**Cell cycle-dependent mRNA localization in P-bodies**

Adham Safieddine[1,*], Marie-Noëlle Benassy[1], Thomas Bonte[2], Floric Slimani[3], Oriane Pourcelot[3],

Michel Kress[1], Michèle Ernoult-Lange[1], Maïté Courel[1], Emeline Coleno[3], Arthur Imbert[2], Antoine

Laine[4], Annie Munier Godebert[5], Angelique Vinit[5], Corinne Blugeon[6], Guillaume Chevreux[7],

Daniel Gautheret[4], Thomas Walter[2], Edouard Bertrand[3], Marianne Bénard[1], Dominique Weil[1,*]

1: Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Institut de Biologie Paris Seine (IBPS), Laboratoire de Biologie

du Développement, France

2 : Centre for Computational Biology (CBIO), Mines Paris, PSL University, Paris, France

3 : Institut de Génétique Humaine, University of Montpellier, CNRS, Montpellier, France

4 : Institute for Integrative Biology of the Cell, UMR 9198, CEA, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay,

Gif-Sur-Yvette, France

5: Sorbonne University, CISA flow cytometry facility, Research Center Saint-Antoine (CRSA),

UMRS 938, F-75012 Paris, France.

6: Génomique ENS, Institut de Biologie de l'ENS (IBENS), Département de biologie, École

normale supérieure, CNRS, INSERM, Université PSL, 75005 Paris, France

7: Université Paris Cité, CNRS, Institut Jacques Monod, 75013 Paris, France.

*Correspondence: dominique.weil@upmc.fr (D.W), adham.safieddine@sorbonne-universite.fr

(A.S)

**Abstract:**

Understanding the dynamics of RNA targeting to membraneless organelles is essential to disentangle their functions. Here, we investigate how P-bodies (PBs) evolve during cell cycle progression. PB purification at different cell cycle phases uncovers widespread changes in their RNA content. Importantly, these changes are partly uncoupled from cell cycle-dependent changes in RNA expression. Single molecule FISH shows various mRNA localization patterns in PBs peaking in G1, S, or G2, with multiple examples illustrating the timely capture of mRNAs in PBs when their encoded protein becomes dispensable. Cyclic mRNA localization in PBs does not directly reflect their non-polysomal pool. While mRNA localization in PBs is tightly linked to their GC content at all cell cycle phases, PB mRNAs are specifically longer in G1. Altogether, our study supports a model where PBs are more than a default location for excess untranslated mRNAs and suggests an RNA-mediated seeding mechanism for post-mitotic PB reassembly.

**Keywords:**

P-bodies, RNA localization, RNA imaging, cell cycle

**Highlights:**

- The RNA content of PBs is dynamics during cell cycle progression
- Cyclic mRNA accumulation in PBs is in part uncoupled from mRNA expression in the cytoplasm
- smFISH highlights various patterns of cyclic mRNA accumulation in PBs, particularly in G1
- PBs do not buffer excess non-polysomal mRNAs
- PB mRNAs have particularly long CDSs in G1 but not G2, while they are strikingly AU-rich all along the cell cycle

## Introduction

Proper compartmentalization of biological molecules is a fundamental aspect of cellular organization. In the last decade, membraneless organelles received increasing attention and appreciation for their contribution in organizing subcellular space[1–5]. In eukaryotic cells, many such organelles have been identified both in the nucleus, including for instance nucleoli, Cajal bodies, speckles and paraspeckles, and in the cytoplasm, including stress granules and P-bodies (PBs).

PBs are ribonucleoprotein granules (RNPs) widespread throughout eukaryotes and constitutively present in mammalian cells[6]. They contain a large variety of RNA binding proteins involved in translation regulation and RNA decay. Our previous purification of PBs from asynchronous human cells allowed the characterization of their RNA content[7]. PBs accumulate a large variety of RNAs, corresponding to one third of the coding transcriptome. These mRNAs are generally abundant, but inefficiently translated. Furthermore, PB mRNAs are strikingly AU-rich[8]. This nucleotide bias in the coding sequence (CDS) results in a codon usage strongly biased towards low usage codons, which leads to poor protein yield. In addition, their AU-rich 3' untranslated regions (3'UTRs) favors their accumulation in RNP granules, likely due to preferential binding to condensation-prone RNA-binding proteins (RBPs). In terms of cellular functions, PB-enriched mRNAs tend to encode regulatory proteins whereas the mRNAs encoding house-keeping proteins tend to be excluded from PBs[7]. While these studies provided a first genome-wide picture of the PB transcriptome, further studies are required to understand to which extent PBs adapt their content to cellular needs.

Various approaches have been used to investigate RNA localization in PBs. In situ hybridization first showed that mRNA repressed by miRNA localize to PBs[9]. Then, single molecule tracking of microinjected RNAs allowed examining their trafficking at a high temporal resolution over minutes[10]. This revealed that miRNAs, repressed mRNAs, and lncRNAs can associate transiently or stably with PBs, in part depending on their functionality. Other studies addressed RNA localization in PBs in response to translational stress. For instance, relief of miR122-mediated silencing in response to amino acid starvation or oxidative stress causes the release of its CAT-1 mRNA target from PBs[11]. A prolonged amino acid starvation, that leads to 60% translation reduction, also increased exogenous RNA targeting to PBs[12]. While such studies suggested a regulatory potential of mRNA targeting to PBs under condition of extreme translational reprogramming, the dynamics of the PB transcriptome in unstressed conditions have not been investigated.

The cell cycle is a program of physiological and molecular changes a cell undergoes to
produce two daughter cells. From an RNA metabolism perspective, cell cycle progression is well
characterized, with specific waves of transcription[13–18] and RNA degradation[19–23]. In terms of
translation, a previous study highlighted that proliferative cells have a distinct tRNA signature
compared to differentiating or arrested cells, which may favor the translation of mRNAs with AU-
rich codon usage[24]. Regarding PBs, it was shown that they dissolve at every mitosis, reform in
G1 phase, and enlarge during S phase progression[25]. Interestingly, we previosuly found that,
among the various regulatory proteins encoded by PB mRNAs, cell cycle regulators were
particularly enriched[6,7]. For these reasons, we chose to investigate the dynamics of RNA
localization in PBs in the context of the cell cycle.

Here, we first determined the composition of PBs purified at various cell cycle stages. This
revealed widespread changes in the RNA content of PBs during cell cycle progression. Some of
these changes were uncoupled from those occurring in the cytoplasm (the ones resulting from
variations in mRNA transcription or stability), demonstrating a regulatory potential of PBs. Single
molecule FISH (smFISH) confirmed the diversity of PB localization patterns, with maximal
localization in PBs peaking in G1, S or G2 phase, depending on the transcript. Notably, some
mRNAs particularly expressed in G2 traffic to PBs specifically in early G1, at a time where their
encoded protein is no longer needed. Reporter mRNAs and puromycin experiments show that
the cyclic pattern of PB localization is not directly related to the amount of untranslated transcripts
in the cytoplasm. While we did not find any phase-specific nucleotide or codon usage bias, we
observed a G1 phase-specific contribution of CDS length. Altogether, our results demonstrate the
existence of differential RNA localization in PBs operating across the cell cycle and suggest that
RNAs with long CDSs are central to the formation of new PBs in early G1.

**Results**

**PBs enlarge during cell cycle progression**

Before analyzing the content of the PBs during the cell cycle, we first refined the description of
their global morphology and number across the cell cycle. To identify cell cycle stages, we relied
on the PIP-FUCCI system. PIP-FUCCI allows accurate determination of cell cycle phases by
expressing decay-sensitive fragments of two known cyclic proteins fused to fluorescent markers:
(i) $Cdt_{11-17}$-mVenus expressed in G1, G2 and mitosis (G2/M); and (ii) mCherry-$Gem_{1-110}$ expressed
in S and G2/M phases[26,27]. Both markers are fused with nuclear localization elements to make
them compatible with cytoplasmic co-labeling. The accurate cell cycle-dependent expression of
PIP-FUCCI was verified by flow cytometry analysis of live cells after DNA labeling with Hoechst.
The mVenus positive, mCherry positive, and double positive cells showed the expected quantity
of DNA (1N to 2N) for cells in G1, S, and G2/M phases, respectively (Figure S1A, B). PB labeling
by immunofluorescence (IF) against the classical PB marker DDX6 (Figure 1A) showed that PB
size increased from G1 to G2 (Figure S1C), and DDX6 mean intensity in PBs increased in G2
(Figure S1D) regardless of PB size (Figure 1B). However, the number of PBs per cell increased
only modestly (Figure S1E). To investigate if these changes resulted from increased expression
of PB proteins required for (DDX6, LSM14A and 4E-T) or contributing to (PAT1B) human PB
assembly[28], we separated HEK293-FUCCI cells in G1, S and G2/M phases using fluorescence
activated cell sorting (FACS). However, none of the tested proteins was induced across the cell
cycle (Figure S1F). In summary, after dissolving in mitosis, PBs form in G1, progressively enlarge
during interphase, particularly in G2, while their number remains similar.

**PB purification reveals the same major PB proteins across the cell cycle**

To characterize changes in PB composition during cell cycle progression, we set out to purify
them from different phases of the cell cycle using our previously developed Fluorescence
Activated Particle Sorting (FAPS) method[7] (Figure 1C) and HEK293 cells that stably express
GFP-LSM14A at levels similar to endogenous LSM14A (Figure S2A). In these cells, GFP-
LSM14A co-localizes with the PB marker DDX6 (Figure S2B) but not the stress granule marker
TIA1 (Figure S2C). We selected 4 cell cycle stages for their biological significance: mid G1, G1S
transition, mid S and G2M transition. Cells were synchronized using two complementary

strategies (Figure 1D): (i) a double thymidine block to harvest cells blocked at the G1S transition,

after which they were released for 5 hr to obtain cells in mid S phase; (ii) a selective CDK1

inhibitor[29] (RO-3306) to block cells at the G2M transition, after which they were released for 8 hr

to obtain cells in mid G1. Forty 15 cm plates were synchronized per phase to obtain sufficient

material for FAPS purification. The quality of the synchronization was assessed on a small fraction

of each plate by propidium iodide staining of the DNA followed by flow cytometry analysis (Figure

1D). After synchronization, cytoplasmic lysates were prepared as described in the Materials and

methods. An aliquot was kept aside for further analysis and thereafter termed the pre-sorting

fraction (PSF). Two controls were used to delineate the PB sorting window (Figures 1E): (i) cell-

free lysis buffer and (ii) a lysate from cells expressing a truncated GFP-LSM14A protein that only

displays diffuse GFP fluorescence (Figure S2D). For all cell cycle phases, PBs were sorted based

on particle size and GFP fluorescence (Figures 1E and S3). After sorting, a fraction of the purified

sample was re-analyzed by flow cytometry (Figures 1E and S3) and visualized in fluorescence

microscopy (Figure 1F) to verify that PBs were conserved while cytoplasmic contaminants were

considerably reduced.

After a total of >140 hr sorting, sufficient material was accumulated for proteomic analysis

of PBs from each cell cycle phase, using liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (LC-

MS/MS, Supplementary Table 1). In all phases, the vast majority of known PB proteins (17-29

proteins detected) were enriched in the purified PB fraction compared to the PSF (Figures 1G

and S4). These included translational repressors and RNA decay factors (including DDX6,

LSM14A and LSM14B, 4E-T, EDC4 and DCP1A) and proteins of the miRNA pathway (AGO1-3

and MOV10). In contrast, proteins such as mitochondrial proteins, translation initiation factors,

components of the proteasome, splicing factors and histones were mostly depleted (Figures 1G

and S4A). We then asked if the protein content of PBs changed during cell cycle. Given the

inherently limited amounts of proteins obtained from purified PBs, we could not carry out the

replicates needed for quantitative MS. Nevertheless, a pairwise comparison of PBs from

successive cell cycle phases did not show drastic changes in the levels of the well-detected PB

proteins (Figure 1H). In summary, the proteomic analysis of purified PBs does not show major

changes of the main PB proteins across the cell cycle.

**PB RNA content is dynamic during cell cycle progression**

We then analyzed the RNA content of the purified PBs and their corresponding PSFs using RNA

sequencing. First, to assess if the PSFs recapitulated known cell cycle-dependent RNA

regulation, we took advantage of a published study that compared G1S to G2M HeLa cells[30]. Most

RNAs reported as more expressed in G1S or in G2M were indeed more abundant in our G1S or

G2M PSFs, respectively, despite the different cell line and protocols (Figure S5A). Then, gene

ontology (GO) analysis showed that RNAs more abundant in our G2M sample encode proteins

involved in chromatin condensation, chromosome segregation, and cell division, while those more

abundant in G1S encode proteins involved in nucleotide metabolism, DNA replication and its

regulation (Figure S5B,C). Altogether, these analyses confirmed the reliability of our

transcriptomic data for cell cycle analysis. We then compared RNA levels before and after sorting

within each cell cycle phase (Figures 2A and S6). Between 3,838 and 5,106 mRNAs were

enriched in PBs (p-adj<0.05, DEseq2 model[31]) depending on the cell cycle phase (Supplementary

Table 2). Among them, 2043 were enriched in only a subset of phases or at a unique phase

(Figure 2B).

