**Oo-site: Dashboard to visualize gene expression in the *Drosophila* germarium**
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**Summary:** Determining how stem cell differentiation is controlled has important implications for understanding the etiology of degenerative disease and designing regenerative therapies. *In vivo* analysesof stem cell model systems have revealed regulatory paradigms for stem cell self-renewal and differentiation. The germarium of the female *Drosophila* gonad, which houses both germline and somatic stem cells, is one such model system. Bulk RNA sequencing (seq), single cell (sc) RNA-seq, and bulk translation efficiency of mRNAs is available for stem cells and their differentiating progeny within the *Drosophila* germarium. However, visualizing those data is hampered by lack of a tool to spatially map gene expression and translational data in the germarium. Here, we have compiled and developed Oo-site, a tool for visualizing bulk- and scRNA-seq and translational efficiency data during different stages of germline differentiation, that makes these data accessible to non-bioinformaticians. Using this tool, we recapitulated previously reported expression patterns of developmentally regulated genes and also discovered that meiotic genes, such as those that regulate the synaptonemal complex, are regulated at the level of translation.

**Introduction:**

The *Drosophila* ovary provides a powerful system to study stem cell differentiation *in vivo* (Lehmann 2012; Spradling et al. 2011). The *Drosophila* ovary consists of two main cell lineages, the germline, which ultimately gives rise to eggs, and the soma, which surrounds the germline and plays a supportive role in egg development (Schüpbach 1987; Roth 2001; Xie and Spradling 2000). Each stage of *Drosophila* female germline stem cell (GSC) differentiation is observable and identifiable, allowing GSC development to be easily studied (Xie and Spradling 1998; Dansereau and Lasko 2008; Lehmann 2012). Specifically, female *Drosophila* GSCs undergo an asymmetric division, giving rise to another GSC and a cystoblast (CB) (**Figure 1A**) (McKearin and Ohlstein 1995; Chen and McKearin 2003b; Xie and Spradling 1998). The GSC and CB are marked by a round structure called the spectrosome (Figure 1A) (De Cuevas and Spradling 1998). The CB then undergoes four incomplete divisions resulting in 2-, 4-, 8-, and finally 16-cell cysts, which are marked by an extended structure called the fusome (**Figure 1A**) (De Cuevas and Spradling 1998; Chen and McKearin 2003a; 2003b). In the 16-cell cyst, one of the cyst cells is specified as the oocyte, while the other 15 cells become nurse cells, which provide proteins and mRNAs to support the development of the oocyte (**Figure 1A**) (Carpenter 1975; J. Huynh and St Johnston 2000; J.-R. Huynh and St Johnston 2004; Theurkauf et al. 1993; Navarro, Lehmann, and Morris 2001). The 16-cell cyst is encapsulated by somatic cells and buds off from the germarium, forming an egg chamber (**Figure 1A**) (Narbonne-Reveau et al. 2006; Xie and Spradling 2000; Forbes et al. 1996). In each chamber, the oocyte grows as the nurse cells synthesizes and then deposits mRNAs and proteins into the oocyte, which eventually gives rise to a mature egg (J. Huynh and St Johnston 2000; Narbonne-Reveau et al. 2006).

Expression of differentiation factors, including those that regulate translation, results in progressive differentiation of GSCs to an oocyte (Blatt et al. 2020; Slaidina and Lehmann 2014). Beginning the CB, Bam is expression promotes differentiation and the transition from CB to 8-cell cyst stage (Chen and McKearin 2003a; McKearin and Ohlstein 1995; Ohlstein and McKearin 1997). In the 8-cell cyst, Rbfox1 promotes exit from the mitotic cell cycles into meiosis (Carreira-Rosario et al. 2016). Both the differentiation factors Bam and Rbfox affect translation of mRNAs to promote differentiation (Li et al. 2009; Carreira-Rosario et al. 2016). In addition, in 8-cell cysts, recombination is initiated across many cyst cells and then eventually is restricted to the specified oocyte (Hinnant, Merkle, and Ables 2020; J. Huynh and St Johnston 2000). Neither the mRNAs that are translationally regulated during this progressive differentiation nor how the recombination is temporally regulated is fully understood (Slaidina and Lehmann 2014; Carreira-Rosario et al. 2016; Mercer et al. 2021).

