# Computational approaches to developmental biology

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED BY LEO BLONDEL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF MOLECULAR AND CELLULAR BIOLOGY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE SUBJECT OF COMPUTATIONAL BIOLOGY

> Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts March 2021

©2021 – Leo Blondel all rights reserved.

#### Computational approaches to developmental biology

#### ABSTRACT

The origin and evolution of new genes is an active topic of research, relying on the taxonomical diversity now present in sequence databases. Using those databases, we described how *oskar*, a key determinant of germ cell determination, likely arose from a horizontal gene transfer and then described its evolution and conservation in insects. The number of ovarioles, the egg-producing unit of the insect ovary, is hypothesized to inform the individual's reproductive capacity. Using network biology approaches, we analyzed the effect of signaling pathway genes on the number of ovarioles and eggs laid by Drosophila melanogaster. We found putative gene modules regulating both traits and predicted novel genes affecting both phenotypes. The specification of germ layers is a central mechanism of the embryogenesis of animals, but the underlying molecular mechanisms have only been extensively studied in model organisms. Using Parhyale hawaiensis, a crustacean amphipod, I generated preliminary methods for the generation of single cell RNA sequencing of early embryogenesis, as well as recorded with light sheet microscopy the first three days of embryogenesis. The preliminary analyses of the sequencing datasets were inconclusive, but, analyzing one of the microscopy datasets, I described new preliminary cellular dynamic results. Finally, to observe and annotate 4D microscopy datasets, I developed a tool that allows the visualization of large volumetric datasets in Virtual Reality.

### Contents

0	INTRODUCTION	1
	0.1 The origin and evolution of <i>oskar</i>	2
	0.2 The origin of <i>new genes</i>	3
	0.3 The evolution of oskar	5
	0.4 The regulation of <i>D. melanogaster</i> ovariole formation and egg-laying	7
	0.5 The unique features of crustacean early embryonic development and germ layer specification	n 9
	0.6 The molecular basis of <i>P. hawaiensis</i> germ layer formation	10
	0.7 <i>P. hawaiensis</i> early embryogenesis	11
	0.8 The interactive visualization of microscopy images	12
	References	13
1	BACTERIAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE GENESIS OF THE NOVEL GERM LINE DETERMINANT OS-	
	KAR	26
	1.1 Introduction	29
	1.2 Results	30
	1.3 Discussion	39
	1.4 Methods	40
	1.5 Acknowledgments:	46
	References	46
2	Evolutionary history and Functional inference of the Oskar protein	56
	2.1 Introduction	59
	2.2 Methods	62
	2.3 Results	72
	2.4 Discussion	95
	References	97
3	TOPOLOGY-DRIVEN PROTEIN-PROTEIN INTERACTION NETWORK ANALYSIS DETECTS GENET	IC
	SUB-NETWORKS REGULATING REPRODUCTIVE CAPACITY	108
	3.1 Introduction	111
	3.2 Results	113
	3.3 Discussion	140
	3.4 Methods	145
	References	154
4	STUDYING OF GERM LAYER SPECIFICATION IN THE EARLY EMBRYOGENESIS OF Parhyale haw	vaien-
	sis with single cell RNA sequencing	167
	4.1 Introduction	170
	4.2 Methods	180
	4.3 Results	192
	4.4 Discussion	222
	4.5 Detailed protocol for <i>P. hawaiensis</i> embryo single-cell dissociation	224
	4.6 List of overrepresented sequences in the two libraries	231
	References	232

5	STUDYING THE GERM LAYER SPECIFICATION IN THE EARLY EMBRYOGENESIS OF Parhyale h	awaien-		
	sis WITH MODERN MICROSCOPY	243		
	5.1 Introduction	246		
	5.2 Methods	251		
	5.3 Results	260		
	5.4 Discussion	275		
	References	276		
6 DIVING IN THE THIDD DIMENSION VIDTIAL DEALITY FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VOLUMETRIC				
Ū	MICROSCOPY	283		
	6.1 Introduction	285		
	6.2 Methods	203		
	6.2 Regults	207		
	6.4 Discussion	297 211		
	References	011 010		
	References	312		
7	CONCLUSION	319		
	7.1 The era of omics	319		
	7.2 <i>oskar</i> , a novel gene with an intriguing evolution	320		
	7.3 The regulation of the development of the <i>Drosophila</i> ovary	322		
	7.4 Towards a better understanding of germ layer specification in <i>P. hawaiensis</i>	323		
	7.5 Expanding our perception with a third dimension	326		
	References	326		
AF	PPENDIX A CHAPTER 1: SUPPLEMENTARY DATA	334		
AF	Δασενριά Β. Ομαρτές 2. Suddi εμεντάςν ράτα			
	References	363		
		000		
AF	PPENDIX C CHAPTER 3: SUPPLEMENTARY DATA	371		

# Listing of figures

1.1 1.2 1.2 1.3	Sequence analysis of the Oskar gene.Phylogenetic analysis of the LOTUS and OSK domains.(continued)Hypothesis for the origin of <i>oskar</i> .	33 34 35 38
2.1	Overview of the Oskar protein.	61
2.2	Presentation of the <i>oskar</i> ortholog detection pipeline	74
2.2	(continued)	75
2.3	Summary of <i>oskar</i> distribution and expression in insects.	76
2.3	(continued)	77
2.4	Differential conservation of amino acids between hemi and helemetabelous sequences	80 84
2.5	(continued)	04 85
2.5	Conservation analysis of the LOTUS domain	88 88
2.6	(continued)	89
2.7	Conservation analysis of the OSK domain.	93
2.7	(continued)	94
3.1	Screen methodology	116
3.2	Relationship between Egg Laying and Ovariole Number phenotypes generated in the screens	.120
3.2	(continued)	121
3.3	Enrichment of genes of individual signalling pathways among the experimentally obtained	
	positive candidates of each screen.	124
3.3	(continued)	125
3.4	Screened genes function as a network.	128
3.5	Representation of Seed Connector Algorithm and output.	132
3.5	(continued)	133
3.6	Phenotypically separable sub-networks formed by analysis of the combined genes from all	105
0 7	Sub-file works.	135
3.7	Positive prediction rates of the connector genes in each of the four sub-networks	139
4.1	Life cycle and early embryogenesis of <i>P. hawaiensis</i>	172
4.1	(continued)	173
4.2	Schematic representation of the blastomere ablation and intra-germ layer compensation ex-	
	periments for the ectodermal lineages	174
4.3	Schematic representation of the blastomere ablation and intra-germ layer compensation ex-	
	periments for the mesodermal lineages	175
4.4	Schematic representation of the Maternal to Zygotic Transition of <i>P. hawaiensis</i>	177
4.5	Schematic representation of the concept of the geo-positioning system	180
4.6	Schematic representation of the creation of a mesh trap for the capture of P. hawaiensis adults	5.182
4.7	Schematic representation of the mounting procedure on a glass slide and coverslip for P. haw	aien-
	sis embryos.	186
4.8	Representative images of heat-shocked embryos and control embryos	194

4.9	Representative images of P. hawaiensis embryos stained with antibodies against different pho	os-
	phorylation states of the RNA Polymerase II CTD.	195
4.10	Positive control for the antibody staining.	196
4.11	Light sheet imaging of <i>P. hawaiensis</i> embryos stained with antibodies against different phos-	-
1	phorylation states of the RNA Polymerase II CTD.	198
1 12	Bioanalyzer traces of 8 CelSeg2 library attempts	200
4.12	Proportion of reads per droplet that mapped on the mitochondrial genome and the nuclear	200
4.13	gonome of <i>D</i> hauginging	207
4 7 4	Droportion of roads per droplet that mapped onto a gone appetation against the roads that m	annod
4.14	to the nuclear generation of <i>D</i> hausigning	appeu
	A natural softhan any for a forming of DNA mathematical and the in Dury	208
4.15	Analysis of the number of unique mRNA molecules captured by inDrop.	209
4.16	Preliminary analysis of the pilot scRNAseq data for II S6_7.1	212
4.16	(continued)	213
4.17	Preliminary analysis of the pilot scRNAseq data for the II S11.1 and II S11.2.	216
4.17	(continued)	217
4.18	Heatmap representation of the expression level for the top 10 marker genes	218
4.19	Comparative analysis of the scRNAseq data for the cells coming from S6, S7 embryos (12-24h	pf),
	and the later stages S11 (64-68hpf) embryos	219
4.20	Expression level analysis for Ectoderm gene markers collected from the literature	220
4.21	Schematic representation of the plate with Elmer's paste seals, parafilm, and lab tape	227
4.22	Schematic representation of the concentration steps.	230
•	1 1	Ũ
5.1	Example micrographs showing the contrast generated by darkfield microscopy.	247
5.2	Schematic representation of the creation of an agar step mold for injection of <i>P. hawaiensis</i> e	m-
•	brvos.	253
5.3	Custom mounting procedure for multiple <i>P. hawaiensis</i> embryos on the SimView scope.	254
5.4	Representative images of <i>P</i> hawaiensis injected embryos	262
55	Maximum intensity projection of fused light sheet recording of <i>P</i> hawaiensis embryos	263
5.5	Results from the automated segmentation and tracking performed using Ilastik and manual	203
5.0	tracking and corrections	265
	Analysis of coll division rates and nuclear velocities in the tracked WT01, 11, 17	205
5./	Analysis of claudin and gorm lineage dynamics during the configuration of D have	200
5.0	Analysis of blastoderin and germ lineage dynamics during the early empryogenesis of P. naw	
- 0	<i>SIS.</i>	269
5.8		270
5.9	Analysis of cellular movement during gastrulation and formation of the midline	271
5.9	(continued)	272
5.10	Schematic and visual representation of the blastomere ablation experiments.	274
6.1	History of VR headset technological development.	289
6.2	Construction of 2D, 3D images and stereoscopy.	291
6.3	Schematic representation of Ray Marching.	292
6.4	Example images of <i>P. hawaiensis</i> embryos at the 16 cell stage (stage S5) resulting from the dif	-
	ferent iterations of the volume rendering shader.	304
6.5	Schematic representation of different 3D image file format strategies	306
6.6	Blueprints of the VR room user experience.	307
6.7	Examples of the VR user experience shown in the form of snapshots of user views from with	in
	the VR.	308
6.7	(continued)	309
0.7		90)
A.1	LOTUS Domain RaxML MUSCLE Tree.	335
A.1	(continued)	336
A.2	LOTUS Domain Bayesian MUSCLE Tree	337
A 2	(continued)	328
A 2	OSK Domain BaxML MUSCLE Tree	220
· · · J		002

A.3	(continued)	340
A.4	OSK Domain Bayesian MUSCLE Tree.	341
A.4	(continued)	342
A.5	SOWHAT constrained trees and results.	343
A.6	LOTUS Domain RaxML PRANK Tree.	344
A.6	(continued)	345
A.7	OSK Domain RaxML PRANK Tree.	346
A.7	(continued)	347
A.8	OSK Tree PRANK Comparison.	348
A.9	LOTUS Tree PRANK Comparison.	348
A.10	LOTUS Domain RaxML T-Coffee Tree.	349
A.10	(continued)	350
A.11	OSK Domain RaxML T-Coffee Tree.	351
A.11	(continued)	352
A.12	OSK Tree T-Coffee Comparison.	353
A.13	LOTUS Tree T-Coffee Comparison.	353
11.10		555
B.1	Summary statistics.	356
B.2	Genome and Transcriptome quality correlation to oskar discovery.	357
B.2	(continued)	358
B.3	Loss of <i>oskar</i> in Lepidopteran	359
B.3	(continued)	360
B.4	Complete Hymenopteran Oskar phylogeny.	364
B.4	(continued)	365
B.5	Tissue and Stage metadata analysis of Oskar presence in transcriptomes datasets.	366
B.6	Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA) of Oskar, OSK and LOTUS.	367
B.7	Evolution of the structure of Oskar in Diptera.	368
В.8	Oskar domains secondary structure conservation.	369
		0-7
C.1	Violin plots of egg laying and ovariole number of controls in each screen batch.	373
C.1	(continued)	374
C.2	Enrichment/depletion analysis of the 273 signalling pathway genes above the threshold  Zgene	
	> 1 (Figure 3.1a) against all signalling candidates.	375
C.3	Comparison of egg laying candidate genes by pathway.	376
C.3	(continued)	377
C.4	Comparisons of the $Z_{gene}$ scores of the positive candidate genes sorted by centrality metrics	378
C.4	(continued)	379
C.5	Comparison of network metrics of seed lists obtained from the screen.	380
C.5	(continued)	381
C.6	<i>Hpo[RNAi]</i> Egg Laying Sub-Network generated by the Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA).	382
C.7	Egg Laying Sub-Network generated by the Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA).	382
C.8	Hpo[RNAi] Ovariole Number Sub-Network generated by the Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA).	.383
C.9	Centrality metrics of the sub-networks.	384
C.10	Comparison of network metrics after application of the seed connector algorithm (SCA).	385
C.11	Signalling pathway enrichment/depletion analysis.	386
C.12	Comparison of edge densities between the seven sub-networks of the meta network, and to	
	a randomly assigned grouping of genes in the meta network	387

**T**O MY DAD, VINCENT BLONDEL, WHO LEFT US MUCH TOO EARLY. YOU PUSHED ME TO OVERCOME DIFFICULTIES AND TO BECOME A SCIENTIST. YOU TAUGHT ME HOW TO TEACH MYSELF ANYTHING. I WISH YOU COULD HAVE SEEN THIS WORK COMPLETED. I WISH YOUR ATOMS A HAPPY NEW CYCLE, INTERMIN-GLING WITH THE OLIVE TREES OF YOUR BELOVED GARDEN.

### Acknowledgments

THERE ARE TOO MANY PEOPLE TO THANK, REALLY! But I will try in this short text to do so.

First, I want to thank all the members of the Extavour laboratory. The days when going to the lab was hard, knowing that such a wonderful community of people were there always cheered me up. But more importantly, everyone taught me so much, about so many things. In particular, Seth Donoughue, thank you for always having crazy ideas and setting such a great example for me to follow. Taro Nakamura, for sharing your knowledge and always being happy to help me troubleshoot any experiment. Tarun Kumar, for being an amazing partner in science, I will always remember our collaboration fondly.

I also want to thank the members of the Harvard community whom I met and shared many adventures with. I was blessed with Ph.D. classmates who were so open-minded and kind. You helped me with science and life, and I am so grateful you were such a beautifully weird group. Thank you Finn, Sean, Georgia, Jamilla, Felix, Alyson, Katie, Yiqun, Jun Han, Linda, Nico, Matt & Sam. And I want to thank the wonderful musicians from around the world with whom I shared amazing musical moments. Harvard World Music Ensemble friends, thank you for the wonderful musical adventures we lived together. I was blessed by the chance to learn from all of you.

To all the staff that make the research endeavour at Harvard possible. Thank you Jack Conlin, Patty Gonzalez and Mike Lawrence for all your dedicated work to help the MCO community. Claire Reardon and Douglas Richardson for all the time you spent helping me with convoluted scientific apparatus. The building operation and custodial service staff for being so kind and helpful.

This adventure was also supported outside of Harvard by the members of the community I lived in during my Ph.D., the Ridgemonites. Thank you for the adventures, food, music, movies, trips, debates, discussions, and so much more. Thank you Marc, Juan, and Deborah for the time we spent together. Thank you Marc for all the knowledge of networks, physics, math, and music you gave me. Thank you Deborah for inviting me to your Philosophy groups at MIT. Thank you Juan for teaching me the ins and outs of business and life hacks.

And from as early as I can remember, thank you my family who always supporting me and accepted me as I was. My mom, Marie-Claude Larrondo who has lived the life of an academic without becoming one. Your curiosity and drive to never stop learning still lives in me. My dad, Vincent Blondel, who's perseverance and love for sciences is one of the main reasons I was able to do a Ph.D. Thank you both for your unwavering love and support. My sister, Lisa Blondel, who's creativity is infectious, and probably the only person I can communicate hours-long discussions without a single word being spoken. My partner, Brenda Marin Rodriguez, for the most wonderful love and support one could have ever hoped for.

I want to thank the member of my Ph.D. committee. The directions and help I received from Allon Klein, Craig Hunter and Sharad Ramanathan were instrumental in the completion of this degree. Thank you for the time you took to listen, and point me in directions I would not have conceived on my own.

And finally, I want to thank my advisor, Cassandra Extavour. When I joined your lab, I knew that it was going to be hard. You are the most rigorous person I know, and I was maybe one of the least rigorous students you had, but your patience to teach me, point my mistakes, and help me grow into a scientist is what molded me into who I am today. Thank you for always having direct conversations, never sugarcoating my mistakes. Thank you for becoming a mentor, in life and in science. Se tenir sur les épaules des géants et voir plus loin. Voir dans l'invisible, à travers l'espace et à travers le temps. Plonger notre regard dans le passé et découvrir que notre passé est immense. Pouvoir remonter le temps à contre courant. Pouvoir distinguer à travers le long écoulement des âges, des éclats de passé qui soudain, resurgissent de l'oubli. Des éclats de mondes disparus. Et partir à la recherche des lointaines métamorphoses qui ont donné naissance au monde d'aujourd'hui. \*

\*

Jean-Claude Ameisen

# U

<sup>\*</sup>Stand on the shoulders of giants and see further. To see in the invisible, through space and through time. To plunge our gaze into the past and discover that our past is immense. To be able to go back in time, against the current. To be able to distinguish, through the long flow of ages, bursts of the past that suddenly resurface from oblivion. Shards of vanished worlds. And go in search of the distant metamorphoses that gave birth to the world of today.

The cells responsible for the transmission of the genetic material to the next generation are called germ cells. Germ cells are a specialized cell lineage that is capable through division and differentiation of generating all cell types of the organism<sup>1,2</sup>. While the molecular basis for germ cells is similar and is speculated to have stemmed from an ancestral stem-cell population<sup>2,3</sup> (reviewed by Ewen-Campen et al.<sup>4</sup>), the way that germ cells are specified during embryogenesis differs across organisms. Animal germline specification can happen in one of two ways, often termed "inheritance" and "induction"<sup>5</sup>. The inheritance mechanism starts with the localized deposition of maternal RNA and protein germ cell determinants in the oocyte. Then, through asymmetric inheritance during the first embryonic divisions, a subset of the embryonic cells inherit the deposited material. Those cells then acquire primordial germ cell fate and give rise to the germline. In the induction mechanism, the specification of germ cells happens through zygotic signals sent by other cells in the embryo to the future germ cells. A small population of cells receive and react to this signaling and give rise to the primordial germ cell population (reviewed by Ewen-Campen et al.<sup>4</sup>). The mechanism of germline specification has been extensively studied in Drosophila melanogaster (D. melanogaster). This organism uses an inheritance mechanism, where the asymmetric deposition of a germline determinant (called germ plasm) leads to the formation of the primordial germ cells<sup>6,7,8,9,10</sup>. However, the inheritance mechanism does not appear to be the ancestral mechanism for germline specification in insects. In basally branching insects, no germ plasm has been reported, and germ cells appear to be specified through an inductive mechanism<sup>11</sup>. The hypothesized shift from induction to inheritance required the acquisition of a new function, the asymmetric deposition of germ plasm. In D. melanogaster, a gene of initially unknown origin called oskar was found to be necessary and sufficient for the localization of germ plasm and specification of germ cell fate<sup>6,9,10</sup>.

#### 0.1 The origin and evolution of *oskar*

In *D. melanogaster*, cells at the posterior end of the embryos that inherit a cellular component called germ plasm will become the primordial germ cells and are called pole cells<sup>12</sup>. As shown by early transplantation experiments, this germ plasm is necessary and sufficient to induce the formation of germ cells by cells that inherit it<sup>12</sup>. This mechanism requires the transport of germ plasm components to the posterior pole of the oocyte<sup>13,14,15</sup>. A key component required for the assembly of this germ plasm is the gene *oskar*<sup>6,9,10</sup>. Once *oskar* mRNA has reached the posterior pole of the embryo, it will be translated into two isoforms, Long and a Short Oskar<sup>16</sup>. The isoforms differ by the addition of 138 amino acids at the N-terminal domain of Long Oskar<sup>16</sup>. Interestingly, this seemingly small addition led to a very different

function of the Short and Long Oskar isoforms. While Short Oskar is necessary for the formation of pole cells (the primordial germ cells of *D. melanogaster*)<sup>16</sup>, it does not participate in the anchoring of the germ plasm in the posterior pole<sup>17</sup>. Long Oskar however is essential for the localization of the germ plasm at the posterior pole, but cannot induce the formation of germ plasm<sup>17</sup>. The mechanism by which *oskar* induces the formation of germ plasm is still unknown today. Interestingly, other organisms specifying their germ cell formation through an inheritance mechanism seem to possess a similar nucleator as *oskar* (reviewed in Kulkarni and Extavour<sup>18</sup>). In *Danio rerio* (Zebrafish), the gene *bucky ball* is necessary and sufficient to organize the Balbiani body<sup>19</sup>. In *Caenorhabditis elegans*, two genes, *pgl-1* and *pgl-3*, were found to be the nucleator of the P-granules, a key component of germ cell specification<sup>20,21</sup>. To better understand how such mechanisms of specification could arise, in the first and second chapters I studied the origin and evolution of the gene *oskar*.

#### 0.2 The origin of *new genes*

In the first chapter of this dissertation, I focus on uncovering the evolutionary origins of *oskar*. As mentioned above, *oskar* is a key determinant in the specification of germ cells in *D. melanogaster*<sup>6,9,10</sup>. Many holometabolous insects specify their germ cells through the inheritance of maternally deposited germ plasm (discussed in Lynch et al.<sup>22</sup>). However, holometabolous species such as *Apis mellifera*<sup>23</sup> or *Bombyx mori*<sup>24</sup> do not display a similar mechanism. In both species *oskar* is seemingly absent from their genome<sup>22</sup>. Lynch et al.<sup>22</sup> proposed that the absence of *oskar* in holometabolous species correlates with the absence of an inheritance-mediated germline specification mechanism. Despite its central role, no homologs of *oskar* have been found outside of insects <sup>11,22</sup>. Therefore, I wanted to know how a gene that does not seem to have homologs predating the evolution of insects became so central to their reproduction. Was *oskar* a *new gene*? And if it was a *new gene*, what evolutionary changes led to its functions?

#### Genesis mechanisms and importance of new genes

The first proposed mechanism of new gene evolution was duplication, predicted to be followed by relaxed selection and mutation of the duplicated copy (reviewed by Kaessmann<sup>25</sup>, Innan and Kondrashov<sup>26</sup>). Jacob<sup>27</sup> proposed that evolution does not have a plan, it does not engineer but tinkers with already existing parts. One such tinkering mechanism proposed for the formation of *new genes* is called rearrangement (reviewed by<sup>25</sup>). Rearrangement is the reordering of parts of genes in a new order that gives rise to new functions (reviewed by Kaessmann<sup>25</sup>). However, the duplication and

rearrangement mechanisms fail to explain the existence of so-called *new genes* (aslo called *orphan genes* or novel genes), genes with no homologs found outside a given lineage (reviewed by Tautz and Domazet-Lošo<sup>28</sup>). Based on the reported lack of homologs inside and outside of insects<sup>?</sup>, oskar can be described as a new gene. One of the main mechanisms of the formation of new genes is by de novo transcription and translation of previously non-coding regions of the genome (reviewed by Tautz and Domazet-Lošo<sup>28</sup>). Under this mechanism, a region of the genome would acquire a transcription starting site through mutation. The RNA molecule produced could function as a non-coding RNA until an open reading frame (ORF) emerged within its sequence, again by random mutation. While the multiple rare events involved in this mechanism seems unlikely, a number of cases of *de novo* evolution have been documented <sup>29,30,31,32,33</sup>. Another mechanism by which organisms can acquire *new genes* is through the transfer of DNA from another organism and subsequent integration of this DNA into their genome. This process is called horizontal gene transfer and it has been speculated that this process can drive the acquisition of new functions in eukaryotes <sup>34,35,36,37,38</sup>. In the subgroup of *D. melanogaster*, a study estimated the rate of origination of new genes to be between 5 and 11 new genes per million years of evolution<sup>39</sup>. A later study estimated that in the Drosophilid lineage, the rate could be as high as 17 new genes for every million years<sup>40</sup>. Not only do *new genes* appear at a higher rate than was previously envisioned <sup>41,42</sup>, they may also play key roles in the acquisition of new functions. The protein product of new genes might be under a relaxed selection allowing it to find new interactors and participate in new biological functions (reviewed in Tautz and Domazet-Lošo<sup>28</sup>). Essential genes are the subset of genes without which the ability of an organism to grow and reproduce is compromised (reviewed by Lewin et al.<sup>43</sup>). Given their importance, it was hypothesized that they must be conserved and ancient (reviewed by Lewin et al. 43). However, in D. melanogaster 30% (59 of 195) new genes (less than 35 million years old) were found to have a lethal phenotype under a RNAi knockdown<sup>44</sup>. This proportion is similar to the 35% (86 of 245) found for a random sample of old genes<sup>44</sup>. Given the similar proportion, the author hypothesized that essentiality was not a hallmark of old genes<sup>44</sup>. The age of *new genes* is also correlated with their centrality in the human and mouse gene-gene interaction (GGI) networks<sup>45</sup>. Younger new genes tend to have a low centrality and be positioned at the periphery of the GGIs, while older new genes are found towards the center of the network with a high centrality and hub topologies<sup>45</sup>. Younger *new genes* also have a higher rate of partner acquisition than older *new genes*<sup>45</sup>. Therefore it has been hypothesised that *new genes* act as a driver of topological change in GGI networks<sup>45</sup>. Taken together with the reports that genes with a higher centrality have a higher chance to be essential genes<sup>46</sup>, I suggest that essentiality is a dynamic process whereby new genes emerge, then integrate within existing networks until a proportion becomes central hubs, and therefore essential. Finally, it has been hypothesized that new

*genes* tended to be expressed more frequently in specific tissues such as the brain and testis<sup>47</sup>. For example, in *D. melanogaster*, almost half (48.8%) of the genes that originated since the divergence with *D. pseudoobscura* were found to be expressed in the brain<sup>48</sup>. A subset of those genes was found to have stereotypic expression patterns in specific neuronal populations, which was hypothesized as a marker of functionalization<sup>48</sup>.

#### The two domains of Oskar led to the horizontal gene transfer hypothesis

If we disregard the dipteran-specific Long Oskar isoform, the structure of Oskar is composed of two conserved domains interspaced by an unconserved region<sup>49,50</sup>. The first domain is a winged-helix domain called LOTUS and is found across eukaryotes, including within the Tudor domain-containing protein family<sup>51</sup>. The second domain called the OSK domain, however, appears to have no homolog within eukaryotes and shows a high sequence and structural similarity to bacterial GDSL lipases<sup>22,49,50</sup>. According to the descriptions of new gene formation mechanisms described above, oskar did not seem to fit any of the classic duplication, rearrangement, or *de-novo* mechanisms. However, the similarity between the OSK domain and bacterial sequences led Lynch et al.<sup>22</sup> to hypothesize that it might be the product of a horizontal gene transfer. In insects, multiple reports have documented endosymbiosis with bacteria (reviewed in <sup>52</sup>). Bacteria of the Wolbachia family are an essential and required symbiont for the reproduction of multiple wasp species<sup>53</sup>. In multiple insect species, pieces, or in some cases the entirety, of the Wolbachia genome were found integrated in the nuclear genomes, which was interpreted as resulting from a bacterial endosymbiosis<sup>54</sup>. Acyrthosiphon pisum, an Aphid species, is dependent on the capacity of their endosymbionts to produce essential amino acids that they cannot receive from the sap they feed on (reviewed by Oliver et al. <sup>55</sup>). If a horizontal gene transfer event was sufficiently recent, it is often possible to detect its signature from a shift in GC content in a region of the genome, or through careful calculation of codon frequencies in the case of a protein-coding gene<sup>56</sup>. But to provide evidence that a new gene is the product of a horizontal gene transfer, the most thorough methodology is careful phylogenetic analysis<sup>56</sup>. Therefore, in the first chapter, I set out to understand the evolutionary origin of the gene oskar, through careful phylogenetic analysis, focusing on testing the hypothesis for a partial gene transfer (or horizontal domain transfer).

#### 0.3 The evolution of oskar

As described above, the absence of *oskar* in an insect genome correlates with the absence of an inheritance mechanism of germ cell specification<sup>22</sup>, but the reverse is not true. In *Gryllus bimaculatus* 

(cricket), the gene oskar is present in the genome and expressed in embryonic neuroblasts and adults' brains<sup>57</sup>. However, G. bimaculatus specifies its germline through an induction mechanism that does not require oskar<sup>58</sup>. This suggests that during the evolution of insects, oskar, as other new genes did<sup>45,48</sup>, first neofunctionalized within the embryonic nervous system. In holometabolous insects however the gene oskar became essential for germ cell specification<sup>22</sup>. It was therefore hypothesized that oskar was co-opted and acquired a new function, namely to nucleate and localize the germ plasm at the posterior pole of some, but not all, holometabolous insects<sup>22</sup> to specify germ cells<sup>57</sup>. While our understanding of the function of oskar in insects remains poor, in D. melanogaster a significant amount of experimental information has been documented about its biochemistry and structure. The Oskar protein interacts with multiple proteins involved in the regulation and specification of the germline. Oskar associates with Vasa<sup>51,59</sup>, a DEAD-box helicase conserved throughout many animals as a marker of germ cells in early embryogenesis (reviewed in Ewen-Campen et al.<sup>4</sup>, Extavour and Akam<sup>5</sup>, Noce et al.<sup>60</sup>, Raz<sup>61</sup>). Oskar was found to interact with Staufen in yeast two hybrid and *in vitro* pull down experiments<sup>59</sup> and Valois in *in* vitro pull down experiments<sup>62</sup>, two proteins involved in the formation of germ plasm<sup>7,63</sup>. Of note, Oskar interacts with its own mRNA, through a mechanism involving the binding of its 3'UTR<sup>50</sup>. Moreover, oskar alleles with point mutations in the OSK domain prevent the maintenance of the oskar mRNA at the posterior pole, despite its correct production and localization during the formation of the oocyte<sup>63</sup>. Those alleles break the interaction between oskar mRNA and the OSK domain<sup>50</sup>. nanos is a conserved gene involved in the specification and localization of the germline<sup>4,5</sup>. The 3'UTR of nanos mRNA also binds to the OSK domain, and alleles that disrupt the 3'UTR binding and localisation of osk mRNA also prevent the binding and localisation of nanos mRNA<sup>50</sup>. As well as the specific binding of nanos and oskar mRNA, OSK also appears to be a general RNA binding domain<sup>49</sup>. Finally, despite its similarity to SGNH hydrolases or GDSL lipases<sup>49,50</sup>, the conserved triad of catalytic amino acids present in those classes of enzyme is absent from the OSK domain<sup>49,50</sup>.

In *D. melanogaster*, when expressed in isolation, the LOTUS domain of Oskar can dimerize <sup>49</sup>. It is believed to homodimerize through an electrostatic and hydrophilic interface composed of the  $\beta_2$  strand of its  $\beta$ -sheet and  $\alpha$ -helix  $\alpha 4^{49}$ . However, when artificially expressed, LOTUS domains of other insect species (two other dipteran species, five hymenopteran species and one orthopteran species) displayed either a monomeric (6 out of 9 tested species) and dimeric state (3 out of 9 tested species), as assayed by static light scattering <sup>49</sup>. Therefore, it was hypothesized that the dimerization property of the LOTUS domain was not conserved within all insects <sup>49</sup>. Moreover, the LOTUS domain interacts directly with Vasa through an interface composed of the  $\alpha$ -helices  $\alpha_2$  and  $\alpha_5$  of the LOTUS domain <sup>51</sup>. This interaction increases the helicase activity of Vasa <sup>51</sup>. The LOTUS domain has also previously been predicted to be an RNA binding

domain<sup>64,65</sup>, and its structure aligns closely with that of MecI, a dsDNA binding domain<sup>50</sup>. While the LOTUS domain does not bind the 3'UTR of *oskar* mRNA<sup>50</sup>, no experiments outside of *D. melanogaster* have been performed to support or contradict the RNA or dsDNA binding prediction.

Expanding on the previous work achieved in the first chapter, I wanted to know what evolutionary changes in the sequence of oskar could have led to the acquisition of its germ plasm nucleation capacity. In the second chapter, we therefore analyzed the evolutionary sequence changes of 379 sequences of *oskar*, sampled from a majority of insect orders, to try to uncover the changes that happened between hemimetabolous insects and holometabolous insects. We also explored the conservation of specific residues in view of the known functions of *oskar* and proposed hypotheses for new important residues.

# 0.4 The regulation of *D. melanogaster* ovariole formation and egg-laying

The fate of germ cells is intricately linked to the development of reproductive organs in animals. In D. melanogaster, primordial germ cells are internalized inside the embryo and migrate towards the location of the formation of the embryonic ovaries and testes<sup>66,67</sup>. In insects, ovaries are organized into repeating structures called ovariole<sup>68,69</sup>. This structure contains the oocyte production machinery (reviewed by Wheeler <sup>68</sup>) and is of a tubular shape where the oocyte starts its formation at one end and exits it as a mature egg at the other end<sup>68,69</sup>. At the anterior end of the ovariole is a structure containing a stack of disk shaped cells called the terminal filament. After the terminal filament is a structure called the germarium which contains the germ cells<sup>68,69</sup>. The number of ovarioles in insects can vary greatly even within the same insect order<sup>70</sup>. For example, in Coleoptera, *Meloe proscarabaeus* has up to a thousand ovarioles<sup>71</sup>, whereas members of Scarabaeinae have only one<sup>72</sup>. During the development of the ovaries in D. melanogaster, terminal filament cells organize themselves in a stack which then become the terminal filament (reviewed by Wheeler<sup>68</sup>). Because each ovariole develops from a stack of terminal filament cells, the number of terminal filaments formed in the developing ovary can be used to predict the number of ovarioles formed in an adult ovary<sup>68,69</sup>. It has been hypothesized that the number of ovarioles inform the reproductive capacity of insects by modulating their capacity to lay a set number of eggs, and has been found to be highly variable and to display phenotypic plasticity (reviewed in Hodin and Others <sup>73</sup>). While the number of ovarioles in *D. melanogaster* can vary when exposed to different environmental conditions, including temperature<sup>74</sup> or altitude and climate<sup>75,76</sup>, in a constant environment it is highly stereotypical<sup>77</sup>. This stereotypicality implies a strong genetic regulation of the number of terminal

filaments. For example, one OTL analysis of genomic variation in the DGRP lines of D. melanogaster revealed loci strongly correlated with variation in ovariole number<sup>78</sup>. The control of the specification of terminal filament cells in the ovary plays a key role in determining ovariole number<sup>79</sup>. The *hippo* signaling pathway, involved in the regulation of organ size and cell proliferation (reviewed by Sebé-Pedrós et al.<sup>80</sup>, Dong et al.<sup>81</sup>), was previously demonstrated to control the proliferation of terminal filament cells<sup>82</sup>. Under a repression of *hippo* signaling in the developing ovary, the number of terminal filament cells increases, along with the number of terminal filaments and ovarioles formed in the adult ovary<sup>79</sup>. Further experiments showed that an over-expression of *yorkie*, the main effector of *hippo* signaling, induced a decrease in the number of terminal filament cells, terminal filaments, and ovarioles<sup>82</sup>. In the third chapter of this thesis, we expanded on those previous results and explored the role of all signaling pathways in the regulation of ovariole number and of reproductive capacity measured as the number of eggs laid in a given time frame. Extavour lab postdoc Tarun Kumar performed a knockdown screen of all known members of signaling pathways in the developing ovary and recorded each phenotypic output. To analyze this dataset, we decided to use tools developed in the field of systems biology and network science. We set out to answer questions such as: What is the contribution of each signaling pathway to the number of ovarioles and egg laying capacity? Are those signaling pathways working in modules? Are there signaling pathway-independent regulatory modules that control ovariole number and egg laying? Can we find epistatic relations between other signaling pathways and *hippo* signaling?

Genes, proteins, and other molecules are connected to each other by their regulatory capacities. An abstraction of the mechanisms involved in the regulation of cells and organisms is found in network science<sup>83,84</sup>. By modeling an entity such as a gene, or its protein product, as a node, and their interactions as edges connecting both in a directional or non-directional manner, it becomes possible to understand higher order regulatory structures<sup>85,86</sup>. One of the concepts to describe and understand how hundreds of genes might interact together is that of modularity, or gene regulatory modules<sup>85,87,88</sup>. A module has been defined in multiple ways<sup>89</sup> but in the third chapter, I focus on the definition given by researchers working with the concept of disease modules<sup>87,90,91</sup>: by this definition, a module is a group of genes involved in controlling a phenotype and showing a statistical enrichment in topological features. The topology of graphs can be described by multiple features, including but not limited to the number of edges connecting a subset of nodes, also called density; the centrality of those nodes with regard to the rest of the graph, or a subset of the graph; the size of the largest connected component; and the average shortest path length between all nodes in the subset (reviewed by Barabási<sup>92</sup>). Using those features and phenotypic data allowed, for example, the discovery of a set of protein interactions regulating the

intensity of a placebo effect<sup>91</sup>. Topological approaches to studying the regulation of cell differentiation also allowed for the discovery of regulatory motifs in the early embryogenesis of *D. melanogaster*<sup>93</sup>. However, while modularity in itself is important for functional separation of parts of the network, other topological features are important for the resilience of those functions to evolutionary pressures<sup>94</sup>.

# 0.5 The unique features of crustacean early embryonic development and germ layer specification

In the fourth and fifth chapters, I studied the development of another organism, *Parhyale hawaiensis* (*P. hawaiensis*). *P. hawaiensis* is a crustacean amphipod. Amphipods are members of a very diverse group called the Malacostraca (reviewed by Thiel and Wellborn <sup>95</sup>). The Malacostraca includes 16 crustacean orders and over 40000 species (reviewed by Thiel and Wellborn <sup>95</sup>). Animals we generally refer to as crustaceans are found within the Malacostraca, such as Decapoda (lobsters, crabs, and shrimp), Peracarida (isopods, amphipods), and Stomatopoda (mantis shrimp) (reviewed by Thiel and Wellborn <sup>95</sup>). From a developmental perspective, animals in the Malacostraca display a number of unique features reviewed in Wolff and Gerberding <sup>96</sup>, Scholtz and Wolff <sup>97</sup>.

One of such interesting phenomena is the convergent evolution in Amphipoda, Euphausiacea, and Decapoda of invariant embryonic cell lineages (reviewed by Scholtz and Wolff<sup>97</sup>). In the organisms showing invariant early cell lineages, the specification of the germ layer is restricted by lineages, however, the division pattern between Amphipoda, Euphausiacea, and Decapoda are very different, implying different germ layer specification strategies (reviewed by Scholtz and Wolff<sup>97</sup>). In other organisms, the process of germ layer specification by invariant lineages has been extensively studied and many of the underlying molecular mechanisms have been documented. For example in *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus* (sea urchin) where the gene regulatory network of the endomesoderm has been elucidated<sup>84</sup>, in *Caenorhabditis elegans* where the par genes pattern the anterior-posterior axis and contribute to blastomere identity acquisition<sup>98</sup>, or in *Ciona intestinalis* (an ascidian) where multiple regulatory factors leading to the specification of the mesendoderm and ectoderm have been found<sup>99,100</sup>.

To my knowledge, the only malacostracan organism where molecular mechanisms of the specification of germ layers has been studied is *P. hawaiensis*, where a study showed asymmetric inheritance of mRNA by the different precursor of each germ layer<sup>101</sup>. Despite the lack of molecular studies, the elucidation of the invariant lineages in crustaceans has a long history and started as early as 1879 with the description of the cleavage pattern of *Moina rectirostris*<sup>102</sup> to modern studies in *Orchestia cavimana*<sup>103</sup> and *P. hawaiensis*<sup>104</sup>.

Within the Malacostraca, embryos of Decapoda, Dendrobranchiata, Euphausiacea, and Amphipoda display an invariant early cell division (discussed in Gerberding et al. <sup>104</sup>). While the number of early cell divisions that occurs before the specification of each germ layer varies between malacostracan orders (from seven divisions in Penaeus and Sicyonia (Decapoda) to three in Parhyale and Orchestia (Amphipoda) (discussed in Gerberding et al. <sup>104</sup>) the specification of germ layer happens at an earlier cell division cycle compared to other arthropods such as *D. melanogaster* where this process happens at the 14th division (reviewed by Gilbert <sup>105</sup>). In amphipods, the first three cell divisions leads to the formation of an asymmetric embryo composed of eight blastomeres, four large macromeres on the ventral side and four small micromeres at the dorsal side <sup>103,104</sup>. Three of the macromere form the ectoderm, one macromere give rise to the germline <sup>103,104</sup>. In the fourth and fifth chapters, I focused on trying to uncover the molecular mechanisms underlying the specification of the germ layers in *P. hawaiensis* using single-cell RNA sequencing and light sheet microscopy.

## 0.6 The molecular basis of *P. hawaiensis* germ layer formation

Recently, multiple laboratories have developed new methodologies that allow for the sequencing of the RNA content of a single cell<sup>106,107,108,109,110</sup>. To increase the multiplexing capacity of single-cell RNA sequencing drastically, Drop-Seq and inDrop<sup>107,108</sup> use a strategy that encapsulates cells in a micro reaction chamber using microfluidic devices. While the advantages of single-cell RNA sequencing allows the obtention of a very high-resolution cartography of the gene expression in a developing embryo, there exist many challenges to successfully sequence the cellular content which are reviewed in Denisenko et al.<sup>111</sup>.

In the fourth chapter, I describe my attempts to use single-cell RNA sequencing to understand *P. hawaiensis* early embryogenesis. I aimed to determine the transcription profiles of the well defined cell lineages coming from the 8 blastomeres. My ultimate goal was to combine this single-cell RNA sequencing data with single-cell resolution imaging of early embryos that I aimed to collect as described in the fifth chapter.

#### 0.7 *P. hawaiensis* early embryogenesis

While experiments pertaining to the molecular mechanisms of germ layer identity in malacostracan is sparse (see above for more detail), information on the morphogenesis of malacostracan embryos has been documented for many species (reviewed by Wolff and Gerberding<sup>96</sup>). Malacostracan embryos can follow a variant or invariant division pattern (reviewed in Gerberding and Patel<sup>112</sup>), but recent descriptions of early cleavages and cell lineages have focused primarily on invariant embryos<sup>104,113,114,115,116,117</sup>. The study of invariant cleavages and gastrulation has been documented for species such as the krill species Meganyctiphanes norvegica (Euphausiacea)<sup>113</sup>, the shrimp Penaeus vannamei (Decapoda)<sup>114</sup>, P. monodon<sup>116</sup>, P. japonicus<sup>118</sup> and Sicyonia ingentis<sup>115</sup>, and the amphipods Orchestia cavimana (Amphipoda)<sup>119</sup>, and P. hawaiensis (Amphipoda)<sup>104</sup>. While all three groups display invariant holoblastic early divisions, their cleavages and morphogenetic events are very different (reviewed by<sup>96</sup>). In Amphipoda, the first three cleavages result in an asymmetry between the macromeres on the ventral side and the micromeres on the dorsal side <sup>104,117</sup>. In Decapoda, the first three cleavages produce cells that are slightly unequal in size, but in comparison to the asymmetry in Amphipoda, the eight blastomeres are equally distributed and of relatively similar sizes<sup>114,116</sup>. In Euphausiacea, the first three cleavages result in eight blastomeres of equal size<sup>114</sup>. Despite their very different cleavage dynamics, in all three groups, the cells that will form the ectodermal lineages undergo a more rapid division cycle than the other cells<sup>114,116,117,120</sup>.

The gastrulation of crustaceans exhibits a very high level of variation (discussed by Gerberding and Patel<sup>112</sup>). In Euphausiacea<sup>113,121,122</sup> and Decapoda<sup>114,115,116,123</sup>, gastrulation happens via cellular ingression at the vegetal pole (reviewed in Gerberding and Patel<sup>112</sup>). At the 7th division cycle (128 cell stage) the future mesoderm and endoderm cells are organized in a ring shape around the vegetal pole, marked by the intra-cellular body (ICB), which is hypothesized to be germ plasm equivalent in Decapoda<sup>118</sup>. Between the 6th and 7th division cycle the cellular divisions of 8 and then 16 cells form a radially oriented rosette towards the vegetal pole<sup>113,114,115,116</sup>. This rosette is hypothesized to be the driver of the ingression towards the interior of the blastula (discussed in Gerberding and Patel<sup>112</sup>).

In Amphipoda, gastrulation happens at the anterior pole of the embryo instead of the posterior pole (discussed in Gerberding and Patel<sup>112</sup>). By the 8 cell stage, the fate of the micromeres and macromeres is already established<sup>104,117</sup>. In *Orchestia cavimana* and *P. hawaiensis*, gastrulation was reported to be very similar, though with one key difference. In both species, the second cleavage ancestor of the visceral mesoderm and germline (A/a in *Orchestia cavimana* and Mav/g in *P. hawaiensis*) is covered by the

ectodermal cells through an active epibolic process<sup>124,125</sup>. In *P. hawaiensis*, the descendants of ml and mr (the micromeres fated to give rise to the somatic mesoderm, homologous to b and d in *Orchestia cavimana*) migrate away from the anterior pole and later ingress inside the embryo. In contrast, *Orchestia cavimana* ba and da cells (the anterior descendants of b and d, homologs of mla/mra in *P. hawaiensis*) ingress inward at the same site as the descendants of a and A. In *Orchestia cavimana*, the descendants of a (germline precursor) ingress before all other cells<sup>125</sup>. It has been hypothesized that they are the main driver of the gastrulation<sup>125</sup>. However, in *P. hawaiensis*, g and Mav ingress independently of each other<sup>124</sup>. Given that Mav and g are independently ingressing, the authors of this study questioned the validity of a as the main driver in *Orchestia cavimana* and proposed that a similar mechanism could be at play (discussed in Chaw and Patel<sup>124</sup>). However, I believe that this might also be a difference between both species.

In the fifth chapter, I wished to study the dynamic of early embryogenesis in *P. hawaiensis*. More specifically, what are the dynamics of the cellular lineages territories? Given the invariance of early cleavages<sup>104</sup> and stereotypic germ band stage<sup>126</sup>, what is the variance in cellular movement and positions in between both stages? What cellular movement and cellular rearrangement lead to the formation of rows at the germ band stage? To tackle those questions, I used light-sheet microscopy<sup>127,128</sup> to image live developing P. hawaiensis embryos from the 8 (and 16) cell stage to the germ band extension stage. To track the cells and assess cellular rearrangements, the nuclei and cellular membranes were tagged with fluorescent markers. Upon ablation of a blastomere from the ectodermal or mesodermal lineages, embryos will display an intra germ layer compensation mechanism<sup>129</sup>. Upon ablation of the right (Er) or left (El) ectodermal blastoderm, cells from the posterior and remaining lateral ectodermal lineage will replace the missing cells<sup>129</sup>, breaking two stereotypic barriers: the anterior-posterior boundary and the midline. By albating Er or El, and subsequently recording the development of the embryo, I hoped to generate hypotheses towards the mechanisms establishing both boundaries. Finally I also hoped to be able to combine these imaging data with the single-cell RNA sequencing dataset that was the goal of the fourth chapter, by using the light-sheet dataset as a reference atlas for the geometrical mapping of gene expression in the developing embryo.

#### 0.8 The interactive visualization of microscopy images

In the last chapter I describe the creation of a Virtual Reality (VR) tool to observe 4D microscopy datasets and track nuclei in 3D. When confronted with the visualization of three-dimensional datasets, computer rendering software will reproject the 3D images onto a two-dimensional screen, therefore losing one of the original dimensions. Using the concept of stereography, augmented reality CAVE (Cave Automatic Virtual Environment) systems were invented to circumvent that issue and observe the specimen in 3D<sup>130</sup>. But those are very costly, require specialized hardware, and occupy a large amount of space<sup>130</sup>. With the invention of consumer virtual reality headset, we now can display those images in 3D, for a relatively low price<sup>131</sup>. Moreover, with "room-scale" virtual reality and controllers projected into the virtual environment, it is not only possible to observe, but also to manipulate the samples. In the last chapter of this thesis, I explore the new possibilities for the observation of 4D biological datasets offered by Virtual Reality. To visualize the datasets generated in the fifth chapter, I built the foundations of a VR software that allows the user to import any three-channel volumetric movie and perform image adjustments, slicing, and playing/pausing. Using this tool allows for new insights and an intuitive understanding of the embryos observed. However, while the observation of 4D datasets was completed, the creation of tracking features was not.

One of the key aspects of the fifth chapter was the tracking of nuclei in the developing embryo of *P. hawaiensis*. To this end, I used the light-sheet dataset FIJI tracking plugin Mamut<sup>132</sup>. However, predicting the movement of nuclei in 3D on a 2D screen is complex, and more often than not, I needed to search for a lost nucleus that went out of the rendered plane. By projecting the embryo in three dimensions in a Virtual Reality environment, the observation of objects becomes continuous, no slices are taken as the object in its integrity is itself in front of the user. A 3D tracking software in VR that would then allow the user to continuously track nuclei in 3D space by using the Virtual Reality controllers.

### References

- [1] John Srouji and Cassandra Extavour. Redefining stem cells and assembling germ plasm: key transitions in the evolution of the germ line. *Key Transitions in Animal Evolution*, page 360, 2010.
- [2] Cassandra G M Extavour. Evolution of the bilaterian germ line: lineage origin and modulation of specification mechanisms. *Integr. Comp. Biol.*, 47(5):770–785, November 2007.
- [3] Cassandra G M Extavour. Gray anatomy: phylogenetic patterns of somatic gonad structures and reproductive strategies across the bilateria. *Integr. Comp. Biol.*, 47(3):420–426, September 2007.
- [4] Ben Ewen-Campen, Evelyn E Schwager, and Cassandra G M Extavour. The molecular machinery of germ line specification. *Mol. Reprod. Dev.*, 77(1):3–18, 2010.
- [5] Cassandra G Extavour and Michael Akam. Mechanisms of germ cell specification across the metazoans: epigenesis and preformation. *Development*, 130(24):5869–5884, December 2003.
- [6] A Ephrussi and R Lehmann. Induction of germ cell formation by oskar. *Nature*, 358(6385):387–392, July 1992.
- [7] A P Mahowald. Assembly of the drosophila germ plasm. Int. Rev. Cytol., 203:187-213, 2001.
- [8] Ana C Santos and Ruth Lehmann. Germ cell specification and migration in drosophila and beyond. *Curr. Biol.*, 14(14):R578–89, July 2004.
- [9] J L Smith, J E Wilson, and P M Macdonald. Overexpression of oskar directs ectopic activation of nanos and presumptive pole cell formation in drosophila embryos. *Cell*, 70(5):849–859, September 1992.
- [10] R Lehmann and C Nüsslein-Volhard. Abdominal segmentation, pole cell formation, and embryonic polarity require the localized activity of oskar, a maternal gene in drosophila. *Cell*, 47(1):141–152, October 1986.

- [11] Ben Ewen-Campen, Seth Donoughe, Donald Nat Clarke, and Cassandra G Extavour. Germ cell specification requires zygotic mechanisms rather than germ plasm in a basally branching insect. *Curr. Biol.*, 23(10):835–842, May 2013.
- [12] K Illmensee and A P Mahowald. Transplantation of posterior polar plasm in drosophila. induction of germ cells at the anterior pole of the egg. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 71(4):1016–1020, April 1974.
- [13] R P Brendza, L R Serbus, J B Duffy, and W M Saxton. A function for kinesin I in the posterior transport of oskar mRNA and staufen protein. *Science*, 289(5487):2120–2122, September 2000.
- [14] J Kim-Ha, P J Webster, J L Smith, and P M Macdonald. Multiple RNA regulatory elements mediate distinct steps in localization of oskar mRNA. *Development*, 119(1):169–178, September 1993.
- [15] J Kim-Ha, J L Smith, and P M Macdonald. oskar mRNA is localized to the posterior pole of the drosophila oocyte. *Cell*, 66(1):23–35, July 1991.
- [16] F H Markussen, A M Michon, W Breitwieser, and A Ephrussi. Translational control of oskar generates short OSK, the isoform that induces pole plasma assembly. *Development*, 121(11): 3723–3732, November 1995.
- [17] Nathalie F Vanzo and Anne Ephrussi. Oskar anchoring restricts pole plasm formation to the posterior of the drosophila oocyte. *Development*, 129(15):3705–3714, August 2002.
- [18] Arpita Kulkarni and Cassandra G Extavour. Convergent evolution of germ granule nucleators: A hypothesis. *Stem Cell Res.*, 24:188–194, October 2017.
- [19] Franck Bontems, Amandine Stein, Florence Marlow, Jacqueline Lyautey, Tripti Gupta, Mary C
   Mullins, and Roland Dosch. Bucky ball organizes germ plasm assembly in zebrafish. *Curr. Biol.*, 19 (5):414–422, March 2009.
- [20] Ichiro Kawasaki, Anahita Amiri, Yuan Fan, Nicole Meyer, Steve Dunkelbarger, Tomoko Motohashi, Takeshi Karashima, Olaf Bossinger, and Susan Strome. The PGL family proteins associate with germ granules and function redundantly in caenorhabditis elegans germline development. *Genetics*, 167(2):645–661, June 2004.
- [21] I Kawasaki, Y H Shim, J Kirchner, J Kaminker, W B Wood, and S Strome. PGL-1, a predicted RNA-binding component of germ granules, is essential for fertility in c. elegans. *Cell*, 94(5):635–645, September 1998.

- [22] Jeremy A Lynch, Orhan Ozüak, Abderrahman Khila, Ehab Abouheif, Claude Desplan, and Siegfried Roth. The phylogenetic origin of oskar coincided with the origin of maternally provisioned germ plasm and pole cells at the base of the holometabola. *PLoS Genet.*, 7(4):e1002029, April 2011.
- [23] James Allen Nelson. The embryology of the honey bee. Princeton University Press, 1915.
- [24] L Nagy, L Riddiford, and K Kiguchi. Morphogenesis in the early embryo of the lepidopteran bombyx mori. *Dev. Biol.*, 165(1):137–151, September 1994.
- [25] Henrik Kaessmann. Origins, evolution, and phenotypic impact of new genes. *Genome Res.*, 20(10): 1313–1326, October 2010.
- [26] Hideki Innan and Fyodor Kondrashov. The evolution of gene duplications: classifying and distinguishing between models. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, 11(2):97–108, February 2010.
- [27] F Jacob. Evolution and tinkering. Science, 196(4295):1161-1166, June 1977.
- [28] Diethard Tautz and Tomislav Domazet-Lošo. The evolutionary origin of orphan genes. Nat. Rev. Genet., 12(10):692–702, August 2011.
- [29] Jing Cai, Ruoping Zhao, Huifeng Jiang, and Wen Wang. De novo origination of a new protein-coding gene in saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Genetics*, 179(1):487–496, May 2008.
- [30] Tobias J A J Heinen, Fabian Staubach, Daniela Häming, and Diethard Tautz. Emergence of a new gene from an intergenic region. *Curr. Biol.*, 19(18):1527–1531, September 2009.
- [31] David G Knowles and Aoife McLysaght. Recent de novo origin of human protein-coding genes. *Genome Res.*, 19(10):1752–1759, October 2009.
- [32] Dan Li, Yang Dong, Yu Jiang, Huifeng Jiang, Jing Cai, and Wen Wang. A de novo originated gene depresses budding yeast mating pathway and is repressed by the protein encoded by its antisense strand. *Cell Res.*, 20(4):408–420, April 2010.
- [33] Chuan-Yun Li, Yong Zhang, Zhanbo Wang, Yan Zhang, Chunmei Cao, Ping-Wu Zhang, Shu-Juan Lu, Xiao-Mo Li, Quan Yu, Xiaofeng Zheng, Quan Du, George R Uhl, Qing-Rong Liu, and Liping Wei. A human-specific de novo protein-coding gene associated with human brain functions. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 6(3):e1000734, March 2010.
- [34] Patrick J Keeling and Jeffrey D Palmer. Horizontal gene transfer in eukaryotic evolution. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, 9(8):605–618, August 2008.
- [35] Matan Shelomi, Etienne G J Danchin, David Heckel, Benjamin Wipfler, Sven Bradler, Xin Zhou, and Yannick Pauchet. Horizontal gene transfer of pectinases from bacteria preceded the diversification of stick and leaf insects. *Scientific Reports*, 6(1), 2016.

- [36] Luis Boto. Horizontal gene transfer in the acquisition of novel traits by metazoans. *Proc. R. Soc. B.*, 281(1777):20132450, 2014.
- [37] Dora G Quispe-Huamanquispe, Godelieve Gheysen, and Jan F Kreuze. Horizontal gene transfer contributes to plant evolution: The case of agrobacterium T-DNAs. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 8, 2017.
- [38] Nicky Wybouw, Yannick Pauchet, David G Heckel, and Thomas Van Leeuwen. Horizontal gene transfer contributes to the evolution of arthropod herbivory. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, 8(6): 1785–1801, 2016.
- [39] Qi Zhou, Guojie Zhang, Yue Zhang, Shiyu Xu, Ruoping Zhao, Zubing Zhan, Xin Li, Yun Ding, Shuang Yang, and Wen Wang. On the origin of new genes in drosophila. *Genome Res.*, 18(9):1446–1455, September 2008.
- [40] Y E Zhang, M D Vibranovski, B H Krinsky, and M Long. Age-dependent chromosomal distribution of male-biased genes in drosophila. *Genome Research*, 20(11):1526–1533, 2010.
- [41] Matthew W Hahn, Mira V Han, and Sang-Gook Han. Gene family evolution across 12 drosophila genomes. *PLoS Genet.*, 3(11):e197, November 2007.
- [42] M Lynch and J S Conery. The evolutionary fate and consequences of duplicate genes. *Science*, 290 (5494):1151–1155, November 2000.
- [43] Benjamin Lewin, Jocelyn E Krebs, Elliott S Goldstein, and Stephen T Kilpatrick. *Lewin's Essential GENES*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers, March 2009.
- [44] S Chen, Y E Zhang, and M Long. New genes in drosophila quickly become essential. *Science*, 330 (6011):1682–1685, 2010.
- [45] Wenyu Zhang, Patrick Landback, Andrea R Gschwend, Bairong Shen, and Manyuan Long. New genes drive the evolution of gene interaction networks in the human and mouse genomes. *Genome Biol.*, 16:202, October 2015.
- [46] H Jeong, S P Mason, A L Barabási, and Z N Oltvai. Lethality and centrality in protein networks. *Nature*, 411(6833):41–42, May 2001.
- [47] Yong E Zhang and Manyuan Long. New genes contribute to genetic and phenotypic novelties in human evolution. *Current Opinion in Genetics & Development*, 29:90–96, 2014.
- [48] Sidi Chen, Maria Spletter, Xiaochun Ni, Kevin P White, Liqun Luo, and Manyuan Long. Frequent recent origination of brain genes shaped the evolution of foraging behavior in drosophila. *Cell Rep.*, 1(2):118–132, February 2012.

- [49] Mandy Jeske, Matteo Bordi, Sebastian Glatt, Sandra Müller, Vladimir Rybin, Christoph W Müller, and Anne Ephrussi. The crystal structure of the drosophila germline inducer oskar identifies two domains with distinct vasa helicase- and RNA-Binding activities. *Cell Reports*, 12(4):587–598, 2015.
- [50] Na Yang, Zhenyu Yu, Menglong Hu, Mingzhu Wang, Ruth Lehmann, and Rui-Ming Xu. Structure of drosophila oskar reveals a novel RNA binding protein. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 112(37): 11541–11546, September 2015.
- [51] Mandy Jeske, Christoph W Müller, and Anne Ephrussi. The LOTUS domain is a conserved DEAD-box RNA helicase regulator essential for the recruitment of vasa to the germ plasm and nuage. *Genes Dev.*, 31(9):939–952, May 2017.
- [52] Thomas A. Miller Kostas Bourtzis. Insect Symbiosis, Volume 3. CRC Press, 2008. doi: 10.1201/9781420064117.
- [53] A A Hoffmann. Essential but unhelpful wasp wolbachia. *Heredity*, 103(3):194–195, 2009.
- [54] Julie C Dunning Hotopp, Michael E Clark, Deodoro C S G Oliveira, Jeremy M Foster, Peter Fischer,
   Mónica C Muñoz Torres, Jonathan D Giebel, Nikhil Kumar, Nadeeza Ishmael, Shiliang Wang,
   Jessica Ingram, Rahul V Nene, Jessica Shepard, Jeffrey Tomkins, Stephen Richards, David J Spiro,
   Elodie Ghedin, Barton E Slatko, Hervé Tettelin, and John H Werren. Widespread lateral gene
   transfer from intracellular bacteria to multicellular eukaryotes. *Science*, 317(5845):1753–1756,
   September 2007.
- [55] Kerry M Oliver, Patrick H Degnan, Gaelen R Burke, and Nancy A Moran. Facultative symbionts in aphids and the horizontal transfer of ecologically important traits. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 55 (1):247–266, 2010.
- [56] Matt Ravenhall, Nives Škunca, Florent Lassalle, and Christophe Dessimoz. Inferring horizontal gene transfer. PLoS Comput. Biol., 11(5):e1004095, May 2015.
- [57] Ben Ewen-Campen, John R Srouji, Evelyn E Schwager, and Cassandra G Extavour. Oskar predates the evolution of germ plasm in insects. *Curr. Biol.*, 22(23):2278–2283, December 2012.
- [58] Seth Donoughe, Taro Nakamura, Ben Ewen-Campen, Delbert A Green, 2nd, Lory Henderson, and Cassandra G Extavour. BMP signaling is required for the generation of primordial germ cells in an insect. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 111(11):4133–4138, March 2014.
- [59] W Breitwieser, F H Markussen, H Horstmann, and A Ephrussi. Oskar protein interaction with vasa represents an essential step in polar granule assembly. *Genes & Development*, 10(17):2179–2188, 1996.

- [60] T Noce, S Okamoto-Ito, and N Tsunekawa. Vasa homolog genes in mammalian germ cell development. *Cell Struct. Funct.*, 26(3):131–136, June 2001.
- [61] E Raz. The function and regulation of vasa-like genes in germ-cell development. *Genome Biol.*, 1(3): REVIEWS1017, September 2000.
- [62] Joël Anne. Targeting and anchoring tudor in the pole plasm of the drosophila oocyte. *PLoS ONE*, 5 (12):e14362, 2010.
- [63] A Ephrussi, L K Dickinson, and R Lehmann. Oskar organizes the germ plasm and directs localization of the posterior determinant nanos. *Cell*, 66(1):37–50, July 1991.
- [64] Isabelle Callebaut and Jean-Paul Mornon. LOTUS, a new domain associated with small RNA pathways in the germline. *Bioinformatics*, 26(9):1140–1144, 2010.
- [65] Vivek Anantharaman, Dapeng Zhang, and L Aravind. OST-HTH: a novel predicted RNA-binding domain. *Biology Direct*, 5(1):13, 2010.
- [66] Ken Howard, Mariusz Jaglarz, Nian Zhang, Jaymini Shah, and Rahul Warrior. Migration of drosophila germ cells: analysis using enhancer trap lines. *Development*, 119(Supplement):213–218, December 1993.
- [67] Giuliano Callaini, Maria Giovanna Riparbelli, and Romano Dallai. Pole cell migration through the gut wall of the drosophila embryo: Analysis of cell interactions. *Developmental Biology*, 170(2): 365–375, 1995.
- [68] Diana E Wheeler. Chapter 188 ovarioles. In Vincent H Resh and Ring T Cardé, editors, Encyclopedia of Insects (Second Edition), pages 743–744. Academic Press, San Diego, January 2009.
- [69] R C King. Ovarian Development in Drosophila melanogaster. Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [70] Samuel H Church, Bruno A S de Medeiros, Seth Donoughe, Nicole L Márquez Reyes, and Cassandra G Extavour. Repeated loss of variation in insect ovary morphology highlights the role of developmental constraint in life-history evolution. July 2020.
- [71] Jürgen Büning. The trophic tissue of telotrophic ovarioles in polyphage coleoptera. *Zoomorphologie*, 93(1):33–50, 1979.
- [72] P O Ritcher, Ritcher Po, and Baker Cw. Ovariole numbers in scarabaeoidea (coleoptera: Lucanidae, passalidae, scarabaeidae). *Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington*, 1974.
- [73] Jason Hodin and Others. She shapes events as they come: plasticity in female insect reproduction.*Phenotypic plasticity of insects: mechanisms and consequences*, pages 423–521, 2009.

- [74] Ricardo B R Azevedo, Vernon French, and Linda Partridge. THERMAL EVOLUTION OF EGG SIZE IN DROSOPHILA MELANOGASTER. *Evolution*, 50(6):2338–2345, December 1996.
- [75] P Capy, E Pla, and J R David. Phenotypic and genetic variability of morphometrical traits in natural populations of drosophila melanogaster and D simulans. II. within-population variability. *Genet. Sel. Evol.*, 26(1):15, February 1994.
- [76] J R David and C Bocquet. Similarities and differences in latitudinal adaptation of two drosophila sibling species. *Nature*, 257(5527):588–590, October 1975.
- [77] P Capy, E Pla, and J R David. Phenotypic and genetic variability of morphometrical traits in natural populations of drosophila melanogaster and D simulans. i. geographic variations. *Genet. Sel. Evol.*, 25(6):517, December 1993.
- [78] Amanda S Lobell, Rachel R Kaspari, Yazmin L Serrano Negron, and Susan T Harbison. The genetic architecture of ovariole number in drosophila melanogaster: Genes with major, quantitative, and pleiotropic effects. G3, 7(7):2391–2403, July 2017.
- [79] Didem Pelin Sarikaya, Abel A Belay, Abha Ahuja, Aisha Dorta, Delbert André Green, 2nd, and Cassandra G Extavour. The roles of cell size and cell number in determining ovariole number in drosophila. *Dev. Biol.*, 363(1):279–289, March 2012.
- [80] Arnau Sebé-Pedrós, Yonggang Zheng, Iñaki Ruiz-Trillo, and Duojia Pan. Premetazoan origin of the hippo signaling pathway. *Cell Rep.*, 1(1):13–20, January 2012.
- [81] Jixin Dong, Georg Feldmann, Jianbin Huang, Shian Wu, Nailing Zhang, Sarah A Comerford, Mariana F Gayyed, Robert A Anders, Anirban Maitra, and Duojia Pan. Elucidation of a universal size-control mechanism in drosophila and mammals. *Cell*, 130(6):1120–1133, September 2007.
- [82] Didem P Sarikaya and Cassandra G Extavour. The hippo pathway regulates homeostatic growth of stem cell niche precursors in the drosophila ovary. *PLoS Genet.*, 11(2):e1004962, February 2015.
- [83] Soon-Hyung Yook, Zoltán N Oltvai, and Albert-László Barabási. Functional and topological characterization of protein interaction networks. *Proteomics*, 4(4):928–942, April 2004.
- [84] Eric H Davidson, Jonathan P Rast, Paola Oliveri, Andrew Ransick, Cristina Calestani, Chiou-Hwa Yuh, Takuya Minokawa, Gabriele Amore, Veronica Hinman, Cesar Arenas-Mena, Ochan Otim, C Titus Brown, Carolina B Livi, Pei Yun Lee, Roger Revilla, Alistair G Rust, Zheng Jun Pan, Maria J Schilstra, Peter J C Clarke, Maria I Arnone, Lee Rowen, R Andrew Cameron, David R McClay, Leroy Hood, and Hamid Bolouri. A genomic regulatory network for development. *Science*, 295(5560): 1669–1678, March 2002.

- [85] E Ravasz, A L Somera, D A Mongru, Z N Oltvai, and A L Barabási. Hierarchical organization of modularity in metabolic networks. *Science*, 297(5586):1551–1555, August 2002.
- [86] Abibatou Mbodj, Guillaume Junion, Christine Brun, Eileen E M Furlong, and Denis Thieffry. Logical modelling of drosophila signalling pathways. *Mol. Biosyst.*, 9(9):2248–2258, September 2013.
- [87] Rui-Sheng Wang and Joseph Loscalzo. Network-Based disease module discovery by a novel seed connector algorithm with pathobiological implications. J. Mol. Biol., 430(18 Pt A):2939–2950, September 2018.
- [88] Emre Guney, Jörg Menche, Marc Vidal, and Albert-László Barábasi. Network-based in silico drug efficacy screening. Nat. Commun., 7:10331, February 2016.
- [89] Sergi Valverde. Breakdown of modularity in complex networks. Front. Physiol., 8:497, July 2017.
- [90] Susan Dina Ghiassian, Jörg Menche, and Albert-László Barabási. A DIseAse MOdule detection (DIAMOnD) algorithm derived from a systematic analysis of connectivity patterns of disease proteins in the human interactome. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 11(4):e1004120, April 2015.
- [91] Rui-Sheng Wang, Kathryn T Hall, Franco Giulianini, Dani Passow, Ted J Kaptchuk, and Joseph Loscalzo. Network analysis of the genomic basis of the placebo effect. *JCI Insight*, 2(11):93911, June 2017.
- [92] Albert-László Barabási. Network Science. Cambridge University Press, July 2016.
- [93] Man-Sun Kim, Jeong-Rae Kim, Dongsan Kim, Arthur D Lander, and Kwang-Hyun Cho. Spatiotemporal network motif reveals the biological traits of developmental gene regulatory networks in drosophila melanogaster. *BMC Syst. Biol.*, 6:31, May 2012.
- [94] Berta Verd, Nicholas A M Monk, and Johannes Jaeger. Modularity, criticality, and evolvability of a developmental gene regulatory network. *eLife*, 8, 2019.
- [95] Martin Thiel and Gary Wellborn. *The Natural History of the Crustacea: Life Histories, Volume 5.* Oxford University Press, May 2018.
- [96] Carsten Wolff and Matthias Gerberding. "crustacea": Comparative aspects of early development. In Andreas Wanninger, editor, *Evolutionary Developmental Biology of Invertebrates 4*, pages 63–100. Springer Wien, Vienna, 2015.
- [97] Gerhard Scholtz and Carsten Wolff. Arthropod embryology: Cleavage and germ band development. In Alessandro Minelli, Geoffrey Boxshall, and Giuseppe Fusco, editors, Arthropod Biology and Evolution: Molecules, Development, Morphology, pages 63–89. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.

- [98] B Bowerman, M K Ingram, and C P Hunter. The maternal par genes and the segregation of cell fate specification activities in early caenorhabditis elegans embryos. *Development*, 124(19):3815–3826, October 1997.
- [99] Ute Rothbächer, Vincent Bertrand, Clement Lamy, and Patrick Lemaire. A combinatorial code of maternal GATA, ets and beta-catenin-TCF transcription factors specifies and patterns the early ascidian ectoderm. *Development*, 134(22):4023–4032, November 2007.
- [100] Kaoru S Imai, Michael Levine, Nori Satoh, and Yutaka Satou. Regulatory blueprint for a chordate embryo. Science, 312(5777):1183–1187, May 2006.
- [101] Peter Nestorov, Florian Battke, Mitchell P Levesque, and Matthias Gerberding. The maternal transcriptome of the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis is inherited asymmetrically to invariant cell lineages of the ectoderm and mesoderm. *PLoS One*, 8(2):e56049, February 2013.
- [102] Carl Grobben. Die entwicklungsgeschichte der moina rectirostris. Arb. zool. Inst. Wien, 2:203–268, 1879.
- [103] Matthias Gerberding and Gerhard Scholtz. Cell lineage of the midline cells in the amphipod crustacean orchestiacavimana (crustacea, malacostraca) during formation and separation of the germ band. *Dev. Genes Evol.*, 209(2):91–102, 1999.
- [104] Matthias Gerberding, William E Browne, and Nipam H Patel. Cell lineage analysis of the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis reveals an early restriction of cell fates. *Development*, 129(24):
   5789–5801, December 2002.
- [105] Scott F Gilbert. Early Drosophila Development. Sinauer Associates, 2000.
- [106] Tamar Hashimshony, Florian Wagner, Noa Sher, and Itai Yanai. CEL-Seq: single-cell RNA-Seq by multiplexed linear amplification. *Cell Rep.*, 2(3):666–673, September 2012.
- [107] Allon M Klein, Linas Mazutis, Ilke Akartuna, Naren Tallapragada, Adrian Veres, Victor Li, Leonid Peshkin, David A Weitz, and Marc W Kirschner. Droplet barcoding for single-cell transcriptomics applied to embryonic stem cells. *Cell*, 161(5):1187–1201, May 2015.
- [108] Evan Z Macosko, Anindita Basu, Rahul Satija, James Nemesh, Karthik Shekhar, Melissa Goldman, Itay Tirosh, Allison R Bialas, Nolan Kamitaki, Emily M Martersteck, John J Trombetta, David A Weitz, Joshua R Sanes, Alex K Shalek, Aviv Regev, and Steven A McCarroll. Highly parallel genome-wide expression profiling of individual cells using nanoliter droplets. *Cell*, 161(5): 1202–1214, May 2015.

- [109] Saiful Islam, Una Kjällquist, Annalena Moliner, Pawel Zajac, Jian-Bing Fan, Peter Lönnerberg, and Sten Linnarsson. Characterization of the single-cell transcriptional landscape by highly multiplex RNA-seq. *Genome Res.*, 21(7):1160–1167, July 2011.
- [110] Grace X Y Zheng, Jessica M Terry, Phillip Belgrader, Paul Ryvkin, Zachary W Bent, Ryan Wilson,
  Solongo B Ziraldo, Tobias D Wheeler, Geoff P McDermott, Junjie Zhu, Mark T Gregory, Joe Shuga,
  Luz Montesclaros, Jason G Underwood, Donald A Masquelier, Stefanie Y Nishimura, Michael
  Schnall-Levin, Paul W Wyatt, Christopher M Hindson, Rajiv Bharadwaj, Alexander Wong, Kevin D
  Ness, Lan W Beppu, H Joachim Deeg, Christopher McFarland, Keith R Loeb, William J Valente,
  Nolan G Ericson, Emily A Stevens, Jerald P Radich, Tarjei S Mikkelsen, Benjamin J Hindson, and
  Jason H Bielas. Massively parallel digital transcriptional profiling of single cells. *Nat. Commun.*, 8:
  14049, January 2017.
- [111] Elena Denisenko, Belinda B Guo, Matthew Jones, Rui Hou, Leanne de Kock, Timo Lassmann,
   Daniel Poppe, Olivier Clément, Rebecca K Simmons, Ryan Lister, and Alistair R R Forrest.
   Systematic assessment of tissue dissociation and storage biases in single-cell and single-nucleus
   RNA-seq workflows. *Genome Biol.*, 21(1):130, June 2020.
- [112] Mathias Gerberding and Nipam H Patel. Gastrulation in crustacean: Germ layers and cell lineages.In Claudio D Stern, editor, *Gastrulation: From Cells to Embryo*, pages 79–90. CSHL Press, 2004.
- [113] Frederike Alwes and Gerhard Scholtz. Cleavage and gastrulation of the euphausiacean meganyctiphanes norvegica (crustacea, malacostraca). Zoomorphology, 123(3):125–137, 2004.
- [114] Philip L Hertzler. Cleavage and gastrulation in the shrimp penaeus (litopenaeus) vannamei (malacostraca, decapoda, dendrobranchiata). *Arthropod Struct. Dev.*, 34(4):455–469, October 2005.
- [115] Philip L Hertzler. Development of the mesendoderm in the dendrobranchiate shrimp sicyonia ingentis. Arthropod Struct. Dev., 31(1):33–49, September 2002.
- [116] Caterina Biffis, Frederike Alwes, and Gerhard Scholtz. Cleavage and gastrulation of the dendrobranchiate shrimp penaeus monodon (crustacea, malacostraca, decapoda). Arthropod Struct. Dev., 38(6):527–540, November 2009.
- [117] Carsten Wolff and Gerhard Scholtz. Cell lineage, axis formation, and the origin of germ layers in the amphipod crustacean orchestia cavimana. *Dev. Biol.*, 250(1):44–58, October 2002.
- [118] John B Pawlak, Melony J Sellars, Andrew Wood, and Philip L Hertzler. Cleavage and gastrulation in the kuruma shrimp penaeus (marsupenaeus) japonicus (bate): A revised cell lineage and

identification of a presumptive germ cell marker. *Development, Growth & Differentiation*, 52(8): 677–692, 2010.