Next, we compared the RNA content of purified PBs across the cell cycle (Supplementary

Tables 3 and 4, Figure S7). Remarkably, this revealed widespread changes in RNA levels in PBs

(Figures 2C and S8A). For example, from mid G1 to G1S, 2943 mRNAs had increased levels in

PBs, while 2599 decreased (Figure 2C, D).  To determine if the mRNAs with cyclic accumulation

in PBs encode proteins enriched for specific functions, we systematically performed GO analyses.

We found that mRNAs accumulating in PBs between mid G1 and mid S were enriched (181 out

of 1889) for transcripts encoding proteins functioning in mitotic cell cycle phase transition,

chromosome condensation, and cytokinesis (Figure 2E, left panel). Inversely, the mRNAs that

decreased in PBs between mid G1 and mid S were enriched (154 out of 1813) for transcripts

encoding proteins involved in transcription, transcriptional regulation, and RNA-binding (Figure

2E, right panel). Taken together, this indicated that the mRNA content of PBs is highly dynamic

throughout the cell cycle.

**RNA accumulation in PBs is in part uncoupled from their cytoplasmic expression level**

Cell cycle variations in mRNA levels have been well characterized and are controlled at the levels

of transcription and/or stability[13,17–20,22,23,30]. The question here was whether there is specific

regulation at the level of mRNA localization in PBs. In a scenario where there is none, we expect

mRNA levels in PBs to closely follow their level in the cytoplasm across phases. We therefore

investigated the relationship between the RNA content of PBs and the surrounding cytoplasm,

using PSFs as a proxy for cytoplasms. Comparing the RNA changes in PBs and PSFs from mid

G1 to G1S indeed showed an overall distribution along the diagonal (Figure 2F), suggesting a

broad coupling between the RNA content of PB and cytoplasm. Yet, when mRNAs decreased in

PBs between the two phases, their decrease was twice less pronounced in the cytoplasm.

Moreover, many cases fell far from the general distribution, as exemplified by FBXO5 and CLK1

mRNAs (studied later), indicating some degree of uncoupling between the PB and cytoplasm

contents. The results were similar from G1S to mid S. In contrast, from mid S to G2M the PB

content was weakly coupled to the prominent transcriptional induction. For example, the PB

fraction did not mirror the cytoplasmic increase in TOP2A, BUB1B, and CENPF levels (Figure 2F,

studied later). Similarly between G2M and mid G1, the PB content did not follow the prominent

decrease of cytoplasmic transcripts. In conclusion, these data suggest that the dynamics of the

PB transcriptome can be uncoupled from cytoplasmic variations, particularly during the 2nd half of

the cell cycle, setting the stage for cell cycle-dependent RNA targeting to PBs.

### In-situ confirmation of various patterns of cyclic RNA localization in PBs

Our transcriptomic analysis revealed cell cycle-dependent changes in the RNA content of PBs.

To supplement these genome-wide analyses, we performed single molecule FISH (smFISH)

experiments on several mRNAs (candidates chosen based on PB-enrichment pattern, p-adj

values, and sufficient expression levels for reliable smFISH detection). smFISH illuminates

individual RNA molecules *in-situ*, allowing localization and counting of RNA molecules[32,33].

We started with the mRNA of the cell cycle protein FBXO5, a major regulator of the

anaphase promoting complex (APC)[34–39]. In our RNA-seq dataset, FBXO5 expression was

highest in G1S and mid S phases in the PSF, in accordance with its transcriptional induction at

G1S[40]. In purified PBs, it also peaked at G1S and mid S, but with a much higher differential with

mid G1 or G2 (Figure 3A). For smFISH, we synchronized HEK293 cells expressing GFP-LSM14A

in G1S, mid S, G2M and mid G1, as performed for PB purification. In agreement with the RNA-

seq data, we observed more FBXO5 mRNA molecules in the cytoplasm, and considerably more

in PBs, in G1S and mid S than in G2M and mid G1 (Figure 3B). This was confirmed by quantitative

image analysis (Figure 3C), which showed that the fraction of FBXO5 mRNAs localized in PBs

cycled between ~25% in mid G1 and ~63% in mid S (Figure 3C).

Similarly, we examined the mRNAs encoding the cell cycle-regulated splicing factor
CLK1[41] and cyclin E2 (CCNE2). In contrast to FBXO5, CLK1 transcripts gradually increased in
both PBs and the cytoplasm throughout the cell cycle, peaking at G2M (sequencing data and
smFISH experiments, Figures 3A,D). Quantitation of the smFISH images indicated that the
fraction of RNA in PBs increased from ~38% of the molecules in mid G1 and G1S to ~48% in
G2M (Figure 3E). CCNE2 transcripts had a similar profile as FBXO5, with both sequencing data
and smFISH experiments showing maximal cytoplasmic and PB levels in G1S (Figure 3A,F), with
the fraction of CCNE2 mRNA molecules in PBs oscillating between ~31% in G1S and ~25% in
G2M (Figure 3G). Thus, CCNE2, FBXO5 and CLK1 mRNAs exhibited various PB localization
patterns, peaking at G1S, mid S, and G2M, respectively. To summarize, these smFISH
experiments provided single-molecule evidence of cyclic mRNA accumulation in PBs across the
cell cycle.

**PBs capture a subset of cyclic mRNAs after mitotic exit**

We next focused on mRNAs harboring prominent induction in the cytoplasm in G2 though with
limited consequences on PB accumulation (Figure 2F). We first analyzed the mRNA encoding
the G2 protein topoisomerase 2A (TOP2A), which regulates chromosome compaction[42] and
relieves topological DNA stress[43,44]. In the sequencing dataset, expression of TOP2A increased
slightly from mid G1 to S and significantly more in G2M, as previously described[45–47]. This
increase however was not mirrored in PBs where TOP2A mRNA levels remain similar from mid
G1 to G2M (Figure 4A). SmFISH experiments on asynchronous cells revealed three TOP2A
localization patterns: (i) some cells had few TOP2A mRNA molecules in both the cytoplasm and
PBs (Figure 4B, white arrows); (ii) others showed high TOP2A mRNA expression in the cytoplasm
but modest localization in PBs (Figure 5B, yellow arrows); and, to our surprise, (iii) a subset of
cells showed heavy TOP2A mRNA accumulation in PBs with few TOP2A mRNA molecules free
in the cytoplasm (Figure 4B, green arrows). Quantitative image analysis further assessed this
striking heterogeneity (Figure 4C). TOP2A biology[48] and our RNA-seq data suggested that cells
with high RNA expression and low PB localization (pattern ii) corresponded to G2 cells, i.e. when
the protein is needed and most highly expressed. We speculated that after mitosis, in early G1 (a
time point not included in the PB purification pipeline, but accessible with smFISH), leftover
TOP2A mRNA could be sent to PBs (pattern iii). To test this hypothesis, we transiently expressed
Halo-tagged LSM14A in HEK293-FUCCI cells to allow for the simultaneous imaging of
cytoplasmic TOP2A mRNAs, PBs and nuclear PIP-FUCCI cell cycle markers. As expected, S and

G2 cells showed high levels of TOP2A mRNA with modest PB localization (Figure 4D, red and
yellow arrows). In contrast, G1 cells showed two patterns, with either minute amount of TOP2A
mRNAs, or moderate TOP2A expression but striking accumulation in PBs (Figure 4D, green
arrows). Since TOP2A remains abundant during mitosis[47] (Figure 4D, white arrow) and is
transcriptionally induced only in G1S or early S[49,50], we conclude that the latter cells correspond
to early G1 where residual TOP2A mRNAs are localized in PBs. To summarize, the burst of
TOP2A mRNA expression in G2 cells, when the protein is needed, does not coincide with PB
accumulation. Rather, localization in PBs occurs when they reform in early G1, at a time when
TOP2A mRNA is down regulated and the protein no longer required.

Looking for mRNAs with similar expression patterns as TOP2A in our transcriptomic
dataset, we identified mRNAs encoding the centromere protein F (CENPF) and, to a lesser extent,
the mitotic checkpoint serine/threonine kinase B (BUB1B) (Figure 4A). Like TOP2A, these mRNAs
are most highly expressed in G2 and encode proteins functioning mainly in G2 and mitosis:
CENPF is essential for kinetochore function[51,52] while BUB1B ensures proper attachment of
chromosomes to the mitotic spindle[53,54]. Using 2-color smFISH, we found that CENPF and BUB1B
mRNAs had indeed similar dynamics as TOP2A: they co-localized with it in PBs in early G1 cells
(Figure 4E, blue arrows), and were highly expressed yet weakly present in PBs in S or G2 cells
(Figure 4E, yellow arrows). As a benchmark, we took advantage of PUM2 mRNA, which displayed
a similar expression and PB localization throughout the cell cycle in our transcriptomic dataset
(Figure 4A) and in the 2-color smFISH (Figure 4E). In summary, a group of transcripts encoding
G2-M proteins traffic into PBs after cell division, when their protein is no longer needed. Such an
observation further highlights that RNA accumulation in PBs can vary independently of its
cytoplasmic abundance and thus contribute to mRNA regulation.

**A subset of mRNAs decaying at the mitosis-to-G1 transition specifically accumulate in PBs**
**in G1**

In a parallel approach to FAPS, we set out to explore RNA localization in PBs across the cell cycle
using high-throughput smFISH (HT-smFISH, Figures 5A, S9). We selected 94 mRNAs with or
without known cyclic expression and carried out the analysis in non-synchronized HEK293 cells
expressing GFP-LSM14A. Cells were classified in G1 or G2 phase based on their DAPI signal.
Briefly, for each imaged RNA, the integrated DAPI signal was used to construct a cell cycle profile,
which allowed to separate cells in G1 or G2 phase with high confidence (example profile in Figure

5A, see Methods for details). While most transcripts displayed a similar fraction in PBs in G1 and

G2 cells, a subgroup of mRNAs showed higher mRNA accumulation in PBs in G1 than in G2

(Figure 5B). Single-cell representation of such transcripts showed that the fraction of mRNA in

PBs was particularly heterogeneous in G1 cells, readily reaching values above 50% of mRNA

molecules (Figure 5C). Interestingly, expression of many of these transcripts was reported to peak

in G2 and decrease in G1, while their encoded proteins are implicated in G2-to-mitosis

progression (such as ECT2[55], TTK[56], and DLGAP5[57]).

297            We therefore hypothesized that mRNA accumulation in PBs may be concomitant with their

elimination after mitosis. Among the 94 mRNAs included in our HT-smFISH, 17 were previously

reported to undergo decay at the mitosis-to-G1 (M-G1) transition[22]. Remarkably, most mRNAs

showing higher accumulation in PBs in G1 than in G2 cells belonged to this group (Figure 5B-D

and G, upper panels). Conversely, mRNAs encoding G2 proteins but not undergoing decay at the

M-G1 transition accumulated similarly in PBs in G2 and G1 cells (Figure 5B-D and G, lower

panels). To extend these data, we considered the 161 mRNAs described as decaying at the M-

G1 transition[22] and well detected in our FAPS dataset. 62% of them were significantly enriched in

PBs purified from G1 cells, which is higher than expected (44% for all mRNAs, Figure 5E). They

also tended to be enriched in PBs to greater extents (Figure 5F). Taken together, HT-smFISH

independently provides evidence of cell cycle-dependent RNA localization in PBs, with a subset

of mRNAs undergoing M-G1 transition decay specifically accumulating in PBs in G1 phase.

**Cyclic mRNA localization in PBs does not result from fluctuating amounts of non-**
**polysomal mRNAs**

To better understand cyclic mRNA localization in PBs, we first envisioned a mechanism related

to the condensate nature of PBs. The examples studied above clearly showed that mRNA

localization in PBs does not follow expression changes in the cytoplasm throughout the cell cycle.

Nevertheless, PBs could be more subtly involved in attenuating cell-to-cell expression differences

within the same cell cycle stage, a mechanism suggested from an artificial condensate study[58].

To address this hypothesis, we used the quantitative analysis of the cell cycle-resolved TOP2A,

FBXO5, and CLK1 smFISH experiments described above. Even within the same cell cycle phase,

the fraction of mRNAs in PBs showed weak or no correlation with cytoplasmic expression (Figure

S10A). This was true whether RNA fractions in PBs were high or low (e.g. TOP2A mRNAs in early

G1 vs S or G2, respectively), and argued against a general role of PBs in recruiting excess
cytoplasmic mRNAs.