Within the germarium, the germline is surrounded by and relies on distinct populations of somatic cells for signaling, structure, and organization (Schüpbach 1987; Roth 2001; Xie and Spradling 1998; 2000). For example, the terminal filament, cap and anterior-escort cells act as a somatic niche for the GSCs (Decotto and Spradling 2005; Xie and Spradling 2000). Once GSCs divide to give rise to CBs, posterior escort cells guide CB differentiation by encapsulating the CB and the early-cyst stages (Upadhyay et al. 2016; Shi et al. 2021; Kirilly, Wang, and Xie 2011). Follicle stem cells (FSCs), which are present towards the posterior of the germarium, divide and differentiate to give rise to follicle cells, (FCs) which surround the late-stage cysts that give rise to egg chambers (Nystul and Spradling 2010; Margolis and Spradling 1995). FSCs also give rise to stalk cells and polar cells which connect the individual egg chambers that comprise the ovariole (Margolis and Spradling 1995; Nystul and Spradling 2010).

While there is a wealth of bulk-seq, single-cell mRNA-seq (scRNA-seq) and translational efficiency data from polysome-seq experiments for the cells in the germarium, there are several hurdles for easy utilization of this data:

1. scRNA-seq has exquisite temporal resolution but it can miss some lowly expressed transcripts which are better captured by bulk-seq (Lähnemann et al. 2020). However, there is no easy way to compare these two data sets.
2. While scRNA-seq provides mRNA levels, it does not indicate if these mRNAs are translated, especially in the germline where translation control plays an important role (Slaidina and Lehmann 2014; Blatt et al. 2020).
3. Lastly, there is a barrier to visualization of the data for those who are not experienced in bioinformatics.

Here, we have developed a tool that we call Oo-site which integrates scRNA-seq, bulk-seq, and polysome-seq data to spatially visualize gene expression and translational efficiency in the germarium.

**Results and discussion**

To make bulk-, scRNA-, and polysome- seq data accessible to the community, we have collated and reprocessed previously published sequencing datasets of ovaries enriched for GSCs, CBs, cysts, and egg chambers (**Figure 1B**). Notably, each genetically enriched sample had matched RNA-seq and polysome-seq libraries prepared, allowing for simultaneous read-out of mRNA level and translation status (**Supplemental Figure 1A**). One limitation is that the enriched cyst stages does not resolve each distinct stage of cyst development, instead these samples represent a mixture of cyst stages. Therefore to supplement the enrichment data, we have integrated scRNA-seq data from Slaidina et al. which provides more discrete temporal resolution of the cyst stages (Slaidina et al. 2021). We present this data as a tool called Oo-site, a collection of interactive visualizations that allows researchers to easily input a gene or collection of genes of interest to determine their expression pattern(s).

Oo-site consists of three modules: ovary-map, ovary-heatmap, and ovary-violin (**Figure 1C**). Each module allows users to visualize expression from matched mRNA seq and polysome-seq data of genetically enriched stages of early GSC differentiation as well as previously published scRNA-seq data (Slaidina et al. 2021). Additionally, we have integrated scRNA-seq expression data for genes that cluster in somatic cell populations that reside in the germarium (Slaidina et al. 2021), however, this work focuses on germline cells (Slaidina et al. 2021). Ovary-map allows users to visualize the expression of a single gene over the course of differentiation in the framework of a germarium schematic, which contextualizes staging for those less familiar with *Drosophila* oogenesis. Ovary-heatmap consists of a clustered, interactive heatmap of genes determined to be differentially expressed that allows users to explore expression trends over development (**Figure 1B, Supplemental Figure 1B-C’**). Finally, ovary-violin allows users to visualize the expression of multiple genes over the course of differentiation (**Figure 1C**). These groups of genes can be selected either by a GO-term of interest or a custom list of genes supplied by the user. The user can download a spreadsheet of gene expression corresponding to the subset of selected or input genes. Finally, Oo-site incorporates a reporting tool which generates a downloadable report of the visualization(s) in a standardized format to facilitate their use for publication (**Figure 1C**). Researchers can use these datasets to enhance hypothesis generation or to confirm expression patterns observed from other methods.

