. Maroudas, A., Palla, G., and Gilav, E. (1992). Racemization of Aspartic Acid in
Human Articular Cartilage. Connective Tissue Research *28*, 161–169.
https://doi.org/10.3109/03008209209015033.

6. Sivan, S.-S., Wachtel, E., Tsitron, E., Sakkee, N., van der Ham, F., DeGroot, J.,
Roberts, S., and Maroudas, A. (2008). Collagen Turnover in Normal and
Degenerate Human Intervertebral Discs as Determined by the Racemization of
Aspartic Acid. Journal of Biological Chemistry *283*, 8796–8801.
https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M709885200.

7. Yurchenco, P.D., and Furthmayr, H. (1984). Self-Assembly of Basement Membrane
Collagen. Biochemistry *23*, 1839–1850. https://doi.org/10.1021/bi00303a040.

8. Fidler, A.L., Vanacore, R.M., Chetyrkin, S.V., Pedchenko, V.K., Bhave, G., Yin, V.P.,
Stothers, C.L., Rose, K.L., McDonald, W.H., Clark, T.A., et al. (2014). A unique
covalent bond in basement membrane is a primordial innovation for tissue evolution.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
111, 331–336. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1318499111.

9. Ramos-Lewis, W., and Page-McCaw, A. (2019). Basement membrane mechanics
shape development: Lessons from the fly. Matrix Biology *75–76*, 72–81.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matbio.2018.04.004.

10. Buszczak, M., Paterno, S., Lighthouse, D., Bachman, J., Planck, J., Owen, S.,
Skora, A.D., Nystul, T.G., Ohlstein, B., Allen, A., et al. (2007). The Carnegie Protein
Trap Library: A Versatile Tool for Drosophila Developmental Studies. Genetics *175*,
1505–1531. https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.106.065961.

11. He, L., Si, G., Huang, J., Samuel, A.D.T., and Perrimon, N. (2018). Mechanical regulation of stem cell differentiation through stretch-activated Piezo channel. Nature *555*, 103–106. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25744.

12. Martin, J.L., Sanders, E.N., Moreno-Roman, P., Koyama, L.A.J., Balachandra, S., Du, X., and O'Brien, L.E. (2018). Long-term live imaging of the Drosophila adult midgut reveals real-time dynamics of division, differentiation and loss. eLife *7*. https://doi.org/10.7554/ELIFE.36248.

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

14. Howard, A.M., Lafever, K.S., Fenix, A.M., Scurrah, C.R., Lau, K.S., Burnette, D.T., Bhave, G., Ferrell, N., and Page-McCaw, A. (2019). DSS-induced damage to basement membranes is repaired by matrix replacement and crosslinking. Journal of Cell Science *132*. https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.226860.

15. Shimshoni, E., Adir, I., Afik, R., Solomonov, I., Shenoy, A., Adler, M., Puricelli, L., Sabino, F., Savickas, S., Mouhadeb, O., et al. (2021). Distinct extracellular–matrix remodeling events precede symptoms of inflammation. Matrix Biology *96*, 47–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matbio.2020.11.001.

16. McCall, A.S., Cummings, C.F., Bhave, G., Vanacore, R., Page-Mccaw, A., and Hudson, B.G. (2014). Bromine is an essential trace element for assembly of collagen IV scaffolds in tissue development and architecture. Cell *157*, 1380–1392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.05.009.

17. Peebles, K.E., LaFever, K.S., Page-McCaw, P.S., Colon, S., Wang, D., Stricker, A.M., Ferrell, N., Bhave, G., and Page-McCaw, A. (2024). Peroxidasin is required for full viability in development and for maintenance of tissue mechanics in adults. Matrix Biology *125*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matbio.2023.11.005.

18. Bhave, G., Colon, S., and Ferrell, N. (2017). The sulfilimine cross-link of collagen IV contributes to kidney tubular basement membrane stiffness. American Journal of Physiology - Renal Physiology *313*, F596–F602. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajprenal.00096.2017.

19. O'Connor, J.T., Stevens, A.C., Shannon, E.K., Akbar, F.B., LaFever, K.S., Narayanan, N.P., Gailey, C.D., Hutson, M.S., and Page-McCaw, A. (2021). Proteolytic activation of Growth-blocking peptides triggers calcium responses through the GPCR Mthl10 during epithelial wound detection. Developmental Cell *56*, 2160-2175.e5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.devcel.2021.06.020.