Alternatively, PBs could simply recruit mRNAs when they are free in the cytoplasm. In this
scenario, the distinctive TOP2A, BUB1B, and CENPF mRNA localization pattern could result from
their specific translational downregulation after mitosis, driving free mRNAs into newly formed
PBs. In that case, disrupting polysomes should be sufficient for their untimely recruitment in PBs
in G2. To test this, we treated HEK293-FUCCI cells transiently expressing LSM14A-Halo with
puromycin. This translation inhibitor disrupts polysomes within a few minutes, disassembling
ribosomes and the translation machinery from the mRNA and releasing nascent peptides[59].
Interestingly, a 1 hr puromycin treatment did not cause TOP2A mRNAs to massively relocalize
into PBs in G2 cells (Figure S10B). Similarly, 2-color smFISH of BUB1B or CENPF mRNAs with
TOP2A mRNAs in the HEK293 cell line expressing GFP-LSM14A did not show significant
difference of localization in PBs between control and puromycin-treated cells (Figure 6A-D). The
efficiency of the puromycin treatment was controlled using HeLa cells expressing endogenous
ASPM-MS2 mRNA that localizes to centrosomes in a translation-dependent manner[60,61]. As
expected, centrosomal localization of this mRNA was abolished after a 15 min puromycin
treatment (Figure S10C). In summary, disrupting polysomes was not sufficient to prematurely
drive TOP2A, BUB1B, and CENPF mRNAs into PBs in G2 phase.

**Long CDSs favor accumulation of AU-rich mRNAs in PBs in early G1**

We then searched for mRNA features that could participate in cell cycle-dependent PB
localization. We previously reported that in asynchronous cells, the GC content of CDS and 3'UTR
is the best predictor of mRNA enrichment in PBs[8]. This held true at all cell cycle phases: PB-
enriched mRNAs were particularly AU-rich, with a striking correlation between PB enrichment and
GC content ($r_s$ between -0.75 and -0.79 for the GC content of the mRNA, Figure S11A, B).
However, this compositional bias displayed only minor changes across the cell cycle. Even
focusing on the top 1000 PB-enriched mRNAs did not reveal any notable difference between cell
cycle phases (Figure S11C). Given the nucleotide bias in the CDS, NNA/U triplets were strongly
overrepresented in PB-enriched mRNAs, as observed previously[8] (Figure S11D). While this
codon usage bias is similar to one reported for cell cycle-regulated genes[62] (Figure S11E), it
appeared unrelated to cell cycle-regulated PB localization (Figure S11D).

We also reported that PB-enriched mRNAs tend to be longer than average[8]. While this
held true at all cell cycle phases (Figure S11F), the correlation between PB enrichment and mRNA
length was higher in G1 phase than in the other phases ($r_s$ of 0.33, compared to 0.20-0.24, Figure
S11G). The analysis of the top 1000 PB-enriched mRNAs further revealed striking differences
between cell cycle phases. These mRNAs were much longer than average in mid G1 (5.1 kb
median, compared to 3.3 kb), shorter in G1S and S (4.2 and 4.4 kb, respectively), and similar to
average in G2 (3.5 kb, Figure 7A). The size differences mainly originated from the CDS, since
3'UTR exhibited less striking differences (Figure 7A). Similarly, mRNAs revealed by HT-smFISH
to accumulate more in PBs in G1 than in G2, had particularly long CDS (Figure S11H).
Furthermore, for the top 500 AU-rich mRNAs, CDS length appeared as a key feature associated
with PB localization in G1 ($r_s$=0.63) but not in G2 ($r_s$=-0.07, Figure S11I). These results suggested
that the CDS length plays an important role in the accumulation of the most AU-rich mRNAs in
PBs in G1 but not in G2 phase.

To investigate if a long CDS directly contributes to driving mRNAs into PBs in G1, we
transiently transfected two Renilla Luciferase reporters, with either a 0.9 kb or a 1.7 kb CDS
(obtained by lengthening Renilla while keeping a similar GC content) in HEK293 cells expressing
GFP-LSM14A. Importantly, both CDSs were AU-rich (36% GC), making them amenable to PB
localization[8]. We then performed a 2-color smFISH against Renilla and TOP2A mRNAs to
distinguish early G1 from S and G2 cells (Figure 7B, C). In early G1 cells, the long CDS reporter
accumulated significantly more in PBs than the short one, while in S and G2 cells both reporters
minimally accumulated in PBs (Figure 7D). This indicated that a longer CDS increases RNA
accumulation in PBs specifically in early G1. Taken together, these data show that CDS length,
in the context of an AU-rich nucleotide composition, is a feature that contributes to RNA
accumulation in PBs specifically in G1 cells.

**Discussion**

**The mRNA content of PBs is dynamic and partly uncoupled from the cytoplasmic content**

In this study, we set out to investigate the dynamics of mRNA localization in PBs at the scale of hours in standard growth conditions. As a biological context, we chose the cell cycle since it entails changes in cytoplasmic RNA abundance that have been well documented at various RNA metabolism levels[13–15,18,19,21,22,22]. During every cell cycle, PBs form in G1, then increase in size more than in number, culminating in G2, before dissolving in mitosis. Cycling cells thus give access to the cell-autonomous dynamics of PB RNA content in the absence of any stress.

PB purification from various stages of the cell cycle provided us with a genome-wide landscape of PB RNAs during cell cycle progression. This allowed us to answer the primary question: does the RNA content of PBs change during cell cycle progression? We observed indeed that, despite no major changes in their main protein composition, PBs undergo widespread changes in their mRNA content. Secondly, do these changes simply mirror changes of cytoplasmic mRNA abundance, or do they behave distinctly? In fact, part of these changes did not reflect those of the cytoplasm: (i) mRNAs could change in PBs more strikingly than in the cytoplasm (particularly from mid G1 till mid S), (ii) and inversely, they could markedly change in the cytoplasm without a similar change in PBs (particularly from mid S to the next G1). Single molecule RNA imaging confirmed the reliability of our PB transcriptomes across the cell cycle and highlighted the remarkable variety in RNA localization patterns: for example, TOP2A, BUB1B and CENPF strikingly accumulated in PBs in early G1; many mRNAs peaking in G2 before undergoing decay accumulated in PBs in G1; CCNE2 at the G1S transition; FBXO5 in mid S; and CLK1 at the G2M transition. Thus, differential localization in PBs is not restricted to specific stages of the cell cycle. In particular, it does not follow the evolution of PBs considered as a whole (increasing size and number) during cell cycle progression. This positions RNA localization in PBs as a potential gene-specific post-transcriptional regulatory layer operating across the cell cycle.

**Biological relevance of differential mRNA accumulation in PBs**

Can differential RNA accumulation in PBs contribute to cell biology? One possibility involves sequestering mRNAs when the protein is not needed anymore. This is illustrated by TOP2A, CENPF and BUB1B mRNAs, which strongly accumulated in PBs in early G1. These transcripts are transcriptionally and translationally upregulated from late S to mitosis, periods when their

encoded protein is needed[48,49,49,52,54], and then subject to mitotic decay pathways[22]. TOP2A
mRNA for instance is degraded by a CCR4-NOT-dependent mechanism[22]. However, when the
process is not fast enough to completely prevent protein production in G1, there is no mechanism
for ensuring translation inhibition of its residual transcripts in G1[22,63]. We hypothesize that PB
localization could contribute to the silencing of such transcripts in early G1. These few examples
are further corroborated by our HT-smFISH analysis which revealed a group of mRNAs that
specifically accumulated in PBs in G1, that are also subject to mitotic decay[22]. Regardless of how
and where their decay is taking place, our data suggest that PBs offer a safety net to attenuate
mistimed protein production of cell cycle regulators by compartmentalizing their mRNAs away
from the translation machinery.

**PBs do not buffer excess non-polysomal mRNAs**

What can be the mechanism underlying cyclic mRNA localization in PBs? We first envisioned a
mechanism inspired by the physical nature of membraneless organelles. Since liquid-liquid phase
separation (LLPS) implies the condensation of molecules that are over their saturation
concentration, membraneless organelles have been proposed as a buffering mechanism to limit
cell-to-cell variability of intracellular concentration[58]. In this context, mRNA accumulation in PBs
may increase for some transcripts in a particular cell cycle phase due to higher heterogeneity of
expression. Our single molecule FISH data did not support such a hypothesis. For all mRNAs
analyzed, despite wide cell-to-cell variability of expression within a given cell cycle phase, we
observed no or limited correlation between mRNA accumulation in PBs and in the cytoplasm. This
is consistent with the observation that, in contrast to minimal condensates like the recently
described nanoclusters forming upon massive mRNA storage in C. elegans arrested oocytes[64],
multicomponent cellular organelles like nucleoli or stress granules, are not governed by a fixed
saturation concentration[65].

Then, since polysomal mRNAs are excluded from PBs, we considered a scenario where
mRNA accumulation in PBs would be governed by the amount of non-translating mRNAs. From
a transcriptome-wide perspective, it has been previously proposed that non-optimal codon usage
could generate cell cycle-dependent translation efficiency[62]. In all cell cycle phases, we found that
PB-enriched mRNAs were particularly AU-rich, leading to a non-optimal codon usage associated
with inefficient translation, as described previously[8]. However, neither the GC content, nor the
codon usage of PB-enriched mRNAs differed between phases, indicating that codon usage is not
involved in the cyclic pattern of mRNA accumulation in PBs. We also addressed the question
experimentally on endogenous mRNAs that have the capacity to accumulate in PBs (TOP2A,

BUB1B and CENPF). Releasing these mRNAs from polysomes in G2 cells was not sufficient to
relocate them in PBs, despite them having appropriate intrinsic features to accumulate in PBs in
early G1. Altogether, we did not find evidence that mRNA accumulation in PBs represents only
the inverted mirror of mRNA translation.

**CDS length contributes to RNA localization in PBs in G1 but not G2**

This prompted us to look for other intrinsic determinants of cell cycle-dependent mRNA
localization in PBs. We previously reported that mRNA accumulation in PBs in asynchronous cells
moderately correlated with their length[8]. To our surprise, this feature was cell cycle-dependent,
with PB mRNAs one and a half times longer in G1 than in G2 (5.1 vs 3.5 kb), the latter being close
to average. Their 3'UTR tended to be longer than average in all phases, consistent with the
hypothesis that they bring binding motifs for translation repressors that favor recruitment in PBs,
as discussed previously[8]. In contrast, the CDSs of PB-enriched mRNAs were particularly long in
mid G1 but not G2M, reaching one a half time the average length (2.3 vs 1.5 kb). Moreover, for
the most AU-rich mRNAs of the transcriptome, CDS length correlated with PB enrichment in G1
but not G2M. Critically, we confirmed using an mRNA reporter that CDS length had more impact
in early G1 than in S or G2. Since translational blockage did not alter cyclic RNA accumulation in
PBs, it is unlikely that differential localization across the cell cycle is linked to the coding capacity
of the CDS. Instead, we speculate that some RBPs that preferentially bind long CDSs and play a
role in mRNA recruitment into PBs are expressed or post-translationally modified at precise cell
cycle stages.

From a LLPS perspective, we favor an alternative non-exclusive possibility. Modeling and
simulations have shown that longer transcripts localize at the core of RNA-protein condensates,
where they augment the density of molecular interactions and saturate chemical bonds[66,67]. This
promotes LLPS and stabilizes condensates, preventing collapse from excessive RNA
recruitment. These in-silico observations seem to fit well the cell cycle dynamics of PBs, which
form in G1, progressively grow through the cell cycle and dissolve in mitosis. It is particularly
tempting to speculate that long RNAs favor the seeding and stabilize nascent PBs in early G1.
These PBs could then progressively accumulate more RNA, growing into "mature" PBs without
collapsing. Long RNAs may at a certain point lose their advantage, because the interaction
network is sufficiently stable and saturated, or also because short RNAs, which are modeled to
localize at the surface of condensates[66], may provide a barrier to long RNA recruitment[68].Such a

model would be also particularly relevant for stress-induced membraneless organelles like stress

granules, which were shown to contain particularly long mRNAs after a 1 hr induction[69].

Taken together, mRNA accumulation in PBs appears to be a multifaceted process

involving the cumulative effect of intrinsic (GC content, CDS length) and extrinsic (RBPs) factors.

If PBs are highly dynamic condensates in a cell-autonomous process like cell cycle progression,

they should be even more so across a whole organism, during development and differentiation,

and in a changing environment or in response to stress.

**Methods**

**Cell culture, drug treatments, and transfections**

HEK293 and HeLa cells were grown in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's Medium (DMEM, Gibco)

supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS, Sigma-Aldrich), and 100 U/mL

penicillin/streptomycin (Sigma-Aldrich). HEK293 cells stably expressing GFP-LSM14A were

obtained by transfecting a pCMV-GFP-LSM1A plasmid and selecting stable clone under 500

µg/mL G418 (Gibco). HEK293-FUCCI cells were obtained via CRISPR-Cas9-mediated insertion

of the PIP-FUCCI reporter in the AAVS1 genomic locus and selection under 1 µg/mL puromycin.