Using Oo-site, we first determined if the bulk mRNA-seq data that was acquired by enriching for specific stages of germline development is representative of the gene expression patterns from purified cell types. We compared bulk-seq data obtained by enriching for GSC and CB cell types without purification from somatic cells (**Figure 1C**) to the GSC and CB data from Wilcockson et al where they included a fluorescent-assisted cell sorting (FACS) step to eliminate somatic cells so that a pure population of these cells was sequenced (Wilcockson and Ashe 2019). We analyzed the expression of genes that Wilcockson *et al* identified as 2-fold or more down- or upregulated with a p-value < 0.01. We found that in the bulk-seq data these genes followed similar trends as identified by Wilcockson *et al*, indicating that despite the lack of FACS purification, our data reproduces meaningful mRNA expression changes over these stages (**Supplemental Figure 2A-A'**).

To determine if our bulk- seq data recapitulates genuine changes in gene expression, we compared the expression of *ribosomal small subunit protein 19b* (*RpS19b*) in bulk mRNAseq to scRNA-seq data. Our bulk-seq data, as well as the available scRNA-seq data indicated that *RpS19b* was highly expressed in GSCs, decreased during differentiation in the cyst stages, and was greatly decreased expression in early egg chambers, consistent with previous reports (**Fig 2A-B**) (McCarthy et al. 2021; Sarkar et al. 2021). To further validate this expression pattern, we probed the expression of *RpS19b* *in vivo* using *in situ* hybridization as well as an RpS19b::GFP line that is under endogenous control elements (McCarthy et al. 2021). We found that *RpS19b* was present in the GSCs and diminishes in the cyst stages both at the mRNA and protein level (**Figure 2C-E**). Additionally, RpS19b::GFP expression resembled it’s mRNA expression indicating that its dynamic expression is achieved primarily through modulating the mRNA level of RpS19b, consistent with its moderate to high translational efficiency in early stages (**Figure 2C-D, Supplemental Figure 2B**). Thus, enriching for specific germline stages captures changes to gene expression in the germline. However, we note that care should be taken in interpreting bulk-seq results as the data may be influenced by the somatic cells present in the samples. However, simultaneous comparison with scRNA-seq can alleviate this problem.

To determine the groups of genes that change as the GSCs differentiate into an egg, we used GO-term analysis to probe for pathways that change at the level of RNA using bulk-seq data. We did not identify any significant GO-terms in genes that are differentially expressed between GSCs and CBs. We found that genes with lower expression in GSCs compared to differentiating cysts are enriched in the GO-term polytene chromosome puffing which is consistent with GO-terms identified in Wilcockson et al. for genes that are expressed more highly in differentiating cysts than GSCs (**Figure 3A**). We also identified the polytene chromosome puffing GO term in genes downregulated in CBs compared to cysts. Additionally, we observed that several GO-terms involving peptidase activity were enriched in genes upregulated in GSCs and CBs compared to cysts. This is consistent with findings suggesting that peptidases can be actively regulated during differentiation and can influence stem cell fate (Tiaden et al. 2012; Han et al. 2015; Perišić Nanut et al. 2021). We found that two GO-terms related to glutathione transferase activity were enriched in genes downregulated in GSCs and CBs compared to ovaries from young-WT flies and in CBs compared to differentiating cysts, suggesting that metabolic processes may be altered during GSC differentiation. Additionally, comparison of CBs and differentiating cysts to young-WT, which contain egg chambers, indicated that downregulated genes were enriched in GO-terms involving vitelline and eggshell coat proteins (**Figure 3A**).

