Region-specific regulation of stem cell-driven regeneration in tapeworms.

Tania Rozario[1*], Edward B. Quinn[1], Jianbin Wang[2], Richard E. Davis[2], and Phillip A.

Newmark[1,3,4]*

[1]Morgridge Institute for Research, Madison, WI, USA, [2]Department of Biochemistry and

Molecular Genetics, RNA Bioscience Initiative, University of Colorado School of Medicine,

Aurora, CO, USA, [3]Howard Hughes Medical Institute, [4]Department of Integrative Biology,

University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA.

* corresponding authors

Email: pnewmark@morgridge.org

13   trozario@morgridge.org

Abstract

Tapeworms grow at rates rivaling the fastest-growing metazoan tissues. To propagate

they shed large parts of their body; to replace these lost tissues they regenerate proglottids

(segments) as part of normal homeostasis. Their remarkable growth and regeneration are fueled

by adult somatic stem cells that have yet to be characterized molecularly. Using the rat intestinal

tapeworm, *Hymenolepis diminuta*, we find that regenerative potential is regionally limited to the

neck, where head-dependent extrinsic signals create a permissive microenvironment for stem

cell-driven regeneration. Using transcriptomic analyses and RNA interference, we characterize

and functionally validate regulators of tapeworm growth and regeneration. We find no evidence

that stem cells are restricted to the regeneration-competent neck. Instead, lethally irradiated

tapeworms can be rescued when cells from either regeneration-competent or regeneration-

incompetent regions are transplanted into the neck. Together, the head and neck tissues provide

extrinsic cues that regulate stem cells, enabling region-specific regeneration in this parasite.

Introduction

Tapeworms are parasitic flatworms that infect humans and livestock, causing lost economic output, disease, and in rare cases, death[1]. These parasites are well known for their ability to reach enormous lengths. For example, humans infected with the broad or fish tapeworm, *Diphyllobothrium latum*, harbor parasites that average 6 m in length[2]. It is less commonly appreciated that tapeworms can regenerate to accommodate their multi-host life cycle. Adult tapeworms in their host intestines develop proglottids (segments) that are gravid with embryos. Tapeworms pinch off the posterior and gravid sections of their body, which exit with the host excrement, to be eaten by a suitable intermediate host that supports larval tapeworm development. Despite losing large body sections, the tapeworm does not progressively shorten; instead, it regenerates proglottids, allowing the worms to maintain an equilibrium length. Despite this remarkable biology, tapeworms are an unexplored animal model in the study of regenerative behaviors.

Up to the 1980s the rat intestinal tapeworm, *Hymenolepis diminuta*, had been a favorite model organism among parasitologists. *H. diminuta* grows rapidly−within the first 15 days of infection, it produces up to 2200 proglottids, increases in length by up to 3400 times, and weight by up to 1.8 million times[3]−and is easily propagated in the laboratory. Foundational work on their biochemistry, ultrastructure, and developmental biology enriched our understanding of these tapeworms[4]. However, with the dawn of the molecular age and the rise of genetic model organisms, *H. diminuta* was essentially left behind. Here, we show that *H. diminuta* is an excellent, tractable model for the study of stem cells and regeneration, with the power to inform us about parasite physiology.

As an obligate endoparasite, adult *H. diminuta* will expire once its host rat dies. However,

the lifespan of *H. diminuta* can be greatly increased via regeneration. A single adult tapeworm can

be serially amputated and transplanted into a new host intestine, where the fragment can regenerate

into a mature tapeworm even after 13 rounds of amputation over 14 years[5]. These observations

have led to speculation that *H. diminuta* may be inherently immortal. This situation is reminiscent

of the free-living cousins of tapeworms: freshwater planarians like *Schmidtea mediterranea*, which

reproduce indefinitely by fission, and can regenerate their whole body from tiny fragments[6].

Planarian immortality and regeneration are enabled by adult somatic stem cells called

neoblasts[6-8]. These stem cells are the only dividing undifferentiated cells within the soma. Like

planarians, *H. diminuta* maintains a population of neoblast-like adult somatic stem cells[3] that are

likely responsible for their growth and regenerative ability. Recently, stem cells of multiple species

of parasitic flatworms have been described[9-13]. Stem cells play crucial roles in parasite

development, transmission, homeostasis, and even disease. For example, stem cells enable prolific

reproduction and longevity[14], mediate host-parasite interactions[15], and allow metastatic parasite

transmission in host tissues[16]. How stem cells may regulate regeneration in parasites such as

tapeworms is largely unexplored and the subject of this study.

We use *H. diminuta,* to investigate the molecular basis of tapeworm regeneration. We

have established and refined experimental tools such as transcriptomics, *in vitro* parasite culture,

whole-mount and fluorescent RNA *in situ* hybridization (WISH and FISH), cycling-cell tracing

with thymidine analogs, RNA interference (RNAi), and cell transplantation, all described in this

work. We determine that the ability to regenerate is regionally limited to the neck of adult *H.*

diminuta. However, regeneration from the neck is finite without signals from the tapeworm head.

Using RNA sequencing (RNA-seq), we identify and characterize various markers of the somatic

cycling-cell population, which includes tapeworm stem cells. Using RNAi, we functionally

validate molecular regulators of growth and regeneration. However, our analyses failed to

uncover a neck-specific stem cell population that explains the regional regenerative ability

displayed by *H. diminuta*. Instead, we show that cells from both regeneration-competent and

regeneration-incompetent regions of *H. diminuta* have stem cell ability and can restore viability

to lethally irradiated tapeworms. Our results show that extrinsic signals present in the tapeworm

neck, rather than specialized stem cells, confer region-specific regenerative ability in this

tapeworm.

Results

The anatomy of adult *H. diminuta* consists of a head with four suckers, an unsegmented neck, and a body with thousands of proglottids/segments that grow and mature in an anterior-to-posterior direction[3,17] (Fig. 1a). What regions of the tapeworm body are competent to regenerate? In order to test regeneration competency, it is necessary to grow tapeworms *in vitro* instead of in the intestine, where the suckers are required to maintain parasites *in vivo*. We established *H. diminuta in vitro* culture conditions modified from Schiller's method[18] and tested the regeneration competence of 1 cm amputated fragments (Fig. 1b-c). The anterior-most fragments (head+neck+body) were competent to regenerate, confirming *in vivo* observations using amputation and transplantation[5,19]. Anterior fragments that were first decapitated (neck+body) were also competent to regenerate. In contrast, "body only" fragments failed to regenerate proglottids. All amputated fragments could grow in length (Fig. 1d), differentiate mature reproductive structures, and mate. Despite the failure to regenerate, "body only" fragments could grow because each existing proglottid increased in length as it progressively matured (Fig. 1 – figure supplement 1a-b). However, only fragments that retained the neck were able to regenerate new proglottids over time. The neck of 6 day-old tapeworms used in this study is typically 2-3 mm long when observed after DAPI staining and widefield fluorescent microscopy. By amputating 2 mm "neck only" fragments, we find that the neck is sufficient to regenerate an average of 383 proglottids (SD=138, N=4, n=20) after 12 days *in vitro* (Fig. 1e). In no case did we observe head regeneration. Furthermore, amputated heads alone could not regenerate *in vitro* (Fig. 1 – figure supplement 1c) nor *in vivo*[5]. Thus, neither the head nor body can regenerate proglottids, but the neck is both necessary and sufficient for proglottid-specific regeneration in *H. diminuta*.

Previous *in vivo* studies have shown that *H. diminuta* can regenerate after serial rounds of

amputation and transplantation for over a decade[5] and perhaps indefinitely. Using *in vitro* culture,

we confirmed that anterior fragments of *H. diminuta* can regenerate after at least four rounds of

serial amputation (Fig. 1f-g). Decapitated (-head) fragments regenerated proglottids after the first

amputation; however, re-amputation abrogated regeneration (Fig. 1f-g). After decapitation, a

definitive neck could not be maintained and eventually, the whole tissue was comprised of

proglottids (Fig. 1–figure supplement 2). Without the head, proglottid regeneration from the neck

is finite. Thus, while the neck is necessary and sufficient for proglottid regeneration, the head is

required to maintain an unsegmented neck and for persistent regeneration.

If signals from the head regulate regeneration, is regenerative potential asymmetric across

the anterior-posterior (A-P) axis of the neck? We subdivided the neck into three 1 mm fragments

and found that the most-anterior neck fragments regenerated more proglottids than the middle or

posterior neck fragments (Fig. 1h-i). Thus, regeneration potential is asymmetric across the neck

A-P axis with a strong anterior bias.

Since the neck is the only region competent to regenerate, are stem cells preferentially

confined to the neck? In lieu of specific molecular markers for stem cells, we examined the

distribution of all cycling cells in adult tapeworms. In flatworms, it has been repeatedly shown that

the only proliferative cells are undifferentiated cells with stem cell morphology and/or function;

these cells have been termed neoblasts, adult somatic stem cells, or germinative cells, depending

on the organism[9,10,20-22]. In *H. diminuta,* proliferation does not occur in regions comprised solely

of differentiated cells (muscle and tegument/parasite skin at the animal edge)[23]. Instead,

proliferation is only detected in regions where undifferentiated cells with the typical morphology

of stem cells can be distinguished[23,24]. Thus, cycling somatic cells in *H. diminuta* would not include

differentiated cells, but would include stem cells and any dividing progeny. To label cycling cells,

we used two methods: (i) uptake of the thymidine analog F-*ara*-EdU[25] to mark cells in S-phase

and (ii) FISH to detect cell cycle-regulated transcripts, such as the replication licensing factor

minichromosome maintenance complex component 2 (*mcm2*) and *histone h2b* (*h2b*), which are

conserved cycling-cell markers in free-living and parasitic flatworms[9,26]. We detected cycling

somatic cells throughout the tapeworm body (Fig. 2a-b). Contrary to previous results[23], we also

detected cycling cells in the head, though in small numbers (Fig. 2a). The scarcity of these cells

may be the reason they were originally missed. Taken together, cycling cells are present in all

regions, regardless of regeneration competence.