All cells were grown at 37 °C with 5% $CO_2$. To inhibit translation, cells were treated with 100

µg/mL puromycin for 1 hr or 15 min, as indicated. For all transient transfections, 5 µl Lipofectamine

2000 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) was used with the following DNA quantities per well of a 6-well

plate: 1 µg LSM14A-Halo tag, and 100 ng of each Renilla luciferase construct with 900 ng of a

non-transcribed plasmid. All transfection were done for 5 hr after which the reagent was washed

off and cells allowed to grow for 24-48 hr before fixation. Cell fixation was done with 4%

paraformaldehyde PFA (Electron Microscopy Sciences) for 20 min at room temperature (25°C).

The Renilla Luciferase short (0.9 kb) and long plasmids (1.7 kb) were expressed under a CMV

promoter.

**Synchronizations**

All synchronizations were performed in HEK293 cells expressing GFP-LSM14A. For PB

purification, synchronizations were done in 15 cm dishes. For double thymidine blocks, 4 million

cells were seeded. The next day, 7.5 mM thymidine was added to the culture medium for 18 hr.

Cells were then washed gently with warm PBS three times and further incubated in fresh complete

medium. Cells were released for 9 hr after which 7.5 mM thymidine was added again for another

18 hr. This results in cells blocked at the G1S transition. To obtain cells in mid S phase, cells were

further washed three times in warm PBS after which fresh complete medium was added. Cells

were released for 5 hr to obtain a population at mid S phase. For CDK1 inhibition, 8 million cells

were seeded. The next day the CDK1 inhibitor RO-3306 was added at 9 µM. After 22 hr, cells

blocked at the G2M transition were harvested. To obtain cells at mid G1, we found that half the

drug's concentration (with the same blockage time) provides a better release from G2M into mid

G1 (with three PBS washes and an 8 hr release in fresh complete medium). Forty to fifty 15 cm

dishes for each cell cycle phase were synchronized. After each synchronization, a small fraction
of each 15 cm dish was tested in flow cytometry for the quality of the synchronization and, if
synchronization reached 55% for mid G1, 80% for G1S or mid S, and 70% for G2M, the rest was
used for PB purification. For microscopy experiments, identical synchronizations were done for
cells grown on 22x22 cm coverslips in 6-well plates, with the addition of poly-L-lysine for better
cell adhesion.

**Cell cycle related flow cytometry analysis and FACS purification**

To fix cells for flow cytometry analysis, ~100,000 cells were washed twice in PBS, trypsinized,
and suspended in PBS. Cells were pelleted at 500 g for 5 min at 4°C and the pellet resuspended
in 300 µl ice-cold PBS to which 900 µl cold ethanol (100% vol/vol) was slowly added. Cells were
stored at -20°C overnight to allow fixation. The next day, cells were pelleted at 500 g for 5 min at
4°C. To label DNA, cells were resuspended in a 500 µl solution of 20 µg/mL RNaseA and 50
µg/mL propidium iodide in PBS and incubated at 37°C for 30 min. Flow cytometry was performed
on a MACSQuant® Analyzer 10 Flow Cytometer (Miltenyi Biotec) using the 561 nm laser and
acquisitions analyzed using FlowJo (v10.6.2). For flow cytometry analysis of living HEK293-
FUCCI cells: cells grown to 80% confluency in 6-well plates were washed three times in PBS,
trypsinized, and suspended in PBS. Cells were then pelleted for 5 min at 500 g at room
temperature (25°C). The pellet was then resuspended in complete DMEM medium containing 15
µg/mL Hoechst 33342 (Life technologies, H3570) and incubated for 30 min at 37°C before flow
cytometry analysis. Cytometry and analysis were performed using the same hardware (with a 405
nm laser) and software.

To sort HEK293-FUCCI cells by FACS: cell were grown to 80% confluency in 10 cm dishes
and processed identically, minus the Hoechst 33342 staining. Around 1.5-2 million cells were
sorted for each cell cycle phase (G1, S, or G2/M) using a MoFlo Astrios EQ (Beckman-Coulter,
488 and 561 nm lasers) and collected cells were pelleted for 5 min at 500 g. Cell pellets were
flash frozen every 30 min to minimize the amount of cells transitioning into the next cell cycle
phase and accumulated for western blotting.

**PB purification by FAPS**

PB purification by FAPS was performed as described previously[7], with a few modifications. HEK293 cells stably expressing GFP-LSM14A (synchronized or not) were allowed to grow to ~70-80% confluency in 15 cm dishes. After two PBS washes, cells were scrapped off, collected in 2 ml Eppendorf tubes and pelleted at 500 g for 5 min. Pellets were flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C until the day before sorting. Each cell pellet was then resuspended in 1.5 mL ice-cold lysis buffer containing 50 mM Tris pH 8, 1 mM EDTA, 150 mM NaCl, and 0.2% Triton X-100 supplemented with 65 U/mL RNase out (Promega) and 2x protease inhibitor cocktail (Roche), pipetted a few times and kept on ice for 20 min. Then, nuclei were pelleted by centrifugation for 5 min at 500 g, and the supernatant containing cytoplasmic organelles, including PBs, was transferred to a new tube. After supplementation with 10 mM $MgSO_4$, 1 mM $CaCl_2$, and 4 U/mL RQ1 DNase (Promega), samples were incubated at room temperature (25°C) for 30 min while avoiding direct sources of light to avoid GFP fluorescence bleaching. Next, the samples were centrifuged at 10,000 g for 7 min at 4°C. The supernatant was gently aspirated and the pellet was resuspended in 30 µl lysis buffer supplemented with 40 U RNase out. This was called the pre-sorting fraction. A small aliquot (1-3 µL) was stained with ethidium bromide and visualized using widefield fluorescence microscopy for a reference image before sorting. For each cell cycle phase, 3 independent pre-sorting fractions were kept aside for RNA-seq and mass spectrometry analyses to compare with their sorted counterparts.

Fluorescence activated particle sorting (FAPS) was carried out on a MoFlo Astrios EQ (Beckman-Coulter) using the 488 nm excitation laser. The PB sorting gate was determined using control samples of lysis buffer alone, or an identical cell preparation but made with cells expressing truncated GFP-LSM14A that does not localize in PBs (GFP-LSM14A-Δ, described in [7]). The pre-sorting sample was diluted 30 times in lysis buffer at the time of sorting (10 µL in 300 µL lysis buffer). The differential pressure during sorting was maintained around 0.8 and the sorting speed was around 8,000 events per second on average. The sorting purity was >95%. After sorting, a small aliquot was stained with ethidium bromide, and visualized under widefield fluorescence microscopy. Purified PBs were pelleted at 10,000 g for 7 min in 2 mL Eppendorf tubes, while the remaining was stored at -80°C. ~6 hr of active sorting were done per day and 2-3 days of sorting output were combined together to constitute a single replicate for RNA-seq for each cell cycle phase. A total of >140 hr of FAPS was needed to accumulate sufficient material for RNA-seq in triplicates and 1 mass spectrometry analysis for each of the 4 cell cycle conditions. Protein and RNA were extracted using TRIzol (Thermo Fisher Scientific). A total of ~400 ng protein per condition and 5-10 ng RNA per replicate per condition were obtained.

**Mass spectrometry**

Liquid chromatography–tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) was performed at the proteomics platform at Institut Jacques Monod, Paris France. Proteins from the purified PB or pre-sorting fractions were dissolved in a 8 M urea solution (Sigma-Aldrich) before trypsin digestion. Samples were analyzed using an Orbitrap Fusion Lumos Tribrid Mass Spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) with the following settings: Ion Source: ESI (nano-spray), Fragmentation Mode: high energy CID, MS Scan Mode: FT-ICR/Orbitrap. Peptide and protein signals were processed using PEAKS Studio (v10.6 build 20201015) with the following parameters: Max Missed Cleavages: 2, Database: Homo Sapiens SwissProt Release_2020_06, Parent Mass Error Tolerance: 15.0 ppm, and Fragment Mass Error Tolerance: 0.5 Da. Protein and peptide signals were selected using a <1% false discovery rate filter.

**cDNA library generation and RNA sequencing**

Library preparation and sequencing were performed at Ecole normale supérieure Génomique ENS core facility (Paris, France). cDNAs were synthesized using a combination of random primers and oligodT to amplify RNAs independently of their polyadenylation status. 2 ng of total RNA were amplified and converted to cDNA using NuGEN's Ovation RNA-Seq kit. Following amplification, libraries were generated using the NexteraXT kit from Illumina. Libraries were multiplexed, and after single-end 75 bp sequencing (NextSeq 500, Illumina), 40 to 60 million reads per sample passed the Illumina filters. Three replicates per fraction and per cell cycle phase were made, for a total of 24 libraries.

**RNA-seq analysis**

RNA-seq analysis was performed on a local Galaxy server. RNA STAR[70,71] (version 2.7.8a) was used to align reads to the GRCh38p.13 assembly of the human genome with haplotypic duplications removed. The following parameters were used: 2 maximum mismatches per read alignment, a maximum ratio of mismatches to mapped length of 0.3, a minimum alignment score, normalized to read length of 0.66. All other parameters were set to default. More than 95% of reads mapped to the human genome, with the rest too short to be mapped. FeatureCounts[72] (version 2.0.1) was used to count read using the Gencode v38 gene annotation. All parameters

were set to default. Differential expression analysis was done using DEseq2 with the default

settings. Normalized counts showed high reproducibility between replicates in both the PB and

pre-sorting fractions across the cell cycle (Figure S7), after exclusion of one PB replicate in G1S

and one pre-sorting replicate in mid G1, due to lower reproducibility (R<0.9). Depending on the

analysis, two normalizations were performed. (i) For PB enrichment calculation, PB replicates

were normalized to pre-sorting replicates within each cell cycle phase, as performed previously[7];

(ii) to follow the evolution of RNA content in the PB and pre-sorting fractions across the cell cycle,

all PB replicates were normalized together on the one hand, and all pre-sorting replicates together

on the other hand. It can be noted that PB enlargement throughout interphase may lead to some

underestimation of RNA content in PBs, since large PBs likely accumulate a larger pool of RNAs,

while RNA-seq only measures relative RNA abundance.

**Gene ontology analysis**

GO term analyses were performed using clusterProfiler[73,74] in R. For GO analysis of PB mRNAs

(Figure 2E): the reference list was a compilation of all mRNAs detected (normalized counts>0) in

the PB fraction of at least one cell cycle phase, and the test lists contained mRNAs displaying

differential abundance in the PB fraction (p-adj<0.05, DEseq2) between 2 cell cycle phases.

Similarly, for GO analysis of the pre-sorted fraction mRNAs (Figure S5B, C), the reference list

was a compilation of all mRNAs detected (normalized counts>0) in this fraction and the test lists

contained the mRNAs differentially expressed (p-adj<0.05, DEseq2). The Benjamini & Hochberg

p-value adjustment method was applied and the significance cutoff was set to <0.05. To limit GO

term redundancy, simplified GO terms were used with a cutoff of 0.6 using the adjusted p-value,

in Figure 2E. Dot plots were used to represent the top 10 GO categories with associated mRNAs

count and p-adj values. Full detailed GO term lists are provided in Supplementary Table 5.

**Immunofluorescence**

Cells grown on 22x22 mm glass coverslips were fixed for 20 min at room temperature (25°C) with

4% PFA (Electron Microscopy Sciences) diluted in PBS and stored at 4°C. Before IF labeling,

cells were permeabilized with 0.1% Triton X-100 in PBS (Sigma-Aldrich) for 15 min at room

temperature (25°C). To label DDX6, we used a rabbit polyclonal anti-DDX6 antibody recognizing

its C-ter extremity (BIOTECHNE, NB200-192) diluted 1/1000 in PBS, coupled to a secondary

F(ab)2 goat anti-rabbit antibody labeled with AF488 (Life technologies, A1107) diluted 1/1000 in
PBS. To label the stress granule marker TIA1, we used goat polyclonal anti-TIA1 antibody (Santa
Cruz, SC1751) diluted 1/200 in PBS, coupled to a secondary donkey anti-goat antibody labeled
with Cy3 (Jackson ImmunoResearch, 705-166-147) diluted 1/800 in PBS. All primary and
secondary antibodies were incubated for 1 hr at room temperature after which coverslips were
washed 3 times in PBS. Coverslips were then mounted using DAPI-containing Vectashield
(Vector Laboratories, Inc.).