Next, to determine if our data could resolve large scale expression changes that occur during oogenesis we examined the expression of genes in the GO-term Meiotic cell cycle. Meiosis is initiated during the cyst stages of differentiation and therefore we would expect genes in the category, in general, to increase in expression in the *bam* RNAi; *bam*-HS samples (Carpenter 1979; Tanneti et al. 2011). We were surprised to find no significant change in the mean mRNA expression of genes in this GO-term in any of our enriched stages compared to enriched GSCs, though this does not preclude gene expression changes for individual genes (**Supplemental Figure A**). However, this is consistent with the observation that several factors that promote meiosis I are transcribed in the GSCs and the stages therein (McCarthy et al. 2021). This suggests that, in general, transition from a mitotic state to a meiotic state is not driven by changes in mRNA levels of meiotic cell cycle genes.

As we did not see overall changes to mRNA levels of genes in the GO-term meiotic cell cycle, we next examined the polysome-seq data of those genes to determine if changes in expression might occur at the level of translation. Polysome-seq uses polysome profiling to separate mRNAs that are associated to polysomes which form by mRNAs engagement with multiple ribosomes. To quantify the degree to which an mRNA is associated with polysome fractions, we compared the relative abundance of mRNAs from the polysome fractions to their relative expression using corresponding input lysates to calculate a metric referred to as translational efficiency (TE). Indeed, genes in the meiotic cell cycle GO-term had a significant increase in translation efficiency in CBs and a more dramatic increase in cysts despite no significant changes to the overall mRNA level of these genes (Supplemental **Figure 3A-B**). Based on scRNA-seq data, the expression of meiotic cell cycle genes increased slightly but significantly in clusters 4CC and 8CC with a median increase in expression of 1.25 fold and 1.19 fold in the 4CC and 8CC clusters respectively (Supplemental Figure 3C). This suggests that some genes in the meiotic cell cycle GO-term may be regulated at the mRNA level, but as a group this regulation is modest. This is likely because genes in this GO-term are robustly expressed even in GSCs as the median mRNA level of meiotic cell cycle genes in enriched GSCs is 36.1 TPM, which exceeds the 70th expression percentile among all genes in enriched GSCs.

To validate this finding, we examined *orientation disrupter* (*ord)* because it is a well characterized gene, is required for sister chromatid cohesion, and has previously been reported to peak in expression as meiosis begins in *Drosophila* (S. E. Bickel et al. 1996; Sharon E Bickel, Wyman, and Orr-Weaver 1997; Khetani and Bickel 2007). Our Oo-site results suggested that *ord* mRNA was expressed before meiosis, both from bulk mRNA-seq (**Figure 4A**) and scRNA-seq (**Supplemental Figure 3D**) consistent with reports that chromosome pairing initiates before meiotic entry (Christophorou, Rubin, and Huynh 2013; Joyce et al. 2013). However, polysome-seq data was consistent with the observation that Ord protein expression increases during the cyst stages due to translation (Figure 4B). This led us to predict that *ord* mRNA would be expressed prior to meiosis, and that Ord protein expression would increase during the cyst stages as previously observed, implying a change in the translation status of *ord* mRNA. To test this, we performed fluorescent *in-situ* hybridization against GFP in a fly expressing Ord-GFP under the control of the *ord* promoter and 5’UTR. We visualized both the GFP protein and the mRNA and observed increased expression of Ord::GFP proteinbut consistent *ord::GFP* mRNA expression, indicating that Ord is controlled post-transcriptionally, likely at the level of translation based on our polysome-seq data (Figure 4C-D’). This finding also underscores the utility of Oo-site in exploring post-transcriptional gene expression changes.