- [119] Gerhard Scholtz and Carsten Wolff. Cleavage, gastrulation, and germ disc formation of the amphipod orchestia cavimana (crustacea, malacostraca, peracarida). *Contrib. Zool.*, 71(1-3):9–28, January 2002.
- [120] Frederike Alwes, Billy Hinchen, and Cassandra G Extavour. Patterns of cell lineage, movement, and migration from germ layer specification to gastrulation in the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Dev. Biol.*, 359(1):110–123, November 2011.
- [121] E Taube. Beinträge zur entwicklungsgeschichte der euphausiden. I die furchung des eis bis zur gastrulation. *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Zoologie*, 92:427–464, 1909.
- [122] E Taube. Beinträge zur entwicklungsgeschichte der euphausiden. II von der gastrulation bis zum furciliastadium. Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Zoologie, 94:577–658, 1915.
- [123] P L Hertzler and W H Clark, Jr. Cleavage and gastrulation in the shrimp sicyonia ingentis: invagination is accompanied by oriented cell division. *Development*, 116(1):127–140, September 1992.
- [124] R Crystal Chaw and Nipam H Patel. Independent migration of cell populations in the early gastrulation of the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Dev. Biol.*, 371(1):94–109, November 2012.
- [125] Vera S Hunnekuhl and Carsten Wolff. Reconstruction of cell lineage and spatiotemporal pattern formation of the mesoderm in the amphipod crustacean orchestia cavimana. *Dev. Dyn.*, 241(4): 697–717, April 2012.
- [126] William E Browne, Alivia L Price, Matthias Gerberding, and Nipam H Patel. Stages of embryonic development in the amphipod crustacean, parhyale hawaiensis. *Genesis*, 42(3):124–149, July 2005.
- [127] Jan Huisken, Jim Swoger, Filippo Del Bene, Joachim Wittbrodt, and Ernst H K Stelzer. Optical sectioning deep inside live embryos by selective plane illumination microscopy. *Science*, 305(5686): 1007–1009, August 2004.
- Philipp J Keller, Annette D Schmidt, Anthony Santella, Khaled Khairy, Zhirong Bao, Joachim
   Wittbrodt, and Ernst H K Stelzer. Fast, high-contrast imaging of animal development with scanned
   light sheet–based structured-illumination microscopy. *Nat. Methods*, 7(8):637–642, August 2010.

- [129] Alivia L Price, Melinda S Modrell, Roberta L Hannibal, and Nipam H Patel. Mesoderm and ectoderm lineages in the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis display intra-germ layer compensation. *Dev. Biol.*, 341(1):256–266, May 2010.
- [130] Carolina Cruz-Neira, Daniel J Sandin, Thomas A DeFanti, Robert V Kenyon, and John C Hart. The CAVE: audio visual experience automatic virtual environment. *Commun. ACM*, 35(6):64–72, June 1992.
- [131] Rensu P Theart, Ben Loos, and Thomas R Niesler. Virtual reality assisted microscopy data visualization and colocalization analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 18(S2), 2017.
- [132] Carsten Wolff, Jean-Yves Tinevez, Tobias Pietzsch, Evangelia Stamataki, Benjamin Harich, Léo Guignard, Stephan Preibisch, Spencer Shorte, Philipp J Keller, Pavel Tomancak, and Anastasios Pavlopoulos. Multi-view light-sheet imaging and tracking with the MaMuT software reveals the cell lineage of a direct developing arthropod limb. *Elife*, 7, March 2018.

Life did not take over the globe by combat, but by networking.

Lynn Margulis

1

# Bacterial contribution to the genesis of the novel germ line determinant oskar
#### ABSTRACT

New cellular functions and developmental processes can evolve by modifying existing genes or creating novel genes. Novel genes can arise not only via duplication or mutation but also by acquiring foreign DNA, also called horizontal gene transfer (HGT). Here we show that HGT likely contributed to the creation of a novel gene indispensable for reproduction in some insects. Long considered a novel gene with unknown origin, *oskar* has evolved to fulfil a crucial role in insect germ cell formation. Our analysis of over 100 insect Oskar sequences suggests that Oskar arose de novo *via* fusion of eukaryotic and prokaryotic sequences. This work shows that highly unusual gene origin processes can give rise to novel genes that can facilitate evolution of novel developmental mechanisms.

## CONTRIBUTIONS AND PUBLICATION

This work was published in the journal Elife in 2020 and has been reformated as the chapter presented here:

Blondel, L.\*, Jones, T. E., & Extavour, C. G. (2020). Bacterial contribution to genesis of the novel germ line determinant oskar. ELife, 9. DOI:10.7554/elife.45539

Tamsin EM Jones collected the first collection of 46 *oskar* ortholog sequences. Cassandra G. Extavour proposed the hypothesis and directed the study design, funding, writing and reviewing. I generated the rest of the original work presented in this chapter.

# 1.1 Introduction

Heritable variation is the raw material of evolutionary change. Genetic variation can arise from mutation and gene duplication of existing genes (reviewed by Taylor and Raes<sup>1</sup>), or through *de novo* processes<sup>2</sup>, but the extent to which such novel, or "orphan" genes participate significantly in the evolutionary process is unclear. Mutation of existing cis-regulatory<sup>3</sup> or protein coding regions<sup>4</sup> can drive evolutionary change in developmental processes. However, recent studies in animals and fungi suggest that novel genes can also drive phenotypic change<sup>5</sup>. Although counterintuitive, novel genes may be integrating continuously into otherwise conserved gene networks, with a higher rate of partner acquisition than subtler variations on preexisting genes<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, in humans and fruit flies, a large proportion of novel genes are expressed in the brain, suggesting their participation in the evolution of major organ systems<sup>7,8</sup>. However, while next generation sequencing has improved their discovery, the developmental and evolutionary significance of novel genes remains understudied.

The mechanism of formation of a novel gene may have implications for its function. Novel genes that arise by duplication, thus possessing the same biophysical properties as their parent genes, have innate potential to participate in preexisting cellular and molecular mechanisms (reviewed by Taylor and Raes<sup>1</sup>). However, orphan genes lacking sequence similarity to existing genes must form novel functional molecular relationships with extant genes, in order to persist in the genome. When such genes arise by introduction of foreign DNA into a host genome through horizontal gene transfer (HGT), they may introduce novel, already functional sequence information into a genome. Whether genes created by HGT show a greater propensity to contribute to or enable novel processes is unclear. Endosymbionts in the host germ line cytoplasm (germ line symbionts) could increase the occurrence of evolutionarily relevant HGT events, as foreign DNA integrated into the germ line genome is transferred to the next generation. HGT from bacterial endosymbionts into insect genomes appears widespread, involving transfer of metabolic genes or even larger genomic fragments to the host genome (see for example<sup>9,10,11,12</sup>).

Here we examined the evolutionary origins of the oskar (osk) gene, long considered a novel gene

that evolved to be indispensable for insect reproduction<sup>13</sup>. First discovered in Drosophila melanogaster<sup>14</sup>, osk is necessary and sufficient for assembly of germ plasm, a cytoplasmic determinant that specifies the germ line in the embryo. Germ plasm-based germ line specification appears derived within insects, confined to insects that undergo metamorphosis (Holometabola)<sup>15,16</sup>. Initially thought exclusive to Diptera (flies and mosquitoes), its discovery in a wasp, another holometabolous insect with germ plasm<sup>17</sup>, led to the hypothesis that oskar originated as a novel gene at the base of the Holometabola approximately 300 Mya, facilitating the evolution of insect germ plasm as a novel developmental mechanism<sup>17</sup>. However, its subsequent discovery in a cricket<sup>15</sup>, a hemimetabolous insect without germ plasm<sup>18</sup>, implied that osk was instead at least 50 My older, and that its germ plasm role was derived rather than ancestral<sup>19</sup>. Despite its orphan gene status, osk plays major developmental roles, interacting with the products of many genes highly conserved across animals<sup>20,21,22</sup>. osk thus represents an example of a novel gene that not only functions within pre-existing gene networks in the nervous system<sup>15</sup>, but has also evolved into the only animal gene that has been experimentally demonstrated to be to be both necessary and sufficient to specify functional primordial germ line cells<sup>23,24</sup>.

# 1.2 Results

The evolutionary origins of this remarkable gene are unknown. Osk contains two biophysically conserved domains, an N-terminal LOTUS domain and a C-terminal hydrolase-like domain called OSK <sup>21,25</sup> (Figure 1.1a). An initial BLASTp search using the full-length *D. melanogaster osk* sequence as a query yielded either other holometabolous insect *osk* genes, or partial hits for the LOTUS or OSK domains (E-value < 0.01; Supplementary files: BLAST search results). This suggested that full length *osk* was unlikely to be a duplication of any other known gene. This prompted us to perform two more BLASTp searches, one using each of the two conserved Osk protein domains individually as query sequences. Strikingly, in this BLASTp search, although we recovered several eukaryotic hits for the LOTUS domain, we recovered no eukaryotic sequences that resembled the OSK domain, even with very low E-value stringency (E-value < 10; see Methods section "*BLAST searches of oskar*" for an explanation of E-value threshold choices;

#### Supplementary files: BLAST search results).

To understand this anomaly, we built an alignment of 95 Oskar sequences (Supplementary files: Alignments>OSKAR\_MUSCLE\_FINAL.fasta; Tables A.1 and A.2) and used a custom iterative HMMER sliding window search tool to compare each domain with protein sequences from all domains of life. Sequences most similar to the LOTUS domain were almost exclusively eukaryotic sequences (Table A.3). In contrast, those most similar to the OSK domain were bacterial, specifically sequences similar to SGNH-like hydrolases<sup>21,25</sup> (Pfam Clan: SGNH\_hydrolase - CL0264; Table A.4; Figure 1.1b). To visualize their relationships, we graphed the sequence similarity network for the sequences of these domains and their closest hits. We observed that the majority of LOTUS domain sequences clustered within eukaryotic sequences (Figure 1.1c). In contrast, OSK domain sequences formed an isolated cluster, a small subset of which formed a connection to bacterial sequences (Figure 1.1d). These data are consistent with a previous suggestion, based on BLAST results<sup>17</sup>, that HGT from a bacterium into an ancestral insect genome may have contributed to the evolution of *osk*. However, this possibility was not formally addressed by previous analyses, which were based on alignments of full length Osk containing only eukaryotic sequences as outgroups<sup>15</sup>. To rigorously test this hypothesis, we therefore performed phylogenetic analyses of the two domains independently. A finding that LOTUS sequences were nested within eukaryotes, while OSK sequences were nested within bacteria, would provide support for the HGT hypothesis.

Both Maximum likelihood and Bayesian approaches confirmed this prediction (Figure 1.2a, Figure A.1, Figure A.2), and these results were robust to changes in the methods of sequence alignment (Figure A.1). As expected, LOTUS sequences from Osk proteins were related to other eukaryotic LOTUS domains, to the exclusion of the only three bacterial sequences that met our E-value cutoff for inclusion in the analyses (Figures A.1 to A.2; see Methods). LOTUS sequences from non-Oskar proteins were almost exclusively eukaryotic. (Table A.3); only three bacterial sequences matched the LOTUS domain with an E-value < 0.01. Osk LOTUS domains clustered into two distinct clades, one comprising all Dipteran sequences, and the other comprising all other Osk LOTUS domains examined from both holometabolous and hemimetabolous orders (Figure 1.2a). Dipteran Osk LOTUS sequences formed a monophyletic group that branched sister

to a clade of LOTUS domains from Tud5 family proteins of non-arthropod animals (NAA). NAA LOTUS domains from Tud7 family members were polyphyletic, but most of them formed a clade branching sister to (Osk LOTUS + NAA Tud5 LOTUS). Non-Dipteran Osk LOTUS domains formed a monophyletic group that was related in a polytomy to the aforementioned (NAA Tud7 LOTUS + (Dipteran Osk LOTUS + NAA Tud5 LOTUS)) clade, and to various arthropod Tud7 family LOTUS domains.

The fact that Tud7 LOTUS domains are polyphyletic suggests that arthropod domains in this family may have evolved differently than their homologues in other animals. The relationships of Dipteran LOTUS sequences were consistent with the current hypothesis for interrelationships between Dipteran species<sup>26</sup>. Similarly, among the non-Dipteran Osk LOTUS sequences, the hymenopteran sequences form a clade to the exclusion of the single hemimetabolous sequence (from the cricket Gryllus bimaculatus), consistent with the monophyly of Hymenoptera<sup>27</sup>. It is unclear why Dipteran Osk LOTUS domains cluster separately from those of other insect Osk proteins. We speculate that the evolution of the Long Oskar domain<sup>28,29</sup>, which appears to be a novelty within Diptera (Supplementary Files: Alignments>OSKAR\_MUSCLE\_FINAL.fasta), may have influenced the evolution of the Osk LOTUS domain in at least some of these insects. Consistent with this hypothesis, of the 17 Dipteran oskar genes we examined, the seven oskar genes possessing a Long Osk domain clustered into two clades based on the sequences of their LOTUS domain. One of these clades comprised five Drosophila species (D. willistoni, D. mojavensis, D. virilis, D. grimshawi and D. immigrans), and the second was composed of two calyptrate flies from different superfamilies, Musca domestica (Muscoidea) and Lucilia cuprina (Oestroidea).



**Figure 1.1: Sequence analysis of the Oskar gene. a**) Schematic representation of the Oskar gene. The LOTUS and OSK hydrolase-like domains are separated by a poorly conserved region of predicted high disorder and variable length between species. In some dipterans, a region 5' to the LOTUS domain is translated to yield a second isoform, called Long Oskar. Residue numbers correspond to the *D. melanogaster* Osk sequence. **b**) Stackplot of domain of life identity of HMMER hits across the protein sequence. For a sliding window of 60 Amino Acids across the protein sequence (X axis), the number of hits in the Trembl (UniProt) database (Y axis) is represented and color coded by domain of life origin (see Methods: Iterative HMMER search of OSK and LOTUS domains), stacked on top of each other. **c & d)** EFI-EST-generated graphs of the sequence similarity network of the LOTUS (**c**) and OSK (**d**) domains of Oskar<sup>30</sup>. Sequences were obtained using HMMER against the UniProtKB database. Most Oskar LOTUS sequences cluster within eukaryotes and arthropods. In contrast, Oskar OSK sequences cluster most strongly with a small subset of bacterial sequences.

**Figure 1.2** *(following page)*: **Phylogenetic analysis of the LOTUS and OSK domains. a**) Bayesian consensus tree for the LOTUS domain. Three major LOTUS-containing protein families are represented within the tree: Tudor 5, Tudor 7, and Oskar. Oskar LO-TUS domains form two clades, one containing only dipterans and one containing all other represented insects (hymenopterans and orthopterans). The tree was rooted to the three bacterial sequences added in the dataset. b) Bayesian consensus tree for the OSK domain. The OSK domain is nested within GDSL-like domains of bacterial species from phyla known to contain germ line symbionts in insects. The ten non-Oskar eukaryotic sequences in the analysis form one clade comprising fungal Carbohy-drate Active Enzyme 3 (CAZ3) proteins. For Bayesian and RaxML trees with all accession numbers and node support values see Figures A.1 to A.4.





In summary, the LOTUS domain of Osk proteins is most closely related to a number of other LOTUS domains found in eukaryotic proteins, as would be expected for a gene of animal origin, and the phylogenetic interrelationships of these sequences are largely consistent with the current species or family level trees for the corresponding insects.

In contrast, OSK domain sequences were nested within bacterial sequences (Figure 1.2b, Figures A.3 and A.4). This bacterial, rather than eukaryotic, affinity of the OSK domain was recovered even when different sequence alignment methods were used (Figures A.7 to A.11). The only eukaryotic proteins emerging from the iterative HMMER search for OSK domain sequences that had an E-value < 0.01 were all from fungi. All five of these sequences were annotated as Carbohydrate Active Enzyme 3 (CAZ3), and all CAZ3 sequences formed a clade that was sister to a clade of primarily Firmicutes. Most bacterial sequences used in this analysis were annotated as lipases and hydrolases, with a high representation of GDSL-like hydrolases (Table A.4). OSK sequences formed a monophyletic group but did not branch sister to the other eukaryotic sequences in the analysis. Within this OSK clade, the topology of sequence relationships was largely concordant with the species tree for insects<sup>31</sup>, as we recovered monophyletic Diptera to the exclusion of other insect species. However, the single orthopteran OSK sequence (from the cricket *Gryllus bimaculatus*) grouped within the Hymenoptera, rather than branching as sister to all other insect sequences in the tree, as would be expected for this hemimetabolous sequence<sup>31</sup>.

Importantly, OSK sequences did not simply form an outgroup to bacterial sequences. To formally reject the possibility that the eukaryotic OSK clade has a sister group relationship to all bacterial sequences in the analysis, we performed topology constraint analyses using the Swofford–Olsen–Waddell–Hillis (SOWH) test, which assigns statistical support to alternative phylogenetic topologies<sup>32</sup>. We used the SOWHAT tool<sup>33</sup> to compare the HGT-supporting topology to two alternative topologies with constraints more consistent with vertical inheritance. The first was constrained by domain of life, disallowing paraphyletic relationships between sequences from the same domain of life (Figure A.5a). The second required monophyly of Eukaryota but allowed paraphyletic relationships between bacterial and archaeal sequences (Figure A.5b). We found that the topologies of both of these constrained trees were significantly

worse than the result we had recovered with our phylogenetic analysis (Figure A.5), namely that the closest relatives of the OSK domain were bacterial rather than eukaryotic sequences (Figures 1.2 to A.4).

OSK sequences formed a well-supported clade nested within bacterial GDSL-like lipase sequences. The majority of these bacterial sequences were from the Firmicutes, a bacterial phylum known to include insect germline symbionts <sup>34,35</sup>. All other sequences from classified bacterial species, including a clade branching as sister to all other sequences, belonged either to the Bacteroidetes or to the Proteobacteria. Members of both of these phyla are also known germline symbionts of insects <sup>9,36</sup> and other arthropods <sup>37</sup>. In sum, the distinct phylogenetic relationships of the two domains of Oskar are consistent with a bacterial origin for the OSK domain. Further, the specific bacterial clades close to OSK suggest that an ancient arthropod germ line endosymbiont could have been the source of a GDSL-like sequence that was transferred into an ancestral insect genome, and ultimately gave rise to the OSK domain of *oskar* (Figure 1.3).

#### a. bacterial DNA transfer to germ line nucleus



**Figure 1.3: Hypothesis for the origin of** *oskar***.** Integration of the OSK domain close to a LOTUS domain in an ancestral insect genome. **a**) DNA containing a GDSL-like domain from an endosymbiotic germ line bacterium is transferred to the nucleus of a germ cell in an insect common ancestor. **b**) DNA damage or transposable element activity induces an integration event in the host genome, close to a pre-existing LOTUS-like domain. **c**) The region between the two domains undergoes *de novo* coding evolution, creating an open reading frame with a unique, chimeric domain structure. **d**) In some Diptera, including *D. melanogaster*, part of the 5' UTR of *oskar* has undergone *de novo* coding evolution to form the Long Oskar domain.

# 1.3 Discussion

While multiple mechanisms can give rise to novel genes, HGT is arguably among the least well understood, as it involves multiple genomes and ancient biotic interactions between donor and host organisms that are often difficult to reconstruct. In the case of *oskar*, however, the fact that both germline symbionts<sup>38</sup> and HGT events<sup>9</sup> are widespread in insects, provides a plausible biological mechanism consistent with our hypothesis that fusion of eukaryotic and bacterial domain sequences led to the birth of this novel gene. Under this hypothesis, this fusion would have taken place before the major diversification of insects, nearly 500 million years ago<sup>31</sup>.

Once arisen, novel genes might be expected to disappear rapidly, given that pre-existing gene regulatory networks operated successfully without them (reviewed by Taylor and Raes<sup>1</sup>). However, it is clear that novel genes can evolve functional connections with existing networks, become essential<sup>39</sup>, and in some cases lead to new functions<sup>40</sup> and contribute to phenotypic diversity<sup>5</sup>. Even given the growing number of convincing examples of HGT from both prokaryotic and eukaryotic origins (see for example Husnik and McCutcheon<sup>41</sup>, Lelio et al.<sup>42</sup>, Wybouw et al.<sup>43</sup>, Quispe-Huamanquispe et al.<sup>44</sup>), some authors suspect that the contribution of horizontal gene transfer to the acquisition of novel traits has been underestimated across animals<sup>45</sup>. Moreover, the functional contribution of genes horizontally transferred specifically from bacteria to insects has been documented for a range of adaptive phenotypes (see for example<sup>46,47,48</sup>), including digestive metabolism<sup>10,11,49</sup>, glycolysis<sup>50</sup> complex symbiosis<sup>12</sup> and endosymbiont cell wall construction<sup>51</sup>. oskar plays multiple critical roles in insect development, from neural patterning<sup>15,52</sup> to oogenesis<sup>53</sup>. In the Holometabola, a clade of nearly one million extant species<sup>54</sup>, oskar's co-option to become necessary and sufficient for germ plasm assembly is likely the cell biological mechanism underlying the evolution of this derived mode of insect germ line specification<sup>15,17,19</sup>. Our study thus provides evidence that HGT can not only introduce functional genes into a host genome, but also, by contributing sequences of individual domains, generate genes with entirely novel domain structures that may facilitate the evolution of novel developmental mechanisms.

# 1.4 Methods

#### 1.4.1 BLAST searches of Oskar

All BLAST searches were performed using the NCBI BLASTp tool suite <sup>55</sup> on the non-redundant (nr) database. Amino Acid (AA) sequences of *D. melanogaster* full length Oskar (EMBL ID AAF54306.1), as well as the AA sequences for the *D. melanogaster* Oskar LOTUS (AA 139-238) and OSK (AA 414-606) domains were used for the BLAST searches. We used the default NCBI cut-off parameters (E-value cut-off of 10) for searches using OSK and LOTUS as queries, and a more stringent E-value threshold of 0.01 for the search using full length *D. melanogaster* Oskar as a query. We chose an E-value threshold of 10 for LOTUS and OSK to capture potentially highly divergent homologs of the two domains, especially for the OSK domain, where we were looking for any viable candidate for a homologous eukaryotic domain. All BLAST searches results are included in the Supplementary files: BLAST search results.

# 1.4.2 Hidden Markov Model (HMM) generation and alignments of the OSK and LOTUS domains

101 1KITE transcriptomes<sup>56</sup> (Table A.1) were downloaded and searched using the local BLAST program (BLAST+) using the tblastn algorithm with default parameters, with Oskar protein sequences of *Drosophila melanogaster, Aedes aegypti, Nasonia vitripennis* and *Gryllus bimaculatus* as queries (EntrezIDs: NP\_731295.1, ABC41128.1, NP\_001234884.1 and AFV31610.1 respectively). For all of these 1KITE transcriptome searches, predicted protein sequences from transcript data were obtained by in silico translation using the online ExPASy translate tool

(https://web.expasy.org/translate/), taking the longest open reading frame. Publicly available sequences in the non-redundant (nr), TSA databases at NCBI, and a then-unpublished transcriptome<sup>57</sup> (kind gift of Matthew Benton and Siegfried Roth, University of Cologne) were subsequently searched using the web-based BLAST tool hosted at NCBI, using the tblastn algorithm with default parameters. Sequences used for queries were the four Oskar proteins described above, and newfound *oskar* sequences from the 1KITE transcriptomes of *Baetis* 

*pumilis, Cryptocercus wright,* and *Frankliniella cephalica*. For both searches, *oskar* orthologs were identified by the presence of BLAST hits on the same transcript to both the LOTUS (N-terminal) and OSK (C-terminal) regions of any of the query *oskar* sequences, regardless of E-values. The sequences found were aligned using MUSCLE (8 iterations)<sup>58</sup> into a 46-sequence alignment (Supplementary files: Alignments>OSKAR\_MUSCLE\_INITIAL.fasta). From this alignment, the LOTUS and OSK domains were extracted (Supplementary files:

Alignments>LOTUS\_MUSCLE\_INITIAL.fasta and Alignments>OSK\_MUSCLE\_INITIAL.fasta) to define the initial Hidden Markov Models (HMM) using the hmmbuild tool from the HMMER tool suite with default parameters<sup>59</sup>. 126 insect genomes and 128 insect transcriptomes (from the Transcriptome Shotgun Assembly TSA database:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Traces/wgs/?view=TSA) were subsequently downloaded from NCBI (download date September 29, 2015; Table A.1). Genomes were submitted to Augustus v2.5.5<sup>60</sup> (using the *D. melanogaster* exon HMM predictor) and SNAP v2006-07-28<sup>61</sup> (using the default 'fly' HMM) for gene discovery. The resulting nucleotide sequence database comprising all 309 downloaded and annotated genomes and transcriptomes, was then translated in six frames to generate a non-redundant amino acid database (where all sequences with the same amino acid content are merged into one). This process was automated using a series of custom scripts available here: https://github.com/Xqua/Genomes. The non-redundant amino acid database was searched using the HMMER v3.1 tool suite<sup>59</sup> and the HMM for the LOTUS and OSK domains described above. A hit was considered positive if it consisted of a contiguous sequence containing both a LOTUS domain and an OSK domain, with the two domains separated by an inter-domain sequence. We imposed no length, alignment or conservation criteria on the inter-domain sequence, as this is a rapidly-evolving region of Oskar protein with predicted high disorder<sup>21,25,62</sup>. Positive hits were manually curated and added to the main alignment, and the search was performed iteratively until no more new sequences meeting the above criteria were discovered. This resulted in a total of 95 Oskar protein sequences, (see Table A.2 for the complete list). Using the final resulting alignment (Supplementary Files: Alignments>OSKAR\_MUSCLE\_FINAL.fasta), the LOTUS and OSK domains were extracted from these sequences (Supplementary Files: Alignments>LOTUS\_MUSCLE\_FINAL.fasta and Alignments>OSK\_MUSCLE\_FINAL.fasta), and the final three HMM (for full-length Oskar, OSK,

and LOTUS domains) used in subsequent analyses were created using hmmbuild with default parameters (Supplementary files: HMM>OSK.hmm, HMM>LOTUS.hmm and HMM>OSKAR.hmm).

### 1.4.3 Iterative HMMER search of OSK and LOTUS domains

A reduced version of TrEMBL<sup>63</sup> (v2016-06) was created by concatenating all hits (regardless of E-value) for sequences of the LOTUS domain, the OSK domain and full-length Oskar, using hmmsearch with default parameters and the HMM models created above from the final alignment. This reduced database was created to reduce potential false positive results that might result from the limited size of the sliding window used in the search approach described here. The full-length Oskar alignment of 1133 amino acids (Supplementary files: Alignments>OSKAR\_MUSCLE\_FINAL.fasta) was split into 934 sub-alignments of 60 amino acids each using a sliding window of one amino acid. Each alignment was converted into a HMM using hmmbuild, and searched against the reduced TrEMBL database using hmmsearch using default parameters. Domain of life origin of every hit sequence at each position was recorded. Eukaryotic sequences were further classified as Oskar/Non-Oskar and Arthropod/Non-Arthropod. Finally, for the whole alignment, the counts for each category were saved and plotted in a stack plot representing the proportion of sequences from each category to create Figure 1.1b. The python code used for this search is available at https://github.com/Xqua/Iterative-HMMER.

# 1.4.4 Sequence Similarity Networks

LOTUS and OSK domain sequences from the final alignment obtained as described above (see *"Hidden Markov Model (HMM) generation and alignments of the OSK and LOTUS domains"*; Supplementary files: Alignments>LOTUS\_MUSCLE\_FINAL.fasta and Alignments>OSK\_MUSCLE\_FINAL.fasta) were searched against TrEMBL<sup>64</sup> (v2016-06) using HMMER. All hits with E-value < 0.01 were consolidated into a fasta file that was then entered into the EFI-EST tool<sup>30</sup> using default parameters to generate a sequence similarity network. An

alignment score corresponding to 30% sequence identity was chosen for the generation of the

final sequence similarity network. Finally, the network was graphed using Cytoscape 3<sup>65</sup>.

## 1.4.5 Phylogenetic Analysis Based on MUSCLE Alignment

For both the LOTUS and OSK domains, in cases where more than one sequence from the same organism was retrieved by the search described above in "Iterative HMMER Search of OSK and LOTUS domains", only the sequence with the lowest E-value was used for phylogenetic analysis. For the LOTUS domain, the first 97 best hits (lowest E-value) were selected, and the only three bacterial sequences that satisfied an E-value < 0.01 were manually added. For oskar sequences, if more than one sequence per species was obtained by the search, only the single sequence per species with the lowest E-value was kept for analysis, generating a set of 100 sequences for the LOTUS domain, and 87 sequences for the OSK domain. Unique identifiers for all sequences used to generate alignments for phylogenetic analysis are available in Tables A.3 and A.4. For both datasets, the sequences were then aligned using MUSCLE<sup>58</sup> (8 iterations) and trimmed using trimAl<sup>66</sup> with 70% occupancy. The resulting alignments that were subject to phylogenetic analysis are available in Supplementary Files: Alignments>LOTUS\_MUSCLE\_TREE.fasta and Alignments>OSK\_MUSCLE\_TREE.fasta. For the maximum likelihood tree, we used RaxML v8.2.4<sup>67</sup> with 1000 bootstraps, and the models were selected using the automatic RaxML model selection tool. The substitution model chosen for both domains was LGF. For the Bayesian tree inference, we used MrBayes V3.2.6<sup>68</sup> with a Mixed model (prset aamodel=Mixed) and a gamma distribution (lset rates=Gamma). We ran the MonteCarlo for 4 million generations (std < 0.01) for the OSK domain, and for 3 million generations (std < 0.01) for the LOTUS domain. For the tree comparisons (Figures A.8 and A.9), the RaxML best tree output from the MUSCLE and PRANK alignments were compared using the tool Phylo.io<sup>69</sup>.

## 1.4.6 Phylogenetic analysis based on PRANK alignment

For the OSK domain, the raw full length sequences obtained from the HMMER search were aligned to each other using HMMER HMM based alignment tool: hmmalign, with the same HMM used to do the search, namely OSK.hmm (supplementary data: Data/HMM/OSK.hmm). Starting from this base alignment, we used the default alignment method option offered by PRANK (version: v.170427)<sup>70</sup>. We then used PRANK to realign those sequences, which in turn led to a usable alignment for phylogenetic analysis. This alignment was trimmed using the same parameters as described in *Hidden Markov Model (HMM) generation and alignments of the OSK and LOTUS domains* above. The final alignment is available in supplementary data: Alignment/OSK\_prank\_aligned.fasta. We then performed a phylogenetic analysis of this alignment using RAXML with the same parameters described in *Phylogenetic Analysis Based on MUSCLE Alignment* above. The resulting tree is presented in Figures A.7 and A.8.

For the LOTUS domain, the raw full length sequences obtained from the HMMER search were aligned to each other using the HMMER HMM based alignment tool: hmmalign, with the same HMM used to do the search, namely LOTUS.hmm (Supplementary data:

Data/HMM/LOTUS.hmm). Starting from this base alignment, we then used PRANK with default options to realign those sequences. This alignment was trimmed using the same parameters as described in the *Hidden Markov Model (HMM) generation and alignments of the OSK and LOTUS domains*. The final alignment is available in supplementary data:

Alignments/LOTUS\_prank\_aligned.fasta. We then performed a phylogenetic analysis using RAXML with the same parameters described above in *Phylogenetic Analysis Based on MUSCLE alignment*. The resulting trees are presented in Figures A.6 and A.9.

# 1.4.7 Phylogenetic Analysis Based on T Coffee alignment

For the LOTUS and OSK domain, the raw full length sequences obtained from the HMMER search were aligned to each other using T-Coffee with its default parameters<sup>71</sup>. This alignment was trimmed using the same parameters as described in *Hidden Markov Model (HMM) generation and alignments of the OSK and LOTUS domains* above. The final alignment is available in supplementary data: Alignment/LOTUS\_tcoffee\_aligned.fasta Alignment/OSK\_tcoffee\_aligned.fasta. We then performed a phylogenetic analysis of this alignment using RAXML with the same parameters described in *Phylogenetic Analysis Based on MUSCLE Alignment* above. The resulting trees are presented in Figures A.10 and A.11.

#### 1.4.8 Visual Comparison of Phylogenetic Trees

To compare the trees obtained with different alignment tools, we used Phylo.io<sup>69</sup>. The trees were imported in Newick format, and the Phylo.io tool generated the mirrored and aligned versions of the trees represented in Figures A.8, A.9, A.12 and A.13. The color of the branches is the tree similarity score, where lighter colors represent a higher number of topological differences. Exactly, it is a custom implementation of the Jacard Index by Phylo.io.

# 1.4.9 Statistical Analysis of Tree Topology

To statistically evaluate our best-supported topology of the OSK and LOTUS trees, we compared constrained topologies to the highest likelihood trees using the SOWHAT tool<sup>33</sup>. SOWHAT automates the stringent SOWH phylogenetic topology test<sup>32</sup>, and compares the log likelihood between generated trees. We defined three constrained trees to test our results, one requiring monophyly of all domains of life, a second requiring only eukaryotic monophyly, and the last one requiring monophyly of the oskar LOTUS domain (Supplementary Files: Data>Trees>constrained\_kingdom\_tree.tre, constrained\_eukmono\_tree.tre & constrained\_lotus\_mono\_tree.tre). We then ran SOWHAT using its default parameters, 1000 bootstraps, and the two constrained trees against the OSK or LOTUS alignment used to generate the phylogenetic trees (Supplementary Files: Alignments>OSK\_MUSCLE\_TREE.fasta & LOTUS\_MUSCLE\_TREE.fasta). All best trees generated by SOWHAT are available in (Supplementary Files: Data>Trees>SOWHAT\_\*\_test.tre).

#### 1.4.10 Data Availability

All sequences discovered using the automatic annotation pipeline described in (M&M HMM and oskar search) are annotated as such in Table A.2.

The data generated and used throughout this study can be downloaded inside the github repository at https://github.com/extavourlab/Oskar\_HGT

1. Subfolder **Alignments**: All sequences identified and analyzed in this study, in FASTA format and with corresponding Alignments

- 2. Subfolder **BLAST search results**: Results of BLASTP searches with full length Oskar, OSK or LOTUS domains as queries
- 3. Subfolder Data: Necessary files for running the different IPython notebooks:
  - a. Subfolder *HMM*: HMM models used for iterative searching for sequences similar to full-length Oskar, LOTUS and OSK domains
  - b. Subfolder *Taxonomy*: Conversion table for UniProt ID to taxon information. (uniprot\_ID\_taxa.tsv)
  - c. Subfolder *Trees*: Contains the tree files obtained from
    - i. RaxML phylogenetic analyses of the OSK and LOTUS domains aligned with MUSCLE, T-Coffee or PRANK
    - ii. MrBayes phylogenetic analyses of the OSK and LOTUS domains aligned with MUSCLE
    - iii. SOWHAT analyses.

# 1.4.11 Code Availability

All custom code generated for this study is available in the GitHub repository

https://github.com/extavourlab/Oskar\_HGT

commit ID 6f6c4c50dfb9391567d70f9eea922f3876a4e153.

# 1.5 Acknowledgments:

We thank Sean Eddy, Chuck Davis, and Extavour lab members for discussion.

# References

- [1] John S Taylor and Jeroen Raes. Duplication and divergence: the evolution of new genes and old ideas. *Annu. Rev. Genet.*, 38:615–643, 2004.
- [2] Diethard Tautz and Tomislav Domazet-Lošo. The evolutionary origin of orphan genes. Nat. Rev. Genet., 12(10):692–702, August 2011.
- [3] Patricia J Wittkopp and Gizem Kalay. Cis-regulatory elements: molecular mechanisms and evolutionary processes underlying divergence. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, 13(1):59–69, December 2011.
- [4] Hopi E Hoekstra and Jerry A Coyne. The locus of evolution: evo devo and the genetics of adaptation. *Evolution*, 61(5):995–1016, May 2007.
- [5] Sidi Chen, Benjamin H Krinsky, and Manyuan Long. New genes as drivers of phenotypic evolution. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, 14(9):645–660, September 2013.
- [6] Wenyu Zhang, Patrick Landback, Andrea R Gschwend, Bairong Shen, and Manyuan Long. New genes drive the evolution of gene interaction networks in the human and mouse genomes. *Genome Biol.*, 16:202, October 2015.
- [7] Yong E Zhang, Patrick Landback, Maria Vibranovski, and Manyuan Long. New genes expressed in human brains: implications for annotating evolving genomes. *Bioessays*, 34 (11):982–991, November 2012.

- [8] Sidi Chen, Maria Spletter, Xiaochun Ni, Kevin P White, Liqun Luo, and Manyuan Long. Frequent recent origination of brain genes shaped the evolution of foraging behavior in drosophila. *Cell Rep.*, 1(2):118–132, February 2012.
- [9] Julie C Dunning Hotopp, Michael E Clark, Deodoro C S G Oliveira, Jeremy M Foster, Peter Fischer, Mónica C Muñoz Torres, Jonathan D Giebel, Nikhil Kumar, Nadeeza Ishmael, Shiliang Wang, Jessica Ingram, Rahul V Nene, Jessica Shepard, Jeffrey Tomkins, Stephen Richards, David J Spiro, Elodie Ghedin, Barton E Slatko, Hervé Tettelin, and John H Werren. Widespread lateral gene transfer from intracellular bacteria to multicellular eukaryotes. *Science*, 317(5845):1753–1756, September 2007.
- [10] Ricardo Acuña, Beatriz E Padilla, Claudia P Flórez-Ramos, José D Rubio, Juan C Herrera, Pablo Benavides, Sang-Jik Lee, Trevor H Yeats, Ashley N Egan, Jeffrey J Doyle, and Jocelyn K C Rose. Adaptive horizontal transfer of a bacterial gene to an invasive insect pest of coffee. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 109(11):4197–4202, March 2012.
- [11] Daniel B Sloan, Atsushi Nakabachi, Stephen Richards, Jiaxin Qu, Shwetha Canchi Murali, Richard A Gibbs, and Nancy A Moran. Parallel histories of horizontal gene transfer facilitated extreme reduction of endosymbiont genomes in sap-feeding insects. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 31(4):857–871, April 2014.
- [12] Filip Husnik, Naruo Nikoh, Ryuichi Koga, Laura Ross, Rebecca P Duncan, Manabu Fujie, Makiko Tanaka, Nori Satoh, Doris Bachtrog, Alex C C Wilson, Carol D von Dohlen, Takema Fukatsu, and John P McCutcheon. Horizontal gene transfer from diverse bacteria to an insect genome enables a tripartite nested mealybug symbiosis. *Cell*, 153(7):1567–1578, June 2013.
- [13] Ruth Lehmann. Germ plasm biogenesis—an oskar-centric perspective. In Current topics in developmental biology, volume 116, pages 679–707. Elsevier, 2016.
- [14] R Lehmann and C Nüsslein-Volhard. Abdominal segmentation, pole cell formation, and embryonic polarity require the localized activity of oskar, a maternal gene in drosophila. *Cell*, 47(1):141–152, October 1986.

- [15] Ben Ewen-Campen, John R Srouji, Evelyn E Schwager, and Cassandra G Extavour. Oskar predates the evolution of germ plasm in insects. *Curr. Biol.*, 22(23):2278–2283, December 2012.
- [16] Cassandra G Extavour and Michael Akam. Mechanisms of germ cell specification across the metazoans: epigenesis and preformation. *Development*, 130(24):5869–5884, December 2003.
- [17] Jeremy A Lynch, Orhan Ozüak, Abderrahman Khila, Ehab Abouheif, Claude Desplan, and Siegfried Roth. The phylogenetic origin of oskar coincided with the origin of maternally provisioned germ plasm and pole cells at the base of the holometabola. *PLoS Genet.*, 7(4): e1002029, April 2011.
- [18] Ben Ewen-Campen, Seth Donoughe, Donald Nat Clarke, and Cassandra G Extavour. Germ cell specification requires zygotic mechanisms rather than germ plasm in a basally branching insect. *Curr. Biol.*, 23(10):835–842, May 2013.
- [19] Ehab Abouheif. Evolution: oskar reveals missing link in co-optive evolution. *Curr. Biol.*, 23 (1):R24–5, January 2013.
- [20] Ruth Lehmann. Germ plasm Biogenesis–An Oskar-Centric perspective. *Curr. Top. Dev. Biol.*, 116:679–707, February 2016.
- [21] Mandy Jeske, Matteo Bordi, Sebastian Glatt, Sandra Müller, Vladimir Rybin, Christoph W Müller, and Anne Ephrussi. The crystal structure of the drosophila germline inducer oskar identifies two domains with distinct vasa helicase- and RNA-Binding activities. *Cell Reports*, 12(4):587–598, 2015.
- [22] Mandy Jeske, Christoph W Müller, and Anne Ephrussi. The LOTUS domain is a conserved DEAD-box RNA helicase regulator essential for the recruitment of vasa to the germ plasm and nuage. *Genes Dev.*, 31(9):939–952, May 2017.
- [23] J Kim-Ha, J L Smith, and P M Macdonald. oskar mRNA is localized to the posterior pole of the drosophila oocyte. *Cell*, 66(1):23–35, July 1991.

- [24] A Ephrussi and R Lehmann. Induction of germ cell formation by oskar. *Nature*, 358(6385): 387–392, July 1992.
- [25] Na Yang, Zhenyu Yu, Menglong Hu, Mingzhu Wang, Ruth Lehmann, and Rui-Ming Xu.
  Structure of drosophila oskar reveals a novel RNA binding protein. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.* S. A., 112(37):11541–11546, September 2015.
- [26] Ashley H Kirk-Spriggs and Bradley J Sinclair. Manual of Afrotropical Diptera Volume 1. 2017.
- [27] Ralph S Peters, Lars Krogmann, Christoph Mayer, Alexander Donath, Simon Gunkel,
  Karen Meusemann, Alexey Kozlov, Lars Podsiadlowski, Malte Petersen, Robert Lanfear,
  Patricia A Diez, John Heraty, Karl M Kjer, Seraina Klopfstein, Rudolf Meier, Carlo Polidori,
  Thomas Schmitt, Shanlin Liu, Xin Zhou, Torsten Wappler, Jes Rust, Bernhard Misof, and
  Oliver Niehuis. Evolutionary history of the hymenoptera. *Curr. Biol.*, 27(7):1013–1018,
  April 2017.
- [28] Nathalie F Vanzo and Anne Ephrussi. Oskar anchoring restricts pole plasm formation to the posterior of the drosophila oocyte. *Development*, 129(15):3705–3714, August 2002.
- [29] Thomas Ryan Hurd, Beate Herrmann, Julia Sauerwald, Justina Sanny, Markus Grosch, and Ruth Lehmann. Long oskar controls mitochondrial inheritance in drosophila melanogaster. *Developmental Cell*, 39(5):560–571, 2016.
- [30] John A Gerlt, Jason T Bouvier, Daniel B Davidson, Heidi J Imker, Boris Sadkhin, David R
  Slater, and Katie L Whalen. Enzyme function Initiative-Enzyme similarity tool (EFI-EST):
  A web tool for generating protein sequence similarity networks. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 1854(8):1019–1037, August 2015.
- [31] Bernhard Misof, Shanlin Liu, Karen Meusemann, Ralph S Peters, Alexander Donath, Christoph Mayer, Paul B Frandsen, Jessica Ware, Tomáš Flouri, Rolf G Beutel, Oliver Niehuis, Malte Petersen, Fernando Izquierdo-Carrasco, Torsten Wappler, Jes Rust, Andre J Aberer, Ulrike Aspöck, Horst Aspöck, Daniela Bartel, Alexander Blanke, Simon Berger, Alexander Böhm, Thomas R Buckley, Brett Calcott, Junqing Chen, Frank Friedrich, Makiko Fukui, Mari Fujita, Carola Greve, Peter Grobe, Shengchang Gu, Ying Huang, Lars S

Jermiin, Akito Y Kawahara, Lars Krogmann, Martin Kubiak, Robert Lanfear, Harald Letsch, Yiyuan Li, Zhenyu Li, Jiguang Li, Haorong Lu, Ryuichiro Machida, Yuta Mashimo, Pashalia Kapli, Duane D McKenna, Guanliang Meng, Yasutaka Nakagaki, José Luis Navarrete-Heredia, Michael Ott, Yanxiang Ou, Günther Pass, Lars Podsiadlowski, Hans Pohl, Björn M von Reumont, Kai Schütte, Kaoru Sekiya, Shota Shimizu, Adam Slipinski, Alexandros Stamatakis, Wenhui Song, Xu Su, Nikolaus U Szucsich, Meihua Tan, Xuemei Tan, Min Tang, Jingbo Tang, Gerald Timelthaler, Shigekazu Tomizuka, Michelle Trautwein, Xiaoli Tong, Toshiki Uchifune, Manfred G Walzl, Brian M Wiegmann, Jeanne Wilbrandt, Benjamin Wipfler, Thomas K F Wong, Qiong Wu, Gengxiong Wu, Yinlong Xie, Shenzhou Yang, Qing Yang, David K Yeates, Kazunori Yoshizawa, Qing Zhang, Rui Zhang, Wenwei Zhang, Yunhui Zhang, Jing Zhao, Chengran Zhou, Lili Zhou, Tanja Ziesmann, Shijie Zou, Yingrui Li, Xun Xu, Yong Zhang, Huanming Yang, Jian Wang, Jun Wang, Karl M Kjer, and Xin Zhou. Phylogenomics resolves the timing and pattern of insect evolution. *Science*, 346(6210):763–767, November 2014.

- [32] Mary Eubanks. Molecular systematics. *Econ. Bot.*, 52(2):133–133, April 1998.
- [33] Samuel H Church, Joseph F Ryan, and Casey W Dunn. Automation and evaluation of the SOWH test with SOWHAT. Syst. Biol., 64(6):1048–1058, November 2015.
- [34] David Wheeler, Amanda J Redding, and John H Werren. Characterization of an ancient lepidopteran lateral gene transfer. *PLoS ONE*, 8(3):e59262, 2013.
- [35] Sharon T Chepkemoi, Enock Mararo, Hellen Butungi, Juan Paredes, Daniel K Masiga, Steven P Sinkins, and Jeremy K Herren. Identification of spiroplasma insolitum symbionts in anopheles gambiae. Wellcome Open Research, 2:90, 2017.
- [36] Einat Zchori-Fein, Steve J Perlman, Suzanne E Kelly, Nurit Katzir, and Martha S Hunter. Characterization of a 'bacteroidetes' symbiont in encarsia wasps (hymenoptera: Aphelinidae): proposal of 'candidatus cardinium hertigii'. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology*, 54(3):961–968, 2004.
- [37] Einat Zchori-Fein and Steve J Perlman. Distribution of the bacterial symbiont cardinium in arthropods. *Mol. Ecol.*, 13(7):2009–2016, July 2004.

- [38] Kostas Bourtzis and Thomas A Miller, editors. *Insect Symbiosis, Volume 3 (Contemporary Topics in Entomology)*. CRC Press, 1 edition, October 2008.
- [39] S Chen, Y E Zhang, and M Long. New genes in drosophila quickly become essential. Science, 330(6011):1682–1685, 2010.
- [40] G Cornelis, O Heidmann, S Bernard-Stoecklin, K Reynaud, G Veron, B Mulot,
  A Dupressoir, and T Heidmann. Ancestral capture of syncytin-car1, a fusogenic
  endogenous retroviral envelope gene involved in placentation and conserved in carnivora.
  Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109(7):E432–E441, 2012.
- [41] Filip Husnik and John P McCutcheon. Functional horizontal gene transfer from bacteria to eukaryotes. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 16(2):67–79, 2018.
- [42] Ilaria Di Lelio, Ilaria Di Lelio, Anna Illiano, Federica Astarita, Luca Gianfranceschi, David Horner, Paola Varricchio, Angela Amoresano, Pietro Pucci, Francesco Pennacchio, and Silvia Caccia. Evolution of an insect immune barrier through horizontal gene transfer mediated by a parasitic wasp. *PLOS Genetics*, 15(3):e1007998, 2019.
- [43] Nicky Wybouw, Yannick Pauchet, David G Heckel, and Thomas Van Leeuwen. Horizontal gene transfer contributes to the evolution of arthropod herbivory. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, 8(6):1785–1801, 2016.
- [44] Dora G Quispe-Huamanquispe, Godelieve Gheysen, and Jan F Kreuze. Horizontal gene transfer contributes to plant evolution: The case of agrobacterium T-DNAs. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 8, 2017.
- [45] Luis Boto. Horizontal gene transfer in the acquisition of novel traits by metazoans.*Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1777):20132450, 2014.
- [46] Alex C C Wilson and Rebecca P Duncan. Signatures of host/symbiont genome coevolution in insect nutritional endosymbioses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112 (33):10255–10261, 2015.
- [47] Sergio López-Madrigal and Rosario Gil. Et tu, brute? not even intracellular mutualistic symbionts escape horizontal gene transfer. *Genes*, 8(10):247, 2017.

- [48] N A Provorov and O P Onishchuk. Microbial symbionts of insects: Genetic organization, adaptive role, and evolution. *Microbiology*, 87(2):151–163, 2018.
- [49] Matan Shelomi, Etienne G J Danchin, David Heckel, Benjamin Wipfler, Sven Bradler, Xin Zhou, and Yannick Pauchet. Horizontal gene transfer of pectinases from bacteria preceded the diversification of stick and leaf insects. *Scientific Reports*, 6(1), 2016.
- [50] Zhen Zeng, Yating Fu, Dongyang Guo, Yuxuan Wu, Olugbenga Emmanuel Ajayi, and Qingfa Wu. Bacterial endosymbiont cardinium csfur genome sequence provides insights for understanding the symbiotic relationship in sogatella furcifera host. *BMC Genomics*, 19 (1), 2018.
- [51] Deanna C Bublitz, Grayson L Chadwick, John S Magyar, Kelsi M Sandoz, Diane M Brooks, Stéphane Mesnage, Mark S Ladinsky, Arkadiy I Garber, Pamela J Bjorkman, Victoria J Orphan, and John P McCutcheon. Peptidoglycan production by an Insect-Bacterial mosaic. *Cell*, 179(3):703–712.e7, 2019.
- [52] X Xu, J L Brechbiel, and E R Gavis. Dynein-Dependent transport of nanos RNA in drosophila sensory neurons requires rumpelstiltskin and the germ plasm organizer oskar. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(37):14791–14800, 2013.
- [53] A Jenny. A translation-independent role of oskar RNA in early drosophila oogenesis. Development, 133(15):2827–2833, 2006.
- [54] Jonathan Rees and Karen Cranston. Automated assembly of a reference taxonomy for phylogenetic data synthesis. *Biodiversity Data Journal*, 5:e12581, 2017.
- [55] Mark Johnson, Irena Zaretskaya, Yan Raytselis, Yuri Merezhuk, Scott McGinnis, and Thomas L Madden. NCBI BLAST: a better web interface. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 36(Web Server issue):W5–9, July 2008.
- [56] P Grobe. 1KITE 1K insect transcriptome evolution. March 2017.
- [57] Matthew A. Benton, Nathan J. Kenny, Kai H. Conrads, Siegfried Roth, and Jeremy A. Lynch. Deep, staged transcriptomic resources for the novel coleopteran models atrachya menetriesi and callosobruchus maculatus. *PLOS ONE*, 11(12):1–23, 12 2016. doi:

10.1371/journal.pone.0167431. URL

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0167431.

- [58] Robert C Edgar. MUSCLE: a multiple sequence alignment method with reduced time and space complexity. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 5:113, August 2004.
- [59] Sean Eddy. HMMER. http://hmmer.org/, 2020. Accessed: 2020-10-8.
- [60] M Stanke, R Steinkamp, S Waack, and B Morgenstern. AUGUSTUS: a web server for gene finding in eukaryotes. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 32(Web Server):W309–W312, 2004.
- [61] Ian Korf. Gene finding in novel genomes. BMC Bioinformatics, 5:59, May 2004.
- [62] Abha Ahuja and Cassandra G Extavour. Patterns of molecular evolution of the germ line specification gene oskar suggest that a novel domain may contribute to functional divergence in drosophila. *Development Genes and Evolution*, 224(2):65–77, 2014.
- [63] The Uniprot Consortium and The UniProt Consortium. The universal protein resource (UniProt) 2009. Nucleic Acids Research, 37(Database):D169–D174, 2009.
- [64] Brigitte Boeckmann, Amos Bairoch, Rolf Apweiler, Marie-Claude Blatter, Anne Estreicher, Elisabeth Gasteiger, Maria J Martin, Karine Michoud, Claire O'Donovan, Isabelle Phan, Sandrine Pilbout, and Michel Schneider. The SWISS-PROT protein knowledgebase and its supplement TrEMBL in 2003. Nucleic Acids Res., 31(1):365–370, January 2003.
- [65] P Shannon. Cytoscape: A software environment for integrated models of biomolecular interaction networks. *Genome Research*, 13(11):2498–2504, 2003.
- [66] S Capella-Gutierrez, J M Silla-Martinez, and T Gabaldon. trimal: a tool for automated alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. *Bioinformatics*, 25(15): 1972–1973, 2009.
- [67] Alexandros Stamatakis. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics*, 30(9):1312–1313, 2014.
- [68] J P Huelsenbeck and F Ronquist. MRBAYES: Bayesian inference of phylogenetic trees. Bioinformatics, 17(8):754–755, August 2001.

- [69] Oscar Robinson, David Dylus, and Christophe Dessimoz. Phylo.io: Interactive viewing and comparison of large phylogenetic trees on the web. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 33(8): 2163–2166, 2016.
- [70] Ari Löytynoja. Phylogeny-aware alignment with PRANK. *Methods Mol. Biol.*, 1079:155–170, 2014.
- [71] C Notredame, D G Higgins, and J Heringa. T-Coffee: A novel method for fast and accurate multiple sequence alignment. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 302(1):205–217, September 2000.

Every individual alive today, even the very highest, is to be derived in an unbroken line from the first and lowest forms.

August Weismann



# Evolutionary history and Functional inference of

the Oskar protein

#### ABSTRACT

Germ line specification is a developmental process essential for the reproduction of sexually reproducing multicellular organisms. In many holometabolous insects, the gene oskar is required for the specification of the germ line. However, in hemimetabolous insects, oskar plays a role in the nervous system and not in the germ line. To better understand this gene's evolutionary history, and to generate hypotheses addressing how evolutionary changes in protein sequence could have led to changes in the function of Oskar protein, we searched for oskar orthologs in 1565 publicly available insect genomic and transcriptomic datasets, and annotated 317 previously undescribed oskar orthologs. The earliest-diverging lineage in which we identified an oskar ortholog was the order Zygentoma (silverfish and firebrats), suggesting that oskar originated before the origin of winged insects (Pterygota). We noted some order-specific trends in oskar sequence evolution, including whole gene duplications, clade-specific indels, and rapid divergence. An alignment of all 379 Oskar sequences revealed highly conserved residues with known biochemical functions in the dimerization of the LOTUS domain. Moreover, we found regions of the OSK domain with conserved predicted RNA binding potential. Furthermore, we show that despite a low overall amino acid conservation, the LOTUS domain shows higher conservation of predicted secondary structure than the OSK domain. Finally, we suggest new key amino acids in the LOTUS domain that may be involved in the previously reported Oskar-Vasa physical interaction.

#### **CONTRIBUTIONS**

This work is presented in its manuscript form. The work presented here stemmed from the internship of Savandara Besse, a brilliant master student who worked under my, and C. Extavour supervision for five months. Savandara Besse extended the scripts I wrote in Chapter 1 and created new scripts for the collection and annotation of *oskar* orthologs, she performed the first analysis including the alignments and conservation score computation. She also wrote the first version of the PyMOL visualizer plugin. She computed summary statistics on the genomes and transcriptomes. Finally she wrote the tissue and stage parsing algorithm. Cassandra G. Extavour directed the study design, funding, writing and reviewing. I, and C. Extavour proposed the original study designed and I extended and completed the work of Savandara Besse. I repeated the collection of sequences in 2019 and automatized the ortholog detection and filtering, as well as the generation of the alignments. I performed all the phylogenetic analysis presented here. I performed the MCA analysis as well as the secondary structure predictions. I extended and rewrote the scripts created by Savandara Besse for publication purposes. the manuscript and figures was primarily written by me with additions from Savandara Besse. Savandara Besse and Cassandra G. Extavour also extensively reviewed this manuscript.

# 2.1 Introduction

With the evolution of obligate multicellularity, many organisms faced a challenge considered a major evolutionary transition: allocating only some cells (germ line) to pass on their genetic material to the next generation, relegating the remainder (soma) to death upon death of the organism (reviewed in Kirk<sup>1</sup>). This is the soma-germline differentiation, where only cells from the germline will create the next generation (reviewed in Kirk<sup>1</sup>). While there are multiple mechanisms of germ cell specification, they can be grouped into two broad categories, induction or inheritance<sup>2</sup>. Under induction, cells respond to an external signal by adopting germ cell fate. Under the inheritance mechanism, maternally synthesized cytoplasmic molecules, collectively called germ plasm, are deposited in the oocyte and "inherited" by a subset of cells during early embryonic divisions. Cells inheriting these molecules commit to a germline fate<sup>2,3</sup>.

The inheritance mechanism in insects that undergo metamorphosis (Holometabola) appears to have evolved by co-option of a key gene, *oskar*<sup>4</sup>. *oskar* was first identified in forward genetic screens for axial patterning mutants in *Drosophila melanogaster*<sup>4</sup>. For the first 20 years following its discovery, *oskar* appeared to be restricted to drosophilids<sup>5</sup>. Its later discovery in the mosquitoes *Aedes aegypti* and *Anopheles gambiae*<sup>6</sup> and the wasp *Nasonia vitripennis*<sup>7</sup> suggested the hypothesis that *oskar* emerged at the base of the Holometabola, and facilitated the evolution of germ plasm in these insects<sup>7</sup>. However, our subsequent identification of *oskar* orthologues in the cricket *Gryllus bimaculatus*<sup>8</sup>, and in many additional hemimetabolous insect species<sup>9</sup>, demonstrated that *oskar* predates the Holometabola, and must be at least as old as the major radiation of insects<sup>10</sup>. Two secondary losses of *oskar* from insect genomes have also been reported, in the beetle *Tribolium castaneum*<sup>7</sup> and the honeybee *Apis mellifera*<sup>11</sup>, and neither of these insects appear to use germ plasm to establish their germ lines<sup>11,12,13,14</sup>. Whether *oskar* is ubiquitous across all insect orders, whether it is truly unique to insects, the evolutionary dynamics of the locus, remain unknown.

oskar remains, to our knowledge, the only gene that has been experimentally demonstrated to

be both necessary and sufficient to induce the formation of functional primordial germ cells<sup>3,15</sup>. Thus, in *D. melanogaster*<sup>3,4,15</sup> and potentially more broadly in holometabolous insects with germ plasm <sup>7,16</sup>, *oskar* plays an essential germ line role. However, it is clear that *oskar*'s germ line function can evolve rapidly, as even within the genus *Drosophila*, *oskar* orthologues from different species cannot always substitute for each other, <sup>17,18</sup>. Moreover, the ancestral function of this gene may have been in the nervous system rather than the germ line<sup>8</sup>. The current hypothesis is therefore that it was co-opted to play a key role in the acquisition of an inheritance-based germ line specification mechanism approximately 300 million years ago<sup>10</sup>, in the lineage leading to the Holometabola<sup>8</sup>. Thus, the case of *oskar* offers an opportunity to study the evolution of protein function at multiple levels of biological organization, from the genesis of a novel protein, through to potential co-option events and the evolution of functional variation.

Neofunctionalization often correlates with a change in the fitness landscape of the protein sequence caused by novel biochemical constraints imposed by amino acid sequence changes<sup>19,20</sup>. Such potential constraints may be revealed by analyzing the conservation of amino acids, their chemical properties, or structure at the secondary, tertiary or quaternary levels<sup>20</sup>. Oskar has two well-structured domains conserved across identified orthologues to date<sup>9</sup>: an N-terminal Helix Turn Helix (HTH) domain termed LOTUS with potential RNA binding properties<sup>21,22,23,24</sup>, and a C-terminal GDSL-lipase-like domain called OSK<sup>21,23,24</sup> (Figure 2.1). These two domains are linked by an unstructured highly variable interdomain sequence<sup>23,24,25</sup>. We previously showed that this domain structure is likely the result of a horizontal transfer event of a bacterial GDSL-lipase-like domain, followed by the fusion of this domain with a LOTUS domain in the host genome<sup>9</sup>. Biochemical assays of the properties of the LOTUS and OSK domains provide some clues as to the molecular mechanisms that Oskar uses to assemble germ plasm in *D. melanogaster*. The LOTUS domain is capable of homodimerization<sup>22,23</sup>, and directly binds and enhances the helicase activity of the ATP-dependent DEAD box helicase Vasa, a germ plasm component<sup>22</sup>. The OSK domain resembles GDSL lipases in sequence<sup>9,23,24</sup>, but is predicted to lack enzymatic activity, as the conserved amino acid triad (S200 D202 H205) that defines the active site of these lipases is not conserved in OSK<sup>21,23,24</sup>. Instead, co-purification



**Figure 2.1: Overview of the Oskar protein**. Presented in the figure is a schematic representation of the Oskar protein. Composed of two folded domains, LOTUS and OSK, separated by an interdomain sequence. Another isoform of the protein is found within some Dipteran insects called Long Oskar (as opposed to Short Oskar, the more commonly found isoform). Below the schematic representation is a rendering of the solved structures for LOTUS (PDBID: 5NT7) and OSK (PDBID: 5A4A) with a putative rendering of the unfolded interdomain region.

experiments suggest that OSK has RNA binding properties, consistent with its predicted basic surface residues<sup>23,24</sup>. Whether or how changes in the primary sequence of Oskar can explain the evolution of its molecular mechanism or tissue-specific function, remain unknown.

To date, sequences of approximately 100 *oskar* orthologues have been reported<sup>7,9,23,26</sup>. However, the vast majority of these are from the Holometabola, and it is thus unclear whether analysis of these sequences alone would have sufficient power to allow extrapolation of conservation and divergence of putative biochemical properties across insects broadly speaking. Multiple hypotheses as to the molecular mechanistic function of particular amino acids in the LOTUS and OSK domains in *D. melanogaster* have been proposed<sup>22,23,24</sup>, but without sufficient taxon sampling, the potential relevance of these mechanisms to *oskar*'s evolution and function in other insects is unclear.

Here we address these outstanding questions by applying a rigorous bioinformatic pipeline to generate the most complete collection of *oskar* sequences to date. By analysing over 1500 Pancrustacean genomes and transcriptomes, we show that *oskar* likely first arose at least 400

million years ago, before the advent of winged insects. We find that the *oskar* locus has been lost independently in some insect orders, including near-total absence from the order Hemiptera, and clarify that the absence of *oskar* from the *Bombyx mori* and *Tribolium castaneum* genomes<sup>26</sup> does not reflect a general absence of *oskar* from Lepidoptera or Coleoptera. By comparing Oskar sequences in a phylogenetic context, we reveal that distinct biophysical properties of Oskar are associated with Hemimetabola and Holometabola. We use these observations to propose testable hypotheses regarding the putative biochemical basis of evolutionary change in Oskar function across insects.

# 2.2 Methods

#### 2.2.1 EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS

This study used no animal model, nor any cell culture lines. However, it used previously generated genomic and transcriptomic datasets. All the information regarding how those datasets were generated can be found on their respective NCBI pages. The list of all the datasets used in this study can be found in the following files: *genome\_insect\_database.csv*, *transcriptome\_insect\_database.csv*, *genome\_crustacean\_database.csv*, and *transcriptome\_crustacean\_database.csv*.

# 2.2.2 Genome and transcriptome preprocessing

We collected all available genome and transcriptome datasets from the NCBI repository registered in September 2019. NCBI maintains two tiers of genomic data: RefSeq, which contains curated and annotated genomes, and GenBank, which contains non-annotated assembled genomic sequences. Transcriptomes are stored in the Transcriptome Shotgun Assembly (TSA) database, with metadata including details on their origin. To search for *oskar* orthologs in datasets retrieved from GenBank, we needed to generate *in silico* gene model predictions. We used the genome annotation tool Augustus<sup>27</sup>, which requires a Hidden Markov Model (HMM) gene model. To use HMMs producing gene models that would be as accurate as possible for non-annotated genomes, we selected the closest related species (species with the
most recent common ancestors) that possessed an annotated RefSeq genome. We then used the Augustus training tool to build an HMM gene model for each genome.

We automated this process by creating a series of python scripts that performed the tasks as follows:

- 1.1\_insect\_database\_builder.py: This script collects the NCBI metadata regarding genomes and transcriptomes. Using the NCBI Entrez API, it collects the most up to date information on RefSeq, GenBank, and TSA to generate two CSV files: genome\_insect\_database.csv and transcriptome\_insect\_database.csv
- 2) 1.2\_data\_downloader.py: This is a python wrapper around the *rsync* tool that downloads the sequence datasets present in the tables created by (1). It automatically downloads all the available information into a local folder.
- 3) 1.3\_run\_augustus\_training.py: This is a python wrapper around the Augustus training tool. It uses the metadata gathered using (1) and the sequence information gathered using (2) to build HMM gene models of all RefSeq datasets. It outputs sbatch scripts that can be run either locally, or on a SLURM-managed cluster. Those scripts will create unique HMM gene models per species.

At the time of this analysis (September 2019), 132 genomes were collected from the RefSeq database, 309 genomes from the GenBank database, and 1114 transcriptomes from the TSA database. All the accession numbers and metadata are available in the two tables (*genome\_insect\_database.csv* and *transcriptome\_insect\_database.csv*) provided in the supplementary files. This pipeline was repeated for crustaceans (this dataset was downloaded in April 2017) and the information can be found in the following two files: *genome\_crustacean\_database.csv* and *transcriptome\_crustacean\_database.csv*.

# 2.2.3 Creation of protein sequence databases

The classical approach for orthology detection compares protein sequences to amino acid HMM corresponding to the gene of interest. Since we used three different NCBI databases, we performed the following preprocessing actions:

- RefSeq: well-annotated genomes from NCBI contain gene model translation; no extra processing was required.
- 2) GenBank: Using the HMMs created from the RefSeq databases, we created gene models for each GenBank genome using Augustus and a custom HMM gene model. To choose which HMM gene model to use, we selected the one for each insect order that had the highest training accuracy. In the case where an insect order did not have any member in the RefSeq database, we used the model of the most closely related order. We then translated the inferred coding sequences to create a protein database for each genome. The assignment of the models used to infer the proteins of each GenBank genome is available in the Table\_S2.csv. To automate the process, we created a custom python script available in the file 1.4\_run\_augustus.py.
- 3) TSA: Transcriptomes were translated using the emboss tool Transeq<sup>28</sup>. We used this tool with the default parameters, except for the 6 frame translation, trim and clean flags. This generated amino acid sequences for each transcript and each potential reading frame.

# 2.2.4 Identification of oskar orthologs

The *oskar* gene is composed of two conserved domains, LOTUS and OSK, separated by a highly variable interdomain linker sequence<sup>23,24,25</sup>. To our knowledge, no other gene reported in any domain of life possesses a similar domain composition<sup>9</sup>. Therefore, here we use the same definition of *oskar* orthology as in our previous work, a sequence possessing a LOTUS domain followed by an interdomain region, and then an OSK domain<sup>9</sup>. To maximize the number of potential orthologs, we searched each sequence with the previously generated HMM for the LOTUS and OSK domains<sup>9</sup>. The presence and order of each domain were then verified for each potential hit and only sequences with the previously defined Oskar structure were kept for further processing. We used the HMMER 3.1 tool suite to build the domain HMM (*hmmbuild* with default parameters), and then searched the generated protein databases (see *Creation of protein sequence databases* above) using those models (*hmmsearch* with default parameters). Hits

with an E value >= 0.05 were discarded.

All the hits were then aligned with *hmmalign* with default parameters and the HMM of the full-length Oskar alignment previously generated<sup>9</sup>. The resulting sequences were automatically processed to remove assembly artifacts, and potential isoforms. This filtration step was automated and went as follows: First, the sequences were grouped by taxa. Then each group of sequences was aligned using Muscle<sup>29</sup> with default parameters. The Hamming distance<sup>30</sup>, a metric that computes the number of different letters between two strings, between each sequence in the alignment was computed. If any group of sequences had a hamming distance of >80%, then we only kept the sequence with the lowest E-value match. This created a set of sequences containing multiple *oskar* orthologs per species only, if they were the likely product of a gene duplication event. We then used the resulting new alignment to generate a new domain HMM and a new full-length Oskar HMM (using *hmmbuild* with default parameters), and ran further iterations of this detection pipeline until we could detect no new *oskar* orthologs in the available sequence datasets. We called this final set, the **filtered set** of sequences, and used it in all subsequent orthology analyses unless otherwise specified.

The Oskar sequences obtained are available in the following supplementary files: Oskar\_filtered.aligned.fasta, Oskar\_filtered.fasta and Oskar\_consensus.hmm.

The domain definitions for the LOTUS and OSK domains are available in the following supplementary files: *Oskar\_filtered.aligned.LOTUS\_domain.fasta*, *LOTUS\_consensus.hmm*, *Oskar\_filtered.aligned.OSK\_domain.fasta*, *OSK\_consensus.hmm*. (See 1.5\_Oskar\_tracker.ipynb)

# 2.2.5 Correlative analysis of assembly quality and absence of oskar

Using the metadata gathered previously (see *Genomes and transcriptomes preprocessing* above) we created two pools of source data: genomes where we found an *oskar* sequence, and genomes where we failed to find a sequence that met our orthology criteria. We then compared the two distributions for each of the 8 available assembly statistics: (1) Contig and (2) Scaffold N50, (3) Contig and (4) Scaffold L50, (5) Contig and (6) Scaffold counts, and (7) Number of Contigs and (8) Scaffolds per genome length. Finally, we performed a Mann-Whitney U statistical analysis to

compare the means of the two distributions. (See 2.1\_Oskar\_discovery\_quality.ipynb)

# 2.2.6 TSA metadata parsing and curation

Datasets in the TSA database are associated with a biosample object that contains all the metadata surrounding the RNA sequencing acquisitions. These metadata can include one of both the tissue of origin and the organism's developmental stage. We first automated the retrieval of these metadata using a custom python script that used the NCBI Entrez API (see **2.3\_Oskar\_tissues\_stages.ipynb**). However, the metadata proved to be complex to parse: (1) not all projects had the data entered in the corresponding tag, (2) some data contain typographical errors, and (3) multiple synonyms used to describe the same thing with different words in different datasets. We, therefore, created a custom parsing and cleaning pipeline that corrected mistakes, and aggregated them into a cohesive set of unique terms that we thought would be most informative to interpret the presence or absence of *oskar* orthologs (see

**2.3\_Oskar\_tissues\_stages.ipynb** to see the mapping table). This strategy sacrificed some of the fine-grained information contained in custom metadata (for example "right leg" became "leg"), but allowed us to analyze the expression of *oskar* uniformly throughout all the datasets. This pipeline generated, for all available datasets, a table of tissues, and developmental stages (see **Oskar\_all\_tissues\_stages.csv**).

# 2.2.7 Dimensionality reduction of Oskar alignment sequence space

The Oskar alignment was subjected to a Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA). Similar to a PCA, dimension vectors are first computed to maximize the spread of the underlying data in the new dimensions, except that instead of a continuous dataset, each variable (here an amino acid at a given position) participates to the continuous value on that dimension. Once the projection vectors are computed, each sequence is then mapped onto the dimensions. Each amino acid position (column) in the alignment was considered a dimension with a possible value set of 21 (20 amino acids and gap). We first removed the columns of low-information (columns that had less than 30% amino acid occupancy) using *trimal*<sup>31</sup> with a cutoff parameter set at 0.3. Then, the alignment was then decomposed into its eigenvectors, and projected to the first 3 components.

To perform this decomposition, we implemented a previously developed preprocessing method <sup>32</sup> in a python script (see *MCA.py* and *2.8\_Oskar\_MCA\_Analysis.ipynb*) and performed the eigenvector decomposition with the previously developed MCA python library (see *Key resource table*). We ran the same algorithm on the LOTUS domain, OSK domain, and full-length Oskar alignments obtained above (see *Identification of oskar orthologs above*).

# 2.2.8 Phylogenetic inference of Oskar sequences in the Hymenopteran

We aligned all Oskar Hymenopteran sequences using PRANK<sup>33</sup> with default parameters. We then used the result of the filtering steps presented in *Identification of oskar orthologs* to detect duplicated *oskar* sequences. If two or more oskar sequence were present within the same specie we annotated them as duplicated. We trimmed this alignment to remove all columns with less than 50% occupancy using trimal with the cutoff parameter set at 0.5. To reconstruct the phylogeny of these sequences, we used the maximum likelihood inference software RAxML<sup>34</sup> with a gamma-distributed protein model, and activated the flag for auto model selection. We ran 1000 bootstraps and then visualized and annotated the obtained tree with Ete3<sup>35</sup> in a custom ipython notebook (see **2.7\_Oskar\_duplication.ipynb**).

# 2.2.9 Calculation of Oskar conservations scores

Using the large set of orthologous Oskar sequences we obtained as described above, we computed different conservation scores for each amino acid position. This methodology relies on the hypotheses that if an amino acid, or the chemical properties associated with it, at a particular position in the sequence is important for the structure and / or function of the protein, they will be conserved across evolution. We considered multiple conservation metrics, each highlighting a particular aspect of the protein properties : (1) Mixed biochemical properties conservation scores with the Valdar<sup>36</sup> and Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD)<sup>37,38</sup> scores (2) Electrostatic charge conservation (3) Hydrophobicity conservation (4) RNA Binding prediction conservation (5) Secondary structure prediction conservation. While we report the JSD score in the table, we did not use it for the analysis presented in this study. The scores can be found in the supplementary file: *scores.csv*.

#### Computation of the Valdar score

The Valdar score attempts to account for transition probabilities, stereochemical properties, amino acid frequency gaps, and, essential for this study, sequence weighting. Due to the heterogeneity for sequence dataset availability, most Oskar sequences occupy only a small portion of insect diversity, primarily Hymenoptera, and Diptera. Sequence weighting allows for the normalization of the influence of each sequence on the score based on how many similar sequences are present in the alignment<sup>36</sup>. We implemented the algorithm described in Valdar<sup>36</sup> in a python script (see *besse\_blondel\_conservation\_scores.py*), then calculated the conservation scores for the Oskar alignment we generated above.

### Computation of the Jensen-Shannon Divergence score

Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD) uses the amino acid properties and stereochemical properties altogether to infer the "amount" of evolutionary pressure an amino acid position is subject to. This score uses an information theory approach by measuring how much information (in bits) any position in the alignment brings to the overall alignment<sup>37</sup>. This score also takes into account neighboring amino acids in calculating the importance of each amino acid. We used previously published python code to calculate the JSD of our previously generated Oskar alignment<sup>37</sup> (see *score\_conservation.py*).

#### Computation of the Conservation Bias

The measure of differences in conservation between the holometabolous and hemimetabolous Oskar sequences presented in the results was done as follows. We first split the alignment into two groups containing the sequences from each clade (see **2.4\_Oskar\_pgc\_specification.ipynb**). Due to the high heterogeneity in taxa sampling between hemimetabolous and holometabolous insects, we ran a bootstrapped approximation of the conservation scores on holometabolous sequences. We randomly selected N sequences (N = the number of hemimetabolous sequences), computed the Valdar conservation score (see *Computation of the Valdar score above*), and stored it. After 1000 iterations, we computed the mean conservation score for each position for holometabolous sequences. For hemimetabolous sequences, we directly calculated the Valdar

score using the method as described above (see *Computation of the Valdar score*). For each position, we then computed what we refer to as the "conservation bias" between holometabola and hemimetabola by taking the ratio of the log of the conservation score holometabola and hemimetabola. *ConservationBias* =  $\frac{\log Valdar_{helo}}{\log Valdar_{hemi}}$  for each position. (see

## 3.4\_LogRatio\_Bootstrap.ipynb)

### Computation of the electrostatic conservation score

To study the conservation of electrostatic properties of the Oskar protein we computed our own implementation of an electrostatic conservation score (see

*besse\_blondel\_conservation\_scores.py*). Aspartic acid and Glutamic acid were given a score of -1, Arginine and Lysine a score of 1, and Histidine a score of 0.5. All other amino acids were given a score of 0. Then, we summed the electrostatic score for each sequence at each position, and divided this raw score by the total number of sequences in the alignment. This computation assigns a score between -1 and 1 at each position, -1 being a negative charge conserved across all sequences, and 1 a positive charge.