To further our understanding of how tapeworm stem cells are distributed and regulated, we

sought to identify stem cell markers. Stem cell genes have been discovered previously in flatworms

by identifying transcripts downregulated after exposure to irradiation, which depletes cycling

cells[9,26,27]. Exposing *H. diminuta* to 200 Gy x-irradiation reduced the number of cycling cells by

$91\pm6\%$ after 3 days (Fig. 2c-d) and abrogated both growth and regeneration (Fig. 2–figure

supplement 1a-b). This dosage is lethal; all fragments from worms exposed to 200 Gy x-irradiation

degenerated after 1 month (Fig. 2–figure supplement 1c-d). We leveraged the sensitivity of *H.*

diminuta to lethal irradiation in order to identify new molecular markers of cycling somatic cells

by RNA-seq (Fig. 2e). A *de novo* transcriptome of 14,346 transcripts was assembled (see Materials

and Methods) to which sequencing reads were mapped. We identified 683 transcripts that were

irradiation sensitive (downregulated; FDR ≤0.05) (Supplementary File 1a).   Expression of

irradiation-sensitive transcripts by WISH was indeed reduced after exposure to irradiation,

validating our RNA-seq approach (Fig. 2–figure supplement 2).

Two rounds of expression screening were then applied to hone in on cycling-cell transcripts

from our irradiation-sensitive dataset (Fig. 2e). The position of cycling cells in the neck is spatially

restricted in a conserved pattern[28] (Fig. 3a): cycling cells reside in the neck parenchyma bounded

by the nerve cords and are absent from the animal edge where muscle and tegument are located[23].

Among 194 irradiation-sensitive transcripts that displayed clear WISH patterns, 63% were

expressed in the neck parenchyma, though in a variety of patterns (Fig. 3–figure supplement 1).

13% showed similar patterns to *h2b* and *mcm2* (Fig. 3b-c, Fig. 3–figure supplement 1b). These

include the predicted nucleic acid binding factors *Zn finger MYM type 3* (*zmym3)* and *pogo*

transposable element with ZN finger domain-like (*pogzl)*, as well as *NAB co-repressor domain 2*

superfamily member (*nab2*) and nuclear lamina component *laminB receptor* (*lbr*). 25% of

irradiation-sensitive transcripts, were expressed in a minority of cells in the neck parenchyma (Fig.

3–figure supplement 1c). 24% were expressed within the parenchyma and more broadly toward

the animal edge (Fig. 3–figure supplement 1d). The remainder represented transcripts expressed

at segment boundaries or in differentiated tissues (Fig. 3–figure supplement 1e-f). All transcripts

that were expressed in the neck parenchyma were also found throughout the worm body, even in

the most posterior proglottids (Fig. 3–figure supplement 1b-c). In conclusion, irradiation-sensitive

transcripts identified by RNA-seq likely represent markers for stem cells, progenitors, and even

differentiated cells that were lost or compromised following irradiation.

To focus on transcripts with enriched expression in cycling cells, we performed double

FISH (dFISH) with irradiation-sensitive candidates and either *h2b* or *mcm2,* which we used

interchangeably as they are co-expressed in the neck parenchyma (Fig. 3–figure supplement 2).

After dFISH for 53 candidates, 72% of transcripts tested were co-expressed in cycling cells (Fig.

3–figure supplement 3a, Supplementary File 1b). The irradiation-sensitive transcripts from Fig. 3c

were indeed colocalized in cycling somatic cells (Fig. 3d). One transcript, the homeobox factor

prospero (*prox1*), was expressed exclusively in a subset of cycling cells (Fig. 3–figure supplement

3b). We confirmed that genes with expression that only partially overlapped in the neck

parenchyma, such as the Zn finger-containing gene *HDt_10981* and *palmitoyl-protein thioesterase*

1 (ppt1), were expressed in both cycling cells and non-cycling cells (Fig. 3–figure supplement 3c).

We propose that these genes likely represent lineage-committed stem cells or progenitors for

tissues such as muscle, neurons, tegument, or protonephridia. 28% of irradiation-sensitive

transcripts were predominantly expressed in non-cycling cells that were juxtaposed to cycling cells

(Fig. 3–figure supplement 3d). The transcriptional heterogeneity detected in the cycling-cell

compartment is reminiscent of similar observations made in the regenerative planarian *S.*

mediterranea. A comparative analysis between verified tapeworm cycling-cell transcripts and their

putative planarian homologs revealed a number of transcripts with conserved expression in

cycling-cell populations from these distantly related flatworms (Supplementary File 1c) (see

Discussion). In summary, our analysis revealed a heterogeneous and complex mixture of cell types

or states in the neck parenchyma as well as within the cycling-cell population.

What role(s) do the newly identified cycling-cell genes play during regeneration? We

performed RNAi of target genes, confirmed knockdown by quantitative PCR (Fig. 4–figure

supplement 1), and assayed for defects in growth and regeneration (Fig. 4a). As a proof of

principle, we knocked down *h2b,* which should compromise growth due to cycling cell loss, as

observed in other flatworms[15,26]. Knockdown of *h2b, zmym3,* and *pogzl* each resulted in

diminished growth and regeneration (Fig. 4b-c). The number of proglottids regenerated was also

reduced, but could not be quantified as many RNAi worms were so thin and frail (Fig. 4b) that

proglottid definition was lost.

Are these RNAi-induced failures in growth and regeneration due to defects in the cycling-

cell population? RNAi knockdown of *h2b, zmym3,* and *pogzl* severely reduced the number of

proliferative cells in the neck that could incorporate F-*ara*-EdU (Fig. 4d-e). We also observed

fewer $mcm2^+$ cells after RNAi (Fig. 4f). Taken together, these results indicate that the cycling-cell

population is either lost or dysregulated. Therefore, *h2b, zmym3,* and *pogzl* are necessary for the

maintenance and/or proper function of cycling cells, likely including stem cells, in *H. diminuta.*

Although we have identified heterogeneity within the cycling-cell population of the neck

parenchyma and uncovered genes that are required for growth and regeneration, it remains unclear

why regeneration competence is restricted to the neck. By WISH and FISH, all cycling-cell

transcripts including *zmym3* and *pogzl* were detected throughout the whole tapeworm body (Fig.

4g, Fig. 3–figure supplement 1b-c). In the tapeworm posterior, *zmym3* and *pogzl* were expressed

in gonadal tissues (which contain mitotic germ cells) but also in somatic cells within the

parenchyma (Fig. 4–figure supplement 2). If *zmym3* and *pogzl* mark stem cells, this suggests that

stem cells reside even in posterior tissues that are not competent to regenerate. Since *zmym3* and

pogzl label all cycling cells, it is possible that stem cells of limited potential exist in the posterior,

but an elusive subpopulation of pluripotent stem cells is confined to the neck.

Since we observed an anterior bias in regenerative ability (Fig. 1h-i), we hypothesized that

RNA-seq may reveal an anteriorly biased stem cell distribution that may point us to a pluripotent

stem cell subpopulation. Thus, we performed RNA-seq of 1 mm anterior, middle, and posterior

neck fragments (Fig. 1h), and identified 461 anterior-enriched and 241 anterior-depleted

transcripts (Supplementary File 1d). By WISH, anterior-enriched and anterior-depleted transcripts

were often detected in corresponding gradients (Fig. 5a), but in patterns that were excluded from

the neck parenchyma. When we overlaid the anterior-enriched and -depleted datasets with our

irradiation-sensitive dataset, the majority of anterior-enriched transcripts (88%) were not

irradiation sensitive (Fig. 5b). Our results suggest that the A-P polarized signals across the neck

region arise predominantly within the non-cycling compartments.

Since our RNA-seq analysis identified 57 transcripts that were anterior enriched and

irradiation sensitive, we examined expression patterns within this category. We found 15

transcripts expressed in a subset of cells within the neck parenchyma (Fig. 5c) and initially

hypothesized that these transcripts may represent subsets of stem cells. We were able to

successfully test 8 candidates by dFISH with cycling-cell markers and found that the majority (7/8)

were not expressed in cycling cells (Fig. 5d, Supplementary File 1b). Only *prox1* was co-expressed

in cycling cells (Fig. 3–figure supplement 3b). At present, the identity and function of *prox1*$^+$ cells

is unknown. Furthermore, *prox1* is expressed throughout the tapeworm body (Figure 3 – figure

supplement 1). Thus, our analyses have not revealed an anteriorly biased subpopulation of stem

cells that confer regenerative ability.

With no evidence for a unique neck-specific subpopulation of stem cells, we hypothesized

that stem cells may be distributed throughout the tapeworm, but that extrinsic signals functioning

in the neck are necessary to instruct stem cell behavior and/or proglottid regeneration. We designed

a functional assay to test populations of cells for the ability to rescue regeneration, modelled after

similar experiments performed on planarians[8]. We exposed tapeworms to a lethal dose of x-

irradiation (200 Gy), injected cells from wild-type donors into the neck region, amputated 5 mm

anterior fragments, and assayed rescue of lethality and regeneration after 30 days *in vitro* (Fig. 6a).

Remarkably, bulk-cell transplants were able to either partially or fully rescue irradiated worms that

were destined to die (Fig. 6a, c). "Full" rescue was ascribed to worms with normal adult appearance

whereas "partial" rescue was assigned to cases in which proglottids were regenerated but the

worms displayed abnormalities, like contracted necks (Fig. 6–figure supplement 1a). We did not

observe any proglottid regeneration in irradiated worms with or without buffer injection (Fig. 6a,

c).