20. Pastor-Pareja, J.C., and Xu, T. (2011). Shaping Cells and Organs in Drosophila by Opposing Roles of Fat Body-Secreted Collagen IV and Perlecan. Developmental Cell *21*, 245–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.devcel.2011.06.026.

21. Ramos-Lewis, W., LaFever, K.S., and Page-McCaw, A. (2018). A scar-like lesion is apparent in basement membrane after wound repair in vivo. Matrix Biology *74*, 101–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matbio.2018.07.004.

22. Asha, H., Nagy, I., Kovacs, G., Stetson, D., Ando, I., and Dearolf, C.R. (2003). Analysis of Ras-Induced Overproliferation in Drosophila Hemocytes. Genetics *163*, 203–215. https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/163.1.203.

23. Amcheslavsky, A., Jiang, J., and Ip, Y.T. (2009). Tissue Damage-Induced Intestinal Stem Cell Division in Drosophila. Cell Stem Cell *4*, 49–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2008.10.016.

24. Choi, N.H., Kim, J.G., Yang, D.J., Kim, Y.S., and Yoo, M.A. (2008). Age-related changes in Drosophila midgut are associated with PVF2, a PDGF/VEGF-like growth factor. Aging Cell *7*, 318–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-9726.2008.00380.x.

25. Buchon, N., Broderick, N.A., Poidevin, M., Pradervand, S., and Lemaitre, B. (2009). Drosophila Intestinal Response to Bacterial Infection: Activation of Host Defense and Stem Cell Proliferation. Cell Host & Microbe *5*, 200–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2009.01.003.

26. Furriols, M., and Bray, S. (2001). A model Notch response element detects Suppressor of Hairless–dependent molecular switch. Current Biology *11*, 60–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-9822(00)00044-0.

27. Evans, C.J., Olson, J.M., Ngo, K.T., Kim, E., Lee, N.E., Kuoy, E., Patananan, A.N., Sitz, D., Tran, P.T., Do, M.T., et al. (2009). G-TRACE: Rapid Gal4-based cell lineage analysis in Drosophila. Nature Methods *6*, 603–605. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.1356.

28. Antonello, Z.A. (2015). Robust intestinal homeostasis relies on cellular plasticity in enteroblasts mediated by miR-8–Escargot switch. The EMBO Journal *34*, 2025–2041. https://doi.org/10.15252/embj.201591517.

29. Min, S., Oh, Y., Verma, P., Whitehead, S.C., Yapici, N., Van Vactor, D., Suh, G.S.B., and Liberles, S.D. (2021). Control of feeding by piezo-mediated gut mechanosensation in Drosophila. eLife *10*, 1–30. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.63049.

30. Lee, J., Cabrera, A.J.H., Nguyen, C.M.T., and Kwon, Y.V. (2020). Dissemination of Ras V12-transformed cells requires the mechanosensitive channel Piezo. Nature Communications *11*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17341-y.

31. Song, Y., Li, D., Farrelly, O., Miles, L., Li, F., Kim, S.E., Lo, T.Y., Wang, F., Li, T., Thompson-Peer, K.L., et al. (2019). The Mechanosensitive Ion Channel Piezo Inhibits Axon Regeneration. Neuron *102*, 373-389.e6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2019.01.050.

32. Coste, B., Mathur, J., Schmidt, M., Earley, T.J., Ranade, S., Petrus, M.J., Dubin,
A.E., and Patapoutian, A. (2010). Piezo1 and Piezo2 Are Essential Components of
Distinct Mechanically Activated Cation Channels. Science *330*, 55–60.
https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1193270.

33. You, J., Zhang, Y., Li, Z., Lou, Z., Jin, L., and Lin, X. (2014). Drosophila Perlecan
Regulates Intestinal Stem Cell Activity via Cell-Matrix Attachment. Stem Cell
Reports *2*, 761–769. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stemcr.2014.04.007.

34. Petsakou, A., Liu, Y., Liu, Y., Comjean, A., Hu, Y., and Perrimon, N. (2023).
Cholinergic neurons trigger epithelial Ca2+ currents to heal the gut. Nature, 1–3.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06627-y.

35. single-cell RNA-seq data portal
https://www.flyrnai.org/scRNA/gut_homeostasis_recovery/.