To determine if changes to biological processes could be detected using Oo-site, we examined the expression of genes in the GO-term “double-strand break repair”, which is known to occur during meiosis 1 (Page and Hawley 2003; Hughes et al. 2018). Double-stranded breaks are resolved prior to egg chamber formation (Page and Hawley 2003; Mehrotra and McKim 2006; Hughes et al. 2018). At the level of input mRNA, we found no significant changes in the expression of genes in this category compared to enriched GSCs. From scRNA-seq data, the median expression of double-strand break repair genes significantly increases, but the median increase was only 1.05 fold in 4-CCs and 1.06 in 8-CCs compared to the GSC/CB/2-CC group. This suggests that double-strand break repair gene transcription begins in GSC stages and increases during the cyst stages.

In contrast, we found a significant increase in the median translational efficiency of double-strand break repair genes, with a 1.20 fold increase in the median translational efficiency in enriched CBs and a 1.56 fold increase in enriched cysts compared to enriched GSCs. In young-WT the median fold change in translational efficiency decreased slightly but significantly compared to enriched GSCs at 0.95 fold. This is consistent with the observed progression of double-stranded break repair that occurs *in vivo*. This demonstrates that Oo-site can be used to derive insights into biological processes that may be changing during early oogenesis (Page and Hawley 2003; Mehrotra and McKim 2006). That key processes related to meiosis and differentiation are controlled post-transcriptionally is consistent with the importance of proteins that regulate translation such as Bam and Rbfox1 in differentiation and meiotic commitment during *Drosophila* oogenesis (Carreira-Rosario et al. 2016; Slaidina and Lehmann 2014; Blatt et al. 2020; Li et al. 2009; Flora et al. 2018; Kim-Ha, Kerr, and Macdonald 1995).

**Conclusions and future directions:**

We have developed an application that facilitates analysis of mRNA-seq, polysome-seq, and single cell-seq data of early *Drosophila* oogenesis that is accessible to non-bioinformaticians. We have demonstrated its utility in reproducing expression at the mRNA and translation level. Additionally, we have demonstrated that it can be used to visualize the expression of groups of genes over development to facilitate hypothesis development.

We have discovered that key meiosis regulators such as proteins of the synaptonemal complex and proteins of the double strand break machinery are regulated at the level of translation. This adds to our understanding of the mechanisms regulating the mitotic to meiotic transition. In future work, identifying the factors mediating the widespread post-transcriptional regulation of crucial meiotic genes and mechanistically how it drives the mitotic to meiotic transition is of high importance.

High-throughput sequencing has enabled researchers to generate more data than ever before (Wang, Lachmann, and Ma’ayan 2019). However, development of analysis tools that are usable without bioinformatics training that enable users to make sense of this data to generate hypotheses and novel discoveries has lagged (Shachak, Shuval, and Fine 2007). Oo-site allows for hypothesis generation and discovery using the powerful model system of *Drosophila* oogenesis. Additionally, the open-source ­­nature of this software facilitates future tool development, which will be crucial as more researchers delve into more data intensive scRNA-seq, where visualization tools are limited and produce plots that may be difficult to interpret for those not versed in bioinformatics. Oo-site can be supplemented in the future to include additional data such as Cut and Run for various chromatin marks, nascent mRNA transcription using transient transcriptome sequencing or similar techniques, or protein levels from mass-spectroscopy to further extend its utility in hypothesis development.
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**Figure Legends:**

**Figure 1: Oo-site integrates and provides an interface for interacting with multiomic data covering major stages of Drosophila GSC differentiation.**