Is the rescue ability described above dependent on tapeworm cycling cells? We exposed

donors to F-*ara*-EdU for 1 hr, to label cycling cells prior to transplantation into irradiated hosts

(Fig. 6–figure supplement 1b). Though bulk-cell transplants were performed, injection sites

contained 0, 1, or small groups of F-ara-EdU$^+$ cells immediately after transplantations (Fig. 6–

figure supplement 1c), likely due to technical challenges. Despite this issue, we were able to detect

large colonies of F-ara-EdU$^+$ cells 3 days post-transplantation (Fig. 6–figure supplement 1d). We

also observed that some labeled cells were incorporated into terminally differentiated tissues at the

animal edge (Fig. 6–figure supplement 1d: inset). Thus, cycling cells from donors are able to

become established and differentiate inside the irradiated host.

To test if the cycling-cell population is necessary to rescue lethally irradiated tapeworms,

we depleted cycling cells from donor worms using 50 mM hydroxyurea (HU), which resulted in

96±3% loss of cycling cells after 6 days (Fig. 6–figure supplement 1e-f). Cycling cells are essential

for rescue of regeneration as injected cells from HU-treated donors rescued only 1% of the time,

compared to 26% rescue using cells sourced from sister donors that did not receive the drug (Fig.

6b-c). HU was used to deplete cycling cells instead of irradiation in order to avoid inducing DNA

damage in the transplanted cells. Cells transplanted from HU-treated donors had otherwise

comparable morphology to untreated cells (Fig. 6–figure supplement 1g). Our results suggest that

tapeworm cycling cells contain *bona fide* stem cell activity.

With this functional assay in hand, we examined the rescue ability of cells from anterior

donor tissues (including the regeneration-competent neck) compared to donor tissues from the

most posterior termini of 6 day-old tapeworms (which are regeneration incompetent and

exclusively comprised of proglottids). Cells from either region were able to rescue regeneration in

lethally irradiated tapeworms (Fig. 6b-c). Thus, cells from posterior proglottids were competent to

receive signals from the head and neck region that regulate regenerative ability. Interestingly, using

pulse-chase experiments with F-*ara*-EdU, we find that the cycling cells of posterior proglottids

can give rise to multiple differentiated cell types like muscle/tegument at the animal edge as well

as flame cells of the protonephridial system marked by anti-acetylated α-tubulin antibodies[17] (Fig.

6 - figure supplement 2). Thus, the cycling cells from tapeworm posteriors show hallmarks of stem

cell activity, despite the fact that this tissue is not competent to regenerate.

Taken together, the results of our study support the idea that the regeneration competence

of the neck is due to extrinsic signals that regulate regeneration, rather than intrinsic properties of

stem cells in the neck region (see Discussion). It appears that in tapeworms, location matters

enormously: the head and neck environment provide cues that regulate the ability of stem cells to

regenerate proglottids, even though cycling cells (and likely stem cells), are not anatomically

confined.

Discussion

Across the flatworm phylum, both free-living and parasitic worms maintain stem cells

throughout adulthood but display a range of regenerative abilities. The freshwater planarian *S.*

mediterranea can regenerate its whole body from tiny amputated fragments[6]. The blood fluke

Schistosoma mansoni cannot regenerate after amputation, though it does employ adult somatic

stem cells in other ways, such as to repair injury[29] and maintain its tegument[15,30]. Prior to this

study, the regenerative ability of tapeworms had never been tested comprehensively. Although it

was known that anterior fragments containing the head, neck, and immature proglottids could

regenerate into fully mature tapeworms once transplanted into a rat intestine[5,19], fragments lacking

heads could not be tested for regenerative ability using transplantation. Attempts were made to

suture *H. diminuta* fragments with mutilated or removed heads into a rat intestine but these

fragments were invariably flushed out[19]. Here we employ a robust *in vitro* culture system that

allowed us to test regeneration of any amputated *H. diminuta* fragment for the first time. We show

that the neck is both necessary and sufficient for proglottid regeneration, though this regenerative

ability is ultimately finite without regulatory signals that depend on the presence of the head. *H.*

diminuta is an intriguing model to discover signals that both drive and limit regenerative ability.

During homeostasis, the neck of *H. diminuta* serves as a "growth zone" from which

proglottids are thought to bud one at a time[31], thus, it makes intuitive sense that this tissue would

retain the ability to regenerate proglottids post-amputation. Furthermore, cells with the typical

morphology of stem cells reside in the neck[23]. However, we find that cycling cells are present in

all regions regardless of regenerative competence. Thus, it was necessary to embark on a more

thorough characterization of tapeworm cycling cells to understand how *H. diminuta* may regulate

stem cells and enable proglottid regeneration.

We depleted cycling cells in *H. diminuta* using irradiation and employed RNA-seq to

uncover potential stem cell regulators in an unbiased fashion. Though irradiation may have

secondary effects beyond stem cell depletion[26], this approach allowed us to generate an initial list

of candidate tapeworm stem cell genes. Using dFISH, we were able to verify 38 transcripts that

were expressed at least partially in cycling cells, providing the first molecular characterization of

this population in *H. diminuta*.

Adult somatic stem cells in free-living flatworms have already been well described

molecularly, and share many conserved regulators. However, parasitic flatworms have lost some

stem cell genes (e.g. *piwi*, *vasa*, and *tudor*)[32] but retained others (e.g. *argonaute*, *fgfr*)[9,10]. How do

the cycling-cell transcripts we identified in *H. diminuta* compare to stem cells in free-living

planarians?[33-36] (Supplementary File 1c). Of 38 verified tapeworm cycling-cell transcripts, 28 had

putative planarian homologs (tblasx E-value $< 10^{-10}$) though not all were reciprocal blast hits. 16

of these planarian transcripts were designated as cluster-defining genes in the Fincher et al. single-

cell sequencing dataset and 6/16 are neoblast cluster-defining genes. Plass et al. also performed

single-cell sequencing of planarians but most of the putative planarian homologs of tapeworm

cycling cell transcripts that we identified were not found in their dataset. However, 8/28 transcripts

showed enriched expression in neoblast clusters. We also compared the expression of these

planarian transcripts in RNA-seq of three cell populations sorted by fluorescence-activated cell

sorting (FACS): 1) X1 (neoblasts in G2/M), 2) X2 (G1 neoblasts and progenitors), and 3) Xins

(differentiated cells)[35,36]. We find that 22/28 putative planarian homologs of tapeworm cycling-

cell transcripts show enriched expression in either the X1 or X2 populations, which contain

neoblasts. Thus, despite >500 million years of separation between free-living and parasitic

flatworm evolution[37], tapeworm cycling-cell transcripts have conserved signatures with planarian

neoblasts.

In multiple species of flatworms, stem cells have been shown to be transcriptionally

heterogenous[26,33,38,39]. For example, in larvae of the tapeworm *Echinococcus multilocularis*, many

putative stem cell markers show limited overlapping gene expression patterns[10]. In keeping with

these findings, we observe transcriptional heterogeneity within the cycling-cell population of *H.*

diminuta. Additionally, we identified 23 transcripts, including *zmym3* and *pogzl*, that label all

cycling cells. Importantly, we were able to use RNAi to functionally verify that cycling-cell genes

like *zmym3* and *pogzl* are critical for stem cell maintenance and that inhibition of these genes leads

to impaired growth and regeneration. Both *zmym3* and *pogzl* are neoblast cluster-defining genes

in planarians (Supplementary File 1c) suggesting that their functions in stem cell regulation may

be conserved across the two species. In fact, the planarian homolog of tapeworm *pogzl, factor*

initiating regeneration 1 (*fir1*), was recently shown to be expressed in planarian neoblasts[40]. RNAi

of *fir1* resulted in decreased cell division after amputation and failure to regenerate blastemas[40].

On the other hand, the function of *zmym3* in regeneration is not known, but in other systems,

zmym3 regulates cell cycle progression[41] and DNA repair[42], two essential functions for stem cells.

Coincidently, both *zmym3* and *pogzl* are Zn finger proteins with predicted DNA-binding activity

and could function as transcriptional regulators of stem cells. Thus, it would be interesting to

further understand the mechanism of action of *zmym3* and *pogzl* in stem cells of parasitic and free-

living flatworms.

In this study, we showed the first use of RNAi in *H. diminuta*. RNAi has been demonstrated

previously in other tapeworm species[43-45], though it has not been widely adopted for studying

tapeworm biology due to technical challenges like poor knockdown efficacy, inefficient

penetrance, and the difficulty of *in vitro* culture. Taking advantage of the robust *in vitro* culture of

H. diminuta, our RNAi scheme can be expanded to ascertain functions for many parasitic flatworm

genes that thus far have been refractory to functional analyses.

Our screening strategy allowed us to verify genes with enriched expression in some or all

cycling cells; however, none of these genes were expressed exclusively in the neck. Since we had

observed that regenerative ability was anteriorly biased across the neck, we attempted to leverage

this observation and query whether a subpopulation of pluripotent cycling cells may be

asymmetrically distributed across the neck and would be identifiable by RNA-seq. Through A-P

transcriptional profiling of the neck, we identified 461 anterior-enriched transcripts, but the vast

majority of them were neither irradiation-sensitive nor detected in cycling cells by dFISH. Thus,

a subpopulation of neck-resident pluripotent stem cells, seems unlikely to explain the region-

specific regenerative ability of tapeworms. Nonetheless, our study does not exclude the existence

of a subpopulation of pluripotent stem cells that may be stably maintained in the adult. Future

studies using single-cell RNA sequencing are likely to provide a thorough characterization of adult

somatic stem cells in *H. diminuta*, as has been the case for planarians[33,34,39].