## Single molecule FISH

Cells grown on 22x22 mm glass coverslips were fixed for 20 min at room temperature with 4%
PFA (Electron Microscopy Sciences) diluted in PBS and permeabilized with 70% ethanol
overnight at 4°C. We used the single molecule inexpensive variant of smFISH (smiFISH)[33], which
uses 24 primary probes for each RNA target each made of a gene-specific sequence that
hybridizes to the RNA, and a common overhang that serve as platforms for recruiting fluorescently
labeled oligos (either Cy3 or Cy5). To this end, 40 pmoles of primary probes were first pre-
hybridized to 50 pmoles of fluorescently labeled oligos in 10 µL of 100 mM NaCl, 50 mM Tris-HCl,
10 mM $MgCl_2$, pH 7.9. This was performed on a thermocycler with the following program: 85 °C
for 3 min, 65 °C for 3 min, and 25 °C for 5 min. The resulting fluorescent probe duplexes were
then used in a hybridization mixture consisting of: 1x SSC, 0.34 mg/mL tRNA, 15% formamide
(Sigma-Aldrich), 2 mM vanadyl ribonucleoside complexes (Sigma-Aldrich), 0.2 mg/mL RNase-
free bovine serum albumin (Roche Diagnostics), 10% Dextran sulfate (MP Biomedicals), and 2
µL fluorescent duplexes per 100 µl hybridization volume. Hybridization was performed overnight
at 37°C. The next day, coverslips were washed in a 15% formamide 1x SSC solution for 40 min
twice. Coverslips were then mounted using DAPI-containing Vectashield (Vector Laboratories,
Inc.). All probe sequence are available in Supplementary Table 6.

## High-throughput smFISH

HT-smFISH was performed as described previously[75]. Probesets against mRNAs of interest were
generated starting from a pool of DNA oligonucleotides (GenScript). The design of DNA
oligonucleotides was based on the Oligostan script[33]. Briefly, oligos belonging to the same
probeset (hybridizing to the same mRNA target) share a common barcode which allows their

specific amplification through 2 rounds of PCR. Then, *in-vitro* transcription is used to generate

transcript-specific primary RNA probesets. Each primary RNA probe contains a hybridization

sequence recognizing the target of interest, flanked by 2 readout sequences. These readout

sequences serve as platforms to recruit fluorescent TYE-563-labeled locked nuclei acids (similar

to the smiFISH technique[33]). For each mRNA target, 25 ng of each of the fluorescent locked nuclei

acids were prehybridized with 50 ng of primary RNA probeset in 100 µL of a solution containing

7.5 M urea (Sigma-Aldrich), 0.34 mg/mL tRNA, and 10% Dextran sulfate. Pre-hybridization was

done using thermocycler with the following program: 90°C for 3 min, 53°C for 15 min, giving rise

to fluorescent duplexes. Cells were grown in 96-well plates with glass bottoms, fixed with 4% PFA

for 20 min, and permeabilized with 70% ethanol overnight. Cells were then washed with PBS and

hybridization buffer (1× SSC, 7.5 M urea), and the 100 µL solution containing fluorescent duplexes

was added. Cells were incubated at 48 °C overnight. The next morning, plates were washed 8

times for 20 min each in 1× SSC, and 7.5 M urea at 48 °C. Finally, cells were washed with PBs,

labeled with DAPI at 5 µg/mL, and mounted in 90% glycerol (VWR), 1 mg/mL p-Phenylenediamine

(Sigma-Aldrich) and PBS pH 8.

## Imaging

smFISH and IF imaging were performed using an inverted Zeiss Z1 widefield fluorescence

microscope equipped with a motorized stage. A 63x oil objective with a numerical aperture of 1.4

and an Axiocam 506 mono camera (Zeiss) with a pixel size of 72 nm were used. The microscope

was controlled by the Zeiss ZEN blue software (version 3.5.093.00003). Z stacks were acquired

with a 0.3 µm spacing between each plane. This spacing provided adequate single molecule

detection without oversampling. Maximum intensity projection (MIP) was used to obtain 2D

images for visualization, mounting, and analysis. The following exposure duration and laser

powers were used: 300-500 ms exposure at 100% laser power to image RNA in the Cy3 or Cy5

channels and PBs labeled with anti-DDX6 in the GFP channel; 50 ms at 50% laser power to image

GFP-LSM14A-labeled PBs in the GFP channel and DNA in the DAPI channel. For the HT-smFISH

screen, 96-well plates were imaged on an Opera Phenix High-Content Screening System

(PerkinElmer), with a 63× water-immersion objective (NA 1.15). Three-dimensional images were

acquired, with a spacing of 0.3 µm. Figures were mounted using ImageJ, Adobe illustrator, and

the OMERO Figure tool[76].

**Image analysis**

To analyze PB characteristics in HEK293-FUCCI cells, nuclei and cell segmentation was done using the Cellpose[77] model with watershed. Nuclei were segmented using the DAPI channel, and the cytoplasm using the DDX6 immunofluorescence channel using an intensity threshold of 350-450. To determine the cell cycle phase based on the nuclear FUCCI signal, we used the Otsu method to classify nuclei as positive or negative in the green and red channels. All images were inspected to verify the reliability of the classification. PBs were detected based on DDX6 immunofluorescence using the BigFISH[78] Segmentation subpackage applied to the cytoplasm, and PB GFP masks were generated based on a fluorescence intensity threshold of 1200-1500. PBs were then assigned to individual cells and the mean PB fluorescence intensity was computed. The fluorescence background (250), estimated from areas of the image without cells, was subtracted from PB intensity values. PB size was computed as the maximal rectangular perimeter occupied by a PB, multiplied by the pixel size (72 nm) and divided by 2. PBs with size appearing smaller than 200 nm were excluded as they approach the diffraction limit of the microscope in the green channel. Images from 2 independent experiments were normalized to have the same PB intensity distribution means. The few PBs overlapping the nucleus in the MIPs were not taken into consideration.

smFISH images were analysed using BigFISH[78], a python implementation of FISH-quant[79] available at https://github.com/fish-quant/big-fish. The specific code used to analyze RNA localization in PBs is available at https://github.com/15bonte/p_bodies_cycle_2023. Nuclei and cell segmentation was done using the Cellpose[77] model with watershed. Nuclei were segmented using the DAPI channel. The cytoplasm was segmented using background from the smFISH channel using an intensity threshold of 400-500. Spot detection was done using the Detection subpackage of BigFISH, which uses a Laplacian of Gaussian filter to enhance the spot signal. A local maximal algorithm then localizes every peak in the image, and a threshold was applied to discriminate the actual spots from the nonspecific background signal. One advantage BigFISH provides is the ability to automatically set an optimal RNA spot detection threshold regardless of the signal-to-background ratio of the smFISH. This parameter-free detection was used for all RNAs imaged in this study and manually adjusted when needed to obtain a unimodal distribution of single molecule fluorescence intensities. Next, we decomposed dense areas of RNA signal, firstly by removing background noise with a Gaussian background subtraction and secondly using the cluster decomposition tool. This tool computes the median detected spot intensity distribution, fits it with a Gaussian distribution signal, and uses it to compute the number of spots that best fit

within each cluster. Next we detected PBs as masks using the GFP channel and the BigFISH
Segmentation subpackage with a fluorescence intensity threshold of 2200 for cells synchronized
in G1S, mid S and G2M, and 1600 for cells synchronized in mid G1, since PBs were less bright.
We then computed two RNA populations: (i) RNA molecules in the cytoplasm (i.e. outside the
nucleus), (ii) and RNA molecules in PBs (i.e. within the GFP mask). Since BigFISH was applied
to MIPs, some PBs overlapped with the nucleus in a minority of cells and were excluded from the
analysis. Cells without labeled PBs, with improper segmentation, or incomplete cell fragments
were also excluded. In experiments involving transient transfection (Figure 7, Renilla Luciferase
reporters), cells with fewer than 15 mRNA molecules (2 cells) or with too high expression for
proper BigFISH detection (2 cells) were excluded.

For HT-smFISH analysis, a similar BigFISH pipeline was used to segment cells, nuclei
and detect RNA spots. The specific code used to analyze HT-smFISH images is available here:
https://github.com/Flo3333/Cell-cycle-and-HT-smFISH-analysis-of-RNA-localization-in-PBs. PBs
were detected as 2D mask using a log filter (sigma = 2.25) to detect PB edges from the average
projection of the image stack. A threshold was then applied to segment PBs edges by detecting
positive grandients of intensity on the filtered image. Finally, PBs masks were filled and artifacts
smaller than 10 pixels are removed. Cells without labeled PBs or RNA spot, with improper
segmentation, and incomplete cells were excluded from the image analysis. To classify cells in
G1 or G2, we first calculated the integrated DAPI signal in each nucleus (nucleus area multiplied
by the mean DAPI signal). The obtained profile was then fitted, using a ranking-based
classification, to a cell cycle profile of HEK293 cells expressing GFP-LSM14A obtained with flow
cytometry and analyzed using the Dean-Jett model (~50% cells in G1 and ~16.5% of cells in G2).

**Western blots**

Cytoplasmic proteins were extracted as described previously[80], separated on a NuPage 4%–12%
gel (Invitrogen, Life Technologies) and transferred to Optitran BA-S83 nitrocellulose membrane
(GE healthcare life science). After blocking in PBS containing 5% (wt/vol) nonfat dry milk for 1 hr
at room temperature, membranes were incubated with the primary antibody overnight at 4°C,
washed in PBS, and incubated with horseradish peroxidase–conjugated secondary antibody
diluted 1/10,000 for 1 hr at room temperature. Primary antibodies were: rabbit anti-DDX6 (Bethyl,
Cat#BL2142, diluted 1/15,000), rabbit anti-4E-T (Abcam, Cat#ab95030, 1/2,500), rabbit anti-
LSM14A (Bethyl, Cat#A305-102A, 1/5,000), rabbit anti-PAT1b (Cell Signaling, Cat#14288S,

1/1,000), and rabbit anti- rProt S6 (5G10, Cell signaling, Cat#2217, 1/5,000). After washing in

PBS, proteins were detected using the Western lightning plus ECL kit (Perkin Elmer) and

visualized by exposure to CL-XPosure film (Pierce).

**Statistical analysis**

Boxplot representations and statistical tests were performed using the GraphPad Prism software

(GraphPad software v8, Inc), the R suite (v 4.2.0, https://www.R-project.org, R Core Team 2018.

R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,

Vienna, Austria), and R studio (v 2022.12.0). Other graphical representations were generated

using Excel 2016 and the Excel Analysis ToolPak (Microsoft).

**Acknowledgments**: A.S., E.C. and A.L. were supported by the Agence Nationale pour la
Recherche (ANR), grant number ANR-19-CE12-0024-01. The work was supported by the
Association pour la Recherche sur le Cancer (PJA20181208011) to D.W., ANR grant ANR-19-
CE12-0024 to D.W., D.G. and E.B. and MSDAvenir to E.B., and by the France Génomique
national infrastructure, funded as part of the "Investissements d'Avenir" program managed by the
ANR (contract ANR-10-INBS-0009). We thank Nancy Standart (University of Cambridge, UK) for
critical reading of the manuscript, Zoher Gueroui (École normale supérieure Paris, France) for
scientific discussions, and Vincent Galy (IBPS, Paris, France) for his contribution to the Zeiss
microscope.

**Author contributions:** Conceptualization, A.S. and D.W.; Formal Analysis, A.S., M-N.B., F.S.,
M.K., A.L. and D.W.; Funding Acquisition, D.W.; Investigation, A.S., M-N.B., M.E.-L., E.C.,
A.M.G., A.V., C.B. and G.C.; Project Administration, D.W.; Software, T.B. and A.I.; Supervision,
A.S., E.B., D.G., T.W., M.B. and D.W.; Validation, A.S., M-N.B., O.P., M.E.-L. and D.W.;
Visualization, A.S., M-N.B. and M.K.; Writing – Original Draft, A.S. and D.W. All authors discussed
the results and commented on the manuscript.

**Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

**References**

1. Lyon, A.S., Peeples, W.B., and Rosen, M.K. (2021). A framework for understanding the functions of biomolecular condensates across scales. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol *22*, 215–235. 10.1038/s41580-020-00303-z.

2. Antifeeva, I.A., Fonin, A.V., Fefilova, A.S., Stepanenko, O.V., Povarova, O.I., Silonov, S.A., Kuznetsova, I.M., Uversky, V.N., and Turoverov, K.K. (2022). Liquid-liquid phase separation as an organizing principle of intracellular space: overview of the evolution of the cell compartmentalization concept. Cell Mol Life Sci *79*, 251. 10.1007/s00018-022-04276-4.

3. Hirose, T., Ninomiya, K., Nakagawa, S., and Yamazaki, T. (2022). A guide to membraneless organelles and their various roles in gene regulation. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol, 1–17. 10.1038/s41580-022-00558-8.

4. Woodruff, J.B., Hyman, A.A., and Boke, E. (2018). Organization and Function of Non-dynamic Biomolecular Condensates. Trends in Biochemical Sciences *43*, 81–94. 10.1016/j.tibs.2017.11.005.