(A) Cartoon illustrating developmental stages of germline development. (B) Summary of the samples used for input mRNAseq and polysome-seq and the cell types these samples are enriched for. (C) Screenshot of Oo-site dashboard, indicating: (1) “Take a Tour!” function, which guides the user through the functionality and operation of Oo-site. (2) The available seq datasets which the user can view, including RNAseq of ovaries genetically enriched for developmental stages (Input mRNAseq), polysome-seq of ovaries genetically enriched for developmental stages (Polysome-seq), single-cell seq of germline stages (Single-Cell seq: Germline), and single-cell seq of somatic stages in the germarium (Single-Cell seq: Soma). (3) the available visualizations which the user can use, including viewing the expression of genes over development at the level of a single gene (Developmental Progression), viewing all significantly changing genes as heatmaps (Heatmap), and viewing groups of genes either derived from GO-term categories or supplied by the user (Gene Groups). (4) The control panel, which the user can use to control the current visualization, and (5) the Generate Report Function, which can be used to download a PDF report of either the current visualization or all active visualizations.

**Figure 2: Oo-site allows for accurate visualization of dynamically regulated genes**

(A-B) Visualization of expression of RpS19b over germline development from (A) developmentally enriched stages and (B) single-cell seq data indicates that the mRNA level of RpS19b decreases starting in the cysts and is dramatically decreased in early egg chambers. Color indicates relative expression and displayed values indicate the mean TPM of RpS19b in each given stage. (C-C’’) Confocal images of ovaries with in-situ hybridization of RpS19b (green, middle greyscale) XXX demonstrate that the mRNA level of RpS19b decreases starting in the cyst stages and are dramatically lower in early egg chambers consistent with the seq data. (D-D’’) Confocal images of ovaries expressing RpS19b::GFP, stained for (D’) GFP (green, middle greyscale), (D’') Vasa (blue, right greyscale), and 1B1 (red) demonstrate that the protein expression of RpS19b::GFP is consistent with its mRNA levels. (D-D’) Quantification of normalized mean intensity of in-situ staining (C’). X-axis represents the distance in microns from the niche, y-axis represents mean intensity normalized to the maximum mean intensity per germarium of RpS19b mRNA. Line represents fit using a loess regression, shaded area represents the standard error of the fit. (n=5 germaria).

**Figure 3: GO-terms enriched from differentially expressed genes between genetically enriched developmental milestones**

(A-B) Heatmaps of significant GO-terms resulting from the pairwise comparison of significantly (A) upregulated or (B) downregulated genes in the first genotype listed relative to the second genotype listed in the x-axis from RNAseq of each developmentally enriched stage. Comparisons that did not generate any significant GO-terms are omitted.

**Figure 4: Ord expression is controlled post-transcriptionally**

(A-B) Visualization of expression of Ord over germline development from (A) RNAseq of developmentally enriched stages and (B) polysome-seq of developmentally enriched stages indicates that the mRNA level of Ord is consistent from GSCs to cysts, until decreasing in early egg chambers, but the translation efficiency of Ord increases during the cyst stages compared to other stages. (C-C’’) Confocal images of ovaries expressing Ord::GFP with in-situ hybridization of *gfp* mRNA (red, middle greyscale) and stained for GFP protein (green, right greyscale) and DAPI (blue) demonstrate that the mRNA level of Ord::GFP is consistent throughout the germarium. (D-D’) Quantification of normalized mean intensity of stainings (C-C’’). X-axis represents the distance in microns from the niche, y-axis represents mean intensity normalized to the maximum mean intensity per germarium of Ord mRNA (C’) or Ord protein (C’’). Line represents fit using a loess regression, shaded area represents the standard error of the fit. (n=8 germaria).