Is the neck competent to regenerate because of a unique stem cell population that has yet

to be identified, or because of signals extrinsic to stem cells that make the neck permissive for

regeneration? Tapeworms exposed to a lethal dose of irradiation prior to amputation are not

competent to regenerate and will eventually degenerate and die. However, transplantation of cells

from wild-type donors into the necks of irradiated tapeworms rescued lethality and regeneration.

This rescue ability is severely compromised if donor worms are first depleted of cycling cells using

drug treatment with HU, suggesting that some or all cycling cells have stem cell ability.

Interestingly, stem cell ability is not restricted to cells from regeneration-competent regions: cells

from posterior tissues that do not regenerate proglottids are still able to rescue regeneration when

transplanted into the neck. These data strongly suggest that the microenvironment within the neck

confers regenerative ability to this region.

The interplay between intrinsic and extrinsic stem cell regulatory signals has been shown

to play important roles in regeneration. Head regeneration was induced in three naturally

regeneration-deficient planarian species by manipulating the gradient of Wnt signaling by RNAi[46-

48]. These planarians maintain pluripotent stem cells but do not normally regenerate heads from

posterior tissues due to inappropriately high levels of Wnt signaling, which inhibit anterior

regeneration. As in planarians, gradients of Wnt signaling delineate A-P polarity in tapeworms[49].

Our transcriptional profiling of the neck A-P axis has already revealed hundreds of candidate genes

with polarized expression profiles. Future experiments will help clarify how Wnt signaling and

other A-P axis regulation in the neck impacts tapeworm regeneration.

Several plausible models can explain region-specific regeneration in *H. diminuta*. Head-

dependent signals may create gradients across the neck that inhibit proglottidization and are

necessary to maintain the neck as an unsegmented tissue. Proglottids can only form once the

inhibitory signals are sufficiently diminished (Fig. 6d). In this model, the neck is competent to

regenerate because of its juxtaposition to the head. After decapitation, the head-dependent signals

eventually dissipate and segmentation signals dominate at the expense of the neck. The cellular

source of the head-dependent signals and their molecular identity will be exciting avenues for

future research.

In addition to its function in maintaining the neck, the head may also play a role in stem

cell regulation (Fig. 6e). The head may regulate a niche (directly or indirectly) that is necessary

for the maintenance of pluripotency in the neck. In this model, stem cells are collectively

pluripotent only when they receive head-dependent niche signals, thus limiting regenerative

potential to the neck. Alternatively, stem cells may depend on a local niche that is independent of

the head. In this model, stem cells have the capacity to form all cell lineages from any amputated

fragment; however, the extrinsic signals that activate proglottid formation are restricted to the

posterior neck region. Identifying the stem cell niche and its relationship to the head and neck

microenvironment will provide crucial insights into our understanding of tapeworm regeneration.

Conclusion

Our study shows that *H. diminuta* is a powerful developmental model for understanding

intrinsic and extrinsic regulation of stem cells and regeneration. The regionally limited

regenerative biology of *H. diminuta* and the technical advances put forth in this work show that

we can exploit this tapeworm to understand the complexities of stem cell regulation in parasites.

We defined heterogenous stem cells that are collectively pluripotent but that require extrinsic head-

dependent signals to enable persistent proglottid regeneration. Understanding how the stem cell

niche we describe is regulated may have broad implications for elucidating stem cell biology in

parasitic flatworms, as well as other regenerative animals.

Acknowledgements

We thank: members of the Newmark lab, especially Melanie Issigonis and Umair Khan,

for discussions and comments on the manuscript; Alvaro Hernandez (Roy J. Carver Biotechnology

Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) for RNA-seq; and Bret Duffin (Morgridge

Institute for Research) for invaluable assistance with irradiation. This work was supported by NIH

R21AI119960. PAN is an investigator of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

Materials and Methods

Animal care and use

Infective *H. diminuta* cysts were obtained from Carolina Biological (132232). To obtain adult tapeworms, 100-400 cysts were fed to Sprague-Dawley rats by oral gavage in ~0.5 mL of 0.85% NaCl. Rats were euthanized in a CO_2 chamber 6 days post-gavage, tapeworms were flushed out of the small intestine, and washed in 1X Hanks Balanced Salt Solution (HBSS; Corning) (140 mg/L $CaCl_2$, 100 mg/L $MgCl_2.6H_2O$, 100 mg/L $MgSO_4.7H_2O$, 400 mg/L KCl, 60 mg/L KH_2PO_4, 350 mg/L $NaHCO_3$, 8 g/L NaCl, 48 mg/L Na_2HPO_4, 1 g/L D-glucose, no phenol red). Rodent care was in accordance with protocols approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) of the University of Wisconsin-Madison (M005573).

In vitro parasite culture

Biphasic parasite cultures were prepared based on the Schiller method[18]. Briefly, the solid phase was made in 50 mL Erlenmeyer flasks by mixing 30% heat-inactivated defibrinated sheep blood (Hemostat) with 70% agar base for 10 mL blood-agar mixture per flask. Fresh blood was heat-inactivated at 56°C for 30 min then kept at 4°C and used repeatedly for one week by first warming the blood to 37°C. The agar base was prepared from 8 g Difco nutrient agar and 1.75 g NaCl in 350 mL water, autoclaved, and stored at 4°C. Before use, the agar base was microwaved to liquify, and cooled to below 56°C before mixing with warmed blood. After the blood-agar mixture solidified, 10 mL of Working Hanks 4 (WH4; 1X HBSS/4 g/L total glucose/1X antibiotic-antimycotic (Sigma)) was added. Each flask was topped with a gas-permeable stopper (Jaece Identi-plug) and pre-incubated at 37°C in hypoxia (3% CO_2/5% O_2/92% N_2) overnight before use. Before tapeworms were transferred into the flasks, the liquid phase was adjusted to pH7.5 with 200 μL 7.5% $NaHCO_3$ (Corning). Tapeworms were first washed in WH4 for 10 mins at 37°C in

438 petri dishes pre-coated with 0.5% BSA to inhibit sticking. Transfers to pre-cultured flasks were

439 performed by gently lifting the worms with a stainless-steel hook (Moody Tools) and immersing

440 them in the liquid phase. Tapeworms were grown in hypoxia and transferred to fresh cultures every

441 3-4 days.

Fixation and DAPI Staining

Tapeworms were heat-killed by swirling in 75°C water for a few seconds until the worms

relaxed and elongated, then fixative (4% formaldehyde in Phosphate Buffered Saline with 0.3%

TritonX-100 (PBSTx)) was added immediately for 30 min-2hr at room temperature or overnight

at 4°C. For DAPI staining, samples were incubated in 1 μg/mL DAPI (Sigma) in PBSTx overnight

at 4°C and cleared in 80% glycerol/10 mM Tris pH7.5/1 mM EDTA overnight at room temperature

before mounting.

F-ara-EdU[31] uptake and staining

For F-ara-EdU pulse, tapeworms were incubated in 0.1 μM F-ara-EdU (Sigma) in 1%

DMSO at 37°C in WH4. Tapeworms were heat-killed (above) and fixed in 4% formaldehyde/10%

DMSO/1% NP40/PBSTx. Large tissues/worms were permeabilized by incubating in PBSTx at

room temp for several days. Additional permeabilization was achieved by treatment with 10

μg/mL Proteinase-K/0.1% SDS/PBSTx for 10-30 min at room temperature, fixed in 4%

formaldehyde/PBSTx for 10 min before samples were cut into small pieces or retained whole in

PBSTx. Samples were further permeabilized in PBSTx/10% DMSO/1% NP40 for 20min-1 hr

(depending on size) before performing the click-it reaction[50] with Oregon Green 488 azide

(Invitrogen). Signal was detected using anti-Oregon Green 488-HRP antibody (1:1000;

Invitrogen) in K-block (5% Horse serum/0.45% fish gelatin/0.3% Triton-X/0.05% Tween-

20/PBS) [51] followed by 10-20 min Tyramide Signal Amplification (TSA) reaction [52]. Tiled

confocal z-stacks through the anterior of the worms were taken and cell numbers were counted

using background subtraction on Imaris software. F-*ara*-EdU$^+$ cells were normalized to worm area

from maximum projections of the DAPI stain. Flame cells were stained using an anti-acetylated

α-tubulin mouse antibody at 1:500 (sc-23950, Santa Cruz) as described previously[17].

<u>Irradiation</u>

Most irradiation was performed using a CellRad irradiator (Faxitron Bioptics) at 200 Gy

(150 kV, 5 mA) with two exceptions. Due to instrument failure, a cesium irradiator was used for

one rescue experiment with donors +/- HU (Fig. 6b) at 400 Gy (92±5 % cycling cell loss 3 days

post-irradiation). The rescue experiment with +/- HU donors was performed a third time once we

gained access to an x-irradiator (Xstrahl RS225 Cell Irradiator), where the lethal dose was 200 Gy

(63±10 % cycling cell loss 3 days post-irradiation). All three experiments gave similar results

despite the use of different irradiators. In all cases, lethal irradiation was determined as the dosage

at which tapeworms degenerated, had 0 proglottids, and were inviable after 30 days in culture.

Irradiation was performed in WH4 in BSA-coated petri dishes.

<u>Transcriptome assembly</u>

RNA was collected from five regions: 1) head and neck, 2) immature proglottids, 3) mature

reproductive proglottids, 4) gravid proglottids, and 5) mixed larval stages isolated from beetles.

The first three regions covered the entirety of 3.5-week old adult tapeworms. Gravid proglottids

were taken from posteriors of 10-week old tapeworms. Paired-end libraries were constructed with

2 x 150 bp reads from a HiSeq2500 chip. 2 x ~30 million reads were obtained for each sample.