5. Bhat, P., Honson, D., and Guttman, M. (2021). Nuclear compartmentalization as a mechanism of quantitative control of gene expression. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol *22*, 653–670. 10.1038/s41580-021-00387-1.

6. Standart, N., and Weil, D. (2018). P-Bodies: Cytosolic Droplets for Coordinated mRNA Storage. Trends Genet. *34*, 612–626. 10.1016/j.tig.2018.05.005.

7. Hubstenberger, A., Courel, M., Bénard, M., Souquere, S., Ernoult-Lange, M., Chouaib, R., Yi, Z., Morlot, J.-B., Munier, A., Fradet, M., et al. (2017). P-Body Purification Reveals the Condensation of Repressed mRNA Regulons. Mol. Cell *68*, 144-157.e5. 10.1016/j.molcel.2017.09.003.

8. Courel, M., Clément, Y., Bossevain, C., Foretek, D., Vidal Cruchez, O., Yi, Z., Bénard, M., Benassy, M.-N., Kress, M., Vindry, C., et al. (2019). GC content shapes mRNA storage and decay in human cells. eLife *8*, e49708. 10.7554/eLife.49708.

9. Pillai, R.S., Bhattacharyya, S.N., Artus, C.G., Zoller, T., Cougot, N., Basyuk, E., Bertrand, E., and Filipowicz, W. (2005). Inhibition of Translational Initiation by Let-7 MicroRNA in Human Cells. Science *309*, 1573–1576. 10.1126/science.1115079.

10. Pitchiaya, S., Mourao, M.D.A., Jalihal, A.P., Xiao, L., Jiang, X., Chinnaiyan, A.M., Schnell, S., and Walter, N.G. (2019). Dynamic Recruitment of Single RNAs to Processing Bodies Depends on RNA Functionality. Molecular Cell *74*, 521-533.e6. 10.1016/j.molcel.2019.03.001.

11. Bhattacharyya, S.N., Habermacher, R., Martine, U., Closs, E.I., and Filipowicz, W. (2006). Relief of microRNA-Mediated Translational Repression in Human Cells Subjected to Stress. Cell *125*, 1111–1124. 10.1016/j.cell.2006.04.031.

12. Aizer, A., Kalo, A., Kafri, P., Shraga, A., Ben-Yishay, R., Jacob, A., Kinor, N., and Shav-Tal, Y. (2014). Quantifying mRNA targeting to P-bodies in living human cells reveals their dual role in mRNA decay and storage. J Cell Sci *127*, 4443–4456. 10.1242/jcs.152975.

13. Cho, C.-Y., Kelliher, C.M., and Haase, S.B. (2019). The cell-cycle transcriptional network
generates and transmits a pulse of transcription once each cell cycle. Cell Cycle *18*, 363–378.
10.1080/15384101.2019.1570655.

14. Sun, Q., Jiao, F., Lin, G., Yu, J., and Tang, M. (2019). The nonlinear dynamics and fluctuations of
mRNA levels in cell cycle coupled transcription. PLOS Computational Biology *15*, e1007017.
10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007017.

15. Bristow, S.L., Leman, A.R., and Haase, S.B. (2014). Cell Cycle-Regulated Transcription: Effectively
Using a Genomics Toolbox. Cell Cycle Control *1170*, 3–27. 10.1007/978-1-4939-0888-2_1.

16. Liu, Y., Chen, S., Wang, S., Soares, F., Fischer, M., Meng, F., Du, Z., Lin, C., Meyer, C., DeCaprio,
J.A., et al. (2017). Transcriptional landscape of the human cell cycle. Proceedings of the National
Academy of Sciences *114*, 3473–3478. 10.1073/pnas.1617636114.

17. Fischer, M., Schade, A.E., Branigan, T.B., Müller, G.A., and DeCaprio, J.A. (2022). Coordinating
gene expression during the cell cycle. Trends in Biochemical Sciences *47*, 1009–1022.
10.1016/j.tibs.2022.06.007.

18. Bertoli, C., Skotheim, J.M., and de Bruin, R.A.M. (2013). Control of cell cycle transcription during
G1 and S phases. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol *14*, 518–528. 10.1038/nrm3629.

19. Eser, P., Demel, C., Maier, K.C., Schwalb, B., Pirkl, N., Martin, D.E., Cramer, P., and Tresch, A.
(2014). Periodic mRNA synthesis and degradation co-operate during cell cycle gene expression.
Molecular Systems Biology *10*, 717. 10.1002/msb.134886.

20. Chávez, S., García-Martínez, J., Delgado-Ramos, L., and Pérez-Ortín, J.E. (2016). The importance
of controlling mRNA turnover during cell proliferation. Curr Genet *62*, 701–710. 10.1007/s00294-016-
0594-2.

21. Catala, M., and Abou Elela, S. (2019). Promoter-dependent nuclear RNA degradation ensures cell
cycle-specific gene expression. Commun Biol *2*, 1–13. 10.1038/s42003-019-0441-3.

22. Krenning, L., Sonneveld, S., and Tanenbaum, M.E. (2022). Time-resolved single-cell sequencing
identifies multiple waves of mRNA decay during the mitosis-to-G1 phase transition. eLife *11*, e71356.
10.7554/eLife.71356.

23. Battich, N., Beumer, J., de Barbanson, B., Krenning, L., Baron, C.S., Tanenbaum, M.E., Clevers, H.,
and van Oudenaarden, A. (2020). Sequencing metabolically labeled transcripts in single cells reveals
mRNA turnover strategies. Science *367*, 1151–1156. 10.1126/science.aax3072.

24. Gingold, H., Tehler, D., Christoffersen, N.R., Nielsen, M.M., Asmar, F., Kooistra, S.M.,
Christophersen, N.S., Christensen, L.L., Borre, M., Sørensen, K.D., et al. (2014). A dual program for
translation regulation in cellular proliferation and differentiation. Cell *158*, 1281–1292.
10.1016/j.cell.2014.08.011.

25. Yang, Z., Jakymiw, A., Wood, M.R., Eystathioy, T., Rubin, R.L., Fritzler, M.J., and Chan, E.K.L.
(2004). GW182 is critical for the stability of GW bodies expressed during the cell cycle and cell
proliferation. Journal of Cell Science *117*, 5567–5578. 10.1242/jcs.01477.

26.     Grant, G.D., Kedziora, K.M., Limas, J.C., Cook, J.G., and Purvis, J.E. (2018). Accurate delineation
of cell cycle phase transitions in living cells with PIP-FUCCI. Cell Cycle *17*, 2496–2516.
10.1080/15384101.2018.1547001.

27.     Sakaue-Sawano, A., Kurokawa, H., Morimura, T., Hanyu, A., Hama, H., Osawa, H., Kashiwagi, S.,
Fukami, K., Miyata, T., Miyoshi, H., et al. (2008). Visualizing spatiotemporal dynamics of multicellular
cell-cycle progression. Cell *132*, 487–498. 10.1016/j.cell.2007.12.033.

28.     Ayache, J., Bénard, M., Ernoult-Lange, M., Minshall, N., Standart, N., Kress, M., and Weil, D.
(2015). P-body assembly requires DDX6 repression complexes rather than decay or Ataxin2/2L
complexes. MBoC *26*, 2579–2595. 10.1091/mbc.E15-03-0136.

29.     Vassilev, L.T., Tovar, C., Chen, S., Knezevic, D., Zhao, X., Sun, H., Heimbrook, D.C., and Chen, L.
(2006). Selective small-molecule inhibitor reveals critical mitotic functions of human CDK1.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *103*, 10660–10665. 10.1073/pnas.0600447103.

30.     Dominguez, D., Tsai, Y.-H., Gomez, N., Jha, D.K., Davis, I., and Wang, Z. (2016). A high-resolution
transcriptome map of cell cycle reveals novel connections between periodic genes and cancer. Cell
Res *26*, 946–962. 10.1038/cr.2016.84.

31.     Love, M.I., Huber, W., and Anders, S. (2014). Moderated estimation of fold change and
dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol *15*, 1–21. 10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8.

32.     Femino, A.M., Fay, F.S., Fogarty, K., and Singer, R.H. (1998). Visualization of Single RNA
Transcripts in Situ. Science *280*, 585–590. 10.1126/science.280.5363.585.

33.     Tsanov, N., Samacoits, A., Chouaib, R., Traboulsi, A.-M., Gostan, T., Weber, C., Zimmer, C.,
Zibara, K., Walter, T., Peter, M., et al. (2016). smiFISH and FISH-quant - a flexible single RNA detection
approach with super-resolution capability. Nucleic Acids Res. *44*, e165. 10.1093/nar/gkw784.

34.     Cappell, S.D., Mark, K.G., Garbett, D., Pack, L.R., Rape, M., and Meyer, T. (2018). EMI1 switches
from being a substrate to an inhibitor of APC/CCDH1 to start the cell cycle. Nature *558*, 313–317.
10.1038/s41586-018-0199-7.

35.     Reimann, J.D., Gardner, B.E., Margottin-Goguet, F., and Jackson, P.K. (2001). Emi1 regulates the
anaphase-promoting complex by a different mechanism than Mad2 proteins. Genes Dev *15*, 3278–
3285. 10.1101/gad.945701.

36.     Machida, Y.J., and Dutta, A. (2007). The APC/C inhibitor, Emi1, is essential for prevention of
rereplication. Genes Dev *21*, 184–194. 10.1101/gad.1495007.

37.     Reimann, J.D., Freed, E., Hsu, J.Y., Kramer, E.R., Peters, J.M., and Jackson, P.K. (2001). Emi1 is a
mitotic regulator that interacts with Cdc20 and inhibits the anaphase promoting complex. Cell *105*,
645–655. 10.1016/s0092-8674(01)00361-0.

38.     Miller, J.J., Summers, M.K., Hansen, D.V., Nachury, M.V., Lehman, N.L., Loktev, A., and Jackson,
P.K. (2006). Emi1 stably binds and inhibits the anaphase-promoting complex/cyclosome as a
pseudosubstrate inhibitor. Genes Dev *20*, 2410–2420. 10.1101/gad.1454006.

39.     Di Fiore, B., and Pines, J. (2007). Emi1 is needed to couple DNA replication with mitosis but does
not regulate activation of the mitotic APC/C. Journal of Cell Biology *177*, 425–437.
10.1083/jcb.200611166.

40.     Hsu, J.Y., Reimann, J.D.R., Sørensen, C.S., Lukas, J., and Jackson, P.K. (2002). E2F-dependent
accumulation of hEmi1 regulates S phase entry by inhibiting APC(Cdh1). Nat Cell Biol *4*, 358–366.
10.1038/ncb785.

41.     Dominguez, D., Tsai, Y.-H., Weatheritt, R., Wang, Y., Blencowe, B.J., and Wang, Z. (2016). An
extensive program of periodic alternative splicing linked to cell cycle progression. eLife *5*, e10288.
10.7554/eLife.10288.

42.     Nielsen, C.F., Zhang, T., Barisic, M., Kalitsis, P., and Hudson, D.F. (2020). Topoisomerase IIα is
essential for maintenance of mitotic chromosome structure. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *117*, 12131–
12142. 10.1073/pnas.2001760117.

43.     Lee, S., Jung, S.-R., Heo, K., Byl, J.A.W., Deweese, J.E., Osheroff, N., and Hohng, S. (2012). DNA
cleavage and opening reactions of human topoisomerase IIα are regulated via Mg2+-mediated
dynamic bending of gate-DNA. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *109*, 2925–2930. 10.1073/pnas.1115704109.

44.     Roca, J. (2009). Topoisomerase II: a fitted mechanism for the chromatin landscape. Nucleic Acids
Res *37*, 721–730. 10.1093/nar/gkn994.

45.     Heck, M.M., Hittelman, W.N., and Earnshaw, W.C. (1988). Differential expression of DNA
topoisomerases I and II during the eukaryotic cell cycle. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *85*, 1086–1090.
10.1073/pnas.85.4.1086.

46.     Woessner, R.D., Mattern, M.R., Mirabelli, C.K., Johnson, R.K., and Drake, F.H. (1991).
Proliferation- and cell cycle-dependent differences in expression of the 170 kilodalton and 180
kilodalton forms of topoisomerase II in NIH-3T3 cells. Cell Growth Differ *2*, 209–214.

47.     Kimura, K., Saijo, M., Ui, M., and Enomoto, T. (1994). Growth state- and cell cycle-dependent
fluctuation in the expression of two forms of DNA topoisomerase II and possible specific modification
of the higher molecular weight form in the M phase. J Biol Chem *269*, 1173–1176.

48.     Lee, J.H., and Berger, J.M. (2019). Cell Cycle-Dependent Control and Roles of DNA
Topoisomerase II. Genes *10*. 10.3390/genes10110859.