**Figure 5. Genes involved in double-strand break repair may be controlled post-transcriptionally.**

(A) Violin plot of expression of genes in the GO category Double-strand break repair from input mRNAseq. No significant overall change in expression of these genes occurs comparing each genetically enriched developmental stage to GSCs. (B) Violin plot of expression of genes in the GO category Double-strand break repair from polysome-seq. Overall expression of these genes increases in CBs, cysts, and young-wt ovaries compared to GSCs. Values above plots represent Holm-Bonnferroni adjusted p-values resulting from a one-sided t-test with mu=0. (C) Violin plot of expression of genes in the GO category Double-strand break repair from scRNA-seq. Overall expression of these genes increases in CBs, cysts, and young-wt ovaries compared to the GSC/CB/2CC cluster. Values above plots represent Holm-Bonnferroni adjusted p-values resulting from a one-sided t-test with mu=0.

**Supplemental Figure 1. Sequencing strategy and clustered heatmaps of differential expression, related to Figure 1**

(A) Schema of strategy used to obtain input mRNA samples and matched polysome-seq libraries of ovaries genetically enriched for developmental milestones. (B-B’) Clustered heatmaps of (B) bulk input mRNAseq and (B’) log2(TE) from bulk polysome-seq of the developmental milestones indicated on the X-axis. Each row in the heatmap indicates a gene that is differentially expressed in at least one of the milestones compared to all others in a pairwise fashion. Color scale denotes average relative expression. (C) scRNA-seq of early germline cells and (C’) scRNA-seq of somatic cells in the germarium. X-axis denotes cell-type and each row in the heatmap indicates a gene that is differentially expressed in at least one of the cell-types compared to all others in a pairwise fashion.

**Supplemental Figure 2. Input mRNAseq recapitulates previously observed expression patterns of gene expression, related to Figure 2**

(A-A’) Violin plots of expression from bulk mRNAseq of genes 2-fold or more (A) down or (A’) upregulated in bam RNAi germline cells compared to UAS-TKV overexpressing germline cell with a p-value < 0.01 over germline development from Wilcockson et al. demonstrate that bulk mRNAseq identifies similar trends in gene expression compared to the FACS based method employed by Wilcockson et al. Values above plots represent Holm-Bonnferroni adjusted p-values resulting from a one-sided t-test with mu=0. (C) Visualization of expression of RpS19b over germline development from (C) polysome-seq data. Color indicates relative expression and values indicate the mean TE of RpS19b in each given stage. RpS19b TE is relatively consistent during early oogenesis and decreases in the egg chambers.

**Supplemental Figure 3. Genes involved in Meiotic cell cycle, including Ord, may be controlled post-transcriptionally, related to Figure 4.**

(A) Violin plots of gene expression from mRNAseq of genes in the GO-term category Meiotic cell cycle. No significant overall change occurs to expression of these genes at any of the developmental milestones compared to GSCs. Values above plots represent Holm-Bonnferroni adjusted p-values resulting from a one-sided t-test with mu=0. (B) Violin plots of TE from polysome-seq of genes in the GO-term category Meiotic cell cycle. Overall TE increases in CBs and cysts significantly compared to GSCs indicating that meiotic entry may be partially controlled post-transcriptionally. Values above plots represent Holm-Bonnferroni adjusted p-values resulting from a one-sided t-test with mu=0. (C) ScRNA-seq data indicates that the mRNA level of *ord* increases starting in the cysts and is dramatically decreased in early egg chambers. Color indicates relative expression and values indicate the normalized expression of *ord* in each given stage.

**Materials and Methods:**

The following RNAi stocks were used in this study; ord-GFP (Bickel Lab), *Rps19b::GFP* (McCarthy et al. 2021), UAS-Dcr2;nosGAL4 (Bloomington stock #25751 ), bam RNAi (Bloomington #58178), hs-bam/TM3 (Bloomington #24637),

**Sequencing data:**

Polysome-seq data was obtained from previous studies conducted by the Rangan lab. Data is available via the following GEO accession numbers:

>UAS-*tkv*  GSE171349

>*bam* RNAi GSE171349, GSE166275

>*bam* RNAi; hs-*bam* GSE143728, XXX (New)

Young wild-type GSE119458

Single cell sequencing data was obtained from Slaidina et al., GEO accession: GSE162192