The transcriptome was assembled from three components: 1) map-based assembly, 2) *de novo*

assembly, and 3) Maker predictions from Wormbase Parasite. The map-based assembly was

performed using TopHat2 with the 2014 *H. diminuta* draft genome courtesy of Matt Berriman

(Wellcome Sanger Institute, UK). 15,859 transcripts were assembled using TopHat. *De novo*

assembly was performed using Velvet/Oases and resulted in 144,682 transcripts. There were

11,275 predicted Maker transcripts and 73.2% matched (>95% along the length) to the TopHat

transcripts. The remaining predicted transcripts that were not represented in the TopHat dataset

were added for a combined TopHat/predicted set of 17,651 transcripts. Most of the Oases

transcripts matched to the TopHat/predicted set but 35,300 or 24.4% of the Oases transcripts did

not (>75% match cut-off). These transcripts could be transcripts missed in the genome,

transcription noise, non-coding transcripts, or contamination. We found significant contamination

from beetle tissue in the larval tapeworm sample (more below). Initial filtering for contamination

excluded 1,388 transcripts (from beetle, rat, bacterial, and viral sources). At this point 51,563

transcripts were retained from the three methodologies described above and were processed for

further filtering.

There was significant contamination from beetle tissues that had adhered to the tapeworm

larvae, which produced transcripts with best hits to beetle proteins (*Ixodes scapularis,*

Harpegnathos saltator, Monodelphis domestica, Nasonia vitripennis, Pediculus humanus

corporis, Solenopsis invicta, Tenebrio molitor, or *Tribolium castaneum*). Most of the transcripts

were from the Oases *de novo* assembly and did not match the *H. diminuta* genome. Furthermore,

they were strongly over-represented in the larval sample only. To filter out beetle contamination,

we removed 11,918 transcripts from the Oases assembly without matches to the *H. diminuta*

genome that showed >90% expression (by RPKM) in the larval sample.

To the remaining 39,645 transcripts, we applied additional filters: 1) Remove transcripts if

average RPKM<1 unless the transcript is long (>1000 bp), has a long ORF (>500 bp) or is

annotated. 11,615 transcripts were removed as they met none of these criteria. 2) A stringent

expression cut-off was applied to the remaining Oases transcripts; transcripts were discarded if

average RPKM<5 and maximum RPKM<10 unless the transcripts were long (>1000 bp), had long

ORFs (>500 bp) or were annotated. 8,027 transcripts were removed. 3) 51 transcripts were

removed because they are mitochondrial or rRNAs. 4) An ORF size filter was applied to remove

all transcripts with ORF <300 bp unless they are annotated. 5,331 transcripts were removed. 5)

For the Maker predicted transcripts, expression and size filters were applied to remove transcripts

with expression <1 RPKM and size <500 bp. 275 transcripts were removed.

Our final transcriptome is comprised of 14,346 transcripts (84.9% TopHat, 8.4% Maker

predictions, 6.1% Oases with match to genome, and 0.6% Oases without match to genome). The

total transcriptome size is 34 Mb with average transcript length of 2,354 bp. This Transcriptome

Shotgun Assembly project has been deposited at DDB/ENA/Genbank under the accession

GHNR00000000. The version described in this paper is the first version, GHNR01000000. All

sequence reads are available at GenBank Bioproject PRJNA546290.

<u>RNA-seq for differential gene expression analyses</u>

Tissue was collected and immediately frozen on dry ice in 100 μL Trizol (Life

Technologies) before RNA extraction. Tissue homogenization was performed as the mixture was

in a semi-frozen state using RNase-free pestles and a pestle motor. RNA was purified using the

Direct-zol RNA MiniPrep kit (Zymo). RNA quality was assessed using Bioanalyzer, libraries were

prepared with TruSeq Stranded mRNAseq Sample Prep kit (Illumina), and sequenced on two lanes

on a HiSeq2500 chip. We performed paired-end sequencing and obtained ~20 million reads per

sample. Samples were obtained in triplicate. To identify irradiation-sensitive transcripts, 2 mm

anterior tapeworm fragments were cut from 10 worms after 3 days *in vitro*. To identify

differentially expressed transcripts across the neck A-P axis, 1 mm fragments were cut from 20

freshly obtained 6 day-old tapeworms. Paired-end reads were mapped to the transcriptome (above)

using default settings on CLC Genomics Workbench 6 (Qiagen) except that read alignments were

done with a relaxed length fraction of 0.5. Differential gene expression analysis was done with the

same software using estimate tagwise dispersions on total read counts and a total count filter cut-

off of 5 reads. All sequence reads used for differential genes expression analyses are available at

GenBank Bioproject PRJNA546293.

Cloning

Target genes were amplified using PCR with Platinum Taq (Life Technologies) from

cDNA generated from RNAs extracted from tapeworm anteriors to enrich for neck transcripts.

PCR products were inserted via TA-mediated cloning into the previously described vector

pJC53.2[53] pre-digested with *Eam1105I*. Anti-sense riboprobes could be generated by *in vitro*

transcription with SP6 or T3 RNA polymerases. For RNAi, dsRNA was generated using T7 RNA

polymerase. For sequences and primers, refer to Supplementary File 1e.

In situ hybridization

WISH and FISH protocols were modified from previously published methods for

planarians[52] and the mouse bile-duct tapeworm *Hymenolepis microstoma* [54]. Tapeworms were heat

killed and fixed in 4% formaldehyde/10% DMSO/1% NP40/PBSTx for 30 min at room

temperature before washing and dehydration into methanol. Dehydrated samples were frozen at -

30°C for at least 2 days. After rehydration, samples were permeabilized in 10 μg/mL Proteinase-

K/0.1% SDS/PBSTx for 30 min, washed into 0.1 M Triethanolamine pH7-8 (TEA), 2.5 μL/mL

acetic anhydride was added for 5 min with vigorous swirling, acetic anhydride step was repeated,

washed in PBSTx, and post-fixed in 4% formaldehyde/PBSTx for 10 min. Probe synthesis,

hybridization, and staining were performed as previously described[52] using probe concentrations

at ~50 ng/mL for 16-48 hrs at 56°C. All probes were synthesized with either DIG or DNP haptens

and detected using the following antibodies, all at 1:2000: anti-DIG-AP (Sigma), anti-DIG-POD

(Sigma), anti-DNP-HRP (Vector Labs). Colorimetric development was done using NBT

(Roche)/BCIP (Sigma) or with Fast-Blue (Sigma)[55]. Fluorescent signal was visualized after 10-20

min TSA reaction[52]. DAPI staining and mounting were performed as described above.

Imaging

Confocal imaging was performed on a Zeiss LSM 880 with the following objectives:

20X/0.8 NA Plan-APOCHROMAT, 40X/1.3 NA Plan-APOCHROMAT, and 63X/1.4 NA Plan-

APOCHROMAT. WISH samples and whole-mount DAPI-stained worms were imaged using

Zeiss AxioZoom V16 macroscope. Image processing was performed using ImageJ for general

brightness/contrast adjustments, maximum-intensity projections, and tile stitching[56].

RNAi

dsRNA was synthesized as previously described[57] and resuspended at concentrations ~ 1.5-

2 μg/μL. For control injections, 1.5 kb dsRNA derived from *ccdB* and *camR*-containing insert of

the pJC53.2 vector was used[53]. 6 day-old tapeworms were obtained and microinjected with dsRNA

using femtotips II via the Femtojet injection system (Eppendorf) to obtain spreading across the

first ~ 3-4 mm anterior of the tapeworm. The spread of injected fluids could be detected by a

temporary increase in opacity. 500 hPa injection pressure for 0.3-1 s was used per injection site.

Whole tapeworms were cultured *in vitro* for 3 days, 2 mm anterior fragments were amputated,

worms were re-injected with dsRNA on day 6, and cultured *in vitro* for an additional 9 days before

termination.

qPCR for target gene knockdown efficacy

Whole worms (6 days old) were injected with dsRNA throughout and frozen in Trizol on

dry ice after 6 days *in vitro* for RNA extraction according to manufacturer's protocol and DNAse

(Promega) treatment for 30 min at 37°C. cDNA synthesis was performed using SuperScriptIII

First-Strand Synthesis System (Invitrogen) with Oligo(dT)$_{20}$ primers followed by iScript cDNA

Synthesis Kit (Bio-Rad). qPCR was performed using GoTaq Mastermix (Promega) on a

StepOnePlus real-time PCR machine (Applied Biosystems). *60S ribosomal protein L13*

(*60Srpl13)* was used as an internal normalization control. For primers refer to Supplementary File

1e.

Hydroxyurea (HU) treatment

Tapeworms were treated with HU (Sigma) or HBSS (for controls) every day for a total of

6 days. HU stock solution was made fresh every day at 2 M in HBSS. 250 μL was added to each

flask of tapeworms for final concentration of 50 mM. HU is unstable at 37°C so worms were

transferred into fresh HU-containing media every two days, and fresh HU was added every other

day.

Cell transplantations

For dissociated cell preparations, tapeworms were placed in a drop of calcium-magnesium

free HBSS (CMF HBSS, Gibco), minced into small pieces with a tungsten needle, incubated in

3X Trypsin-EDTA (Sigma) in CMF HBSS for 30 min at 37°C and dissociated using a dounce

homogenizer (Kontes). Cells were pelleted by centrifugation at 250 g for 5 min. The cell pellet

was washed in CMF HBSS and passed through cell strainers at 100 μm, 40 μm, 20 μm, and 10

μm (Falcon and Sysmex) with one spin and wash in between. Cells were pelleted and resuspended

in 200-400 μL WH4 with 0.05% BSA. Cell injections were performed using the Cell Tram Oil 4

injection system (Eppendorf) into the necks of irradiated worms. For +/- HU donors, cell

concentrations were measured using a hemocytometer and normalized (to ~10^8 cells/mL) to ensure

equal numbers of cells were injected. For all rescue experiments, cells were injected into irradiated

hosts on the same day that the hosts were irradiated. After 3 days *in vitro,* 5 mm anterior fragments

were amputated and grown for an additional 27 days.