49.     Hopfner, R., Mousli, M., Jeltsch, J.M., Voulgaris, A., Lutz, Y., Marin, C., Bellocq, J.P., Oudet, P.,
and Bronner, C. (2000). ICBP90, a novel human CCAAT binding protein, involved in the regulation of
topoisomerase IIalpha expression. Cancer Res *60*, 121–128.

50.     Magan, N., Szremska, A.P., Isaacs, R.J., and Stowell, K.M. (2003). Modulation of DNA
topoisomerase II alpha promoter activity by members of the Sp (specificity protein) and NF-Y (nuclear
factor Y) families of transcription factors. Biochem J *374*, 723–729. 10.1042/BJ20030032.

51.     Liao, H., Winkfein, R.J., Mack, G., Rattner, J.B., and Yen, T.J. (1995). CENP-F is a protein of the
nuclear matrix that assembles onto kinetochores at late G2 and is rapidly degraded after mitosis. J
Cell Biol *130*, 507–518. 10.1083/jcb.130.3.507.

52.     Yang, Z.Y., Guo, J., Li, N., Qian, M., Wang, S.N., and Zhu, X.L. (2003). Mitosin/CENP-F is a
940           conserved kinetochore protein subjected to cytoplasmic dynein-mediated poleward transport. Cell
941           Res *13*, 275–283. 10.1038/sj.cr.7290172.

942   53.     Chan, G.K., Jablonski, S.A., Sudakin, V., Hittle, J.C., and Yen, T.J. (1999). Human BUBR1 is a
943           mitotic checkpoint kinase that monitors CENP-E functions at kinetochores and binds the
944           cyclosome/APC. J Cell Biol *146*, 941–954. 10.1083/jcb.146.5.941.

945   54.     Shin, H.J., Baek, K.H., Jeon, A.H., Park, M.T., Lee, S.J., Kang, C.M., Lee, H.S., Yoo, S.H., Chung,
946           D.H., Sung, Y.C., et al. (2003). Dual roles of human BubR1, a mitotic checkpoint kinase, in the
947           monitoring of chromosomal instability. Cancer Cell *4*, 483–497. 10.1016/s1535-6108(03)00302-7.

948   55.     Tatsumoto, T., Xie, X., Blumenthal, R., Okamoto, I., and Miki, T. (1999). Human Ect2 Is an
949           Exchange Factor for Rho Gtpases, Phosphorylated in G2/M Phases, and Involved in Cytokinesis.
950           Journal of Cell Biology *147*, 921–928. 10.1083/jcb.147.5.921.

951   56.     Liu, X., and Winey, M. (2012). The MPS1 Family of Protein Kinases. Annu Rev Biochem *81*, 561–
952           585. 10.1146/annurev-biochem-061611-090435.

953   57.     Zhang, Y., Tan, L., Yang, Q., Li, C., and Liou, Y.-C. (2018). The microtubule-associated protein
954           HURP recruits the centrosomal protein TACC3 to regulate K-fiber formation and support chromosome
955           congression. Journal of Biological Chemistry *293*, 15733–15747. 10.1074/jbc.RA118.003676.

956   58.     Klosin, A., Oltsch, F., Harmon, T., Honigmann, A., Jülicher, F., Hyman, A.A., and Zechner, C.
957           (2020). Phase separation provides a mechanism to reduce noise in cells. Science *367*, 464–468.
958           10.1126/science.aav6691.

959   59.     Azzam, M.E., and Algranati, I.D. (1973). Mechanism of Puromycin Action: Fate of Ribosomes
960           after Release of Nascent Protein Chains from Polysomes. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *70*, 3866–3869.
961           10.1073/pnas.70.12.3866.

962   60.     Chouaib, R., Safieddine, A., Pichon, X., Imbert, A., Kwon, O.S., Samacoits, A., Traboulsi, A.-M.,
963           Robert, M.-C., Tsanov, N., Coleno, E., et al. (2020). A Dual Protein-mRNA Localization Screen Reveals
964           Compartmentalized Translation and Widespread Co-translational RNA Targeting. Developmental Cell
965           *54*, 773-791.e5. 10.1016/j.devcel.2020.07.010.

966   61.     Safieddine, A., Coleno, E., Salloum, S., Imbert, A., Traboulsi, A.-M., Kwon, O.S., Lionneton, F.,
967           Georget, V., Robert, M.-C., Gostan, T., et al. (2021). A choreography of centrosomal mRNAs reveals a
968           conserved localization mechanism involving active polysome transport. Nat Commun *12*, 1352.
969           10.1038/s41467-021-21585-7.

970   62.     Frenkel-Morgenstern, M., Danon, T., Christian, T., Igarashi, T., Cohen, L., Hou, Y.-M., and Jensen,
971           L.J. (2012). Genes adopt non-optimal codon usage to generate cell cycle-dependent oscillations in
972           protein levels. Mol Syst Biol *8*, 572. 10.1038/msb.2012.3.

973   63.     Tanenbaum, M.E., Stern-Ginossar, N., Weissman, J.S., and Vale, R.D. (2015). Regulation of mRNA
974           translation during mitosis. eLife *4*, e07957. 10.7554/eLife.07957.

64.    Cardona, A.H., Ecsedi, S., Khier, M., Yi, Z., Bahri, A., Ouertani, A., Valero, F., Labrosse, M.,
Rouquet, S., Robert, S., et al. (2023). Self-demixing of mRNA copies buffers mRNA:mRNA and
mRNA:regulator stoichiometries. Cell *186*, 4310-4324.e23. 10.1016/j.cell.2023.08.018.

65.    Riback, J.A., Zhu, L., Ferrolino, M.C., Tolbert, M., Mitrea, D.M., Sanders, D.W., Wei, M.-T.,
Kriwacki, R.W., and Brangwynne, C.P. (2020). Composition-dependent thermodynamics of
intracellular phase separation. Nature *581*, 209–214. 10.1038/s41586-020-2256-2.

66.    Sanchez-Burgos, I., Herriott, L., Collepardo-Guevara, R., and Espinosa, J.R. (2023). Surfactants or
scaffolds? RNAs of different lengths exhibit heterogeneous distributions and play diverse roles in
RNA-protein condensates. Biophysical Journal. 10.1016/j.bpj.2023.03.006.

67.    Sanchez-Burgos, I., Espinosa, J.R., Joseph, J.A., and Collepardo-Guevara, R. (2022). RNA length
has a non-trivial effect in the stability of biomolecular condensates formed by RNA-binding proteins.
PLOS Computational Biology *18*, e1009810. 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009810.

68.    Cochard, A., Garcia-Jove Navarro, M., Piroska, L., Kashida, S., Kress, M., Weil, D., and Gueroui, Z.
(2022). RNA at the surface of phase-separated condensates impacts their size and number.
Biophysical Journal *121*, 1675–1690. 10.1016/j.bpj.2022.03.032.

69.    Khong, A., Matheny, T., Jain, S., Mitchell, S.F., Wheeler, J.R., and Parker, R. (2017). The Stress
Granule Transcriptome Reveals Principles of mRNA Accumulation in Stress Granules. Molecular Cell
*68*, 808-820.e5. 10.1016/j.molcel.2017.10.015.

70.    Dobin, A., Davis, C.A., Schlesinger, F., Drenkow, J., Zaleski, C., Jha, S., Batut, P., Chaisson, M., and
Gingeras, T.R. (2013). STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. Bioinformatics *29*, 15–21.
10.1093/bioinformatics/bts635.

71.    Goecks, J., Nekrutenko, A., and Taylor, J. (2010). Galaxy: a comprehensive approach for
supporting accessible, reproducible, and transparent computational research in the life sciences.
Genome Biol *11*, 1–13. 10.1186/gb-2010-11-8-r86.

72.    Liao, Y., Smyth, G.K., and Shi, W. (2014). featureCounts: an efficient general purpose program
for assigning sequence reads to genomic features. Bioinformatics *30*, 923–930.
10.1093/bioinformatics/btt656.

73.    Wu, T., Hu, E., Xu, S., Chen, M., Guo, P., Dai, Z., Feng, T., Zhou, L., Tang, W., Zhan, L., et al.
(2021). clusterProfiler 4.0: A universal enrichment tool for interpreting omics data. Innovation *2*.
10.1016/j.xinn.2021.100141.

74.    Yu, G., Wang, L.-G., Han, Y., and He, Q.-Y. (2012). clusterProfiler: an R Package for Comparing
Biological Themes Among Gene Clusters. OMICS: A Journal of Integrative Biology *16*, 284–287.
10.1089/omi.2011.0118.

75.    Safieddine, A., Coleno, E., Lionneton, F., Traboulsi, A.-M., Salloum, S., Lecellier, C.-H., Gostan, T.,
Georget, V., Hassen-Khodja, C., Imbert, A., et al. (2023). HT-smFISH: a cost-effective and flexible
workflow for high-throughput single-molecule RNA imaging. Nat Protoc *18*, 157–187.
10.1038/s41596-022-00750-2.

76.      Allan, C., Burel, J.-M., Moore, J., Blackburn, C., Linkert, M., Loynton, S., MacDonald, D., Moore,
W.J., Neves, C., Patterson, A., et al. (2012). OMERO: flexible, model-driven data management for
experimental biology. Nat Methods *9*, 245–253. 10.1038/nmeth.1896.

77.      Stringer, C., Wang, T., Michaelos, M., and Pachitariu, M. (2021). Cellpose: a generalist algorithm
for cellular segmentation. Nat Methods *18*, 100–106. 10.1038/s41592-020-01018-x.

78.      Imbert, A., Ouyang, W., Safieddine, A., Coleno, E., Zimmer, C., Bertrand, E., Walter, T., and
Mueller, F. (2022). FISH-quant v2: a scalable and modular tool for smFISH image analysis. RNA *28*,
786–795. 10.1261/rna.079073.121.

79.      Mueller, F., Senecal, A., Tantale, K., Marie-Nelly, H., Ly, N., Collin, O., Basyuk, E., Bertrand, E.,
Darzacq, X., and Zimmer, C. (2013). FISH-quant: automatic counting of transcripts in 3D FISH images.
Nat. Methods *10*, 277–278. 10.1038/nmeth.2406.

80.      Balak, C., Benard, M., Schaefer, E., Iqbal, S., Ramsey, K., Ernoult-Lange, M., Mattioli, F., Llaci, L.,
Geoffroy, V., Courel, M., et al. (2019). Rare De Novo Missense Variants in RNA Helicase DDX6 Cause
Intellectual Disability and Dysmorphic Features and Lead to P-Body Defects and RNA Dysregulation.
Am J Hum Genet *105*, 509–525. 10.1016/j.ajhg.2019.07.010.

1027

**Figure 1: PBs enlarge during cell cycle progression while maintaining a similar proteome.** (A) Widefield fluorescence images of HEK-FUCCI cells with DDX6-labeled PBs. Left panel: nuclear Cdt1-mVenus signal indicates cells in G1 or G2 phase, while cytoplasmic PBs were immunostained with anti-DDX6 antibodies (both in green in the merge). Middle panels: nuclear mCherry-Gem signal indicates cells in S or G2 phase (in red in the merge). Cell cycle phases are indicated on the left. Right insets present enlargements of a representative PB. Scale bars, 10 and 1 µm in the merge panels and insets, respectively. (B) Scatter plot representation of PB size and DDX6 intensity across the cell cycle (from 2 independent experiments). (C) Main steps of the FAPS procedure. (D) Cell cycle analysis from representative synchronized samples. The percentage of cells in the targeted cell cycle phase is displayed in each panel. (E) Representative FAPS profiles of pre-sorting lysate (middle-left panel) and sorted PBs (rightmost panel) from GFP-LSM14A cells synchronized at the G1S transition. Associated controls (buffer and lysate from GFP-LSM14Δ cells) are shown in left panels. The window used to sort PBs is outlined. (F) Representative widefield fluorescence images of lysates before and after sorting. PBs were labelled with GFP-LSM14A (in green) and contaminants were revealed by non-specific ethidium bromide (EtBr) staining (in red). Scale bar, 10 µm. (G) Boxplot showing the enrichment or depletion of several protein groups after sorting (ratio of MS area after/before sorting) in cells at the G1S transition. For each group, the number of detected proteins (protein area >1) is indicated in brackets. (H) Pairwise comparison of the abundance (MS area) of known PB proteins in the PB fraction between successive cell cycle stages.