### Computation of the hydrophobic conservation score

To study the conservation of hydrophobic properties of the Oskar protein we implemented our own hydrophobic conservation score (see *besse\_blondel\_conservation\_scores.py*). At each position, each amino acid was given a hydrophobic score taken from a previously published scoring table<sup>39</sup> (This table is implemented in the *besse\_blondel\_conservation\_score.py* file for simplicity). Scores at each position were then averaged across all sequences. This metric allowed us to measure the hydrophobicity conservation of each position in the alignment, and is bounded between 5.39 and -2.20.

## Computation of the RNA binding affinity score

RNA binding sites are defined as areas with positively charged residues and hydrophobic residues. To estimate the conservation of RNA binding sites in *oskar* orthologs, we used RNABindR<sup>40</sup>, an algorithm predicting putative RNA binding sites based on sequence information only. We automated the calculation for each sequence by writing a python script

that submitted a request to the RNABindR web service (see **RNABindR\_run\_predictions.py**). We then aggregated all results into a scoring matrix, and averaged the score obtained for each position. We call this score the RNABindR score, and hypothesize that it reflects the conservation of RNA binding properties of the protein. Importantly, this score was obtained in 2017 for only a subset of 219 proteins used in this study. Since then, the RNABindR server has been defunct and we could not repeat those measurements as the source code for this software is unavailable.

#### Computation of secondary structure conservation

Due to the overall low conservation of the LOTUS domain, we decided to see whether the secondary structure was conserved. To this end, we used the secondary structure prediction algorithm JPred  $4^{41}$ , a tool which, given an amino acid sequence, returns a positional prediction for a-helix,  $\beta$ -sheet or unstructured. We used the JPred4 web servers to compute the predictions and processed them into a secondary structure alignment (see

**2.6\_Oskar\_lotus\_osk\_structures.ipynb**). We then used WebLogo<sup>42</sup> to visualize the conservation of the secondary structure.

## 2.2.10 Visualization of conservation scores

We used Pymol<sup>43</sup> to look at the different computed conservation scores mapped onto the solved structures of LOTUS and OSK<sup>22,23</sup>. At the time of writing, no full-length Oskar protein structure had been reported. With the caveat that all visualization was done on the structure of the *Drosophila melanogaster* protein, we created a custom python script that augments pymol with automatic display and coloring capacities. This script is available as

*Oskar\_pymol\_visualization.py*, and contains a manual at the beginning of the file. For the OSK domain, we used the structure PDBID: 5A4A, and for the LOTUS domain, PDBID: 5NT7<sup>22,23</sup>. The LOTUS structure we used is in complex with Vasa, and in a dimeric form<sup>22</sup>, allowing for easy interpretation of the different conservation scores. For the OSK structure, we removed the residues 399-401 and 604-606 from the PDB file as those amino acids did not align across all sequences and therefore showed highly biased conservation scores.

# 2.2.11 QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

## Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using the scipy stats module (<u>https://www.scipy.org/</u>). Significance thresholds for p-values were set at 0.05. Statistical tests and p-values are reported in the figure legends. All statistical tests can be found in the ipython notebooks mentioned below.

## 2.2.12 DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY

The study generated a series of python3 script and python 3 ipython notebook files that perform the entire analysis. All the results presented in this paper can be reproduced by running the aforementioned python3 code. The primary data, *oskar* orthologs, Oskar alignments, trees, and conservation statistics as well as the code created and used are available as supplementary information. For ease of access, legibility, and reproducibility, the code and datasets have been deposited in a GitHub repository available at https://github.com/extavourlab/Oskar\_Orthologs

## 2.2.13 KEY RESOURCES TABLE

## Software and libraries

All software and libraries used in this study are published under open source libre licenses and are therefore available to any researchers.

Туре	Name	Version	Source
Software	HMMER	3.1.b2	http://hmmer.org/
Software	Pymol	1.8.x	https://pymol.org
Software	rsync	3.1.2	http://rsync.samba.org/
Software	Python3	3.7	https://www.python.org/
Software	Mrbayes	3.2.6	http://nbisweden.github.io/MrBayes/
Software	trimal	1.2rev59	http://trimal.cgenomics.org/
Software	transeq	6.6.0.0	http://emboss.sourceforge.net/
Software	augustus	2.5.5	http://augustus.gobics.de/

Туре	Name	Version	Source
Software	JPred4	4.0	http://www.compbio.dundee.ac.uk/jpred/
Software	RNABindR	2.0	http://ailab1.ist.psu.edu/RNABindR/
Software	Inkscape	0.92.3	https://inkscape.org/
Library	jupyter	4.4.0	https://jupyter.org/
Library	ete3	3.3.1	http://etetoolkit.org
Library	pandas	0.25.1	https://pandas.pydata.org/
Library	mca	1.0.3	https://pypi.org/project/mca/
Library	fuzzywuzzy	0.17.0	https://github.com/seatgeek/fuzzywuzzy
Library	BeautifulSoup4	4.6.3	https://pypi.org/project/beautifulsoup4/
Library	biopython	1.74	https://pypi.org/project/biopython/
Library	numpy	1.16.2	https://www.numpy.org/
Library	seaborn	0.9.0	https://seaborn.pydata.org/
Library	matplotlib	3.0.0	https://matplotlib.org/
Library	scipy	1.1.0	https://www.scipy.org/
Library	progressbar	3.38.0	https://github.com/niltonvolpato/python-progressbar

# 2.3 Results

# 2.3.1 HMM-based discovery pipeline yields hundreds of novel *oskar* orthologs

We wished to study the evolution of the *oskar* gene sequence as comprehensively as possible across all insects. To expand our previous collection of nearly 100 orthologous sequences<sup>9</sup>, we designed a new bioinformatics pipeline to scan and search for *oskar* orthologs across all 1565 NCBI insect transcriptomes and genomes that were publicly available at the time of analysis (Figure 2.2; see Methods: *Genome and transcriptome pre-processing* for NCBI accession numbers and additional information). First, we used the HMMER tool suite to build HMM models for each of the LOTUS and OSK domains, using our previously generated multiple sequence

alignments (MSA)<sup>9</sup>. We subjected genomes to *in silico* gene model inference using Augustus<sup>27</sup>. We translated the resulting predicted transcripts, as well as the predicted transcripts from RNA-seq datasets, in all six frames. We then scanned the resulting protein sequences for the presence of LOTUS and OSK domains using the aforementioned HMM models. Sequences were designated as *oskar* orthologs based on the same criteria as in our previous study<sup>9</sup>, namely, sequences containing both a LOTUS and OSK domain<sup>23</sup>, separated by a variable interdomain region. We then aligned all sequences using *hmmalign* and the HMM derived from our previously published full length Oskar alignment<sup>9</sup>, and manually curated sequence duplicates and sequences that did not align correctly.

With these methods, we recovered a total of 379 unique *oskar* sequences from 350 unique species, 317 of which were previously unannotated. To our knowledge, this comprises the largest collection of *oskar* orthologs described to date. To determine if *oskar* orthologues might predate Insecta, we applied the discovery pipeline to all 31 non-insect pancrustacean genomes and 266 transcriptomes available at the time of analysis (see methods: *Genomes and transcriptomes preprocessing* for complete list). However, we did not recover any non-insect sequences meeting our criteria for *oskar* orthologs (Figure 2.3), strongly suggesting that *oskar* is restricted to the insect lineage<sup>7,25</sup>.

We found that 58% of RefSeq genomes, 31% of GenBank genomes, and 19% of transcriptomes analysed contained predicted *oskar* orthologs (Table B.1 and Figure B.1a). Given that detection of putative orthologs is highly dependent on the quality of the genome assembly and annotation, we asked whether there were differences in the assembly statistics of genomes with and without predicted *oskar* orthologs. We observed a significant difference in N50, L50, number of contigs and number of scaffolds between genomes lacking *oskar* hits and those where *oskar* was found (Mann-Withney U test p-value < 0.05). Genomes where we did not find *oskar* showed a higher contig (255015 vs 43280) and scaffold count (182706 vs 23596), a smaller N50 for contigs (324036bp vs 726696bp) and scaffolds (2636825bp vs 5695299bp), a larger L50 for contigs (40955 vs 3701) and scaffolds (27269 vs 1500), and a larger number of contigs (0.00060 vs 0.00017) or scaffolds (0.00045 vs 0.00009) per genome length, than genomes where we detected an *oskar* ortholog (as shown in Figure B.2).

**Figure 2.2** (following page): Presentation of the oskar ortholog detection pipeline. Sequences were collected automatically from the three NCBI databases, Genbank (GCA), RefSeq (GCF) and Transcriptome Shotgun Assemblies (TSA). RefSeq genomes were used to generate augustus gene model HMM which were used to annotate and predict proteins in the GenBank non annotated genomes. Transcripts from the TSA database were 6-frame translated using TRANSEQ. Amino acid sequences were consolidated into three protein databases. *hmmsearch* from the HMMER tool suite was used to search for LOTUS and OSK hits in those sequences. Sequences with both a LOTUS and OSK hit with a E-value < 0.05 were kept and annotated as Oksar sequences. Sequences were then cleaned to remove duplicates (sequences with > 80% sequence similarity coming from the same organism). Remaining sequences were then aligned using hmmalign, and the process was repeated until no new sequences were found. Finally, the sequences were consolidated with the dataset metadata into the *oskar* ortholog database that is used for the rest of the analysis.

Figure 2.2: (continued)

# **1** Collect available sequences datasets from NCBI and generate amino acid sequences databases



**Figure 2.3** (*following page*): Summary of *oskar* distribution and expression in insects. Phylogeny from Misof et al. <sup>10</sup>. In order from left to right: Color code for the insect order, if grey, no *oskar* was found in this order. Number of dataset searched. Proportion and absolute number of *oskar* sequences found. Proportion and absolute number of *oskar* sequences found in RefSeq datasets. Proportion and absolute number of *oskar* sequences found in Genbank datasets. Proportion and absolute number of *oskar* sequences found in tissue related to germline (reproductive organs + eggs). *oskar* sequences found in tissue related to the brain (neuronal, brain and head). *oskar* sequences found in an egg transcriptome. *oskar* sequences found in a nymph/juvenile transcriptome. *oskar* sequences found in an adult transcriptome. All numbers represented here can be found in the Table B.1.





## 2.3.2 oskar predates the divergence of Ametabola and other insects

We found *oskar* orthologs in 14 of the 29 generally recognized <sup>10</sup> insect orders, including six holometabolous orders, seven hemimetabolous orders, and one ametabolous order. This result is consistent with our previous finding that *oskar* predates the origins of the Holometabola<sup>8,9,25</sup>. The novel finding of an *oskar* ortholog from the silverfish *Atelura formicaria* (Zygomenta) allows us to date back the origin of *oskar* further than previous analyses, to at least 420 million years ago<sup>10</sup>, before the divergence of Ametabola from the remaining insect lineages.

We then explored the distribution of *oskar* sequences across insect phylogeny. Interestingly, we found multiple lineages where *oskar* appeared to have been lost independently, including confirming the previously reported<sup>7</sup> losses from the genomes of the red flour beetle *Tribolium castaneum*, the honeybee *Apis mellifera*, and the silk moth *Bombyx mori* (Figure 2.3). Notably, within Lepidoptera we found *oskar* orthologues in only four species, despite the fact that we searched 232 available lepidopteran sequence datasets (Figure 2.3 and Figure B.3), including 17 well-annotated RefSeq genomes, and 135 transcriptomes. In principle, this apparent widespread absence of *oskar* in Lepidoptera could be due to unusually rapid evolution of the *oskar* sequence in this lineage, which might render lepidopteran *oskar* orthologues undetectable by our methods. However, we note that the only four lepidopteran orthologs we detected all belonged to species of the basally branching *Adelidae* and *Palaephatidae* families. We therefore favor the interpretation that *oskar* was lost from a last common ancestor of *Meessiidae* and *Palaphaetidae*, approximately 180 million years ago, with the consequence that the majority of extant lepidopteran lineages lack an *oskar* ortholog (Figure B.3)<sup>44,45</sup>.

The Hemiptera also appear to have lost *oskar*, based on our analysis of the 222 datasets available for this clade, including 12 RefSeq genomes and 192 transcriptomes. However, we did identify an *oskar* ortholog in the Thysanoptera, which is a hemipteran sister group<sup>10</sup>. Finally, we found *oskar* orthologs in only four of the 11 orders of the Polyneoptera for which data were available. With the exception of Mantodea (13 transcriptomes), the four orders with detectable *oskar* sequences all had more than 10 available sequence datasets (Plecoptera: 3 genome; 8 transcriptomes, Orthoptera: 3 genomes; 28 transcriptomes, Phasmatodea: 13 genomes; 31

transcriptomes, Blattodea: 5 genomes; 51 transcriptomes). The remaining six orders had fewer than eight datasets each available for analysis (Figure 2.3; Table B.1), which could account for the apparent paucity of *oskar* genes in this clade. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that *oskar* in these lineages may have diverged beyond our ability to detect it, or that it may have been lost multiple times, as observed for multiple holometabolous orders.

As well as multiple convergent losses of *oskar*, we also uncovered evidence for independent instances of duplication of the oskar locus. We defined a putative duplication instance as two or more oskar sequences (possessing both a LOTUS and OSK domain as per our definition) in the same species that shared less than 80% of sequence similarity. All of these events were detected within the Hymenoptera. We therefore performed a phylogenetic analysis of the hymenopteran sequences to test the hypothesis that these were the result of duplication events (Figure 2.4; Figure B.4). Our analysis of recovered previously published hymenopteran phylogenic relationships<sup>46</sup>. We found that oskar was duplicated in the four *Figitidae* species studied, a family of parasitoid wasps. Moreover, one out of two Cynipidae species, as well as the only *Ceraphronidae* species examined, also harbored a duplicated *oskar* sequence. This suggests that a duplication of oskar occurred in the common ancestor of those three families. Multiple oskar duplications were also found in the Chalcid wasps (Chalcidoidea families), notably in the Mymaridae (three out of four species), the Eupelmidae (two out of three species), the Aphelinidae (two out of two species) and the Pteromalidae (one out of twelve species). A duplication of oskar in a common ancestor of the Chalcid wasps is more likely than multiple duplication events. Finally, two isolated duplication events were found in the Aculeata, one in the Vespidae family in the wasp Polistes fuscatus, and one in the Formicidae in the red imported fire ant Solenopsis invicta.



**Figure 2.4: Phylogeny reconstruction of hymenopteran Oskar sequences.** Phylogenetic tree inferred using RaxML with 100 bootstrap. Each leaf is an Oskar ortholog. In gray, only one Oskar sequence was found in this species, in red duplicated Oskars sequences (sequence similarity < 80%). Only the families which displayed a putative duplication are shown here, see Figure B.4 for complete hymenopteran phylogeny.

# 2.3.3 Evidence for oskar expression in multiple somatic tissues

In studied insects to date, oskar is expressed and required in one or both of the germ line<sup>3,6,7</sup> or the nervous system (the cricket G. bimaculatus<sup>8</sup> and the fruit fly D. melanogaster<sup>47</sup>). We asked whether these expression patterns could be generalized across the insects studied here. To this end, we downloaded all available metadata for the transcriptomes analysed here, to obtain information on the source tissues and developmental stages. We obtained these data for 371 out of the 1164 transcriptomes in our analysis, including both Holometabolous and Hemimetabolous orders. To first explore the distribution of oskar expression in the brain and the germline, we binned the different tissues reported in the metadata into two categories, brain or germline. This was done independently of the developmental stage (if that information was included in the metadata) by creating a mapping table and checking the extracted tissues against this table (see Methods: TSA metadata parsing and curation). We then cross referenced our orthology detection with these metadata. We found evidence for oskar expression in the germ line of four orders (Phasmatodea, Hymenoptera, Coleoptera and Diptera), and in the brain of five orders (Orthoptera, Blattodea, Hymenoptera, Coleoptera, Diptera) (see Methods: TSA metadata parsing and curation for details on keyword extractions). In addition, we found evidence of oskar expression in a number of somatic tissues not previously implicated in studies of oskar expression and function. These tissues included the midgut (Polistes fuscatus, Sitophilus oryzae), fat body (Polistes fuscatus, Arachnocampa luminosa), salivary gland (Culex tarsalis, Anopheles aquasalis, Leptinotarsa decemlineata), venom gland (Culicoides sonorensis, Fopius arisanus), and silk gland (Bactrocera cucurbitae) (Figure B.5). In terms of developmental stage, only holometabolous insects appeared to express oskar during embryonic, larval or nymphal stages; for all other insects, oskar was detected in transcriptomes derived from adults (Figure 2.3). However, it is important to note that for most species, transcriptomes are available only from adult tissues, rather than from a full range of developmental stages (Figure B.5). We therefore cannot rule out the possibility that oskar expression at pre-adult stages is also a feature of multiple Hemimetabola. Indeed, we previously reported that oskar is expressed and required in the embryonic nervous system of a cricket, a hemimetabolous insect<sup>8</sup>.

# 2.3.4 LOTUS and OSK evolved differently between hemimetabolous and holometabolous insects

The fact that an oskar-dependent germ plasm mode of germ line specification mechanism is found only in holometabolous insects suggests that oskar may have been co-opted in this clade for this function (discussed in Ewen-Campen et al.<sup>48</sup>). Under this hypothesis, evolution of the oskar sequence in the lineage leading to the Holometabola may have changed the physico-chemical properties of Oskar protein, such that it acquired germ plasm nucleation abilities in these insects. To test this hypothesis, we asked whether there were particular sequence features associated with Oskar proteins from holometabolous insects, in which Oskar can assemble germ plasm, and hemimetabolous insects, which lack germ plasm. In particular, we assessed the differential conservation of amino acids at particular positions across Oskar, and asked if these might be predicted to change the physico-chemical properties of Oskar in specific ways that could potentially be relevant to germ plasm nucleation. We decided to use the Valdar score<sup>36</sup> as the main conservation indicator for this study (Supplementary File *scores.csv*). The Valdar score accounts not only for transition probabilities, stereochemical properties and amino acid frequency gaps, but also for the availability of sequence diversity in the dataset. It computes a weighted score, where less represented sequences participate to a greater effect to the score than overrepresented sequences. Due to the highly unbalanced sampling between hemimetabolous and holometabolous sequences the choice of a weighted score was necessary to not bias the results towards insect orders such as Dipteran or Hymenopteran. In order to study the difference between Hemimetabolous and Holometabolous sequences, we did not use the Valdar score directly, but instead computed the conservation ratio between both groups for each position; which we call the Conservation bias (See Methods: Computation of the Conservation Bias). We plotted the conservation bias on the solved three-dimensional crystal structure of the LOTUS and OSK domain<sup>23,24</sup> to ask whether specific functionally relevant structures showed phylogenetic or other patterns of residue conservation (Figure 2.5).

First, we asked if the overall conservation score of the domains was different between holometabolous and hemimetabolous sequences. We observed that the conservation bias for

the LOTUS domain was centered around a mean of 1.00, indicating that both holometabolous and hemimetabolous displayed a similar conservation of the LOTUS domain (Figure 2.5a). For the OSK domain however, the conservation bias was centered around 0.84, indicating that the hemimetabolous sequences displayed a higher level of conservation compared to holometabolous sequences (Figure 2.5a). We then looked at the conservation bias scores *in-situ* on the LOTUS domain structure. We asked if the amino acids of the  $\beta$  sheets of the LOTUS domain thought to be involved in dimerization of the protein<sup>23</sup> displayed conservation bias. Both  $\beta$  sheets had an overall even bias (mean: 1.03 and 1.05 for  $\beta$ 1 and  $\beta$ 2 respectively) between both groups (Figure 2.5b). Second, as we had observed that the OSK domain had an overall biased conservation, with hemimetabolous OSK showing a higher conservation overall, we asked if there were any clear pattern of conservation bias in the structure(Figure 2.5a and b). Some of the secondary structures showed a differential conservation ( $\alpha_2$ : 0.54,  $\alpha_6$ : 0.42,  $\beta_2$ : 0.52), whereas the other structures were within less than 0.1 of the median value for OSK. Moreover, we observed a large pocket of amino acids showing a conservation bias towards hemimetabolous sequences located on the surface of OSK (Figure 2.5c). This particular area contains the previously reported important amino acids for the RNA binding function of OSK<sup>23,24</sup> namely, R442, R436 and R576. Surprisingly, when we looked at the differences in electrostatic conservation between holometabolous and hemimetabolous sequences, we noticed that the electrostatic properties at those positions were conserved in the holometabolous sequences R436:0.36, R442:0.29 and R576:0.81 (Figure 2.5d).

#### Figure 2.5 (following page): Differential conservation of amino acids between hemimetabolous and holometabolous se-

**quences.** In **a**), boxplot showing the conservation bias between hemimetabolous and holometabolous sequences. Represented are the conservation bias for each of the two domains of Oskar. Statistical difference tested using MannWhitney U test (p < 0.05). In **b**), cartoon representation of LOTUS (PDBID: 5NT7) and OSK (PDBID: 5A4A) where each amino acid is colored by its conservation bias. In **c and d**), protein surface representation of the OSK (PDBID: 5A4A) domain. Circled with black dash lines are the three amino acids reported previously to be necessary for OSK binding to RNA in *D. melanogaster*<sup>23,24</sup>. In **c**), amino acids are colored by their conservation bias. In cyan, amino acids show higher conservation in hemimetabolous sequences while in purple they are more conserved in holometabolous sequences. In **d**), amino acids are colored by their electrostatic conservation score. On the left, hemimetabolous sequences and on the right holometabolous sequences.



To gain further insight into the differences in conservation across insects, we reduced the multiple sequence alignment dimensionality using a Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA), an equivalent of PCA for categorical variables<sup>49</sup>. We performed the dimensionality reduction for the full length Oskar sequence alignment as well as for the LOTUS and OSK alignments (Figure B.6). Interestingly, we found that most of the variance in sequence space was due to dipterans and hymenopterans (Figure B.6). When we considered the OSK domain only, we found clusters of *Drosophilidae*, *Culicidae* and *Formicidae* sequences (Figure B.6). This clustering is also reflected for the LOTUS domain, where the *Drosophilidae* and *Culicidae* contribute to a high amount of variance in the first MCA dimension. However, for the LOTUS domain, the *Formicidae* sequences do not cluster away from other Oskar sequences (Figure B.6). This suggests that the LOTUS domain of Diptera diverged in sequence between *Drosophilidae* and *Culicidae*.

Finally, we examined the origins and evolutionary dynamics of Oskar isoforms. *D. melanogaster* has two isoforms of Oskar<sup>50</sup>: Short Oskar, containing the LOTUS, OSK and interdomain, and Long Oskar, containing all domains of Short Oskar as well as an additional 5' domain (Figure B.7). It was previously reported that Long Oskar was absent from *N. vitripennis* and *C. pipiens*<sup>7</sup>, and within our alignment of Oskar sequences we could only detect the Long Oskar isoform within Diptera. Therefore, using our dataset, we asked when these two isoforms had evolved. We selected the dipteran sequences from our Oskar alignment and then grouped the sequences by family. We plotted the amino acid occupancy at each alignment position (Figure B.7). We found that Long Oskar predates the Drosophilids, being found as early as the *Pinpunculidae* (Figure B.7). Moreover, following the evolution of the Long Oskar isoform, the Long Oskar domain was conserved in all families except for the *Glossinidae* and *Scathophagidae*. However, given that we found only eight and two Oskar sequences for these families respectively, we cannot eliminate the possibility that apparent absence of the Long Oskar domain in these groups reflects our small sample size, rather than true evolutionary loss.

# 2.3.5 Evidence for evolution of stronger dimerization potential of the Oskar LOTUS domain in Holometabola

The LOTUS domain dimerizes *in vitro* through electrostatic and hydrophobic contacts of Arg215 of the  $\beta$ 2 sheet and Thr195, Asp197 and Leu200 of the a2 helix<sup>23,24</sup>. To date, however, the biological significance of Oskar dimerization remains unknown. Moreover, the dimerization of the LOTUS domain does not appear to be conserved across all Oskar sequences<sup>23</sup>. Specifically, ten LOTUS domains from non-drosophilid species were tested for dimerization, and only LOTUS domains from *Drosophilidae*, *Tephritidae* and *Pteromalidae* formed homodimers<sup>23</sup>. The other sequences tested, from *Culicidae*, *Formicidae* and *Gryllidae*, remained monomeric under the tested conditions<sup>23</sup>. We selected the LOTUS sequences in our alignment from those six families and placed them into one of two groups, dimeric and monomeric LOTUS, under the assumption that any sequence from that family would conserve the dimerization (or absence thereof) properties previously reported<sup>23</sup>. We asked whether we could detect any evolutionary changes in protein sequence between the two groups, by looking at different properties of known important dimerization interfaces and residues in our sequence alignment<sup>23</sup>.

In the *D. melanogaster* structure, two key amino acids, D197 and R215, are predicted to form hydrogen bonds that stabilize the dimer<sup>23</sup>. We found that in the dimer group, the electrostatic properties of these two amino acids are highly conserved (-0.75 for D197 and 0.81 for R215), while in the monomer group the electrostatic interaction is not conserved (0.03 for D197 and -0.11 for R215) (Figure 2.6e). Given the differential conservation between the two groups, our results support the previous finding that disrupting this interaction prevents the dimerization<sup>23</sup>. L200 was previously hypothesized to stabilize the interface via hydrophobic forces<sup>23</sup>. We observed that the hydrophobicity of this residue is highly conserved in the dimer group (L200: 0.89), but that in the monomer group this residue is hydrophilic (L200: 2.33) (Figure 2.6f). In sum, our analyses show that key amino acids in the LOTUS domain evolved differently in distinct insect lineages, in a way that may explain why some insect LOTUS domains dimerize and some do not.

**Figure 2.6** (following page): **Conservation analysis of the LOTUS domain.** in **a**), cartoon rendering of the LOTUS domain in complex with Vasa (PDBID: 5NT7) from two different angles. Each amino acid is colored based on its Valdar conservation score. The  $\alpha$  helix and  $\beta$  sheets are displayed on top of the structure. In yellow is the Vasa protein. In **b**" **and c**"), Logo of the  $\alpha$ 5 and  $\alpha$ 2 helix resp. generated with Weblogo. In black are hydrophobic residues, in blue charged residues, and in green polar residues. In **b**, **b**'), close up of the conserved  $\alpha$ 5 helix, with key amino acids displayed as sticks and colored by Valdar conservation score. Two potential contacts are highlighted with dashed lines, namely: H227 and Q235. In **c**, **c**'), close up of the conserved  $\alpha$ 2 helix, with key amino acids displayed as sticks and colored by hydrophily conservation score. In **d**), surface mesh rendering colored with the RNABindR RNA binding conservation score. In **e**, **f**), close up of the LOTUS  $\beta$  sheet dimerization interface. On the left is the conservation in the monomeric LOTUS and on the right in the dimeric LOTUS. In **e**), Amino acids are colored by electrostatic conservation score. Highlighted with dashed lines is the key electrostatic interaction stabilizing the dimerization. In **f**), Amino acids are colored by hydrophobicity conservation scores. Highlighted with dashed lines is the key electrostatic interaction stabilizing the dimerization.

#### Figure 2.6: (continued)



## 2.3.6 Conservation of the Oskar-Vasa interaction interface

Next, we asked whether we could detect differential conservation of the LOTUS-Vasa interface. It was previously reported that the LOTUS domain acts as an interaction domain with Vasa, a key protein in the establishment of the germline<sup>3,22</sup>. The interaction between LOTUS and Vasa acts through an interaction surface situated in the pocket formed by the helices  $\alpha_2$  and  $\alpha_5$  of the LOTUS domain (Figure 2.6a b and c). Due to the essential role that *vasa* plays in germline determination (reviewed in Extavour and Akam<sup>2</sup>, Noce et al.<sup>51</sup>, Raz<sup>52</sup>, Ewen-Campen et al.<sup>53</sup>, and the potential co-option of oskar to the germline determination mechanism in Holometabola<sup>8</sup>, we hypothesized that changes in the conservation of the residues of this interface might be detectable. First, we observed that the residues of the LOTUS domain a2 and a5 helix contacting Vasa were highly conserved overall ( $\alpha_2$  average valdar score: 0.49 and  $\alpha_5$ valdar score 0.56) (Figure 2.6b). Specifically, we observed that the previously reported Vasa interacting amino acids A162 and L228 of the LOTUS domain were highly conserved (Valdar score: 0.64 for both residues)<sup>22</sup>. We also noted that Q235 and H227 of the LOTUS domain  $\alpha_5$ helix are likely to be important interaction partners due to their high conservation (valdar score: 0.90 and 0.90 respectively) (Figure 2.6b). Moreover, facing the LOTUS domain H227 is Vasa M540, which may act as a proton donor to form a hydrogen bond between the His ring and the sulfur atom of the Met<sup>54</sup> (Fig 6b and b'). The LOTUS domain a2 helix is overall slightly less conserved than the LOTUS domain a5 helix (Valdar score: 0.49 vs 0.56) (Figure 2.6a, b", c"), but hydrophobic properties are conserved on one side of the a2 helix (Figure 2.6c, c') forming a motif of conserved amino acid properties (Figure 2.6c").

Previous reports have hypothesized that the *D. melanogaster* LOTUS domain could act as a dsRNA binding domain<sup>21,55</sup>. However, in *D. melanogaster*, it was later reported that the LOTUS domain did not bind to nucleotides<sup>23</sup>. Therefore, using our dataset we predicted the RNA binding properties of LOTUS domains to test the conservation of this prediction. We used the RNABindR algorithm<sup>40</sup> to predict potential RNA binding sites of the LOTUS domain, and computed a conservation score for each position<sup>40</sup>. The α5 helix is also the location in the LOTUS domain that has the most conserved prediction for RNA binding (Figure 2.6d).

Finally, we asked whether the secondary structure of the LOTUS domain might be conserved. Secondary structures are often indicative of the tertiary structure of a domain. Therefore, the secondary structure might be conserved even if the sequence varies. We submitted the LOTUS sequences from all identified Oskar orthologs to the Jpred4 servers<sup>41</sup> for secondary structure prediction and mapped the results onto the Oskar alignment we obtained. The secondary structure of LOTUS is highly conserved throughout Oskar orthologs, with the exception of the a1 helix (Figure B.8) which also displays a low conservation score of 0.19 (Figure 2.6a).

## 2.3.7 The core of the OSK domain is conserved

We asked whether the OSK domain showed any differential conservation across the different parts of the domain. We found that the OSK domain of Oskar showed an overall conservation across all insects, similar to the LOTUS domain (Valdar score: 0.51) (Figure 2.7a). However, the conservation pattern is higher in the core amino acids (Valdar score average of core amino acid: 0.54) when compared to the residues at the surface (Valdar score average for surface amino acid: 0.23) (Figure 2.7a). Despite the overall low conservation of the residues at the surface of the OSK domain, we found that the electrostatic properties are conserved overall (electrostatic conservation score > 0; conserved) in the previously reported putative RNA binding pocket<sup>24</sup>. However, as previously mentioned, this conservation is stronger in holometabolous sequences (Figure 2.5d). Those results are in accordance with the potential role of OSK as an RNA Binding domain<sup>23,24</sup>. We also submitted the OSK sequences gathered to the same secondary structure analysis performed on LOTUS. In a similar fashion, the secondary structure of OSK is highly conserved throughout all insect sequences analyzed (Figure B.8).

We then asked if the conservation patterns observed at the core of OSK were clustered in sequence motifs. When we looked at the location of the highly conserved amino acids, we found that the conservation was driven by four well-defined sequence motifs (Figure 2.7c, c', c", c"). Given that *oskar* plays different roles in Holometabola and Hemimetabola, we asked whether the conserved OSK motifs showed any difference in conservation between these two groups. Of the four highly conserved OSK core motifs (Figure 2.7c, c', c", c"), two of them (Figure 2.7c Valdar average score: 0.80 and c" Valdar average score: 0.71) were conserved across all insects, but the

other two showed differential conservation between the holometabolous and hemimetabolous sequences (Figure 2.7c' Valdar score average holo: 0.78 hemi: 0.58 and c''' Valdar score average holo: 0.70 hemi: 0.55). Finally, we noted that only one of the affected residues in known alleles affecting posterior patterning in *Drosophila melanogaster*, S457 is conserved across all insects (Valdar score: 0.86). This suggests that the role of the other previously reported important amino acids in the function of *D. melanogaster* OSK<sup>24</sup> might not be conserved in other insects (red positions in Figure 2.7c, c', c'', c''').

**Figure 2.7** (*following page*): **Conservation analysis of the OSK domain.** In **a**), cartoon rendering of the OSK domain (PDBID: 5A4A) from two different angles. Each amino acid is colored based on its Valdar conservation score. Showed in sticks are known amino acids location of *Drosophila melanogaster* alleles leading to the loss of *oskar* polarization. In **b**), surface rendering of the OSK domain colored by Valdar conservation score, Electrostatic conservation score and hydrophobicity conservation score. In **c, c', c'', c'''**), close up of conserved motifs of the OSK domain. Each location is colored with Valdar conservation scores of the Hemimetabola and Holometabola sequences. At the bottom are sequence logos of each motif generated with Weblogo. In black are hydrophobic residues, in blue charged residues, and in green polar residues. Positions in red are amino acids location of *Drosophila melanogaster* alleles leading to the loss of *oskar* polarization. Showed in sticks in the structure rendering are the amino acids displayed in the logo.



# 2.4 Discussion

## 2.4.1 An expanded collection of *oskar* orthologs

*oskar* provides a powerful case study of functional evolution of a gene with an unusual genesis<sup>9</sup>. Here, we gathered the most extensive set of orthologous *oskar* sequences to date. However, most insect genomic and transcriptomic data have been generated from only a few orders, and the vast majority from the Holometabola. Diptera, Lepidoptera, Coleoptera, Hymenoptera and Hemiptera represent 82% of the available datasets. We emphasize that expanded taxon sampling, particularly for the Hemimetabola, will be critical for further studies of the evolution of protein function across insects. Moreover, only a fraction (27% for tissue type, 26% for organism stage, and 14% for sex) of the TSA datasets contained usable metadata regarding the stage and tissue type sampled. Future standardization of the nature and format of transcriptomic metadata would also be a worthwhile endeavor that could increase the efficiency and efficacy of future work.

# 2.4.2 Convergent losses of oskar in insect evolution

Our observations strongly suggest the loss of *oskar* in the Lepidoptera. This is supported by the fact that a common ancestor of Lepidopteran and other holometabolous insects had already established the new, *oskar* dependent, inheritance germline specification (See Figure 2.3 for phylogenetic relationships). In the wasp *Nasonia vitripennis*, a Hymenopteran, *oskar* is known to be expressed at the posterior of the oocyte and in germ cells<sup>7</sup> as well as being a necessary component of the function of the Oosome (the wasp germ plasm homolog)<sup>56</sup>. Therefore, the apparent subsequent loss in nearly all Lepidoptera examined, of a gene responsible for the establishment of the germ plasm in other Holometabola was unexpected (but note the previously reported absence of *oskar* from the *Bombyx mori* genome<sup>7</sup>). This suggests either that Lepidopteran species that lack *oskar* do not use germ plasm to specify their germ line, or that they do so using a germ plasm nucleator other than Oskar. As was previously discussed in Quan and Lynch<sup>26</sup>, Lepidopteran species such as *Bombyx mori*<sup>57</sup> or *Parage aegeria*<sup>58</sup> seem to harbor a

germ plasm specification strategy.

# 2.4.3 Functional implications of differential conservation of the LOTUS and OSK domains

We have identified novel conserved amino acid positions that we hypothesize are important for the LOTUS Vasa binding and RNA binding of OSK (Figures 2.6 and 2.7). Our observation of the conservation of the a2 helix is consistent with its previously reported importance in the LOTUS domain capacity to interact with Vasa<sup>22</sup>. In the a2 helix, we also observed high conservation of H227 and Q235, whose position suggests they may contribute to the interaction between Vasa and LOTUS, and that we suggest should be the target of future mutational studies.

We also uncovered an interesting new conservation pattern within the OSK domain. The conserved amino acids were higher in the core of the domain than on the surface. This differential conservation might reflect the acquisition of the germplasm nucleator role of *oskar* (Figure 2.5). We noted that the basic properties of surface residues previously reported for *D. melanogaster*<sup>24</sup>, are conserved across insects. If the RNA binding properties of OSK observed in *D. melanogaster*<sup>23,24</sup> are conserved throughout holometabolous insects, then it is possible that the low amino acid conservation of the surface, which nevertheless displays highly conserved basic properties, could be due to the co-evolution of specific RNA binding partners for the OSK domains of different lineages.

# 2.4.4 OSK evolved differentially between holometabolous and hemimetabolous insects

Finally, we observed a differential conservation of the OSK domain between hemimetabolous and holometabolous insects. We found that the OSK sequence was less conserved across the Holometabola than across the Hemimetabola. This observation raises two important and interesting questions about the role of the OSK domain in the functional evolution of Oskar: first, was the apparently relaxed purifying selection experienced by OSK in the Holometabola necessary for the co-option of *oskar* in germ plasm nucleation? Second, is there a function of

<sup>96</sup> 

Oskar in the hemimetabolous insects that requires strong conservation of OSK? More studies on the roles and biochemical properties of OSK in hemimetabolous insects should be undertaken to further our understanding of the difference in conservation.

In conclusion, analysis of the large dataset of novel Oskar sequences presented here provides multiple new hypotheses concerning the molecular mechanisms and functional evolution of the Oskar gene, that we hope will be tested in the future.

# References

- David L Kirk. A twelve-step program for evolving multicellularity and a division of labor. *Bioessays*, 27(3):299–310, March 2005.
- [2] Cassandra G Extavour and Michael Akam. Mechanisms of germ cell specification across the metazoans: epigenesis and preformation. *Development*, 130(24):5869–5884, December 2003.
- [3] A Ephrussi and R Lehmann. Induction of germ cell formation by oskar. *Nature*, 358(6385):
  387–392, July 1992.
- [4] R Lehmann and C Nüsslein-Volhard. Abdominal segmentation, pole cell formation, and embryonic polarity require the localized activity of oskar, a maternal gene in drosophila. *Cell*, 47(1):141–152, October 1986.
- [5] Drosophila 12 Genomes Consortium, Andrew G Clark, Michael B Eisen, Douglas R Smith, Casey M Bergman, Brian Oliver, Therese A Markow, Thomas C Kaufman, Manolis Kellis, William Gelbart, Venky N Iyer, Daniel A Pollard, Timothy B Sackton, Amanda M Larracuente, Nadia D Singh, Jose P Abad, Dawn N Abt, Boris Adryan, Montserrat Aguade, Hiroshi Akashi, Wyatt W Anderson, Charles F Aquadro, David H Ardell, Roman Arguello, Carlo G Artieri, Daniel A Barbash, Daniel Barker, Paolo Barsanti, Phil Batterham, Serafim Batzoglou, Dave Begun, Arjun Bhutkar, Enrico Blanco, Stephanie A Bosak, Robert K Bradley, Adrianne D Brand, Michael R Brent, Angela N Brooks, Randall H Brown, Roger K Butlin, Corrado Caggese, Brian R Calvi, A Bernardo de Carvalho, Anat Caspi, Sergio
Castrezana, Susan E Celniker, Jean L Chang, Charles Chapple, Sourav Chatterji, Asif Chinwalla, Alberto Civetta, Sandra W Clifton, Josep M Comeron, James C Costello, Jerry A Coyne, Jennifer Daub, Robert G David, Arthur L Delcher, Kim Delehaunty, Chuong B Do, Heather Ebling, Kevin Edwards, Thomas Eickbush, Jay D Evans, Alan Filipski, Sven Findeiss, Eva Freyhult, Lucinda Fulton, Robert Fulton, Ana C L Garcia, Anastasia Gardiner, David A Garfield, Barry E Garvin, Greg Gibson, Don Gilbert, Sante Gnerre, Jennifer Godfrey, Robert Good, Valer Gotea, Brenton Gravely, Anthony J Greenberg, Sam Griffiths-Jones, Samuel Gross, Roderic Guigo, Erik A Gustafson, Wilfried Haerty, Matthew W Hahn, Daniel L Halligan, Aaron L Halpern, Gillian M Halter, Mira V Han, Andreas Heger, Ladeana Hillier, Angie S Hinrichs, Ian Holmes, Roger A Hoskins, Melissa J Hubisz, Dan Hultmark, Melanie A Huntley, David B Jaffe, Santosh Jagadeeshan, William R Jeck, Justin Johnson, Corbin D Jones, William C Jordan, Gary H Karpen, Eiko Kataoka, Peter D Keightley, Pouya Kheradpour, Ewen F Kirkness, Leonardo B Koerich, Karsten Kristiansen, Dave Kudrna, Rob J Kulathinal, Sudhir Kumar, Roberta Kwok, Eric Lander, Charles H Langley, Richard Lapoint, Brian P Lazzaro, So-Jeong Lee, Lisa Levesque, Ruiqiang Li, Chiao-Feng Lin, Michael F Lin, Kerstin Lindblad-Toh, Ana Llopart, Manyuan Long, Lloyd Low, Elena Lozovsky, Jian Lu, Meizhong Luo, Carlos A Machado, Wojciech Makalowski, Mar Marzo, Muneo Matsuda, Luciano Matzkin, Bryant McAllister, Carolyn S McBride, Brendan McKernan, Kevin McKernan, Maria Mendez-Lago, Patrick Minx, Michael U Mollenhauer, Kristi Montooth, Stephen M Mount, Xu Mu, Eugene Myers, Barbara Negre, Stuart Newfeld, Rasmus Nielsen, Mohamed A F Noor, Patrick O'Grady, Lior Pachter, Montserrat Papaceit, Matthew J Parisi, Michael Parisi, Leopold Parts, Jakob S Pedersen, Graziano Pesole, Adam M Phillippy, Chris P Ponting, Mihai Pop, Damiano Porcelli, Jeffrey R Powell, Sonja Prohaska, Kim Pruitt, Marta Puig, Hadi Quesneville, Kristipati Ravi Ram, David Rand, Matthew D Rasmussen, Laura K Reed, Robert Reenan, Amy Reily, Karin A Remington, Tania T Rieger, Michael G Ritchie, Charles Robin, Yu-Hui Rogers, Claudia Rohde, Julio Rozas, Marc J Rubenfield, Alfredo Ruiz, Susan Russo, Steven L Salzberg, Alejandro Sanchez-Gracia, David J Saranga, Hajime Sato, Stephen W Schaeffer, Michael C Schatz, Todd Schlenke, Russell Schwartz, Carmen Segarra, Rama S Singh, Laura Sirot, Marina Sirota, Nicholas B Sisneros, Chris D Smith, Temple F Smith,

John Spieth, Deborah E Stage, Alexander Stark, Wolfgang Stephan, Robert L Strausberg, Sebastian Strempel, David Sturgill, Granger Sutton, Granger G Sutton, Wei Tao, Sarah Teichmann, Yoshiko N Tobari, Yoshihiko Tomimura, Jason M Tsolas, Vera L S Valente, Eli Venter, J Craig Venter, Saverio Vicario, Filipe G Vieira, Albert J Vilella, Alfredo Villasante, Brian Walenz, Jun Wang, Marvin Wasserman, Thomas Watts, Derek Wilson, Richard K Wilson, Rod A Wing, Mariana F Wolfner, Alex Wong, Gane Ka-Shu Wong, Chung-I Wu, Gabriel Wu, Daisuke Yamamoto, Hsiao-Pei Yang, Shiaw-Pyng Yang, James A Yorke, Kiyohito Yoshida, Evgeny Zdobnov, Peili Zhang, Yu Zhang, Aleksey V Zimin, Jennifer Baldwin, Amr Abdouelleil, Jamal Abdulkadir, Adal Abebe, Brikti Abera, Justin Abreu, St Christophe Acer, Lynne Aftuck, Allen Alexander, Peter An, Erica Anderson, Scott Anderson, Harindra Arachi, Marc Azer, Pasang Bachantsang, Andrew Barry, Tashi Bayul, Aaron Berlin, Daniel Bessette, Toby Bloom, Jason Blye, Leonid Boguslavskiy, Claude Bonnet, Boris Boukhgalter, Imane Bourzgui, Adam Brown, Patrick Cahill, Sheridon Channer, Yama Cheshatsang, Lisa Chuda, Mieke Citroen, Alville Collymore, Patrick Cooke, Maura Costello, Katie D'Aco, Riza Daza, Georgius De Haan, Stuart DeGray, Christina DeMaso, Norbu Dhargay, Kimberly Dooley, Erin Dooley, Missole Doricent, Passang Dorje, Kunsang Dorjee, Alan Dupes, Richard Elong, Jill Falk, Abderrahim Farina, Susan Faro, Diallo Ferguson, Sheila Fisher, Chelsea D Foley, Alicia Franke, Dennis Friedrich, Loryn Gadbois, Gary Gearin, Christina R Gearin, Georgia Giannoukos, Tina Goode, Joseph Graham, Edward Grandbois, Sharleen Grewal, Kunsang Gyaltsen, Nabil Hafez, Birhane Hagos, Jennifer Hall, Charlotte Henson, Andrew Hollinger, Tracey Honan, Monika D Huard, Leanne Hughes, Brian Hurhula, M Erii Husby, Asha Kamat, Ben Kanga, Seva Kashin, Dmitry Khazanovich, Peter Kisner, Krista Lance, Marcia Lara, William Lee, Niall Lennon, Frances Letendre, Rosie LeVine, Alex Lipovsky, Xiaohong Liu, Jinlei Liu, Shangtao Liu, Tashi Lokyitsang, Yeshi Lokyitsang, Rakela Lubonja, Annie Lui, Pen MacDonald, Vasilia Magnisalis, Kebede Maru, Charles Matthews, William McCusker, Susan McDonough, Teena Mehta, James Meldrim, Louis Meneus, Oana Mihai, Atanas Mihalev, Tanya Mihova, Rachel Mittelman, Valentine Mlenga, Anna Montmayeur, Leonidas Mulrain, Adam Navidi, Jerome Naylor, Tamrat Negash, Thu Nguyen, Nga Nguyen, Robert Nicol, Choe Norbu, Nyima Norbu, Nathaniel Novod, Barry O'Neill, Sahal

Osman, Eva Markiewicz, Otero L Oyono, Christopher Patti, Pema Phunkhang, Fritz Pierre, Margaret Priest, Sujaa Raghuraman, Filip Rege, Rebecca Reyes, Cecil Rise, Peter Rogov, Keenan Ross, Elizabeth Ryan, Sampath Settipalli, Terry Shea, Ngawang Sherpa, Lu Shi, Diana Shih, Todd Sparrow, Jessica Spaulding, John Stalker, Nicole Stange-Thomann, Sharon Stavropoulos, Catherine Stone, Christopher Strader, Senait Tesfaye, Talene Thomson, Yama Thoulutsang, Dawa Thoulutsang, Kerri Topham, Ira Topping, Tsamla Tsamla, Helen Vassiliev, Andy Vo, Tsering Wangchuk, Tsering Wangdi, Michael Weiand, Jane Wilkinson, Adam Wilson, Shailendra Yadav, Geneva Young, Qing Yu, Lisa Zembek, Danni Zhong, Andrew Zimmer, Zac Zwirko, David B Jaffe, Pablo Alvarez, Will Brockman, Jonathan Butler, Cheewhye Chin, Sante Gnerre, Manfred Grabherr, Michael Kleber, Evan Mauceli, and Iain MacCallum. Evolution of genes and genomes on the drosophila phylogeny. *Nature*, 450(7167):203–218, November 2007.

- [6] J Juhn and A A James. oskar gene expression in the vector mosquitoes, anopheles gambiae and aedes aegypti. *Insect Mol. Biol.*, 15(3):363–372, June 2006.
- [7] Jeremy A Lynch, Orhan Ozüak, Abderrahman Khila, Ehab Abouheif, Claude Desplan, and Siegfried Roth. The phylogenetic origin of oskar coincided with the origin of maternally provisioned germ plasm and pole cells at the base of the holometabola. *PLoS Genet.*, 7(4): e1002029, April 2011.
- [8] Ben Ewen-Campen, John R Srouji, Evelyn E Schwager, and Cassandra G Extavour. Oskar predates the evolution of germ plasm in insects. *Curr. Biol.*, 22(23):2278–2283, December 2012.
- [9] Leo Blondel, Tamsin Em Jones, and Cassandra G Extavour. Bacterial contribution to genesis of the novel germ line determinant oskar. *Elife*, 9, February 2020.
- [10] Bernhard Misof, Shanlin Liu, Karen Meusemann, Ralph S Peters, Alexander Donath, Christoph Mayer, Paul B Frandsen, Jessica Ware, Tomáš Flouri, Rolf G Beutel, Oliver Niehuis, Malte Petersen, Fernando Izquierdo-Carrasco, Torsten Wappler, Jes Rust, Andre J Aberer, Ulrike Aspöck, Horst Aspöck, Daniela Bartel, Alexander Blanke, Simon Berger, Alexander Böhm, Thomas R Buckley, Brett Calcott, Junqing Chen, Frank Friedrich,

Makiko Fukui, Mari Fujita, Carola Greve, Peter Grobe, Shengchang Gu, Ying Huang, Lars S Jermiin, Akito Y Kawahara, Lars Krogmann, Martin Kubiak, Robert Lanfear, Harald Letsch, Yiyuan Li, Zhenyu Li, Jiguang Li, Haorong Lu, Ryuichiro Machida, Yuta Mashimo, Pashalia Kapli, Duane D McKenna, Guanliang Meng, Yasutaka Nakagaki, José Luis Navarrete-Heredia, Michael Ott, Yanxiang Ou, Günther Pass, Lars Podsiadlowski, Hans Pohl, Björn M von Reumont, Kai Schütte, Kaoru Sekiya, Shota Shimizu, Adam Slipinski, Alexandros Stamatakis, Wenhui Song, Xu Su, Nikolaus U Szucsich, Meihua Tan, Xuemei Tan, Min Tang, Jingbo Tang, Gerald Timelthaler, Shigekazu Tomizuka, Michelle Trautwein, Xiaoli Tong, Toshiki Uchifune, Manfred G Walzl, Brian M Wiegmann, Jeanne Wilbrandt, Benjamin Wipfler, Thomas K F Wong, Qiong Wu, Gengxiong Wu, Yinlong Xie, Shenzhou Yang, Qing Yang, David K Yeates, Kazunori Yoshizawa, Qing Zhang, Rui Zhang, Wenwei Zhang, Yunhui Zhang, Jing Zhao, Chengran Zhou, Lili Zhou, Tanja Ziesmann, Shijie Zou, Yingrui Li, Xun Xu, Yong Zhang, Huanming Yang, Jian Wang, Jun Wang, Karl M Kjer, and Xin Zhou. Phylogenomics resolves the timing and pattern of insect evolution. *Science*, 346(6210):763–767, November 2014.

- [11] Peter K Dearden. Germ cell development in the honeybee (apis mellifera); vasa and nanos expression. BMC Dev. Biol., 6:6, February 2006.
- [12] L Nagy, L Riddiford, and K Kiguchi. Morphogenesis in the early embryo of the lepidopteran bombyx mori. *Dev. Biol.*, 165(1):137–151, September 1994.
- [13] Reinhard Schröder. vasa mRNA accumulates at the posterior pole during blastoderm formation in the flour beetle tribolium castaneum. *Dev. Genes Evol.*, 216(5):277–283, May 2006.
- [14] James Allen Nelson. The embryology of the honey bee. Princeton University Press, 1915.
- [15] J Kim-Ha, J L Smith, and P M Macdonald. oskar mRNA is localized to the posterior pole of the drosophila oocyte. *Cell*, 66(1):23–35, July 1991.
- [16] Ab Matteen Rafiqi, Arjuna Rajakumar, and Ehab Abouheif. Origin and elaboration of a major evolutionary transition in individuality. *Nature*, 585(7824):239–244, 2020.

- [17] P J Webster, J Suen, and P M Macdonald. Drosophila virilis oskar transgenes direct body patterning but not pole cell formation or maintenance of mRNA localization in d. melanogaster. *Development*, 120(7):2027–2037, July 1994.
- [18] Jennifer R Jones and Paul M Macdonald. Oskar controls morphology of polar granules and nuclear bodies in drosophila. *Development*, 134(2):233–236, January 2007.
- [19] Tobias Sikosek, Hue Sun Chan, and Erich Bornberg-Bauer. Escape from adaptive conflict follows from weak functional trade-offs and mutational robustness. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* U. S. A., 109(37):14888–14893, September 2012.
- [20] Tobias Sikosek and Hue Sun Chan. Biophysics of protein evolution and evolutionary protein biophysics. J. R. Soc. Interface, 11(100):20140419, November 2014.
- [21] Vivek Anantharaman, Dapeng Zhang, and L Aravind. OST-HTH: a novel predicted RNA-binding domain. *Biology Direct*, 5(1):13, 2010.
- [22] Mandy Jeske, Christoph W Müller, and Anne Ephrussi. The LOTUS domain is a conserved DEAD-box RNA helicase regulator essential for the recruitment of vasa to the germ plasm and nuage. *Genes Dev.*, 31(9):939–952, May 2017.
- [23] Mandy Jeske, Matteo Bordi, Sebastian Glatt, Sandra Müller, Vladimir Rybin, Christoph W Müller, and Anne Ephrussi. The crystal structure of the drosophila germline inducer oskar identifies two domains with distinct vasa helicase- and RNA-Binding activities. *Cell Reports*, 12(4):587–598, 2015.
- [24] Na Yang, Zhenyu Yu, Menglong Hu, Mingzhu Wang, Ruth Lehmann, and Rui-Ming Xu.
  Structure of drosophila oskar reveals a novel RNA binding protein. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.* S. A., 112(37):11541–11546, September 2015.
- [25] Abha Ahuja and Cassandra G Extavour. Patterns of molecular evolution of the germ line specification gene oskar suggest that a novel domain may contribute to functional divergence in drosophila. *Development Genes and Evolution*, 224(2):65–77, 2014.
- [26] Honghu Quan and Jeremy A Lynch. The evolution of insect germline specification strategies. *Curr Opin Insect Sci*, 13:99–105, February 2016.

- [27] Mario Stanke, Oliver Keller, Irfan Gunduz, Alec Hayes, Stephan Waack, and Burkhard Morgenstern. AUGUSTUS: ab initio prediction of alternative transcripts. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 34(Web Server issue):W435–9, July 2006.
- [28] Fábio Madeira, Young Mi Park, Joon Lee, Nicola Buso, Tamer Gur, Nandana Madhusoodanan, Prasad Basutkar, Adrian R N Tivey, Simon C Potter, Robert D Finn, and Others. The EMBL-EBI search and sequence analysis tools APIs in 2019. Nucleic Acids Res., 47(W1):W636–W641, 2019.
- [29] Robert C Edgar. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 32(5):1792–1797, March 2004.
- [30] R W Hamming. Error detecting and error correcting codes. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 29(2):147–160, April 1950.
- [31] S Capella-Gutierrez, J M Silla-Martinez, and T Gabaldon. trimal: a tool for automated alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. *Bioinformatics*, 25(15): 1972–1973, 2009.
- [32] Antonio Rausell, David Juan, Florencio Pazos, and Alfonso Valencia. Protein interactions and ligand binding: from protein subfamilies to functional specificity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 107(5):1995–2000, February 2010.
- [33] Ari Löytynoja. Phylogeny-aware alignment with PRANK. *Methods Mol. Biol.*, 1079:155–170, 2014.
- [34] Alexandros Stamatakis. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics*, 30(9):1312–1313, 2014.
- [35] Jaime Huerta-Cepas, François Serra, and Peer Bork. ETE 3: Reconstruction, analysis, and visualization of phylogenomic data. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 33(6):1635–1638, June 2016.
- [36] William S J Valdar. Scoring residue conservation. Proteins, 48(2):227–241, August 2002.
- [37] John A Capra and Mona Singh. Predicting functionally important residues from sequence conservation. *Bioinformatics*, 23(15):1875–1882, August 2007.

- [38] J Lin. Divergence measures based on the shannon entropy. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 37(1): 145–151, January 1991.
- [39] C Preston Moon and Karen G Fleming. Side-chain hydrophobicity scale derived from transmembrane protein folding into lipid bilayers. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 108(25): 10174–10177, June 2011.
- [40] Michael Terribilini, Jeffry D Sander, Jae-Hyung Lee, Peter Zaback, Robert L Jernigan,
  Vasant Honavar, and Drena Dobbs. RNABindR: a server for analyzing and predicting
  RNA-binding sites in proteins. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 35(Web Server issue):W578–84, July 2007.
- [41] Alexey Drozdetskiy, Christian Cole, James Procter, and Geoffrey J Barton. JPred4: a protein secondary structure prediction server. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 43(W1):W389–94, July 2015.
- [42] Gavin E Crooks, Gary Hon, John-Marc Chandonia, and Steven E Brenner. WebLogo: a sequence logo generator. *Genome Res.*, 14(6):1188–1190, June 2004.
- [43] Warren L DeLano and Others. Pymol: An open-source molecular graphics tool. CCP4 Newsletter on protein crystallography, 40(1):82–92, 2002.
- [44] Charles Mitter, Donald R Davis, and Michael P Cummings. Phylogeny and evolution of lepidoptera. Annu. Rev. Entomol., 62:265–283, January 2017.
- [45] Akito Y Kawahara, David Plotkin, Marianne Espeland, Karen Meusemann, Emmanuel F A Toussaint, Alexander Donath, France Gimnich, Paul B Frandsen, Andreas Zwick, Mario Dos Reis, Jesse R Barber, Ralph S Peters, Shanlin Liu, Xin Zhou, Christoph Mayer, Lars Podsiadlowski, Caroline Storer, Jayne E Yack, Bernhard Misof, and Jesse W Breinholt. Phylogenomics reveals the evolutionary timing and pattern of butterflies and moths. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 116(45):22657–22663, November 2019.
- [46] Ralph S Peters, Lars Krogmann, Christoph Mayer, Alexander Donath, Simon Gunkel, Karen Meusemann, Alexey Kozlov, Lars Podsiadlowski, Malte Petersen, Robert Lanfear, Patricia A Diez, John Heraty, Karl M Kjer, Seraina Klopfstein, Rudolf Meier, Carlo Polidori, Thomas Schmitt, Shanlin Liu, Xin Zhou, Torsten Wappler, Jes Rust, Bernhard Misof, and

Oliver Niehuis. Evolutionary history of the hymenoptera. *Curr. Biol.*, 27(7):1013–1018, April 2017.

- [47] Josh Dubnau, Ann-Shyn Chiang, Lori Grady, Jody Barditch, Scott Gossweiler, John McNeil, Patrick Smith, Francois Buldoc, Rod Scott, Uli Certa, Clemens Broger, and Tim Tully. The staufen/pumilio pathway is involved in drosophila long-term memory. *Curr. Biol.*, 13(4): 286–296, February 2003.
- [48] Ben Ewen-Campen, Seth Donoughe, Donald Nat Clarke, and Cassandra G Extavour. Germ cell specification requires zygotic mechanisms rather than germ plasm in a basally branching insect. *Curr. Biol.*, 23(10):835–842, May 2013.
- [49] L Lebart, A Morineau, and K M Warwick. Multivariate descriptive statistical analysis: Correspondence analysis and related techniques for large matrices. John Wiley & Sons; Chichester, UK, 1984.
- [50] F H Markussen, A M Michon, W Breitwieser, and A Ephrussi. Translational control of oskar generates short OSK, the isoform that induces pole plasma assembly. *Development*, 121(11):3723–3732, November 1995.
- [51] T Noce, S Okamoto-Ito, and N Tsunekawa. Vasa homolog genes in mammalian germ cell development. *Cell Struct. Funct.*, 26(3):131–136, June 2001.
- [52] E Raz. The function and regulation of vasa-like genes in germ-cell development. *Genome Biol.*, 1(3):REVIEWS1017, September 2000.
- [53] Ben Ewen-Campen, Evelyn E Schwager, and Cassandra G M Extavour. The molecular machinery of germ line specification. *Mol. Reprod. Dev.*, 77(1):3–18, 2010.
- [54] D Pal and P Chakrabarti. Non-hydrogen bond interactions involving the methionine sulfur atom. J. Biomol. Struct. Dyn., 19(1):115–128, August 2001.
- [55] Isabelle Callebaut and Jean-Paul Mornon. LOTUS, a new domain associated with small RNA pathways in the germline. *Bioinformatics*, 26(9):1140–1144, 2010.

- [56] Honghu Quan, Deanna Arsala, and Jeremy A Lynch. Transcriptomic and functional analysis of the oosome, a unique form of germ plasm in the wasp nasonia vitripennis. *BMC Biol.*, 17(1):78, October 2019.
- [57] Hajime Nakao, Tomoko Matsumoto, Yuichi Oba, Teruyuki Niimi, and Toshinobu
  Yaginuma. Germ cell specification and early embryonic patterning in bombyx mori as revealed by nanos orthologues. *Evol. Dev.*, 10(5):546–554, September 2008.
- [58] Jean-Michel Carter, Melanie Gibbs, and Casper J Breuker. Divergent RNA localisation patterns of maternal genes regulating embryonic patterning in the butterfly pararge aegeria. *PLoS One*, 10(12):e0144471, December 2015.

No observations on single genes can ever illuminate the overall mechanisms of development of the body plan or of body parts except at the minute and always partial, if not wholly illusory, level of the worm's eye view. The same must be true as well of major evolutionary change in the body plan or in body parts.

Eric H. Davidson, 2011

3

Topology-driven protein-protein interaction network analysis detects genetic sub-networks regulating reproductive capacity

#### ABSTRACT

Understanding the genetic regulation of organ structure is a fundamental problem in developmental biology. Here, we use egg-producing structures of insect ovaries, called ovarioles, to deduce systems-level gene regulatory relationships from quantitative functional genetic analysis. We previously showed that Hippo signalling, a conserved regulator of animal organ size, regulates ovariole number in *Drosophila melanogaster*. To comprehensively determine how Hippo signalling interacts with other pathways in this regulation, we screened all known signalling pathway genes, and identified Hpo-dependent and Hpo-independent signalling requirements. Network analysis of known protein-protein interactions among screen results identified independent gene regulatory sub-networks regulating one or both of ovariole number and egg laying. These sub-networks predict involvement of previously uncharacterised genes with higher accuracy than the original candidate screen. This shows that network analysis combining functional genetic and large-scale interaction data can predict function of novel genes regulating development.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS

This work was published in the journal Elife in 2020 and has been reformated as the chapter presented here:

Kumar, T.\*, Blondel, L.\*, & Extavour, C. G. (2020). **Topology-driven protein-protein interaction network analysis detects genetic sub-networks regulating reproductive capacity.** ELife, 9. DOI: 10.7554/elife.54082

The work presented here is the result of the collaboration between Tarun Kumar, Cassandra G. Extavour and myself. Tarun Kumar and Cassandra G. Extavour designed the screen, and Cassandra G. Extavour directed the study design, funding, writing and reviewing. Tarun Kumar performed all the biological experiments. He collected egg counts and ovariole numbers for each of the *Drosophila melanogaster* lines used in this study. Finally, he wrote a major part of the manuscript. I, Leo Blondel, proposed and designed the data analysis. I created all the scripts and performed all the data analysis presented here. I assisted Tarun Kumar on the writing of the manuscript. I created all the figures presented in the manuscript.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I cannot stress enough that this study is the fruit of the amazing collaboration between Tarun Kumar, Cassandra G. Extavour and I. I had the honor of working with Tarun Kumar, a really brilliant scientist with whom long work hours always turned into exciting productive time. It is important for me to thank him prior to this chapter for his skill, his dedication and his patience. I also want to thank Cassandra G. Extavour for the trust she placed in both of us to complete this project and the pertinent advices she always delivered. Finally, I would like to thank Marc Santolini for the many inputs and advises given towards bettering the network science part of this chapter. His help has be invaluable.

### 3.1 Introduction

The final shape and size of an organ is critical to organismal function and viability. Defects in human organ morphology cause a multitude of pathologies, including cancers, organ hypertrophies and atrophies (e.g. Yang and Xu<sup>1</sup>). It is thus critical to understand the regulatory mechanisms underlying the stereotypic shape and size of organs. To this end, assessing the genetic regulation of size is significantly facilitated by using quantifiable changes in organ size and shape.

The *Drosophila melanogaster* female reproductive system is a useful paradigm to study quantitative anatomical traits. In these organs, the effects of multiple genes and the environment combine to produce a quantitative phenotype: a species-specific average number of egg-producing ovarian tubes called ovarioles. Fruit fly ovaries can contain as few as one and as many as 50 ovarioles per ovary, depending on the species<sup>2,3,4,5</sup>, with each ovariole capable of producing eggs. Ovariole number, therefore, may affect the reproductive fitness of *Drosophila* species by determining the potential of an adult female to produce eggs<sup>6,7</sup>. While ovariole number within a species can vary across temperatures<sup>8</sup>, altitudinal and latitudinal clines<sup>9,10</sup>, under constant environmental conditions ovariole number is highly stereotypic<sup>7,11,12,13</sup>. The reproducibility of ovariole number thus indicates a strong genetic component<sup>5</sup>. Genome wide association studies and quantitative trait locus mapping have demonstrated that the ovariole number is a highly polygenic trait<sup>14,15,16,17,18,19</sup>. In contrast, functional genetic studies have identified only a small number of genes whose activity regulates ovariole number (discussed below). Thus, the complexity of the genetic regulation of this important trait remains largely unknown.

The determination of ovariole number in *D. melanogaster* occurs during late larval and pupal development<sup>20</sup>. Each ovariole in the adult fly arises from a single primordial structure called a terminal filament (TF), which forms in the late third instar larval ovary<sup>21</sup> by convergent extension<sup>22</sup> of the terminal filament cells (TFCs)<sup>21,23</sup>. TFCs are first specified from an anterior population of somatic cells in the larval ovary by the expression of transcription factors including Bric-à-brac 1/2 (*bric-à-brac 1/2; bab1/2*) and Engrailed (*engrailed; en*)<sup>21,24</sup>. Initially a

loosely arranged group in the anterior of the larval ovary, TFCs undergo morphogenetic movements to give rise to the ordered columns of cells that are TFs. Cell intercalation during convergent extension is dependent on the actin regulators Cofilin (*twinstar*) and the large Maf factor Traffic Jam (*traffic jam; tj*), and on E-cadherin dependent adhesion<sup>21,25</sup>. Regulation of ovariole number is thus largely dependent on the specification of the TFCs and their rearrangement into TFs<sup>26</sup>.

We previously showed that the regulation of both TFC and TF number is dependent on the Hippo signalling pathway<sup>26</sup>, a pan-metazoan regulator of organ and tissue size<sup>27,28</sup>. At the core of the Hippo kinase cascade are two protein kinases, Hippo (*hippo; hpo*) and Warts (*warts*), which prevent the nuclear localisation of the transcriptional co-activator Yorkie (*yorkie; yki*). Yki and the transcription factor Scalloped (*scalloped*) together initiate the transcription of multiple target genes, including those that promote cell proliferation and survival. In the *D. melanogaster* larval ovary, loss of Hpo in the somatic cells causes an increase in nuclear Yki, leading to an increase in TFCs, TFs, ovariole number and egg laying in adults<sup>26</sup>.

Production of fertile eggs from a stereotypic number of ovarioles requires a spatially and temporally coordinated interplay of signalling between the somatic and germ line cells of the ovary. Thus, signalling amongst somatic and germ line cells in the larval ovary is crucial to all stages of ovarian development<sup>26,29,30,31,32,33</sup>. For instance, disruptions in insulin or Tor signalling affect both somatic and germ line cell

proliferation <sup>26,32,33,34,35,36</sup>. Similarly, ecdysone pulses from the prothoracic gland regulate the timely differentiation of the primordial germ cells (PGCs) and the somatic TFCs <sup>37,38,39</sup>. Both Hpo and ecdysone signalling also control the proportion of germ line to somatic cells by differentially regulating proliferation of both cell types <sup>26,37</sup>.

Although it is clear that genes function together in regulatory networks<sup>40</sup>, determining how the few genes functionally verified as required for ovariole development and function, work together to coordinate ovariole number and ovarian function more generally, is a challenge because most genes or pathways have been considered individually. An alternative approach that is less often applied to animal developmental genetics, is a systems biology representation of complex biological systems as networks<sup>41,42</sup>. Protein-protein interaction networks (PINs) are

such an example<sup>43</sup>. The availability of high throughput molecular biology datasets from, for example, yeast two-hybrid, protein CHiP and microarrays has allowed for the emergence of large scale interaction networks representing both functional and physical molecular interactions<sup>40,44,45,46</sup>.

With ample evidence that signalling in the ovary can affect ovarian development, but few genes functionally verified to date, we aimed to identify novel regulators of ovariole development by functionally testing all known members of all characterized *D. melanogaster* signalling pathways. We used tissue-specific RNAi to systematically knock down 463 genes in the larval ovary and looked for modifiers of the *hpo* loss of function egg laying and ovariole number phenotypes. To analyse the results of this phenotypic analysis, we used topology-driven network analysis to identify genetic networks regulating these phenotypes, thus generating hypotheses about the relationships between these networks. With this systems biology approach, we identify not only signalling pathway genes, but also previously untested genes that affect these reproductive traits. Functional testing showed that these novel genes affect ovariole number and/or egg laying, providing us with a novel *in silico* method to identify target genes that affect ovarian development and function. We use these findings to propose putative developmental regulatory networks underlying one or both of ovariole formation and egg laying.

### 3.2 Results

# 3.2.1 An RNAi modifier screen for signalling pathway involvement in ovariole number

To systematically ascertain the function of signalling pathway genes and their interactions with Hippo signalling in the development of the *D. melanogaster* ovary, we first curated a list of all known and predicted signalling genes<sup>47,48,49</sup>. We identified 475 genes belonging to the 14 developmental signalling pathways characterised in *D. melanogaster* (Table 3.1; Table C.1), and obtained UAS:RNAi lines for 463 of these genes from the Vienna *Drosophila* RNAi centre (VDRC) or the TRiP collections at the Bloomington *Drosophila* Stock centre (BDSC) (all *D. melanogaster* 

Signalling pathway	Number of genes in screen
EGF	45
FGF	25
FOXO	67
Нірро	60
JAK/STAT	31
JNK	28
МАРК	29
Notch	48
SHH	54
TGF B	52
Toll	36
VEGF	17
Wnt	125
mTOR	36

**Table 3.1: Number of candidate genes tested in each signalling pathway.** Candidate genes are grouped by their reported roles in one or more signalling pathways based on published literature. Genes in this list are not necessarily unique to a single pathway, but rather may function in more than one signalling pathway. The list of specific genes per pathway that were included in the screen for functional analysis (Figure 3.1) is found in the Table C.1.

genetic lines used are listed in Methods).

We previously showed that reducing the levels of *hpo* in the somatic cells of the larval ovary using *traffic jam* Gal4 (*tj*:*Gal4*) driving *hpo*[*RNAi*] increased both ovariole number and egg laying of adult female flies<sup>26</sup>. To identify genes that modify these phenotypes, we used *tj*:*Gal4* to drive simultaneous *hpo*[*RNAi*] and *RNAi* against a signalling candidate gene, and quantified the phenotypic change (Figure 3.1a-d). We observed that on driving two copies of *hpo*[*RNAi*] using *tj*:*Gal4*, we obtained a further increase in both egg laying and ovariole number (Figure 3.1e). This indicates that ovaries have further potential to increase ovariole number and egg laying beyond the increase induced by *tj:Gal4* driving one copy of *hpo[RNAi]*, and that *tj:Gal4* can drive the expression of two RNAi constructs, indicating that our screen could identify both enhancers and suppressors of the *tj:Gal4>hpo[RNAi]* phenotype.

We proceeded to identify modifiers of the *tj:Gal4>hpo[RNAi]* phenotype by crossing males of each of the 463 candidate genes RNAis individually with *tj:Gal4>hpo[RNAi]* females, and performing three phenotypic screens on the offspring. In the first screen (Figure 3.1a), we measured egg laying of three F1 female offspring (*tj:Gal4>hpo[RNAi], signalling candidate[RNAi]*) over 5 days. To address batch variation (Figure C.1), we standardized egg laying measurements by calculating the Z scores ( $Z_{gene} =$  number of standard deviations from the mean) for each candidate line relative to its batch controls. 190 genes had an egg laying | $Z_{gene}$ | below 1. Previous studies have shown that the egg laying of newly eclosed adult mated females correlates with ovariole number during the first five days<sup>6</sup>. We therefore eliminated these 190 genes from subsequent screening, because the change in egg laying was so modest that we considered these candidates were unlikely to show changes in ovariole number when compared to controls.

In the second screen (Figure 3.1b), we measured egg laying in a wild-type background (*tj>signalling candidate[ RNAi]*) for the 273 remaining candidate genes. For the third screen (Figure 3.1c), we quantified the ovariole number of *tj:Gal4>hpo[RNAi], signalling candidate[RNAi]* F1 adult females for the same 273 candidate genes. To choose candidates from the second and third screens for further study, we wished to account for the fact that the two screens had different effective numbers of data points. This was because egg laying data were obtained from individual vials of three females over five days, while ovariole numbers were obtained from 20 ovaries from ten females (see methods). We therefore selected the 67 genes with a  $|Z_{gene}|$  above two for ovariole number (Figure 3.1c, d; Table 3.2), and the 49 genes with a more conservative  $|Z_{gene}|$  above five for egg laying (Figure 3.1a, b, d; Table 3.2), for a total of 116 positive candidates for subsequent analyses.



**Figure 3.1: Screen methodology. a,b,c**) Diagrammatic representation of screen workflow. **d**) Distributions of results of genes in the three screens. n = number of genes tested in each screen (see also Table 3.2). **e**) Total eggs laid by three female flies over five days (left panel) and ovariole number (right panel) of Oregon R (top row), *tj:Gal4* driving one copy of *UAS:hpo[RNAi]* (middle row), and *tj:Gal4* driving two copies of *UAS:hpo[RNAi]* (bottom row), showing that, the previously reported *tj:Gal4>hpo[RNAi]* ovariole number and egg laying phenotypes<sup>26</sup> can be modified by further UAS:RNAi-mediated gene knockdown. Distribution of egg laying and ovariole number of controls in each screen batch is illustrated in **Figure C.1**.

Egg Laying Screens	<i>hpo[RNAi]</i> Egg Laying (Figure 1a)	Egg Laying (Figure 1b)	Ovariole Number Screen	<i>hpo[RNAi]</i> Ovariole Number (Figure 1c)
RNAi stocks unavailable	12	0	RNAi stocks unavailable	0
Primary filter $( Z_{gene}  < 1)$	190	N/A	Primary filter $( Z_{gene}  < 1)$	N/A
No effect (-5 < $ Z_{gene}  < 5$ )	214	224	No effect (-2< $ Z_{gene} $ < 2)	206
Negative effect $(Z_{gene} < -5)$	48	44	Negative effect $(Z_{gene} < -2)$	54
Positive effect $(Z_{gene} > 5)$	11	5	Positive effect (Z <sub>gene</sub> > 2)	13
Total	475	273	Total	273

**Table 3.2: Results of the three functional genetic screens.** Number of genes tested in each screen and cumulative results. "Negative effect" corresponds to a reduction in eggs laid or number of ovarioles below the Z score ( $Z_{gene}$ ) threshold for each phenotype. "Positive effect" indicates an increase above the set  $Z_{gene}$  thresholds.  $Z_{gene}$  thresholds for each category in each screen are indicated in brackets. The primary filter of  $|Z_{gene}| < 1$  was applied only to the hpo[RNAi] Egg Laying screen shown in Figure 3.1a. The list of specific genes that exceeded our chosen  $Z_{gene}$  thresholds for each scored phenotype (Figure 3.1) and were therefore considered to have a positive or negative effect on the phenotype, is found in the Table C.1. The 12 genes for which RNAi stocks were unavailable at the time of testing are listed in Table 3.3.