36. Tian, A., Wang, B., and Jiang, J. (2017). Injury-stimulated and self-restrained BMP
signaling dynamically regulates stem cell pool size during Drosophila midgut
regeneration. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *114*.
https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1617790114.

37. Bhave, G., Cummings, C.F., Vanacore, R.M., Kumagai-Cresse, C., Ero-Tolliver, I.A.,
Rafi, M., Kang, J.S., Pedchenko, V., Fessler, L.I., Fessler, J.H., et al. (2012).
Peroxidasin forms sulfilimine chemical bonds using hypohalous acids in tissue
genesis. Nature Chemical Biology *8*, 784–790.
https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.1038.

38. Deng, H., Gerencser, A.A., and Jasper, H. (2015). Signal integration by Ca2+
regulates intestinal stem-cell activity. Nature *528*, 212–217.
https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16170.

39. Xu, C., Luo, J., He, L., Montell, C., and Perrimon, N. (2017). Oxidative stress
induces stem cell proliferation via TRPA1/RyR-mediated Ca2+ signaling in the
Drosophila midgut. eLife *6*, e22441. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.22441.

40. Baghdadi, M.B., Houtekamer, R.M., Perrin, L., Rao-Bhatia, A., Whelen, M., Decker,
L., Bergert, M., Pérez-Gonzàlez, C., Bouras, R., Gropplero, G., et al. (2024). PIEZO-
dependent mechanosensing is essential for intestinal stem cell fate decision and
maintenance. Science *386*, eadj7615. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adj7615.

A
Posterior midgut structure

Basement membrane
Muscle Actin

Epithelial nuclei

Ingested DSS damages gut basement membranes

Lumen — DSS

Genes required for maintenance and repair:
Col4
Laminin
Nidogen
Perlecan
SPARC
Pxn

Lumen
Body cavity
Basement membrane muscles

Maintenance
Healthy basement membrane
Repair (2 d)
Damaged basement membrane

B
Fat body Source of Col4
Col4-GFP
Col4
Fat Body
vkg-GFP
vkg+
mRNA

Fat body knockdown of *GFP*
Col4
Fat Body>GFP^RNAi
vkg-GFP
vkg+
mRNA

Fat body>GFP^RNAi

C
Vehicle
Vkg-GFP

D
DSS

E
Vkg-GFP Intensity (A.U.)
**
Vehicle   DSS

F
Vehicle
Vkg-GFP Actin

G
DSS

H
Cg>GFP   Vehicle
R4

I
Vehicle
DAPI
Cg>GFP

J
DSS
R4

K
DSS

L
 # gut cells expressing Col4
Cg>GFP cells/100
Vehicle
DSS
****
Start (3-5 d old)
Vehicle/DSS
0 1 2 3 4 9 (days)
Flies moved to regular food

M
Col4 reporter intensity
Normalized GFP Intensity (A.U.)
*
Vehicle   DSS

N
Vehicle
Vkg-GFP

O
Bleomycin

P
Muscle Shape (h/w)
ns
Vehicle (13 guts)   Bleomycin (13 guts)

Q
Cg>GFP cells/100
ns
Vehicle   Bleomycin

R
Vehicle
Vkg-GFP

S
Paraquat

T
Muscle Shape (h/w)
****
Vehicle (23 guts)   Paraquat (20 guts)

U
Cg>GFP cells/100
**
Vehicle   Paraquat

A Enteroendocrine ← Intestinal Stem Cell → Enteroblast → Enterocyte

Matrix menders are *Su(H)GBE+* (enteroblasts)

B DSS — *Cg>GFP* **B'** *Su(H)GBE-LacZ* **B"** Merge

C

Vehicle
Su(H)GBE+ EBs — *Cg+* MMs
144 / 38 / 9

% *Cg+* cells that are *Su(H)GBE+*
81% (47), 95% (158)
Vehicle / DSS

DSS
Su(H)GBE+ EBs — *Cg+* MMs
199 / 150 / 8

% *Su(H)GBE+* cells that are *Cg+*
***
21% (182), 43% (349)
Vehicle / DSS

D *Su(H)GBE+* cells increase with DSS
Vehicle / DSS
Su(H)GBE>GFP cells/100
Vehicle/DSS
Start (3-5 d old) 0 ... 2 ... 4 (days)
Flies moved to regular food

E Tissue specific knockdown: Col4 from enteroblasts is required for repair

Embryo → Adult → Vehicle / DSS → Recovery (2 days)
Knock down Col4 in Fat body - Enteroblasts - Enterocytes - Other
Healthy? OR Damaged?