<u>Statistical Analysis.</u>

Statistical analyses were performed using Prism7 software (GraphPad Prism). All

experiments were repeated at least twice. All measurements were taken from distinct samples.

Error bars, statistical tests, number of replicates (N) and sample sizes (n) are indicated in

corresponding figure legends. Either Dunnett's or Tukey's multiple comparison tests were used

for one-way ANOVAs. SD=standard deviation. P-values: ns= not significant, *= p$\leq$ 0.5, ****=

p$\leq$ 0.0001.

References

1. Del Brutto, O. H. Human cysticercosis (*Taenia solium*). *Trop Parasitol* **3,** 100–103 (2013).

2. Craig, P. & Ito, A. Intestinal cestodes. *Curr. Opin. Infect. Dis.* **20,** 524–532 (2007).

3. Roberts, L. S. Development of *Hymenolepis diminuta* in its definitive host in *Biology of the Tapeworm Hymenolepis diminuta.* 357–423 (Academic Press, Inc., NY, 1980).

4. Arai, H. P. (Ed.) *Biology of the Tapeworm Hymenolepis diminuta.* (Academic Press, Inc., NY, 1980).

5. Read, C. P. Longevity of the tapeworm, *Hymenolepis diminuta. J. Parasitol.* **53,** 1055–1056 (1967).

6. Newmark, P. A. & Sánchez Alvarado, A. Not Your Father's Planarian: A Classic Model Enters The Era Of Functional Genomics. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **3,** 210–219 (2002).

7. Reddien, P. W. The Cellular and Molecular Basis for Planarian Regeneration. *Cell* **175,** 327–345 (2018).

8. Baguñà, J. The planarian neoblast: the rambling history of its origin and some current black boxes. *Int. J. Dev. Biol.* **56,** 19–37 (2012).

9. Collins, J., III *et al.* Adult somatic stem cells in the human parasite *Schistosoma mansoni. Nature* **494,** 476–479 (2013).

10. Koziol, U., Rauschendorfer, T., Zanon Rodríguez, L., Krohne, G. & Brehm, K. The unique stem cell system of the immortal larva of the human parasite *Echinococcus multilocularis. EvoDevo* **5,** 10 (2014).

11. Koziol, U. *et al.* A Novel Terminal-Repeat Retrotransposon in Miniature (TRIM) Is Massively Expressed in *Echinococcus multilocularis* Stem Cells. *Genome Biol Evol* **7,** 2136–2153 (2015).

12. Wang, B., Collins, J., III & Newmark, P. A. Functional genomic characterization of neoblast-like stem cells in larval *Schistosoma mansoni. Elife* **2,** e00768 (2013).

13. Koziol, U., Domínguez, M. F., Marín, M., Kun, A. & Castillo, E. Stem cell proliferation during in vitro development of the model cestode *Mesocestoides corti* from larva to adult worm. *Front. Zool.* **7,** 22 (2010).

14. Collins, J., III. Platyhelminthes. *Current Biology* **27,** R252–R256 (2017).

15. Collins, J., III, Wendt, G. R., Iyer, H. & Newmark, P. A. Stem cell progeny contribute to the schistosome host-parasite interface. *Elife* **5,** 243 (2016).

16. Brehm, K. & Koziol, U. On the importance of targeting parasite stem cells in anti-echinococcosis drug development. *Parasite* **21,** 72 (2014).

17. Rozario, T. & Newmark, P. A. A confocal microscopy-based atlas of tissue architecture in the tapeworm *Hymenolepis diminuta. Exp. Parasitol.* **158,** 31–41 (2015).

18. Schiller, E. L. A simplified method for the in vitro cultivation of the rat tapeworm, *Hymenolepis diminuta. J. Parasitol.* **51,** 516–518 (1965).

19. Goodchild, C. G. Transfaunation and Repair of Damage in the Rat Tapeworm, *Hymenolepis diminuta. J. Parasitol.* **44,** 345–351 (1958).

20. Baguñà, J., Salo, E. & Auladell, C. Regeneration and Pattern-Formation in Planarians .3. Evidence That Neoblasts Are Totipotent Stem-Cells and the Source of Blastema Cells. *Development* **107,** 77–86 (1989).

21. Newmark, P. A. & Sánchez Alvarado, A. Bromodeoxyuridine Specifically Labels the Regenerative Stem Cells of Planarians. *Dev. Biol.* **220,** 142–153 (2000).

22. Ladurner, P., Rieger, R. & Baguñà, J. Spatial distribution and differentiation potential of
stem cells in hatchlings and adults in the marine platyhelminth macrostomum sp.: a
bromodeoxyuridine analysis. *Dev. Biol.* **226,** 231–241 (2000).
23. Bolla, R. I. & Roberts, L. S. Developmental physiology of cestodes. IX. Cytological
characteristics of the germinative region of *Hymenolepis diminuta*. *J. Parasitol.* **57,** 267–
277 (1971).
24. Sulgostowska, T. The development of organ systems in cestodes. I. A study of histology
of *Hymenolepis diminuta* (Rudolphi, 1819)(Hymenolepididae). *Acta Parasitologica*
Polonica **20,** 449–462 (1972).
25. Neef, A. B. & Luedtke, N. W. Dynamic metabolic labeling of DNA in vivo with
arabinosyl nucleosides. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108,** 20404–
20409 (2011).
26. Solana, J. *et al.* Defining the molecular profile of planarian pluripotent stem cells using a
combinatorial RNAseq, RNA interference and irradiation approach. *Genome Biol.* **13,** R19
(2012).
27. Eisenhoffer, G. T., Kang, H. & Sánchez Alvarado, A. Molecular Analysis of Stem Cells
and Their Descendants during Cell Turnover and Regeneration in the Planarian *Schmidtea*
mediterranea. *Cell Stem Cell* **3,** 327–339 (2008).
28. Koziol, U. & Castillo, E. Cell proliferation and differentiation in cestodes. *Research in*
Helminths 121–138 (2011).
29. Collins, J. N. R. & Collins, J., III. Tissue Degeneration following Loss of *Schistosoma*
mansoni cbp1 Is Associated with Increased Stem Cell Proliferation and Parasite Death In
Vivo. *PLoS Pathog* **12,** e1005963 (2016).
30. Wendt, G. R. *et al.* Flatworm-specific transcriptional regulators promote the specification
of tegumental progenitors in *Schistosoma mansoni*. *Elife* **7,** (2018).
31. Lumsden, R. D. & Specian, R. The morphology, histology, and fine structure of the adult
stage of the cyclophyllidean tapeworm *Hymenolepis diminuta* in *Biology of the Tapeworm*
Hymenolepis diminuta. 157–280 (Academic Press., Inc, NY, 1980).
32. Tsai, I. J. *et al.* The genomes of four tapeworm species reveal adaptations to parasitism.
Nature **496,** 57–63 (2013).
33. Fincher, C. T., Wurtzel, O., de Hoog, T., Kravarik, K. M. & Reddien, P. W. Cell type
transcriptome atlas for the planarian *Schmidtea mediterranea*. *Science* **360,** eaaq1736
(2018).
34. Plass, M. *et al.* Cell type atlas and lineage tree of a whole complex animal by single-cell
transcriptomics. *Science* **360,** eaaq1723 (2018).
35. Labbé, R. M. *et al.* A comparative transcriptomic analysis reveals conserved features of
stem cell pluripotency in planarians and mammals. *Stem Cells* **30,** 1734–1745 (2012).
36. Rozanski, A. *et al.* PlanMine 3.0-improvements to a mineable resource of flatworm
biology and biodiversity. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **47,** D812–D820 (2019).
37. Laumer, C. E., Hejnol, A. & Giribet, G. Nuclear genomic signals of the
'microturbellarian' roots of platyhelminth evolutionary innovation. *Elife* **4,** e05503 (2015).
38. van Wolfswinkel, J. C., Wagner, D. E. & Reddien, P. W. Single-Cell Analysis Reveals
Functionally Distinct Classes within the Planarian Stem Cell Compartment. *Cell Stem Cell*
15, 326–339 (2014).
39. Zeng, A. *et al.* Prospectively Isolated Tetraspanin+ Neoblasts Are Adult Pluripotent Stem
Cells Underlying Planaria Regeneration. *Cell* **173,** 1593–1608.e20 (2018).