FbID	CG Number	Name	Symbol
FBgn0283468	CG3412	supernumerary limbs	slmb
FBgn0267821	CG5102	daughterless	da
FBgn0266724	CG5161	TRAPP subunit 20	Trs20
FBgn0267378	CG7085	sauron	sau
FBgn0267487	CG9181	Protein tyrosine phosphatase 61F	Ptp61F
FBgn0267912	CG9819	Calcineurin A at 14F	CanA-14F
FBgn0086371	CG9829	poly	poly
FBgn0267350	CG10260	Phosphatidylinositol 4-kinase III alpha	PI4KIIIalpha
FBgn0267698	CG10295	p21-activated kinase	Pak
FBgn0283462	CG18279	Immune induced molecule prepropeptide	ІМРРР
FBgn0267339	CG33338	p38c MAP kinase	р38с
FBgn0085506	CG40635	-	CG40635

Table 3.3: Candidates with no genetic lines. 12 signalling candidate genes with no available RNAi lines at either BDSC or VDRC at the time of this study.

#### 3.2.2 Ovariole number is weakly correlated with egg laying

Standardization of the results from the three screens using Z scores allowed us to compare the effects of individual genes on one or both of egg laying and ovariole number. We performed a pairwise comparison of the  $Z_{gene}$  values for all combinations of screens, and considered genes with  $|Z_{gene}|$  values that were above the thresholds set for the phenotype in each screen (above two for ovariole number, above five for egg laying; green dots in Figure 3.2a-c. Across all three screens, loss of function of our positive candidates yielded reductions in ovariole number and egg laying more commonly than increases (Figure 3.2a-c). Comparing the  $|Z_{gene}|$  values of egg laying and ovariole number of *tj:Gal4>hpo[RNAi], signalling candidate[RNAi]* adult females revealed that genes that caused a change in egg laying did not always similarly affect ovariole number, and vice versa (Figure 3.2a). We therefore hypothesise that egg laying and ovariole number may be regulated by genetically separable mechanisms. This hypothesis notwithstanding, we observed a weak but statistically significant correlation between egg laying and ovariole number (p=1e10<sup>-5</sup>; Figure 3.2d), and this correlation was most significant in adult females that had a drastic reduction in both phenotypes (Figure 3.2a).

**Figure 3.2** (following page): Relationship between Egg Laying and Ovariole Number phenotypes generated in the screens. a) Scatter plots of the Z score for each gene ( $Z_{gene}$ ) of egg laying versus the ovariole number of adult tj>hpo[RNAi], candidate[RNAi] females. **b**) Scatter plots of the Z score for each gene ( $Z_{gene}$ ) of egg laying of adult tj>candidate[RNAi] females versus the ovariole number of adult tj>hpo[RNAi], candidate[RNAi] females. **c**) Scatter plots of the Z score for each gene ( $Z_{gene}$ ) of egg laying of adult tj>candidate[RNAi] females versus egg laying of adult tj>hpo[RNAi], candidate[RNAi] females. In **a**, **b** and **c**, bar graphs on the top and right sides of each panel show the distribution of genes in each axis of the adjacent scatter plots. Green dots = genes that meet the  $Z_{gene}$  threshold for the indicated phenotype. Grey dots = genes that do not meet the  $Z_{gene}$  threshold for the indicated phenotype. Dark grey dotted lines = thresholds for each phenotype:  $|Z_{gene}| > 5$  for Egg Laying and  $|Z_{gene}| > 2$  for Ovariole Number. In **a** and **c**, the white vertical bar removes all genes in the tj>hpo[RNAi], candidate[RNAi] with a  $|Z_{gene}| < 1$  for egg laying. These genes were not measured in the other two conditions and are therefore not represented in the scatter plots. **d**) Correlation between non-zero Ovariole Number and Egg Laying values.





## 3.2.3 No single signalling pathway dominates regulation of ovariole number or egg laying

We found that at least some genes from all tested signalling pathways could affect both egg laying and ovariole number (Figure 3.3). To determine if some pathway(s) appeared to play a more important role than others in these processes, we asked whether any of our screens were enriched for genes from a specific signalling pathway. To measure enrichment, we compared the distribution of individual pathway genes among the positive candidates in each screen, to a randomly sampled null distribution of pathway genes among a group of the same number of genes randomly selected from our curated list of 463 signalling genes (Figure 3.3a). Involvement of a pathway in the regulation of a phenotype would be reflected in a difference between the representation of pathway genes in an experimentally derived list and a randomly selected group of signalling genes. We found that rather than only one or a few pathways showing functional evidence of regulating ovariole number or egg laying, nearly all pathways affected both phenotypes (Figure 3.3a). We further tested this result by calculating the hypergeometric p-value for the enrichment of each signalling pathway, in each of the three groups of genes. Consistent with the results of the random sampling approach (Figure 3.3a), we found that most pathway members were not significantly enriched for egg laying or ovariole number phenotypes (Figure 3.3b). The absence of significant enrichment of any specific pathway is not simply attributable to the pool of genes that were screened, because our experimental manipulations of ovariole number and egg laying did cause a change in the distribution of signalling pathway members (Figure C.2). Instead, both phenotypes appeared to be regulated by members of most or all signalling pathways (Figure 3.3). The only two exceptions to this trend were a greater than twofold enrichment of (1) genes from the Notch signalling pathway in the regulation of ovariole number (p-value < 0.05, pink bar in Figure 3.3a, b), and (2) members of the Hedgehog (Hh) signalling pathway in the regulation of Hippo-dependent egg laying (p-value < 0.05, brown bar in Figure 3.3a, 3b; Figure C.3).In summation, our analyses of the enrichment of signalling pathways within the different screens indicated that both ovariole number and egg laying are regulated by genes from nearly all described animal signalling pathways (Figure 3.3a), rather

than being dominated by any single pathway.

Comparing the results of the Egg Laying screens performed in a wild type background (Figure 3.1b) or in a hpo[RNAi] background (Figure 3.1a), revealed that most of the genes that met a threshold of  $|Z_{gene}| > 5$  in one screen, did not meet that threshold in the other screen (Figure 3.2c). This result suggests the existence of both Hippo-dependent and Hippo-independent mechanisms of regulation of egg laying. The interpretations of separable Hippo-dependent and -independent regulation of egg laying, and of the separable regulation of ovariole number and egg laying, was supported by the results of the network analysis described in the following section. **Figure 3.3** (following page): Enrichment of genes of individual signalling pathways among the experimentally obtained positive candidates of each screen. a) Enrichment/depletion analysis to identify over- or under-represented members of individual signalling pathways among positive candidates of each screen. Positive Z scores represent an enrichment, and negative Z scores represent depletion, of genes of a pathway among those genes that experimentally affected the phenotype Enrichment and depletion are defined relative to a null distribution of the expected number of members of a signalling pathway among a group containing the same number of randomly selected signalling genes. b) Fold enrichment and hypergeometric p-value calculation to identify over- or under-representation of the genes of a pathway in each screen. Significantly enriched pathways (coloured bars: brown = Hedgehog; pink = Notch) are defined by having a hypergeometric p-value less than 0.05. Enrichment/depletion analysis of the 273 signalling pathway genes above the threshold  $|Z_{gene}| > 1$  (Figure 3.1a) before screening is illustrated in **Figure C.2. Figure C.3** compares the  $Z_{gene}$  of egg laying of adult females of tj>hpo[RNAi], candidate[RNAi] plotted against  $Z_{gene}$  of egg laying of tj>candidate[RNAi] adult females displayed by pathway.

#### Figure 3.3: (continued)



## 3.2.4 Centrality of genes in the ovarian protein-protein interaction networks can predict the likelihood of loss of function phenotypic effects

The finding that these reproductive traits were regulated by the genes of all signalling pathways led us to consider the broader topology of putative gene regulatory networks in the analysis of our data. Previously characterized genes in the ovary are often pleiotropic and can regulate both ovariole number and egg laying<sup>26,30</sup>. As with proteins in a linear pathway, proteins in a protein-protein interaction network (PIN) are more likely to function in conjunction with genes that are connected to them within the network (e.g. Ideker and Sharan<sup>50</sup>, Jeong et al.<sup>51</sup>). Centrality is one measure of the connectedness of a gene in the PIN and can be used to identify the most important functional centres within a protein network<sup>52,53</sup>. Most centrality measures use path length, which is a measure of the number of other proteins required to link any two proteins in the network. Here we used four commonly used metrics to quantify gene centrality, each measuring slightly different properties <sup>54,55</sup>. (1) Degree centrality is proportional to the number of proteins that a given protein directly interacts with. (2) Betweenness centrality measures the number of shortest paths amongst all the shortest paths between all pairs of proteins that require passing through a particular protein. (3) *Closeness centrality* measures the average shortest path that connects a given protein to all other proteins in the network. (4) Eigenvector centrality is a measure of the closeness of a given protein to other highly connected proteins within the network.

We hypothesised that if the candidate genes we identified in our screen as playing roles in ovarian function worked together as a PIN, then the degree of centrality of a gene might be an indicator of function. To test this hypothesis, we first compiled a PIN consisting of all described interactions between *D. melanogaster* proteins, from the combination of publicly available protein-protein interaction (PPI) studies in the DroID database (see Methods). We then calculated the four centrality measures described above for all genes within the *D. melanogaster* PIN (Table C.1). We rank ordered only the genes tested in each screen by their score for each centrality measure, and asked whether their rank order correlated with the results of the screen,

plotting these results as a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. Positive correlations between centrality (a continuous variable) and phenotype (a binary variable: above or below the  $|Z_{gene}|$  threshold) are reflected in an area under the curve (AUC) of more than 0.5. We found that the higher the centrality score, the greater the likelihood that a gene had  $|Z_{gene}|$  values above our threshold for effects on ovariole number and egg laying (Figure 3.4a; Table C.2). This supports the premise that the positive candidates identified in our screen function together as a network in the regulation of either ovariole number or egg laying. Interestingly, while the centrality of genes did predict whether a gene would affect our phenotypes of interest, it could only weakly predict the strength of that effect (p-value < 0.05 in Figure C.4).



**Figure 3.4: Screened genes function as a network. a)** Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves of genes ordered by rank for each of four network centrality metrics (Betweenness centrality, Eigenvector centrality, Closeness centrality and Degree centrality) versus a binary outcome (above or below Z score threshold) for each of the three screens. For each screen and metric, the Area Under the Curve (AUC) is > 0.5 (Table C.2). b) Genes whose  $|Z_{gene}|$  value was above the threshold (green dots; Table 3.2) in all three screens were assigned to the Core seed list. c) Genes whose  $|Z_{gene}|$  value was above the threshold (green dots; Table 3.2) in each screen were assigned to the corresponding seed list. **Table C.2** Tabulates the AUC values for the ROC curves for each centrality measure for the three screens (Figure 3.4a). **Figure C.4** Compares the distribution of  $Z_{gene}$  scores of the positive candidate genes for the first and fifth quintile genes sorted by their centrality metrics. **Figure C.5** compares the network metrics of the four gene lists in Figure 3.4b to two null distribution of genes selected from the PIN.

### 3.2.5 Genes regulating egg laying and ovariole number regulation form non-random gene interaction networks

The centrality analyses above suggested that the genes implicated in ovariole number and egg-laying displayed characteristics of a functional network. PINs can often be further sorted into a collection of sub-networks. A sub-network is a smaller selection of proteins from the PIN. Examples of such sub-networks could be proteins within the same subcellular organelle<sup>56</sup> or genes that are expressed at the same time<sup>57</sup>, thus making them likely to function together<sup>58</sup>. A putative module is a sub-network that can perform regulatory functions as a unit, independent of other sub-networks, and has key measurable features<sup>44,59,60,61</sup>. Genes and interactions between genes are not mutually exclusive to such putative modules and can be shared between putative modules. We therefore asked if our sub-networks, consisting of genes that showed similar mutant phenotypes, might display features of modularity. To determine whether genes that were implicated in regulation of ovariole number and egg laying interacted with each other in specific groups more than would be expected by chance, we created four lists of genes, called "seed" lists, based on their individual phenotypic effects based on our screen results: (1) the core seed list, including genes positive in all three screens (Figure 3.4b); (2) the egg laying seed list, including genes positive in the wild type background egg-laying screen (Figure 3.1b; Figure 3.4c); (3) the *hpo*[*RNAi*] egg laying seed list, including genes positive in the *hpo*[*RNAi*] background egg laying screen (Figure 3.1a; Figure 3.4c); and (4) the hpo[RNAi] ovariole seed list, including genes positive in the *hpo*[*RNAi*] background ovariole number screen (Figure 3.1c; Figure 3.4c). Interestingly, the core seed list, comprising genes that affected all three measured phenotypes, only consisted of genes that caused a reduction in both ovariole number and egg laying (Figure 3.4b).

We then asked whether these four seed lists were more connected than would be expected by chance. In other words, we formally tested them for modularity as defined above. Meeting our criteria for modularity would suggest that the genes in these phenotypically separated seed lists might operate together as putative functional modules within the *Drosophila* PIN. We performed our modularity test using four commonly measured network metrics: (1) Largest Connected

Component (LCC) (the number of proteins or nodes connected together by at least one interaction), (2) network density (the relative number of edges as compared to the theoretical maximum), (3) total number of edges, and (4) average shortest path (average of the minimum distances connecting any two proteins). We considered a sub-network to show modular features if they showed most of the following properties: higher LCC, higher network density, more edges, and shorter average shortest path length when compared to a similarly sized, randomly sampled selection of genes from the PIN.

To determine whether these criteria would correctly identify signalling genes, which are known to function together as a module, we measured these four parameters in the original set of genes (all signalling genes) used in this study (Table 3.1). We found that the signalling genes display features of modularity when compared both to a randomly selected set of genes, as well as to a degree-controlled list of genes (Figure C.5a). We then used this approach to test the modularity of the four phenotypic sub-networks, when compared to two different "control sub-networks" consisting of a group of the same number of genes as contained in the sub-network, one chosen randomly from among the candidate genes from our initial screen list (Table 3.1), and the second chosen from a degree-controlled list of genes selected from the entire PIN (see Methods: Building degree-controlled randomized networks). We found that the four predicted phenotypic sub-networks showed higher LCC, higher network density, more edges (Figure C.5b), compared to both "control sub-networks". This result suggests that these sub-networks display many features of modularity (although their average shortest path length is higher than controls, rather than lower) and may function as putative modules within the PIN to regulate one or both of ovariole number or egg laying.

Based on published molecular interactions, in addition to the four criteria described above, further evidence for putative functional modules of genes can also be obtained by applying algorithms that use either the shortest path method<sup>62</sup> or the Steiner Tree approach<sup>63</sup>. Such methods identify and predict functional connections between the seed proteins, as well as additional nodes (proteins or genes) that have not been experimentally tested within the given parameters, but are known to interact with the seed genes in the PIN<sup>64,65</sup>. This process can provide evidence for or against the existence of a predicted functional module, and subsequent

experimental testing of this predicted module can confirm its functionality. Given its recent success in predicting gene modules, we applied the previously published Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA), a member of the Steiner Tree algorithm family<sup>66,67</sup>, to the groups of genes that had similar phenotypic effects in our screens (seed genes; Figure 3.4b, c). The SCA connects seed genes and previously untested novel genes (connectors) to each other using a known PIN, producing the largest possible connected putative module given the data. Using the PIN and the aforementioned four lists of seed genes, we applied a custom python implementation of the SCA (Methods: 04\_Seed-Connector.ipynb) to build and extract the largest possible (given our PIN) connected putative modules that regulate egg laying and ovariole number.

This SCA method yielded four putative modules, one for each seed list, which we initially referred to as the Core Module (Figure 3.5b), *hpo[RNAi]* Egg Laying module (Figure C.6), Egg Laying Module (Figure C.7), and *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number Module (Figure C.8) respectively. Each of these four putative modules contained seed genes, which had been functionally evaluated in our screens (green and red circles in Figure 3.5), as well as connector genes, which were genes newly predicted as regulators of these phenotypes (green and red triangles in Figure 3.5). Of the four putative modules generated by the SCA, we found that the Core module had higher centrality measures than the other three putative modules (Figure C.9). We interpret this to mean that the genes regulating these "Core phenotypes" are more strongly connected to each other.

We found, however, that these four groups of genes produced by the SCA did not have increased LCC values, increased network density, more edges nor decreased average shortest path (Figure C.10), compared to our "control sub-networks". This result shows that the SCA in this instance does not provide evidence for putative functional modules from the four phenotypic sub-networks in our system, above and beyond the evidence provided by the application of the four network metrics discussed above. To be conservative in our description of these results, we therefore henceforth refer to these four groups of genes united by phenotype and with strong predicted interactions, as sub-networks rather than as modules. We noted that each of these four sub-networks contains genes from most, if not all, known signalling pathways, rather than only genes from a single pathway (Figure C.11).

Figure 3.5 (following page): Representation of Seed Connector Algorithm and output. a) Schematic representation of the seed connector algorithm. The algorithm initializes by creating a sub-network of seed genes from the PIN and computes the Largest Connected Component (LCC) and coverage (number of genes from the seed set in the LCC). At each iteration, genes in the direct neighbourhood of the LCC (distance = 1) are added one at a time to the seed set, and the coverage and LCC are recomputed. This process is repeated for each gene in the direct neighbourhood, each time restarting from the seed set of the preceding iteration. If any gene outside the seed set but in the direct neighbourhood is found to maximize coverage while minimizing the LCC, it is added to the seed set as a connector gene. Black arrows indicate the path taken by the algorithm for which the criteria of maximal coverage and minimal LCC are met; such a path would be used to proceed to the subsequent iteration. Grey arrows indicate paths that fail to meet these criteria; such paths would be disregarded. The iteration repeats until the coverage cannot be increased; in this schematic example, this state is achieved in iteration 3. b) The Core sub-network generated by the Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA) based on the results of the genetic screens (Figure 3.1a-c). The size and colour of the shapes indicate the relative Z<sub>aene</sub> score of ovariole number of adult tj>hpo[RNAi], candidate[RNAi] females. Circles indicate seed genes (functionally tested in the screen; Table 3.2; Table C.1) while triangles are connector genes (novel predicted genes; Table C.1, Figures C.6 to C.8). Green = genes with a positive  $Z_{gene}$  score above the threshold; red = genes with a negative  $Z_{gene}$  score above the threshold; grey = genes with Z<sub>gene</sub> values below the threshold. *hpo[RNAi]* Egg Laying, Egg laying and *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number sub-networks generated by the Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA) are illustrated in Figures C.6 to C.8 respectively. Figure C.9 shows the distribution of the four centrality measures calculated for the genes in each of the four phenotypic sub-networks obtained from the SCA (Figure 3.5 and Figures C.6 to C.8). Figure C.10 Compares the network metrics after application of the SCA. Figure C.11 shows the enrichment/depletion of signalling pathway genes in each of the four sub-networks obtained from the SCA.



# 3.2.6 Low edge densities between sub-networks suggest genetically separable mechanisms of ovariole number and egg laying

Our network analysis identified four highly connected sub-networks of genes that regulate two distinct developmental processes, together with or independently of Hippo signalling activity: ovariole number determination, which occurs primarily during larval development, and egg laying, which takes place in adult life (Figure 3.5). We wished to assess the degree to which there might be any shared genetic components between these four phenotypic sub-networks, and whether the addition of connector genes by the SCA had any impact on this. To understand potential interactions between the phenotypic sub-networks in the regulation of both ovariole number and egg laying, we constructed a composite network of all genes in each of the four phenotypic sub-networks (Figure 3.5b; Figures C.6 to C.8), which we refer to as the "meta network" (Figure 3.6a). We then grouped the genes of the meta network into seven bins based on their phenotypic effects as measured in the three screens, resulting in sub-groups I through VII shown in Figure 3.6a. To ask whether the genes in these phenotypic groupings showed any notable interaction patterns, we compared the connectivity between genes assigned to the same phenotypic group, to the connectivity of a group of the same size randomly assembled from the genes of the meta network (Figure C.12). As a measure of connectivity, we used an edge density map, which reflects the number of interactions between the genes within a group and between groups. We quantified the deviation between the edge density of each of groups I through VII, and their corresponding randomly assigned groups of the same size, by computing their respective Z score. When we included only seed genes in each of groups I through VII, we found that the edge density values of these groups were somewhat lower (Z score < -1.5) than those of the randomized groups (Figure C.12a). The single exception to this was group IV, whose members shared more edges with each other than did the members of its randomized comparison group of the same size (Figure C.12a). In other words, these groups of phenotypically binned seed genes were not notably more connected to each other then we would expect by chance.

In contrast, expanding each of the seven phenotypic sub-groups to include both seed genes and


**Figure 3.6: Phenotypically separable sub-networks formed by analysis of the combined genes from all sub-networks.** The meta network is generated by the union of the genes in the four phenotypic sub-networks: *hpo[RNAi]* Egg Laying (Figure C.6), Egg Laying (Figure C.7), *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number (Figure C.8) and Core (Figure 3.5b). **a)** The meta network is represented as a Venn diagram, in which each grey dotted outline represents the screen in which a given gene was identified as affecting the scored phenotype. Within each sub-network, grey circles indicate seed genes, and blue circles indicate connector genes. Solid grey lines indicate interactions between genes in the meta network from the PIN. **b)** Edge densities between the seven sub-networks of the meta network. **c)** Relative enrichment of screened members of the 14 tested developmental signalling pathways within the seven sub-networks of the meta network. **Figure C.12** compares the edge density of the seven sub-networks of the meta network to the edge densities of a random assignment of the positive candidates in the screen to a seven similarly sized sub-networks.

the connector genes predicted by the SCA changed the edge densities of these groups relative to their randomized control groups. Specifically, edge densities were much lower between groups I, II and III (Z score < -3), and much higher within group IV (Z score > 3) (Figure C.12b). This shows that applying the SCA to these phenotypically binned groups increased the non-random differences in connectivity between them that were already present within the seed genes (Figure C.12a), thus clarifying the internal structure of the meta network.

We then asked if these seven sub-groups were as connected to each other, as were the genes within each of the sub-groups, again using the edge density assessment as described above (Figure 3.6b). This analysis yielded three principal findings. First, edge densities between the three groups corresponding to the three scored phenotypes (I, II and III in Figure 3.6a) were very low (Figure 3.6b). This implies that the genes in each of the groups that regulate only one phenotype (I, II and III in Figure 3.6a) share more interactions with themselves than with genes in the other two groups, suggesting that each of these initially scored phenotype can be largely regulated by an independent, non-interacting set of genes. Second, the core group (IV in Figure 3.6a) displayed a higher edge density with the other three groups (I, II and III in Figure 3.6a) than any of those three groups did with each other (Figure 3.6b). Consistent with the definition of core genes as regulating all three scored reproductive phenotypes, this result suggests that the core genes, in contrast to those from the other three groups, may share substantial functional interactions with genes of the other groups. Finally, three small additional groups emerged from this analysis (V, VI and VII in Figure 3.6a), suggesting small networks of genes that might work together to regulate two of the three scored phenotypes. In sum, this meta network analysis supports the hypothesis of three potentially largely non-interacting genetic networks that regulate Hippo-dependent ovariole number, Hippo-dependent egg laying, and Hippo-independent egg laying respectively. The presence of smaller sub-networks (V, VI and VII in Figure 3.6a) that interact with each other further supports the observation that the putative modules predicted by the SCA - which we refer to as sub-networks – could include genes that function within more than one such sub-network (Figure C.9). Moreover, each of these genetically separable sub-networks included genes in multiple signalling pathways (Figure 3.6c).

# 3.2.7 Network analysis predicts novel genes involved in egg laying and ovariole number

The four predicted phenotypic sub-networks produced by the SCA approach included connector genes that were not included in our original screen, and thus had not been tested for possible effects on our phenotypes of interest (triangles in Figure 3.5b; Figures C.6 to C.8). Given that prior work in human disease models showed that predicted disease modules can correctly predict gene involvement in the relevant diseases<sup>66,67,68,69</sup>, we asked whether our deployment of the SCA had likewise successfully p:*RNAi* lines for each connector, driven by *tj:Gal4* to measure the effects of knocking down each of the connector genes (triangles in Figure 3.5b and Figures C.6 to C.8) both on phenotypes within the sub-network where they were predicted (Figure 3.7a-b, Table C.3), and on either of the other two tested phenotypes (Figure 3.7c, Table C.4).

Of the ten predicted novel connectors within the Core sub-network, loss of function of several of these had significant effects on at least one of the three scored phenotypes. Five affected ovariole number, two affected Hpo-dependent egg laying and one affected Hpo-independent egg laying. However, only one of them significantly altered all three scored phenotypes (Figure 3.7a; Table C.3).

The predicted connector genes from two of the other three phenotypic sub-networks showed high positive prediction rates for novel genes within the sub-networks. RNAi against seven out of 18 of the *hpo[RNAi]* Egg Laying connectors, three out of 11 of the *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number connectors, and none of the 11 Egg Laying connectors, significantly affected the sub-network phenotype (Table C.3). Thus, although the Egg Laying connectors failed to impact this phenotype in our assay, 41.1% and 27.2% of the connectors from the other two sub-networks were correctly predicted (Figure 3.7b; Table C.3).

In sum, taken across all sub-networks, this methodology correctly identified genes regulating at least one of the scored reproductive phenotypes, at significantly higher rates than those obtained in the original screen of 463 members of all known signalling pathways (Figure 3.7c; Table C.4). By this measure, testing network-predicted novel genes derived from experimentally

obtained data was even more successful than testing signalling pathways as a means of identifying novel genes that regulate ovariole number and egg laying.



**Figure 3.7: Positive prediction rates of the connector genes in each of the four sub-networks. a)** Proportion of Core subnetwork connector genes with  $|Z_{gene}|$  above the threshold in each of the three screens. The "All phenotypes" category includes the genes with  $|Z_{gene}|$  above the threshold in all three screens. **b)** Proportion of tested connector genes in each of the three subnetworks with  $|Z_{gene}|$  above the threshold within their corresponding screen. **c)** Proportion of all unique connector genes (dark grey bars) predicted by all four sub-networks compared to the proportion of signaling candidate genes (light grey bars) with  $|Z_{gene}|$  above the respective threshold in any of the three phenotypic screens (Figure 3.1a-c). Positive connector and signaling candidates that were above the  $|Z_{gene}|$  threshold in all three phenotypic screens (Figure 3.1a-c) are indicated in an "All phenotypes" column. Statistical significance was computed using the binomial test, comparing the probability of a positive candidate amongst the connectors to the probability of a positive candidate amongst the signalling candidates (p-value is found below each bar). **Table C.3** tabulates the distribution of seed genes and connectors in each sub-network used in Figure 3.7a, b. **Table C.4** tabulates the unique connector and signaling genes above  $|Z_{gene}|$  threshold for the three phenotypic measurements plotted in Figure 3.7c. The connector genes are listed in the Table C.1 and can be identified under the column header **[SubNetworkName]\_Connector.** The raw data for egg laying and ovariole number for each of the connector genes can be found within the Table C.1.

#### 3.3 Discussion

In this study, we have identified many novel genes that regulate either or both of egg laying and ovariole number. Though the development of the insect ovary has been studied for over 100 years, our understanding of the genetic mechanisms that regulate the development of the ovary is sparse. The female reproductive system and its ability to produce eggs are one of the key determinants for the survival of a species in an ecological niche. The genes we have uncovered here are possible targets for the regulation of the construction and function of the reproductive system in *Drosophila melanogaster*, and potentially in other species of insects as well. Understanding the gene regulatory networks that regulate egg laying and ovariole development could provide a framework to understand the key regulatory steps during this process that may be modified over evolutionary time, to yield the wide diversity of ovariole numbers and fecundities displayed by extant insects. We suggest that, given our success in applying a network approach to the results of a traditional forward genetic screen, the field of developmental genetics should find it fruitful to apply network analyses to the interpretation of large scale transcriptomic and proteomic data.

## 3.3.1 Identification of regulatory sub-networks for ovariole development and egg laying

The *D. melanogaster* ovary is a commonly studied model for organogenesis<sup>15,21,25</sup>, stem cell maintenance<sup>30</sup> and interactions of development and ecology<sup>5,12,70,71</sup>. Nevertheless, our understanding of the genetic mechanisms that regulate these processes remains fragmentary. In this paper, we have identified four distinct protein interaction sub-networks that regulate ovariole number and egg laying in the *D. melanogaster* ovary. These sub-networks consist of both novel and previously characterized genes that regulate either ovariole number or egg laying or both, thus enhancing our understanding of the genetic underpinnings of this reproductive system.

Of the four sub-networks, the Core sub-network affects both ovariole number and egg laying. The Core sub-network contains numerous housekeeping genes, including regulators of

transcription, translation and cell division such as *polo*<sup>72</sup>, *cyclin K*<sup>73</sup>, *nucleosome assembly protein* 1<sup>74</sup> and *eukaryotic translation release factor* 1<sup>75</sup>. While *polo* and *eukaryotic translation release factor* 1 are members of signalling pathways, *cyclin K* and *nucleosome assembly protein* 1 are genes predicted by the SCA. Given that the Core sub-network largely consists of genes whose loss of function decreases both of these parameters, we hypothesise that these are essential genes for the basic structure and function of the ovaries. Essential genes are more interconnected in a PIN with higher centrality measures (<sup>51</sup>; but see<sup>76</sup>) and interestingly, we find that the genes in the Core sub-network also have higher connectivity than those in the other three sub-networks (Figure C.9).

In addition to genes that regulate basic cellular processes, the Core sub-network is enriched for the central components of the Hh signalling cascade, namely *patched (ptc), smoothened (smo)* and *costa (cos)*<sup>77</sup>. However, we find that the loss of Hh ligand, which is expressed in the TF cells in the developing larval ovary<sup>78</sup>, does not significantly affect either ovariole number or egg laying. Though surprising, ligand-independent activation of Hedgehog signalling has been observed before. For example, in the *Drosophila* eye, loss of either *ptc* or *cos* in clones leads to non-cell autonomous proliferation in wild type cells, as well as growth disadvantages in the mutant tissue<sup>79</sup>. In another example, sufficient intracellular *smo* levels can also activate downstream transcription of Hh pathway targets, showing that Hh itself is not always required to activate the cascade<sup>80</sup>.

#### 3.3.2 Development of the larval ovary

The *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number sub-network is composed of genes that affect the Hippo signalling activity-dependent determination of ovariole number during development. Establishment of ovariole number occurs largely during the third instar stage of larval development in *D. melanogaster*<sup>20,21,23,38</sup>. During this period, the TFCs are specified in the anterior of the ovary and undergo rearrangement into stacks of cells called TFs, each of which gives rise to an ovariole<sup>21,24</sup>. TF specification requires the expression of *engrailed* (En)<sup>81</sup> and the transcription factors Bab1 and Bab2, encoded by the *bric-à-brac* locus<sup>82,83</sup>. A third transcription factor, Lmx1a, was recently found to be necessary for the specification of the TFCs<sup>84</sup>. Our

*hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number sub-network identifies numerous additional novel transcription factors including *bunched* (*bun*) and *retinoblastoma-family protein* (*rbf*), which we hypothesize could also be involved in the specification of ovariole number. *bun* and *rbf* have been implicated in the migration<sup>85</sup> and endoreplication<sup>86</sup> of the follicle cells during oogenesis, but have not, to our knowledge, been previously identified as playing a role in the context of larval ovary development.

The TFCs specified in the larval ovary undergo a process of convergent extension to form TFs. This process of convergent extension requires cell intercalation, and the actin depolymerizing factor Cofilin, encoded by the gene *twinstar*, is essential to this process<sup>25</sup>. During intercalation, the cells also dynamically modify their actin cytoskeleton and their expression of E-cadherin<sup>21</sup>. Our *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number sub-network further identifies *Rho1*<sup>87</sup> and *Rho kinase* (*Rok*)<sup>88</sup> as necessary for correct ovariole number. During the extension of the *D. melanogaster* embryonic germ band, a commonly studied model of convergent extension, the localised activation of the actin-myosin network facilitated by *Rho1* and *Rok* is necessary for cell intercalation. A third actin cytoskeleton regulator, *misshapen* (*msn*), was also identified by our *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number sub-network. *msn* encodes a MAP kinase previously shown to regulate the polarisation of the actin cytoskeleton during oogenesis<sup>91</sup>, but has not, to our knowledge, been studied to date in the context of larval ovarian development.

We propose that the polarity of the somatic cells in the ovary is also necessary for correct larval ovary development, given the presence of the lateral membrane proteins *discs large 1 (dlg1)* and *prickle (pk)* in the ovariole sub-network. During the maturation of the TFs during larval development, the TFCs undergo significant cell shape changes, coincident with localised expression of beta-Catenin and actin to the lateral edges of the TFCs<sup>21</sup>. Restriction of the E-cadherin domain in epithelia requires establishment of the basolateral domain<sup>92</sup> and we propose that testing a similar requirement for *dlg1* and *pk* in the larval ovary would be a fruitful avenue for future studies.

#### 3.3.3 Network analysis as a tool in developmental biology

Using a systems biology approach to analyse RNAi screening data has proven fruitful, providing us with new insights into the development and function of the *D. melanogaster* ovary by identifying novel and previously understudied genes that regulate this process. Systematic analysis of the function of single genes in development has been a historical convention and has provided valuable and precise genetic interaction information<sup>93,94</sup>. With the advent of genome-wide analysis, however, we can use data from a larger number of genes to predict the identity of additional functionally significant genes with relative ease<sup>65</sup>. We note that the novel gene prediction rate within each individual sub-network ranged from as high as 41.1% from the hpo/RNAi] Ovariole Number sub-network to as low as 0% from the Egg Laying sub-network (Figure 3.7b; Table C.3). We suggest that this may be due to multiple factors. Firstly, the possible incompleteness of the PIN is expected to lead to some areas of the network being sparse or non-existent<sup>94</sup>. If the sub-network of interest happens to fall in such regions of the PIN, prediction algorithms will fail. Secondly, the initial restriction of tested genes to signalling pathway members might have provided a seed list too sparse to usefully predict functional connectors. Finally, it could be the case that "Egg Laying" is such a complex phenotype that its gene regulation cannot be adequately captured within a highly connected network of the type suited for identification by the analyses we have used here.

Ovariole number in *D. melanogaster* is the outcome of a discrete developmental process with a clear beginning and end, comprising a specific series of cellular behaviours that take place in the confines of one organ<sup>21,23,71</sup>. Once established during larval life, ovariole number in *Drosophila* remains unaltered through to and during adulthood, even if oogenesis within those ovarioles suffers congenital or age-related defects<sup>3</sup>. Because previous work suggested that ovariole number in *Drosophila* could have at least some predictive relation to egg laying<sup>6,70</sup>, we reasoned that scoring the latter phenotype in a primary screen (Figure 3.1a) could be an effective way to uncover ovariole number regulators (Figure 3.1c). While our results showed that this was true in many cases, it was also clear that these two traits can vary independently (Figure 3.2), highlighting the fact that ovariole number is not the only determinant of egg laying. Egg-laying dynamics, even during the limited five-day assay used in our study, are likely

influenced not just by a single anatomical parameter such as ovariole number, but rather by many biological, biomechanical, hormonal and behavioural processes. Consequently, the sub-network we were able to extract from the results of this screen (Figure 3.1a, b) might be too coarse to extract novel genes that participate in potentially complex gene interactions regulating egg laying. Furthermore, genes predicted within each of the sub-networks are unlikely to function exclusively within just one sub-network. This conclusion is supported by our observation that genes predicted to function in any of the sub-networks, also function in at least one of the four sub-networks at a higher rate than genes selected for screening by their presence in a signalling pathway (Figure 3.7c). We also observe that though substantial regions of the meta network do not share interactions with genes in the other sub-networks (Figure 3.6b), we do find smaller sub-networks where there is some overlap, further indicating pleiotropy of some genes in both egg laying and ovariole number regulation.

The predictive rates of the approach we have used here, although encouraging, are likely limited by the degree of noise in the high-throughput data used to generate the PIN<sup>95</sup>, the sparseness of the PIN, and the degree of misidentification of protein interactions<sup>96</sup>. Addressing one or more of these parameters could improve the outcomes of future network predictions from developmental genetics data. For example, the problem of sparseness, which is a paucity of high confidence detectable interactions relative to all biologically relevant interactions, has been addressed in other studies by using an "Interolog PIN"<sup>97</sup> in place of an organism-specific PIN. An Interolog PIN combines known interactions from multiple organisms, and has been used successfully to identify, for example, gene modules relevant in squamous carcinoma, based on a starting dataset of microarray data on differentially expressed genes between cancer cells and the surrounding tissue<sup>98</sup>. Future studies applying such an Interolog PIN to the outcomes of genetic screens for developmental processes of interest could potentially overcome the problem of sparseness, as well as the biases towards proteins that are more heavily studied and thus better represented in organism-specific PINs.

## 3.4 Methods

#### 3.4.1 Experimental model and subject details

Wild type and mutant lines of *Drosophila melanogaster* were obtained from publicly accessible stock centers and maintained as described in "Fly Stocks" below. Candidate genes were randomly assigned to batches for screening (see the Table C.1 for which genes were in each batch). F1 animals from the same cross were randomly assigned to experimental groups for phenotyping in all screens.

#### 3.4.2 Fly stocks

Flies were reared at 25°C at 60% humidity with standard *Drosophila* food <sup>99</sup> containing yeast and in uncrowded conditions as previously defined <sup>26</sup>. RNAi lines were obtained from the TRiP RNAi collection at the Bloomington *Drosophila* Stock Centre (BDSC) and from the Vienna *Drosophila* Resource Centre (VDRC). Oregon R was used as a wild type strain. The genotype of the *traffic jam:Gal4* line used in the screen was *y w; P{w[+mW.hs] = GawB}NP1624* (Kyoto Stock Center, K104–055; abbreviated hereafter as *tj:Gal4*). The *hippo* RNAi line used in the screen was *y[1] v[1]; P{y[+t7.7]v[+t1.8]=TRiP. HMS00006}attP2* (BDSC:33614; abbreviated hereafter as *hpo[RNAi]*).

#### 3.4.3 Egg and ovariole number counts

Adult egg laying was quantified by crossing three virgin females of the desired genotype (see *"Screen design"* below) with two males in a vial containing standard food and yeast granules (day one) and then transferring them into a fresh food vial without yeast granules for a 24-hour period. Eggs from vials were then counted by visual inspection of the surface of the food in the vial. Males and females were transferred to fresh food vials without yeast granules, every day thereafter until day six. All egg laying measurements reported and analysed in the paper are the sum of the eggs laid by three adult female flies over the five days of this assay (days two through six without yeast granules). Data from any vial in which either a female or male died, during the course of the experiment, were not included in the analysis.

Ovariole number was quantified by mating ten virgin adult females with five virgin adult Oregon R males for three days post-eclosion in vials with yeast at 25°C and 60% humidity. After this three-day mating period, all 20 adult ovaries from the mated females were dissected in 1X PBS with 0.1% Triton-X-100 and stained with 1ug/ml Hoechst 33321 (1:10,000 of a 10mg/ml stock solution). Ovarioles were separated from each other with No. 5 forceps (Fine Science Tools) and counted by counting the number of germaria under a ZEISS Stemi 305 compact stereo microscope with a NIGHTSEA stereo microscope UV Fluorescence adaptor.

#### 3.4.4 Screen design

In the primary screen (Figure 3.1a: hpo[RNAi] Egg Laying), 463 candidate genes (Table C.1) were screened for the effect of an RNAi-induced loss of gene function in a hpo[RNAi] background on the number of eggs laid in the first five days of mating (see "*Egg and ovariole number counts*" above) by adult females. These females were the F1 offspring of UAS:*candidate gene* RNAi males crossed to  $P\{w[+mW.hs] = GawB\}NP1624$ ;  $P\{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS00006\}attP2$  (*tj:Gal4; UAS:hpo[RNAi]*) virgin adult females (Figure 3.1a: hpo[RNAi] Egg Laying). All genes that yielded an egg laying count with a  $|Z_{gene}| > 1$  (see "*Gene selection based on Z score and batch standardization*" below) were selected to undergo two secondary screenings (n=273, Table 3.2; Figure 3.1d). First, these genes were screened for effects on the egg laying of mated adult female offspring from a cross of *UAS:candidate gene[RNAi]* males and *tj:Gal4* virgin adult females (Figure 3.1b: Egg Laying). Secondly, these genes were screened for effects on ovariole number in a *hpo[RNAi]* background. All 20 ovaries from ten adult female F1 offspring of a cross between *UAS:candidate gene[RNAi]* males to  $P\{w[+mW.hs] = GawB\}NP1624$ ;  $P\{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS00006}attP2$  (*tj:Gal4; UAS:hpo[RNAi]*) virgin adult females were scored for ovariole number (see "*Egg and ovariole number counts*" above). (Figure 3.1c: *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number).

#### 3.4.5 Gene selection based on Z score and batch standardization

Candidate genes were screened in batches with an average size of 50 genes. For each batch, control flies were the female F1 offspring of Oregon R males crossed to  $P\{w[+mW.hs] = GawB\}NP1624; P\{y[+t7.7] v[+t1.8]=TRiP.HMS00006\}attP2 (tj:Gal4; UAS:hpo[RNAi])$  virgin adult females. Because the control group in each batch had slightly different distributions of egg laying and ovariole number values (Figure C.1), it was inappropriate to compare absolute mean values between genes that were scored in different batches. Instead, comparisons of the Z score of each candidate ( $Z_{gene}$ ) to its batch control group was used as a discriminant. This approach standardizes for batch effects and allows the comparison of all genotypes within and across the primary and secondary screens with a single metric ( $Z_{gene}$ ).

Firstly, the mean and standard deviation of the eggs laid by the control genotype for a batch were calculated as  $\mu_b$  and  $\sigma_b$  respectively. Then, using the number of eggs laid by adult females of a candidate gene RNAi ( $x_{gene}$ ) of the same batch, the Z score for the egg laying count of that gene ( $Z_{gene}$ ) was calculated as  $Z_{gene} = (x_{gene} - \mu_b) / \sigma_b$ . The same standardization protocol was applied to both egg laying and ovariole number counts of every gene and its corresponding batch control.

Ovariole numbers were derived from counts of the number of ovarioles per ovary for 20 ovaries per candidate gene, and a threshold of  $|Z_{gene}| > 2$  was applied for ovariole number phenotype. Egg laying counts were derived from measurements of three females in a single vial per gene. We therefore chose to be more conservative in our Z score comparisons for the egg laying phenotype, than for ovariole number phenotype, and applied a stringent threshold of  $|Z_{gene}| > 5$ to select genes of interest. All genes with  $|Z_{gene}|$  values above these thresholds are referred to throughout the study as "positive candidates". (See Ipython notebooks

02\_Z\_score\_calculation.ipynb and

02.2\_Z\_score\_calculation\_prediction.ipynb for code implementation and calculation of Z scores, and 06\_Screen Analysis.ipynb for batch effects.)

#### 3.4.6 Signalling pathway enrichment analysis

To study the enrichment of a particular signalling pathway in a group of candidate genes that had similar phenotypic effects revealed by the screen, custom scripts (see 07\_Signaling\_pathway\_analysis.ipynb for code implementation) were generated to implement two different methods (Figure 3.3a, b; Figure C.2; Figure C.11a, b).

The first method is a numerical method that uses random sampling to calculate the null distribution of the number of members (M) of a signalling pathway (S) that would be expected at random in a set of genes of size (N). The script randomly sampled N genes from among the 463 tested *D. melanogaster* signalling genes 10,000 times, and counted the number of genes (M) that were members of the signalling pathway S. Positive candidates in each of the three screens were sorted by their presence in signalling pathways and counted. The Z score was then calculated by comparing the experimentally observed number of positive candidates in each signalling pathway against the randomly sampled null distribution.

The second method used the hypergeometric p-value to calculate the probability of M members of a signalling pathway being in a group of N genes, given a starting population of 463 tested *D*. *melanogaster* signalling genes, and the known attribution to a pathway S of each gene.

#### 3.4.7 Protein-Protein Interaction Network (PIN) building

There is no standard complete Protein-Protein Interaction network (PIN) available for *Drosophila melanogaster*. However, there exist many smaller networks from different screens, as well as literature extractions. We therefore combined data from these sources and then created a PIN for use in the present study, as follows:

**Step 1:** Several screens assessing protein-protein interactions have been centralized in a database called DroID: <u>http://www.droidb.org</u>. The version DroID\_v2018\_08 was used. All available datasets were first downloaded from that database using this link: <u>http://www.droidb.org/Downloads.jsp</u>. The description of all of these datasets can be found here: <u>http://www.droidb.org/DBdescription.jsp</u>

**Step 2:** We used the datasets from all screens that assessed direct protein-protein interactions and did not use the interolog database (predicted protein interaction based on mouse human and yeast PPIs). These direct assessment screens were seven in total, as follows:

- Finley Yeast Two-Hybrid Data (size 2.0 MB; 3610 Nodes & 9007 Edges)
- Curagen Yeast Two-Hybrid Data (size 4.6 MB; 6678 Nodes & 19506 Edges)

- Hybrigenics Yeast Two-Hybrid Data\_(size 381 KB; 1269 Nodes & 1842 Edges)
- Perrimon co-AP complex (size 108 KB; 252 Nodes & 384 Edges)
- DPiM co-AP complex (size 6.3 MB; 3732 Nodes & 17652 Edges)
- <u>PPI from other databases</u> (size 16.2 MB; 7524 Nodes & 47471 Edges)
- PPI curated by FlyBase (size 7.4 MB; 5125 Nodes & 31491 Edges)

We did not consider self-loop edges from proteins predicted to interact with themselves (homotypic or self-interactions). An important element to note is that the PPIs curated by FlyBase is a literature-based PPIs. FlyBase protein-protein interactions are experimentally derived physical interactions curated from the literature by FlyBase and does not include FlyBase-curated genetic interactions.

**Step 3:** We concatenated the seven datasets listed above into a single unique database. A custom python script was created that downloads and reads each of the above seven unique PPI tables, and generates a single PIN (see 01\_PIN\_builder.ipynb). From this concatenation, a single edge undirected network was created and saved. This network is hereafter referred to as the PIN (see 01\_PIN\_builder.ipynb). The PIN contains 10,632 proteins (nodes) and 85,019 interactions (edges), giving a network density of 0.0015.

#### 3.4.8 Network metric computations

The centrality of a node is often used as a measure of a node's importance in a network. Within a PIN, the centrality of a gene reflects the number of interactions in which the gene directly or indirectly participates. Four different centrality metrics were computed for all genes in the PIN using the networkx python library:

(1) **Betweenness** reflects the number of shortest paths passing through a gene.

(2) Eigenvector is a measure of the influence of a gene in the network.

(3) **Closeness** measures the sum of shortest distance of a gene to all the other genes.

(4) **Degree centrality** corresponds to the normalized number of edges of a gene in the network.

While there exist more centrality measures, these four are commonly used to assess biological networks. These computed centrality parameters of the genes measured in the screen were computed with 03\_ROC\_curve\_analysis\_of\_network\_metrics.ipynb, and are reported in the Table C.1 (see 09\_Making\_the\_database\_table.ipynb).

#### 3.4.9 Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves

To check whether the centrality of a gene in the network could predict the phenotypic effect produced by RNAi against that gene, ROC curves were plotted for the four aforementioned centrality measures of each gene in each screen. A ROC analysis is used to measure the correlation between a continuous variable (centrality) and a binary outcome (above or below Z score threshold). Therefore, for each screen, measured genes were rank ordered from high centrality to low centrality, and plotted against the binary outcome of  $|Z_{gene}|$  being above or below the appropriate |Z score| threshold (>5 for egg laying and >2 for ovariole number). The Area Under the Curve (AUC) measures the extent of correlation between centrality and effect of a gene on measured phenotype. AUC above or below 0.5 indicates a positive or negative correlation respectively, while an AUC of 0.5 indicates no correlation of the parameters. The scikit-learn python package was used to calculate the AUC of each ROC curve plotted (see 03\_ROC\_curve\_analysis\_of\_network\_metrics.ipynb).

#### 3.4.10 Building degree-controlled randomized networks

We assessed the modularity of the networks by comparing the network metrics of each sub-network to a degree-controlled randomly sampled network. To generate this degree controlled random network, we applied a previously developed method<sup>100</sup>. In short, nodes in the PPI are binned by degree with the minimum size of each bin being set at 100 nodes. Bins are constructed iteratively from the lowest degree to the highest degree in the network. To sample a set of nodes, the sub-network degree distribution is computed, using the bin cut-off, from the PPI. Then, nodes are randomly selected from each bin to match this degree distribution (see 05.2\_Degree\_Controlled\_Testing.ipynb for code implementation).

# 3.4.11 Assessing the utility of the Seed Connector Algorithm in building network modules

Network modules were assessed using the previously published Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA)<sup>66,67</sup>, implemented here in python (see 04\_Seed-Connector.ipynb) and illustrated in Figure 3.5a. Creating a module using the SCA requires a list of seed genes and a PIN. From each of the three screens, we selected the genes whose  $|Z_{gene}|$  value was above the threshold and created three seed lists respectively (Figure 3.4c: Egg laying, hpo[RNAi] egg laying and hpo[RNAi] ovariole 'seed' list). A fourth list consisting of the intersection of the aforementioned seed lists was also collated and called the core 'seed' list (Figure 3.4b). Genes were assigned in the core list if they passed the Z threshold in all 3 screens. The Seed Connector Algorithm was then executed on each of these seed lists using the PIN. Not all genes in the four seed lists were found in the PIN (specifically, CG12147 in the *hpo*[RNAi] Egg Laying seed list and CG6104 in the *hpo*[RNAi] Ovariole number seed list were absent from the PIN) and were therefore eliminated from further network analysis. The removal of these two genes accounts for the variation in the number of positive candidates in Table 3.2 and the number of seed genes in the module. Modules were obtained for each seed list (Figure 3.5b; Figures C.6 to C.8) consisting of the seed genes (circles in Figure 3.5b and Figures C.6 to C.8) and previously untested genes added by the SCA (squares in Figure 3.5b and Figures C.6 to C.8) to increase the LCC size that we refer to as connector genes (see 04\_Seed-Connector.ipynb). The results of the algorithm are summarized in the Table C.1.

The modularity of the sub-networks was then assessed using four network metrics namely Largest Connected Component (LCC), number of edges, network density and average shortest path in the LCC. Each metric for each module was assessed using distance of the network metric to a null distribution. Initially, the null distribution was calculated by taking 1000 samples of 463 genes randomly selected from the PIN and calculating the above metrics. We found that the 463 genes selected in the signalling screen were already more connected than the null distribution of sets of 463 genes randomly selected from the PIN (Figure C.9a). Therefore, to avoid a false positive detection of modularity, the four experimentally obtained sub-networks were compared

to null distributions obtained by randomly sampling an equal number of genes from the 463 signalling candidate genes selected for our screen. For each of the four modules, comparison of the metrics was performed on the seed lists and the sub-network after the SCA. Most metrics were enriched in the seed group when compared to the null distribution with the exception of the Average shortest path (Figure C.9b, light red line). The sub-networks obtained from the SCA further increased all four metrics suggesting the modularity of the four sub-networks (Figure C.9b, dark red line; see 05\_Network\_Module\_testing.ipynb for code implementation).

#### 3.4.12 Meta network

To build the meta network, the genes from all four sub-networks were concatenated into one network. This network was then visually sorted in an approach akin to projecting the network onto a Venn Diagram. The meta network was sorted by which of the three screens the gene was positive in. The intersections were genes whose  $|Z_{gene}|$  value was above the threshold in more than one and possibly all three of the screening paradigms. For example, if a gene was found in the *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number and Egg Laying sub-networks it is then assigned to the dual positive group *hpo[RNAi]* Ovariole Number / Egg Laying (Figure 3.6a, sub-network VI). After applying this grouping strategy, the connectivity across the groups was studied by calculating the edge density between all groups ( $density = \frac{Edges_{1:2}}{Nodes_1 * Nodes_2}$ ). Finally, the proportion of each signalling candidate in each of those groups was calculated by taking the number of members of a signalling pathway divided by the total members of a group (see Ipython notebook 08\_MetaModule\_Analysis.ipynb). A single gene, *sloppy paired 1*, was a seed in the Egg Laying sub-network VII in the meta network, and is marked as a seed (grey) in Figure 3.6a.

#### 3.4.13 Number of samples

The number of samples across the different screens were as follows:

#### hpo[RNAi] Egg Laying and Egg Laying screens

- Controls: five vials of three females and two males
- Sample: one vial of three females and two males

#### hpo[RNAi] Ovariole number screen

- Controls: 20 flies, two ovaries per fly considered as independent measurements

- Sample: 10 flies, two ovaries per fly considered as independent measurements

#### 3.4.14 Correction of batch effect

Despite best efforts to maintain the exact same condition between each experiment, some variation was measured between the batches. Control flies showed variations in both measured phenotypes, ovariole number and egg laying (Figure C.1). In order to compare the values measured across different batches, each sample was standardized by calculating its Z score  $(Z_{gene})$  to the control distribution. For each batch, the measurements for controls were pooled into a distribution, and the mean and standard deviation was computed. Then each sample was compared to its respective batch and its Z score computed (see "Gene selection based on Z score and batch standardization" for formula).

#### 3.4.15 Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using the scipy stats module (<u>https://www.scipy.org/</u>) and scikit-learn (<u>https://scikit-learn.org/</u>) python package. Statistical tests and p-values are reported in the figure legends. All statistical tests can be found in the Ipython notebooks mentioned below.

#### 3.4.16 Data and code availability

This study generated a series of python3 Ipython notebook files that perform the entire analysis presented in this study. All the results presented in this paper, including the figures with the exception of the network visualizations, which were created using Cytoscape3 (<a href="https://cytoscape.org/">https://cytoscape.org/</a>) can be reproduced by running the aforementioned python3 code. The raw data, calculations made with these data, and code used for calculations and analyses (Ipython notebooks) are available as supplementary information. For ease of access, legibility and reproducibility, the code and datasets have been deposited in a GitHub repository available

https://github.com/extavourlab/hpo\_ova\_eggL\_screen.

## References

- Xiaolong Yang and Tian Xu. Molecular mechanism of size control in development and human diseases. *Cell Res.*, 21(5):715–729, May 2011.
- [2] M P Kambysellis and W B Heed. Studies of oogenesis in natural populations of drosophilidae. i. relation of ovarian development and ecological habitats of the hawaiian species. Am. Nat., 105(941):31–49, January 1971.
- [3] R C King. Ovarian Development in Drosophila melanogaster. Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [4] T A Markow, S Beall, and L M Matzkin. Egg size, embryonic development time and ovoviviparity in drosophila species. *J. Evol. Biol.*, 22(2):430–434, February 2009.
- [5] Didem P Sarikaya, Samuel H Church, Laura P Lagomarsino, Karl N Magnacca, Steven L Montgomery, Donald K Price, Kenneth Y Kaneshiro, and Cassandra G Extavour. Reproductive capacity evolves in response to ecology through common changes in cell number in hawaiian drosophila. *Curr. Biol.*, 29(11):1877–1884.e6, June 2019.
- [6] P Klepsatel, M Gáliková, N De Maio, S Ricci, C Schlötterer, and T Flatt. Reproductive and post-reproductive life history of wild-caught drosophila melanogaster under laboratory conditions. J. Evol. Biol., 26(7):1508–1520, July 2013.
- [7] Samia R'kha, Brigitte Moreteau, Jerry A Coyne, and Jean R David. Evolution of a lesser fitness trait: egg production in the specialist drosophila sechellia. *Genetical Research*, 69(1): 17–23, 1997.

- [8] Ricardo B R Azevedo, Vernon French, and Linda Partridge. THERMAL EVOLUTION OF EGG SIZE IN DROSOPHILA MELANOGASTER. *Evolution*, 50(6):2338–2345, December 1996.
- [9] P Capy, E Pla, and J R David. Phenotypic and genetic variability of morphometrical traits in natural populations of drosophila melanogaster and D simulans. II. within-population variability. *Genet. Sel. Evol.*, 26(1):15, February 1994.
- [10] J R David and C Bocquet. Similarities and differences in latitudinal adaptation of two drosophila sibling species. *Nature*, 257(5527):588–590, October 1975.
- [11] P Capy, E Pla, and J R David. Phenotypic and genetic variability of morphometrical traits in natural populations of drosophila melanogaster and D simulans. i. geographic variations. *Genet. Sel. Evol.*, 25(6):517, December 1993.
- [12] Peter Klepsatel, Martina Gáliková, Nicola De Maio, Christian D Huber, Christian Schlötterer, and Thomas Flatt. Variation in thermal performance and reaction norms among populations of drosophila melanogaster. *Evolution*, 67(12):3573–3587, December 2013.
- [13] S R'Kha, P Capy, and J R David. Host-plant specialization in the drosophila melanogaster species complex: a physiological, behavioral, and genetical analysis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 88(5):1835–1839, March 1991.
- [14] Alan O Bergland, Anne Genissel, Sergey V Nuzhdin, and Marc Tatar. Quantitative trait loci affecting phenotypic plasticity and the allometric relationship of ovariole number and thorax length in drosophila melanogaster. *Genetics*, 180(1):567–582, September 2008.
- [15] Amanda S Lobell, Rachel R Kaspari, Yazmin L Serrano Negron, and Susan T Harbison. The genetic architecture of ovariole number in drosophila melanogaster: Genes with major, quantitative, and pleiotropic effects. *G*<sub>3</sub>, 7(7):2391–2403, July 2017.
- [16] Virginie Orgogozo, Karl W Broman, and David L Stern. High-resolution quantitative trait locus mapping reveals sign epistasis controlling ovariole number between two drosophila species. *Genetics*, 173(1):197–205, May 2006.

- [17] M L Wayne and L M McIntyre. Combining mapping and arraying: An approach to candidate gene identification. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 99(23):14903–14906, November 2002.
- [18] Marta L Wayne, J Brant Hackett, and Trudy F C Mackay. QUANTITATIVE GENETICS OF OVARIOLE NUMBER IN DROSOPHILA MELANOGASTER. i. SEGREGATING VARIATION AND FITNESS. *Evolution*, 51(4):1156–1163, August 1997.
- [19] M L Wayne, J B Hackett, C L Dilda, S V Nuzhdin, E G Pasyukova, and T F Mackay.
  Quantitative trait locus mapping of fitness-related traits in drosophila melanogaster. *Genet. Res.*, 77(1):107–116, February 2001.
- [20] R C King, S K Aggarwal, and U Aggarwal. The development of the female drosophila reproductive system. J. Morphol., 124(2):143–166, February 1968.
- [21] D Godt and F A Laski. Mechanisms of cell rearrangement and cell recruitment in drosophila ovary morphogenesis and the requirement of bric à brac. *Development*, 121(1): 173–187, January 1995.
- [22] Ray Keller. Mechanisms of elongation in embryogenesis. *Development*, 133(12):2291–2302, June 2006.
- [23] Isabelle Sahut-Barnola, Bernard Dastugue, and Jean-Louis Couderc. Terminal filament cell organization in the larval ovary of drosophila melanogaster: ultrastructural observations and pattern of divisions. *Rouxs. Arch. Dev. Biol.*, 205(7-8):356–363, May 1996.
- [24] I Sahut-Barnola, D Godt, F A Laski, and J L Couderc. Drosophila ovary morphogenesis: analysis of terminal filament formation and identification of a gene required for this process. *Dev. Biol.*, 170(1):127–135, July 1995.
- [25] J Chen, D Godt, K Gunsalus, I Kiss, M Goldberg, and F A Laski. Cofilin/ADF is required for cell motility during drosophila ovary development and oogenesis. *Nat. Cell Biol.*, 3(2): 204–209, February 2001.
- [26] Didem P Sarikaya and Cassandra G Extavour. The hippo pathway regulates homeostatic growth of stem cell niche precursors in the drosophila ovary. *PLoS Genet.*, 11(2):e1004962,

February 2015.

- [27] Dror Hilman and Uri Gat. The evolutionary history of YAP and the hippo/YAP pathway. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 28(8):2403–2417, August 2011.
- [28] Arnau Sebé-Pedrós, Yonggang Zheng, Iñaki Ruiz-Trillo, and Duojia Pan. Premetazoan origin of the hippo signaling pathway. *Cell Rep.*, 1(1):13–20, January 2012.
- [29] Elizabeth T Ables and Daniela Drummond-Barbosa. Steroid hormones and the physiological regulation of Tissue-Resident stem cells: Lessons from the drosophila ovary. *Curr Stem Cell Rep*, 3(1):9–18, March 2017.
- [30] Lilach Gilboa. Organizing stem cell units in the drosophila ovary. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.*, 32:31–36, June 2015.
- [31] Delbert A Green, 2nd, Didem P Sarikaya, and Cassandra G Extavour. Counting in oogenesis. *Cell Tissue Res.*, 344(2):207–212, May 2011.
- [32] Leesa LaFever and Daniela Drummond-Barbosa. Direct control of germline stem cell division and cyst growth by neural insulin in drosophila. *Science*, 309(5737):1071–1073, August 2005.
- [33] Leesa LaFever, Alexander Feoktistov, Hwei-Jan Hsu, and Daniela Drummond-Barbosa. Specific roles of target of rapamycin in the control of stem cells and their progeny in the drosophila ovary. *Development*, 137(13):2117–2126, July 2010.
- [34] Dana Gancz and Lilach Gilboa. Insulin and target of rapamycin signaling orchestrate the development of ovarian niche-stem cell units in drosophila. *Development*, 140(20): 4145–4154, October 2013.
- [35] Delbert A Green, 2nd and Cassandra G Extavour. Convergent evolution of a reproductive trait through distinct developmental mechanisms in drosophila. *Dev. Biol.*, 372(1):120–130, December 2012.
- [36] Hwei-Jan Hsu and Daniela Drummond-Barbosa. Insulin levels control female germline stem cell maintenance via the niche in drosophila. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 106(4):

1117-1121, January 2009.

- [37] Dana Gancz, Tamar Lengil, and Lilach Gilboa. Coordinated regulation of niche and stem cell precursors by hormonal signaling. *PLoS Biol.*, 9(11):e1001202, November 2011.
- [38] J Hodin and L M Riddiford. The ecdysone receptor and ultraspiracle regulate the timing and progression of ovarian morphogenesis during drosophila metamorphosis. *Dev. Genes Evol.*, 208(6):304–317, August 1998.
- [39] J Hodin and L M Riddiford. Parallel alterations in the timing of ovarian ecdysone receptor and ultraspiracle expression characterize the independent evolution of larval reproduction in two species of gall midges (diptera: Cecidomyiidae). *Dev. Genes Evol.*, 210 (7):358–372, July 2000.
- [40] Mileidy W Gonzalez and Maricel G Kann. Chapter 4: Protein interactions and disease. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 8(12):e1002819, December 2012.
- [41] A L Barabasi and R Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(5439): 509–512, October 1999.
- [42] D J Watts and S H Strogatz. Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature*, 393 (6684):440–442, June 1998.
- [43] R Albert and A-L Barabási. Statistical Mechanics of Complex Networks, volume 74. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003.
- [44] Albert-László Barabási and Zoltán N Oltvai. Network biology: understanding the cell's functional organization. Nat. Rev. Genet., 5(2):101–113, February 2004.
- [45] Seth I Berger, Jeremy M Posner, and Avi Ma'ayan. Genes2Networks: connecting lists of gene symbols using mammalian protein interactions databases. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 8: 372, October 2007.
- [46] L Giot, J S Bader, C Brouwer, A Chaudhuri, B Kuang, Y Li, Y L Hao, C E Ooi, B Godwin,
  E Vitols, G Vijayadamodar, P Pochart, H Machineni, M Welsh, Y Kong, B Zerhusen,
  R Malcolm, Z Varrone, A Collis, M Minto, S Burgess, L McDaniel, E Stimpson, F Spriggs,

J Williams, K Neurath, N Ioime, M Agee, E Voss, K Furtak, R Renzulli, N Aanensen, S Carrolla, E Bickelhaupt, Y Lazovatsky, A DaSilva, J Zhong, C A Stanyon, R L Finley, Jr, K P White, M Braverman, T Jarvie, S Gold, M Leach, J Knight, R A Shimkets, M P McKenna, J Chant, and J M Rothberg. A protein interaction map of drosophila melanogaster. *Science*, 302(5651):1727–1736, December 2003.

- [47] L S Gramates, S J Marygold, G D Santos, J M Urbano, G Antonazzo, B B Matthews, A J Rey, C J Tabone, M A Crosby, D B Emmert, K Falls, J L Goodman, Y Hu, L Ponting, A J Schroeder, V B Strelets, J Thurmond, P Zhou, and C FlyBase. FlyBase at 25: looking to the future. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 45:663–671, 2016.
- [48] Minoru Kanehisa, Susumu Goto, Miho Furumichi, Mao Tanabe, and Mika Hirakawa.
  KEGG for representation and analysis of molecular networks involving diseases and drugs.
  *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 38(Database issue):D355–60, January 2010.
- [49] Abibatou Mbodj, Guillaume Junion, Christine Brun, Eileen E M Furlong, and Denis Thieffry. Logical modelling of drosophila signalling pathways. *Mol. Biosyst.*, 9(9): 2248–2258, September 2013.
- [50] Trey Ideker and Roded Sharan. Protein networks in disease. *Genome Res.*, 18(4):644–652, April 2008.
- [51] H Jeong, S P Mason, A L Barabási, and Z N Oltvai. Lethality and centrality in protein networks. *Nature*, 411(6833):41–42, May 2001.
- [52] Matthew W Hahn and Andrew D Kern. Comparative genomics of centrality and essentiality in three eukaryotic protein-interaction networks. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 22(4): 803–806, April 2005.
- [53] Avi Ma'ayan. Introduction to network analysis in systems biology. Sci. Signal., 4(190):tr5, September 2011.
- [54] Mahdi Jalili, Ali Salehzadeh-Yazdi, Shailendra Gupta, Olaf Wolkenhauer, MarjanYaghmaie, Osbaldo Resendis-Antonio, and Kamran Alimoghaddam. Evolution of

centrality measurements for the detection of essential proteins in biological networks. *Front. Physiol.*, 7:375, August 2016.

- [55] Dirk Koschützki and Falk Schreiber. Centrality analysis methods for biological networks and their application to gene regulatory networks. *Gene Regul. Syst. Bio.*, 2:193–201, May 2008.
- [56] Leonard J Foster, Carmen L de Hoog, Yanling Zhang, Yong Zhang, Xiaohui Xie, Vamsi K Mootha, and Matthias Mann. A mammalian organelle map by protein correlation profiling. *Cell*, 125(1):187–199, April 2006.
- [57] P T Spellman, G Sherlock, M Q Zhang, V R Iyer, K Anders, M B Eisen, P O Brown,
  D Botstein, and B Futcher. Comprehensive identification of cell cycle-regulated genes of the yeast saccharomyces cerevisiae by microarray hybridization. *Mol. Biol. Cell*, 9(12): 3273–3297, December 1998.
- [58] Balaji S Srinivasan, Nigam H Shah, Jason A Flannick, Eduardo Abeliuk, Antal F Novak, and Serafim Batzoglou. Current progress in network research: toward reference networks for key model organisms. *Brief. Bioinform.*, 8(5):318–332, September 2007.
- [59] L H Hartwell, J J Hopfield, S Leibler, and A W Murray. From molecular to modular cell biology. *Nature*, 402(6761 Suppl):C47–52, December 1999.
- [60] E Ravasz, A L Somera, D A Mongru, Z N Oltvai, and A L Barabási. Hierarchical organization of modularity in metabolic networks. *Science*, 297(5586):1551–1555, August 2002.
- [61] Soon-Hyung Yook, Zoltán N Oltvai, and Albert-László Barabási. Functional and topological characterization of protein interaction networks. *Proteomics*, 4(4):928–942, April 2004.
- [62] Kenneth D Bromberg, Avi Ma'ayan, Susana R Neves, and Ravi Iyengar. Design logic of a cannabinoid receptor signaling network that triggers neurite outgrowth. *Science*, 320 (5878):903–909, May 2008.
- [63] Shao-Shan Carol Huang and Ernest Fraenkel. Integrating proteomic, transcriptional, and interactome data reveals hidden components of signaling and regulatory networks. *Sci.*

*Signal.*, 2(81):ra40, July 2009.

- [64] István Albert and Réka Albert. Conserved network motifs allow protein-protein interaction prediction. *Bioinformatics*, 20(18):3346–3352, December 2004.
- [65] Haiyuan Yu, Alberto Paccanaro, Valery Trifonov, and Mark Gerstein. Predicting interactions in protein networks by completing defective cliques. *Bioinformatics*, 22(7): 823–829, April 2006.
- [66] Rui-Sheng Wang, Kathryn T Hall, Franco Giulianini, Dani Passow, Ted J Kaptchuk, and Joseph Loscalzo. Network analysis of the genomic basis of the placebo effect. *JCI Insight*, 2 (11):93911, June 2017.
- [67] Rui-Sheng Wang and Joseph Loscalzo. Network-Based disease module discovery by a novel seed connector algorithm with pathobiological implications. J. Mol. Biol., 430(18 Pt A):2939–2950, September 2018.
- [68] Jake Yue Chen, Changyu Shen, and Andrey Y Sivachenko. Mining alzheimer disease relevant proteins from integrated protein interactome data. *Pac. Symp. Biocomput.*, 11: 367–378, 2006.
- [69] Graciela Gonzalez, Juan C Uribe, Luis Tari, Colleen Brophy, and Chitta Baral. Mining gene-disease relationships from biomedical literature: weighting protein-protein interactions and connectivity measures. *Pac. Symp. Biocomput.*, 12:28–39, 2007.
- [70] Y Cohet and J David. Control of the adult reproductive potential by preimaginal thermal conditions : A study in drosophila melanogaster. *Oecologia*, 36(3):295–306, January 1978.
- [71] J Hodin and L M Riddiford. Different mechanisms underlie phenotypic plasticity and interspecific variation for a reproductive character in drosophilids (insecta: Diptera). *Evolution*, 54(5):1638–1653, October 2000.
- [72] S Llamazares, A Moreira, A Tavares, C Girdham, B A Spruce, C Gonzalez, R E Karess, D M Glover, and C E Sunkel. polo encodes a protein kinase homolog required for mitosis in drosophila. *Genes Dev.*, 5(12A):2153–2165, December 1991.

- [73] M C Edwards, C Wong, and S J Elledge. Human cyclin k, a novel RNA polymerase
  II-associated cyclin possessing both carboxy-terminal domain kinase and cdk-activating
  kinase activity. *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, 18(7):4291–4300, July 1998.
- [74] T Ito, M Bulger, R Kobayashi, and J T Kadonaga. Drosophila NAP-1 is a core histone chaperone that functions in ATP-facilitated assembly of regularly spaced nucleosomal arrays. *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, 16(6):3112–3124, June 1996.
- [75] Anna T Chao, Herman A Dierick, Tracie M Addy, and Amy Bejsovec. Mutations in eukaryotic release factors 1 and 3 act as general nonsense suppressors in drosophila. *Genetics*, 165(2):601–612, October 2003.
- [76] Haiyuan Yu, Pascal Braun, Muhammed A Yildirim, Irma Lemmens, Kavitha Venkatesan, Julie Sahalie, Tomoko Hirozane-Kishikawa, Fana Gebreab, Na Li, Nicolas Simonis, Tong Hao, Jean-François Rual, Amélie Dricot, Alexei Vazquez, Ryan R Murray, Christophe Simon, Leah Tardivo, Stanley Tam, Nenad Svrzikapa, Changyu Fan, Anne-Sophie de Smet, Adriana Motyl, Michael E Hudson, Juyong Park, Xiaofeng Xin, Michael E Cusick, Troy Moore, Charlie Boone, Michael Snyder, Frederick P Roth, Albert-László Barabási, Jan Tavernier, David E Hill, and Marc Vidal. High-quality binary protein interaction map of the yeast interactome network. *Science*, 322(5898):104–110, October 2008.
- [77] Raymond Teck Ho Lee, Zhonghua Zhao, and Philip W Ingham. Hedgehog signalling. Development, 143(3):367–372, February 2016.
- [78] Chun-Ming Lai, Kun-Yang Lin, Shih-Han Kao, Yi-Ning Chen, Fu Huang, and Hwei-Jan Hsu. Hedgehog signaling establishes precursors for germline stem cell niches by regulating cell adhesion. J. Cell Biol., 216(5):1439–1453, May 2017.
- [79] Audrey E Christiansen, Tian Ding, and Andreas Bergmann. Ligand-independent activation of the hedgehog pathway displays non-cell autonomous proliferation during eye development in drosophila. *Mech. Dev.*, 129(5-8):98–108, July 2012.
- [80] Kai Jiang, Yajuan Liu, Jie Zhang, and Jianhang Jia. An intracellular activation of smoothened that is independent of hedgehog stimulation in drosophila. J. Cell Sci., 131(1):

211367, January 2018.

- [81] J Bolívar, J Pearson, L López-Onieva, and A González-Reyes. Genetic dissection of a stem cell niche: the case of the drosophila ovary. *Dev. Dyn.*, 235(11):2969–2979, November 2006.
- [82] Jean-Louis Couderc, Dorothea Godt, Susan Zollman, Jiong Chen, Michelle Li, Stanley Tiong, Sarah E Cramton, Isabelle Sahut-Barnola, and Frank A Laski. The bric à brac locus consists of two paralogous genes encoding BTB/POZ domain proteins and acts as a homeotic and morphogenetic regulator of imaginal development in drosophila. *Development*, 129(10):2419–2433, May 2002.
- [83] D Godt, J L Couderc, S E Cramton, and F A Laski. Pattern formation in the limbs of drosophila: bric à brac is expressed in both a gradient and a wave-like pattern and is required for specification and proper segmentation of the tarsus. *Development*, 119(3): 799–812, November 1993.
- [84] Andrew W Allbee, Diego E Rincon-Limas, and Benoît Biteau. Lmx1a is required for the development of the ovarian stem cell niche in drosophila. *Development*, 145(8):163394, April 2018.
- [85] Leonard Dobens, Alejandra Jaeger, Jeanne S Peterson, and Laurel A Raftery. Bunched sets a boundary for notch signaling to pattern anterior eggshell structures during drosophila oogenesis. *Dev. Biol.*, 287(2):425–437, November 2005.
- [86] Pelin Cayirlioglu, William O Ward, S Catherine Silver Key, and Robert J Duronio. Transcriptional repressor functions of drosophila E2F1 and E2F2 cooperate to inhibit genomic DNA synthesis in ovarian follicle cells. *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, 23(6):2123–2134, March 2003.
- [87] K Barrett, M Leptin, and J Settleman. The rho GTPase and a putative RhoGEF mediate a signaling pathway for the cell shape changes in drosophila gastrulation. *Cell*, 91(7): 905–915, December 1997.
- [88] T Mizuno, M Amano, K Kaibuchi, and Y Nishida. Identification and characterization of drosophila homolog of rho-kinase. *Gene*, 238(2):437–444, October 1999.

- [89] Karen E Kasza, Dene L Farrell, and Jennifer A Zallen. Spatiotemporal control of epithelial remodeling by regulated myosin phosphorylation. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 111(32): 11732–11737, August 2014.
- [90] Anne J Ridley. Rho GTPases and actin dynamics in membrane protrusions and vesicle trafficking. *Trends Cell Biol.*, 16(10):522–529, October 2006.
- [91] Lindsay Lewellyn, Maureen Cetera, and Sally Horne-Badovinac. Misshapen decreases integrin levels to promote epithelial motility and planar polarity in drosophila. J. Cell Biol., 200(6):721–729, March 2013.
- [92] Tony J C Harris and Mark Peifer. Adherens junction-dependent and -independent steps in the establishment of epithelial cell polarity in drosophila. J. Cell Biol., 167(1):135–147, October 2004.
- [93] Ronald Jansen, Dov Greenbaum, and Mark Gerstein. Relating whole-genome expression data with protein-protein interactions. *Genome Res.*, 12(1):37–46, January 2002.
- [94] Christian von Mering, Roland Krause, Berend Snel, Michael Cornell, Stephen G Oliver, Stanley Fields, and Peer Bork. Comparative assessment of large-scale data sets of protein-protein interactions. *Nature*, 417(6887):399–403, May 2002.
- [95] Xiaoli Li, Min Wu, Chee-Keong Kwoh, and See-Kiong Ng. Computational approaches for detecting protein complexes from protein interaction networks: a survey. *BMC Genomics*, 11 Suppl 1:S3, February 2010.
- [96] Yijia Zhang, Hongfei Lin, Zhihao Yang, Jian Wang, and Yiwei Liu. An uncertain model-based approach for identifying dynamic protein complexes in uncertain protein-protein interaction networks. *BMC Genomics*, 18(Suppl 7):743, October 2017.
- [97] L R Matthews, P Vaglio, J Reboul, H Ge, B P Davis, J Garrels, S Vincent, and M Vidal. Identification of potential interaction networks using sequence-based searches for conserved protein-protein interactions or "interologs". *Genome Res.*, 11(12):2120–2126, December 2001.