% guts without damage after recovery (scored blinded)
ns / ns / *** / ns
92% (26) / 96% (23) — ∅>*Cg^RNAi* (no expression)
75% (8) / 56% (9) — *c564>Cg^RNAi* (Fat body)
100% (15) / 30% (10) — *Su(H)GBE>Cg^RNAi* (Enteroblasts)
92% (12) / 85% (13) — *Myo1a>Cg^RNAi* (Enterocytes)
Veh / DSS

F Collagen IV enhancer → Gal4
Gal4 | UAS → RFP (Real-time expression, magenta)
Gal4 | UAS → FLP
Ubi^p63 — Stop — GFP (FRT FRT)
Ubi^p63 — GFP (FRT)
Cell color: Real-time expression (magenta) ↔ Lineage expression (green)

G Vehicle
cells/100
Vehicle
Start (3-5 old) 0 2 4 6 9 (days)
Flies moved to regular food

H DSS
cells/100
DSS
Start (3-5 old) 0 2 4 6 9 (days)
Flies moved to regular food

I *Cg>GTRACE* DSS 2 d recovery — Real-time expression **I'** anti-CC3 **I"** Merge

J % of *Cg>RFP* recognized by anti-Cleaved Caspase 3
% colocalized
DSS
n=131 to 601 cells
Start (3-5 d old) 0 2 3 4 6 (days)
Flies moved to regular food

Repair requires *Piezo*

A control — Vkg-GFP

B *Piezo^{KO}*

C
Muscle Shape (h/w)

****

Control (7 guts) | *Piezo^{KO}* (10 guts) | Control (5 guts) | *Piezo^{KO}* (9 guts)

Vehicle feeding + 2 d normal food | DSS feeding + 2 d normal food

Maintenance does not require *Piezo*

D control

E *Piezo^{KO}*

F
Muscle Shape (h/w)

ns

Control (11 guts) | *Piezo^{KO}* (10 guts)

10 d aged

Matrix menders require *Piezo*

G DSS — *Cg>GFP* — DAPI

H *Piezo^{KO}* DSS — *Cg>GFP* — DAPI

I # gut cells expressing Col4

Cg>GFP cells/100

**** ; **

Vehicle | DSS | Vehicle | DSS
Cg>GFP | *Piezo^{KO}, Cg>GFP*

J Col4 reporter intensity

Normalized GFP Intensity (A.U.)

*

Cg>GFP DSS | *Piezo^{KO}, Cg>GFP* DSS

Piezo is expressed in some intestinal stem cells

K Regular food — *Piezo>GFP*

K' anti-Delta

K'' Merge

K''' DAPI

L Regular Food — *Piezo>GFP* anti-Delta Actin

M % of Piezo+ cells that are Dl+ stem cells

93%
105
Regular Food

N % of Dl+ stem cells that are Piezo+ cells

36%
271
Regular Food

O Regular food

Dl+ ISCs
173 | 98 | 7 Piezo+

Matrix menders are adjacent to Dl+ stem cells

P DSS — *Cg>GFP*

P' anti-Dl

P'' Merge

Q % of *Cg*+ cells adjacent to Dl+ stem cells

% adjacent

74%
236
DSS

A

PHG → Pxn

Met — S=N — Hyl
          OH

B   *Vkg-GFP*   No PHG

C   5 mM PHG

D

Muscle Shape (h/w)

****
***   *

Control   100 μM   5 mM
(5 guts)   PHG   PHG
               (4 guts)   (6 guts)

E   *Cg>GFP*   No PHG   DAPI

F   *Cg>GFP*   5 mM PHG   DAPI

G   *Piezo^{KO}*   5 mM PHG   DAPI
    Cg>GFP

H

 # gut cells expressing Col4

Cg>GFP cells/100

***   **

No PHG 100 μM 5 mM   No PHG 100 μM 5 mM
        PHG   PHG   PHG   PHG

Cg>GFP   *Piezo^{KO}, Cg>GFP*

I   *Cg>myrRFP* Col4

    Vehicle

J

    DSS