40. Han, X.-S. *et al.* Neoblast-enriched zinc finger protein FIR1 triggers local proliferation
during planarian regeneration. *Protein Cell* **10,** e1004400 (2018).
41. Hu, X. *et al.* Gene knockout of *Zmym3* in mice arrests spermatogenesis at meiotic
metaphase with defects in spindle assembly checkpoint. *Cell Death Dis* **8,** e2910 (2017).
42. Leung, J. W. C. *et al.* ZMYM3 regulates BRCA1 localization at damaged chromatin to
promote DNA repair. *Genes Dev.* **31,** 260–274 (2017).
43. Pierson, L. *et al.* RNA interference in a cestode reveals specific silencing of selected
highly expressed gene transcripts. *Int. J. Parasitol.* **40,** 605–615 (2010).
44. Mizukami, C. *et al.* Gene silencing in *Echinococcus multilocularis* protoscoleces using
RNA interference. *Parasitol. Int.* **59,** 647–652 (2010).
45. Spiliotis, M. *et al. Echinococcus multilocularis* primary cells: improved isolation, small-
scale cultivation and RNA interference. *Mol. Biochem. Parasitol.* **174,** 83–87 (2010).
46. Sikes, J. M. & Newmark, P. A. Restoration of anterior regeneration in a planarian with
limited regenerative ability. *Nature* **500,** 77–80 (2013).
47. Liu, S. Y. *et al.* Reactivating head regrowth in a regeneration-deficient planarian species.
Nature **500,** 81–84 (2013).
48. Umesono, Y. *et al.* The molecular logic for planarian regeneration along the anterior-
posterior axis. *Nature* **500,** 73–76 (2013).
49. Koziol, U., Jarero, F., Olson, P. D. & Brehm, K. Comparative analysis of Wnt expression
identifies a highly conserved developmental transition in flatworms. *BMC Biol.* **14,** 1
(2016).
50. Salic, A. & Mitchison, T. J. A chemical method for fast and sensitive detection of DNA
synthesis in vivo. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105,** 2415–2420
(2008).
51. Collins, J., III, King, R. S., Cogswell, A., Williams, D. L. & Newmark, P. A. An atlas for
Schistosoma mansoni organs and life-cycle stages using cell type-specific markers and
confocal microscopy. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **5,** e1009 (2011).
52. King, R. S. & Newmark, P. A. In situ hybridization protocol for enhanced detection of
gene expression in the planarian *Schmidtea mediterranea. BMC Dev. Biol.* **13,** 8 (2013).
53. Collins, J., III *et al.* Genome-wide analyses reveal a role for peptide hormones in planarian
germline development. *PLoS Biol.* **8,** e1000509 (2010).
54. Olson, P. D. *et al.* Genome-wide transcriptome profiling and spatial expression analyses
identify signals and switches of development in tapeworms. *EvoDevo* **9,** R991 (2018).
55. Currie, K. W. *et al.* HOX gene complement and expression in the planarian *Schmidtea*
mediterranea. EvoDevo **7,** 7 (2016).
56. Preibisch, S., Saalfeld, S. & Tomancak, P. Globally optimal stitching of tiled 3D
microscopic image acquisitions. *Bioinformatics* **25,** 1463–1465 (2009).
57. Rouhana, L. *et al.* RNA interference by feeding in vitro-synthesized double-stranded RNA
to planarians: methodology and dynamics. *Dev. Dyn.* **242,** 718–730 (2013).
740

 Figure Legends

Figure 1. Regeneration competence of *H. diminuta*. a, Schematic of *H. diminuta* adults. **b**,

DAPI-stained 1 cm fragments grown *in vitro*. **c-d**, Quantification of proglottid number and growth

in length from (**b**). Error bars=SD, N=2-5, n=7-21; one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple

comparison test, compared to day 0. **e**, Representative DAPI-stained "neck only" fragment

regeneration. **f-g**, 2 mm anterior fragments, with or without the head, grown *in vitro* for 12-15 days

and then re-amputated serially. Error bars=SD, +head: one-way ANOVA with Tukey's multiple

comparison test, -head: Student's t-test. **h-i**, DAPI-stained 1 mm fragments from the anterior,

middle, and posterior of the neck grown *in vitro*. Error bars=SD, N=3, n=22-29, one-way ANOVA

with Tukey's multiple comparison test.

Figure 2. Cycling somatic cells are distributed throughout the tapeworm body and are

irradiation sensitive. a-b, Maximum-intensity projections of confocal sections showing

distribution of cycling cells by 2 hr uptake of F-*ara*-EdU (**a**) or FISH for *mcm2* (**b**). Fewer cycling

cells were found in the head (box), while abundant cycling cells were observed in both somatic

and gonadal tissues throughout the body. t=testis, o=ovary. **c**, Maximum-intensity projections of

tile-stitched confocal sections after 1 hr uptake of F-*ara*-EdU (green) 3 days post-irradiation. **d**,

Quantification of F-*ara*-EdU$^+$ cell inhibition from (**c**). Error bars=SD, N=2, n=11 and 9, Student's

t-test. **e**, RNA-seq strategy to identify genes expressed in cycling cells. (Nuclei are counterstained

with DAPI (gray) in this and all subsequent figures.)

Figure 3. Expression screening for cycling cell markers. a, Confocal section of a tapeworm

anterior. Cycling cells (*mcm2*: magenta) in the neck parenchyma are between the nerve cords

(*cadherin*: green). s: sucker, nc: nerve cord, oc: osmoregulatory canal, t: tegument, m: muscle, and

p: parenchyma. **b**, WISH of known cycling-cell markers *h2b* and *mcm2*. sc: scolex (head) and n:

neck. **c**, WISH for irradiation-sensitive transcripts expressed in the neck parenchyma. **d**, Confocal

sections of dFISH for irradiation-sensitive transcripts (green) with *h2b* or *mcm2* (magenta) from

neck parenchyma. Cyan arrowheads indicate cells magnified at the far right.

Figure 4. RNAi to identify genes required for growth and regeneration in *H. diminuta*. a,

Schematic of RNAi paradigm. **b**, DAPI-stained worms after RNAi knockdown of *h2b, zmym3*,

and *pogzl*. **c**, Quantification of worm lengths after RNAi. Error bars=SD, N=3-4, n=26-37, one-

way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison test compared to control. **d-e**, Maximum-

intensity projections (**d**) and quantification (**e**) of cycling-cell inhibition after 1 hr F-*ara*-EdU

uptake following RNAi. Worms with degenerated necks were excluded from analysis. Error

bars=SD, N=3, n=11-14, one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison test compared to

control. **f**, *mcm2* WISH on worm anteriors after RNAi. **g**, WISH of *zmym3* and *pogzl* sampled from

anterior to posterior of adult 6 day-old worms. ga: genital anlagen; t: testis; o: ovary.

Figure 5. RNA-seq identifies anterior-enriched transcripts that are expressed predominantly

in non-cycling cells. a, WISH of tapeworm anteriors for transcripts that were anterior-enriched

(FC ≥1.5, FDR ≤0.05) or -depleted (FC ≤-1.5, FDR ≤0.05) by RNA-seq. Panels oriented anterior

facing left. **b,** Differential gene expression analyses of 1 mm anterior, middle, and posterior neck

fragments overlaid with irradiation-sensitive transcripts. **c**, WISH of transcripts that were anterior-

enriched and irradiation-sensitive by RNA-seq that showed expression in a subset of cells in the

neck parenchyma. **d**, Confocal sections from dFISH of anterior-enriched transcripts (green) and

mcm2 (magenta). Cyan arrowheads indicate cells that are magnified at the far right.

Figure 6. Stem cell activity depends on cycling cells but is not confined to cells from the neck.

a-b, DAPI-stained worms after rescue with cell transplantations from whole-worm donors (**a**) or

sourced from depicted donors (**b**). **c**, Quantification of rescue phenotypes from pooled

experiments. Number of animals listed above bars. **d**, Model for head-dependent neck maintenance

and proglottid formation. **e**, Models of head-dependent or -independent stem cell niches.

Figure 1–figure supplement 1. Phenotypic description of regeneration-incompetent tissues of

***H. diminuta*. a**, Quantification of mean proglottid length (fragment length/# of proglottids). Mean

proglottid length from body only fragments are significantly longer than mean proglottid length

from either head+neck+body or neck+body fragments. Error bars=SD, N=2-5, n=7-21; one-way

ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparison test done at each timepoint. **b**, Confocal sections of

the most mature proglottids from "body only" fragments showing immature proglottids at day 0

and a gravid proglottid at day 9. t: testis, ga: genital anlagen, and u: uterus. **c**, Micrographs of

amputated heads over 30 days *in vitro* showing a failure to regenerate. White arrowheads point to

examples shown in the insets.

Figure 1–figure supplement 2. Unsegmented neck is depleted after decapitation. DAPI-

stained worms with or without decapitation were cultured *in vitro* for the indicated number of days.

Red arrowheads mark the position of the first visible proglottid. After 18 days *in vitro,* the neck

tissue is no longer identifiable in -head worms.

Figure 2–figure supplement 1. Irradiation inhibits tapeworm regeneration. a, DAPI staining

of 5 mm anterior fragments from control and irradiated worms before and after 6 days *in vitro*

culture. **b**, Quantification of (**a**). Error bars=SD, N=2, n= 10-16, one-way ANOVA with Tukey's

multiple comparison test. **c-d**, Lethal dose of irradiation was revealed when 5 mm anterior

fragments were amputated and grown *in vitro* for 1 month from worms exposed to 0 Gy or 200 Gy

x-irradiation. The irradiated samples in (**d**) are shown to scale as an inset in (**c**).

Figure 2–figure supplement 2. Validation of RNA-seq by WISH after irradiation. WISH (with

Fast-Blue Development) from two regions of the tapeworm: anterior (left) and body (right), 3 days

post-irradiation.

Figure 3–figure supplement 1. WISH patterns of irradiation-sensitive transcripts identified

using RNA-seq. a, Classification of WISH expression patterns of irradiation-sensitive transcripts.

b-f, Examples of transcripts expressed in the neck parenchyma (**b**), in subsets of cells within the

neck (**c**), in neck parenchyma and broadly toward the animal edge where differentiated muscle and

tegument are located (**d**), at segment boundaries (**e**), and in differentiated tissues (**f**) like the

osmoregulatory canals (left) and nervous system (right).

Figure 3–figure supplement 2. Colocalization of *mcm2* and *h2b*. Confocal section of dFISH to

detect *mcm2* (green) and *h2b* (magenta) in the neck parenchyma at low (top) and high (bottom)

magnification.

Figure 3–figure supplement 3. The cycling somatic cell population is heterogeneous. a,

Summary of different co-expression patterns obtained from 53 dFISH experiments. Also refer to

Supplementary File 1b. **b-d**, Confocal sections of dFISH to detect irradiation-sensitive transcripts

(green) with *h2b* or *mcm2* (magenta). Cyan arrowheads indicate cells magnified at the far right.