- [98] Shinichiro Wachi, Ken Yoneda, and Reen Wu. Interactome-transcriptome analysis reveals the high centrality of genes differentially expressed in lung cancer tissues. *Bioinformatics*, 21(23):4205–4208, December 2005.
- [99] Didem Pelin Sarikaya, Abel A Belay, Abha Ahuja, Aisha Dorta, Delbert André Green, 2nd, and Cassandra G Extavour. The roles of cell size and cell number in determining ovariole number in drosophila. *Dev. Biol.*, 363(1):279–289, March 2012.
- [100] Emre Guney, Jörg Menche, Marc Vidal, and Albert-László Barábasi. Network-based in silico drug efficacy screening. Nat. Commun., 7:10331, February 2016.

The student of heredity is confronted with two different groups of problems. The first group, including such questions as: 'Why do two white mice produce another white mouse, but not a black or a brown one?' has been answered, at least up to a point, by the geneticists. The second, typified by such a question as: 'Why do two mice produce a mouse, and not a rabbit, a mass of Protozoa, or a sarcoma?' has been answered much less satisfactorily.

J. B. S. Haldane, 1940

# 4

Studying of germ layer specification in the early embryogenesis of *Parhyale hawaiensis* with single cell RNA sequencing

#### ABSTRACT

Understanding the molecular mechanism underlying the specification of the germ layers is a fundamental question of developmental biology. In this chapter, I focused on measuring and understanding the gene expression profiles of the first three days of *P. hawaiensis* embryogenesis. To achieve a comprehensive understanding of the differentiation processes underlying the germ layers specification, I aimed to generate a developmental time course single-cell RNA sequencing library. I developed cell separation protocols required to sequence single cells with Cel-Seq2 and inDrop. After analyzing the libraries generated, it appeared that the sequencing depth of the cells was not sufficient to study the specification of germ layers. However, I demonstrate the technical feasibility of generating single-cell RNA sequencing data for *P. hawaiensis* developing embryos.

#### **CONTRIBUTIONS**

For this study, I received the help of members of Allon Klein laboratory, in particular James Briggs who shared his dissociation protocol. Moreover, droplet capture and sequencing were performed by the members of the Harvard Medical School Single Cell Core and the Harvard Bauer Core Facility. Cassandra G. Extavour assisted and taught me how to separate the blastomeres of *P. hawaiensis* embryos.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Allon Klein and the members of the Harvard Medical School Single Cell Core for the help and advice they offered throughout my Ph.D. I would also like to thank Claire Reardon of the Harvard Bauer Core Facility for her help in sequencing the libraries and advices with the CelSeq2 protocol. Finally I would like to thank Shreeharsha (Harsha) Tarikere from the Extavour laboratory for the long discussions and exchanges regarding the dissociation of complex tissues in single cells and their subsequent sequencing.

### 4.1 Introduction

In the next two chapters, I present the work that I have conceptualized and performed towards understanding the early specification of germ layers in the crustacean amphipod *P. hawaiensis*. In this chapter, the central question I tried to tackle was: What changes in transcriptomic profiles does *P. hawaiensis* undergo during the specification and differentiation of its germ layers? I introduce the emerging non-model organism I used and explain the choice of this organism. I continue by presenting what is known about the specification of germ layers in this organism, and place this within a broader context. I introduce the original hypothesis and plans that guided the experimental design. I conclude by presenting the first part of this project containing the presentation of the single-cell RNA sequencing techniques I employed and the results obtained.

# 4.1.1 The amphipod *P. hawaiensis*, an emerging model organism for the study of germ layer specification

*P. hawaiensis* is a small crustacean amphipod measuring as an adult between 5 and 15 mm<sup>1</sup>. It has a circumtropical, worldwide, intertidal and shallow water ecology, and follows a detritivorous diet<sup>2</sup>. It is commonly found in mangroves where it participates in the destruction of leafy materials<sup>3</sup>, and recent studies of its genome showed the presence of multiple lignocellulose digestive enzymes<sup>4</sup>. *P. hawaiensis* has been found to thrive in areas of rapid salinity and temperature changes<sup>2,3</sup>. It can also live at high population density, with upwards of thousands of individuals in one square meter<sup>2,3</sup>. The female reproductive cycle is two weeks long, where each cycle leads to a molt and a new egg brood (Figure 4.1). All those factors make *P. hawaiensis* a very resilient animal with a widespread ecology and fast generation time, traits that are particularly favorable to the establishment of laboratory culture. The laboratory of Nipam Patel established the first colony from individuals coming from the filtration system of the Chicago aquarium<sup>5</sup>. The first embryonic divisions are holoblastic, allowing the injection of mRNA or other molecules into each blastomere<sup>6</sup>. The early divisions are highly stereotypical, leading to a reproducible position of each blastomere by the 8 and 16 cell stages<sup>7</sup> (Figure 4.1).
The fate of each cell is established as early as the 8 cell stage, where each of the 8 blastomeres will give rise to unique cell lineages (Figure 4.1). Three blastomeres will give rise to the Ectoderm, three to the Mesoderm, one to the Endoderm, and one to the Germline<sup>1,7</sup> (Figure 4.1). Similar to other arthropod species, *P. hawaiensis* embryos develop a germ band that elongates along the anterior-posterior axis and will become divided into the different segments of the adult organism<sup>6,8</sup>. Moreover, the ectodermal cells are organized in a grid-like pattern at the germ band stage, where each row of the grid follows a stereotypical division cycle<sup>6,9</sup>. Importantly, the genome and multiple transcriptomes of this organism have been sequenced<sup>4,10,11</sup>, and the asymmetrical inheritance of maternal transcripts was measured at the S4 stage (8 cells)<sup>10</sup>, which could be necessary for the early specification of cell fate<sup>10</sup>. Finally, the relatively low number of cells during the early stages of embryogenesis (1200-1500 cells by the 3rd day of development) make this organism well suited for the tracking of cell behavior<sup>7,9</sup>.

In addition to the multiple advantages this organism offers to understand the development of amphipods and crustaceans, it also shows high regenerative capacity (reviewed in Sun and Patel <sup>12</sup>). After ablation, an adult limb can be regenerated <sup>13</sup> through the induction and migration of progenitor cells<sup>14</sup>. Moreover, at the early stages of development, the ablation of an ectodermal or mesodermal blastomere can be compensated for through an intra-germ layer compensation mechanism<sup>15</sup> (Figures 4.2 and 4.3). This phenomenon might be considered counter-intuitive for this organism given the high degree of stereotypic developmental processes <sup>1,6,7</sup>. To conclude, thanks to the adaptation of multiple biological techniques, *P. hawaiensis* has become an attractive crustacean arthropod for the study of development.

During the early phase of the development of metazoans, cells differentiate into three populations, called germ layers. The Ectoderm gives rise to the external most tissues, the Endoderm the internal, often luminal, tissues, and the Mesoderm gives rise to tissues generally situated between the other two (reviewed in Gerberding and Patel<sup>16</sup>). However, while the understanding of the gene regulatory network underlying germ layer specification has been studied in a number of traditional model organisms<sup>17,18,19,20</sup>, these processes are less understood in other animals (discussed in Chapter 0).

**Figure 4.1** (*following page*): Life cycle and early embryogenesis of *P. hawaiensis* adapted from <sup>4,6,7,21,22</sup>. **a**) Life cycle of *P. hawaiensis*, adult male and female form a mating pair (or a couple) resulting in the female laying eggs in a brood pouch. Those eggs will develop into a juvenile within 10 days. Sexual maturity is achieved within 3 months. hpf: hours post-fertilization, dpf: days post-fertilization, w: weeks, d: days. **b**) Above, white light microphotographs of *P. hawaiensis* embryos during the early stages of embryogenesis from the one-cell stage (S11) to the elongation of the Germ Band (S11). Below, schematic representation of the stages shown above, those schematics are reused throughout the document. **c**) Schematic represented and specified by the 8 cell stage (S4). Adult *P. hawaiensis* animals, male and female.

#### Figure 4.1: (continued)





**Figure 4.2: Schematic representation of the blastomere ablation and intra-germ layer compensation experiments for the ectodermal lineages** adapted from <sup>15</sup>. Each of the three ectodermal blastoderms, El Er and Ep, were ablated while another blastomere was injected with a dye. The results of the experiments are presented in the schematic representation of germ band embryos.



**Figure 4.3: Schematic representation of the blastomere ablation and intra-germ layer compensation experiments for the mesodermal lineages** adapted from <sup>15</sup>. Each of the three mesodermal blastoderms, ml mr and Mav, were ablated while another blastomere was injected with a dye. The results of the experiments are presented in the schematic representation of germ band embryos.

#### 4.1.2 The maternal to zygotic transition of *P. hawaiensis*

One fascinating phenomenon during development is the activation of the zygotic genome. Indeed, in most metazoan embryos, the formation of the egg is accompanied by the maternal deposition of key mRNA transcripts (reviewed by Tadros and Lipshitz<sup>23</sup>). Maternal transcripts will play a key role in the first stages of embryonic development (reviewed by Tadros and Lipshitz<sup>23</sup>), such as the gene *oskar* discussed in Chapters 0 to 2<sup>24</sup>. However, while the correct expression and segregation of transcripts in early development are essential to initiate early differentiation (reviewed by Tadros and Lipshitz<sup>23</sup>), the later activation of zygotic genetic programs is required to continue the differentiation process (reviewed by Tadros and Lipshitz<sup>23</sup>). This transition is called the Maternal to Zygotic Transition (MZT) (reviewed by Tadros and Lipshitz<sup>23</sup>). To study the changes in gene expression specifying the germ layers of P. hawaiensis the MZT must happen prior to the starting time of the study or during. An earlier study measured the activation of transcription via the phosphorylation of the Serine 2 of the RNA pol II C terminal domain of embryos as early as the S1 stage up to the end of the S5 stage (100 cells) had suggested that the MZT happens during the S5 stage (starting at 32 cells and finishing at 100 cells) (Figure 4.4)<sup>10</sup>. Moreover, the activation of the genome in *P. hawaiensis* does not happen uniformly across all cells as previously shown by two populations of nuclei at the 32 cell phase of S5, one with detectable RNA pol II Ser2P and one without<sup>10</sup>. In this chapter, I will present some results of experiments aimed at improving our understanding of the activation of transcription variability seen in P. hawaiensis.



**Figure 4.4: Schematic representation of the Maternal to Zygotic Transition of** *P. hawaiensis* adapted from the results of Nestorov et al. <sup>10</sup> with the schematic representation from the review paper Tadros and Lipshitz <sup>23</sup>. Speculative extrapolation of the timing of the activation of transcription from the beginning of the S5 stage (32 cells) with the minor wave and the general activation at the end of the S5 stage (128 cells) with the major wave.

### 4.1.3 The use of single-cell RNA sequencing to study embryonic development

In 1940, Conrad H. Waddington published a book called *Organisers and genes* in which he proposed a model called the "epigenetic landscape"<sup>25</sup>. Under this model, cells possess a differentiation potential resting on a landscape. Through forces that he called "epigenetic", the landscape's shape was modified, inducing the cell to "move" through it to arrive at its final differentiated destination<sup>25</sup>. Using the recent advances in single-cell RNA sequencing, we can attempt to reconstruct the differentiation trajectories of cells in time by measuring their gene expression landscape. Recent reports of the study of the development of *C. elegans* with Cel-Seq<sup>26</sup>, *Xenopus laevis* with inDrop<sup>27</sup>, and *Danio rerio* with 10X<sup>28,29</sup> are examples of such attempts to understand at the single cell resolution the mechanisms that determine the differentiation of cells.

These techniques all rely on the embryo being dissociated into single cells, thereby losing the spatial information necessary to fully understand development. In *D. rerio*, by using published expression patterns of genes to create a positioning system, sequenced single cells could be relocalized to general embryonic areas<sup>30</sup>. Other technologies such as single-molecule fluorescent *in situ* hybridization (smFISH) that allow for the accurate localization of transcripts could in principle be used to generate single-cell resolution maps of transcripts<sup>31</sup> but suffer

from low throughput in term of mRNA diversity. In cultured cells, newer techniques such as MERFISH offer a higher throughput by using a fluorescent probe encoding system, but have not yet been successfully applied to complex tissues such as a developing embryo<sup>32,33</sup>. One of the technical goals I had initially set for this chapter was to generate a new method that would allow for the successful geo-positioning of sequenced single cells onto a developing embryo at the single-cell resolution without the need for previously known landmark gene expression patterns. By studying the morphogenesis of a developing embryo (discussed in Chapter 5), we can observe all cells *in situ*, and know both their lineage and their positional relationships. By sequencing the transcriptome of the cells in the embryo we can determine the internal gene expression state of the cells. By combining visual and sequence data, I hoped to understand the differentiation processes and cell fate acquisitions in the early stages of development of *P. hawaiensis*.

## 4.1.4 Mapping single-cell transcriptomes onto a virtual developing embryo to understand the differentiation of the germ layers

Both cell lineages identity (Figure 4.5 I)<sup>9</sup> and cellular differentiation trajectories (Figure 4.5 II)<sup>27,29</sup> can be modeled using a tree. While not directly related, both trees share a common feature, the developmental and morphogenic state of the embryo. One aim of both this chapter and Chapter 5 was to find a common feature between both trees such that the information they contained could be merged into a single developmental tree that would encompass lineage, position, dynamic, and gene expression information. I refer to this process as obtaining a geo-positioning system for single-cell RNA sequencing towards making a developmental atlas of embryogenesis. I believe that trying to merge both trees without any processing would be unlikely to result in accurate mapping. First, I reasoned that the time scale at which cell divide and cell differentiate (measurable changes in expression profile) might not correlate, such that the branching events between both trees would not necessarily overlap. Second, the lineage tree is at the single-cell resolution while the differentiation tree is at the cell type, or cell cluster, resolution. Due to this, the lineage tree will harbor a large number of branches while the differentiation tree will have fewer branches. To overcome those problems, I reasoned that I

would need to reproject both trees onto another tree that would serve as an abstraction to remap the information in both original trees (Figure 4.5 III). My proposed solution would be to enrich the branches of the lineage tree using features extracted from the microscopy images, including velocity, cell shape, cell size, and cell position relative to the major embryonic axes (Figure 4.5 II). Such features have been successfully used together to inform cell clusters and infer molecular mechanisms in the study of the Zebrafish posterior Lateral Line Primordium<sup>34</sup>. I expected that I would have to scale the differentiation tree appropriately to match the projected lineage tree (Figure 4.5 III). Branching events could then be correlated to changes in cell clusters of the lineage tree. Finally, by combining all trees, I hoped that it would become possible, potentially at the single-cell resolution, to position gene expression profiles from the RNA sequencing dataset onto a 3D developing embryo (Figure 4.5 IV).

For this approach to be feasible, it would require accurate tracking of nuclei from as early in development as possible, as well as a low enough number of cells such to make this tracking feasible. Therefore, the organism *P. hawaiensis* seemed perfectly suited for this procedure. However, a large number of common protocols in other model organisms such as *D. melanogaster* are not yet developed for this emerging model organism. The main challenge of this section of my Ph.D. was the large amount of protocol development that had to be done to achieve the goals set forth. Here and in Chapter 5, I present the advances that I made towards generating the datasets that would have been required for the geospatial mapping of single-cell RNA sequenced cells onto a developing embryo.

While this idea above directed the experimental procedure described below, most of this chapter is dedicated to the presentation of the developments of the protocols required to obtain single cell RNA sequencing data from embryos. Due to multiple unforeseen difficulties, no usable transcriptomic data was obtained. In this chapter, I describe the attempts and failures that led to the development of a single cell dissociation protocol for stage S6, S7, and S11 *P. hawaiensis* embryos. Finally, I describe the resulting libraries from two inDrop encapsulation experiments and propose some rationale for the lack of depth in sequence data generated by those libraries.



**Figure 4.5: Schematic representation of the concept of the geo-positioning system presented in this chapter.** In I), cells from embryos at different time points are sequenced and their differentiation tree is reconstructed. In parallel in II), embryos are imaged using light sheet microscopy, lineages are tracked and cell features are extracted. In III), the trees are matched against each other and the scRNAseq cells are mapped back onto the developing embryo. Finally, in IV), gene expression is projected onto a virtual developing embryo.

### 4.2 Methods

#### 4.2.1 *P. hawaiensis* cultures

Three cultures of *P. hawaiensis* were initiated from animals kindly provided by Anastasios Pavlopoulos (Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Greece): The original line from the Chicago aquarium (referred to as Wild Type)<sup>5</sup>, an Isogenic female line created by Anastasios Pavlopoulos from which the genome was derived<sup>4</sup> and a genetically modified line containing an *H2B-mRFPruby* cassette under the control of a heat-shock inducible promoter (*PhHS>H2B-mRFPruby*)<sup>9</sup>. The three lines were put in culture in artificial seawater (ASW) (Instant Ocean Artificial Seawater #671442) with a specific gravity of 1.020 (*P. hawaiensis* is resilient to salt concentration and will develop with a specific gravity ranging from 1.018 to 1.022). Each tank consisted of a bottom layer of two centimeters of sterilized crushed coral and an aquarium bubbler fed by an aquarium air pump. The crushed coral was sterilized by being boiled in distilled water for 2h. Each tank received a 50-75% water change every 7-10 days depending on the concentration of animals in culture (the higher the concentration the more frequent the water change).

Animals were fed a mixture of ¼ Tetra Tetramin Flakes, ¼ wheat germ, ¼ Tetra Algae Wafers. The food preparation was done by mixing the three ingredients in a clean bowl and grinding them with a mortar into a fine powder. The powder was then used directly by sprinkling it over the water in the culture tank twice a week. However, this tends to increase the turbidity of the water quickly, therefore a second approach was later used, as follows: a layer of powdered food 6-7 mm thick was laid into a 15cm petri dish. Then 50ml of liquid 1% agar in sterile distilled water was poured into the dish. The food and the agar were then mixed thoroughly and left to rest in a 4°C fridge until the agar had solidified. This preparation can be kept at 4°C for 2 weeks at most. The gel is cut into 2cmx2cm pieces, and each cube was then dropped into the tank. One to two cubes were fed to a large tank every week.

To avoid loss of an entire line, clones of the cultures were kept at all times, such that in the event of a total population collapse in one tank, that line would not be lost. Moreover, all tanks had two air pumps feeding into the bubbler to guard against the malfunction of a given pump.

#### 4.2.2 Collection of *P. hawaiensis* embryos

*P. hawaiensis* males will attach to a fecund female with the use of the front gnathopods, resulting in a pair of individuals that are called a couple. Once the female has received a spermatophore from the male, it will molt, freeing itself from the male, and will shortly after laying her eggs in an external ventral brooding pouch. Embryos can then be harvested from the single females for subsequent use.

Couples are easily visible by eye in the culture tank and can be captured with a small net. To create a capturing net, a 50ml falcon tube and a 200um nylon mesh are combined as shown in Figure 4.6:

Once couples have been captured in the net, they are placed in a petri dish filled with ASW for subsequent use.

Couples were harvested the evening before an experiment and placed in Petri dishes. On the



**Figure 4.6: Schematic representation of the creation of a mesh trap for the capture of** *P. hawaiensis* **adults.** 50ml Falcon tube and 200um mesh are used to create this net. Cut the falcon tube between the 30 and 35ml mark using a metal saw or a hot wire. Cut a circular hole in the lid which will allow for the water to flow out of the net. Cut a 200um nylon mesh into a square piece of side length the diameter of the falcon tube plus 5mm. Place the mesh over the screw part of the tube and screw the lid back, trying to keep the mesh flat and under tension.

morning of the experiment, detached females were collected from the Petri dishes, and anesthetized using ASW saturated with CO2. To saturate the ASW, a stone bubbler connected to a CO2 tank was placed in a bottle of ASW for 3 minutes. Most of the ASW in the Petri dishes with females was removed and replaced by the CO2-saturated ASW. In this medium, the females will go unconscious within one minute or less. Using a dissecting microscope and forceps, the embryos were removed from the brooding pouch. Embryos were checked to determine their developmental stages, and one cell stage embryos were kept in filtered artificial seawater with antibiotics (FASWA) (3ml of pen/strep (10000U/ml Thermo: 15140122) + 1.5ml amphotericin (250ug/ml stock 15290-026 Gibco life technology) in 300ml of filtered artificial seawater (FASW)) for subsequent injection and imaging. This protocol was derived from standard practices published in Kontarakis and Pavlopoulos <sup>35</sup>.

#### 4.2.3 Heat Shock of PhHS>H2B-mRFPruby P. hawaiensis embryos

*P. hawaiensis* embryos were collected as described above (see: *Collection of P. hawaiensis embryos*), then placed in a 5cm petri dish filled with FASW. The embryos were placed in an incubator set at 37°C for 60 minutes, then were left at room temperature for 30 minutes. After the heat shock, the FASW was replaced with an equal volume of fresh FASW to avoid the effect of increased salinity due to water evaporation during the heat shock period. Embryos were then kept in a 26°C incubator. All embryos were imaged within 12-24h after the heat shock was performed.

### 4.2.4 Imaging of *P. hawaiensis* embryos with the Zeiss AxioZoom fluorescent stereomicroscope

*P. hawaiensis* embryos were placed in a 5cm or 10cm petri dish filled with FASW. The petri dish was placed under the Zeiss AxioZoom microscope on an air table to avoid vibrations and specimen drift. Images were taken using a Hamamatsu OrcaFlash4.0 v2 camera installed on the microscope. Illumination for white light imaging was provided from a white light source through two focusable optic fiber connections, resulting in an incident light illumination. The angle of incidence was adjusted each time to provide the best visible contrast.

#### 4.2.5 Dissection and fixation of *P. hawaiensis* embryos

*P. hawaiensis* embryos were collected as described above (see: *Collection of P. hawaiensis embryos*), then placed in a 5cm petri dish filled with FASW. Stages were selected using a dissecting microscope with incident lighting. The fixation and dissection procedure was followed exactly as previously described in *Fixation and Dissection of P. hawaiensis Embryos*<sup>36</sup>. Embryos were kept in 100% Methanol at -20°C for later use or used directly after post-fixation washing for immunostaining.

#### 4.2.6 Collection and fixation of *D. melanogaster* embryos

*D. melanogaster* adults were put in a collection cage with a 15cm apple juice/agar petri dish<sup>37</sup>and left at 25°C for four hours before collection. The 15 cm petri dish was removed from the cage and replaced with a ten cm apple juice petri dish with 1g of wet yeast<sup>38</sup>. After ten minutes, the petri dish was removed and embryos were collected as previously described in Rothwell and Sullivan<sup>38</sup>. The embryos were dechorionated with 50% bleach for 1min and fixed with a 50/50 mixture of heptane/4% ParaFormAldehyde (PFA). They were then dehydrated in methanol and either stored at -20°C or rehydrated and used directly for staining as described below.

#### 4.2.7 Immunostaining of RNA Polymerase II in P. hawaiensis embryos

Fixed embryos were stained using the protocol *Antibody Staining of P. hawaiensis Embryos*<sup>39</sup>, with the following modifications: Because the secondary antibodies used were conjugated to fluorescent proteins no chemical development was performed on the embryos. The washing steps were followed by an additional overnight wash in 1X PBT at room temperature. After the last washing step of the secondary antibody, embryos were mounted as described in *Confocal imaging and mounting of P. hawaiensis embryos* and *Preparation and analysis of fixed embryos for light sheet microscopy with the Zeiss Z1 microscope* for subsequent imaging. Three primary antibodies were used against RNA Polymerase II C-terminal domain (CTD) at 1:500: Purified anti-RNA Polymerase II RPB1 Antibody H5 (BioLegend 920203) which targets the CTD when the Serine 2 is phosphorylated, Purified anti-RNA Polymerase II RPB1 Antibody H14 1:500

(BioLegend 920304) which targets the CTD when the Serine 5 is phosphorylated and Go-ChIP-Grade<sup>™</sup> Purified anti-RNA Polymerase II RPB1 Antibody Clone 8WG16 at 1:500 (BioLegend 664911) which targets the unphosphorylated CTD. One primary antibody targeting Tubulin was used as a positive control: Anti-alpha Tubulin antibody [DM1A] - Microtubule Marker at 1:1000 (Alexa Fluor® 488) (Abcam ab195887). For *D. melanogaster* embryos, a rabbit anti-Vasa antibody was used to mark pole cells at 1:100 (Vasa d-260 Santa Cruz Biotechnology #sc-30210). All secondary antibodies were used at 1:1000. Donkey anti-mouse conjugated with Alexa fluorophore 488 and 555 were used as secondary antibodies: Donkey anti-Mouse IgG (H+L) Highly Cross-Adsorbed Secondary Antibody, Alexa Fluor 488 (Thermo Fisher #A-21202 RRID: AB\_141607) and Donkey anti-Mouse IgG (H+L) Highly Cross-Adsorbed Secondary Antibody, Alexa Fluor 555 (Thermo Fisher #A-31570 RRID: AB\_2536180). For Vasa a goat anti-Rabbit conjugated with the far red Alexa 647 dye was used: Goat anti-Rabbit IgG (H+L) Highly Cross-Adsorbed Secondary Antibody, Alexa Fluor Plus 647 (Thermo Fisher #A-21246 RRID: AB\_2633282).

Pole cells in wild type *D. melanogaster* embryos at 75-85 minute post-fertilization undergo the MZT with a delay compared to the somatic nuclei<sup>40</sup>, providing an internal control. In all experiments, *D. melanogaster* embryos at 75-85 minute post-fertilization were added to the tube containing fixed *P. hawaiensis* embryos, and stained and imaged using the same confocal settings as the *P. hawaiensis* embryos.

#### 4.2.8 Confocal imaging and mounting of *P. hawaiensis* embryos

*P. hawaiensis* embryos are ~500um diameter and spherical, embryos were mounted between a glass slide and coverslip with wax feet. First, a single embryo was deposited on a glass slide and the excess liquid removed, then a drop of Vectashield (VectorLabs: H-1000) supplemented with a 1:10000 Hoechst 33258 dilution was deposited onto the embryo. The coverslip was prepared by scraping each corner against Dental wax (Amazon: BooFKDCoUU) until a small amount (~1mm) of wax accumulated. Then, the coverslip with wax risers was deposited atop the drop of vectashield and embryo. Finally, the coverslip was gently secured by pushing with forceps on each corner until the embryo was just touching both the slide and the coverslip. The procedure

is represented in Figure 4.7.



**Figure 4.7: Schematic representation of the mounting procedure on a glass slide and coverslip for** *P. hawaiensis* **embryos.** The coverslip is padded with dental wax. The embryo is mounted in Vectashield. The coverslip is placed gently atop the Vectashield drop and fixed by gently pressing each corner.

# 4.2.9 Preparation and analysis of fixed embryos for light sheet microscopy with the Zeiss Z1 microscope

Embryos were mounted in 1% low melt agar with fluorescent beads (see: *Preparation of low melt agar gel with fluorescent beads*) inside a glass capillary affixed with a micro Teflon plunger. Glass capillaries (Brand #708718) and plungers (Brand #701932) were provided by Seth Donoughue. To mount *P. hawaiensis* embryos, the black color-coded capillaries (BlauBrand: 708718) and plunger were used. Embryos were dropped into liquid 1% LowMelt agar with fluorescent beads kept at 42°C and stirred until they dropped to the bottom of the tube. Then using the capillary and the plunger, first ~2cm of agar was aspirated, then the embryos, one at a time to avoid having them mounted at the same height in the tube. Finally, 2-3mm more agar was added. The tips of the capillary were kept submerged in PBS until the samples were mounted in the Zeiss Z1 microscope.

Each embryo was annotated with Mamut, a FIJI plugin for light sheet dataset cell tracking, and every nucleus was annotated. Then, from this set of annotations, nuclei that did not show a signal for RNA Pol II CTD Ser2P or Ser5P were removed. Both annotation sets were then imported into python for subsequent analysis (Figure 4.11).

#### 4.2.10 Isolation of P. hawaiensis embryo blastomeres

Embryos were collected as described previously (see: Collection of *P. hawaiensis* embryos) and staged to select for four cell stage embryos and placed in FASWA. The isolation of single blastomeres was performed as previously described by Cassandra Extavour<sup>41</sup>.

#### 4.2.11 Dissociation of *P. hawaiensis* embryo into single-cells

The dissociation of *P. hawaiensis* embryos was carried out as described in the results section: **Detailed protocol for** *P. hawaiensis* embryo single-cell dissociation. Over 100 couples were collected into 15cm Petri dishes filled with ASW. After one hour, detached females were removed from the Petri dishes. Couples were left at 26°C for the following four hours, then detached females were harvested and placed in a separate 15cm petri dish filled with ASW. This was performed such that the exact timing of embryonic development could be assessed up to a four hour (or shorter if needed) time window. Embryos were then collected from anesthetized females (see: Collection of P. hawaiensis embryos) and placed in FASWA prior to dissociation. All material used for the cell dissociation was coated with Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) by placing a 1% BSA in sterile water solution in the Petri dishes, pipettes tips, and glass Pasteur pipettes. The solution was left to passively coat the material for 12 hours. The material was then quickly rinsed in sterile water before being used for the dissociation. The embryos were first washed two times with the dissociation buffer composed of Isethionic acid 15mg/ml (Isethionic acid sodium salt: Sigma-Aldrich 220078-25G), Sodium pyrophosphate 9mg/ml (Sodium pyrophosphate tetrabasic decahydrate Sigma-Aldrich S6422-100G), and CAPS 2.2mg/ml (CAPS Sigma-Aldrich C2632-25G) to remove any excess calcium from the solution. Embryos were then dissected out of the eggshell as gently as possible while minimizing any damage to the cells. The dissection was performed on a BSA-coated Sylgard plate using tungsten needles in batches of 30 embryos (working with batches of more embryos resulted in decreased dissociation efficiency) in a drop of dissociation buffer. The dissected embryos were transferred to one well of a BSA coated 12 well plate using a BSA coated glass Pasteur pipette. Extra care was taken not to transfer any of the eggshells as they interfere with the dissociation. The well was filled entirely with dissociation buffer, then covered with parafilm such that no air bubble got trapped in the liquid column. The plate was then sealed with tape and vortexed for 25 minutes. The plate was removed and cells were then transferred onto a 15ml BSA coated tube. The next steps are detailed in Figure 4.22. At the bottom of the tube, using a 21G needle, a gradient density of optiprep was backfilled. First, 60ul of 5% Optiprep in 1x PBS with Phenol Red dye (OptiPrep™ Density Gradient Medium, Sigma: D1556), followed by 60ul of 10% Optiprep in PBS, then 20ul of 20% Optiprep in PBS, and 20ul of 30% Optiprep in PBS with Phenol Red dye and finally 50ul of 40% Optiprep in PBS. The cells were concentrated by centrifuging the tube at 2500rpm in a bucket centrifuge for 4 minutes at 4°C. All liquid before the first red band (5% Optiprep) was removed by gentle pipetting, then, using a 1ml syringe, the content between the two red bands was harvested, making sure not to aspirate the 40% optiprep containing debris. This solution of dissociated cells was then kept at 4°C and used for subsequent experiments.

## 4.2.12 Assessment of dissociation efficiency, cell concentration, and cell viability

Dissociation efficiency was assessed using a hemocytometer. 20ul of the cell suspension was added between the hemocytometer and the coverslip. Cells were counted using differential interferometry contrast (DIC) white light imaging on a Zeiss AxioScan. Every single cell, doublet, triplet, or aggregate of more than three cells was counted. The dissociation efficiency was calculated by taking the ratio of single cells to the total number of counted cells.

Cell viability was assessed using the Propidium Iodide (Thermo: P3566) staining method. Dissociated cells were incubated with a 1:5000 Hoechst 33258 (stock at 1 mg/mL) and 1:5000 PI (stock at 1 mg/mL) for 1 minute. 20ul of the cell solution was then placed in a hemocytometer to quantify cell concentration. Finally, all Hoechst-positive and PI-positive cells were counted using an epifluorescent upright microscope (Zeiss AxioScan). The viability was calculated by taking 1 minus the ratio of PI-positive cells to the total number of cells.

#### 4.2.13 Preparation of CelSeq2 libraries

Embryos earlier than stage S6 were dissected out of their eggshells with tungsten needles, and cells were separated using an eyelash as previously described<sup>41</sup>. Individual cells from dissociated embryos were pipetted on to the lid of a LoBind PCR 96 well plate under a dissection microscope. The lids were then placed on the corresponding PCR 96 well plates and the plate stored at -80°C. The library preparation protocol was then applied, adapted from the official CelSeq2 protocol from the original paper<sup>42</sup>. The only difference was the use of the BioMek pipetting robot to perform all the pipetting after the first primer annealing.

#### 4.2.14 Preparation of inDrop libraries

Embryos were harvested and staged such that Stage 6-7 (12-24hpf) and Stage 11 (64-68hpf) were dissected and dissociated as described above (see: Dissociation of *P. hawaiensis* embryo into single cells). 160 embryos were used per experiment, with two replicates per time points. inDrop libraries were prepared by the Harvard Medical School Single Cell Core

(https://singlecellcore.hms.harvard.edu/)<sup>43</sup>. The libraries were sequenced on the NextSeq platform at the Harvard Bauer Core Facility (https://bauercore.fas.harvard.edu/) with an estimated 100,000 reads per cell. Libraries were sequenced Paired-end with the special inDrop protocol (protocol developed by the Harvard Bauer Core Facility, personal communication with C.B. Reardon) which produced 61bp reads for the 3' end of the captured transcripts, along with the 3 required barcodes: Library, Cell, and UMI.

#### 4.2.15 Annotation of P. hawaiensis genome

The version of the *P. hawaiensis* genome, v5.0 (GCA\_001587735.2 Phaw\_5.0), was annotated using the MAKER2 annotation tool suite<sup>44</sup>. Unpublished RNA sequencing reads for use in annotation were kindly donated from the laboratories of Michaelis Averof (Institut de Génomique Fonctionnelle de Lyon, France), Nipam Patel (Marine Biological Laboratory, Woodshole USA), Ezio Rosato (University of Leicester, Leicester, UK), Anastasios Pavlopoulos (Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Greece) and the Extavour lab. All published RNA sequencing libraries were collected from published databases as well (NCBI IDs: PRJNA399131, PRJEB2845, PRJEB2844). Transcript data from other crustacean species were added to the maker pipeline as external gene evidence (NCBI TSA ids: *Gammarus pulex* HAFM01, *Hyalella azteca* GAJP01 GAJQ01 GEHV01 JQDR02, and *Talitrus saltator* GDUJ01).

First, the detection of repeated regions and transposons was generated to create a mask for further filtering. A pipeline developed by Guillem Ylla in the Extavour lab was used. It consisted of running the following repeated region detection algorithms and matches against databases: MITE-tracker<sup>45</sup>, LTRharvest + LTRDigest<sup>46</sup>, RepeatModeler<sup>47</sup>, SINE database<sup>48</sup>, RepeatMasker<sup>49</sup> and RepBase<sup>50</sup>. The algorithms were run with default parameters. The results were then joined into a single file and regions classified using RepeatClassifier<sup>47</sup>. Possible protein-coding genes detected as transposable elements were filtered out of the set. Elements classified as "Unknown" by the RepeatClassifier and with a Blastx hit (e-value < 1e-10) against the insect proteins from the well-defined SwissProt database were removed. Finally, the genome was masked using RepeatMasker<sup>49</sup>. This mask was used as a repeat mask in the MAKER2 pipeline.

Second, all reads from the RNA sequencing datasets were mapped against the genome sequence

to create transcript models. Reads were mapped onto the genome using hisat2<sup>51</sup> with default parameters. The SAM files outputs were converted to BAM files, concatenated, and sorted using SAMtools<sup>52</sup>. The BAM read maps were then put into the gene model prediction algorithm StringTie<sup>53</sup>. Finally, the gene model was converted to GFF3 format using the Cufflinks built-in converter<sup>54</sup>. This GFF3 file was used as gene evidence in the MAKER2 pipeline.

Third, a *de novo* gene prediction algorithm model was constructed for Augustus<sup>55</sup> using the BUSCO arthropod dataset as input<sup>56</sup>. BUSCO looks for highly conserved genes onto the P. hawaiensis genome and automatically launches the Augustus training pipeline to fit a gene model. This gene model was used as the *de novo* Augustus model in the MAKER2 pipeline. The MAKER2 pipeline was then executed on the Harvard High Processing Cluster (HPC) Odyssey with the following parameters:

EST: The assembled transcripts for P. hawaiensis published previously<sup>4</sup>

- ALTEST: The RNA sequencing transcripts collected from NCBI mentioned above
- EST\_GFF: The GFF3 file generated above
- PROTEIN: The 2018 Uniprot Swiss Prot database<sup>57</sup>
- RMLIB: The repeat masker output generated above.
- SOFTMASK: Turned on

•

- AUGUSTUS\_SPECIES: The Augustus model generated above
- EST2GENOME: turned on
- PROTEIN2GENOME: turned on
- TRNA: turned on
- MAX\_DNA\_LENGHT: 300000
- **AED\_THRESHOLD: 1**
- All other parameters are set to default.

The MAKER2 pipeline was run two consecutive times, with the second one using the generated annotations from the first. BUSCO<sup>56</sup> was used to compare the annotations against the arthropod database to assess their quality.

#### 4.2.16 Computational processing of inDrop libraries

The processing of the inDrop libraries was performed using a published demultiplexing pipeline<sup>43</sup>. The pipeline was downloaded from the GitHub repository <u>https://github.com/indrops/indrops</u> and used with the default parameters except for the "d" parameters, where the maximum allowed distance between a hit and an annotation was set to 5000bp.

The analysis of the demultiplexed counts was performed using Scanpy, a single-cell RNA seq analysis toolkit in python<sup>58</sup>.

### 4.3 Results

### 4.3.1 Attempts to examine the timing of *P. hawaiensis* Maternal to Zygotic Transition

As we have seen above, the Maternal to Zygotic Transition (MZT) plays a central role in the specification of cell fate (reviewed in<sup>23</sup>). A previous study had suggested that the MZT of *P. hawaiensis* might start as early as the S5 stage (at 32 cells), based on the report that some cells at this stage, but not all, contained levels of RNA Polymerase II that were detectable with an antibody against a phosphorylated Serine diagnostic of polymerase activity<sup>10</sup>. The RNA polymerase II C terminal domain (CTD) is phosphorylated on Serine 2 prior to transcript elongation, and phosphorylated on Serine 5 when the polymerase is primed at the starting site (reviewed by Bartkowiak et al. <sup>59</sup>. However, only the general timing of detection of this signal was reported<sup>10</sup>, namely that by the end of the S5 stage (reported as 100 cell stage), all nuclei displayed a positive signal for RNA Pol II Ser2P-CTD<sup>10</sup>.

To assess the timing of the MZT I first proposed to use an alternative method. By activating the

expression of an inducible promoter controlling a reporter gene in a transgenic animal, I hoped to detect the timing of the MZT. I hypothesized that the promoter would only become inducible after the MZT happened. To try to refine the timing of the putative MTZ in *P. hawaiensis*, we obtained a transgenic *P. hawaiensis* line <sup>60</sup> containing a cassette expressing *H2B-mRFPruby* under the control of a heat-shock promoter *PhHS* (referred to as *PhHS>H2B-mRFPruby*) from Anastasios Pavlopoulos<sup>9</sup>. I first tested the transgene by subjecting S6-7 embryo (after the reported onset of the MZT during the S5 stage<sup>10</sup>) to a heat shock at 37°C s, and detected subsequent red fluorescence in the nucleus of all cells under an epifluorescence stereomicroscope (100% of embryos examined showed expression n=16) (Figure 4.8). This suggested that the transgenic cassette was expressing mRFPruby tagged H2B as expected.

I then tried a similar experiment with embryos at the S1-S5 stage (1 to 128 cell), I did not detect any transgene expression 12 hours following heat shock for any of them (Figure 4.8; sample size in legend). Given the previous report suggesting that the MZT might start as early as the 32 cell phase of the S5 stage and continue through to the end of the S5 stage (100 cells)<sup>10</sup>, I was surprised that I could not detect any expression of the transgene in response to heat shock in 128 cell stage embryos. Therefore, I used the same transcriptional activity assessment technique as the previous report<sup>10</sup>, namely fixing embryos at different stages and detecting RNA Pol II CTD Serine 2 and Serine 5 phosphorylation states via immunohistochemistry. At stage S4, no positive staining was detected. The intermediate stage between the 16 and 32 cell phase of the S5 stage showed mosaic phosphorylation of the Serine 2 and the Serine 5 of the CTD (Figure 4.9; n=6 for Ser5P CTD 4/6 showed a positive signal and n=3 for Ser2P CTD 1/3 showed a positive signal). By 32 to 64 and 64 to 128 cell phase of the S5 stage, cells showing detectable anti-phosphoSerine 2 and -Serine 5 of the CTD was detected in all embryos (Figure 4.9; n=11 for Ser5P CTD and n=4 for Ser2P CTD, all embryos showed a positive signal in at least one nuclei). In all cases (n=6 for all conditions), D. melanogaster pole cells showed a negative Ser2P CTD staining and the somatic cells positive staining (Figure 4.10). To conclude, I found a similar mosaic expression pattern similar to the previously reported results<sup>10</sup> but with an earlier onset at the transition between the 16 to the 32 cell phase of the S5 stage (compared to the reported 32 cell phase of the S5 stage).

	Emrbyo before heat shock	White H2B light mRFPruby		Merge	
64 Cell stage					Control
			***		Heat shocked
ell stage				C	Control
128 ce					Heat shocked
ierm disk			•		Control
Early G					Heat shocked
Mid Germ disk					Control
					Heat shocked

**Figure 4.8: Representative images of heat-shocked embryos and control embryos.** Shown are PhHS>H2B-mRFPruby transgenic embryos at four different developmental stages. For each experiment, a clutch of eggs from a single female was used and split in two, one set of eggs for control, and one set for heat shock treatment. S5 stage (64-cell): n=9, 4 controls, and 5 heatshocked embryos; S6 stage (128-cell): n=12, 6 controls and 6 heat-shocked embryos; S7 stage (Early Germ disk): n=7, 3 controls, and 4 heat-shocked embryos; S7 stage (Mid germ disk): n=14, 7 controls and 7 heat-shocked embryos. Imaging was done on a Zeiss AxioZoom stereo microscope with an Orca Flash 4.0 camera.



**Figure 4.9: Representative images of** *P. hawaiensis* **embryos stained with antibodies against different phosphorylation states of the RNA Polymerase II CTD. a, b, c)** Staining of *P. hawaiensis* embryos at different cell count of the S5 stage (16-128) and early S6 stage (GD stage) with Hoechst-33258 and monoclonal antibodies against the CTD. **a)** Staining with monoclonal mouse antibody clone H14 against Ser5P CTD, an indication of primed RNA Pol II. n=25 b) Staining with monoclonal mouse antibody clone H5 against Ser2P CTD, an indication of elongating RNA Pol II. n=10 **c)** Positive control staining with monoclonal mouse antibody clone 8WG16 against the unphosphorylated CTD. n=4



**Figure 4.10: Positive control for the antibody staining** presented in Figure 4.9. Representative images of *D. melanogaster* embryos stained with antibodies against different phosphorylation states of the RNA Polymerase II CTD and Vasa as a marker of pole cells. **a**, **b**, **c**) Staining of *D. melanogaster* embryos at 75-85mn post-fertilization (pole cell formation) with Hoechst-33258, anti-Vasa, and monoclonal antibodies against the CTD. **a**) Staining with monoclonal mouse antibody clone H5 against Ser2P CTD showing elongating RNA Pol II. n=6 **b**) Staining with monoclonal mouse antibody clone 8WG16 against the CTD. n=6

One of the open questions that I hoped to answer was whether the timing of mosaic activation of RNA pol II was happening randomly or was restricted to particular lineages. Due to P. hawaiensis early embryogenesis following a stereotypical division pattern<sup>1,7</sup>, I hypothesized that by collecting a sufficient number of embryos, carefully dissecting them to preserve their 3D structure, and image them in 3D using a light sheet microscope, I could spatially align the images to assess whether the activation of certain cells as early as 16-32 cells during the S5 stage was restricted to some lineages. Working with Robbert Appleby, an undergrad summer student from Cambridge University, we repeated the staining protocol as described above and imaged all embryos using a light sheet microscope. The collection of embryos, staining, and imaging were successful and 80 embryos across all conditions were imaged (Figure 4.11b-d, breakdown of sample size per stage in Figure 4.11a, n=37 for Ser2P, n=26 for Ser5P, n=17 controls). Due to the internship of Robert Appleby finishing before the completion of the annotations and to advance the second part of this chapter, namely the single-cell RNA sequencing of embryos, I left the analysis of this dataset unfinished. The annotation of nuclei was partially completed and shows promising results (Figure 4.11e) whereby the partial activation of nuclei can be seen before the end of the S5 stage (128 cells) embryo (n=2 analyzed for Ser2P and n=1 analyzed for Ser5P).







**Figure 4.11: Light sheet imaging of** *P. hawaiensis* **embryos stained with antibodies against different phosphorylation states** of the RNA Polymerase II CTD. a) Distribution of stained embryos per antibody and stages. 69/80 of the embryos sampled to date are between the 16-128c stages. **b-d)** All images are maximum intensity projections of the entire embryo volume acquired with the Zeiss light sheet Z1. **b)** Representative image of a positive control 64-128c stage embryo stained for PolII-CTD. **c)** Staged embryos stained with antibody H14 (PolII CTD:Ser5P) showing primmed PolII. **d)** Staged embryos stained with antibody H5 (PolII CTD:Ser5P) showing elongating PolII. **e)** Example visualization of annotations of nuclei positions and transcription state. 3D scatter plot showing the position of the nuclei and its activation state for each antibody. In blue, the nuclei are negative for the stain, and in orange they are positive. From top to bottom, phases of stage S5 are 64-128c, 64-128c, 16-32c, and 64-128c.

## 4.3.2 Isolation of single cells for plate-based single-cell RNA sequencing and failure to generate single-cell libraries using the CelSeq2 protocol

Given the putative relatively early activation of the zygotic genome (Figure 4.9, Figure 4.11) in P. hawaiensis<sup>10</sup>, and the early restriction of germ layer identity (Figure 4.1)<sup>1</sup>, I wanted to sequence cells from embryos as early as the S4 stage (8 cells). To understand the gene expression changes happening between the S4 and S6 stage, I hoped to generate a single cell RNA sequencing library of those stages. The manual isolation of single blastomeres of P. hawaiensis was previously achieved by Cassandra Extavour<sup>41</sup>. Therefore, I decided to apply the cell picking and plate-based single-cell RNA sequencing technique, CelSeq2<sup>42</sup>. I dissected and dissociated embryos as young as the S4 stage (8 cells) with the help of Cassandra Extavour to separate blastomeres with an eyelash and up until S6 stage (the aggregation of the germ disk) by placing the dissected embryos in a 500ul Eppendorf tube and flicking it. I picked 6 plates (each plate contained a variable number of embryos, depending on the availability of cells after dissociation) for a total of 576 cells in this fashion and kept them at -80C. I then lysed the cells, purified and reverse transcribed their mRNA to generate cDNA libraries using the Cel-Seq2 protocol<sup>42</sup>. I repeated this procedure eight times, but none of these eight attempts at creating libraries were successful as can be seen in Figure 4.12. After the linear amplification step, products from the reverse transcription are fragmented to a 300-1000 bp size prior to the generation of the cDNA library. In my hands, all fragmentations led to a distribution of cDNA molecules length centered around 80bp (Figure 4.12).



**Figure 4.12: Bioanalyzer traces of 8 CelSeq2 library attempts.** Each color is one of eight attempts to generate cDNA libraries from isolated blastomeres. The traces were measured of the fragmented amplified RNA after bead cleanup. The main peak in all of them is around 80bp, whereas the expected peak, according to the CelSeq2 protocol<sup>42</sup> is between 300-1000bp. The Y-axis is Fluorescent Units, a measure of the quantity of DNA flowing through the bioanalyzer elution column at a given size.

## 4.3.3 Development of an embryo cell dissociation protocol for *P. hawaiensis*

To sequence embryos older than stage S6, I attempted to apply the inDrop microfluidic encapsulation device<sup>43</sup>. inDrop requires a highly concentrated (>10000 cells per ml) solution of well-dissociated (>95% single cells), highly viable cells (>95% survival rate) (Allon Klein, Harvard Medical School Single Cell Core (https://singlecellcore.hms.harvard.edu/), personal communication). The manual separation of cells used above was not a viable technique to generate such a cell suspension, because cells beyond stage S6 were forming a cohesive structure that would not dissociate with a similar tube flicking employed for CelSeq2. Therefore I aimed to develop a new protocol for cell dissociation that would be compatible with inDrop<sup>43</sup>.

I assumed that *P. hawaiensis* blastomeres would contain adherens junctions, a crucial component of which are Cadherins<sup>61</sup>. Cadherin-mediated cell adhesion is mediated by the presence of Ca2+ ions. I also considered previous reports that enzymatic cell dissociation at high temperatures can stress cells and change their transcriptomic state<sup>62</sup>. Therefore, I aimed to develop a protocol that would maintain the cells at 4°C and avoid the use of proteases. I started from a protocol kindly provided by James A. Briggs (Harvard Medical School) that was

developed for the dissociation of *Xenopus laevis* embryos<sup>27</sup>. This protocol involved treatment with pronase to remove the vitelline membrane of *X. laevis* eggs<sup>27</sup>. Upon pronase treatment, the *P. hawaiensis* eggshell remained intact and showed no sign of softening or digestion with up to two hours of treatment at 37°C (data not shown). To my knowledge, the only tested chemical known to digest the eggshell of *P. hawaiensis* embryo is bleach (personal communication with Anastasios Pavlopoulos). However, I feared that upon contact with a solution of bleach, cells in the embryo would suffer significant damage. To my knowledge, no studies have developed a successful enzymatic method for crustacean eggshell digestion<sup>63</sup>. I therefore manually removed the eggshell using tungsten needles. This step limited my capacity to work sufficiently rapidly to dissociate large numbers of embryos. Moreover, the manual dissection of the eggshell results in some damage to the embryo, resulting in the loss of some cells. However, this was the most successful methodology I could find to dissociate a large number of embryos into single cells. With practice, I was able to dissociate 160 embryos in 90 minutes (1.7 embryos per minute).

Once the embryos were removed from their eggshells, I took extra care to remove any extra debris, as I noted that the dissociated cells tended to aggregate around debris particles and did not dissociate properly (data not shown). Similarly, Briggs et al.<sup>27</sup> noted that failure to remove all eggshell fragments in the dissociation of X. laevis embryos resulted in an aggregation of cells. Upon transferring the embryos, free of their eggshells, into the dissociation buffer, I noted that the embryos dissociated into individual cells (data not shown). This may have been caused by the sequestration of Ca2+ by CAPS (3-(Cyclohexylamino)-1-propanesulfonic acid) in the medium. However, without strong mechanical agitation, I noted that the cells did not fully dissociate, and that doublet and triplet cell aggregates remained (7.7% of doublets and 2.4% of triplets, n=3 dissociation experiments performed for each with 30 S11 staged embryos). Therefore, I subjected the cells to mechanical agitation as follows: I immersed cells in 7 ml of dissociation buffer in one well of a 12 well plate. The well was sealed such that no air was trapped within it. This prevented cells from coming into contact with air bubbles, which was important to avoid because I noted that, if air bubbles were trapped in the column, almost no cells could be detected in a well after agitation (data not shown). I believe that this is because the surface tension between the cell and a water-air interface leads to the destruction of these

blastomeres, by tearing of the cell membrane. After sealing the wells, I vortexed the plate for 20 minutes. This resulted in a very dilute cell suspension (<1000 cell/ml, the technical lower limit of the hemocytometer used), but the single cell dissociation efficiency increased, when compared to no mechanical dissociation, to 95.4% (with 4.3% of doublets and 0.3% of triplets, n=3), and the viability of the cells was high (96.5%, n=3 dissociation experiments performed for each with 30 S11 staged embryos).

The low concentration of cells (<1000/ml) that I obtained with my method could not be used for inDrop. Therefore, I tried to adapt a methodology to reconcentrate the cell suspension based on the protocol of Briggs and colleagues<sup>27</sup>. After dissociation, I let the plate rest for five minutes to allow the cells to settle at the bottom of the well. Subsequently, I backfilled (150ul of each Optiprep concentration was pipetted at the bottom of the well one after the other) a density gradient column of Optiprep from the bottom to the top, starting from a 5% solution and finishing with a 40% solution, in 5% increments, creating multiple interfaces between the different densities. Cells were lifted from the bottom of the plate when a denser layer was backfilled. Under a stereomicroscope, the cells visible at the interface between two layers could then be aspirated into a syringe for loading in the inDrop device. This method led to a concentration of 5000 cells/ml (n=3 dissociation experiments performed for each with 30 S11 staged embryos).

Using this technique, I performed a first experiment (referred to as First experiment) at the Harvard Medical School Single Cell Core (https://singlecellcore.hms.harvard.edu/). Embryos were collected and staged such that stage S6-7 (12-24hpf) and stage S11 (64-68hpf) embryos were dissociated for an inDrop experiment. The embryos were split into two replicates. Following dissociation, 200 ul of cell suspension, containing approximately 1000 cells (pooled from 30 embryos), were encapsulated for library preparation per replicate (n=2 per time point) (The core staff counted the cells flowing in the inDrop device, however, I believe after discussing with them that they counted yolk granules as well inflating the number). Although this implies that my cell suspension was at a concentration of 5000cell/ml, the results of the subsequent sequencing (discussed below) suggested that the cell concentration was in fact much lower, as fewer than 1000 cells were detected for each of the X libraries prepared in this experiment

(Table 4.1). The protocol was then further refined to increase the cell concentration as the first attempt was under the lower end of the technical feasibility of the inDrop microfluidic device. To increase the total number of cells, I changed the concentration methodology as follows: First, instead of letting the cells settle at the bottom of the well following the mechanical separation step, I transferred the liquid column containing the dissociated cells into a 15ml falcon tube. This approach removed the limitation of using only one well to dissociate embryos, as multiple wells (less than 15 ml of total solution) could be pooled into the 15 ml falcon tube. After collecting the suspension, I created a small gradient density by backfilling different concentrations of Optiprep at the bottom of the falcon tube (see detailed protocol below). Finally, the tube was spun in a centrifuge to concentrate the cells, which were then resuspended in 100ul.

A second inDrop experiment (referred to as Second experiment) was then performed at the Harvard Medical School Single Cell Core (https://singlecellcore.hms.harvard.edu/) using this new concentration protocol. For each stage S11 (64-68hpf) I dissociated 160 embryos. The embryos were again split into two technical replicates of 80 embryos each. Less than 160 embryos could be collected for the S6-7 time point and only one replicate of 80 embryos was done. Following the dissociation, I encapsulated approximately 600 cells for the single S6-7 replicate, 1000 cells for the first S11 replicate, and 2000 cells for the second S11 replicate. I estimated the number of cells encapsulated by making a time-lapse video of the cell suspension passing through the inDrop device under the compound microscope (data not shown).

In total, two inDrop experiments were performed, with 4 conditions for the first one and 3 for the second one. The libraries from the first experiment are marked as I SX.replicate and from the second one as II SX.replicate. The resulting libraries were sequenced by the Harvard Bauer sequencing core on the NextSeq platform. The detailed final protocol for the dissociation of *P. hawaiensis* embryos can be found at the end of this chapter.

Library name	Develop- mental Stage	# of embryos	Estimated number of encap- sulated	Total number of reads	Reads after QC	Propor- tion of reads	Expected propor- tion
			cells				
First experiment							
I S6_7.1	S6-7	30	1000	107102966	88895461	26.29%	25%
	12-24hpf						
I S6_7.2	S6-7	30	1000	81350942	69148304	19.97%	25%
	12-24hpf						
I S11.1	S11	30	1000	80390297	67447459	19.73%	25%
	64-68hpf						
I S11.2	S11	30	1000	112067856	99740391	27.51%	25%
	64-68hpf						
Second experiment							
II S6_7.1	S6-7	80	600	67693910	54493597	18.12%	25%
	12-24hpf						
II S11.1	S11	80	1000	84664503	57233204	22.66%	25%
	64-68hpf						
II S11.2	S11	80	2000	204487930	166453175	54.72%	50%
	64-68hpf						

**Table 4.1: List of all inDrop experiments executed on dissociated** *P. hawaiensis* **embryos.** Each library is displayed as a row with its sample name. The number of encapsulated cells along with the library's summary statistics are represented in the following columns. The estimated number of cells encapsulated was calculated by watching cells flow through in the inDrop device over a set time window, and extrapolated for the entire experiment. For the first experiment, the measure was done by staff members of the Harvard Medical School Single Cell Core (). For the second experiment, I performed the counting. The Proportion of reads is the number of reads with the index from one inDrop run divided by the total number of reads in that library. The expected proportion corresponds to the mixing of each single library on the same NextSeq lane that was done prior to the sequencing.

# 4.3.4 Pilot analysis of the transcriptomic profile of cells from S6-7 and S11 stage embryos

To assess the sequencing quality of each library, I ran quality control analyses using FastQC<sup>64</sup> on the two libraries generated above. The proportion of reads coming from each inDrop run was deviating only slightly from the expected count (expected proportion of reads provening from each library based on the library mixing performed prior to sequencing) (Table 4.1, Proportion of reads vs Expected proportion).

FastQC reported an over-representation of the specific sequence

experiment. A BLAST<sup>65</sup> search for this sequence on the genome Phaw\_5.0 (NCBI ID: GCA\_001587735.2) with default parameters yielded no hits, but an NCBI BLAST search<sup>66</sup> against the non-redundant (nr) database with default parameters recovered two hits, the first against the *P. hawaiensis* complete mitochondrial genome (NCBI ID: NC\_039402.1) and the second against the *P. hawaiensis* partial mitochondrial genome (NCBI ID: AY639937.1). After running NCBI blasts on nr for the 63 overrepresented sequences (listed at the end of the chapter in: *List of overrepresented sequences in the two libraries*) detected by FastQC, all the reads mapped to the *P. hawaiensis* mitochondrial genome. I, therefore, concluded that these reads were likely of mitochondrial origin, and removed them by mapping all reads against the previously published *P. hawaiensis* complete mitochondrial genome (NCBI ID: NC\_039402.1) and retaining only the unmapped reads. The full results of the filtering are displayed in Table 4.2.

I believe that the large amount of mitochondrial RNA (mtRNA) may be due to cell damage during the dissociation protocol, causing mitochondria to enter the suspension along with the cells. The mitochondria could in principle have been encapsulated into droplets, in which case some droplets should contain only mitochondrial DNA, and others might contain a mixture of both mitochondrial and genomic DNA (as cells contain mitochondria and a proportion of ~20% mtRNA was reported previously<sup>27,29</sup>). An alternative hypothesis is that embryonic cells contain a large amount of mtRNA, in which case every droplet would display a high amount of mtRNA reads. Plotting the per droplet proportion of reads matching mitochondrial genes versus the proportion of reads matching nuclear genes did not distinguish clearly between these hypotheses (Figure 4.13). For the first experiment, I detected a continuum between droplets containing >90% mtRNA to droplets containing >90% genomic mRNA, with 57% of droplets containing >70% mtRNA. For the second experiment, each of the three runs displayed a different profile. II S6\_7.1 showed a similar distribution as I S11.2 (mtRNA proportion for II S6\_7.1 average: 45%, standard deviation: 22%; I S11.2 average 43%, standard deviation: 22%). II S11.1 had 69% of the droplets with more than 60% of the reads mapping to the nuclear genome, a result that is also evident in Table 4.2, which shows that 33% of the reads from II S11.1 map onto the mitochondrial genome. Finally, II S11.2 showed a distribution with only 3% of the droplets with more than 60% of the reads mapping to the nuclear genome. However, this low

Library Name	Develop- mental Stage	# Reads after QC	Non- mtRNA	% mtRNA	% Genome	# droplet barcodes	# droplet after QC	
<b>First experiment</b>								
I S6_7.1	12-24hpf	89M	19M	78%	18%	2709	8	
I S6_7.2	12-24hpf	69M	8M	88%	10%	446	15	
I S11.1	60-64hpf	67M	18M	81%	16%	1726	60	
I S11.2	60-64hpf	100M	23M	77%	20%	650	112	
Second experiment								
II S6_7.1	12-24hpf	54M	16M	70%	25.90%	1091	405	
II S11.1	60-64hpf	57M	38M	33%	58.90%	2359	1344	
II S11.2	60-64hpf	166M	69M	58%	34.50%	68784	607	

**Table 4.2: Summary statistics of the processing for each inDrop experiment.** The sample and library names are provided in the first two columns. # Reads after QC present the statistics for the number of reads after quality control. Non-mtRNA is the number of reads mapped on the nuclear genome. % mtRNA is the proportion of reads mapping to the mitochondrial genome. % Genome is the proportion of reads mapping to the nuclear genome. # droplet barcodes is the number of detected droplet barcodes in a library. Droplets containing a Cell is the total number of cells kept after droplet quality control.

proportion is due to the much larger number of droplet barcodes, 68784, versus 2359 for II S11.1 and 1091 for II S6\_7.1 (Number of barcodes for all libraries in Table 4.2). The very high proportion of reads mapping to the mitochondrial genome implies that the first experiment resulted in mostly mitochondria being encapsulated, reducing proportionally the signal coming from encapsulated cells to the point that less than 23M reads per experiment remained (Table 4.2). The differences in the cell concentration technique, as discussed above, could explain this discrepancy.

To try to retain only the droplets that likely contained a cell (and not just mitochondria) for analysis, I removed the reads deriving from out any droplet that had more than 20% of its reads mapping to the mitochondrial genome and fewer than 50% of its reads mapping to the nuclear genome. This process is referred to as droplet Quality Control or droplet QC. The droplets meeting these criteria were called "cells", and their numbers for each library are displayed in Table 4.2. The first experiment yielded a total of 195 "cells" across all four runs (compared to a predicted 4000 cells). The second experiment yielded 2361 total cells across all three runs (compared to a predicted 3600 cells). Therefore for the subsequent analysis, I did not analyze data from the first experiment, as almost no usable data remained following my attempt to correct for likely mitochondrial contamination.

To analyze the gene expression pattern of the remaining droplets, I needed to map each read to


**Figure 4.13:** Proportion of reads per droplet that mapped on the mitochondrial genome and the nuclear genome of *P. hawaiensis*. Each droplet corresponds to a unique cell barcode sequenced. The distribution of droplets was fitted using a Kernel Density Estimation (KDE) and the distribution was drawn above the droplets using a contour plot. **a)** Reads from the first sequencing library coming from the first four inDrop experiments. **b)** Reads from the second sequencing library coming from the second three inDrop experiments.



**Figure 4.14:** Proportion of reads per droplet that mapped onto a gene annotation against the reads that mapped to the nuclear genome of *P. hawaiensis*. Each droplet corresponds to a unique cell barcode sequenced. The distribution of droplets was fitted by a Kernel Density Estimation (KDE) and the distribution was drawn above the droplets using a contour plot. **a)** Reads from the first sequencing library coming from the first four inDrop experiments. **b)** Reads from the second sequencing library coming from the second three inDrop experiments.

a predicted transcript or gene. The *P. hawaiensis nuclear genome* annotation set used for this analysis was kindly provided by Damian Kao (University of Oxford. UK). This annotation was based on adult RNA transcriptome data, and therefore lacked de novo or non-coding annotations. The proportion of reads that mapped to an annotation varied across libraries. Droplets in II S6\_7.1 displayed a bimodal distribution, with 56% of droplets having ~35% of the reads mapping to an annotation, and 44% of droplets having ~15% of the reads mapping to an annotation (Figure 4.14). For II S11.1 and II S11.2, 59% of droplets had between 40% and 50% of their reads mapping to an annotation, however, 12% of droplets displayed ~15% of their reads mapping to an annotation (Figure 4.14).

The inDrop protocol performs the reverse transcription step with a primer tagged with a Unique Molecular Identifier (UMI)<sup>43</sup>. In the "cells" remaining after the filtering steps described above, I computed the number of unique UMI per cell, and used this number as a proxy for the depth



**Figure 4.15: Analysis of the number of unique mRNA molecules captured by inDrop. a)** Violin plots of the number of UMI in each droplet from the three inDrop runs performed during the second experiment. **b)** Saturation plot for the number of UMI per cells. The number of UMI in each cell is plotted against the number of reads sequenced for that droplet.

with which a particular cell was sequenced. To determine the expected number of UMI per cell, I performed a saturation analysis by plotting the number of unique UMIs against the number of reads. In other reported droplet-based single cell RNA sequencing experiments<sup>27,29,43</sup>, the UMI saturation curve converges asymptotically to a value that is the maximum expected amount of UMI's in a cell. For the second experiment, none of the runs displayed a complete curve, so that I was unable to accurately measure the saturation point (Figure 4.15). However, II S11.2 and II S11.1 showed inflections that might suggest a saturation point between 4000 and 5000 unique UMIs (Figure 4.15b). By plotting the distribution of unique UMI counts per run, I found that the II S11.2 run showed the highest number of unique UMI (median 1699), whereas II S11.1 had a 484 median UMIs, and II S6\_7.1 had a median of 271 UMIs (Figure 4.15). Thus, the sequencing depth of each cell was lower than the expected 4000-5000 UMIs per cell. Interestingly, the depth at which cells from II S11.2 were sequenced was much higher than those from II S11.1, despite the mtRNA content being much higher in II S11.2.

Based on this analysis, I removed data from droplets with fewer than 100 UMI. After this filtering, 1337 cells remained in II S11.1, 537 in II S11.2, and 402 in II S6\_7.1.

Using these admittedly sparse data, I ran pilot analyses aimed at testing multiple hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Four main cell clusters would be detectable at stages of S6-7, each one corresponding to a germ layer.

- Hypothesis 2: The diversity of cell types would be larger at stage S11 than at Stage S6-6.
- Hypothesis 3: Some cell populations would be shared by both time points.
- Hypothesis 4: Putative cell types could be identified, and gene markers could be used to assess their germ layer identity.

RNAseq generates datasets that contain thousands of cells and tens of thousands of genes<sup>43</sup>. This creates high dimensionality matrices which in turn can become problematic due to, for example, the distance metric tending towards 0 when the number of dimensions increases<sup>67</sup>. Therefore, one of the common ways to preprocess such a dataset is to reduce its dimensionality by filtering out dimensions contributing little information<sup>67</sup>. As such, the 21763 genes (65% of the total of 33385 detected genes) that were expressed by fewer than 3 cells were removed from the matrix. Finally, the counts were normalized as previously described in Weinreb et al.<sup>68</sup>.

I computed cell clusters on the II S6\_7.1 dataset using the Leiden algorithm<sup>69</sup>. I then computed a UMAP embedding on the cells<sup>70</sup>, and plotted each cell on the resulting two-dimensional space (Figure 4.16). Three main clusters of cells appeared (Figure 4.16). One of those clusters, Cluster 2, was composed of cells that had a smaller distance between them than the distances between the cells in the other two clusters (Figure 4.16). This suggests that the cells within Cluster 2 have similar transcriptional states.

To determine whether the apparent cluster separation was due solely to the number of genes or number of reads per cell, I colored each cell on the UMAP embedding by those two metrics. In both cases, visual inspection did not suggest that any clusters displayed enrichment in any of those values (Figure 4.16). I then asked whether clear sets of gene markers for each cluster could be inferred by fitting a logistic regression model for each cluster<sup>71</sup>. Cluster 0 did not show a clear set of genes. Cluster 1 and 2 however showed a set of genes that were only expressed in those cells (Figure 4.16). This result can be visualized by coloring the cells on the UMAP embedding according to the normalized expression value of each gene. A similar result was obtained by looking at the top three marker genes of the three clusters: cells from Clusters 1 and 2 having a strong differential signal compared to Cluster 0 (Figure 4.16). None of the gene

210

markers for those clusters matched any known protein. Thus, I cannot speculate as to the potential germ layer or other differentiated identities of those clusters based on these data alone. I cannot definitively conclude that at the S6-7 stage, these scSeq data can differentiate between three cell populations.

I repeated the analysis above in the exact same fashion for the II S11.1 and II S11.2 samples, merging both samples into a single dataset. The Leiden clustering algorithm predicted 15 clusters<sup>69</sup> (Figure 4.17). Visual inspection of the distribution of gene and read counts on the UMAP embedding, did not suggest any clear pattern; the read counts appeared evenly spread across the different clusters (Figure 4.17). The gene marker detection analysis<sup>71</sup> did not show a strong step decrease in the score for most clusters (Figure 4.17). To better understand how the gene expression varied between clusters, I plotted heatmap and dendrogram representations of the clusters (Figure 4.18). Consistent with the results of the gene marker analysis<sup>71</sup>, there did not appear to be a clear set of genes differentially expressed between the clusters, with the exception of clusters 2, 7, and 12, which appeared to have a stronger unique expression of genes than other clusters (Figure 4.18). To conclude, the analysis of the S11 datasets did not lead to clear segregation of the cells into subpopulations. **Figure 4.16** (following page): Preliminary analysis of the pilot scRNAseq data for II S6\_7.1. Each cell is represented in a 2D UMAP embedding. **a**) Results of the Leiden clustering algorithm (a clustering algorithm tailored to scRNAseq data<sup>69</sup>) are shown as different colors per cluster. Three clusters were found. **b**) Visualisation of the number of unique genes and the number of reads for each cell on top of the UMAP embedding. Each cell was colored using a gradient representing the number of unique genes or the number of reads. **c**) Ranked scatter plot of the top 25 gene markers for each cluster. Genes are ranked in decreasing order of their Logistic regression scores<sup>68</sup> (The one-sided Z score of the p-value given by the logistic regression model for a given marker restriction within a cluster) (Y-axis). **d**) Visualisation of the top three marker genes (from the analysis shown in c) expression patterns on the UMAP embedding. Their normalized expression level is represented by coloring each cell. The gene name, if the reads mapped to an annotated gene with a putative homology identity, is displayed on top of each plot (applies only to UCH (Ubiquitin carboxyl-terminal hydrolase) and HIS3.3A (Histone H3.3A)). All other marker genes lacked predicted homologs; their unique identifiers from the published genome annotation<sup>4</sup> are used.

Figure 4.16: (continued)



To compare the gene expression profile between cells from S6-7 embryos and S11 embryos, I merged the II S6\_7.1, II S11.1, and II S11.2 dataset and performed a UMAP embedding onto the resulting dataset. First, it appeared that part of the cells of S6\_7 embryos separated from the main S11 cell cluster (Figure 4.19). A large cluster of cells from S6\_7 and S11 clustered together, away from all other clusters. Finally, a smaller proportion of cells from both S6\_7 and S11 embryos clustered tightly together (Figure 4.19). To distinguish differential expression patterns between the S6\_7 and S11 embryos I plotted the top 10 genes of each cluster against the different runs. The resulting dendrogram confirmed that the S6\_7 library clustered away from the two S11 libraries. Moreover, some gene markers could be distinguished that were only expressed in either S6\_7 or S11 (Figure 4.19). Because I hypothesized that the cells from S6\_7 embryos would not cluster with S11 embryos due to the high amount of development time between the two time points, I researched the gene markers making the two co-clusters. The larger cluster's most differentially expressed gene was phaw\_50.282654bG828.1, an unknown Ubiquitin protease of the USP family. Some marker genes of this cluster included ribosomal proteins and ubiquitin hydrolases. One hypothesis to explain this observation might be that this cluster is mostly formed by cells with a high translation rate. The second, smaller cluster is composed of unknown proteins with no match in the UniprotKB database<sup>72</sup>. Moreover, this is the same cluster that in the analysis of the S6\_7 cells was found to have less distance in gene expression between cells. Once more, the low amount of information in each cell with only a few hundred genes per cell precludes a more thorough analysis of the dataset. Nevertheless, I consider these results encouraging, as even with such a low-quality dataset, the gene expression landscape seems to have changed enough for cells from the earlier embryos (S6\_7) to cluster independently of the cells from later embryos (S11).

Finally, I wanted to know if I could use known markers of germ layers to identify cells and observe whether clusters were expressing them even at low levels. As a pilot experiment, I collected a set of 84 ectodermal markers expressed during arthropod development and found in the genome of *P. hawaiensis* (based on publications and GO terms)<sup>16,73,74</sup>. The ectoderm composes most of the cells of the early embryo of *P. hawaiensis*, therefore I expected to find a large number of cells expressing ectodermal markers. Out of the 84 putative ectodermal

214

markers, 42 were expressed by at least one cell in at least one of the three dataset. I then visualized the expression of each gene by coloring the cells on the UMAP embedding by their expression levels. From the 42 genes expressed in my datasets, I selected the 15 with the highest number of cells expressing them for further analysis (Figure 4.20). Four genes were expressed in the S6\_7 cluster: single-minded (sim), a ventral midline marker in P. hawaiensis<sup>75</sup>, paired (prd) an early embryonic segmentation gene<sup>76</sup>, groucho (gro), a Wnt and TGF-beta downstream effector<sup>77</sup> and *escargot (esg)* a Snail-type transcription factor involved in morphogenesis<sup>78</sup> (Figure 4.20). This is interesting in light of an earlier report of the expression of sim in later stages of *P. hawaiensis* embryogenesis, starting at S11 and establishing a strong expression by S14<sup>75</sup>. Here, I detected the expression of *sim* in a small population of cells as early as S6\_7 embryos. These results are encouraging as some putative ectodermal markers could be found in a subpopulation of the cells in my dataset. However, the absence of expression of ectodermal markers that I would have expected to be expressed at the S11 stage, such as eve (even-skipped) or distal-less (dll)<sup>75</sup>, is consistent with the overall low quality of the scRNAseq datasets. Reads mapping to one gene are found in at least some cells of all cell clusters, belle (bel), a DEAD-box helicase necessary for Drosophila embryo survival, and active in the male germline<sup>79</sup>(Figure 4.20).

To conclude, the low depth at which the cells were sequenced led me to abandon any further analysis of this dataset, as it would not be not useful for the questions of interest to this thesis, namely, the study of germ layer differentiation. While I obtained some encouraging results, the high mtRNA amount present in the libraries prevented the detection of mRNA reads in the cells at sufficient depth. Until the cell dissociation steps can be further refined, the study of single-cell transcriptomics of *P. hawaiensis* will be difficult.

**Figure 4.17** (following page): Preliminary analysis of the pilot scRNAseq data for the II S11.1 and II S11.2. Each cell is represented on a 2D UMAP embedding. **a**) Leiden clustering results are shown as different colors per cluster. 15 clusters were found. **b**) Visualisation of the number of unique genes and numbers of reads for each cell plotted on top of the UMAP embedding. Each cell was colored using a gradient (colored bar at right) representing the number of unique genes (left plot) or the number of reads (right plot). **c**) Ranked scatter plot of the top 25 gene markers for each cluster (each gene receives a score, and are ranked from lowest to highest, the ranked plots here only display a subset of those genes). For all plots, the X-axis is the ranking of a gene and the Y-axis the Logistic regression score (as in Figure 4.16). Genes are ranked in decreasing order for the Logistic regression scores. Each score is computed for the segregation capacity of a gene against all other clusters.

Figure 4.17: (continued)





**Figure 4.18: Heatmap representation of the expression level for the top 10 marker genes** (as per the Logistic regression model performed in Figure 4.17) in each cell cluster predicted from the II S11.1 and II S11.2 datasets. The clusters are displayed based on the computation of the dendrogram displayed on the right and each row represents a cell. Each column represents a gene. Genes are grouped in their clusters based on their ranking in the logistic regression model. Clusters are colored using the same colors as in Figure 4.17. On the right, a dendrogram representation showing the results of a parsimonious tree computation. The distance between each cluster is measured from the gene expression levels and used to compute this tree. The color of the heat map represents the normalized gene expression level and corresponds to the heatmap on the right.