**A**

Mid S phase

RNA levels after sorting (normalized counts)

4289 PB-enriched mRNAs

5769 PB-excluded mRNAs

RNA levels before sorting (normalized counts)

**B**

PB-enriched mRNAs

G1S

Mid S

Mid G1

G2M

3324

**C**

Mid G1 compared to G1S PBs

2599 mRNAs with higher levels in mid G1

2943 mRNAs with higher levels in G1S

P-adj ($-\log_{10}$)

p-adj<0.05

Fold Change ($\log_2$)

**D**

PB fractions, p-adj<0.05

Mid G1

913 up
903 down

2943 up
2599 down

G2M

G1S

1639 up
1931 down

1194 up
1363 down

Mid S

**E**

Higher mRNA levels in mid S vs. mid G1 PBs

mitotic cell cycle phase transition
cilium organization
chromosome segregation
negative regulation of cell cycle process
regulation of response to DNA damage stimulus
DNA−templated DNA replication
mitotic cell cycle checkpoint signaling
cytokinesis
protein localization to kinetochore
protein localization to condensed chromosome

GeneRatio

Count
20
40
60
80

p.adjust
0.008
0.006
0.004
0.002
2.07 x10⁻⁴

Lower mRNA levels in mid S vs. mid G1 PBs

transcription coregulator activity
DNA−binding transcription factor binding
ubiquitin−like protein transferase activity
DNA−binding transcription activator activity
ubiquitin−protein transferase activity
mRNA binding
transcription coactivator activity
single−stranded RNA binding
mRNA 3'−UTR binding
poly−pyrimidine tract binding

GeneRatio

Count
25
50
75
100

p.adjust
0.012
0.008
0.004
1.35 x10⁻⁷

**F**

Mid G1 to G1S

FBXO5
CLK1

G1S to mid S

Mid S to G2M

CENPF
TOP2A
BUB1B

G2M to mid G1

FC before sorting ($\log_2$)

FC after sorting ($\log_2$)

**Figure 2: Analysis of purified PBs uncovers their dynamic transcriptome**. (A) RNA levels (normalized DEseq2 counts) before and after PB sorting from mid S cells. Grey dots correspond to all expressed mRNAs (average counts >0). The mRNAs significantly enriched and depleted in PBs (p-adj<0.05) are shown in red and green, respectively. (B) Venn diagram showing the overlap between PB-enriched mRNAs in the different cell cycle phases. (C) Volcano plot showing the changes in PB mRNA content from mid S to G2M. Grey dots correspond to all expressed mRNAs (average counts >0). Significant changes (p-adj<0.05) are highlighted in red. Indicated mRNAs are further studied by smFISH. (D) Schematic summary of significant changes in PBs (p-adj<0.05) across the cell cycle. (E) GO analyses of PB mRNAs with significant changes in mid S compared to mid G1. The 10 most enriched GO categories are shown. The size of each dot represents the number of mRNAs within the GO category. The fraction of PB transcripts belonging to the category is on the x-axis (GeneRatio) and the significance of the enrichment is color-coded according to the right scale. (F) Quadrant plots comparing mRNA fold-changes before and after sorting (normalized counts >50) between successive cell cycle stages. Quadrant numbers and mRNAs further studied by smFISH are indicated. Volcano plots associated with these plots are in Figure S8.

**Figure 3: mRNA localization in PBs can peak at any cell cycle phase.** (A) Evolution of FBXO5, CLK1, and CCNE2 mRNA levels (in normalized counts) in purified PBs and the pre-sorting fraction across the cell cycle. Each dot corresponds to one replicate (overlapping replicated appear as 1 dot), with the line connecting the mean value of the replicates. (B) Widefield fluorescence image of synchronized HEK293 cells expressing GFP-LSM14A after smFISH of FBXO5 mRNA. For better visualization, the Cy3 smFISH signal is in green and GFP-LSM14A in red. Nuclei were stained with DAPI (in blue). Individual mRNA molecules appear as small dots (indicated by green arrows). Insets present enlargements of representative PBs, illustrating the heterogeneity of RNA concentration in PBs. Cell cycle phases are indicated on the left. Scale bars, 10 and 1 μm in the images and insets, respectively. (C) Number of FBXO5 mRNA molecules in the cytoplasm or in PBs in individual cells, and resulting fraction of mRNA in PBs across the cell cycle. Each dot corresponds to a cell (n indicated on the x-axis, from 2 independent experiments). Horizontal line, median; error bars, 95% CI. Statistical analyses were performed with a two-tailed Mann-Whitney test: ****, $p<0.0001$; *, $p<0.05$, ns, non-significant ($p>0.5$). (D, E) Same as in B and C, for CLK1 mRNA. (F, G) Same as in B and C, for CCNE2 mRNA.

A

mRNA levels in PBs or PSF (normalized counts)

TOP2A, CENPF, BUB1B, PUM2 — mRNA levels in PBs (red) or PSF (green) across Mid G1, G1S, Mid S, G2M.

B

TOP2A mRNA, GFP-LSM14A, DAPI — Non-synchronized

Identical contrast

i, ii, iii

C

TOP2A mRNA, non-synchronized, 427 cells

Fraction of mRNA in PBs vs Number of mRNA in cytoplasm

D

HEK-FUCCI

Early G1 | G1 | S | G2 | Mitosis

TOP2A mRNA / FUCCI S, G2

FUCCI G1, G2

Merge, LSM14A-Halo

TOP2A mRNA | LSM14A-Halo

Early G1 | G1 | S | G2

E

Early G1 cells, S or G2 cells

mRNA 1: TOP2A

BUB1B | CENPF | PUM2

mRNA 2

GFP-LSM14A, Merge

**Figure 4: TOP2A, CENPF, BUB1B mRNAs concentrate in PBs after cell division.** (A) Evolution of TOP2A, CENPF, BUB1B, and PUM2 mRNA levels (in normalized counts) in purified PBs and pre-sorting fraction across the cell cycle. Each dot corresponds to one replicate (overlapping replicated appear as 1 dot), with the line connecting the mean value of the replicates. (B) Widefield fluorescence image of asynchronous HEK293 cells expressing GFP-LSM14A after smFISH of TOP2A mRNA. For better visualization, the Cy3 smFISH signal is in green and GFP-LSM14A in red. Nuclei were stained with DAPI (in blue). Insets present enlargements of representative PBs, illustrating the intercellular heterogeneity of RNA concentration in PBs. Green arrows point to cells with low expression and high accumulation in PBs; yellow ones to cells with high expression and low accumulation in PBs; and white ones to cells with low expression and low accumulation in PBs. Scale bars, 10 and 1 µm in the main image and insets, respectively. (C) Fraction of TOP2A mRNAs localized in PBs as a function of their number in the cytoplasm. Each dot corresponds to one cell (n=427, from 2 independent experiments). (D) Left panel: Widefield fluorescence image of HEK-FUCCI cells transiently expressing LSM14A-Halo to label PBs (in far-red, shown in blue), after smFISH of TOP2A mRNA (Cy3, in red). The green, red, yellow, and white arrows point to cells in G1, S, G2, and M, respectively, identified based on the FUCCI system. These cells are enlarged in the middle panels, with the upper row showing the cytoplasmic TOP2A mRNAs and the nuclear mCherry-Gem signal (in red in the merge), the middle row showing the nuclear Cdt1-mVenus (in green in the merge), and the lower row showing the merge including the PB signal (in blue). The mitotic cell was identified based on DAPI staining which is shown in white. Insets on the right present enlargements of the representative PBs framed in white in the merges. Scale bars, 10 µm for left and middle images and 1 µm for insets. (E) 2-color smFISH of TOP2A mRNAs and BUB1B, CENPF or PUM2 mRNAs in asynchronous HEK293 cells expressing GFP-LSM14A. In the merge, TOP2A mRNAs (in Cy5, upper row) are in red, co-detected mRNAs (in Cy3, middle row) are in green, LSM14A-GFP-labelled PBs are in blue, and DAPI-staining of the nuclei in white. Light blue arrows point to early G1 cells and yellow ones to S or G2 cells, as revealed by the TOP2A mRNA labeling pattern. The green circles surround mRNA clustered in PBs. The pink arrows point to nuclear transcription sites. Scale bars, 10 µm.

**Figure 5: A high-throughput smFISH screen reveals PB localization of an mRNA subset after cell division.** (A) Summary of the HT-smFISH workflow and a typical cell cycle profiling based on DAPI staining (taken from TTK mRNA smFISH analysis). The cells considered as in G1 or G2 with good confidence (see material and methods) are indicated in blue and red, respectively. (B) Scatter plot comparing the fraction of mRNA molecules in PBs in G1 and G2 cells for the 94 screened mRNAs. The mRNAs decayed or not during M-G1 transition were taken from Krenning et al., 2022[22]. The named mRNAs are those shown in (G). (C) Dot plot showing the fraction of mRNA molecules in PBs for several transcripts in G1 and G2 cells. The number of analyzed cells for each mRNA ranges from 163 to 837 for G1 cells, and from 54 to 276 for G2 cells, as detailed in Figure S9C. Horizontal line, mean; error bars, 95% CI. Statistical analyses were performed using a two-tailed Welch t test: ****, $p<0.0001$; ns, non-significant ($p>0.5$). (D) Boxplot showing the fold-change of the mRNA fraction in PBs in G1 versus G2 cells for mRNAs decaying at the M-G1 transition and other screened mRNAs. Statistical analyses were performed using a two-tailed Mann-Whitney test: ****, $p<0.0001$. (E) Stacked bar graph showing the proportion of PB-enriched (in red), PB-depleted (in green), or neither (in grey) mRNAs in G1 in the whole coding transcriptome and in the mRNAs decaying at the M-G1 transition (normalized counts >100). Statistical analyses were performed using a Chi-squared test: ****, $p<0.0001$. (F) Box plot showing PB enrichment in G1 for mRNAs decaying at the M-G1 transition and for the whole coding transcriptome (normalized counts >100). Statistical analyses were performed using a two-tailed Mann-Whitney test: ****, $p<0.0001$. (G) Widefield images of HEK293 cells expressing GFP-LSM14A and hybridized using HT-smFISH. Six examples of mRNAs undergoing M-G1 transition decay (upper panels) and 3 examples of mRNAs not undergoing such decay (lower panels) are shown. For better visualization, mRNA is shown in green, PBs in red, and nuclei in blue. DAPI-based cell cycle classification is indicated within cells. Insets highlight differential mRNA accumulation in the PBs framed in white. Scale bars, 10 and 1 μm in the main images and insets, respectively.

**Figure 6: Non-polysomal mRNA levels do not drive cyclic localization of mRNAs in PBs.**
(A) 2-color smFISH of BUB1B and TOP2A mRNAs in asynchronous HEK293 cells expressing LSM14A-GFP, treated or not with puromycin for 1 hr. In the merge, BUB1B mRNAs (Cy3, left column) are in red, TOP2A mRNAs (Cy5, middle column) in green, LSM14A-GFP-labelled PBs in blue and DAPI-staining of the nuclei in white. Cells were classified in early G1, or in S or G2 based on TOP2A mRNA labeling pattern. Scale bars, 10 and 1 µm in the main images and insets, respectively. (B) Fraction of BUB1B and TOP2A mRNAs localized in PBs in early G1 and in S or G2, in control and puromycin-treated cells. Each dot corresponds to one cell (n indicated on the x-axis, from 2 independent experiments). Horizontal line, median; error bars, 95% CI. Statistical analyses were performed with a two-tailed Mann-Whitney test: ****, $p<0.0001$; ns, non-significant ($p>0.05$). (C and D) Same as A and B for CENPF and TOP2A mRNAs. ****, $p<0.0001$; ***, $p<0.0005$; ns, non-significant ($p>0.05$).

**Figure 7: Long CDSs increase RNA accumulation in PBs particularly in early G1.** (A) Lengths of the full mRNA, CDS, and 3'UTR for all detected mRNAs (all mRNAs, normalized counts>100) or for the top 1000 PB-enriched mRNAs (FC>0, p-adj<0.05, cytoplasmic normalized counts>100) in the various cell cycle phases. Whiskers represent the 10 to 90% percentile. Statistical analyses were performed with a two-tailed Mann-Whitney test: ****, $p<0.0001$; **, $p<0.005$; *, $p<0.05$; ns, non-significant ($p>0.05$). (B) Schematic of the CDS length reporter experiment, with smFISH probes in red. (C) 2-color smFISH of the reporter mRNA and TOP2A mRNA in asynchronous HEK293 cells expressing GFP-LSM14A and transiently transfected with either the long or short form of the Renilla Luciferase reporter. For better visualization, Renilla Luciferase mRNAs (Cy3, left column) are in red, TOP2A mRNAs (Cy5, middle column) in green, GFP-LSM14A-labelled PBs in blue and DAPI in white. Cells in early G1 and in S or G2 were classified based on TOP2A mRNA labeling pattern. Insets below present enlargements of the representative PBs framed in white in the merges. Scale bars, 10 and 1 μm in the main images and insets, respectively. (D) Fraction of long and short Renilla Luciferase mRNAs stored in PBs, with TOP2A mRNAs as an internal control. Each dot corresponds to one cell (n indicated on the x-axis, from 2 independent experiments). Horizontal line, median; error bars, 95% CI. Statistical analyses were performed with a two-tailed Mann-Whitney test: ****, $p<0.0001$; ns, non-significant ($p>0.05$).