For (**c**), yellow arrowheads point to examples of expression in non-cycling cells.

Figure 4–figure supplement 1. Validation of target gene knockdown by quantitative PCR.

Knockdown of *h2b*, *zmym3*, or *pogzl* in whole worms observed after RNAi. Error bars: RQ

min/max, N=2, n=3 each.

Figure 4–figure supplement 2. Expression of *zmym3* and *pogzl* in posterior proglottids.

Confocal sections of *in situ* hybridizations showing expression of cycling-cell transcripts in the

gonads as well as in the non-gonadal parenchyma. t: testis and o: ovary.

Figure 6–figure supplement 1. Stem cell activity depends on cycling cells. a, DAPI-stained

worms showing phenotypes observed after attempted rescue of irradiation-induced lethality. No

rescue results in degenerated worms with no proglottids, full rescue results in normal worms with

multiple proglottids, and partial rescue refers to worms with visible proglottids but with defects

such as contracted necks. **b**, Schematic for rescue experiment using donors with labeled cycling

cells. **c-d**, Maximum-intensity projections of tile-stitched confocal sections 0 or 3 days post-

transplanation according to (**b**). Injections sites marked with asterisks. White arrowhead points to

a single transplanted cell. After 3 days, large colonies of F-*ara*-EdU$^+$ (green) cells could be

detected with some labeled cells incorporated into terminally differentiated tissues at the animal

edge (inset). **e**, Maximum-intensity projections of tile-stitched confocal sections after 1 hr F-*ara*-

EdU uptake (green) from control worms or worms cultured with hydroxyurea (HU) for 6 days. **f**,

Quantification of cycling cells from (**e**). Error bars=SD, N=3, n=11 and 8, Student's t-test. **g**, Cell

morphology with or without HU treatment prior to transplantation.

Figure 6–figure supplement 2. Cycling cells give rise to multiple lineages in both anterior and

posterior fragments. a, Schematic of F-*ara*-EdU pulse-chase protocol to label cycling cells from

2 mm amputated fragments and detect their progeny after 3 days. **b-c**, Confocal sections of both

anterior and posterior fragments on day 0 showing the absence of F-*ara*-EdU (green) at the animal

edge (yellow double-headed arrows) where differentiated muscle and tegument are located. After

3 days, F-*ara*-EdU has chased into the edge-most nuclei (examples marked by red arrowheads).

d-f, Confocal sections from posterior fragments after F-*ara*-EdU pulse-chase in combination with

acetylated α-tubulin antibody staining to label flame cells (magenta). Yellow arrowheads point to

F-*ara*-EdU$^-$ flame cell nuclei at day 0 (**d**) which are exclusively post-mitotic. Cyan arrowheads

point to two examples of flame cell nuclei that are F-*ara*-EdU$^+$ after 3 days chase (**e-f**).

Supplementary File 1a**. Irradiation-sensitive transcripts identified by RNA-seq.**

Supplementary File 1b**. Summary of dFISH experiments with irradiation-sensitive transcripts**

and cycling cell markers *h2b* and/or *mcm2*.

Supplementary File 1c**. Comparative analysis of verified tapeworm cycling-cell transcripts to**

gene expression datasets for planarian neoblasts.

Supplementary File 1d**. Anterior-enriched and anterior-depleted neck transcripts by RNA-**

seq.

Supplementary File 1e**. Sequences and primers for all genes reported.**

Figure 1

Figure 2

a F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI
head (box)   anterior   posterior
50 µm   100 µm   100 µm

b *mcm2*/DAPI
anterior   posterior
100 µm   100 µm

c
0 Gy
F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI
F-*ara*-EdU
100 µm

200 Gy
F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI
F-*ara*-EdU
100 µm

d

Irradiation-induced
inhibition of cycling cells

****

F-*ara*-EdU cells/mm^2

0 Gy   200 Gy

e

0 Gy vs. 200 Gy

3 days post irradiation

RNA sequencing

683
irradiation-sensitive
transcripts
(down, FDR ≤0.05)

WISH

dFISH with cycling cell
markers (*h2b/mcm2*)

Figure 3

Figure 4

a dsRNA → 3 days → 2 mm → 3 days → dsRNA → 9 days → Assays 1) Growth 2) + F-*ara*-EdU 3) *mcm2 in situ*

b Control (RNAi) / h2b (RNAi) / zmym3 (RNAi) / pogzl (RNAi) — 2 mm scale bars

c Growth after RNAi — length (cm) vs RNAi (control, h2b, zmym3, pogzl) ****

d F-*ara*-EdU — Control (RNAi), h2b (RNAi), zmym3 (RNAi), pogzl (RNAi) — 100 µm

e Effect on cycling cells after RNAi — F-*ara*-EdU+ cells/mm² vs RNAi (control, h2b, zmym3, pogzl) ****

f *mcm2* — Control (RNAi) 7/7, h2b (RNAi) 5/5, zmym3 (RNAi) 7/7, pogzl (RNAi) 8/8 — 100 µm

g A → P — zmym3 (ga, t, t, o), pogzl — 100 µm

Figure 5

a

anterior-enriched (FC ≥1.5, FDR ≤0.05)   anterior-depleted (FC ≤-1.5, FDR ≤0.05)

frizzled   *delta*

b4gat1   *mox1*

1 mm

b

irradiation-sensitive
(683)

anterior-enriched
(461)

anterior-depleted
(241)

404   57   574   52   189

c

slc13   *HDt_14640*   *HDp_01486*   *HDt_13768*   *hnf4*   *HDp_00300*   *HDt_02958*

100 µm

d

merge/DAPI   *hnf4*   *mcm2*   merge

merge/DAPI   *HDt_14640*   *mcm2*   merge

10 µm

10 µm

Figure 6

a

donor cells — 5 mm — regenerate?
3 days — 27 days

lethal irr

lethal irr + cells from whole worms

1 mm

b

Donors: − HU   + HU (deplete cycling cells)   anterior   posterior

− HU   + HU   anterior   posterior

5 mm

c

Normalized Rescues

162   41   100   106   37   39

0%   51%   26%   1%   19%   13%

buffer/none   whole worms   − HU   + HU   Ant   Post

Percentage (%)

none   partial   full

d

Neck tissue is maintained
by signal gradient from head

form proglottid

inhibit
proglottidization

e

Head provides stem cell niche

lineage commitment

niche

pluripotent
zone

Stem cell niche is independent
of the head and/or neck

local niche

Figure 1 – figure supplement 1

a

Mean proglottid length

- head+neck+body
- neck+body
- body only

length (μm)

days *in vitro*

b

body only

Day 0

t

ga

200 μm

Day 9

U

200 μm

c

head only

Day 0

200 μm

Day 19

Day 30

55/55 dead

Figure 1 – figure supplement 2

Figure 2 – figure supplement 1

a

0 Gy
Day 0   Day 6

200 Gy
Day 0   Day 6

1 mm

b

Regeneration after irradiation

- ● Day 0
- ● Day 6

proglottids

****

ns

0 Gy   200 Gy

c

0 Gy   5 mm

d

200 Gy   1 mm

Figure 2 – figure supplement 2

	0 Gy	200 Gy
zfp (HDt_10981) FC=10 FDR=6.28e-171		
HDp_01159 FC=6 FDR=3.16e-103		
lamin (HDt_01618) FC=1.6 FDR=1.6e-4		

100 µm

Figure 3 – figure supplement 1

a

WISH classifications

- 13.4%
- 25.3%
- 24.2%
- 11.3%
- 25.8%

Total=194

- ■ neck parenchyma
- ■ neck parenchyma subset
- ■ neck parenchyma (broad)
- ■ segment boundaries
- ■ differentiated tissues

b neck parenchyma
gag-pol *lamin* *SWI/SNF* *HDt_08686* *HDt_09494*

anterior

100 μm

posterior

50 μm

c neck parenchyma subset
prox1 *pchd1* *HDp_00980* *tubb2c*

100 μm

50 μm

d neck parenchyma (broad)
p63 *zfp HDt_10981* *zfp HDt_05316*

100 μm

e segment boundaries
tnf16 *hox-like*

100 μm

f differentiated tissues
oxlT *cadherin*

100 μm

Figure 3 – figure supplement 2

Figure 3 – figure supplement 3

a **Co-expression in cycling cells**

- ■ complete and exclusive
- ■ complete and expansive
- ■ partial and exclusive
- ■ partial and expansive
- ■ none

Total=53

b partial and exclusive

c partial and expansive

d none

Figure 4 – figure supplement 1

Knockdown efficacy

Figure 4 – figure supplement 2

Figure 6 – figure supplement 1

a

+ buffer (none) + cells from whole worms (full rescue) + cells from whole worms (partial rescue)

1 mm

b

+ F-*ara*-EdU

Donor: Host: 0 or 3 days fix

c

Day 0

F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI

d

Day 3

F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI

100 µm

e

0 mM HU 50 mM HU

F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI

100 µm

f

Loss of cycling cells after HU treatment

F-ara-EdU+ cells/mm²

****

-HU +HU

g

0 mM HU 50 mM HU

Figure 6 – figure supplement 2

a

amputate

+ F-*ara*-EdU
(1 hr) wash & fix   fix

Day: 0   1   2   3

anterior   posterior

b anterior fragment (neck)

Day 0

Day 3

F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI

F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI   100 µm

c posterior fragment

Day 0

Day 3

F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI

F-*ara*-EdU/DAPI   100 µm

posterior fragment

Day 0

d merge   F-*ara*-EdU   acetylated α-tubulin   DAPI   10 µm

Day 3

e

f   10 µm