**Figure 4.19: Comparative analysis of the scRNAseq data for the cells coming from S6, S7 embryos (12-24hpf), and the later stages S11 (64-68hpf) embryos.** Each cell is represented on a 2D UMAP embedding. **a)** UMAP embedding colored by cell library. Both S11 libraries overlap mostly, while S6\_7 clusters slightly apart. **b)** Leiden clustering results are shown as different colors per cluster. 12 clusters were found. **c)** Heatmap representation of the expression level for the most discriminant 10 genes in each cell cluster. The cells are ranked from top to bottom by cluster identity. The corresponding clusters are displayed from left to right. Clusters are colored using the same colors as in b. On the right, a dendrogram representation showing the results of a parsimonious tree computation. The distance between each cluster is measured from the gene expression levels and used to compute this tree.



**Figure 4.20: Expression level analysis for Ectoderm gene markers collected from the literature.** Visualization of the gene's expression patterns on the UMAP embedding computed in Figure 4.19. For each marker, its normalized expression level is represented by coloring each cell. The gene name is written atop each plot using the *D. melanogaster* gene symbol nomenclature.

#### 4.3.5 Annotation of the P. hawaiensis v5.0 genome

The first publication of the *P. hawaiensis* genome displayed a highly fragmented genome assembly<sup>4</sup> with an N50 of 81190 bp. Therefore, four laboratories that study *P. hawaiensis* (Nipam Patel laboratory, Marine Biological Laboratory, Woodshole USA; Michaelis Averof laboratory, Institut de Génomique Fonctionnelle de Lyon, France; Anastasios Pavlopoulos laboratory Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Greece; Cassandra Extavour laboratory, Harvard USA; unpublished data) collaborated to resequence the genome using the Dovetail platform<sup>80</sup>, resulting in a new version of the genome, Phaw\_5.0 (NCBI ID: GCA\_001587735.2). This new version displayed an N50 of 20228728 bp, almost 250 times longer than the initial assembly. However, the new version was unannotated. Because<50% of the reads from my pilot inDrop libraries mapped to the original *P. hawaiensis* genome annotation (see above), I decided to generate a new annotation set using the Phaw\_5.0 genome.

I first tried to annotate the genome using the previously published set of transcripts annotated from the V3.0 genome. However, this led to a mapping of only 1% of my inDrop reads to an annotated region of the genome, while 96.5% of the reads mapped onto unannotated regions. I, therefore, attempted to improve the genome annotation by collecting published and unpublished sequencing reads from the *P. hawaiensis* community (reads obtained from Michaelis Averof (Institut de Génomique Fonctionnelle de Lyon, France), Anastasios Pavlopoulos (Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Greece), and Ezio Rosato (University of Leicester, UK)), and using the MAKER2<sup>44</sup> genome annotation pipeline. To quantify the annotation quality I used the BUSCO score metric <sup>56</sup> against the Arthropod taxonomic set.

The MAKER2 pipeline<sup>44</sup> was set to use all gene evidence mapped against the genome, external ESTs from available amphipod transcriptomes, and a de novo gene model generated for Augustus by BUSCO<sup>56</sup> (see Methods: Annotation of *P. hawaiensis* genome for the full list of parameters used). After running the MAKER2 pipeline for two subsequent rounds, I generated an annotation set with a BUSCO score of 91.5%, containing 24,422 predicted protein-coding genes, and 109,376 other annotations including repeated elements, transposons, etc. In the future, I recommend that this new annotation be used for the re-analysis of the scRNAseq

libraries generated in this thesis.

## 4.4 Discussion

In this chapter, I presented the first steps towards a highly ambitious goal, the creation of an Atlas of early embryonic development for *P. hawaiensis*. However, multiple difficulties hindered the completion of this project. I here discuss some of the reasons behind those failures, and summarize the findings and original datasets that I generated.

In the first part of this chapter, I investigated the Maternal to Zygotic Transition (MZT) of *P. hawaiensis.* My results suggest that some, but not all, cells may begin zygotic transcription by the 16 cell phase of the S5 stage, which is earlier than the 32 cell phase of the S5 stage previously reported <sup>10</sup>. Moreover, I observed a mosaic pattern of phosphorylated RNA Pol II transcription in these embryos, consistent with previous reports <sup>10</sup>. This mosaic pattern might reflect random zygotic genome activation occurring between the 16 and 128 cell phases of the S5 stage. Alternatively, it might reflect the activation of different lineages at different times. To try to distinguish between these hypotheses, I began to generate a new dataset of light sheet microscopy images of embryos stained for phosphorylated RNA Pol II, but did not complete analysis of these data. Going forward, I would recommend an algorithm such as RANSAC<sup>81</sup> to align embryos of the same stage and analyze the inter-embryo viability of genome activation. If the analysis of this dataset is completed in the future, I believe that it might be possible to correlate the activation of nuclei between embryos, thus providing data to test the hypothesis that zygotic genome activation is non-random and depends on the lineage.

In the second part of this chapter, I discussed the difficulties and successes towards the sequencing of the transcriptome of single embryonic cells in *P. hawaiensis*. The dissociation of embryos was much more complex than I expected. Because it was impossible to digest the eggshell without damaging the underlying cells, generating a large number of cells was difficult. Nonetheless, I developed a dissociation protocol that generated a concentration of cells at the low end of the technical capabilities for droplet-based scRNAseq. However, despite the apparent viability of the cells, a large number of mitochondria may have been released into the solution.

222

This led to libraries saturated by mtRNA, which prevented the sequencing depth of cellular mRNA that would have been necessary to produce any meaningful analysis of germ layer specification or cell type differentiation. In this dataset, by 64-68 hours of development, the embryo still lacks a strong differentiation in gene expression. Though, this seems unlikely given that by that stage the specification of each germ layer is established as well as the major polarization axes and segmentation has started. More likely is that the low sequencing depth for each cell led to a relatively low amount of information captured. Without more information on gene expression, the statistical analysis of this dataset is not possible beyond this point.

I would like to come back to this point and develop a bit further the main issues that lead to this part of the project not functioning as expected. First, the low number of cells in *P. hawaiensis* embryos that facilitates accurate tracking, and, in theory, would make the problem of mapping single-cell RNA sequencing results to light sheet data less complex problem, is a disadvantage for single cell RNA sequencing given that dissociation of embryos requires manual dissection of the eggshell. I was able to dissect 1.7 embryos per minute, which was not enough to produce the number of cells needed. Second, the fact that the highest quality available version of the genome was not well annotated, required an extensive amount of work to generate new annotations. I cannot stress enough the fact that this endeavor would not have been possible without the unfettered support from the members of Michaelis Averof (Institut de Génomique Fonctionnelle de Lyon, France), Anastasios Pavlopoulos (Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Greece), and Ezio Rosato (University of Leicester, UK) laboratories, who shared unpublished reads to allow the new annotation to be as accurate as possible. I have shared this new annotation with the *Parhyale* community and I hope that it will be helpful to other researchers working on similar projects.

Despite the multiple problems encountered, I believe that it would still be possible to use a version of the protocol I developed here towards the creation of a *P. hawaiensis* Atlas. Indeed, thanks to CRISPR-Cas9 technology, it is now possible and inexpensive to remove sequences from a cDNA library<sup>82,83</sup>. By creating a set of guide RNAs targeting the most common *P. hawaiensis* mtRNA sequences, it might be possible to reduce their concentration by breaking them down prior to the final amplification step<sup>82,83</sup>. Using this method could potentially artificially increase

223

the depth of sequencing for the remaining cells. However, due to the overall low encapsulation of cells, multiple subsequent rounds of dissociation and encapsulations would be required, increasing the overall cost of the experiment.

To conclude, I developed part of the foundations required for the generation of an Atlas for *P. hawaiensis*, which can serve as a starting point for future work in this area.

# 4.5 Detailed protocol for *P. hawaiensis* embryo single-cell dissociation

For the whole protocol, work at 4°C (this includes any dissection and dissociation steps that must be done in a cold room), and place all solutions on ice.

### 4.5.1 Prepare material

Materials

- 48 well plate (CytoOne, #CC7672-7548)
- Tungsten needles (prepared as described in Anastasia R. Nast<sup>84</sup>)
- Parafilm, cut into squares, a little bigger than the diameter of the well (12-13mm length).
- VWR laboratory tape (VWR #89097)
- Elmer's paste or silicone seal (Thermo Fisher Scientific #P18175)
- inDrop device<sup>43</sup> (provided by Harvard Medical School Single Cell Core (https://singlecellcore.hms.harvard.edu/))
- Micro medical tubing (Scientific Commodities Incorporated #BB31695-PE/2)
- 15 ml falcon tube
- 2ml Pasteur pipettes (VWR #63A54)

- Filtered Artificial Sea Water (FASW) (Artificial SeaWater made from Instant
   Ocean #671442 filtered with a Nalgene bottle-top 0.2um filter (Sigma #Z358215))
- Sylgard plate: 10 cm Petri dish filled halfway with Sylgard (Sigma Aldricht #761036) or 2% agar in FASW plate: 10cm Petri dish filled halfway with 2% agar in FASW.
- Vortex Adapter for 48 well plate (ThermoFisher #AM10014)

Coat everything that will touch cells with BSA for at least 2 hours as follows:

To coat an object, apply the BSA solution such that any plastic or glass that might come in contact with cells is covered by the solution.

- Prepare 1% BSA solution in ddH2O
- Coat 8 wells from 48 well plate with 1%BSA by pouring BSA solution into the wells
- Coat Pasteur pipettes for embryos and cell transfers with 1%BSA by aspirating the solution in the pipette and leaving it filled
- Coat Micro medical tubing and syringes by mounting the tube on the syringe and aspirating 1ml of BSA solution
- Coat 15 ml falcon tube by pouring BSA solution into it

#### Prepare 40ml of dissociation buffer

To prepare the dissociation buffer, mix the following ingredients in 40ml of ddH2O.

- 600mg of Isethionic acid sodium salt (Sigma-Aldrich #220078-25G)
- 360mg of Sodium pyrophosphate tetrabasic decahydrate (Sigma-Aldrich #S6422-100G)
- 88mg of CAPS (3-(Cyclohexylamino)-1-propanesulfonic acid Sigma-Aldrich #C2632-25G)

	5%	10%	20%	30%	40%
10x PBS	200	200	200	200	200
ddH2O	1695	1600	1400	1195	1000
Phenol red (Sigma-Aldrich #P0290-100ML)	5	0	0	5	0
Optiprep (Sigma-Aldrich #D1556-250ML)	100	200	400	600	800

Prepare 2ml each of 5 different solutions of Optiprep in 1x PBS All volumes in ul

## 4.5.2 Collect embryos

This protocol was tested on embryos at 12-24hpf and 60-64hpf.

Collect mated females that are carrying embryos, harvest embryos from the brood pouch, and place them in FASW in a petri dish.

Prepare the dissociation wells

- Remove the 1% BSA from the wells of the 48 well plate and wash with the dissociation buffer once. Then fill halfway (around 3ml) with the dissociation buffer.
- On the lid, locate the position of the wells and place a ring of Elmer's paste that will serve as a seal for each well that will be used. The ring forces the parafilm to stay pressed between the lid and the well, preventing air bubbles from coming in.
- Place the tape on the edges of the lid to allow for it to stay in place once closed.

See Figure 4.21 for a schematic representation of the process.



Figure 4.21: Schematic representation of the plate with Elmer's paste seals, parafilm, and lab tape. 48 well plate design adapted from MatTek.

#### Remove Egg Shell

- Place 160 embryos on a Sylgard plate or a 2% agar in FASW plate in a small drop (around 200-300ul) of FASW.
- Separate the embryos on the plate into 8 pools of 20 embryos per pool, each in a drop of FASW (around 50-100ul).
- One drop at a time, aspirate as much as possible of the FASW away from the embryos
- Wash with a drop of dissociation buffer by dropping dissociation buffer onto the embryo, then removing the liquid away from the embryos and discarding it.
   Make sure not to aspirate embryos in the process. Repeat until no white precipitate caused by the buffering of calcium by CAPS is visible.
- Repeat for all 8 drops containing embryos.
- Drop by drop, using the tungsten needles, remove the eggshell from each embryo.
- Make sure to remove the eggshells from the drop once they are removed from the embryos, as if they remain with the embryos in the next step, they will prevent the correct dissociation, and clog the inDrop device.
- Once the eggshell has been removed from all embryos, transfer the entire drop containing the embryos into one of the wells of the 48-well plate, which was previously filled with the dissociation buffer. More than 20 embryos per well results in a failed dissociation(data not shown).

#### Seal the well for dissociation

- Fill each well containing embryos all the way to the top with the dissociation buffer until a meniscus is visible.
- Place a parafilm square on the meniscus. THERE MUSN'T BE ANY BUBBLES
   TRAPPED.

• Close the lid, sealing the parafilm in place thanks to the paste previously placed on the lid, and fix it with the tape around.

See Figure 4.21 for a schematic representation of the process.

#### Dissociate the cells

• Place the sealed 48 well plate onto the Vortex plate adapter, and start the vortex at max speed for 20 minutes

#### Clean the dissociation buffer

- During the 20 minute dissociation step, wash the 15ml falcon tube filled with BSA with PBS.
- Stop the vortex, remove the plate.
- One well at a time, transfer the content to the 15ml BSA coated tube. (Figure 4.22 step I)
- Using a syringe with a 21g needle, backfill the tube with Optiprep PBS 6oul 5%, 6oul 10%, 2oul 20%, 2oul 30%, and 4ooul 40%. To backfill the tube, start by injecting 6oul of the 5% optiprep solution, then the 6oul of 10% Optiprep solution, all the way to the 40% Optiprep solution. Inject the liquid very slowly to prevent the mixing of the different densities. The tip of the needle must touch the bottom of the falcon tube. (Figure 4.22 step II-V)
- Spin the tube in a bucket centrifuge at 2500rpm for 4 minutes at 4°C. (Figure 4.22 step VI)
- Remove the tube and aspirate carefully above the first red band (5% optiprep) removing all of the dissociation buffers. (Figure 4.22 step VII)
- Then very gently, pipette up and down with the Pasteur pipette the 5%, 10%, 20%, and 30% content that is marked by the two red bands (the 5% layer and the 30% layer). While doing this, be very gentle so that the 40% optiprep layer does

not get disturbed. (Figure 4.22 step VIII)

- This is important because at the bottom of the tube is a lot of debris. That debris if resuspended will interfere with the microfluidic flow.
- Finally, aspirate the mixed Optiprep from 5% to 30% which is red-colored, and backfill the BSA coated syringe. (Figure 4.22 step IX)

#### Microfluidic flow

Connect the BSA coated syringe containing the cells to the cell port on an inDrop device and start the flow of cells at 250ul/h



**Figure 4.22: Schematic representation of the concentration steps. I)** The cells are transferred to the 15ml Falcon tube. **II)** 5% Optiprep solution is backfilled with a 21G needle. **III-V)** The different concentrations of Optiprep are backfilled from the lowest density to the highest density. **VI)** The Falcon tube is centrifuged at 2500 RPM for 4 minutes at 4°C. **VII)** The dissociation buffer is removed from the falcon tube. **VIII)** The cells are resuspended and the gradient density is mixed except for the 40% layer. **IX)** The concentrated cells are aspirated in the syringe pre-coated with BSA.

# 4.6 List of overrepresented sequences in the two libraries

 GGGTAGTTTATTTATTTAATTAATTTAATTAATACTTAATGGTTTTAAGAGCCTTTAA TTCTTATTTATATTTGATTGCGACCTCGATGTTGAATTAATGACTCTTTATAGAGC CGTAATAGGTATTAGAAGTTCTTATTTATATATTTGATTGCGACCTCGATGTTGAATTAAT AGCCTTTAAATAAAGATTAATAGAAAAAGTTACTTTAGGGCTAACAGCGTAATAGGTATT GGCTAACAGCGTAATAGGTATTAGAAGTTCTTATTTATATATTTGATTGCGACCTCGATGT GTAATTTTTATTTGTTTTTATATAAATTTATTTAGAAATTTTTAACTGGGGTAGTTTATT GCCTGCCCGATGTAATTATGAATGGCTGCGGTATTGTGACCGTGCTAAGGTAGCATAATC GGGGTAGTTTATTTATTTAATTAATTTAATTAATACTTAATGGTTTTAAGAGCCTTTA ATCCTTATTTTATTATTATCTCAGGTTTAATTTTTAACATTAATTCTCATTCTTGGTATTAT GGTAGTTTATTTATTTAATTAATTTAATTAATTAATACTTAATGGTTTTAAGAGCCTTTAAAT GTTTCTATCTTTGTTTATATACTCAATAATTTATTTAGTACGAAAGGATTAATAAATTTT GGGCTAACAGCGTAATAGGTATTAGAAGTTCTTATTTATATATTTGATTGCGACCTCGATG ACCCCGTAAACAAAATTCTATTTGATCATTTGTGTAGTAATTTTAATTTTATTAACATGGAT

 TGCCCGATGTAATTATGAATGGCTGCGGTATTGTGACCGTGCTAAGGTAGCATAATCATTT CCCGATGTAATTATGAATGGCTGCGGTATTGTGACCGTGCTAAGGTAGCATAATCATTTGT GTGGCCAAAAAGTTTTTTTATCAATAAGAAATAAAATTCAAGTAGCTCAGCTAAGAGAAAT TGTAATAGGTATTAGAAGTTCTTATTTTATATATTTGATTGCGACCTCGATGTTGAATTAAT TGGGGTAGTTTATTTATTTAATTAATTTAATTAATACTTAATGGTTTTAAGAGCCTTT AGGGGCTTGTTTTTAATCGATAATCCGCGCTTAGTTCTACTTATCTGATTTTTATATATCG GCGTTATTCTGATTATCCTGATTCTTACTCTGCTTGAAATATAGTTTCTTCTTTAGGATCT ACCACGATAAATTGCTTAAGTATAAATTTAATAGAGTTAGCTCCTTTAAATATTTATAAGG CCTTTAAATAAAGATTAATAGAAAAAGTTACTTTAGGGCTAACAGCGTAATAGGTATT CACGGTGTTTATATTAAGTTAAATAGAGGGCTTCCATAGAGGGTTTATACTTGAATATCTC GGGCTTGTTTTTAATCGATAATCCGCGCTTAGTTCTACTTATCTGATTTTTATATCGTT TTCAACTTTAAAATTATTACATGATTTGAGTTCAAATCGGTTTAAGCCAGATTGGTTTCT GCCCGATGTAATTATGAATGGCTGCGGTATTGTGACCGTGCTAAGGTAGCATAATCATTTG TAGGTGGTTTAACAGGAGTAATACTTGCTAACTCTTCTATTGATATTATCCTTCATGATAC GGCCTTTAAATAAAGATTAATAGAAAAAGTTACTTTAGGGCTAACAGCGTAATAGGTATT ACTGGGGTAGTTTATTTATTTTAATTAATTTAATTAATACTTAATGGTTTTAAGAGCCTT GCTAACAGCGTAATAGGTATTAGAAGTTCTTATTTATATATTTGATTGCGACCTCGATGTT GGCTTGTTTTTAATCGATAATCCGCGCTTAGTTCTACTTATCTGATTTTTATATATCGTT

# References

- Matthias Gerberding, William E Browne, and Nipam H Patel. Cell lineage analysis of the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis reveals an early restriction of cell fates. *Development*, 129(24):5789–5801, December 2002.
- [2] Clarence R Shoemaker. Observations on the amphipod genus parhyale. *Proceedings of the United States National Museum*, 106(3372):345–358, 1956.
- [3] S Poovachiranon, K Boto, and N Duke. Food preference studies and ingestion rate measurements of the mangrove amphipod parhyale hawaiensis (dana). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 98(1-2):129–140, 1986.
- [4] Damian Kao, Alvina G Lai, Evangelia Stamataki, Silvana Rosic, Nikolaos Konstantinides, Erin Jarvis, Alessia Di Donfrancesco, Natalia Pouchkina-Stancheva, Marie Sémon, Marco Grillo, Heather Bruce, Suyash Kumar, Igor Siwanowicz, Andy Le, Andrew Lemire, Michael B Eisen, Cassandra Extavour, William E Browne, Carsten Wolff, Michalis Averof, Nipam H Patel, Peter Sarkies, Anastasios Pavlopoulos, and Aziz Aboobaker. The genome of the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis, a model for animal development, regeneration, immunity and lignocellulose digestion. November 2016.
- [5] E Jay Rehm, Roberta L Hannibal, R Crystal Chaw, Mario A Vargas-Vila, and Nipam H Patel. The crustacean parhyale hawaiensis: a new model for arthropod development. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, 2009(1):db.emo114, January 2009.
- [6] William E Browne, Alivia L Price, Matthias Gerberding, and Nipam H Patel. Stages of

embryonic development in the amphipod crustacean, parhyale hawaiensis. *Genesis*, 42(3): 124–149, July 2005.

- [7] Frederike Alwes, Billy Hinchen, and Cassandra G Extavour. Patterns of cell lineage, movement, and migration from germ layer specification to gastrulation in the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Dev. Biol.*, 359(1):110–123, November 2011.
- [8] Julia M Serano, Arnaud Martin, Danielle M Liubicich, Erin Jarvis, Heather S Bruce, Konnor La, William E Browne, Jane Grimwood, and Nipam H Patel. Comprehensive analysis of hox gene expression in the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Dev. Biol.*, 409(1):297–309, January 2016.
- [9] Carsten Wolff, Jean-Yves Tinevez, Tobias Pietzsch, Evangelia Stamataki, Benjamin Harich, Léo Guignard, Stephan Preibisch, Spencer Shorte, Philipp J Keller, Pavel Tomancak, and Anastasios Pavlopoulos. Multi-view light-sheet imaging and tracking with the MaMuT software reveals the cell lineage of a direct developing arthropod limb. March 2018.
- [10] Peter Nestorov, Florian Battke, Mitchell P Levesque, and Matthias Gerberding. The maternal transcriptome of the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis is inherited asymmetrically to invariant cell lineages of the ectoderm and mesoderm. *PLoS One*, 8(2): e56049, February 2013.
- [11] Victor Zeng, Karina E Villanueva, Ben S Ewen-Campen, Frederike Alwes, William E Browne, and Cassandra G Extavour. De novo assembly and characterization of a maternal and developmental transcriptome for the emerging model crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *BMC Genomics*, 12:581, November 2011.
- [12] Dennis A Sun and Nipam H Patel. The amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis: An emerging comparative model of arthropod development, evolution, and regeneration. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Dev. Biol.*, 8(5):e355, September 2019.
- [13] A Pavlopoulos, Z Kontarakis, D M Liubicich, J M Serano, M Akam, N H Patel, andM Averof. Probing the evolution of appendage specialization by hox gene misexpression in

an emerging model crustacean. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(33): 13897–13902, 2009.

- [14] Frederike Alwes, Camille Enjolras, and Michalis Averof. Live imaging reveals the progenitors and cell dynamics of limb regeneration. *Elife*, 5, October 2016.
- [15] Alivia L Price, Melinda S Modrell, Roberta L Hannibal, and Nipam H Patel. Mesoderm and ectoderm lineages in the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis display intra-germ layer compensation. *Developmental Biology*, 341(1):256–266, 2010.
- [16] Mathias Gerberding and Nipam H Patel. Gastrulation in crustacean: Germ layers and cell lineages. In Claudio D Stern, editor, *Gastrulation: From Cells to Embryo*, pages 79–90. CSHL Press, 2004.
- [17] Hanna L Sladitschek and Pierre A Neveu. A gene regulatory network controls the balance between mesendoderm and ectoderm at pluripotency exit. *Mol. Syst. Biol.*, 15(12):e9043, December 2019.
- [18] Matt Thomson, Siyuan John Liu, Ling-Nan Zou, Zack Smith, Alexander Meissner, and Sharad Ramanathan. Pluripotency factors in embryonic stem cells regulate differentiation into germ layers. *Cell*, 145(6):875–889, 2011.
- [19] Sumin Jang, Sandeep Choubey, Leon Furchtgott, Ling-Nan Zou, Adele Doyle, Vilas Menon, Ethan B Loew, Anne-Rachel Krostag, Refugio A Martinez, Linda Madisen, Boaz P Levi, and Sharad Ramanathan. Dynamics of embryonic stem cell differentiation inferred from single-cell transcriptomics show a series of transitions through discrete cell states. *Elife*, 6, March 2017.
- [20] Noriko Wakabayashi-Ito and Y Tony Ip. Mesoderm Formation in the Drosophila Embryo. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2006.
- [21] Lucas Alegretti, Gisela de Aragão Umbuzeiro, and Maurea Nicoletti Flynn. Biologia
   populacional de parhyale hawaiensis associada ao fital, itanhém, são paulo. *RevInter*, 8(3), 2015.

- [22] Lucas Alegretti, Gisela de A Umbuzeiro, and Maurea N Flynn. Population dynamics of parhyale hawaiensis (dana, 1853) (amphipoda: Hyalidae) associated with an intertidal algal belt in southeastern brazil. J. Crustacean Biol., 36(6):785–791, November 2016.
- [23] Wael Tadros and Howard D Lipshitz. The maternal-to-zygotic transition: a play in two acts. *Development*, 136(18):3033–3042, September 2009.
- [24] A Ephrussi, L K Dickinson, and R Lehmann. Oskar organizes the germ plasm and directs localization of the posterior determinant nanos. *Cell*, 66(1):37–50, July 1991.
- [25] Conrad Hal Waddington and Others. Organisers and genes. Organisers and genes., 1940.
- [26] Tamar Hashimshony, Florian Wagner, Noa Sher, and Itai Yanai. CEL-Seq: single-cell
   RNA-Seq by multiplexed linear amplification. *Cell Rep.*, 2(3):666–673, September 2012.
- [27] James A Briggs, Caleb Weinreb, Daniel E Wagner, Sean Megason, Leonid Peshkin, Marc W Kirschner, and Allon M Klein. The dynamics of gene expression in vertebrate embryogenesis at single-cell resolution. *Science*, 360(6392), June 2018.
- [28] Dylan R Farnsworth, Lauren Saunders, and Adam C Miller. A Single-Cell transcriptome atlas for zebrafish development. *Developmental Biology*, 459(2):100–108, March 2020.
- [29] Jeffrey A Farrell, Yiqun Wang, Samantha J Riesenfeld, Karthik Shekhar, Aviv Regev, and Alexander F Schier. Single-cell reconstruction of developmental trajectories during zebrafish embryogenesis. *Science*, 360(6392), June 2018.
- [30] Rahul Satija, Jeffrey A Farrell, David Gennert, Alexander F Schier, and Aviv Regev. Spatial reconstruction of single-cell gene expression data. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 33(5):495–502, May 2015.
- [31] Tatjana Trcek, Timothée Lionnet, Hari Shroff, and Ruth Lehmann. mRNA quantification using single-molecule FISH in drosophila embryos. *Nat. Protoc.*, 12(7):1326–1348, July 2017.
- [32] Jeffrey R Moffitt, Junjie Hao, Guiping Wang, Kok Hao Chen, Hazen P Babcock, and Xiaowei Zhuang. High-throughput single-cell gene-expression profiling with multiplexed

error-robust fluorescence in situ hybridization. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 113(39): 11046–11051, September 2016.

- [33] Jeffrey R Moffitt, Junjie Hao, Dhananjay Bambah-Mukku, Tian Lu, Catherine Dulac, and Xiaowei Zhuang. High-performance multiplexed fluorescence in situ hybridization in culture and tissue with matrix imprinting and clearing. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 113 (50):14456–14461, December 2016.
- [34] Jonas Hartmann, Mie Wong, Elisa Gallo, and Darren Gilmour. An image-based data-driven analysis of cellular architecture in a developing tissue. *Elife*, 9, June 2020.
- [35] Zacharias Kontarakis and Anastasios Pavlopoulos. Transgenesis in non-model organisms: The case of parhyale. In Yacine Graba and René Rezsohazy, editors, *Hox Genes: Methods and Protocols*, pages 145–181. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2014.
- [36] E Jay Rehm, Roberta L Hannibal, R Crystal Chaw, Mario A Vargas-Vila, and Nipam H Patel.
   Fixation and dissection of parhyale hawaiensis embryos. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, 2009(1):
   db.prot5127, January 2009.
- [37] Drosophila apple juice-agar plates. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, 2011(9):db.rec065672, September 2011.
- [38] Wendy F Rothwell and William Sullivan. Drosophila embryo collection. *CSH Protoc.*, 2007: db.prot4825, September 2007.
- [39] E Jay Rehm, Roberta L Hannibal, R Crystal Chaw, Mario A Vargas-Vila, and Nipam H Patel. Antibody staining of parhyale hawaiensis embryos. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, 2009(1): db.prot5129, January 2009.
- [40] Rui Gonçalo Martinho, Prabhat S Kunwar, Jordi Casanova, and Ruth Lehmann. A noncoding RNA is required for the repression of RNApolII-dependent transcription in primordial germ cells. *Curr. Biol.*, 14(2):159–165, January 2004.
- [41] Cassandra G Extavour. The fate of isolated blastomeres with respect to germ cell formation in the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Dev. Biol.*, 277(2):387–402, January 2005.

- [42] Tamar Hashimshony, Naftalie Senderovich, Gal Avital, Agnes Klochendler, Yaron de Leeuw, Leon Anavy, Dave Gennert, Shuqiang Li, Kenneth J Livak, Orit Rozenblatt-Rosen, Yuval Dor, Aviv Regev, and Itai Yanai. CEL-Seq2: sensitive highly-multiplexed single-cell RNA-Seq. *Genome Biol.*, 17:77, April 2016.
- [43] Allon M Klein, Linas Mazutis, Ilke Akartuna, Naren Tallapragada, Adrian Veres, Victor Li, Leonid Peshkin, David A Weitz, and Marc W Kirschner. Droplet barcoding for single-cell transcriptomics applied to embryonic stem cells. *Cell*, 161(5):1187–1201, May 2015.
- [44] Carson Holt and Mark Yandell. MAKER2: an annotation pipeline and genome-database management tool for second-generation genome projects. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 12:491, December 2011.
- [45] Juan Manuel Crescente, Diego Zavallo, Marcelo Helguera, and Leonardo Sebastián Vanzetti. MITE tracker: an accurate approach to identify miniature inverted-repeat transposable elements in large genomes. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 19(1):348, October 2018.
- [46] David Ellinghaus, Stefan Kurtz, and Ute Willhoeft. LTRharvest, an efficient and flexible software for de novo detection of LTR retrotransposons. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 9:18, January 2008.
- [47] Jullien M Flynn, Robert Hubley, Clément Goubert, Jeb Rosen, Andrew G Clark, Cédric Feschotte, and Arian F Smit. RepeatModeler2 for automated genomic discovery of transposable element families. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 117(17):9451–9457, April 2020.
- [48] Nikita S Vassetzky and Dmitri A Kramerov. SINEBase: a database and tool for SINE analysis. Nucleic Acids Res., 41(Database issue):D83–9, January 2013.
- [49] SMIT and F A A. Repeat-Masker open-3.0. http://www.repeatmasker.org, 2004.
- [50] Weidong Bao, Kenji K Kojima, and Oleksiy Kohany. Repbase update, a database of repetitive elements in eukaryotic genomes. *Mob. DNA*, 6:11, June 2015.
- [51] Daehwan Kim, Joseph M Paggi, Chanhee Park, Christopher Bennett, and Steven L Salzberg. Graph-based genome alignment and genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 37(8):907–915, August 2019.

- [52] Heng Li, Bob Handsaker, Alec Wysoker, Tim Fennell, Jue Ruan, Nils Homer, Gabor Marth, Goncalo Abecasis, Richard Durbin, and 1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup. The sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*, 25(16):2078–2079, August 2009.
- [53] Mihaela Pertea, Geo M Pertea, Corina M Antonescu, Tsung-Cheng Chang, Joshua T Mendell, and Steven L Salzberg. StringTie enables improved reconstruction of a transcriptome from RNA-seq reads. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 33(3):290–295, March 2015.
- [54] Cole Trapnell, Adam Roberts, Loyal Goff, Geo Pertea, Daehwan Kim, David R Kelley, Harold Pimentel, Steven L Salzberg, John L Rinn, and Lior Pachter. Differential gene and transcript expression analysis of RNA-seq experiments with TopHat and cufflinks. *Nat. Protoc.*, 7(3):562–578, March 2012.
- [55] Mario Stanke, Oliver Keller, Irfan Gunduz, Alec Hayes, Stephan Waack, and Burkhard Morgenstern. AUGUSTUS: ab initio prediction of alternative transcripts. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 34(Web Server issue):W435–9, July 2006.
- [56] Felipe A Simão, Robert M Waterhouse, Panagiotis Ioannidis, Evgenia V Kriventseva, and Evgeny M Zdobnov. BUSCO: assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs. *Bioinformatics*, 31(19):3210–3212, October 2015.
- [57] Brigitte Boeckmann, Amos Bairoch, Rolf Apweiler, Marie-Claude Blatter, Anne Estreicher, Elisabeth Gasteiger, Maria J Martin, Karine Michoud, Claire O'Donovan, Isabelle Phan, Sandrine Pilbout, and Michel Schneider. The SWISS-PROT protein knowledgebase and its supplement TrEMBL in 2003. Nucleic Acids Res., 31(1):365–370, January 2003.
- [58] F Alexander Wolf, Philipp Angerer, and Fabian J Theis. SCANPY: large-scale single-cell gene expression data analysis. *Genome Biol.*, 19(1):15, February 2018.
- [59] Bartlomiej Bartkowiak, April L Mackellar, and Arno L Greenleaf. Updating the CTD story: From tail to epic. *Genet. Res. Int.*, 2011:623718, October 2011.
- [60] Anastasios Pavlopoulos and Michalis Averof. Establishing genetic transformation for comparative developmental studies in the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Proc. Natl.*

Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 102(22):7888-7893, May 2005.

- [61] B M Gumbiner. Cell adhesion: the molecular basis of tissue architecture and morphogenesis. *Cell*, 84(3):345–357, February 1996.
- [62] Susanne C van den Brink, Fanny Sage, Ábel Vértesy, Bastiaan Spanjaard, Josi
   Peterson-Maduro, Chloé S Baron, Catherine Robin, and Alexander van Oudenaarden.
   Single-cell sequencing reveals dissociation-induced gene expression in tissue
   subpopulations. *Nat. Methods*, 14(10):935–936, September 2017.
- [63] Francis R Horne. The effect of digestive enzymes on the hatchability of artemia salina eggs. *Transactions of the American Microscopical Society*, 85(2):271, 1966.
- [64] Simon Andrews and Others. FastQC: a quality control tool for high throughput sequence data. 2010.
- [65] S F Altschul, T L Madden, A A Schäffer, J Zhang, Z Zhang, W Miller, and D J Lipman. Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 25(17):3389–3402, September 1997.
- [66] Mark Johnson, Irena Zaretskaya, Yan Raytselis, Yuri Merezhuk, Scott McGinnis, and Thomas L Madden. NCBI BLAST: a better web interface. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 36(Web Server issue):W5–9, July 2008.
- [67] Eamonn Keogh and Abdullah Mueen. Curse of dimensionality. In Claude Sammut and Geoffrey I Webb, editors, *Encyclopedia of Machine Learning and Data Mining*, pages 314–315. Springer US, Boston, MA, 2017.
- [68] Caleb Weinreb, Samuel Wolock, and Allon M Klein. SPRING: a kinetic interface for visualizing high dimensional single-cell expression data. *Bioinformatics*, 34(7):1246–1248, April 2018.
- [69] V A Traag, L Waltman, and N J van Eck. From louvain to leiden: guaranteeing well-connected communities. *Sci. Rep.*, 9(1):5233, March 2019.

- [70] Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. UMAP: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. February 2018.
- [71] Vasilis Ntranos, Lynn Yi, Páll Melsted, and Lior Pachter. Identification of transcriptional signatures for cell types from single-cell RNA-Seq. February 2018.
- [72] UniProt Consortium. UniProt: a worldwide hub of protein knowledge. Nucleic Acids Res.,47(D1):D506–D515, January 2019.
- [73] The Gene Ontology Consortium. The gene ontology resource: 20 years and still GOing strong. Nucleic Acids Res., 47(D1):D330–D338, January 2019.
- [74] M Ashburner, C A Ball, J A Blake, D Botstein, H Butler, J M Cherry, A P Davis, K Dolinski,
  S S Dwight, J T Eppig, M A Harris, D P Hill, L Issel-Tarver, A Kasarskis, S Lewis, J C Matese,
  J E Richardson, M Ringwald, G M Rubin, and G Sherlock. Gene ontology: tool for the
  unification of biology. the gene ontology consortium. *Nat. Genet.*, 25(1):25–29, May 2000.
- [75] Mario A Vargas-Vila, Roberta L Hannibal, Ronald J Parchem, Paul Z Liu, and Nipam H
   Patel. A prominent requirement for single-minded and the ventral midline in patterning
   the dorsoventral axis of the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Development*, 137(20):
   3469–3476, October 2010.
- [76] François Kilchherr, Stefan Baumgartner, Daniel Bopp, Erich Frei, and Markus Noll.
   Isolation of the paired gene of drosophila and its spatial expression during early embryogenesis. *Nature*, 321(6069):493–499, May 1986.
- [77] A Preiss, D A Hartley, and S Artavanis-Tsakonas. The molecular genetics of enhancer of split, a gene required for embryonic neural development in drosophila. *EMBO J.*, 7(12): 3917–3927, December 1988.
- [78] M Whiteley, P D Noguchi, S M Sensabaugh, W F Odenwald, and J A Kassis. The drosophila gene escargot encodes a zinc finger motif found in snail-related genes. *Mech. Dev.*, 36(3): 117–127, February 1992.
- [79] Oona Johnstone, Renate Deuring, Ronald Bock, Patrick Linder, Margaret T Fuller, and Paul Lasko. Belle is a drosophila DEAD-box protein required for viability and in the germ line.

*Dev. Biol.*, 277(1):92–101, January 2005.

- [80] Nicholas H Putnam, Brendan L O'Connell, Jonathan C Stites, Brandon J Rice, Marco Blanchette, Robert Calef, Christopher J Troll, Andrew Fields, Paul D Hartley, Charles W Sugnet, David Haussler, Daniel S Rokhsar, and Richard E Green. Chromosome-scale shotgun assembly using an in vitro method for long-range linkage. *Genome Res.*, 26(3): 342–350, March 2016.
- [81] Martin A Fischler and Robert C Bolles. Random sample consensus: a paradigm for model fitting with applications to image analysis and automated cartography. *Commun. ACM*, 24 (6):381–395, June 1981.
- [82] Andrew A Hardigan, Brian S Roberts, Dianna E Moore, Ryne C Ramaker, Angela L Jones, and Richard M Myers. CRISPR/Cas9-targeted removal of unwanted sequences from small-RNA sequencing libraries. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 47(14):e84, August 2019.
- [83] W Gu, E D Crawford, B D O'Donovan, M R Wilson, E D Chow, H Retallack, and J L DeRisi. Depletion of abundant sequences by hybridization (DASH): using cas9 to remove unwanted high-abundance species in sequencing libraries and molecular counting applications. *Genome Biol.*, 17:41, March 2016.
- [84] Cassandra G Extavour Anastasia R. Nast. Ablation of a single cell from eight-cell embryos of the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *J. Vis. Exp.*, (85), 2014.
The scientist does not study nature because it is useful to do so. He studies it because he takes pleasure in it, and he takes pleasure in it because it is beautiful. If nature were not beautiful it would not be worth knowing, and life would not be worth living.

Henri Poincaré, 1908

# 5

Studying the germ layer specification in the early embryogenesis of *Parhyale hawaiensis* with modern microscopy

#### ABSTRACT

Gastrulation is a fundamental morphogenetic event that often orchestrates the specification of germ layers. In this chapter, I used recent advances in light sheet microscopy to record *in toto* the first 4 days of *Parhyale hawaiensis* embryos. Using the early germ layer specification of *Parhyale hawaiensis*, I tracked each of the lineages. By establishing a ground truth annotation of an embryo by tracking every cell I showed a correlation between developmental stages, division rate, and nuclei velocity. Moreover, I provide novel insights into the dynamics of each germ layer's contribution to the total cell population in the embryo. Finally, I ablated the ectodermal Er blastomere in 4 embryos to study the changes in cellular behavior happening during the regeneration of the missing lineage. I successfully recorded the first 3 days following ablation using light sheet microscopy. Finally, I generated valuable resources for the study of the early development of *Parhyale hawaiensis*.

#### **CONTRIBUTIONS**

For this study, I received the help of multiple members from Philip Keller's laboratory. In particular, Bill Lemon who assisted and taught me how to manipulate the SIMView microscope. Anastasios Pavlopoulos and Evangelia Stamataki, funded in part this study and invited me to come to Janelia Farm to perform those experiments. Moreover, they performed the injection of the 2017 datasets, taught me how to inject mRNA in one cell stage embryos and provided the injected mRNAs. Cassandra G. Extavour assisted and taught me how to ablate single blastomeres of *Parhyale hawaiensis* embryos.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study would not have been possible without the help I received from Anastasios (Tassos) Pavlopoulos and Evangelia (Valia) Stamataki. They provided us with the *P. hawaiensis* lines used throughout this thesis, invited me and Cassandra Extavour to the HHMI Janelia Research Campus, and taught me how to produce mRNA and inject them into *P. hawaiensis* embryos. Moreover, I also want to thanks A. Pavlopoulos for the long discussion on the biology of crustaceans and his willingness to help and answer any question. I want to thank Cassandra Extavour for supporting the ideas I attempted here, and her help in teaching me microdissection and ablation techniques. Finally, I want to thank the members of Philip Keller's Laboratory who helped me with the complex microscopes they developed, especially Bill Lemon and Kate McDole who spend hours teaching me the intricacies of their machines.

#### 5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I present my advances towards the recording of live *P. hawaiensis* embryos. I then present the results of the tracking of nuclei in one of the recorded embryos. Finally, I conclude chapters 4 and 5 with a general discussion regarding the potential for a future generation of any embryonic developmental atlas.

### 5.1.1 The uses of Selective Plane Illumination Microscopy to study live developing embryos

In 1903, Siedentopf and Zsigmondy set out to measure the size of gold nanoparticles in rubies<sup>1</sup>. Because the size of the particles was smaller than the wavelength of visible light, classical light absorption microscopy did not work<sup>1</sup>. Using the work of Lord Rayleigh (John William Strutt) on the scattering of light by small particles<sup>2</sup>, they used Rayleigh scattering to study the size of the gold nanoparticles. To this end, they invented the ultramicroscope, which shines condensed light on a sample at a high angle from the observing objective<sup>1</sup>. In this way, only light scattered by the particles would reach the observing objective, and all remaining light would pass through the sample<sup>1</sup>. By measuring the diffraction ring caused by the scattered light, Siedentopf and Zsigmondy calculated the size of the nanoparticles<sup>1</sup>. For this work, they were awarded the 1925 Nobel prize<sup>3</sup>. This seminal research led to what is known today as darkfield microscopy (discussed in Keller and Dodt<sup>4</sup>), a technique used to observe the scattering of light by a sample from incident illumination created by a ring filter on the path of the condenser (reviewed by Sheppard<sup>5</sup>). The ring prevents direct light ray trajectories from reaching the objective, such that only light scattered by the sample reaches the objective (reviewed by Sheppard<sup>5</sup>). It allows the observation of unstained transparent samples due to the differences in the refractive index of different parts of tissues and cells (reviewed by Sheppard<sup>5</sup>). Example darkfield micrographs are shown in Figure 5.1.

In 2004 Huisken and Stelzer proposed a new microscopic method to study live biological specimens that they called Selective Plane Illumination Microscopy (SPIM) and that became more widely known as light sheet microscopy<sup>6</sup>. The high angle of incidence of the emission



**Figure 5.1: Example micrographs showing the contrast generated by darkfield microscopy. a)** Unknown species of diatoms laid between glass and coverslip. The ultrastructures of the diatoms become visible through this contrast technique. **b)** Example of a live unknown species of *Stentor* (ciliate) found in a river sample from the Charles River in Cambridge, MA. The internal calcified teeth-like structures are visible, as well as some of the internal structures of the animal.

light was akin to dark field microscopy, but the use of fluorescence made it different in that it did not use the scattering of light, but instead the emission of photons from an excited fluorophore<sup>6</sup>. In a SPIM light sheet microscope, an emission laser source is bent into a plane with a thickness of a few micrometers<sup>6</sup>. This sheet can then selectively be moved through a three-dimensional sample embedded in a chamber<sup>6</sup>. The sheet is aimed at 90° from the collection objective, creating an illuminated plane perpendicular to the collection objective path<sup>6</sup>. This achieves a planar excitation of the fluorophores, guaranteeing that only molecules within the focal plane are excited, resulting in very high contrast<sup>6</sup>. This microscopy technique offers multiple advantages, from a low required excitation intensity and therefore low biological damage, with the ability to collect, at higher speeds than before<sup>7</sup>, three-dimensional images of live biological samples (reviewed by Keller et al.<sup>8</sup>). By changing the plane to a vertically scanned laser beam with structured pulses, and timing those pulses to the reading of the corresponding pixel line of a CMOS sensor, Phillip Keller was able to increase the contrast and resolution of deep tissue imaging<sup>9</sup>, paving the way for the invention of the higher speed, higher resolution, and higher contrast (relative to classical SPIM microscopes<sup>6</sup>) SIMView microscope that I used during my Ph.D.<sup>7</sup>.

Light sheet microscopy has been used to study the development of embryos<sup>6,7,9,10,11,12,13,14</sup>. An example of the advantages of light sheet microscopy in recording embryogenesis is the difficult task of imaging mammalian embryos. Mammalian embryos are particularly sensitive to light and require a specific medium to develop properly outside of a uterus<sup>10</sup>. Using light sheet microscopy, Kate McDole successfully recorded the first days of embryogenesis of a mouse embryo at the single-cell resolution<sup>10</sup>. Isomorphic three-dimensional recordings also allow for the study of morphogenesis. An example is the recent study by Anastasios Pavlopoulos of the developing limb of *P. hawaiensis*<sup>11</sup>. In this study, they tracked cells during limb development and found that the resulting cellular architecture of the developing limb could be traced back to the position of the cells in the grid stage<sup>11</sup>. The high recording speed of light sheet microscopy allowed William C. Lemon to image the activity of neurons in a developing *Drosophila melanogaster* larva. By recording the neuronal activity of the entire larva, he and his colleagues modeled the relation between specific neurons and the backward and forward activation

waves<sup>15</sup>. In this thesis, I used this microscopy technique to record the early development of *P*. *hawaiensis* under normal conditions, as well as after the ablation of one of the ectodermal blastomeres at the S4 stage.

#### 5.1.2 The advantages and challenges of volumetric microscopy data

There are multiple computational challenges to process and analyze light sheet microscopy datasets. First, the accurate registration of the recording of a sample from multiple angles in time is necessary to correctly assign the position of each recorded image in three-dimensional space. Two main techniques have been used to achieve this. First, the position of the objectives, the cameras, and the sample are fixed, and the recording is done through two<sup>9</sup> or four objectives<sup>16</sup>. This way, it becomes trivial to register the datasets, as the rotation and translation are built in the microscope<sup>9,16</sup>. However, this technique only allows for at most four angles and is therefore not as accurate as the second method. The second method uses the embedding of microscopic fluorescent beads within the sample embedding medium. Given that the size of the beads is smaller than the wavelength of light, the resulting image is equivalent to a point spread function, allowing for the inference of the position at a higher resolution than that permitted by traditional light microscopy<sup>17</sup>. The positions of beads are extracted from each view and cross-correlated through the RANSAC algorithm to extract the rotation, translation, and scale matrices required to realign each sample<sup>17</sup>. The positions of the beads can also be used through time to register each image with the others, allowing for the correction of drift<sup>17</sup>. As we will see below, I decided to use the second methodology to register the datasets I collected during my Ph.D., as this allowed me to record the embryos from 6 or 8 angles, and to mount and record multiple embryos in parallel.

The second challenge regards the correct generation of a volumetric image (a three-dimensional image composed of voxels) from single two-dimensional planes. This has seen two main developments. The first one was the generation of voxel data through the fusion of the corresponding pixel of the different imaged planes. To compute the voxel value, the weighted average of the multiple planes is computed<sup>9,17,18</sup>. The second one used a Bayesian deconvolution of the datasets by using the fact that the same location can be observed from

multiple angles (multiple sampling of the same voxel), and that the beads provide an accurate point spread function (giving an estimation of the scattering of light for a sample)<sup>19</sup>. While the deconvolution method proposed by its developers is optimized for large three-dimensional datasets, it remains computationally expensive and might generate artifacts<sup>19</sup>. Therefore, the volumetric images in this chapter were generated using the weighted average fusion algorithm.

The third challenge regards the segmentation and tracking of objects in three dimensions, which is a very active and non-trivial research topic (reviewed and benchmarked in Ulman et al.<sup>20</sup>). To this day, this remains a major problem to analyze large three-dimensional datasets containing a large number of cells (reviewed and benchmarked in Ulman et al.<sup>20</sup>). While tools have been generated to automatically segment, track and analyze large datasets in two dimensions<sup>21,22,23</sup>, fewer algorithms have been developed for use in three dimensions (reviewed and benchmarked in Ulman et al.<sup>20</sup>). The first class of algorithms tries to use the advances in 2D segmentation by analyzing each plane of the volume as a 2D image, such as Ilastik<sup>22</sup>, but those algorithms usually perform poorly due to the lack of three-dimensional integration (benchmarked in Ulman et al.<sup>20</sup>). The second class of algorithms fully uses all three dimensions of the dataset. One such algorithm is TGMM<sup>10,24</sup> which finds ellipsoidal objects (such as nuclei) by fitting a 3D gaussian mixture model onto each volume. Other algorithms use recent advances in deep learning to segment volumetric images such as the StarDist algorithm<sup>25</sup> which first classifies pixels using a U-Net<sup>26</sup> or ResNet<sup>27</sup> architecture by creating two maps, an object center, and a star convex polygon distance map. Another approach is used by CellPose (also based on a U-Net<sup>26</sup> architecture) which first learns to segment nuclei on two-dimensional images, and then applies this segmentation across all slices from all three axes, resulting in a 3D probability matrix<sup>28</sup>.

The final challenge comes from the amount of data generated by light sheet microscopy, where the number of voxels increases as the cube of the image size. For example, a single time point of the fused dataset generated below represents about 2Gb of data, with a whole dataset of 367 time points using 722Gb (after processing, prior to processing each dataset represents between 3 and 5 Tb of images). In comparison, the entire *P. hawaiensis* genome contains 3.6Gb of data<sup>29</sup>. I believe that the large amount of data and the processing complexity of volumetric data can

make the use of light sheet datasets difficult for non-computer scientists. Thankfully, the increasing computer power and the progress in developing user-friendly plugins for FIJI<sup>11,17,18,19,25,30</sup> are making such tasks more amenable to non-computer scientists.

To understand the developmental dynamics of *P. hawaiensis* early embryogenesis, I needed to segment and track the position of nuclei to analyze the behavior of all cells in the embryo. Second, while seminal papers on *P. hawaiensis* embryogenesis laid the foundation for the understanding of its early embryogenesis<sup>31,32,33,34,35</sup>, no comprehensive study of the cells in developing embryos from the 8 cell stage to the germ band elongation stage had been attempted. Finally, it is known that the fate of cells is restricted from the 8 cell stage onward, the blastomeres acquiring their identity, and giving rise to populations of cells that are separated by clear boundaries. For example, the Ep blastomere gives rise to a population of cells is found at later stages forming the ventral midline between the descendant of El and Er<sup>31,32,33,34,35</sup>, raising a number of unanswered questions: What are the cellular motions and rearrangements necessary for that population of cells to come to be located at the midline? Is the boundary between the right and left ectoderm absolute? What are the intra-embryonic variability in cell behavior, motion, and final fate? I aimed to generate datasets that would be capable of providing initial answers to these questions.

#### 5.2 Methods

#### 5.2.1 Preparation of low melt agar gel with fluorescent beads

This part of the protocol was performed by me. First, a 20ml solution of a 2% low melt agar in FASW was prepared and left in a 65°C incubation oven overnight. To achieve a uniform melting of the agar and avoid artifacts due to light bending on unmelted agar granules, it is critical to leave the agar at 65°C overnight. I prepared a 1:100 dilution of the fluorescent beads (Estapore Microsphere F-Y cat nb: 80380495, initial concentration 1% of beads, dilution is at 0.01%) by vortexing the bead stock for 2 minutes, then diluting 10ul of the stock solution in 990ul of FASW. The final concentration of a stock solution is at 0.0001%. This stock solution was sonicated with

a water bath sonicator (BRANSON 1510) for 10 minutes before any use and kept at 4°C until use. The final mounting medium, 1% low melt agar in FASW with beads, was prepared by mixing 40ul of the sonicated bead stock with 460ul of FASW and 500ul of the 2% low melt agar stock. The solution was vortexed thoroughly for at least 1 minute, then placed at 42°C. The final concentration used for imaging is at 4e-6%.

#### 5.2.2 Preparation of mRNA injection mix

This part of the protocol was performed by A. Pavlopoulos and E. Stamataki (Janelia Research Campus). mRNA of fusion proteins for nuclei and membrane tagging was prepared using the mMESSAGE mMACHINE kit (ThermoFisher: AM1344). Two different mRNA expression plasmids (designed by A. Pavlopoulos) were used: H2A-mCherry (PCS2 + H2A-mCherry:pDest) and Lyn-GFP (PCS2 + Lyn-GFP). The concentration of mRNA was measured, then the mRNA was stored at -20°C in isopropanol before subsequent use.

The injection mix consisted of phenol red dye at 0.13% (Sigma P0290) along with the prepared mRNA at a final concentration of 2ug/ul. A total of 5ul of injection mix was prepared before each injection. The mix was then spun at 13000rpm for 30 min at 4°C before being loaded into a needle (Eppendorf FemtoTip II #5242957000) and kept on ice at all times.

#### 5.2.3 Injection of probe mRNA into one-cell stage embryos

This part of the protocol was performed by E. Stamataki (Janelia Research Campus) for WT01\_11-17 and WT02\_11-17. I performed all injections for the 2018 wild type datasets and ablated embryos. A. Pavlopoulos and E. Stamataki performed part of the embryo collection. One cell stage embryos (see: Collection of *P. hawaiensis* embryos) were placed on an injection stand apparatus molded from agar. To create the injection mold (see schematic), two glass slides were used to create a small stair shape by placing one on top of the other with a slight offset, and taping the slides into place with lab tape. The taped slides were placed onto a 10cm petri dish. A 1% agar in FASW solution was prepared and poured into the petri dish until the agar reaches the top of the glass slides. After the agar gelified, the glass slides were carefully removed. Finally, FASWA was poured onto the petri dish and the embryos were placed onto the created steps.



**Figure 5.2: Schematic representation of the creation of an agar step mold for injection of** *P. hawaiensis* **embryos.** Glass slides are affixed with tape in a stair shape. Then agar is poured into a petri dish containing the glass slides mold until the agar level is just under the glass slide. The glass slide mold is gently removed taking care to not damage the agar. Finally, the petri dish is filled with FASWA and embryos can be injected atop the first step.

Injection of the one-cell stage embryos was performed using a microinjection setup composed of a Narishige IM-300 Microinjector, a 3 axis micromanipulator, a foot pedal for injection, and Femtotip II needles (Eppendorf: ep5242957000). The needle was backfilled with the injection mix, and visual confirmation of the injection in the embryo was performed using the phenol red dye. After the injection, the embryos were collected and placed in a clean petri dish that was placed in a 26°C incubator.

Starting at two hours following the injection, embryos were checked for expression of Lyn-GFP and H2A-mCherry using a fluorescent dissection microscope. Embryos that died or did not develop properly (e.g. missing cell, arrest in division, etc.) were removed from the petri dish to avoid microbial growth that could contaminate the remaining embryos.

### 5.2.4 Preparation of embryos for light sheet microscopy with the SimView Keller laboratory scope

Injected embryos were selected for mounting and imaging based on the following criteria, which were assessed through visual inspection on a fluorescent dissection microscope: The embryo must have just reached 4 cell stages, and have a strong uniform expression of the injected H2A-mCherry (nuclei) and Lyn-GFP (membrane). The best looking three embryos



**Figure 5.3: Custom mounting procedure for multiple** *P. hawaiensis* **embryos on the SimView scope. I)** A plasticine mount is laid out on a flat surface. A glass capillary is inserted inside the plasticine. Then using forceps, a PTFE tube is inserted into the glass capillary, then filled up until the top of the glass capillary with 1% Low melt agar with fluorescent beads. II) The embryo is selected and picked from a petri dish. **III)** The embryo is dropped and mixed in liquid 42°C 1% low melt agar with fluorescent beads. **IV)** The embryo is aspirated with 10ul of agar and laid atop the already solidified agar gel in the column. Extra care is taken to centering it in the tube by gently moving it while the agar is still liquid. IV is then repeated for each new embryo, making sure that each of them is mounted atop each other.

according to these criteria were then mounted into a PTFE tube (External diameter 2mm, thickness 25um) inserted in a glass capillary (external diameter 3mm, internal diameter 2mm). Both the PTFE tube and the glass capillary were custom made by the Keller laboratory (Janelia Research Campus) to be mounted on the SimView scope. The mounting procedure, shown in the schematic below, consisted of creating a plasticine mount onto which a glass capillary was inserted. Inside the capillary, using clean forceps, the PTFE tube is gently pushed, until it reaches the plasticine. Finally, the PTFE tube is backfilled with the 1% low melt agar in FASW with beads until the agar reaches about 1mm above the glass capillary (schematic step I). A 10ul fine pipette tip was cut at the end such that the opening was big enough to aspirate an embryo. One embryo from the petri dish (schematic step II) was transferred onto the 1% low melt agar with beads solution using the tip and a P10 pipette. The embryo was mixed thoroughly in the low melt agar by swirling the solution around the embryo with the pipette tip (schematic step III). Finally, the embryo was aspirated and gently deposited on top of the agar column in the PTFE tube, taking great care to center it in the column (schematic step VI). This procedure was repeated until 3 embryos were mounted on top of each other in the column.

#### 5.2.5 Blastomere ablation

This part of the protocol was performed by myself and C. Extavour at the Janelia Research Campus. Embryos injected with tracer mRNA were selected as previously described (see: Preparation of embryos for light sheet microscopy with the SimView Keller laboratory scope) for ablation. Once the embryos reached the 8 cell stage, one blastomere per embryo was ablated using the previously published method<sup>33</sup>. The Er blastomere was targeted for ablation each time. However, some embryos had El or Mav removed by mistake instead, which became evident after ablation. Ablated embryos were left to recover for an hour at 26°C before being visually inspected. Three healthy embryos were then selected for mounting as previously described.

#### 5.2.6 Recording of embryos with the SimView microscope

This and all subsequent parts of the protocol were performed by me. The mounted embryos were imaged using the custom microscope SimView at the Keller laboratory in Janelia Research Campus<sup>7</sup>. Each embryo was imaged using two channels, one for the Lyn-GFP membrane tag using a 488nm emission laser and one for the H2A-mCherry using a 555nm emission laser. The exact settings for each embryo are reported in the **??**ow. Embryos were imaged with 3 or 4 angles, and two objectives located 180° from each other, resulting in 6- or 8-angle datasets. The angle spacing was uniform (for example, for 3 angles, spacing was at 0, 60, and 120°, with the corresponding opposite objective recording 180, 240, and 320°). The time resolution was 10 minutes between time points, except for Ablated-03-06 which was 12 minutes, which was the minimum amount of time required to complete all scans for four embryos.

#### 5.2.7 Processing and fusion of multiview microphotographs

The files generated by the SimView scopes are KLB formats, one KLB file for each view (a view is defined as one Z-scan for one camera and one angle). The processing was done using the open-source toolkit MultiView Reconstruction, a FIJI plugin<sup>17</sup>. This plugin relies on the BigDataViewer FIJI plugin, which allows for the efficient loading and processing of large

(multiple terabytes) microscopy datasets<sup>30</sup>. The dataset metadata was defined into an XML file using the KLB importer tool of BigDataViewer. This XML file is the central file that will be used throughout the whole process. It contains all the necessary information for processing, opening, registration, and fusing. Due to the SimView dual-camera setup, one of the settings of the XML file was manually changed; namely, each dataset captured by the second camera was flipped symmetrically on its Z-axis. To do this, the ViewSetup transform matrix for Angle 1 views was changed, with the m11 value changed from 1 to -1.

Next, using the embedded fluorescent beads, the different views were registered to each other such that each voxel from each view would be correctly aligned for fusion. The registration was performed using the MultiView Reconstruction plugin with the following settings:

- Interest point detection: Channel 0, difference-of-gaussian (sigma=1.7065, threshold=9.701738E-4). All other settings were default values.
- Remove detection by distance: Set to Distance threshold with Min 0 and Max determined as the highest point of the first peak on the shown histogram composed of two mixed Gaussians (in the range of 10-30px). All other settings were default values.
- Registration: Fast Descriptor based, All to All time point matching with range (10 time points), Only compare overlapping views. All other settings were default values.
- Fusion: Select the bounding box corresponding to the embryo minimizing extraneous space. Make sure to verify across all time points for embryo movement outside the bounding box. Select intensity normalization to global maxima. Select One file per time point. All other settings were default values.

The output created was a collection of H5 (HDF5) files containing the fused dataset, with one file per time point, one H5 file containing metadata about the other H5 files, and one XML file containing the resolution, angles, and location of the H5 data files.

#### 5.2.8 Automatic tracking of nuclei with Ilastik

On the first dataset (WT\_01-11-17), nuclei were segmented and tracked using Ilastik, a Random Forest pixel classification machine learning tool<sup>22</sup>.

Because of the high variability in nuclei intensity throughout the recording time (which I hypothesize was caused by variability between nuclei in the dynamics of the fluorescent protein being expressed, then slowly bleached while not being replaced), the dataset was split into three parts, time points 0-100, 101-200, and 201-300. A model was created for each subset by painting nuclei and background areas. For the training, one time point for every 30 recorded time points was sampled and all nuclei were painted within the volume. Finally, the three subsets were fully segmented.

Then, using the segmented results, the Ilastik Object tracking algorithm was used to track nuclei in all three subsets, merged into a single dataset. Finally, the results were exported using the MaMuT export plugin that is available in Ilastik by default, using its default parameters.

#### 5.2.9 Manual correction and tracking of nuclei with MaMuT

Tracks were imported into the Open Source FIJI light sheet nuclei tracking plugin, MaMuT<sup>11</sup> for visualization, verification, and correction. The tracks were manually corrected for errors due to the automatic object tracking of Ilastik. Due to the high error rate induced by Ilastik, every single track was manually corrected. The correction was performed as follows: Starting at time point 0 each track was followed one time point at a time. At each division, each track was split and one daughter cell was followed until the next division. When the next division occurred, the track was followed backward to the previous division, and the other track (second daughter cell) was followed. This was continued with one of the two daughter cells until another division happened. The other daughter's cell was then followed until the following division. This process was repeated until all tracks had been manually verified and corrected. The tracks were saved throughout the process, and a final XML file was generated when all tracks were completed. The WT\_01-11-17 embryo was tracked in this way up until time point 300 (out of 367).

#### 5.2.10 Analysis of the number of nuclei and rate of division

A custom Python script was created to import the final XML file for subsequent analysis (ref: Chapter\_4/Scripts/light sheetUtils/mamut.py). This script imports the tracks into a NetworkX<sup>36</sup> Directed Graph (DiGraph) instance for further processing. Using the DiGraph instance, any node (nuclei) that had an out-degree (the number of connecting annotations on the next time point) of two was counted and annotated as a cell division. All division events were stored and their times into an array and subsequently binned them into an equally spaced histogram with a bin size of one hour. Finally, the number of divisions was normalized by the total number of nuclei during the corresponding hour. This computation is the hourly rate of division, which was then plotted using SeaBorn<sup>37</sup>, a python plotting library.

The total number of nuclei for each frame was computed by counting the number of nodes at each time point. A linear regression of the rate of division was performed for different phases of embryonic development. The following four bins were created: 16-64 cell stage, 64 to 128 cell stage, gastrulation, germ disk formation, and aggregation. For each bin, the division rate was computed using the Scipy stats linear regression module. The number of nuclei and rate were then plotted using SeaBorn<sup>37</sup>.

#### 5.2.11 Analysis of nuclei velocity

Using the DiGraph of nuclei tracks, the velocity of each nucleus from one time point to the next was calculated. To calculate the velocity of a nucleus, the euclidean distance between the position at t-1 and t was calculated. Then, the distance was divided by the time elapsed in one time point. Finally, the velocities of each nucleus were plotted using SeaBorn<sup>37</sup>.

#### 5.2.12 Mercator projection of nuclei onto a 2D space

The position of the nuclei in the embryo was projected onto a 2D image. First, given the spherical shape of *P. hawaiensis* embryos, a sphere was fitted by using a Least Square Sphere Fit<sup>38</sup>. Then, using this sphere model (center and radius), a Mercator projection was performed<sup>39</sup> using only the Phi and Theta parameters of each nucleus (thereby projecting the nuclei onto the

sphere and removing their offset to the sphere shell). Finally, using the X and Y coordinates obtained from the projection, I plotted each time point using SeaBorn<sup>37</sup>.

#### 5.2.13 Rendering of embryos in volumetric space with Blender

I used a procedure that I had previously developed for rendering a volumetric dataset in Blender and made publicly available:

https://hackmd.io/@sOXXFIraQiiB2hiInQpyMw/rketOixDG?type=view

## 5.2.14 Additional scripts created to manipulate file formats used in light sheet microscopy

All additional scripts that I created to perform these analyses are found in the GitHub repository <a href="https://github.com/extavourlab/Blondel\_Leo\_Thesis">https://github.com/extavourlab/Blondel\_Leo\_Thesis</a> under scripts/Chapter\_4/Scripts/light sheetUtils

- MaMuT.py: A python library to open and manipulate MaMuT XML files. Exposes the parameters and allows for the resaving of XML files.
- MaMuTUtils.py: A set of tools to manipulate MaMuT XML files as a Python library. It can:
  - Merge multiple MaMuT XML files.
  - Append a set of annotations to an existing XML file.
  - Change the path of the microscopy images associated with a set of annotations
  - Change the number of time points in a dataset
  - Clean Unlaid spots
  - Remove annotation given a set of parameters (position or size)
  - Merge colocalized spots

- hdf5\_Make\_BDVXML.py: Creates a BigDataViewer XML file from a BigDataViewer HDF5 file.
- hdf5\_to\_8RAW.py: Converts a BigDataViewer HDF5 file into an 8-bit RAW file.
  Allows for the selection of time points, and resolution. Useful for importing into
  OpenGL volumetric renderer such as Blender.
- hdf5\_to\_TIFF.py: Converts a BigDataViewer HDF5 file into a TIFF stack. Allows for the selection of time points, and resolution.
- bdvxml.py: Open and parses a BigDataViewer XML file for manipulation. Allows for resaving of manipulated XML files.
- HDF5\_Merge\_multiple.py: Merges multiple BigDataViewer HDF5 files into one.
- CleanUnlaid.py: Remove Unlaid spots in a MaMuT XML file. Unlaid spots are annotations that do not belong to any track.
- ExtractPixelsFromMaMuT.py: Uses the MaMuT annotations to extract small image cubes containing a single nucleus. Useful for subsequent training, or visualization of the quality of the annotations.

#### 5.3 Results

#### 5.3.1 Imaging of nuclei and membrane of wild type *P*.

#### hawaiensis embryos with the light sheet SimView scope

As discussed in the introduction of Chapter 4, the main goal of this chapter was to generate a geo-localization system for transcripts, on a live developing embryo. To achieve this goal I needed to generate high-quality volumetric recordings of developing embryos and track every cell.

Thanks to Anastasios Pavlopoulos, I was invited to record the early embryogenesis of *P. hawaiensis* at the HHMI Janelia Research Campus, in the laboratory of Philip Keller. The Keller

laboratory specializes in the light sheet microscopy and has developed multiple cutting edge light sheet microscopes<sup>7,16,40</sup>. For all of the experiments described in this chapter, I used the SimView<sup>7</sup> microscope.

Due to the invariant early cleavages which allow for the unambiguous identification of each lineage up until the 16 cell stage, the beginning of the recording was set to be at 8 cells (stage S4), with an error margin up to the 16 cell stage (beginning of stage S5). As mentioned in Chapter 4, the transgenic line *PhHS*>*H*2*B*-*mRFPruby* could not be used for the recording of early embryogenesis due to the inability to activate the heat shock element until the S6 stage. I, therefore, used transient expression of marker proteins through the micro-injection (performed by E. Stamataki for the 2017 datasets and me for the 2018 datasets) of messenger RNA<sup>41</sup>. One cell stage (stage S1) embryos were injected with two different mRNAs, one encoding the nuclear protein Histone 2 A (H2A) tagged with the fluorescent reporter mCherry (H2A-mCherry), and the second encoding the membrane localization domain Lyn tagged with the fluorescent reporter GFP (Lyn-GFP) (Figure 5.4). One cell stage embryos injected with these mRNAs had an 81%(+-8%) survival rate. For each of two replicate experiments (Table 5.1), three successfully injected embryos were mounted and imaged on the SimView scope using a custom mounting procedure I developed (see Methods: Preparation of embryos for light sheet microscopy with the SimView Keller laboratory scope). For every experiment, a unique set of parameters within the constraints of light sheet microscopy was chosen to maximize the number of angles while reducing light damage and to have a small time-resolution to allow for accurate nuclei tracking (Table 5.1). In total, I successfully recorded four wild type embryos, in two experiments, expressing H2A-mCherry and Lyn-GFP (Table 5.1). For both experiments, out of the three embryos I mounted, one failed to develop fully and stopped developing during the recording. The images were then processed using the FIJI Multiview Reconstruction pipeline<sup>17</sup>. The registration was done successfully on each dataset using the beads embedded in the agar with a pixel error rate of 2.5(+-0.5)px. Each dataset was then fused, using the weighted-average fusion algorithm<sup>17</sup>, resulting in a 0.406um isometric voxel resolution. Representative images of the fused datasets are shown in (Figure 5.5).



**Figure 5.4: Representative images of** *P. hawaiensis* **injected embryos.** Embryos were injected at the one-cell stage with mRNA for *H2A-mCherry* and *Lyn-GFP* and imaged using a stereomicroscope 4h later (when they are at the one, two, or four cell stage). Embryos are showing different expression levels along with stages from the 2 to 4 cell stages.

Date	Name	Condition	Angles (equally spaced)	time points	Time reso- lution	Status
11-2017	WT_01-11- 17	Wild Type	8 angles	366	10mn	Fused and Tracked
11-2017	WT_02-11- 17	Wild Type	8 angles	366	10mn	Fused
11-2017	WT_03-11- 17	Wild Type	8 angles	366	10mn	Deleted due to embryo death
11-2018	WT_01-20- 11-18	Wild Type	6 angles	419	10mn	Fused
11-2018	WT_02-20- 11-18	Wild Type	6 angles	419	10mn	Deleted due to embryo death
11-2018	WT_03-20- 11-18	Wild Type	6 angles	419	10mn	Fused

**Table 5.1: List of every wild type** *P. hawaiensis* **embryo recorded with the SimView microscope.** Important dataset metadata are written in the corresponding columns. The status of the processing is reported in the "Status" column. Images of embryos shown here are visible in Figure 5.5.



**Figure 5.5: Maximum intensity projection of fused light sheet recording of** *P. hawaiensis* **embryos.** Projections were computed for each embryo from the same angle and every 8.3 hours of recording. WT01\_11-18 and WT02\_11-18 recordings continue for another 11.5 hours but are not shown here. In cyan are the nuclei tagged with H2A-mCherry and in magenta is the membrane tagged with Lyn-GFP.

#### 5.3.2 Analysis of nuclei movement and division dynamic

To track the exact position of the nuclei in space the first step I took was the segmentation of the nuclei in the embryos. Multiple methodologies for the segmentation of nuclei in 2D have been developed over time<sup>25,42,43,44,45</sup>. Using Ilastik<sup>22</sup>, I trained a random forest model with the training interface to segment the nuclei. Due to the changes in fluorescence intensity, three different models had to be trained, one for the first 100 time points, one for the next 100, and one for the last 100. Due to the high amount of time required to segment nuclei with Ilastik, I trained, tested, and segmented only the first dataset (WT\_01-11-17) to assess the viability of this algorithm. Finally, I used the segmented model as an input to the object tracking pipeline of Ilastik and exported the results to visually assess their quality using the MaMuT plugin<sup>11</sup>.

The results contained many erroneous annotations. First, a large number of objects were unconnected and corresponded to fluorescent artifacts in the images (Figure 5.6). Second, the tracks showed a heavy level of fragmentation, with over 1062 generated tracks for 16 originating cells (Figure 5.6). I first wrote a small algorithm that would remove any annotation that was not part of a track (unconnected annotations) to reduce the amount of noise. Then I manually corrected all of the tracks from the first time point to time point 300. While performing this task, I also cleaned any tracks that followed fluorescent artifacts, along with tracks tracking fluorescent beads. This resulted in a clean set of annotations for all nuclei in the WT01-11-17 dataset (Figure 5.6). The remaining embryos were not segmented or tracked. However, WT01\_11-17 is a fully tracked positive control that can be used as a comparison to any new automated segmentation and tracking algorithm.

Using the fully tracked WT\_01-11-17 embryo I first asked if there was any pattern to the nuclei's division dynamics across the different stages of embryogenesis recorded, namely early division, gastrulation, germ disk aggregation, and germ band formation. I extracted the number of nuclei in each frame and computed the rolling hourly average. Due to the exponential nature of cellular divisions, I plotted the Log2 of the number of nuclei against time. Interestingly, I observed four different rates of division corresponding to four different stages of development (Figure 5.7). In the first half of stage S5, from 16 to 64 cells (Early divisions), the rate of division



**Figure 5.6: Results from the automated segmentation and tracking performed using llastik and manual tracking and correc-tions. a)** Example of artefactual segmentation by the automated process. Each circle represents an annotation, the green circle shows the artifact. **b)** Tracks generated by the flow tracking algorithm of llastik. Each unique track is given a color from blue to red. 1062 unique tracks are represented on this embryo. **c)** Tracks remaining after manually correcting the tracks from (b) using MaMuT. Each track is colored by its blastoderm origin: blues are El Er and Ep, yellow is g, green is en, reds are ml, and mr and orange is Mav. In gray are tracks for which the blastoderm origin is unknown due to the nuclei becoming invisible while traveling inside the yolk.

is the highest. It then slows in the second half of stage S5 between 64 and 128 cells (Cell migration) (Figure 5.7). During gastrulation, cellular division seemingly stops (Figure 5.7). Finally, the rate of division resumes at a slower pace during the formation of the germ band (Figure 5.7). Moreover, for the first three different division phases, the nucleus velocities change concurrently. During the early divisions, the velocity of nuclei slowly drops. I speculate that this may be due to the fact that the volume occupied by each cell halves at each division, such that the total distance traveled halves twice, leading to a reduction in speed from 90um/h to 30um/h. During the next phase, the velocity increases. This phase is called the yolk segregation phase<sup>31</sup> and corresponds to a reduction in the size of the cells due to the extrusion of the yolk from the forming cells, as well as the start of active cellular movement<sup>31,35,46</sup>. Finally, during gastrulation, the motion of cells diminishes to what will become the baseline cellular velocity during germ band formation. While these results are robust within this embryo, they must be subjected to replication in future studies, since only a single embryo was used to assess these dynamics.

I then asked what the contribution of each germ layer lineage was to the total amount of cells in the embryo during early embryogenesis. I first plotted each track as a tree, where all lines represent a cell and are colored by the originating blastomere (Figure 5.8). I then calculated the contribution of each blastomere to the cell population at 60hpf, as well as the contribution of each germ layer (Figure 5.8). The ectoderm contributed the majority (79%) of cells. This was expected, as most of the mesoderm is generated during the segmentation of the germ band, which only starts towards the end of the recording<sup>32,35,47</sup>. I then plotted the contribution of each blastomere lineage and germ layer to the cell population over time (Figure 5.8). At first, the mesoderm and ectoderm lineages contribute equally to the cell population (by the 8 and 16 cell stages, 3 and 6 (respectively) of the blastomeres are from the mesoderm and ectoderm lineages<sup>32,35</sup>) (Figure 5.8). However, by the time gastrulation starts, the proportion of cells is already heavily skewed towards the ectodermal lineage, with 77% of the cells coming from El, Er, or Ep (Figure 5.8). This proportion maintains itself until 52hpf, when the contribution from other lineages starts to increase again (Figure 5.8). Importantly, no descendants of El, Er, and Ep disappeared, and all were fully tracked. Therefore the contribution from unknown lineages cannot come from the ectoderm. However, due to the loss of cells to the tracking process from

the other lineages during gastrulation, I was not able to assign a direct lineage identity to 19% of the population by 60hpf (Figure 5.8).