**Code Availability:**

All code used in preparation of this manuscript are available on GitHub at <https://github.com/elliotmartin92/Developmental-Landscape/tree/master/Paper>

All code that powers Oo-site are available on GitHub at <https://github.com/elliotmartin92/Developmental-Landscape/tree/master/ShinyExpresionMap>

**Polysome-seq data processing:**

Reads were mapped to the *Drosophila* genome (dm6.01) using STAR version 2.6.1c. Mapped reads were assigned to features also using STAR. Translation efficiency was calculated as in (Flora et al., 2018) using a custom R script which is available in the Oo-site Github repo. Briefly, TPMs (transcripts per million) values were calculated The log2 ratio of TPMs between the polysome fraction and total mRNA was calculated as such to prevent zero counts from overly influencing the data and to prevent divide by zero errors: . This ratio represents TE, TE of each replicate was averaged and standard error about the calculated average for each gene was calculated.

**Differential Expression:**

Differential expression analysis between all Input bulk mRNAseq samples in a pairwise manner was performed using DEseq2 (Love, Huber, and Anders 2014). Differential expression was considered as Foldchange > |4| fold, FDR < 0.05.

Differential expression analysis between all polysome-seq samples in a pairwise manner was performed using DEseq2 (Love, Huber, and Anders 2014) using the model ~ type + genotype + genotype:type with LRT (reduced = ~ type + genotype) to test for changes in polysome counts controlling for input counts. Differential expression was considered as (Foldchange > |2| fold, pvalue < 0.05)

Differentially expressed genes between all germline clusters from scRNA-seq was determined using the FindAllMarkers function from Seurat (Hao et al. 2021). Cutoff was logfc.threshold = 0.75.

Differentially expressed genes between all germarium soma clusters from scRNA-seq was determined using the FindAllMarkers function from Seurat (Hao et al. 2021). Cutoff was logfc.threshold = 0.75.

**GO term heatmaps:**

GO-term enrichment analysis was performed using Panther (release 20210224) using the default settings for an Overrepresentation Test of genes differentially expressed between Input samples. Top 5 GO-terms based on fold enrichment of each category was plotted using ggplot2 (Wickham 2016).

**Fluorescent in situ hybridization:**

A modified in situ hybridization procedure for Drosophila ovaries was followed from Sarkar et al. (2021). Probes were designed and generated by LGC Biosearch Technologies using Stellaris® RNA FISH Probe Designer, with specificity to target base pairs of target mRNAs. Ovaries (3 pairs per sample) were dissected in RNase free 1X PBS and fixed in 1 mL of 5% formaldehyde for 10 minutes. The samples were then permeabilized in 1mL of Permeabilization Solution (PBST+1% Triton X-100) rotating in RT for 1 hour. Samples were then washed in wash buffer for 5 minutes (10% deionized formamide and 10% 20x SSC in RNase-free water). Ovaries were covered and incubated overnight with 1ul of probe in hybridization solution (10% dextran sulfate, 1 mg/ml yeast tRNA, 2 mM RNaseOUT, 0.02 mg/ml BSA, 5x SSC, 10% deionized formamide, and RNase-free water) and primary antibody at 30°C. Samples were then washed 2 times in 1 mL wash buffer with 1ul of corresponding secondary antibody for 30 minutes each and mounted in Vectashield (VectaLabs).

**Quantification of Stainings**

Stainings were quantified using the Fiji Measure tool. Images were cropped to place the stem cell niche at x=0. Individual cells were outlined within the germarium and Measure was used to calculate the Mean intensity of staining within the cell as well as the X coordinate of the centroid of the cell. Values were normalized to 1 by dividing Mean Intensity values by the maximum of the Mean Intensity per germarium. Data were plotted using ggplot2 and a fit line was added using ggplot2 geom\_smooth with a “loess” function with default settings. The shaded area around the line represents standard error.
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