Finally, I characterized two major cellular rearrangements during gastrulation and the formation of the germ band. First, right before gastrulation, the cells go from a state of random motion to one of directed motion towards the anterior pole of the embryo (Figure 5.9). This pole is located at the point where the descendants of El, Er, and Ep cross (Figure 5.9). This directed motion is followed by the ingression of the descendants of Mav and en between cells coming from El and Er. Mav and en descendants subsequently migrate inside the embryo forming a second layer of cells under the descendants of El and Er, which migrate over that area via epiboly (Figure 5.9). Second, the cells from Ep that will form the midline lying between El and Er descendants, comes from a small group of precursor cells. These precursor cells are slowly engulfed between descendants of El and Er. However, the lineage boundaries are already present after gastrulation and slowly refine themselves subsequently (Figure 5.9).

Without the study of more embryos to confirm those results, it is not possible to conclude whether the observed cell rearrangement, cellular territories, lineages proportion, division rates, and nuclei dynamic observed here are variable or conserved between embryos. However, this pilot experiment demonstrates the feasibility of these methods to successfully image, track, and analyze the early development of *P. hawaiensis* at the single-cell resolution.



**Figure 5.7: Analysis of cell division rates and nuclear velocities in the tracked WT01\_11-17.** Four different key developmental processes are represented by grey backgrounds. Each process is annotated in a. **a**) 1h rolling average of the number of nuclei at each time point. Due to the exponential nature of cell division, the number of nuclei is represented on a log scale. Black dotted lines represent the linear regression for the number of nuclei. Each regression was performed on the subset of time points representing a developmental process. All four regressions have a p-value < 0.05. Inflection points are shown by black arrows. **b**) Average velocity of nuclei at each measured time point. The developmental stages are shown in grey following the order and annotation drawn in a.

**Figure 5.8** (following page): **Analysis of blastoderm and germ lineage dynamics during the early embryogenesis of** *P. hawaiensis.* **a**) Tree representation of blastoderm lineages derived from the WT01\_11-17 tracked embryo. Each blastomere is colored according to the legend at the bottom of the figure. Each division generates a horizontal line while time goes from top to bottom. If a track stops it means that the cell was lost during tracking. All tracks that could not be mapped back to a blastomere were removed from this representation. **b**) Analysis of the number of cells coming from each blastoderm lineage at 60hpf. The total number of cells was counted and plotted on a bar plot. Cells from unknown lineages (ukn) are displayed in grey. **c**) Analysis of the number of cells participating in each germ layer at 60hpf. The total number of cells was counted and plotted on a bar plot. Cells from unknown lineages are displayed in grey. **d**) Contribution of each blastoderm lineage to the total number of cells during the first 60 hours of embryogenesis. At each time point, the number of cells from each lineage was extracted from the annotations and the ratio to the total number of cells in the embryo computed. Each ratio was then plotted on a time stackplot and each area was colored by the blastoderm lineage. **e**) Contribution of each germ layer to the total number of cells during the first 60 hours of embryogenesis. At each time point, the number of cells from each germ layer was extracted from the annotations and the ratio to the total number of cells in the embryo computed. Each ratio was then plotted on a time stackplot and each area was colored by the blastoderm lineage. **e**) Contribution of each germ layer to the total number of cells during the first 60 hours of embryogenesis. At each time point, the number of cells from each germ layer was extracted from the annotations and the ratio to the total number of cells in the embryo computed. Each ratio was then plotted on a time stackplot and each area was co

Figure 5.8: (continued)



**Figure 5.9** (following page): Analysis of cellular movement during gastrulation and formation of the midline. A sphere was mapped onto the embryo and used to project each cell position to a 2D representation via a Mercator projection. Cells are colored by their blastoderm lineage. Blastoderm lineage borders of cell territories are schematized using dashed lines and text annotation. The site of gastrulation is represented via a greyed dashed circle. The ventral midline is represented via a red shade and dashed border. Cell movement is represented by a vector; the direction of the vector is the direction of movement and the length of the vector is proportional to the velocity of the cell between this time point and the next. **a)** Visualisation of the gastrulation on the Mercator projections. Four representative time points of gastrulation were selected and annotated here. **b)** Visualization of the ventral midline. Two representative time points of midline migration and formation were selected and annotated here.

Figure 5.9: (continued)



#### 5.3.3 The effect of loss of a blastomere on morphogenesis

As mentioned before, upon ablation of one of the eight cell stage blastomere from the ectodermal or mesodermal lineages, the embryo is capable of compensating for the missing lineage by the germ band stage (Chapter 4: Figures 4.2 and 4.3)<sup>48</sup>. This display of intra-germ layer compensation may seem at first counterintuitive given the high level of stereotypic divisions in the early embryo<sup>32,35,48</sup> (Figure 5.10). To better understand how such compensation could occur, I designed in collaboration with Anastasios Pavlopoulos and Cassandra Extavour an experiment to study the compensation of the loss of one of the right or left Ectoderm lineage founder blastomeres (El or Er). We chose to ablate El or Er for two main reasons: First, as we have seen above, the ectoderm lineage remains at the surface of the embryo and is, therefore, easier to track and image with light sheet microscopy. Second, the Er (or El) cells are regenerated from both the Ep and El (or Er) cell lineages (<sup>48</sup>). This implies that two embryonic body plan boundaries must be crossed, the Anterior-Posterior boundary with cells from the Ep lineage invading the anterior part, and the Right-Left boundary with cells from El (resp. Er) invading the right side of the embryo or vice versa. Using the previously developed blastomere ablation technique<sup>33</sup> Cassandra Extavour and I ablated the Er blastomere in embryos injected with tracer mRNA. The first part of this experiment was done exactly as described in the previous section. Then, at the eight cell stage, we performed the ablation of Er, then waited for one hour for the embryo to recover (Figure 5.10) before mounting and imaging three embryos per experiment on the SimView scope as described previously. In total six successful ablations were recorded in two experiments (Table 5.2). The datasets were then registered successfully. One of the embryos was lost during the recording at time point 124. To date, no further analysis has been performed on those datasets.



**Figure 5.10: Schematic and visual representation of the blastomere ablation experiments. a)** Schematic representation of the ablation experiment adapted from <sup>48</sup>. Each of the three ectodermal blastoderms, El, Er, and Ep, were ablated while another blastomere was injected with a dye. The results of the experiments are presented in the schematic representation of germband embryos. b) Representative images of the blastomere ablation experiments performed at the Janelia Research Campus. Two of the 6 recorded embryos are shown here, showing an ablation or Er. Embryos were injected at the one-cell stage with mRNA for H2A-mCherry and Lyn-GFP.

Date	Name	Ablated cell	Angles (equally spaced)	time points	Time reso- lution	Status
11-2018	Ablated_01	Er	6 angles	433	10mn	Registered
11-2018	Ablated_02	Er	6 angles	433	10mn	Registered
11-2018	Ablated_03	Er	6 angles	330	10mn	Registered
11-2018	Ablated_04	Er	6 angles	124	12mn	Registered
11-2018	Ablated_05	Mav	6 angles	331	12mn	Registered
11-2018	Ablated_06	Er	6 angles	331	12mn	Registered

**Table 5.2:** List of all embryos successfully ablated and imaged using the SimView microscope. The date and name of each embryo are reported along with the identity of the ablated blastomere. Metadata regarding the dataset are reported in the subsequent columns. Finally, the current status of the dataset is reported in the last column.

#### 5.4 Discussion

In this chapter, I described the recording of the early embryogenesis of P. hawaiensis using light sheet microscopy. This project generated high-quality datasets of wild type embryos developing for 3 or 4 days. However, I did not finish the complete tracking and analysis of all embryos. As described in the introduction, the challenges of automatizing the analysis of three-dimensional datasets are not yet solved. Despite this, I generated full tracks of a wild type embryo that can now be used to try and test any algorithm against. I believe that automated approaches are needed due to the extensive amount of time necessary to track a single embryo from start to finish. For any comparative study involving a sufficient amount of embryos for statistics to be derived, I believe that a fully (or almost fully) automated pipeline must be developed. The embryo that I tracked can be used to train a deep learning model thanks to the vast amount of data contained in a single dataset. For example, considering only the last 100 time points of the dataset, the 1000 nuclei per frame, the three dimensions of the cube, and image augmentation, it would be possible to generate one million annotated nuclei to train a deep learning algorithm. New methods such as the star-convex deep learning algorithm StarDist<sup>25</sup> could in principle be trained with 1% of the potential data annotated here, given that successful segmentation is reported with as few as four training volumes containing >1000 nuclei<sup>25</sup>).

Beyond the segmentation of nuclei, the tracking of nuclei in three dimensions is a current challenge<sup>20</sup>. New object tracking algorithms in three dimensions have been proposed, such as the time-reversed flow algorithm used in the tracking of the mouse embryo in the Keller

laboratory<sup>10</sup>, or the Baxter algorithm<sup>49</sup>. Using tracks I generated for my embryonic dataset WT01\_11-17, it should be possible to assess the accuracy of those algorithms and to tune their hyperparameters such that optimal tracking can be achieved.

In the final part of this chapter, I discussed the advances that I made towards understanding the processes underlying the intra-germ layer regeneration. By using the same imaging techniques that were successful for the wild type embryos, and by leveraging the ablation protocol developed previously in the lab, I generated a large microscopy dataset of regenerating embryos. The tracking of nuclei in these datasets will need to be performed in the future, and should be automatized as discussed above. This dataset holds the potential for fascinating discoveries on morphogenesis and the establishment of cellular territories. By comparing the motions and positions of cells of the ectodermal lineage, hypotheses towards the establishment of the strict boundaries may be established. Similarly, future studies of what other processes may be involved in the compensatory mechanisms will shine a light on this regenerative property.

I note that I used only half of the data generated, namely the nuclear information, and did not analyze the membrane channel. Another current Ph.D. student in the Extavour laboratory, Beatrice Steinert, has successfully used the surface projection tool IMSane<sup>50</sup> to create two-dimensional projections of the membranes of embryonic dataset WT01\_11-17. This information can be used in the future to study the morphogenetic changes happening during the development of *P. hawaiensis*. For example, these data can help to determine the cellular rearrangements that are required for the establishment of the grid stage.

Finally, the experiments of both the preceding chapter and this chapter have been the most challenging I have ever executed. The diversity of skills required for the successful completion of this project was probably, in hindsight, too high for a single person. Moreover, the amount of time required for each step made this project complex to finish within the timespan of a Ph.D. Nevertheless, this has also been extremely inspiring, and I consider the successes regarding the collection of rich light sheet datasets in itself a great contribution. I look forward to the completion of the analysis of those datasets by future researchers.

### References

- H Siedentopf and R Zsigmondy. Uber sichtbarmachung und größenbestimmung ultramikoskopischer teilchen, mit besonderer anwendung auf goldrubingläser. *Annalen der Physik*, 315(1):1–39, 1902.
- [2] John William Strutt. LVIII. on the scattering of light by small particles. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science.*, 41(275):447–454, 1871.
- [3] Jichao Li, Yian Yin, Santo Fortunato, and Dashun Wang. A dataset of publication records for nobel laureates. *Sci Data*, 6(1):33, April 2019.
- [4] Philipp J Keller and Hans-Ulrich Dodt. Light sheet microscopy of living or cleared specimens. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.*, 22(1):138–143, February 2012.
- [5] C J R Sheppard. Advanced light microscopy. vol. 2. specialized methods. J. Mod. Opt., 37
  (7):1277–1278, July 1990.
- [6] Jan Huisken, Jim Swoger, Filippo Del Bene, Joachim Wittbrodt, and Ernst H K Stelzer.
  Optical sectioning deep inside live embryos by selective plane illumination microscopy. *Science*, 305(5686):1007–1009, August 2004.
- [7] Raju Tomer, Khaled Khairy, Fernando Amat, and Philipp J Keller. Quantitative high-speed imaging of entire developing embryos with simultaneous multiview light-sheet microscopy. *Nat. Methods*, 9(7):755–763, June 2012.
- [8] Philipp J Keller, Francesco Pampaloni, and Ernst Hk Stelzer. Life sciences require the third dimension. *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.*, 18(1):117–124, February 2006.

- [9] Philipp J Keller, Annette D Schmidt, Anthony Santella, Khaled Khairy, Zhirong Bao, Joachim Wittbrodt, and Ernst H K Stelzer. Fast, high-contrast imaging of animal development with scanned light sheet–based structured-illumination microscopy. *Nat. Methods*, 7(8):637–642, August 2010.
- [10] Katie McDole, Léo Guignard, Fernando Amat, Andrew Berger, Grégoire Malandain, Loïc A Royer, Srinivas C Turaga, Kristin Branson, and Philipp J Keller. In toto imaging and reconstruction of Post-Implantation mouse development at the Single-Cell level. *Cell*, 175 (3):859–876.e33, October 2018.
- [11] Carsten Wolff, Jean-Yves Tinevez, Tobias Pietzsch, Evangelia Stamataki, Benjamin Harich, Léo Guignard, Stephan Preibisch, Spencer Shorte, Philipp J Keller, Pavel Tomancak, and Anastasios Pavlopoulos. Multi-view light-sheet imaging and tracking with the MaMuT software reveals the cell lineage of a direct developing arthropod limb. March 2018.
- [12] Frederic Strobl, Selina Klees, and Ernst H K Stelzer. Light sheet-based fluorescence microscopy of living or fixed and stained tribolium castaneum embryos. J. Vis. Exp., (122), April 2017.
- [13] Anna Kaufmann, Michaela Mickoleit, Michael Weber, and Jan Huisken. Multilayer mounting enables long-term imaging of zebrafish development in a light sheet microscope. *Development*, 139(17):3242–3247, September 2012.
- [14] Takehiko Ichikawa, Kenichi Nakazato, Philipp J Keller, Hiroko Kajiura-Kobayashi, Ernst H K Stelzer, Atsushi Mochizuki, and Shigenori Nonaka. Live imaging and quantitative analysis of gastrulation in mouse embryos using light-sheet microscopy and 3D tracking tools. *Nat. Protoc.*, 9(3):575–585, March 2014.
- [15] William C Lemon, Stefan R Pulver, Burkhard Höckendorf, Katie McDole, Kristin Branson, Jeremy Freeman, and Philipp J Keller. Whole-central nervous system functional imaging in larval drosophila. *Nature Communications*, 6(1), 2015.
- [16] Raghav K Chhetri, Fernando Amat, Yinan Wan, Burkhard Höckendorf, William C Lemon, and Philipp J Keller. Whole-animal functional and developmental imaging with isotropic
spatial resolution. *Nat. Methods*, 12(12):1171–1178, December 2015.

- [17] Stephan Preibisch, Stephan Saalfeld, Johannes Schindelin, and Pavel Tomancak. Software for bead-based registration of selective plane illumination microscopy data. *Nat. Methods*, 7(6):418–419, June 2010.
- [18] Stephan Preibisch, Stephan Saalfeld, and Pavel Tomancak. Globally optimal stitching of tiled 3D microscopic image acquisitions. *Bioinformatics*, 25(11):1463–1465, June 2009.
- [19] Stephan Preibisch, Fernando Amat, Evangelia Stamataki, Mihail Sarov, Robert H Singer,
   Eugene Myers, and Pavel Tomancak. Efficient bayesian-based multiview deconvolution.
   Nat. Methods, 11(6):645–648, June 2014.
- [20] Vladimír Ulman, Martin Maška, Klas E G Magnusson, Olaf Ronneberger, Carsten Haubold, Nathalie Harder, Pavel Matula, Petr Matula, David Svoboda, Miroslav Radojevic, Ihor Smal, Karl Rohr, Joakim Jaldén, Helen M Blau, Oleh Dzyubachyk, Boudewijn Lelieveldt, Pengdong Xiao, Yuexiang Li, Siu-Yeung Cho, Alexandre C Dufour, Jean-Christophe Olivo-Marin, Constantino C Reyes-Aldasoro, Jose A Solis-Lemus, Robert Bensch, Thomas Brox, Johannes Stegmaier, Ralf Mikut, Steffen Wolf, Fred A Hamprecht, Tiago Esteves, Pedro Quelhas, Ömer Demirel, Lars Malmström, Florian Jug, Pavel Tomancak, Erik Meijering, Arrate Muñoz-Barrutia, Michal Kozubek, and Carlos Ortiz-de Solorzano. An objective comparison of cell-tracking algorithms. *Nat. Methods*, 14(12):1141–1152, December 2017.
- [21] Anne E Carpenter, Thouis R Jones, Michael R Lamprecht, Colin Clarke, In Han Kang, Ola Friman, David A Guertin, Joo Han Chang, Robert A Lindquist, Jason Moffat, Polina Golland, and David M Sabatini. CellProfiler: image analysis software for identifying and quantifying cell phenotypes. *Genome Biol.*, 7(10):R100, October 2006.
- [22] Stuart Berg, Dominik Kutra, Thorben Kroeger, Christoph N Straehle, Bernhard X Kausler, Carsten Haubold, Martin Schiegg, Janez Ales, Thorsten Beier, Markus Rudy, Kemal Eren, Jaime I Cervantes, Buote Xu, Fynn Beuttenmueller, Adrian Wolny, Chong Zhang, Ullrich Koethe, Fred A Hamprecht, and Anna Kreshuk. ilastik: interactive machine learning for (bio)image analysis. *Nat. Methods*, 16(12):1226–1232, December 2019.

- [23] Xiaomeng Li, Hao Chen, Xiaojuan Qi, Qi Dou, Chi-Wing Fu, and Pheng-Ann Heng.
   H-DenseUNet: Hybrid densely connected UNet for liver and tumor segmentation from CT volumes. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging*, 37(12):2663–2674, December 2018.
- [24] Fernando Amat, William Lemon, Daniel P Mossing, Katie McDole, Yinan Wan, Kristin Branson, Eugene W Myers, and Philipp J Keller. Fast, accurate reconstruction of cell lineages from large-scale fluorescence microscopy data. *Nat. Methods*, 11(9):951–958, September 2014.
- [25] Martin Weigert, Uwe Schmidt, Robert Haase, Ko Sugawara, and Gene Myers. Star-convex polyhedra for 3d object detection and segmentation in microscopy. In *The IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 3666–3673, 2020.
- [26] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-Net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. May 2015.
- [27] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [28] C Stringer, M Michaelos, and M Pachitariu. Cellpose: a generalist algorithm for cellular segmentation. *bioRxiv*, 2020.
- [29] D Kao, A G Lai, E Stamataki, S Rosic, N Konstantinides, E Jarvis, and A Aboobaker. The genome of the crustacean parhyale hawaiensio: a model for animal development, regeneration, immunity and lignocellulose digestioon. biorxiv 65789. 2016.
- [30] Tobias Pietzsch, Stephan Saalfeld, Stephan Preibisch, and Pavel Tomancak.
   BigDataViewer: visualization and processing for large image data sets. *Nat. Methods*, 12(6): 481–483, June 2015.
- [31] William E Browne, Alivia L Price, Matthias Gerberding, and Nipam H Patel. Stages of embryonic development in the amphipod crustacean, parhyale hawaiensis. *Genesis*, 42(3): 124–149, July 2005.

- [32] Matthias Gerberding, William E Browne, and Nipam H Patel. Cell lineage analysis of the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis reveals an early restriction of cell fates. *Development*, 129(24):5789–5801, December 2002.
- [33] Cassandra G Extavour Anastasia R. Nast. Ablation of a single cell from eight-cell embryos of the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *J. Vis. Exp.*, (85), 2014.
- [34] Cassandra G Extavour. The fate of isolated blastomeres with respect to germ cell formation in the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Dev. Biol.*, 277(2):387–402, January 2005.
- [35] Frederike Alwes, Billy Hinchen, and Cassandra G Extavour. Patterns of cell lineage, movement, and migration from germ layer specification to gastrulation in the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Dev. Biol.*, 359(1):110–123, November 2011.
- [36] NetworkX. https://networkx.github.io/,. Accessed: 2020-9-22.
- [37] seaborn. https://seaborn.pydata.org/, . Accessed: 2020-9-22.
- [38] Charles F Jekel. *Obtaining non-linear orthotropic material models for PVC-coated polyester via inverse bubble inflation*. PhD thesis, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University, 2016.
- [39] Gerard Mercator. Nova Et Aucta Orbis Terrae Descriptio Ad Usum Navigantium Emendate Accommodata. 1569.
- [40] Misha B Ahrens, Michael B Orger, Drew N Robson, Jennifer M Li, and Philipp J Keller.
   Whole-brain functional imaging at cellular resolution using light-sheet microscopy. *Nat. Methods*, 10(5):413–420, May 2013.
- [41] E Jay Rehm, Roberta L Hannibal, R Crystal Chaw, Mario A Vargas-Vila, and Nipam H Patel. Injection of parhyale hawaiensis blastomeres with fluorescently labeled tracers. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, 2009(1):db.prot5128, January 2009.
- [42] Lee Kamentsky, Thouis R Jones, Adam Fraser, Mark-Anthony Bray, David J Logan, Katherine L Madden, Vebjorn Ljosa, Curtis Rueden, Kevin W Eliceiri, and Anne E

Carpenter. Improved structure, function and compatibility for CellProfiler: modular high-throughput image analysis software. *Bioinformatics*, 27(8):1179–1180, 2011.

- [43] Khin Yadanar Win, Somsak Choomchuay, Kazuhiko Hamamoto, and Manasanan Raveesunthornkiat. Comparative study on automated cell nuclei segmentation methods for cytology pleural effusion images. *J. Healthc. Eng.*, 2018:9240389, September 2018.
- [44] Feixiao Long. Microscopy cell nuclei segmentation with enhanced U-Net. BMC Bioinformatics, 21(1):8, January 2020.
- [45] Uwe Schmidt, Martin Weigert, Coleman Broaddus, and Gene Myers. Cell detection with Star-Convex polygons. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2018*, pages 265–273. Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- [46] R Crystal Chaw and Nipam H Patel. Independent migration of cell populations in the early gastrulation of the amphipod crustacean parhyale hawaiensis. *Dev. Biol.*, 371(1):94–109, November 2012.
- [47] Roberta L Hannibal, Alivia L Price, Ronald J Parchem, and Nipam H Patel. Analysis of snail genes in the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis: insight into snail gene family evolution. *Dev. Genes Evol.*, 222(3):139–151, May 2012.
- [48] Alivia L Price, Melinda S Modrell, Roberta L Hannibal, and Nipam H Patel. Mesoderm and ectoderm lineages in the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis display intra-germ layer compensation. *Developmental Biology*, 341(1):256–266, 2010.
- [49] Klas E G Magnusson, Joakim Jalden, Penney M Gilbert, and Helen M Blau. Global linking of cell tracks using the viterbi algorithm. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging*, 34(4):911–929, April 2015.
- [50] Idse Heemskerk and Sebastian J Streichan. Tissue cartography: compressing bio-image data by dimensional reduction. *Nat. Methods*, 12(12):1139–1142, December 2015.

Cyberspace. A consensual hallucination experienced daily by billions of legitimate operators, in every nation, by children being taught mathematical concepts... A graphic representation of data abstracted from banks of every computer in the human system. Unthinkable complexity. Lines of light ranged in the nonspace of the mind, clusters and constellations of data. Like city lights, receding...

William Gibson, Neuromancer, 1989



# Diving in the third dimension, virtual reality for the analysis of volumetric microscopy

#### ABSTRACT

From hand drawing to digital images, the way we record microscopy observation evolved drastically over the last centuries. Light sheet microscopy provides researchers with isomorphic three-dimensional images of biological samples. To observe the datasets generated in Chapter 5, I developed a software that allows the visualization of 3D images in Virtual Reality. By using a Ray Marching rendering shader, volumetric images can be imported and manipulated in a virtual environment. The environment implemented image processing such as contrast and intensity adjustments, slicing, and multi-channel rendering. I designed a virtual interface that allowed the user to change images settings. Moreover, I added the capacity for a user to play through a 3D + time dataset. Finally, I created a visualizer for nuclei tracking annotations to observe the tracks generated in Chapter 5.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I want to thank the members of the Extavour laboratory who tried and tested different iterations of this tool, especially Taro Nakamura who provided numerous datasets and extensively explored this VR environment. Moreover, I want to thank my friends Marc Santolini and Juan Giraldo for countless nights where they tried some new functionality, even though biology was not their area of expertise.

# 6.1 Introduction

In Chapter 5, I generated 4D datasets of developing embryos. Few software packages allow the import and observation of such large datasets. The tool I used throughout my thesis is BigDataViewer<sup>1</sup>, a FIJI plugin developed for the express purpose of observing very large 4D microscopy datasets. However, despite its ease of use, BigDataViewer only allows the dynamic observation of slices through the dataset, and does not offer a reconstructed 3D view of the object. The software package Blender<sup>2</sup> allows users to observe 3D images, but does not support the fourth dimension of time. When it came to tracking nuclei, having to follow objects in 3D by observing a 2D slice was quite arduous and took a long time in Blender. Finally, all of these software packages project a three dimensional object onto a 2D image, approximating the depth information via perspective rules. Therefore, I aimed to build an alternative solution to observe 4D datasets.

I wanted this tool to solve multiple issues. First it needed to render the object in 3D and not as a 2D projection. Second, it needed to allow for the time axis such that 4D datasets could be loaded. Third, it needed to allow image parameter tuning, such as contrast and intensity. Fourth, it needed to be able to support the placements of annotations in 3D space to simplify tracking. I decided to use Virtual Reality as the underlying technology to address these issues. This chapter describes the advances that I made towards creating a tool to achieve these goals. The development of this tool relies on the previous work of many researchers to create hardware and software solutions tailored to the rendering of datasets. To place my work in this context, I first start by giving a short introduction to the history of computer rendering and

285

virtual reality. I then present the challenges of 3D images and the rendering methodology I chose to use. Finally I present the current context of VR development for microscopy analysis.

#### 6.1.1 The many ways computers render images

With the advent of personal computers, one of the early artistic fields of programming was computer graphics (examples such as Thompson<sup>3</sup> and reviewed in Tom<sup>4</sup>). Two main groups of people used this technology, the movie industry, and the hacker cracker scene (discussed in Silvast and Reunanen<sup>5</sup>). Starting in the 1970s, both groups started to create increasingly complex and artistic images (discussed in Silvast and Reunanen<sup>5</sup>). To this day, I believe that there remains a nostalgia of a time in the field of computer graphics that was governed by the rise of the demoscene<sup>5</sup>, an underground hacker artistic movement consisting of creating stunning computer graphics animations that would push beyond the foreseen limits of the available hardware of their time<sup>5,6</sup>. Programmers would show their skills, coding software as small as a few kilobytes of code, creating stunning 3D artistic universes (discussed in Silvast and Reunanen<sup>5</sup>). Up until the end of the 1990s, each program had to use the programming language integrated into the graphical processing unit (GPU) (reviewed by Blythe<sup>7</sup>) and each device had a different access point interface (API) (reviewed by Blythe<sup>7</sup>). This changed with the invention in the 1980s<sup>8</sup> of GPUs capable of executing a new, foreign set of instructions called a shader (the idea for shaders is credited to Cook<sup>8</sup> and discussed in Hanrahan and Lawson<sup>9</sup>). With shaders, it was possible to execute an arbitrary set of logic rules, opening the doors for artists to experiment at will. First with the invention of RenderMan in 1988 by Pixar<sup>10</sup>, and then democratized by Nvidia in 2001 with the Geforce 3 GPU<sup>11</sup>, shaders became the central pillar of modern computer graphics<sup>7</sup>. Today many shading languages exist and are used by different software packages and for different applications (discussed and reviewed in \citet{<sup>12</sup>}), but one of the most commonly used languages is the OpenGL Shading Language (GLSL)<sup>13,14</sup>. While the demoscene still exists, the shading scene developed the concept of programmed computer graphics further. Today Visual DJs and digital artists use the power of shaders to generate stunning graphics<sup>15</sup>.

### 6.1.2 A short history of Virtual Reality and real-time rendering

Using the power of shaders, developers of game engines built the first tools allowing the creation and rendering of complex 3D graphics in Real-Time<sup>16,17</sup>. The advent of real-time rendering opened the doors for today's vast array of games, simulations, data visualization tools, and much more. Multiple game engines were invented, each with different strengths and weaknesses, and each using different programming paradigms (reviewed by Paul et al. <sup>18</sup>). Today, the most popular ones (in term of number of game created using said engine<sup>19,20</sup>) are Unreal Engine<sup>21</sup> and Unity<sup>22</sup>, along with the rising open-source engine Godot<sup>23</sup>. Those engines allow for the creation of customized tools such as the one presented here and custom rendering through the creation of shaders<sup>21,22</sup>. This capacity to program unique behavior using the GPU compute potential is what allowed me to create the pilot Virtual Reality (VR) tool that I present in this chapter.

Here I define Virtual Reality as a technology whereby the user is immersed in a non-reality-bound universe, often 3D rendered. The user's perception is tricked into believing that what their eyes are seeing is real, even if they are actually a computer-generated projection. I would argue that the first step toward the invention of Virtual Reality started with the creation of the stereoscope in 1838 by Sir Charles Wheatstone<sup>24</sup>. Using the concept of stereoscopy, the cinematographer Morton Heilig created Sensorama in the 1960s<sup>25</sup>, a virtual reality booth offering viewers a 3D stereoscopic movie with vibration, scents, sound, and wind (Figure 6.1). He later invented the Telesphere Mask, what we would today refer to as a Virtual Reality Headset or a Head-Mounted Display (HMD)<sup>26</sup> (Figure 6.1). However, this invention lacked a critical aspect for the immersion of the user, namely the motion tracking of the head. In 1965, Ivan Sutherland invented another HMD that did track the user's head, linking it to computer rendering software that changed the position of the virtual camera to fully immerse the user in a virtual world<sup>27</sup>. He called this display the Ultimate Display<sup>27,28</sup> (Figure 6.1), and from this technology emerged what we know of today as Virtual Reality (reviewed by Mandal<sup>29</sup>) (Figure 6.1). Until the creation of the Oculus headset in 2012 (patented in 2014<sup>30</sup>), HMD remained bulky, expensive, and ill-equipped tools (reviewed by Mandal<sup>29</sup>). At the time of its creation, the first Oculus HMD could only track the user's head in three degrees of freedom (3

287

DoF) (Figure 6.1), therefore the user's position in space was not registered by the computer, and the position of the virtual camera was not updated<sup>30</sup>. Later iterations by Oculus, and then by HTC<sup>31</sup> and Valve<sup>32</sup> allowed for the creation of the fully immersive HMD now commercially available (Figure 6.1). Those headsets all possess 6 DoF, tracking not only the user's head direction but also its position (Figure 6.1). The addition of hand controllers permitted the projection of the user's hands in the simulation, increasing the immersion, and allowing for direct interactions with virtual objects (Figure 6.1).



е



pitch yaw rotation x position y position z position

**Figure 6.1: History of VR headset technological development. a)** First virtual reality cinema, the Sensorama created in 1956 by Morton Heilig (image from Heilig<sup>25</sup>). **b)** First patented design for a virtual reality HMD designed by Morton Heilig, the Telesphere (image from Heilig<sup>26</sup>). **c)** Photographs of the Ultimate Display system created by Ivan Sutherland (images from the original paper Sutherland<sup>28</sup>) **d)** Schematic representation of 3 and 6 degrees of freedom (DoF) applied to virtual reality motion tracking. **e)** Example of modern virtual reality headsets, from left to right Oculus Rift, HTC Vive, Valve Index.

#### 6.1.3 Rendering 3D images and the implications for light sheet data

I generated the datasets I used to develop the software I present here with light sheet microscopy, which was introduced at length in Chapter 5 of this thesis. After processing those microscopy datasets, the final result is a volumetric image, defined as a three-dimensional image composed of voxels whose positions are defined by three orthogonal euclidian axes, here called x, y, and z (Figure 6.2). Contrary to a two-dimensional image (Figure 6.2), a volumetric image cannot be directly rendered onto a 2D computer screen without being projected to two dimensions. The stereoscopic nature of Virtual Reality makes it possible to render such an image in three dimensions, each eye is only observing a two-dimensional projection of the scene, shifted slightly such that the brain reconstructs it into three dimensions (Figure 6.2).

A rendering technique is a set of instructions that will take the elements in a virtual environment, and generate an image that can be visualized on a screen. One technique to render volumetric images is called Ray Marching<sup>33</sup>. For each pixel to be rendered, one virtual ray will be projected from the virtual camera, with position O (for origin) and in the direction  $\vec{D}$ (Figure 6.3). If O is a point in space and  $\vec{D}$  a normalized vector, then we can define any point along that line by  $P = O + t * \vec{D}$ , where *t* is a scalar corresponding to the distance along the ray to the origin (Figure 6.3). To sample our 3D image, for each pixel, the shader computes the sum of intensity values along that ray at multiple positions P, where at each step we increase t with a small value dt (Figure 6.3). When we reach the end of the 3D image we stop and we return the total value for that pixel. The resulting image will be a sum of intensity projection of our 3D image onto a 2D image (Figure 6.3). One can then change this shader, for example, to return the maximum value, or the minimum value, or any other mathematical function. Furthermore, the values returned can then be blended in with a Look-Up Table (LUT), the intensity modified, or the values scaled non linearly through a power law. Moreover, multiple performance improvements can be coded into this shader, such as an automatic loop break when the sum of intensity reaches its maximum allowed value of 1.0, which avoids extraneous dt steps. Another performance improvement is the breakdown of the volume into smaller cubes, where each cube that does not contain information is removed from the rendering pipeline. This later technique can be further improved for performance by dynamically rendering (culling) the cubes facing



**Figure 6.2: Construction of 2D, 3D images and stereoscopy. a)** schematic representation of a 2D image. Each pixel is represented by a set of 5 values, its position in the grid as x and y, and color as red (r) green (g) and blue (b) values. **b)** Schematic representation of a 3D image. Each voxel is represented as a cube with a position in space given by x y and z as well as a transparency value alpha (a). **c)** Example of a stereoscopic rendering of a *P. hawaiensis* embryo at stage S6 imaged with a light sheet microscope. In red nuclei are shown and in green the membrane are shown. The 3D image is rendered from two different camera points distanced by the average interpupillary distance to mimic three-dimensional vision. To see this object in 3D, place a sheet of paper between both images and look at them with the left and right eye only seeing the left or right image (a good tutorial on how to do this can be found here: ).



**Figure 6.3: Schematic representation of Ray Marching. a)** 3D schematic showing the projection of rays from the camera onto a 3D image. Each ray (in red) crosses the image plane at the center of each pixel then continues towards the 3D image. **b)** Schematic 2D projection of Ray Marching. Each ray is projected from the camera and may intersect the 3D image. In case it intersects, it will then sample the image along the ray every *dt*. The pixel value for that ray will be, for example, the sum of sampled values along the ray.

the camera. Finally, new rendering techniques, albeit more complex to implement, have been developed to allow the real time rendering of very large volumetric dataset<sup>34,35</sup>. In this chapter, I will describe the coding of a primitive Ray Marching shader for Unity, which uses simple performance enhancement.

Finally, while this chapter focuses on the rendering of microscopy images, the software that I have begun to create is in principle not limited to the observation of 3D microphotographs, but rather should be able to load any volumetric image. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (reviewed in Williams and Drew<sup>36</sup>) and Computed Tomography scans (reviewed in Williams and Drew<sup>36</sup>) are two imaging techniques that generate a 3D image of the (often human) specimen. The medical field has been using specialized tools and software allowing for the rendering and analysis of such datasets for a long time (reviewed in El Beheiry et al.<sup>37</sup>, Feng et al.<sup>38</sup>). However, these tools are specialized for the medical community and do not often offer the adjustment or analysis needed for other types of biological samples. For example, MedicalHolodeck<sup>39</sup> offers a VR visualizer for MRI and scan data , DICOM VR<sup>40</sup> lets you import DICOM datasets (a common file format for medical 3D images) and annotate areas by painting over structures. However, at the time of writing, the tool was still under development and not yet publicly available<sup>40</sup>. When I started this project, to my knowledge there existed For the visualization of microscopy datasets,

Earlier work with 3D screens and CAVE systems had developed VR tools<sup>41,42,43</sup>. When I started this project, to my knowledge there existed three softwares that allowed to import 3D microscopy datasets in HMD based VR: Arivis Vision VR<sup>44</sup> and syGlass<sup>45</sup> which are commercial products, and an open source and peer reviewed tool tailored to 3D colocalization analysis in confocal images<sup>46</sup>. Another study<sup>47</sup> reported the development of a tool to observe light sheet images but did not publish their code making it impossible to use or iterate on their research. Moreover, the use of VR was also developed for scientific communication such as Journey to the center of the cell<sup>48</sup> that used electron microscopy data of a cell to recreate a virtual cell. In between the time I started this project and the time of writing this thesis newer tools emerged such as ConfocalVR<sup>49</sup> which was developed to observe confocal 3D stacks in VR. Other microscopy techniques such as single molecule microscopy have also seen recent tools developed for such task<sup>50</sup>

Other aspects of biological systems are also starting to be integrated with VR system such as the observation of DNA, RNA and protein structure in BioVR<sup>51</sup>, or the co-creation of molecular simulations in VR<sup>52</sup>. Conectomics approaches are also seeing new VR tool to observe the results of electron microscopy stacks and allow users perform annotation or refine the segmentation<sup>53</sup>. Finally, a great review detailing the use of VR for data visualization in biology has recently been published<sup>37</sup>. Here, I present my work towards the creation of a VR software to enhance the perception of three-dimensional biological structures and the tracking of objects in 3D. The goal of this tool is to allow users to observe a 3D dataset and immerse themselves into, for example, a developing embryo. I aimed to allow users to use this tool to manipulate 3D data of biological tissues as a three-dimensional object, performing cuts, deformations, or annotations on the data directly in space, therefore in three dimensions. I (and others<sup>37</sup>) believe that this technology revolutionizes our intuitive understanding of biological systems as it is now possible to observe the entirety of the data in an immersive way instead of a two-dimensional projection.

293

# 6.2 Methods

#### 6.2.1 Development of the software

The software was developed in C# and Unity shader language for the Unity game engine<sup>54</sup>. The SteamVR and VRTK libraries were used for locomotion and interactions. The TextMeshPro library was used for the UI panels. The current development requires a steamVR or openXR compatible VR HMD. The code is available at https://gitlab.com/xqua/microscopy\_vr.

## 6.2.2 Ray Marching shader

The ray marching shader was coded in Unity shader language and can be found in the main repository: <u>https://gitlab.com/xqua/microscopy\_vr</u>. The shader is customizable via the following exposed parameters:

- \_**Data**: Data Texture -> Texture3D
- \_DataChannel: Data Channel for monochromatic dataset, normally use A8 so
   4th channel => Vector4(0,0,0,1)
- \_Axis: Axes order -> Vector3(1, 2, 3)
- \_TexFilling: Data filling factors -> Vector3(1.0, 1.0, 1.0)
- **\_Color**: Color for shading monochromatic dataset -> Vector3(1.0, 1.0, 1.0)
- \_SliceAxis1Min: Slice along axis X: min -> Range(0, 1)
- \_SliceAxis1Max: Slice along axis X: max -> Range(0, 1)
- \_SliceAxis2Min: Slice along axis Y: min -> Range(0, 1)
- \_SliceAxis2Max: Slice along axis Y: max -> Range(0, 1)
- \_SliceAxis3Min: Slice along axis Z: min -> Range(0, 1)
- \_SliceAxis3Max: Slice along axis Z: max -> Range(0, 1)
- \_C1: Channel 1 ON/OFF -> Range(0,1)

- \_C2: Channel 2 ON/OFF -> Range(0,1)
- \_C3: Channel 3 ON/OFF -> Range(0,1)
- **\_DataMinR**: R: Data threshold: min -> Range(0, 1)
- **\_DataMaxR**: R: Data threshold: max -> Range(0, 1)
- **\_DataMinG**: G: Data threshold: min -> Range(0, 1)
- **\_DataMaxG**: G: Data threshold: max -> Range(0, 1)
- **\_DataMinB:** B: Data threshold: min -> Range(0, 1)
- **\_DataMaxB:** B: Data threshold: max -> Range(0, 1)
- \_StretchPowerR: R: Data stretch power -> Range(0.1, 3)
- **\_StretchPowerG:** G: Data stretch power -> Range(0.1, 3)
- \_StretchPowerB: B: Data stretch power -> Range(0.1, 3)
- \_NormPerStepR: R: Intensity normalization per step -> Float
- \_NormPerStepG: G: Intensity normalization per step -> Float
- \_NormPerStepB: B: Intensity normalization per step -> Float
- \_NormPerRay: Intensity normalization per ray -> Float
- \_Steps: Max number of steps -> Range(1,1024)

#### 6.2.3 Conversion of BigDataViewer HDF5 files to RAW

The conversion of BigDataViewer HDF5 files onto RAW and JSON files was done using a custom python script. This script can be found in the LightSheetUtils repository. The parameters are Options:

-h, --help show this help message and exit

-i FILENAME, --input=FILENAME [REQUIRED] hdf5 file path

-o FILENAMEOUT, --output=FILENAMEOUT [REQUIRED] bin file path

-l LEVEL, --level=LEVEL [REQUIRED] resolution level to extract (0: full size, 1: 2x downsample,

2: 4x downsample, 3: 8x downsample)

-0 To, --timepoint-start=To first time point to extract

-n TN, --timepoint-end=TN last time point to extract

- -C, --multichannel Is the dataset a multichannel dataset?
- -N, --normalize Global intensity normalization?

-c CROP, --crop=CROP Number of pixels to crop from the cube

- -m MIN, --min=MIN Manually set the min. channel1, channel2
- -M MAX, --max=MAX Manually set the max. Channel1, channel2

#### 6.3 Results

#### Observing 3D images and coding a Ray Marching shader 6.3.1

I used Unity game engine to develop a Ray Marching shader to observe the P. hawaiensis light sheet data gathered in Chapter 5 in 3D. Tools to make the development of virtual reality applications had already been developed by others, such as the open source library Virtual Reality ToolKit (VRTK)<sup>55</sup>. Because 3D images are by nature a cuboid (three-dimensional rectangle), I needed to render them into a cuboidal mesh. Therefore the shader must project the 3D image onto the faces of that cube. To this end, the shader I coded needed to first detect the bounds of the cuboid, then the position of the faces so that the algorithm could start the ray marching steps from that point forward (Figure 6.3). This is achieved using the function IntersectBox shown in Listing 1:

Listing 1: Hitting the bounding box. This function takes a ray origin, a ray direction, the bounding box and returns a boolean that is true if the ray hits the bounding box. It also returns the closests and farthest points.

```
bool IntersectBox(float3 ray_o, float3 ray_d, float3 boxMin,
                  float3 boxMax, out float tNear, out float tFar)
{
    // compute intersection of ray with all six bbox planes
    float3 invR = 1.0 / ray_d;
    float3 tBot = invR * (boxMin.xyz - ray_o);
    float3 tTop = invR * (boxMax.xyz - ray_o);
    // re-order intersections to find smallest and largest on each axis
    float3 tMin = min (tTop, tBot);
    float3 tMax = max (tTop, tBot);
    // find the largest tMin and the smallest tMax
    float2 t0 = max (tMin.xx, tMin.yz);
    float largest_tMin = max (t0.x, t0.y);
    t0 = min (tMax.xx, tMax.yz);
    float smallest_tMax = min (t0.x, t0.y);
    // check for hit
    bool hit = (largest_tMin <= smallest_tMax);</pre>
    tNear = largest_tMin;
    tFar = smallest_tMax;
    return hit;
```

}

Listing 1 returns information on whether a ray from the camera hit an object, along with the two intersection distances  $t_{Near}$  and  $t_{Far}$  for that ray (as we have seen in the introduction, those t values correspond to a unique point P on the ray) (Figure 6.3). The Ray Marching loop is then

started from the originating point  $t_{Near}$ , then stops when we either hit our maximum saturation value of 1.0 for that pixel or when we hit the back of the cube  $t_{Far}$ . To perform the loop, a set dt is added to  $t_{Near}$  and the shader samples the 3D image at each new point *P*. Listing 2 shows the monochrome sampling function get\_data. The pixel value is then colorized by being multiplied by a set color.

```
Listing 2: Sampling data from the 3D image This function takes a position in the 3D image, samples the intensity value for that given voxel, and returned a color vector.
```

```
bool IntersectBox(float3 ray_o, float3 ray_d, float3 boxMin,
                  float3 boxMax, out float tNear, out float tFar)
{
. . .
}
// gets data value at a given position
float4 get_data(float3 pos) {
 // sample texture (pos is normalized in [0,1])
 // This sets the axis to read the texture, it allows to
 // change the order in which the texture is Loaded
  // For example it can reverse an axis or switch them
  float3 posTex = float3(pos[_Axis[0]-1],
                         pos[_Axis[1]-1],
                         pos[_Axis[2]-1]);
  // This allows to display dataset that are not isomorphic
  // at a pseudo isomorphic dataset
  // _TexFilling is a vec3 of scaling factors, for example
  11
     if the resolution is x: 0.5um y: 0.5um z: 2um then
  // a _TexFilling of vec3(1, 1, 0.25) should be used
  posTex = (posTex-0.5) * _TexFilling + 0.5;
  // This loads the value at the position posTex with the
      Level of Detail 0, aka with no MipMapping (so that
  //
      we get an accurate reading and not an interpolation)
  //
  float4 data4 = tex3Dlod(_Data, float4(posTex,0));
  // colourize
  float4 col = float4(data4.a, data4.a, data4.a, data4.a);
  col *= _Color;
  return col;
}
float4 frag(frag_input i) : COLOR
{
. . .
}
```

Finally, we can write the fragment shader function (also called pixel shader). Listing 3 is the main loop that will be executed for each pixel in the rendering pipeline. We obtain the starting and stopping positions with the IntersectBox function described above, and loop for a set

number of values through the 3D image. The number of steps \_Steps sets the distance between each sampling point along that ray *dt*. Finally, we blend the value obtained starting from the closest point to the camera and giving less weight to values from further inside the volume. This guarantees that the contribution of data closest to the camera will get precedence over voxels that are behind them in the same ray trajectory. Listing 3 shows the complete fragment function. This code was implemented as a Unity shader and tested on a 3D image generated in Chapter 5. The result is shown in Figure 6.4.

Listing 3: The fragment shader main function. This is the main function of the shader, it computes the ray origin and direction, then checks if that ray hits the bounding box of our 3D image by calling IntersectBox. If the ray hits the box, it performs the ray marching steps by adding the intensity values sampled from the get\_data function. Once it reaches the end of the box, or saturates at 1.0 the loop is broken and the color for this pixel is returned.

```
ł
 i.ray_d = normalize(i.ray_d);
 // calculate eye ray intersection with cube bounding box
 // The cube is defined as a unit cube centered around the origin
 float3 boxMin = { -0.5, -0.5, -0.5 };
 float3 boxMax = { 0.5, 0.5, 0.5 };
 // check if the ray intersects the bounding box
 // This will hold the t values for the near and far faces
 float tNear, tFar;
 // run the intersection function to check if the ray hits
 bool hit = IntersectBox(i.ray_o, i.ray_d, boxMin, boxMax,
                         tNear, tFar);
 if (!hit) discard; // If it does not hit, stop the processing
 // If the ray hits but that the nearest t is negative then it
    is behind us, therefore set it to 0 to start the ray
 //
 // marching from that point in space
 if (tNear < 0.0) tNear = 0.0;
 // calculate intersection points
 float3 pNear = i.ray_o + i.ray_d*tNear;
 float3 pFar = i.ray_o + i.ray_d*tFar;
 // convert to texture space, we add 0.5 because our unit cube
     is centered around the origin. therefore the positions
 //
      from -0.5 to 0.5 must be converted into 0 to 1.
 //
 pNear = pNear + 0.5;
 pFar = pFar + 0.5;
 // march along ray inside the cube, accumulating color
 // First set the starting point for sampling as the nearest
      interestion
 //
 float3 ray_pos = pNear;
 // Then set the vector direction as the direction between
 // the nearest and the far intersects
 float3 ray_dir = pFar - pNear;
 // We then create dt as a small vector that we can add to
```

float4 frag(frag\_input i) : COLOR

```
//
    our sampling point
// We set the _Steps as a value which corresponds to the
// number of steps taken to sample the volume
float3 ray_step = normalize(ray_dir) * sqrt(3) / _Steps;
// We initialize the color of the pixel
float4 ray_col = 0;
// Start the main marching loop between 0 and 1 with _Steps
for(int k = 0; k < _Steps; k++)</pre>
{
  // We sample the 3D image at that point
  float4 voxel_col = get_data(ray_pos);
 // Then we blend in the value sampled with the previous values
  // This blending function gives more weight to voxel that
 // are near the camera
  // and decreases the value as we move further inside the cube
  ray_col = ray_col + (1 - ray_col) * voxel_col;
 // We move the sampling point by dt
  ray_pos += ray_step;
  // The we check that we are still within the cube otherwise
 // we will sample outside the 3D image
 if (ray_pos.x < 0 || ray_pos.y < 0 || ray_pos.z < 0) break;
 if (ray_pos.x > 1 || ray_pos.y > 1 || ray_pos.z > 1) break;
 // If the pixel value for this ray is already saturated,
 // break the loop.
 if (ray_col.a > 1.0) break;
}
// Clamp the value between 0 and 1 to avoid erroneous colors
ray_col = clamp(ray_col, 0, 1);
// Finally return the color for that pixel.
return ray_col;
```

}

To allow for the modifications of contrasts and intensities in a similar fashion as by software such as FIJI<sup>56</sup>, I modified the shader to perform voxel normalization and intensity clamping. First I added a minimum intensity threshold (\_DataMinR, whereby any value in the image lower than this would return 0. Similarly, I added a maximum value threshold (\_DataMaxR) which clamped any voxel above a certain value to 1. Second, I added a normalization to the returned color that multiplies that voxel value by a step normalization factor (\_NormPerStep). Finally, I added a data stretching normalization by taking the power of the voxel value (\_StretchPower). This allows the user to fine-tune each unique dataset, and maximizes the rendering quality, along with letting the user choose which part of the sample needs to be

displayed at any given time. The results of a fine-tuned rendering can be seen in Figure 6.4.

**Listing 4:** Intensity normalization. The get\_data function is modified to clip values with a lower and upper bound. The ray marching loop normalizes the sampled intensity value by taking that value to the power of \_StretchPower.

```
bool IntersectBox(float3 ray_o, float3 ray_d, float3 boxMin,
                  float3 boxMax, out float tNear, out float tFar)
{
. . .
}
// gets data value at a given position
float4 get_data(float3 pos) {
  . . .
 // We pass the value for the voxel through a step function
  // which returns 0 if the value is below the first argument
  // And returns 1 if the value is above the second argument
 data4.a *= step(_DataMinR, data4.a);
 data4.a *= step(data4.a, _DataMaxR);
  . . .
}
float4 frag(frag_input i) : COLOR
{
  . . .
  // Start the main marching loop between 0 and 1 with _Steps
  for(int k = 0; k < \_Steps; k^{++})
  {
    // We sample the 3D image at that point
    float4 voxel_col = get_data(ray_pos);
    //
    voxel_col.a = _NormPerStep
                  * length(ray_step)
                  * pow(voxel_col.a,_StretchPower);
    • • •
  }
}
```

I added the capability to slice the dataset along any axis in order to expose the inside of the image. This was implemented by modifying the sampling function and checking whether the position sampled is before or after the cutting plane. New parameters (\_SliceAxisMin and \_SliceAxisMax) to set the min and max planes were added and the resulting code can be seen in the Listing 5. The results can be seen in Figure 6.4.

**Listing 5:** Slicing the 3D image. To allow for slicing of the 3D image along the three axes, the get\_data function is modified. For each axis *x*, *y* and *z* the returned value is campled to 0 if the position is beyond the slicing parameter for this axis.

```
bool IntersectBox(float3 ray_o, float3 ray_d, float3 boxMin,
                  float3 boxMax, out float tNear, out float tFar)
{
. . .
}
// gets data value at a given position
float4 get_data(float3 pos) {
  . . .
  // We check that the sampled position is within
  // the bounds set by the Slice Axis parameters
  data4 *= step(_SliceAxis1Min, posTex.x);
  data4 *= step(_SliceAxis2Min, posTex.y);
  data4 *= step(_SliceAxis3Min, posTex.z);
  data4 *= step(posTex.x, _SliceAxis1Max);
  data4 *= step(posTex.y, _SliceAxis2Max);
  data4 *= step(posTex.z, _SliceAxis3Max);
}
float4 frag(frag_input i) : COLOR
{
  . . .
}
```

Finally, fluorescent microscopy today allows the recording of multiple fluorophores in the same sample (as in Chapter 5). In my case, *P. hawaiensis* embryos expressed H2A-mCherry and Lyn-GFP, markers of nucle and membranes respectively. I wanted to display the colors for each of the two channels onto the rendered 3D image. To this end, I changed the image format in the shader from the monochromatic A8 (alpha 8 bit) to the trichromatic RGB8 (red green blue 8 bit). Then at each step, I sample each of the three colors and keep them separate as RGB values. Finally, each channel is given its own normalization, clipping, and stretching factors for fine-tuning each color. The resulting code can be seen in Listing 6. The complete final shader for the Unity engine can be found in the Methods section: *Ray Marching shader*.

**Listing 6: Displaying multiple channels.** To allow the visualization of up to three microscopy channel the texture type was modified from Alpha8 to RGB8. Each channel is sampled accordingly in the get\_data function and the normalization steps are modified to be applied to each channel. Each channel uses a different set of normalization parameter that allows to fine tune the image normalization.

```
// gets data value at a given position
float4 get_data(float3 pos) {
  . . .
  float4 data4 = tex3Dlod(_Data, float4(posTex,0));
  ... // Plane clipping is done here
  data4.r *= step(_DataMinR, data4.r);
  data4.r *= step(data4.r, _DataMaxR);
  data4.g *= step(_DataMinG, data4.g);
  data4.g *= step(data4.g, _DataMaxG);
  data4.b *= step(_DataMinB, data4.b);
  data4.b *= step(data4.b, _DataMaxB);
  float4 col = float4(data4.r,
                      data4.g,
                      data4.b,
                      data4.r+data4.g+data4.b);
 // We can activate or deactivate a channel through
 // a change in parameter.
  if (_C1 == 0) {
    col.r = 0;
  }
  if (_C2 == 0) {
    col.g = 0;
  }
  if (_C3 == 0) {
    col.b = 0;
  }
  return saturate(col);
}
float4 frag(frag_input i) : COLOR
{
  . . .
  float4 voxel_col = get_data(ray_pos);
  // Each channel gets its own normalization factor.
  voxel_col.r = _NormPerStepR
                * length(ray_step)
                * pow(voxel_col.r,_StretchPowerR);
  voxel_col.g = _NormPerStepG
                * length(ray_step)
                * pow(voxel_col.g,_StretchPowerG);
  voxel_col.b = _NormPerStepB
                * length(ray_step)
                * pow(voxel_col.b,_StretchPowerB);
  . . .
}
```



**Figure 6.4: Example images of** *P. hawaiensis* **embryos at the 16 cell stage (stage S5) resulting from the different iterations of the volume rendering shader. a)** Rendering with no normalization or stretching applied to the 3D image. b) Rendering with normalization and stretching applied to the 3D image. **c)** Rendering of the volume sliced on the Y and Z axis to reveal the interior of the sample. **d)** Rendering of the volume with multiple microscopy channels represented as red and green values.

#### 6.3.2 Dataset handling strategies

Having developed a working shader, the next requirement was for the user to be able to load and manage datasets. Contrary to 2D images, where file formats have been stable for years<sup>57</sup> (e.g. JPG, PNG, TIFF), 3D image formats do not have unified standards despite efforts to reach a consensus<sup>57</sup>. For example, Ilastik<sup>58</sup> and BigDataViewer<sup>1</sup>, which were used in Chapter 5, both store their data in an HDF5 database. However, their data storage strategies are completely different. Ilastik stores the volumetric data as multi-layer 2D images<sup>58</sup>, whereas BigDataViewer stores chunks of the volume in smaller cubes (called cube chunks)<sup>1</sup>, as well as downsampled versions of the data for fast access in real-time rendering (Figure 6.5). Another format for 3D images is the RAW format. It is a linear string of bytes, and requires that metadata about the 3D image be stored and accessed from another location. Due to the efficiency of the BigDataViewer data handling, I aimed to load the 3D images from HDF5 files using the BigDataViewer structure. Under this structure, all the necessary metadata is written to an XML file and the setting for each dataset can then be written to that file and recovered in later sessions. However, the Unity C# environment did not come with a functional HDF5 library. Moreover, after many attempts, I failed at compiling a native version of the C++ HDF5 library for Unity. Therefore, I set aside the goal of reading from HDF5 files of volumetric data and instead used the much simpler RAW format.

To this end, I created a JSON file holding the metadata for each dataset, namely the size of the cube in x y and z, the number of channels, and the number of time points. Finally, I created a small python script that would convert a BigDataViewer HDF5 file into a set of RAW files with the attached JSON metadata at the desired resolution (this script is available at: https://github.com/extavourlab/Blondel\_Leo\_Thesis).

I then implemented a database manager in Unity. For each dataset, it reads the JSON file, and populates the database accordingly. For each dataset, a maximum number of allowed bytes is set. This was set to 4 Gbytes due to the memory limitation of the GPU I used to create this software, but can be changed for different hardware. Finally, I preloaded the dataset into the GPU memory via the instantiation of a *Texture3D* array. This pre-instantiation is necessary to be able to smoothly play a 3D image movie.



**Figure 6.5: Schematic representation of different 3D image file format strategies. a)** Schematic representation of the storing strategy in an HDF5 database for Ilastik and BigDataViewer. Ilastik stores the dataset in two dimensions within the HDF5 database, one for the time point and one for the channel<sup>58</sup>. BigDataViewer takes advantage of the HDF5 format by adding a third dimension which are downsampled versions of the main dataset for faster access<sup>1</sup>. **b)** Example of RAW versus HDF5 for storing a 3D image. In a RAW formatted file, the entire data must be loaded into memory to access a point within the 3D space. In HDF5, thanks to the chunking of the data, it is possible to retrieve specific parts of the 3D image. Each smaller part is orders of magnitude faster to load than the whole dataset<sup>1</sup>. This is a key feature for performance optimization.

## 6.3.3 Designing the user experience for manipulating 3D images in VR

The next step was to construct a user interface to interact with the data. Doing this poses new challenges, as the world that the user is projected into is itself the design object that must be created. Classical interfaces such as UI menus, actions, and mouse interactions do not apply in VR. Therefore, I decided on a few parameters that I considered essential to the experience. First, the user must be able to move around the space to observe the dataset from any angle. Second, the user must be able to load multiple datasets in the same room to compare them. Third, the user must be able to tune each dataset parameter and perform different analysis as intuitively as possible, without occluding the view of the dataset. Those ideas can be seen in the blueprint design I created before starting the implementation (Figure 6.6).



**Figure 6.6: Blueprints of the VR room user experience.** The user is projected on a transparent platform inside of a dark sphere. Floating is a dataset selection menu allowing the user to open datasets and load them into the room. Each dataset can be placed, scaled, rotated, and normalized at will.

**Figure 6.7** (following page): Examples of the VR user experience shown in the form of snapshots of user views from within the VR. a) The dataset selection panel appears on the side of the wall. Each white square displays the name of the dataset defined in the metadata. The user must point its laser towards it to load any dataset. b) Example of a volumetric dataset grabbed by the user. When the user selects a dataset on the selection panel, the dataset is first loaded onto the hand of the user. The user can use this to rotate and place the dataset at any location in the room. c) Example of a selected dataset. The white hovering sphere indicates that this dataset is now linked to the glove menu. d) The hovering glove menu attached to the left arm of the user. The user must point with its right-hand laser onto the buttons to enter any submenu or modify a value. e) Example of the user modifying the contrast of the dataset by pointing the laser at the contrast slider and changing the value. The effects are shown in real time thanks to the exposed shader variables. f) Example of the channel selector to display multiple channels of the same dataset.

Figure 6.7: (continued)



In a VR experience, the user's hands are visible through controllers, but text input is limited and there is no cursor to select or mouse buttons to click. Moreover, multiple VR experiences had already created intuitive user experience designs that I could use as inspiration. Because it offered a high number of tunable parameters, I decided to build a virtual glove similar to the Google 3D drawing application Tilt Brush<sup>59</sup>. This interface consists of a hovering multipanel interface locked onto the left arm of the user (Figure 6.7). I recreated a similar interface where three panels containing the main user interface (UI) were set to hover on the user's left arm. Using the right controller, a laser pointer would be emitted to serve a cursor to select the different functions. Using the laser pointer, the user was presented with a selection of panels each serving to tune a different set of parameters available in the shader (Figure 6.7). Similarly, the laser pointer was used to select different datasets in the room (Figure 6.7). The selection mechanism worked by creating a hovering sphere above the dataset. This avoided the highlighting of the 3D image, increasing the feeling of immersion. Once a dataset was selected, the menu panel on the virtual glove only affects its parameters.

I performed multiple testing sessions of the interface with three researchers from the Extavour lab as well as over 15 members of the Molecular and Cellular Organism research community during the annual conference of the department in 2018. For each session I first tried to let the user navigate freely, but answered any question they had. I then asked non standardized questions to collect their feedback on features they had used. This technique is not quantitative therefore no data was collected. Feedback from users (data not shown) was that the virtual glove menu is overall a good design to interact with the parameters. However, it required a high learning curve to understand all the functionalities. Anecdotally, users found the selection cursor to be confusing or not visible enough. Finally, the overall experience of the room was highly appreciated.

#### 6.3.4 Implementing tracking of nuclei in Virtual Reality

The original goal of this project was to not only allow for the intuitive observation of 3D images but also offer a better tracking experience to Mamut<sup>60</sup>. I hypothesized that tracking objects in VR would be more accurate than tracking them in 2D as Mamut allows<sup>60</sup>. As I did not complete the tracking part of the software, I was not ultimately able to compare the results of tracking in 3D versus 2D. Here I describe the progress that I made towards generating the tracking option of this VR tool.

I first created a visualizer for object tracking annotations by instantiating spheres and cylinders. Each sphere corresponded to a nucleus annotation and each cylinder to a movement from one time point to the next. I based these annotations on the Mamut XML file format<sup>60</sup>. The first version of this visualizer worked well up until 600 annotations, at which point the instantiation of new objects between time points in the virtual environment began to lower the frame rate to below the acceptable VR standard of 90 frames per second (technical challenges of VR frame rates discussed in \cite{<sup>37</sup>}).

## 6.4 Discussion

In this chapter, I presented results towards the creation of a VR software for the observation and annotation of 3D images. VR poses some new challenges in terms of user interfaces and user experiences such as occluding views, locomotion, physics simulations, and object interaction to name a few. One key aspect to successfully develop the user experience was to have repeated testing sessions with different users to gather feedback. A critical aspect of such sessions is to avoid guiding the user so as to try to determine how intuitive the software seems to the user. Though I have not yet collected quantitative data from a user survey, the overall impression is highly positive. One of the main comments offered by users was that the observation of a 3D dataset in a virtual three-dimensional universe gave them a new perspective on the observed biological data. In one instance I offered Extavour lab members the opportunity to look at a gastrulating *P. hawaiensis* embryo alongside a *G. bimaculatus* gastrulating embryo. The feedback I received from some users was that they could see the difference between invagination (in *G. bimaculatus*) and delamination (in *P. hawaiensis*) for the first time in a non-schematic representation.

While the capacity to open and observe datasets was completed, many features of this tool remain to be developed. As discussed above, the integration of file formats with the existing central tool BigDataViewer is a key change that must be made to the existing tool in the future,

311

for users to quickly and easily load their datasets. Moreover, the ability to create annotations and interact with tracked objects is a central feature that should be developed in the future, for this tool to be functional. Therefore, a better coding strategy must be used to achieve the visualization of thousands of annotations. One solution could be to use a particle system, however, particles are non-interactable objects. One key aspect of annotating a dataset is to interact with the annotations by adding, deleting, moving, and scaling them. Particles by default do not allow for such types of interactions. Another solution would be to use object pooling or GPU instantiations. This could allow the user to still interact with the objects and render thousands of them at the same time. Smaller improvements regarding the dynamic loading of datasets should also be implemented such as an automatic out of memory detection and a sliding window of fixed size to dynamically load the samples. The latter will require buffering computations to verify that the playing speed is not faster than buffering time. Finally, continuous user experience changes will need to be implemented such as changes to the selection cursor. Due to the high level of expertise required for the tool a tutorial explaining what each parameter does and how to access them will need to be created. Moreover surveys of customary 3D interaction techniques such as Argelaguet and Andujar<sup>61</sup> can be used to guide the implementation choices.

Finally, in order to show the efficacy of virtual reality, a proper experiment with users will need to be devised. While the subjective perception of volumetric rendering is hard to assess, the tracking of objects in space can be objective. If future work on this project completes the development of 3D tracking features, I suggest that users should be asked users to track nuclei using Mamut. The time it takes the users to perform this tracking should be recorded, and they should be asked to complete a user experience survey with qualitative questions guided by best practice in the field (described in Albert and Tullis<sup>62</sup>) regarding the experience such as the level of difficulty to learn the tool, or to track objects. Then, the same users should be asked to repeat nucleartracking of the same data in VR. The time it takes them to complete this task should be recorded, and a user feedback survey the same questions should be administered. Whether users are asked to track using Mamut first or the VR tool first, should be randomized to control for prior familiarity with the dataset.

312

# References

- [1] Tobias Pietzsch, Stephan Saalfeld, Stephan Preibisch, and Pavel Tomancak.
   BigDataViewer: visualization and processing for large image data sets. *Nat. Methods*, 12(6): 481–483, June 2015.
- [2] Blender Foundation. blender.org home of the blender project free and open 3D creation software. https://www.blender.org/. Accessed: 2020-11-6.
- [3] Michael Thompson. The computer in art by jasia reichardt, and: Cybernetics, art and ideas ed. by jasia reichardt (review). *Leonardo*, 6(1):81–82, 1973.
- [4] Sito Tom. Moving innovation: A history of computer animation. 2013.
- [5] Antti Silvast and Markku Reunanen. Multiple users, diverse users: Appropriation of personal computers by demoscene hackers. In Gerard Alberts and Ruth Oldenziel, editors, *Hacking Europe: From Computer Cultures to Demoscenes*, pages 151–163. Springer London, London, 2014.
- [6] WIRED Staff. Demo or die! https://www.wired.com/1995/07/democoders/, July 1995. Accessed: 2020-10-6.
- [7] D Blythe. Rise of the graphics processor. Proc. IEEE, 96(5):761–778, May 2008.
- [8] Robert L Cook. Shade trees. In Proceedings of the 11th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques, SIGGRAPH '84, pages 223–231, New York, NY, USA, January 1984. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [9] Pat Hanrahan and Jim Lawson. A language for shading and lighting calculations. In Proceedings of the 17th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques, SIGGRAPH '90, pages 289–298, New York, NY, USA, September 1990. Association for

Computing Machinery.

- [10] A A Apodaca and M W Mantle. RenderMan: pursuing the future of graphics. *IEEE Comput. Graph. Appl.*, 10(4):44–49, July 1990.
- [11] Chris Maughan and Matthias Wloka. Vertex shader introduction. NVIDIA Technical Brief, 2001.
- [12] Chris McClanahan. History and evolution of gpu architecture. A Survey Paper, 9, 2010.
- [13] John Kessenich, Dave Baldwin, and Randi Rost. The opengl shading language. Language version, 1, 2004.
- [14] Course Rost. 17: State-of-the-Art in hardware rendering. *The OpenGL Shading Language, SIGGRAPH*, 2002.
- [15] Iñigo Quilez and Pol Jeremias. Shadertoy. https://www.shadertoy.com/, 2013.
- [16] Alyn Rockwood, Kurt Heaton, and Tom Davis. Real-time rendering of trimmed surfaces. In Proceedings of the 16th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques, SIGGRAPH '89, pages 107–116, New York, NY, USA, July 1989. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [17] Kurt Akeley and Tom Jermoluk. High-performance polygon rendering. In Proceedings of the 15th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques, SIGGRAPH '88, pages 239–246, New York, NY, USA, June 1988. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [18] Partha Sarathi Paul, Surajit Goon, and Abhishek Bhattacharya. History and comparative study of modern game engines. International Journal of Advanced Computed and Mathematical Sciences, 3(2):245–249, 2012.
- [19] Marcus Toftedahl and Henrik Engström. A taxonomy of game engines and the tools that drive the industry. In DiGRA 2019, The 12th Digital Games Research Association Conference, Kyoto, Japan, August, 6-10, 2019. Digital Games Research Association (DiGRA), 2019.
- [20] Marcus Toftedahl. Which are the most commonly used game engines? Gamasutra, 2019.
- [21] Tim Sweeney. Unreal engine, 1995.
- [22] David Helgason, Nicholas Francis, and Joachim Ante. Unity, 2005.
- [23] Juan Linietsky and Ariel Manzur. Godot engine, 2007.
- [24] Sir Charles Wheatstone. Contributions to the Physiology of Vision: Part the First: On Some Remarkable and Hitherto Unobserved Phenomena of Binocular Vision. 1838.
- [25] Morton L Heilig. Sensorama simulator, August 1962.
- [26] Morton L Heilig. Stereoscopic-television apparatus for individual use, October 1960.
- [27] Ivan E Sutherland. The ultimate display. *Proceedings of IFIP Congress*, pages 506–508, 1965.
- [28] Ivan E Sutherland. A head-mounted three dimensional display. In Proceedings of the December 9-11, 1968, fall joint computer conference, part I, AFIPS '68 (Fall, part I), pages 757–764, New York, NY, USA, December 1968. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [29] Sharmistha Mandal. Brief introduction of virtual reality & its challenges. International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 4(4):304–309, 2013.
- [30] Palmer Luckey, Brendan Iribe Trexler, Graham England, and Jack McCauley. Virtual reality headset, March 2014.
- [31] Claude Zellweger, Brent Edward Barberis, Catherine Sayim Kim, I V Carl Samuel Conlee, and Benjamin Kai Norman Robertson. Head mounted display, July 2016.
- [32] Agnieszka Różańska. Valve index as a new approach for virtual reality studies. Zeszyty Naukowe. Elektryka/Politechnika Opolska, 2019.
- [33] K Perlin and E M Hoffert. Hypertexture. In Proceedings of the 16th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques, SIGGRAPH '89, pages 253–262, New York, NY, USA, July 1989. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [34] Cyril Crassin, Fabrice Neyret, Sylvain Lefebvre, and Elmar Eisemann. GigaVoxels: ray-guided streaming for efficient and detailed voxel rendering. In Proceedings of the 2009 symposium on Interactive 3D graphics and games, I3D '09, pages 15–22, New York, NY, USA, February 2009. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [35] Johanna Beyer, Markus Hadwiger, and Hanspeter Pfister. State-of-the-art in GPU-based large-scale volume visualization. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, volume 34, pages 13–37, 2015.
- [36] Lauren H Williams and Trafton Drew. What do we know about volumetric medical image interpretation?: a review of the basic science and medical image perception literatures. *Cogn Res Princ Implic*, 4(1):21, July 2019.
- [37] Mohamed El Beheiry, Sébastien Doutreligne, Clément Caporal, Cécilia Ostertag, Maxime Dahan, and Jean-Baptiste Masson. Virtual reality: Beyond visualization. J. Mol. Biol., 431 (7):1315–1321, March 2019.

- [38] Wei Feng, Hang Zhao, and Guijie Li. Research on application of novel virtual reality technology in medical teaching. 2018 International Conference on Robots & Intelligent System (ICRIS), 2018.
- [39] Medical XR. medical virtual reality for surgery planning, medical education and patient information. https://www.medicalholodeck.com/, . Accessed: 2020-10-6.
- [40] DICOM VR visualizing and manipulating medical imaging in a new dimension. http://www.dicomvr.com/, . Accessed: 2020-10-6.
- [41] Y Q Guan, Y Y Cai, M Opas, Z W Xiong, and Y T Lee. A VR ENHANCED COLLABORATIVE SYSTEM FOR 3D CONFOCAL MICROSCOPIC IMAGE PROCESSING AND VISUALIZATION. *Int. J. Image Graph.*, 06(02):231–250, April 2006.
- [42] R van Liere, W de Leeuw, J Mulder, P Verschure, A Visser, E Manders, and R van Driel. Virtual reality in biological microscopic imaging. *Proceedings IEEE International Symposium* on Biomedical Imaging, July 2002.
- [43] Zhuming Ai, Xue Chen, Mary Rasmussen, and Robert Folberg. Reconstruction and exploration of three-dimensional confocal microscopy data in an immersive virtual environment. *Comput. Med. Imaging Graph.*, 29(5):313–318, July 2005.
- [44] arivis VisionVR. https://imaging.arivis.com/de/inviewr, November 2016. Accessed: 2020-11-6.
- [45] Bruce D Campbell. Immersive visualization to support scientific insight. *IEEE Comput. Graph. Appl.*, 36(3):17–21, May 2016.
- [46] Rensu P Theart, Ben Loos, and Thomas R Niesler. Virtual reality assisted microscopy data visualization and colocalization analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 18(S2), 2017.
- [47] Yichen Ding, Arash Abiri, Parinaz Abiri, Shuoran Li, Chih-Chiang Chang, Kyung In Baek, Jeffrey J Hsu, Elias Sideris, Yilei Li, Juhyun Lee, Tatiana Segura, Thao P Nguyen, Alexander Bui, René R Sevag Packard, Peng Fei, and Tzung K Hsiai. Integrating light-sheet imaging with virtual reality to recapitulate developmental cardiac mechanics. *JCI Insight*, 2(22), November 2017.
- [48] Angus P R Johnston, James Rae, Nicholas Ariotti, Benjamin Bailey, Andrew Lilja, Robyn Webb, Charles Ferguson, Sheryl Maher, Thomas P Davis, Richard I Webb, John McGhee, and Robert G Parton. Journey to the centre of the cell: Virtual reality immersion into

scientific data. *Traffic*, 19(2):105–110, February 2018.

- [49] Caroline Stefani, Adam Lacy-Hulbert, and Thomas Skillman. ConfocalVR: Immersive visualization for confocal microscopy. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 430(21):4028–4035, October 2018.
- [50] Alexander Spark, Alexandre Kitching, Daniel Esteban-Ferrer, Anoushka Handa, Alexander R Carr, Lisa-Maria Needham, Aleks Ponjavic, Ana Mafalda Santos, James McColl, Christophe Leterrier, Simon J Davis, Ricardo Henriques, and Steven F Lee.
   vLUME: 3D virtual reality for single-molecule localization microscopy. *Nat. Methods*, 17 (11):1097–1099, November 2020.
- [51] Jimmy F Zhang, Alex R Paciorkowski, Paul A Craig, and Feng Cui. BioVR: a platform for virtual reality assisted biological data integration and visualization. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 20 (1):78, February 2019.
- [52] Michael O'Connor, Helen M Deeks, Edward Dawn, Oussama Metatla, Anne Roudaut, Matthew Sutton, Lisa May Thomas, Becca Rose Glowacki, Rebecca Sage, Philip Tew, Mark Wonnacott, Phil Bates, Adrian J Mulholland, and David R Glowacki. Sampling molecular conformations and dynamics in a multiuser virtual reality framework. *Sci Adv*, 4(6): eaat2731, June 2018.
- [53] Will Usher, Pavol Klacansky, Frederick Federer, Peer-Timo Bremer, Aaron Knoll, Jeff Yarch, Alessandra Angelucci, and Valerio Pascucci. A virtual reality visualization tool for neuron tracing. *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph.*, 24(1):994–1003, January 2018.
- [54] Unity Technologies. Unity unity. https://unity.com/frontpage. Accessed: 2020-10-6.
- [55] VRTK virtual reality toolkit. https://www.vrtk.io/, . Accessed: 2020-10-6.
- [56] Johannes Schindelin, Ignacio Arganda-Carreras, Erwin Frise, Verena Kaynig, Mark Longair, Tobias Pietzsch, Stephan Preibisch, Curtis Rueden, Stephan Saalfeld, Benjamin Schmid, Jean-Yves Tinevez, Daniel James White, Volker Hartenstein, Kevin Eliceiri, Pavel Tomancak, and Albert Cardona. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nat. Methods*, 9(7):676–682, July 2012.
- [57] Jens Krüger, Kristin Potter, Rob S Macleod, and Christopher Johnson. Uvf unified volume format: A general system for efficient handling of large volumetric datasets. *IEEE Conf. Inf. Vis.*, 2008:19–26, 2008.

- [58] C Sommer, C Straehle, U Köthe, and F A Hamprecht. Ilastik: Interactive learning and segmentation toolkit. In 2011 IEEE International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging: From Nano to Macro, pages 230–233, March 2011.
- [59] Tilt brush. https://www.tiltbrush.com/, . Accessed: 2020-10-6.
- [60] Carsten Wolff, Jean-Yves Tinevez, Tobias Pietzsch, Evangelia Stamataki, Benjamin Harich, Léo Guignard, Stephan Preibisch, Spencer Shorte, Philipp J Keller, Pavel Tomancak, and Anastasios Pavlopoulos. Multi-view light-sheet imaging and tracking with the MaMuT software reveals the cell lineage of a direct developing arthropod limb. *Elife*, 7, March 2018.
- [61] Ferran Argelaguet and Carlos Andujar. A survey of 3D object selection techniques for virtual environments. *Comput. Graph.*, 37(3):121–136, May 2013.
- [62] William Albert and Thomas Tullis. *Measuring the User Experience: Collecting, Analyzing, and Presenting Usability Metrics*. Newnes, May 2013.

We shall not cease from exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time.

Thomas Stearns Eliot

# **7** Conclusion

## 7.1 The era of omics

I conducted my doctoral research soon after a technological revolution<sup>1</sup> which led to a radical shift in how researchers generated data about biological systems (reviewed by Heather and Chain<sup>2</sup>). The creation of technologies to sequence organisms' genomes and transcriptomes led to the generation of large sequence databases (such as the Sequence Read Archive described in Kodama et al.<sup>3</sup>). In the span that it took from the first analysis to the preparation of the manuscript for Chapter 2, the number of available insect transcriptomes nearly doubled (See Chapter 2 Methods: *Genome and transcriptome preprocessing*). Not only do we now have access to sequence information from many more species, but the nature of those datasets has also changed, with the resolution at which we measure gene expression now reaching the single cell<sup>4,5,6,7,8</sup>. Furthermore, the continuously accumulating knowledge of decades of research on

the regulatory information of genes and protein-protein interactions has now been synthesized into databases such as FlyBase<sup>9</sup>, KEGG<sup>10</sup> or BioGrid<sup>11</sup>. The large amount of information available created new avenues for complex system approaches to biology<sup>12,13,14,15,16</sup> and new microscopy techniques transformed the imaging of biological samples<sup>17,18,19,20,21,22</sup>. Finally, the way we can see, interpret, and analyze high dimensionality data is about to be transformed by new visualization technologies such as Virtual Reality (See Chapter 6). When reality itself can be molded to be an expression of creative visualization, I believe that the possibilities to understand, teach, and intuit novel ideas increase drastically. In this era of omics, I composed my Ph.D. around the analysis of previously published datasets, the remapping of large-scale novel phenotypic data onto existing datasets, and the generation of new "omics" datasets.

## 7.2 *oskar*, a novel gene with an intriguing evolution

In Chapter 1 we showed that the origin of oskar resulted from a horizontal gene transfer followed by a fusion with a eukaryotic domain<sup>23</sup>. To my knowledge, this is only the second time such a mechanism for the formation of a new gene was described<sup>24</sup>. This study was made possible due to the increase in sequence diversity in databases allowing for a more accurate reconstruction of the evolutionary history of genes. Two key aspects of Chapter 1 were aided by this diversity. First, it allowed me to collect over 100 oskar ortholog sequences which brought statistical power to the amino acid sequence information of both the LOTUS and OSK domain. One of the key techniques I used throughout Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 was the modeling of sequence data by a Hidden Markov Model<sup>25,26</sup>. This model becomes more accurate, with the increasing number and diversity of sequence information used to create it. The use of this model was crucial to find bacterial genes with likely homology to oskar and especially to the OSK domain. Second, the large collection of sequence data from all kingdoms of life made the collection of sequences and the phylogenetic analysis more robust. It is always difficult to assess whether an absence of homologs is due to effects like sequence divergence and taxonomic undersampling. With increased sampling, the correlation between an absence of hits and the real absence of homologs increases with each sequence added. This also affected the phylogenetic reconstruction of LOTUS and OSK, and statistical tools such as SOWHAT<sup>27</sup>. Indeed,

both uses maximum likelihood estimation<sup>27,28</sup> or bayesian statistics<sup>29</sup> which compute estimated distributions from the underlying alignment, therefore sensible to sample size. Finally, recent studies are starting to show the importance and prevalence of Horizontal Gene Transfers<sup>30,31,32,33,34</sup>. By proposing this new mechanism, I hope that further studies will look for similar evolutionary events for new genes of unknown origins.

Not only did oskar turn out to have an intriguing origin, but its evolutionary history was mostly unknown<sup>23,35</sup>. Therefore in Chapter 2, we studied the sequence evolution of *oskar*. We proposed hypotheses as to the putative functions of of conserved motifs, which are testable and could be the subject of future studies including biochemical and mutational experiments. One of the main questions behind Chapter 2 was whether we could observe differences between Oskar sequences from the Hemimetabolous insects and Holometabolous insects. While the LOTUS domain did not show any differential conservation, the OSK domain was more conserved in hemimetabolous sequences. Given the importance of *oskar* in recruiting key mRNA to the posterior pole of the embryo<sup>36</sup> through the binding of mRNA via the RNA binding of the OSK domain<sup>37</sup>. I would have expected this result to be reversed. However, to form a liquid-liquid phase separation such as germ plasm, it was described that as the valency between two interacting proteins needed to reach a critical threshold<sup>38</sup>. My hypothesis is that the need to increase valency to form germ plasm<sup>38</sup> led to a relaxation of the selective pressure on OSK (as measured by the lower overall conservation) to allow for more RNA partners. These results should be further studied by expanding the biochemical analysis of hemimetabolous Oskar. For example, future studies should identify the primary partners of Oskar in the neuroblasts of developing Gryllus bimaculatus embryos. With respect to reported observations of OSK's ability to interact with the 3'UTR of specific mRNAs<sup>37</sup>, future studies should determine whether the rate of evolution of the 3'UTR of oskar is particularly high when compared to other 3'UTR in D. melanogaster, and whether there is any significant degree of co-evolution between OSK and the 3'UTRs of oskar partners.

Another key biochemical property of *D. melanogaster* Oskar is the dimerization of the LOTUS domain<sup>39</sup>. We found that while the amino acid sequence of this domain was not highly conserved at the dimerization interface, the LOTUS domains from insect Oskars that were predicted to dimerize<sup>39</sup> showed high physicochemical conservation compared to the

monomeric ones. In order to follow up on this result, a machine learning approach using a classifier could be trained on the predicted dimerizing and monomeric sequences and then used to predict the dimerization properties of the other Oskar LOTUS sequences. To confirm the prediction of the classifier, in vitro expression of soluble full length Oskar protein (or at a minimum expression of LOTUS domains) and biochemical confirmation of the dimerization via SDS-PAGE or size elution chromatography<sup>39,40</sup> would be needed. Furthermore, we also found that the interface with Vasa showed high sequence conservation across all insects. To further explore the evolution of this interface, a sequence co-evolution analysis between the exposed amino acids of LOTUS and Vasa could shed light on the exact biochemical nature of their binding<sup>41,42</sup>.

In both of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, the automatization process was key for the discovery and analysis of *oskar* orthologs. While sequence databases of orthologous gene groups such as EggNog<sup>43</sup> and OrthoDB<sup>44</sup> provide invaluable information, they rely on well-defined Hidden Markov Model representations of sequence groups. They also rely on the correct annotation of genomes and assembly of transcriptomes. In the case of new genes or less-studied genes, such an automated process might fail to define an orthologous group. This is the case with *oskar*, for example: in OrthoDB only 51 (search performed on the 10/25/2020) sequences are described. The careful building of a gene model for *oskar* that I carried out in Chapter 1 allowed us to automate the discovery process for Chapter 2 and was the only necessarily manual step of the process. I hope that further studies will continue to automate such processes for less-studied genes.

# 7.3 The regulation of the development of the *Drosophila* ovary

When Extavour lab postdoc Tarun Kumar presented the first results of the screen he was performing on *D. melanogaster*, we decided to collaborate together. The amount of phenotypic data he was collecting allowed us to conduct a systematic analysis of the effect of signaling pathways on the regulation of ovariole number and egg-laying capacity, which constituted the work presented in Chapter 3. Our discovery of putative gene modules underlying the regulation of ovariole numbers and egg laying is a stepping stone for further studies on the genetic control of both traits. In the future, combining the ovariole number information collected from Hawaiian *Drosophila*<sup>45</sup> with genome or transcriptome data could make it possible to determine whether the evolution of network topology is linked to the evolution of ovariole number. By hypothesizing that the protein protein interaction network is conserved throughout drosophilids, network attacks<sup>46</sup> (a process by which nodes are removed from a network and the topological integrity and resilience is measured) can be performed.

Another conclusion that we drew from this study was that all described animal signaling pathways play a role in the regulation of both phenotypes. In my opinion, this is not a surprising result as I expected that the formation of an organ such as the ovary would require the interplay of many factors. I believe that future studies should apply similar approaches to other phenotypes, and I expect that similar results showing a complex web of interconnected regulatory mechanisms will emerge.

Finally, previous works have successfully shown that dynamical modeling can be achieved with only a directed network topology<sup>47</sup>. One of the promising new avenues this study generated is the creation of dynamical regulatory models by using the known interactions between signaling pathway genes. Using the underlying network topology found in our study, I predict that dynamical models of ovariole number regulation can be acquired by fitting the models published in Santolini and Barabási<sup>47</sup> onto the measured phenotypic data. However, those models were generated and tested on single cells only, therefore their extension to the regulation of tissue will likely require multiple adjustments.

## 7.4 Towards a better understanding of germ layer specification in *P. hawaiensis*

When I started my Ph.D., I proposed an ambitious plan in which I would generate single-cell libraries for multiple time points of the first three days of wild type *P. hawaiensis* development, image live embryos in 4D the same period of time, and merge both datasets to create an

interactive virtual 4D gene expression atlas. In Chapter 4, I discussed the advances made towards obtaining single-cell transcriptomic data of developing embryos, but did not achieve the goals originally set for Chapter 4. Despite the difficulties encountered, the encapsulation and sequencing of a small number of cells was detected (as per the filtering and selection for cells in the library explained in Chapter 4). I would recommend collaboration with a chemist to determine new enzymatic or chemical methods to digest the egg shell. Moreover, a high quality embryonic transcriptome should be generated before attempting this experiment again in the future, to alleviate the difficulties that I encountered during genome annotation. If a transcriptome were generated at multiple embryonic time points, it could also be used to explore the gene expression changes happening during the first three days of embryogenesis. Depending on the observed expression changes in these whole-embryo transcriptomes over time, the definition of the number of time points needed for subsequent single cell RNA sequencing could be further refined. To conclude, while I did not generate libraries of sufficient quality for the questions I set out to answer, I demonstrated the in-principle feasibility of this approach, and identified important technical bottlenecks that would have to be overcome by anyone wishing to carry these experiments forward. I hope that future work will continue to expand on this process and fully succeed at generating libraries.

In Chapter 5, I recorded in 4D the first 3 and 4 days of four wild type developing *P. hawaiensis* embryos. The high spatio-temporal resolution of light sheet microscopy allowed me to successfully track one of the four embryos, generating a ground truth dataset for subsequent analysis. The generation of those tracks was more time consuming than I had planned for. At the time I was doing this analysis, to my knowledge there were few options to automatically segment and track embryos in three dimensions. I used the Ilastik random forest classifier <sup>48</sup> on the first embryo, but it yielded unusable tracks that required me to check the entire embryo, such that I believe it would likely have been faster to track it manually. The other package that I was aware of at the time was TGMM, a gaussian kernel segmentation and tracking algorithm tailored for light sheet datasets<sup>49</sup>. However, despite my best efforts, I found it impossible to compile this package.

At the time of writing this thesis, two new packages using an artificial neural network architecture were published, StarDist and CellPose<sup>50,51</sup>. StarDist<sup>50</sup> uses a U-Net and ResNet

architecture as a first segmentation step and to map a cell border probability, so I expect that good results could be achieved with this new algorithm if it were used to analyze the P. hawaiensis lightsheet data that I collected. Indeed, during my Ph.D. as an exercise in learning artificial neural networks I trained U-Net architecture<sup>52</sup> on a small ground truth dataset which resulted in a 97% pixel classification accuracy (data not shown). However, I could not use the native U-Net architecture as it is designed for 2D images and does not allow for the subsequent separation of objects. Both CellPose and StarDist have added subsequent layers to the segmentation to allow for the separation of single objects<sup>50,51</sup>. Thanks to the fully tracked embryo that I was able to analyze, it should, in principle, be possible to extract an appropriately large amount of data to train those networks. Therefore I believe that the segmentation of the nuclei will not be a bottleneck issue in the near future. Finally, even if the 3D positions of the cells are known at a given time point, their tracking in 4D is a current challenge<sup>53</sup>. The current top performing algorithm on lightsheet datasets according to the Cell Tracking Benchmark<sup>53</sup> is the Baxter Algorithm, which defines probability functions for events like migration, division, or death and maximizes a scoring function (akin to information entropy maximization)<sup>54</sup>. However, the more recent TGMM2 and Vector Flow algorithm<sup>55</sup> were not part of the challenge, therefore it is hard to know how the Baxter algorithm compares to them on light sheet data. In the second part of Chapter 5, I described an ablation experiment aimed at understanding the intra-germ layer compensation mechanism previously reported for *P. hawaiensis*<sup>56</sup>. To analyse the resulting data, in addition to the segmentation and tracking challenges described above for wild type embryos, a custom surface reprojection will be needed to compare the ablated embryos with each other and with wild type embryos. P. hawaiensis embryos are roughly spherical, which helps with morphometric analysis (see Chapter 5 Methods: Mercator projection of nuclei onto a 2D space). Ablated embryos, however, do not recuperate their spherical shape within the 3 days that we performed our imaging. To compare the wild type and ablated embryos, a custom surface will therefore need to be created to project the position of the cells onto a 2D or 3D map. Software like IMSane should allow for such a reprojection in 2D<sup>57</sup>. Another possible method would be to use a 3D lattice transformer, as was used in the comparison of developing mouse embryos<sup>55</sup>. Due to the invariant early cleavage nature of P. hawaiensis embryos, understanding the morphogenetic changes that compensate for the lack of

a blastomere will increase our understanding of the establishment of cellular territories and body plans in this crustacean.

To conclude, while I made progress towards the understanding of the germ layer specification of *P. hawaiensis*, I could not complete the project. Nonetheless, I generated valuable datasets that can be further analyzed, and could help to provide answers to those questions in the future.

## 7.5 Expanding our perception with a third dimension

In the final chapter, Chapter 6, of this thesis, I took a detour from biology into the field of computer graphics and virtual reality. This was motivated by the absence of open visualization interfaces to observe and annotate in 3D the light sheet dataset generated in Chapter 5. The first part of this tool was completed successfully, namely a tool to permit the observation and manipulation of 3D images in a virtual space. User feedback was uniformly positive (see Chapter 6), and the software source was published in a Open Source licence (), allowing for anyone to extend its base. This tool also allows for to import and render tracks generated with Mamut<sup>17</sup>. However, the necessary features to track cells within the tool was not completed yet, because I found that creating a custom tracking mechanism in VR was a more complex task than the visuzalition of tracks.

In the future, upon completion of this project, I plan to perform a user survey comparing user perception and speed of annotation between state of the art tracking software BigDataViewer<sup>58</sup> and Mamut<sup>17</sup> and my new VR tool, to quantify the difference. I am convinced that 3D tracking will be faster than 2D tracking. I plan to continue the development of this software after my Ph.D., to be able to release a more complete version with features such as importing datasets from BigDataViewer<sup>58</sup> and allowing multiple users to interact with a dataset in real time. To conclude, while this was a detour from the main biological questions of my thesis work, it was a very rewarding project that I believe will serve the biological community.

## References

- Karl V Voelkerding, Shale A Dames, and Jacob D Durtschi. Next-generation sequencing: from basic research to diagnostics. *Clin. Chem.*, 55(4):641–658, April 2009.
- [2] James M Heather and Benjamin Chain. The sequence of sequencers: The history of sequencing DNA. *Genomics*, 107(1):1–8, January 2016.
- [3] Yuichi Kodama, Martin Shumway, Rasko Leinonen, and International Nucleotide Sequence Database Collaboration. The sequence read archive: explosive growth of sequencing data. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 40(Database issue):D54–6, January 2012.
- [4] Tamar Hashimshony, Florian Wagner, Noa Sher, and Itai Yanai. CEL-Seq: single-cell
   RNA-Seq by multiplexed linear amplification. *Cell Rep.*, 2(3):666–673, September 2012.
- [5] Allon M Klein, Linas Mazutis, Ilke Akartuna, Naren Tallapragada, Adrian Veres, Victor Li, Leonid Peshkin, David A Weitz, and Marc W Kirschner. Droplet barcoding for single-cell transcriptomics applied to embryonic stem cells. *Cell*, 161(5):1187–1201, May 2015.
- [6] Tamar Hashimshony, Naftalie Senderovich, Gal Avital, Agnes Klochendler, Yaron de Leeuw, Leon Anavy, Dave Gennert, Shuqiang Li, Kenneth J Livak, Orit Rozenblatt-Rosen, Yuval Dor, Aviv Regev, and Itai Yanai. CEL-Seq2: sensitive highly-multiplexed single-cell RNA-Seq. *Genome Biol.*, 17:77, April 2016.
- [7] Evan Z Macosko, Anindita Basu, Rahul Satija, James Nemesh, Karthik Shekhar, Melissa Goldman, Itay Tirosh, Allison R Bialas, Nolan Kamitaki, Emily M Martersteck, John J Trombetta, David A Weitz, Joshua R Sanes, Alex K Shalek, Aviv Regev, and Steven A McCarroll. Highly parallel genome-wide expression profiling of individual cells using nanoliter droplets. *Cell*, 161(5):1202–1214, May 2015.

- [8] Grace X Y Zheng, Jessica M Terry, Phillip Belgrader, Paul Ryvkin, Zachary W Bent, Ryan Wilson, Solongo B Ziraldo, Tobias D Wheeler, Geoff P McDermott, Junjie Zhu, Mark T Gregory, Joe Shuga, Luz Montesclaros, Jason G Underwood, Donald A Masquelier, Stefanie Y Nishimura, Michael Schnall-Levin, Paul W Wyatt, Christopher M Hindson, Rajiv Bharadwaj, Alexander Wong, Kevin D Ness, Lan W Beppu, H Joachim Deeg, Christopher McFarland, Keith R Loeb, William J Valente, Nolan G Ericson, Emily A Stevens, Jerald P Radich, Tarjei S Mikkelsen, Benjamin J Hindson, and Jason H Bielas. Massively parallel digital transcriptional profiling of single cells. *Nat. Commun.*, 8:14049, January 2017.
- [9] Jim Thurmond, Joshua L Goodman, Victor B Strelets, Helen Attrill, L Sian Gramates, Steven J Marygold, Beverley B Matthews, Gillian Millburn, Giulia Antonazzo, Vitor Trovisco, Thomas C Kaufman, Brian R Calvi, and FlyBase Consortium. FlyBase 2.0: the next generation. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 47(D1):D759–D765, January 2019.
- [10] Minoru Kanehisa, Yoko Sato, Masayuki Kawashima, Miho Furumichi, and Mao Tanabe.
   KEGG as a reference resource for gene and protein annotation. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 44(D1):
   D457–62, January 2016.
- [11] Chris Stark, Bobby-Joe Breitkreutz, Teresa Reguly, Lorrie Boucher, Ashton Breitkreutz, and Mike Tyers. BioGRID: a general repository for interaction datasets. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 34 (Database issue):D535–9, January 2006.
- [12] Rui-Sheng Wang, Kathryn T Hall, Franco Giulianini, Dani Passow, Ted J Kaptchuk, and Joseph Loscalzo. Network analysis of the genomic basis of the placebo effect. *JCI Insight*, 2 (11):93911, June 2017.
- [13] Susan Dina Ghiassian, Jörg Menche, and Albert-László Barabási. A DIseAse MOdule detection (DIAMOnD) algorithm derived from a systematic analysis of connectivity patterns of disease proteins in the human interactome. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 11(4):e1004120, April 2015.
- [14] Soon-Hyung Yook, Zoltán N Oltvai, and Albert-László Barabási. Functional and topological characterization of protein interaction networks. *Proteomics*, 4(4):928–942, April 2004.
- [15] Emre Guney, Jörg Menche, Marc Vidal, and Albert-László Barábasi. Network-based in silico drug efficacy screening. *Nat. Commun.*, 7:10331, February 2016.

- [16] H Jeong, S P Mason, A L Barabási, and Z N Oltvai. Lethality and centrality in protein networks. *Nature*, 411(6833):41–42, May 2001.
- [17] Carsten Wolff, Jean-Yves Tinevez, Tobias Pietzsch, Evangelia Stamataki, Benjamin Harich, Léo Guignard, Stephan Preibisch, Spencer Shorte, Philipp J Keller, Pavel Tomancak, and Anastasios Pavlopoulos. Multi-view light-sheet imaging and tracking with the MaMuT software reveals the cell lineage of a direct developing arthropod limb. *Elife*, 7, March 2018.
- [18] Raghav K Chhetri, Fernando Amat, Yinan Wan, Burkhard Höckendorf, William C Lemon, and Philipp J Keller. Whole-animal functional and developmental imaging with isotropic spatial resolution. *Nat. Methods*, 12(12):1171–1178, December 2015.
- [19] Philipp J Keller, Annette D Schmidt, Anthony Santella, Khaled Khairy, Zhirong Bao, Joachim Wittbrodt, and Ernst H K Stelzer. Fast, high-contrast imaging of animal development with scanned light sheet–based structured-illumination microscopy. *Nat. Methods*, 7(8):637–642, August 2010.
- [20] Misha B Ahrens, Michael B Orger, Drew N Robson, Jennifer M Li, and Philipp J Keller.
   Whole-brain functional imaging at cellular resolution using light-sheet microscopy. *Nat. Methods*, 10(5):413–420, May 2013.
- [21] Bi-Chang Chen, Wesley R Legant, Kai Wang, Lin Shao, Daniel E Milkie, Michael W Davidson, Chris Janetopoulos, Xufeng S Wu, John A Hammer, 3rd, Zhe Liu, Brian P English, Yuko Mimori-Kiyosue, Daniel P Romero, Alex T Ritter, Jennifer Lippincott-Schwartz, Lillian Fritz-Laylin, R Dyche Mullins, Diana M Mitchell, Joshua N Bembenek, Anne-Cecile Reymann, Ralph Böhme, Stephan W Grill, Jennifer T Wang, Geraldine Seydoux, U Serdar Tulu, Daniel P Kiehart, and Eric Betzig. Lattice light-sheet microscopy: imaging molecules to embryos at high spatiotemporal resolution. *Science*, 346 (6208):1257998, October 2014.
- [22] Alexandre W Bisson-Filho, Yen-Pang Hsu, Georgia R Squyres, Erkin Kuru, Fabai Wu, Calum Jukes, Yingjie Sun, Cees Dekker, Seamus Holden, Michael S VanNieuwenhze, Yves V Brun, and Ethan C Garner. Treadmilling by FtsZ filaments drives peptidoglycan synthesis and bacterial cell division. *Science*, 355(6326):739–743, February 2017.
- [23] Leo Blondel, Tamsin Em Jones, and Cassandra G Extavour. Bacterial contribution to

genesis of the novel germ line determinant oskar. *Elife*, 9, February 2020.

- [24] Jörg Schultz. HTTM, a horizontally transferred transmembrane domain. *Trends Biochem. Sci.*, 29(1):4–7, January 2004.
- [25] S R Eddy. Multiple alignment using hidden markov models. Proc. Int. Conf. Intell. Syst. Mol. Biol., 3:114–120, 1995.
- [26] S R Eddy. Profile hidden markov models. *Bioinformatics*, 14(9):755–763, 1998.
- [27] Samuel H Church, Joseph F Ryan, and Casey W Dunn. Automation and evaluation of the SOWH test with SOWHAT. Syst. Biol., 64(6):1048–1058, November 2015.
- [28] Alexandros Stamatakis. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies, 2014.
- [29] J P Huelsenbeck and F Ronquist. MRBAYES: Bayesian inference of phylogenetic trees. Bioinformatics, 17(8):754–755, August 2001.
- [30] Julie C Dunning Hotopp, Michael E Clark, Deodoro C S G Oliveira, Jeremy M Foster, Peter Fischer, Mónica C Muñoz Torres, Jonathan D Giebel, Nikhil Kumar, Nadeeza Ishmael, Shiliang Wang, Jessica Ingram, Rahul V Nene, Jessica Shepard, Jeffrey Tomkins, Stephen Richards, David J Spiro, Elodie Ghedin, Barton E Slatko, Hervé Tettelin, and John H Werren. Widespread lateral gene transfer from intracellular bacteria to multicellular eukaryotes. *Science*, 317(5845):1753–1756, September 2007.
- [31] Patrick J Keeling and Jeffrey D Palmer. Horizontal gene transfer in eukaryotic evolution. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, 9(8):605–618, August 2008.
- [32] Alex C C Wilson and Rebecca P Duncan. Signatures of host/symbiont genome coevolution in insect nutritional endosymbioses, 2015.
- [33] Filip Husnik, Naruo Nikoh, Ryuichi Koga, Laura Ross, Rebecca P Duncan, Manabu Fujie, Makiko Tanaka, Nori Satoh, Doris Bachtrog, Alex C C Wilson, Carol D von Dohlen, Takema Fukatsu, and John P McCutcheon. Horizontal gene transfer from diverse bacteria to an insect genome enables a tripartite nested mealybug symbiosis. *Cell*, 153(7):1567–1578, June 2013.
- [34] Daniel B Sloan, Atsushi Nakabachi, Stephen Richards, Jiaxin Qu, Shwetha Canchi Murali, Richard A Gibbs, and Nancy A Moran. Parallel histories of horizontal gene transfer facilitated extreme reduction of endosymbiont genomes in sap-feeding insects. *Mol. Biol.*

*Evol.*, 31(4):857–871, April 2014.

- [35] Jeremy A Lynch, Orhan Ozüak, Abderrahman Khila, Ehab Abouheif, Claude Desplan, and Siegfried Roth. The phylogenetic origin of oskar coincided with the origin of maternally provisioned germ plasm and pole cells at the base of the holometabola. *PLoS Genet.*, 7(4): e1002029, April 2011.
- [36] A Ephrussi, L K Dickinson, and R Lehmann. Oskar organizes the germ plasm and directs localization of the posterior determinant nanos. *Cell*, 66(1):37–50, July 1991.
- [37] Na Yang, Zhenyu Yu, Menglong Hu, Mingzhu Wang, Ruth Lehmann, and Rui-Ming Xu.
   Structure of drosophila oskar reveals a novel RNA binding protein. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.* S. A., 112(37):11541–11546, September 2015.
- [38] Pilong Li, Sudeep Banjade, Hui-Chun Cheng, Soyeon Kim, Baoyu Chen, Liang Guo, Marc Llaguno, Javoris V Hollingsworth, David S King, Salman F Banani, Paul S Russo, Qiu-Xing Jiang, B Tracy Nixon, and Michael K Rosen. Phase transitions in the assembly of multivalent signalling proteins. *Nature*, 483(7389):336–340, March 2012.
- [39] Mandy Jeske, Matteo Bordi, Sebastian Glatt, Sandra Müller, Vladimir Rybin, Christoph W Müller, and Anne Ephrussi. The crystal structure of the drosophila germline inducer oskar identifies two domains with distinct vasa helicase- and RNA-Binding activities, 2015.
- [40] Mandy Jeske, Christoph W Müller, and Anne Ephrussi. The LOTUS domain is a conserved DEAD-box RNA helicase regulator essential for the recruitment of vasa to the germ plasm and nuage. *Genes Dev.*, 31(9):939–952, May 2017.
- [41] Thomas A Hopf, Charlotta P I Schärfe, João P G L M Rodrigues, Anna G Green, Oliver Kohlbacher, Chris Sander, Alexandre M J J Bonvin, and Debora S Marks. Sequence co-evolution gives 3D contacts and structures of protein complexes. *Elife*, 3, September 2014.
- [42] Saulo de Oliveira and Charlotte Deane. Co-evolution techniques are reshaping the way we do structural bioinformatics. *F1000Res.*, 6:1224, July 2017.
- [43] Jaime Huerta-Cepas, Damian Szklarczyk, Davide Heller, Ana Hernández-Plaza, Sofia K Forslund, Helen Cook, Daniel R Mende, Ivica Letunic, Thomas Rattei, Lars J Jensen, Christian von Mering, and Peer Bork. eggNOG 5.0: a hierarchical, functionally and phylogenetically annotated orthology resource based on 5090 organisms and 2502 viruses.

*Nucleic Acids Res.*, 47(D1):D309–D314, November 2018.

- [44] Evgenia V Kriventseva, Dmitry Kuznetsov, Fredrik Tegenfeldt, Mosè Manni, Renata Dias, Felipe A Simão, and Evgeny M Zdobnov. OrthoDB v10: sampling the diversity of animal, plant, fungal, protist, bacterial and viral genomes for evolutionary and functional annotations of orthologs. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 47(D1):D807–D811, November 2018.
- [45] Didem P Sarikaya, Samuel H Church, Laura P Lagomarsino, Karl N Magnacca, Steven L Montgomery, Donald K Price, Kenneth Y Kaneshiro, and Cassandra G Extavour.
   Reproductive capacity evolves in response to ecology through common changes in cell number in hawaiian drosophila. *Curr. Biol.*, 29(11):1877–1884.e6, June 2019.
- [46] Ayşe Kılıç, Marc Santolini, Taiji Nakano, Matthias Schiller, Mizue Teranishi, Pascal Gellert, Yuliya Ponomareva, Thomas Braun, Shizuka Uchida, Scott T Weiss, Amitabh Sharma, and Harald Renz. A systems immunology approach identifies the collective impact of 5 mirs in th2 inflammation. JCI Insight, 3(11), June 2018.
- [47] Marc Santolini and Albert-László Barabási. Predicting perturbation patterns from the topology of biological networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 115(27):E6375–E6383, July 2018.
- [48] C Sommer, C Straehle, U Köthe, and F A Hamprecht. Ilastik: Interactive learning and segmentation toolkit. In 2011 IEEE International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging: From Nano to Macro, pages 230–233, March 2011.
- [49] Fernando Amat, William Lemon, Daniel P Mossing, Katie McDole, Yinan Wan, Kristin Branson, Eugene W Myers, and Philipp J Keller. Fast, accurate reconstruction of cell lineages from large-scale fluorescence microscopy data. *Nat. Methods*, 11(9):951–958, September 2014.
- [50] Martin Weigert, Uwe Schmidt, Robert Haase, Ko Sugawara, and Gene Myers. Star-convex polyhedra for 3d object detection and segmentation in microscopy. In *The IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision,* pages 3666–3673, 2020.
- [51] C Stringer, M Michaelos, and M Pachitariu. Cellpose: a generalist algorithm for cellular segmentation. *bioRxiv*, 2020.
- [52] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-Net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. May 2015.

- [53] Vladimír Ulman, Martin Maška, Klas E G Magnusson, Olaf Ronneberger, Carsten Haubold, Nathalie Harder, Pavel Matula, Petr Matula, David Svoboda, Miroslav Radojevic, Ihor Smal, Karl Rohr, Joakim Jaldén, Helen M Blau, Oleh Dzyubachyk, Boudewijn Lelieveldt, Pengdong Xiao, Yuexiang Li, Siu-Yeung Cho, Alexandre C Dufour, Jean-Christophe Olivo-Marin, Constantino C Reyes-Aldasoro, Jose A Solis-Lemus, Robert Bensch, Thomas Brox, Johannes Stegmaier, Ralf Mikut, Steffen Wolf, Fred A Hamprecht, Tiago Esteves, Pedro Quelhas, Ömer Demirel, Lars Malmström, Florian Jug, Pavel Tomancak, Erik Meijering, Arrate Muñoz-Barrutia, Michal Kozubek, and Carlos Ortiz-de Solorzano. An objective comparison of cell-tracking algorithms. *Nat. Methods*, 14(12):1141–1152, December 2017.
- [54] Klas E G Magnusson, Joakim Jalden, Penney M Gilbert, and Helen M Blau. Global linking of cell tracks using the viterbi algorithm. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging*, 34(4):911–929, April 2015.
- [55] Katie McDole, Léo Guignard, Fernando Amat, Andrew Berger, Grégoire Malandain, Loïc A Royer, Srinivas C Turaga, Kristin Branson, and Philipp J Keller. In toto imaging and reconstruction of Post-Implantation mouse development at the Single-Cell level. *Cell*, 175 (3):859–876.e33, October 2018.
- [56] Alivia L Price, Melinda S Modrell, Roberta L Hannibal, and Nipam H Patel. Mesoderm and ectoderm lineages in the crustacean parhyale hawaiensis display intra-germ layer compensation. *Dev. Biol.*, 341(1):256–266, May 2010.
- [57] Idse Heemskerk and Sebastian J Streichan. Tissue cartography: compressing bio-image data by dimensional reduction. *Nat. Methods*, 12(12):1139–1142, December 2015.
- [58] Tobias Pietzsch, Stephan Saalfeld, Stephan Preibisch, and Pavel Tomancak.
  BigDataViewer: visualization and processing for large image data sets. *Nat. Methods*, 12(6): 481–483, June 2015.



## Chapter 1: Supplementary data

This appendix contains the supplementary figures for the Chapter 1.

**Figure A.1** (following page): LOTUS Domain RaxML MUSCLE Tree. Phylogenetic tree of the HMMER sequences retrieved from the UniProt database using the LOTUS alignment HMM model. The top 97 hits were selected for phylogenetic analysis, and the only three bacterial sequences found to be a match were added to the alignment manually. The resulting 100 sequences were aligned using MUSCLE with default settings. The sequences were filtered to contain only one sequence per species (best E-value kept) yielding 100 sequences for analysis. Finally, the tree was created using RaxML v8.2.4, using 1000 bootstraps and model selection performed by the RaxML automatic model selection tool. See Section 1.4.5 Phylogenetic Analysis Based on MUSCLE Alignment for further detail. Sequences are color-coded as follows: Purple = Oskar; Red = Non-Oskar Arthropod; Green = Non-Arthropod Eukaryote; Blue = Bacteria. Names following leaves display the UniProt accession number followed by the species name and the UniProt protein name.

#### Figure A.1: (continued)



**Figure A.2** (following page): LOTUS Domain Bayesian MUSCLE Tree. Phylogenetic tree of the HMMER sequences retrieved from the UniProt database using the LOTUS alignment HMM model. 100 sequences were chosen for analysis as described for Figure A.1. The tree was created using Mr Bayes V3.2.6 using a Mixed model (prset aamodel=Mixed) and a gamma distribution (lset rates=Gamma). The algorithm was allowed to run for 3 million generations to achieve a std < 0.01. See Section 1.4.5 **Phy-logenetic Analysis Based on MUSCLE Alignment** for further detail. Sequences are color-coded as follows: Purple = Oskar; Red = Non-Oskar Arthropod; Green = Non-Arthropod Eukaryote; Blue = Bacteria. Names following leaves display the UniProt accession number followed by the species name and the UniProt protein name.

#### Figure A.2: (continued)



- Oskar Protein
- Non-Arthropod Eukaryota
- Non-Oskar Arthropoda

**Figure A.3** (*following page*): OSK Domain RaxML MUSCLE Tree. Phylogenetic tree of the HMMER sequences retrieved from the UniProt database using the OSK alignment HMM model. The top 95 hits were selected for phylogenetic analysis, and the only five non-Oskar eukaryotic sequences found to be a match were added to the alignment manually. The resulting 100 sequences were aligned using MUSCLE with default settings. The sequences were filtered to contain only one sequence per species (best E-value kept), yielding 87 sequences for analysis. Finally, the tree was created using RaxML v8.2.4, using 1000 bootstraps and model selection performed by the RaxML automatic model selection tool. See Section 1.4.5 **Phylogenetic Analysis Based on MUSCLE Alignment** for further detail. Sequences are color-coded as follows: Purple = Oskar; Red = Non-Oskar Arthropod; Green = Non-Arthropod Eukaryote; Blue = Bacteria. Names following leaves display the UniProt accession number followed by the species name and the UniProt protein name.

#### Figure A.3: (continued)



**Figure A.4 (following page): OSK Domain Bayesian MUSCLE Tree.** Phylogenetic tree of the HMMER sequences hit on the UniProt database using the OSK alignment HMM model. 87 sequences were chosen for analysis as described for Figure A.3.The tree was created using Mr Bayes V3.2.6 using a Mixed model (prset aamodel=Mixed) and a gamma distribution (lset rates=Gamma). The algorithm was allowed to run for 4 million generations to achieve a std < 0.01. See Section 1.4.5 **Phyloge-netic Analysis Based on MUSCLE Alignment** for further detail. Sequences are color-coded as follows: Purple = Oskar; Red = Non-Oskar Arthropod; Green = Non-Arthropod Eukaryote; Blue = Bacteria. Names following leaves display the UniProt accession number followed by the species name and the UniProt protein name.

#### Figure A.4: (continued)





### P-value = 0.037

**Figure A.5: SOWHAT constrained trees and results.** Two trees constrained by alternative relationships that would be expected under vertical transmission of sequences were designed and tested against our result supporting a putative HGT event of the OSK domain. (a) The first tree (right) is constrained by domain of life, requiring bacterial and eukaryotic sequences to be monophyletic, and disallowing sister group relationships of subsets of eukaryotic sequences and bacterial sequences. Our unconstrained tree topology (left) outperformed this topology with a p-value of 0.002 (95% confidence interval upper: 0.007 lower: 0.0002). (b) The second tree requires monophyly of Eukaryota. Our unconstrained tree topology (left) outperformed this topology with a p-value of 0.004). (c) The third tree tested whether the LOTUS domain split observed in the tree generated with the MUSCLE alignment was significantly different from a tree where the LOTUS sequences formed a monophyly. The unconstrained tree (left) outperformed this topology with a p-value of 0.037 (95% confidence interval upper: 0.026).

**Figure A.6** (following page): LOTUS Domain RaxML PRANK Tree. Phylogenetic tree of the same sequences used for the previous LOTUS trees. The sequences were aligned using PRANK and the tree generated with RaxML as described in Section 1.4.6 **Phylogenetic Analysis Based on PRANK alignment**. Sequences are color-coded as follows: Purple = Oskar; Red = Non-Oskar Arthropod; Green = Non-Arthropod Eukaryote; Blue = Bacteria. Names following leaves display the UniProt accession number followed by the species name and the UniProt protein name.

#### Figure A.6: (continued)



**Figure A.7** (following page): OSK Domain RaxML PRANK Tree. Phylogenetic tree of the same sequences used for the previous OSK trees. The sequences were aligned using PRANK and the tree generated with RaxML as described in Section 1.4.6 **Phyloge-netic Analysis Based on PRANK alignment**. Sequences are color-coded as follows: Purple = Oskar; Red = Non-Oskar Arthropod; Green = Non-Arthropod Eukaryote; Blue = Bacteria. Names following leaves display the UniProt accession number followed by the species name and the UniProt protein name.

#### Figure A.7: (continued)





**Figure A.8: OSK Tree PRANK Comparison.** Comparison of the tree obtained with RaxML starting from the MUSCLE alignment (left) versus the PRANK alignment (right) for the OSK domain. Similarity scores for the branching events are color coded from yellow to blue (see figure color bar legend). The OSK (purple) clade and CAZ3 (green) clade have been colored and compacted for readability as they do not have any internal branching changes. Node color is blue if the leaf is a sequence, and red if this is a compacted group of sequences.



**Figure A.9: LOTUS Tree PRANK Comparison.** Comparison of the tree obtained with RaxML starting from the MUSCLE alignment (left) versus the PRANK alignment (right) for the LOTUS domain. Similarity scores for the branching events are color coded from yellow to blue (see figure color bar legend). The LOTUS (purple) clades have been colored and compacted for readability as they do not have any internal branching changes. Node color is blue if the leaf is a sequence, and red if this is a compacted group of sequences.

**Figure A.10** (*following page*): LOTUS Domain RaxML T-Coffee Tree. Phylogenetic tree of the same sequences used for the previous LOTUS trees. The sequences were aligned using T-Coffee and the tree generated with RaxML as described in Section 1.4.7 Phylogenetic Analysis Based on T-Coffee alignment. Sequences are color-coded as follows: Purple = Oskar; Red = Non-Oskar Arthropod; Green = Non-Arthropod Eukaryote; Blue = Bacteria. Names following leaves display the UniProt accession number followed by the species name and the UniProt protein name.

#### Figure A.10: (continued)




**Figure A.11** (following page): OSK Domain RaxML T-Coffee Tree. Phylogenetic tree of the same sequences used for the previous OSK trees. The sequences were aligned using T-Coffee and the tree generated with RaxML as described in Section 1.4.7 **Phylogenetic Analysis Based on T-Coffee alignment**. Sequences are color-coded as follows: Purple = Oskar; Red = Non-Oskar Arthropod; Green = Non-Arthropod Eukaryote; Blue = Bacteria. Names following leaves display the UniProt accession number followed by the species name and the UniProt protein name.

#### Figure A.11: (continued)



**MUSCLE** tree

T COFFEE tree



**Figure A.12: OSK Tree T-Coffee Comparison.** Comparison of the tree obtained with RaxML starting from the MUSCLE alignment (left) versus the T-Coffee alignment (right) for the OSK domain. Similarity scores for the branching events are color coded from yellow to blue (see figure color bar legend). The OSK (purple) clade and CAZ3 (green) clade have been colored and compacted for readability as they do not have any internal branching changes. Node color is blue if the leaf is a sequence, and red if this is a compacted group of sequences.



**Figure A.13: LOTUS Tree T-Coffee Comparison.** Comparison of the tree obtained with RaxML starting from the MUSCLE alignment (left) versus the T-Coffee alignment (right) for the LOTUS domain. Similarity scores for the branching events are color coded from yellow to blue (see figure color bar legend). The LOTUS (purple) clades have been colored and compacted for read-ability as they do not have any internal branching changes. Node color is blue if the leaf is a sequence, and red if this is a compacted group of sequences.

#### Table A.1: List of genomes and transcriptomes used for automated oskar search. The table can be accessed here: https:

//github.com/extavourlab/Oskar\_HGT/blob/master/Data/Tables/Supp\_Table1.csv List of genomes and transcriptomes that were downloaded, annotated, and searched for oskar sequences (see "Hidden Markov Model (HMM) generation and alignments of the OSK and LOTUS domains" in Methods). The table reports the database provenance (NCBI genome or TSA, or 1KITE database) and the accession number. The TSA accession ID can be searched using the NCBI TSA browser here: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Traces/wgs/?view=TSA.

Table A.2: List of oskar sequences used in the final alignment. The table can be accessed here: https://github.com/extavourlab/Oskar\_HGT/blob/master/Data/Tables/Supp%20Table2.csv

List of accession numbers and database provenance of the sequences used in the final alignments of Oskar analysed herein. The table contains the database provenance (Type), the database accession number (ID), the species, family and order, and extraction notes. In the "Annotation" Column, P = homolog identified by pipeline; DB = homolog identified by database annotation. \*Sequence recomposed from two transcripts: GBCX01024638.1 and GBCX01024637.

Table A.3: List of sequences and their BLAST results used for phylogenetic analysis of the LOTUS domain. The table can be accessed here: https://github.com/extavourlab/Oskar\_HGT/blob/master/Data/Tables/Supp% 20Table3.csv

The sequences were obtained by searching the TrEMBL database using hmmsearch and the final HMM generated for LOTUS (Supplementary files: HMM >LOTUS.hmm). Reported are the UniProtID (Accession Number), the Domain and Phylum origin of the sequence, the E-value, score and bias given by hmmsearch, and the description of the target from UniProt. To obtain sequences for each entry, either search UniProt directly (https://www.uniprot.org/) or consult the final alignment in Supplementary Files: Alignments >LOTUS\_TREE.fasta. Phylum abbreviations: A = Arthropoda; An = Annelida; E = Echinodermata; F = Firmicutes; M = Mollusca; T = Tunicata; V = Vertebrata; ? = unclassified

Table A.4: List of sequences and their BLAST results used for phylogenetic analysis of the OSK domain. The table can be accessed here: https://github.com/extavourlab/0skar\_HGT/blob/master/Data/Tables/Supp%20Table4. csv

The sequences were obtained by searching the TrEMBL database using hmmsearch and the final HMM generated for OSK (Supplementary files: HMM >OSK.hmm). Reported parameters are as described for Supplementary Table S3. To obtain sequences for each entry, either search UniProt directly (https://www.uniprot.org/) or consult the final alignment in Supplementary Files: Alignments >OSK\_TREE.fasta. Phylum Abbreviations: A = Arthropoda; Ar = Archaea; As = Ascomycota; B = Bacteroidetes; C = Cyanobacteria; Eu = Euryarchaeota; F = Firmicutes; Fu = Fungi; P = Proteobacteria

# B

## Chapter 2: Supplementary data

This appendix contains the supplementary figures for the Chapter 2.



**Figure B.1: Summary statistics.** In **a**), Overall statistics for each of the three sources of dataset searched, from left to right: The number of dataset searched coming from any of the sources, the number of *oskar* sequences found in each of those datasets, and the proportion of *oskar* sequences found in any of the three sources. In **b**), Summary statistics broken down by insect orders. Only orders where an *oskar* sequence was found are shown. From left to right: The number of *oskar* sequences found in each of the three data sources, the total number of *oskar* sequences found, the proportion of *oskar* sequences found.

**Figure B.2** *(following page)*: **Genome and Transcriptome quality correlation to** *oskar* **discovery.** Shown are boxplots of the distribution of multiple genome and transcriptome quality metrics. The distributions were split between the presence and absence of *oskar* in a dataset (found / not found). For each metric, the mean of both distributions was tested for significance using a Mann Whitney U test, and a bar with an \* is displayed if the p-value was less than 0.05.



358

**Figure B.3** (*following page*): Loss of *oskar* in Lepidopteran. Phylogeny of the Lepidopteran extracted from Kawahara et al.<sup>1</sup>. Next to each Lepidopteran family is shown summary data regarding the status of *oskar* discovery. In gray, no *oskar* sequences were found, colored means some *oskar* sequences were found. From left to right: The number of datasets where we searched for *oskar*, the number of *oskar* sequences found in those datasets, the number of *oskar* sequences found in RefSeq genomes, Genbank genomes and TSA transcriptomes.

#### Figure B.3: (continued)

Agathiphagidae     3     010%     Genbank     TSA       Agathiphagidae     3     010%     010%     010%       Heterobathmildae     1     010%     010%     010%       Heterobathmildae     3     010%     010%     010%       Carposinidae     3     010%     010%     010%       Acanthopteroctetidae     3     010%     010%     010%       Carposinidae     1     010%     010%     010%       Carposinidae     1     010%     010%     010%       Adelidae     1     010%     010%     010%       Adelidae     2     010%     010%     010%       Adelidae     1     010%     010%     010%       Prodoxidae     2     010%     010%     010%       Prodoxidae     2     010%     010%     010%       Prodoxidae     1     010%     010%     010%     010%       Prodoxidae     1     010%     010%     010%     010% <th></th> <th>Number of</th> <th></th> <th colspan="2">% of <i>oskar</i> found in</th> <th></th>		Number of		% of <i>oskar</i> found in		
Agathiphagidae     3     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%       Micropterijdae     1     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%       Heterobathmildae     1     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%       Heterobathmildae     1     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%       Hepialidae     3     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%       Carposinidae     1     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%       Carposinidae     1     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%       Opostegidae     1     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%       Opostegidae     1     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%     0   9%       Adelidae     1     2   20%     2   22%     0   9%		searched	All sources	RefSeq	Genbank	TSA
Micropterigidae     1     0	Agathiphagidae	3	0   0%			0   0%
Heterobathmildae     1     0   0%     0   0%       Neopseutidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Hepialidae     3     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Acanthopteroctetidae     3     0   0%	Micropterigidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Neopseustidae     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Hepialidae     3     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Hepialidae     3     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Acanthopteroctetidae     3     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Carposinidae     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Opostegidae     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Adeisianidae     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Adeidae     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Palaephatidae     2     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Psychidae     2     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Urudidea     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Castnidae     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Castnidae     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Castnidae     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0%       Castnidae     1     0 1 0%     0 1 0%     0 1 0% <th>Heterobathmiidae</th> <th>1</th> <th>0   0%</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>0   0%</th>	Heterobathmiidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Line     Eriocraniidae     3     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Hepialidae     3     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Acanthopteroctetidae     3     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Carposinidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Nepticulidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Adelidae     2     0   0%     0	Neopseustidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Hepialidae     3     0   0%     0   0%       Acanthopteroctetidae     3     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Carposinidae     3     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Carposinidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Prodoxidae     2     0   0%	4 C Eriocraniidae	3	0   0%			0   0%
Acanthopteroctetidae     3     0   0% <t< th=""><th>Hepialidae</th><th>3</th><th>0   0%</th><th></th><th></th><th>0   0%</th></t<>	Hepialidae	3	0   0%			0   0%
Lophocoronidae     1     0   0%     0	Acanthopteroctetidae	3	0   0%			0   0%
Carposinidae     3     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Nepticulidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Andesianidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Andesianidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Andesianidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Adelidae     2     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Palaephatidae     2     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Psychidae     3     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Oryadaulidae     2     0   0%	Lophocoronidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Opostegidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Prodoxidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Adelidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Adelidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Palaephatidae     1     0   0%     0   0%     2   12%       Meessidae     2     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Palaephatidae     9     2   22%     0   0%     0   0%       Palaephatidae     2     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Pyonomeutidae     2     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Urudidea     1     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%     0   0%       Vyponomeutidae     1     0   0%     0	Carposinidae	3	0   0%			0   0%
Nepticulidae     1     0   0%	Opostegidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Prodoxidae     2     0   0% </th <th>Nepticulidae</th> <th>1</th> <th>0   0%</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>0   0%</th>	Nepticulidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Andesianidae   1   0   0%   0   0%     Andesianidae   1   2   108%   2   108%     Tischeriidae   9   2   22%   2   22%     Meessidae   2   0   0%   0   0%     Psychidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Dryadaulidae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Plutellidae   5   0   0%   0	Prodoxidae	2	0   0%			0   0%
Adelidae   1   2 100%   2 100%     Tischeriidae   2   0 10%   2 122%     Palaephatidae   2   0 10%   0 10%     Psychidae   3   0 10%   0 10%     Tineidae   2   0 10%   0 10%     Pryzdaulidae   2   0 10%   0 10%     Pryadaulidae   2   0 10%   0 10%     Pryadaulidae   2   0 10%   0 10%     Pryzdaulidae   1   0 10%   0 10%     Pryadaulidae   1   0 10%   0 10%     Tortricidae   11   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%     Cossidae   1   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%     Papilionidae   7   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%     Pyraidae   2   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%     Papilionidae   2   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%     Pyraidae   3   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%   0 10%     Py	Andesianidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Tischeriidae     2     0   0%     0   0%     2   22%     0   0% <th>Adelidae</th> <th>1</th> <th>2   100%</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>2   100%</th>	Adelidae	1	2   100%			2   100%
Palaephatidae   9   2 1 22%   2 1 22%     Meessidae   2   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Psychidae   2   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Dryadaulidae   2   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Plutellidae   2   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Purdilidae   1   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Tortricidae   1   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Tortricidae   1   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Castniidae   1   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Sesidea   1   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Cossidae   1   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Pailionidae   5   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Nymphalidae   2   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Gelechiidae   2   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Gelechiidae   1   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Mimallonidea   2   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0%     Pieridae   3   0 1 0%   0 1 0%   0 1 0	└┤ ┌───── Tischeriidae	2	0   0%			0   0%
Meessiidae     2     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0     0%     0	Palaephatidae	9	2   22%			2   22%
Psychidae   3   0   0%	Meessiidae	2	0   0%			0   0%
Tineidae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Dryadaulidae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Putuellidae   1   0   0% <td< th=""><th>📙 🗖 🖵 —————————————————————————————————</th><th>3</th><th>0   0%</th><th></th><th>0   0%</th><th>0   0%</th></td<>	📙 🗖 🖵 —————————————————————————————————	3	0   0%		0   0%	0   0%
Dryadaulidae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Plutellidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Yoponomeutidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Urudidea   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Castniidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Cossidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Papilionidae   7   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Nymphalidae   60   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Pieridae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Lycaenidae   2   0   0%   0	Tineidae	2	0   0%			0   0%
Plutellidae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Yponomeutidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Urudidea   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Sesidea   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Papilionidae   7   0   0%<	Dryadaulidae	2	0   0%			0   0%
Yponomeutidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Urudidea   11   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Castniidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Castniidae   1   0   0%   0	Plutellidae	5	0   0%	0   0%		0   0%
Urudidea   11   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Sesidea   1   0   0%	∏ Yponomeutidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Tortricidae   11   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Castniidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Sesidea   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Cossidae   1   0   0%<	Urudidea					
Castniidae   1   0   0%   0   0%     Sesidea   1   0   0%   0   0%     Zygaenidae   1   0   0%   0   0%     Cossidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Papilionidae   7   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Nymphalidae   60   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Riodinidae   2   0   0%	Tortricidae	11	0   0%		0   0%	0   0%
Sesidea   1   0   0%   0   0%     Cossidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Papilionidae   7   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Nymphalidae   60   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Pieridae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Riodinidae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Cosmopterigidae   1   0   0%	Castniidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Image: Cossidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Papilionidae   7   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Nymphalidae   60   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Pieridae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Riodinidae   2   0   0%   0	Sesidea					
Cossidae   1   0   0%	🛛 🚽 🗠 — Zygaenidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Papilionidae   7   0   0%	Cossidae	1	0   0%			0   0%
Nymphalidae     60     0   0%	Papilionidae	7	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%
Pieridae   5   0   0%	Nymphalidae	60	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%
Riodinidae   2   0   0%	└┤ [] Pieridae	5	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%
Lycaenidae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Hesperiidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Cosmopterigidae   1   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Gelechiidae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Alucitidea   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Caliidulidea   10   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Crambidae   10   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Pyralidae   6   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Drepanidea   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Notodontidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Notcuidae   41   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Geometridae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Bombycidae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Sphingidae   3   0   0% <th>Riodinidae</th> <th>2</th> <th>0   0%</th> <th></th> <th>0   0%</th> <th></th>	Riodinidae	2	0   0%		0   0%	
Hesperiidae   3   0   0%   0   0%     Cosmopterigidae   1   0   0%   0   0%     Gelechiidae   2   0   0%   0   0%     Alucitidea   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Callidulidea   Callidulidea   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Pyralidae   6   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Mimallonidea   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Notodontidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Kumantriidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Geometridae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Saturniidae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Sphingidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%	Lycaenidae	2	0   0%		0   0%	0   0%
Cosmopterigidae   1   0   0%   0   0%     Gelechiidae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Alucitidea   Callidulidea   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Crambidae   10   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Pyralidae   6   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Drepanidea   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Notodontidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Lymantriidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Geometridae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Bombycidae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Sphingidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%	Hesperiidae	3	0   0%		0   0%	
Gelechiidae   2   0   0%	Cosmopterigidae	1	0   0%	0   0%		
Alucitidea     Callidulidea     Crambidae     Pyralidae     Pyralidae     Drepanidea     Drepanidea     Notodontidae     Secondaria     Q	Gelechiidae	2	0   0%		0   0%	0   0%
Callidulidea   10   0   0%	Alucitidea					
Crambidae   10   0   0%	Callidulidea					
Pyralidae   6   0   0%	لا المراجعة Crambidae	10	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%
Mimallonidea     Drepanidea     Notodontidae   3   0   0%   0   0%     Erebidae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Lymantriidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Noctuidae   41   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Geometridae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Bombycidae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Saturniidae   7   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%	Pyralidae	6	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%
Drepanidea   3   0   0%   0   0%     Notodontidae   3   0   0%   0   0%     Erebidae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Lymantriidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Noctuidae   41   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Geometridae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Lasiocampidea   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Saturniidae   7   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%	📙 Mimallonidea					
Notodontidae   3   0   0%   0   0%     Erebidae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Lymantriidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Noctuidae   41   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Geometridae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Lasiocampidea   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Saturniidae   7   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%	Drepanidea					
Erebidae   5   0   0%	Notodontidae	3	0   0%			0   0%
Image: Construction of the construc	└┤┌─── Erebidae	5	0   0%		0   0%	0   0%
Image: Construction of the second	🕂 Lymantriidae	3	0   0%		0   0%	0   0%
Geometridae   2   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Lasiocampidea   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Bombycidae   5   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Saturniidae   7   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%     Sphingidae   3   0   0%   0   0%   0   0%	└│ └─── Noctuidae	41	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%
Lasiocampidea Bombycidae Saturniidae Sphingidae 3 D   0% D   0%	Geometridae	2	0   0%		0   0%	0   0%
Image: Second	└┤ ┌──── Lasiocampidea					
Saturniidae 7 0   0% 0   0%   Sphingidae 3 0   0% 0   0%	H _ Bombycidae	5	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%	0   0%
Sphingidae 3 0   0% 0   0% 0   0%	🖵 🖵 Saturniidae	7	0   0%			0   0%
	<sup>¬</sup> — Sphingidae	3	0   0%	0   0%		0   0%

Insect Order	Source	Number of	Total	Filtered	Proportion of
		dataset	hits	hits	oskar found
Archaeognatha	GCA	1	0	0	0%
Archaeognatha	TSA	2	0	0	0%
Blattodea	GCA	3	1	1	33.33%
Blattodea	GCF	2	0	0	0%
Blattodea	TSA	51	7	7	13.73%
Coleoptera	GCA	12	1	1	8.33%
Coleoptera	GCF	9	3	2	22.22%
Coleoptera	TSA	86	31	14	16.28%
Collembola	TSA	9	0	0	0%
Dermaptera	TSA	7	0	0	0%
Diptera	GCA	115	63	60	52.17%
Diptera	GCF	43	58	43	100%
Diptera	TSA	162	72	58	35.8%
Embioptera	TSA	5	0	0	0%
Ephemeroptera	GCA	2	0	0	0%
Ephemeroptera	TSA	5	1	1	20%
Grylloblattodea	TSA	2	0	0	0%
Hemiptera	GCA	18	0	0	0%
Hemiptera	GCF	12	0	0	0%
Hemiptera	TSA	192	1	0	0%
Hymenoptera	GCA	52	32	30	57.69%
Hymenoptera	GCF	47	36	32	68.09%
Hymenoptera	TSA	301	157	128	42.52%
Lepidoptera	GCA	80	0	0	0%
Lepidoptera	GCF	17	0	0	0%
Lepidoptera	TSA	135	24	4	2.96%
Mantodea	TSA	13	0	0	0%

Insect Order	Source	Number of	Total	Filtered	Proportion of
		dataset	hits	hits	oskar found
Mantophasmatodea	TSA	2	0	0	0%
Mecoptera	TSA	4	2	2	50%
Megaloptera	TSA	3	0	0	0%
Neuroptera	TSA	7	1	1	14.29%
Odonata	GCA	2	0	0	0%
Odonata	TSA	7	0	0	0%
Orthoptera	GCA	3	0	0	0%
Orthoptera	TSA	28	2	2	7.14%
Phasmatodea	GCA	13	0	0	0%
Phasmatodea	TSA	31	6	2	6.45%
Phthiraptera	GCF	1	0	0	0%
Phthiraptera	TSA	7	0	0	0%
Plecoptera	GCA	3	0	0	0%
Plecoptera	TSA	8	3	3	37.5%
Psocoptera	TSA	23	5	5	21.74%
Raphidioptera	TSA	3	0	0	0%
Siphonaptera	GCF	1	0	0	0%
Siphonaptera	TSA	4	0	0	0%
Strepsiptera	GCA	1	0	0	0%
Strepsiptera	TSA	2	0	0	0%
Thysanoptera	GCA	1	1	1	100%
Thysanoptera	GCF	1	1	1	100%
Thysanoptera	TSA	11	10	8	72.73%
Trichoptera	GCA	3	1	1	33.33%
Trichoptera	TSA	7	2	2	28.57%
Zoraptera	TSA	2	0	0	0%
Zygentoma	TSA	4	1	1	25%

Insect Order	Source	ource Number of Total		Filtered Proportion of	
		dataset	hits	hits	oskar found
Crustacea	TSA	168	0	0	0%
Crustacea	GCF	1	0	0	0%
Crustacea	GCA	11	0	0	0%

**Table B.1: Number of** oskar sequence found per order and per data source. Each line corresponds to an order and a data source: GCF, GCA, TSA. The number of total hits is reported as well as the number of hits after the filtration algorithm described in the methods is applied. Finally, the proportion of *oskar* sequences found, defined as the number datasets with a positive hit divided by the total number of dataset searched is reported.

**Figure B.4** *(following page)*: **Complete Hymenopteran Oskar phylogeny.** Phylogenetic tree of all Hymenopteran Oskar sequences inferred using RaxML with 100 bootstrap. Branch length normalized to only show the topology. Each leaf is an Oskar ortholog. In gray, only one Oskar sequence was found in this species, in red duplicated Oskars sequences (sequence similarity < 80%).

#### Figure B.4: (continued)





**Figure B.5: Tissue and Stage metadata analysis of** *oskar* **presence in transcriptomes datasets.** On the left, the proportion of datasets analyzed with the corresponding stage or tissue type. On the right, the proportion of datasets with a given stage or tissue type where *oskar* was detected. In red, tissue types where *oskar* was detected in.



**Figure B.6: Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA) of Oskar, OSK and LOTUS.** MCA analysis of trimmed (30% occupancy) alignments for Oskar, OSK and LOTUS colored by order (see legend). The alignment was projected onto the first three main MCA dimensions. Each dot corresponds to one sequence.



**Figure B.7: Evolution of the structure of Oskar in Diptera**. On the left is the dipteran phylogeny from Wiegmann et al.<sup>2</sup>, Maddison et al.<sup>3</sup>. At the top is a schematic representation of the Oskar structure. In blue is a heatmap showing the overall occupancy of a position in the Oskar alignment trimmed for at least 10% overall occupancy at a position. For each Dipteran family, the occupancy at a position is defined as: number of non gap Amino Acids / Number of sequences in that family. If a 3' or 5' extension was detected in a family, a transparent box is shown overlaid. Finally, the Long Oskar version of Oskar is shown on the left of the families where it was detected.



**Figure B.8: Oskar domains secondary structure conservation.** Sequence logo of Jpred4 predictions for LOTUS and OSK domains showing the conservation of secondary structures. Represented are logos computed with WebLOGO. The height of each letter represents that state (X H or B) conservation throughout the alignment in bits. X (black) are unfolded amino acids, H (red) are  $\alpha$  helices and E (blue) are  $\beta$  sheets. In **a**), prediction for the LOTUS domain. In **b**), prediction for the OSK domain.

### References

- Akito Y Kawahara, David Plotkin, Marianne Espeland, Karen Meusemann, Emmanuel F A Toussaint, Alexander Donath, France Gimnich, Paul B Frandsen, Andreas Zwick, Mario Dos Reis, Jesse R Barber, Ralph S Peters, Shanlin Liu, Xin Zhou, Christoph Mayer, Lars Podsiadlowski, Caroline Storer, Jayne E Yack, Bernhard Misof, and Jesse W Breinholt. Phylogenomics reveals the evolutionary timing and pattern of butterflies and moths. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 116(45):22657–22663, November 2019.
- [2] Brian M Wiegmann, Michelle D Trautwein, Isaac S Winkler, Norman B Barr, Jung-Wook Kim, Christine Lambkin, Matthew A Bertone, Brian K Cassel, Keith M Bayless, Alysha M Heimberg, Benjamin M Wheeler, Kevin J Peterson, Thomas Pape, Bradley J Sinclair, Jeffrey H Skevington, Vladimir Blagoderov, Jason Caravas, Sujatha Narayanan Kutty, Urs Schmidt-Ott, Gail E Kampmeier, F Christian Thompson, David A Grimaldi, Andrew T Beckenbach, Gregory W Courtney, Markus Friedrich, Rudolf Meier, and David K Yeates. Episodic radiations in the fly tree of life. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 108(14):5690–5695, April 2011.
- [3] David R Maddison, Katja-Sabine Schulz, and Wayne P Maddison. The tree of life web project. *Zootaxa*, 1668(1):19–40, 2007.



## Chapter 3: Supplementary data

This appendix contains the supplementary figures for the Chapter 3.

#### Table C.1: Tabulation of raw data and analysis for every gene in the screen.

The content of this table can be downloaded on GitHub.

This table contains a summary representation of the data generated by the three screens as well as results from the analysis. Each line corresponds to an independent measurement of a particular RNAi line. Some genes which did not pass the first filter of  $|Z_{gene}| > 1$  in the *hpo[RNAi]* Egg Laying screen where then predicted as connectors, therefore they have two entries as they have been independently measured again. The Z scores have been rounded up to 4 significant digits in this table and the Centrality metrics rounded up to 10 significant digits due to their low values, but the full values for both are available in the raw data files provided in the supplementary files in Data/Screens for the Z scores and Results for the centrality values. Moreover, this is a summary table and does not contain values for controls as well as batch numbers, all are available in the supplementary files in Data/Screens.

- FbID: FlyBase ID of the tested gene.

- CG number: CG Number of the tested gene.

- NAME: Common name (as per FlyBase nomenclature) of the gene if existing, else it is a -.

- **SYMBOL**: Symbol (as per FlyBase nomenclature) of the gene if existing, else CG number

- [ScreenName]\_[Variable]\_(Metric)\_Count: Within the screen [ScreenName], the count of the measured variable [Variable]. Optional: (metric) will indicate if a particular operation was done over the data, such as sum, mean or standard deviation.

e.g. [HippoRNAi\_EggL] [Day\_4\_Egg] Count is the count of eggs, on day 4, of the *hpo*[*RNAi*] Egg Laying screen.

- [ScreenName]\_[Variable]\_(Metric)\_Zscore: Within the screen [ScreenName], the Z score of the measured variable [Variable] as calculated to batch control. Optional: (metric) will indicate if a particular operation was done over the data, such as sum, mean or standard deviation.

e.g. [EggL]\_[All\_Days\_Egg]\_(Sum)\_Zscore is the Z score of the sum of eggs count, of the Egg Laying screen.

- PIN\_[Metric]\_centrality: Within the PIN used in this study, the calculated centrality value for the metric [Metric].

- [SubNetworkName]\_Network: Presence of absence of a gene in the sub-network [SubNetworkName]. If the gene is in the module, this value is True, if it is absent it is False. (An exception is made for the Meta Network displayed in Figure 6 where instead of True/False, the group assignment I-VII is written)

- [SubNetworkName]\_Connector: Status of a gene in the sub-network [SubNetworkName] as a connector. If True, the gene is a connector, else if False, the gene is not a connector.

- [*PathwayName*]\_Pathway: Participation of a gene to the signalling pathway [*PathwayName*]. If the gene participates in the pathway the value is 1, else it is 0.

**Figure C.1** (*following page*): **Violin plots of egg laying and ovariole number of controls in each screen batch. a**) Distribution of number of eggs laid by five replicates of three *tj:Gal4>hpo[RNAi]* females over five days for each batch. **b**) Distribution of number of eggs laid by five replicates of three *tj:Gal4* females over five days for each batch. **c**) Distribution of number of ovarioles per ovary in 20 ovaries from ten *tj:Gal4>hpo[RNAi]* females in each batch.

Figure C.1: (continued)









374



**Figure C.2: Enrichment/depletion analysis of the 273 signalling pathway genes above the threshold** |Z<sub>gene</sub>| > 1 (Figure 3.1a) **against all signalling candidates.** We also measured the enrichment/depletion of positive signalling candidate genes in the *hpo*[*RNAi*] Ovariole (Figure 1c) and Egg Laying (Figure 1b) screens from the 273 genes tested in those screens.

Centrality	hpo[RNAi] Ovariole Number	hpo[RNAi] Egg Laying	Egg Laying
Betweenness	0.603	0.57	0.586
EigenVector	0.632	0.573	0.586
Closeness	0.612	0.551	0.588
Degrees	0.615	0.592	0.599

**Table C.2:** Area under the curve (AUC) of ROC curves. AUC values for the ROC curves for each centrality measure for the three screens (Figure 4a). AUC values range from 0 to 1. A score above 0.5 indicates a positive correlation between the continuous variable (centrality) and the binary variable (above or below the Z score threshold). A score of 0.5 or less indicates no correlation between the variables.

**Figure C.3** (*following page*): Comparison of egg laying candidate genes by pathway. *Z*<sub>gene</sub> of egg laying of adult females of *tj>hpo*[*RNAi*], *candidate*[*RNAi*] plotted against *Z*<sub>gene</sub> of egg laying of *tj>candidate*[*RNAi*] adult females displayed by pathway. Contour plots indicate a 2D gaussian kernel density estimation.

Figure C.3: (continued)



<sup>377</sup> 

**Figure C.4** (following page): Comparisons of the  $Z_{gene}$  scores of the positive candidate genes sorted by centrality metrics. In each screen (a, b, c), the  $|Z_{gene}|$  values of the first (dark grey) and fifth (light grey) quintiles of positive candidate genes ordered by rank for each of the four chosen centrality metrics, are plotted as a bar plot. Bars indicate standard error, and significant differences (p-value<0.05 Mann Whitney U test) are indicated by asterisks. p-values are displayed below every bar plot.



379

Sub-Network	Number of Seeds	Number of Connectors	Number of connector genes above  Z <sub>gene</sub>   threshold within sub-network phenotype
hpo[RNAi] Egg Laying	58	18	7 (41.1%)
Core	27	10	1 (10.0%)
Egg Laying	49	11	0 (0.0%)
<i>hpo[RNAi]</i> Ovariole Number	66	11	3 (27.2%)

**Table C.3: Distribution of seed genes and connectors in each sub-network.** Two genes that were above  $|Z_{gene}|$  threshold (Table 2 and Figure 7- Figure supplement 2) in the *hpo*[*RNAi*] Egg Laying (CG12147) and *hpo*[*RNAi*] Ovariole Number seed list (CG6104) were not found in the PIN, and therefore not included in the network analysis or in this table (see methods for details). The removal of these two genes accounts for the difference between the number of positive candidates in Table 2 and Figure 7- Figure supplement 2, and the number of seed genes in these two sub-networks (Supplementary File 1 and Figure 7- Figure supplement 1). The proportion of connectors whose loss of function produced a significant phenotype ( $|Z_{gene}|$  above threshold) is in parentheses and plotted in Figure 7a, 7b). All connectors except *eukaryotic translation initiation factor 3 subunit j (eIF3J)* in the *hpo*[*RNAi*] Egg Laying sub-network, for which no RNAi line was available at the time of testing, were tested. Therefore, the percentages of connectors above the threshold for the *hpo*[*RNAi*] Egg Laying sub-network were calculated out of 17 connectors.

**Figure C.5** (*following page*): Comparison of network metrics of seed lists obtained from the screen. a) Comparison of network metrics of all screened genes (red line) to two null distributions of network metrics derived by randomly sampling an equal number of random genes (light grey curve) or degree-controlled genes (dark grey curve) from the PIN. b) Comparisons of the Largest Connected Component (LCC), network density, number of edges and average shortest path between the seed network (red line) and the randomly sampled null distribution (1000 random samples) of both an equal number of random genes (light grey curve) from the PIN.

Figure C.5: (continued)



381



**Figure C.6:** *Hpo*[*RNAi*] **Egg Laying Sub-Network generated by the Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA).** The size of the shapes indicates the  $Z_{gene}$  score of the gene. Circles = seed genes; triangles = connector genes. Green = genes with a positive  $Z_{gene}$  above the threshold. Red = genes with a negative  $Z_{gene}$  above threshold. Grey = genes with  $Z_{gene}$  values below the threshold. All connectors were phenotypically tested (Supplementary File 1) except *eukaryotic translation initiation factor 3 subunit j (eIF3J*), in the *hpo*[*RNAi*] Egg Laying Module (black triangle), for which no RNAi stock as available at the time of testing.



**Figure C.7: Egg Laying Sub-Network generated by the Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA).** The size of the shapes indicates the  $Z_{gene}$  score of the gene. Circles = seed genes; triangles = connector genes. Green = genes with a positive  $Z_{gene}$  above the threshold. Red = genes with a negative  $Z_{gene}$  above threshold. Grey = genes with  $Z_{gene}$  values below the threshold. All connectors were phenotypically tested (Table C.1).





**Figure C.8:** *Hpo*[*RNAi*] **Ovariole Number Sub-Network generated by the Seed Connector Algorithm (SCA).** The size of the shapes indicates the  $Z_{gene}$  score of the gene. Circles = seed genes; triangles = connector genes. Green = genes with a positive  $Z_{gene}$  above the threshold. Red = genes with a negative  $Z_{gene}$  above threshold. Grey = genes with  $Z_{gene}$  values below the threshold. All connectors were phenotypically tested (Supplementary File 1).

Unique Genes	s with	Number of genes above threshold in				
RNAis		hpo[RNAi] Egg Laying Z <sub>gene</sub> > 1	Egg Laying Z <sub>gene</sub> >[5]	hpo[RNAi] Egg Laying Z <sub>gene</sub> > 5	hpo[RNAi] Ovariole Number Z <sub>gene</sub> > 2	All three screens
Connectors	42	32	10/32	13/42	12/32	8/32 (25%)
			(31.2%)	(30.9%)	(37.5%)	
Signalling	463	273	49/273	59/463	67/273	27/273
candidates			(17.9%)	(12.7%)	(24.5%)	(9.8%)

Table C.4: Number of unique connector and signaling genes above  $|Z_{gene}|$  threshold for the three phenotypes measured in this screen (Figure 1a, 1b, 1c). Table indicates the number of unique genes among the connector genes and signaling genes screened, that had available RNAi lines at the time of analysis. The number of genes in the *hpo[RNAi]* Egg Laying sub-network that were above the primary filter of  $|Z_{gene}| > 1$  are also indicated. Percentage of the number of connectors and signalling candidates above threshold for each phenotype from the number of connectors above the primary filter is in parentheses and plotted in Figure 7c. All connectors except *eukaryotic translation initiation factor 3 subunit j (eIF3J)* in the *hpo[RNAi]* Egg Laying subnetwork, for which no RNAi line was available at the time of testing, were tested. Therefore, the percentages of connectors above the threshold were calculated out of 32 unique connectors.



#### a. Network modules predicted by SCA









**Figure C.11: Signalling pathway enrichment/depletion analysis**. a) For each putative module generated by the SCA, a null distribution of the expected number of members of a signalling pathway from a group of the same number of randomly selected signalling pathway genes was calculated. The Z score from the expected distribution was then calculated. Negative Z scores represent a depletion, while positive Z scores represent an enrichment. No single pathway is enriched in any of those SCA-generated putative modules. b) Fold enrichment and hypergeometric p-value calculation for each pathway in the four SCA-generated putative modules. Pathway members in colour (orange = mTor; brown = Hedgehog; pink = Notch) have a p-value < 0.05.






THIS THESIS WAS TYPESET using LTEX, originally developed by Leslie Lamport and based on Donald Knuth's TEX. The body text is set in 11 point Source Sans Pro. I modified the Dissertate template that can be used to format a PhD thesis with this look and feel. It has been released under the permissive MIT (X11) license, and can be found online at github.com/suchow/Dissertate or from its author, Jordan Suchow, at suchow@post.harvard.edu.

Thank you for reading this thesis until the end.