www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/330/6011/1682/DC1

Supporting Online Material for

New Genes in *Drosophila* **Quickly Become Essential**

Sidi Chen, Yong E. Zhang, Manyuan Long*

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: mlong@uchicago.edu

Published 17 December 2010, *Science* **330**, 1682 (2010) DOI: 10.1126/science.1196380

This PDF file includes:

Materials and Methods Figs. S1 to S8 Tables S1 to S11 References

Materials and Methods

Identification of new gene origination events and gene age dating in *Drosophila*

We used the original gene age assignment in *(S1)* to generate a refined young gene dataset. In brief, for each *D.melanogaster* gene, we first inferred the presence or absence of its ortholog in other *Drosophila* species by syntenic genomic alignment (Fig. S1a, b) generated by the University of California – Santa Cruz (UCSC) bioinformatic group *(S2).* Then, we assigned the origination timing by following the parsimony rule (Fig. S1a). Finally, we identified 947 young genes, which originated after the split of *Sophophora* and *Drosophila* subgroup. Extensive estimation showed that our method tends to generate a conservative dataset of new genes, namely to assign genes with relatively older ages compared to previous related work *(S1).*

We further improved the young gene dataset for experimental characterization. Specifically, first, we considered a gene to be a "new gene" (or a "young gene") if it is less than 35 Myr old (arising after the divergence between *D. melanogaster* and *D. willistoni*). In other words, only genes with branch 2~6 of *(S1)* were considered. Second, we manually verified all these cases based on both UCSC genome-alignment based synteny and FlyBase protein-based synteny map to exclude genes with multiple losses. For example, a gene (*CG7627*) that was lost in *D.grimshawi, D. willistonni* and the *Obscura* group was assigned as branch 4 in *(S1),* and was excluded from the young gene dataset in this study. Moreover, genes with any slight homology in *Drosophila* subgroup or *D.willistoni* revealed by Tblastn track of UCSC were also excluded. Third, we considered a gene to be an "old gene" if it is older than 40 Myr (shared by all 12 sequenced *Drosophila* species). Fourth, genes with orthologs that are present in *D. willistoni* but not in all sequenced *Drosophila* subgenus species were excluded in either group due to the uncertainty in their age inferences. With these improvements, we identified 566 young genes that had originated within the past 35 million years (Myr) and 11,909 old genes that are shared by the 12 *Drosophila* genomes (>40 Myr). The refinement of the young gene dataset has excluded 180 (or 22%) previous cases *(S1),* and expanded with 19 new entries that were not assignment according to the presence/absence information of UCSC, but instead assigned through manual verification of FlyBase protein-based synteny maps. The current new gene dataset is more conservative and has higher accuracy in gene age dating.

As performed previously *(S1, S3, S4),* we then classified the new genes into DNA-based duplicated genes, RNA-based retroposed genes, and *de novo* genes according their DNA sequence signatures (Fig. S1 b-c) including the existence of parental genes, number of exons and introns. Briefly, a DNA-based duplicated gene has more than one exon, and has at least one existing paralogs; an RNA-based retroposed gene is intronless, and has a multi- exon parental gene. A *de novo* gene does not have an identifiable paralog. After classifying a *de novo* gene, we collected three pieces of evidence for confirmation: first, no similarity hits could be found outside the clade where the gene was located in a sequence search against the NCBI NR protein database; second, it is unique in the *D. melanogaster* genome and has no paralogs; finally, it does not encode any known protein domains in the FlyBase annotation.

The identification of gene structure renovation (Fig. S1 b-c) and the calculation of protein sequence divergence were carried out as described previously (*S4, S5*). Peptide sequence data for the new genes were retrieved from mass spectra databases (PeptideAtlas (*S6*)).

RNAi lines targeting young genes

All UAS-IR RNAi lines were ordered from the RNAi library of Vienna Drosophila RNAi Center (VDRC) (*S7*) in Austria. This RNAi library is known to be potent and specific in gene silencing, showing efficient reductions in the mRNA levels of genes of interest (70–90% on average) and low false-positive rates in phenotype detection (2%) (*S7*). Briefly, we first searched for available RNAi lines targeting 566 young genes. To avoid off-target effects, we excluded the RNAi lines with any level of off-target 19 mers $(S7)$, retaining only the lines with off-target $= 0$ (no off-target 19-mer matches anywhere in the genome) and $s19 = 1$ (100% on-target 19-mer matches). Therefore genes that are highly similar to their paralogs were not included in this study due to technical unavailability. Moreover, we removed lines with lethal or sterile phenotypes caused by insertion of the P-element carrying the UAS-IR construct before the induction of Gal4. By applying these filters, we obtained a set of specific RNAi lines for 195 young genes. For a few genes there are multiple RNAi lines with independent constructs available, which we used for confirmation of phenotypes.

Other fly stocks, crosses and lethality phenotyping

The following Gal4 lines were ordered from the Bloomington stock center:

yw; Act5C-Gal4,w+/CyO,y+ yw; ; TubP-Gal4,w+/Tm3,Sb w,Bx(ms1096)-Gal4,w+; UAS-dcr2,w+ w,UAS-dcr2,w+; bbg(C96)-Gal4,w+ w,UAS-dcr2,w+; pannier-Gal4,w+/TM3,Ser

All flies were raised on standard cornmeal media (*S8*) under standard laboratory conditions $(21-25\degree C, 40-60\%$ humidity, 12 h: 12 h daylight cycle).

As shown briefly in a schematic representation (Fig. S2), the constitutive RNAi knockdown of new genes was performed by crossing the UAS-RNAi lines to a constitutive Act5C-Gal4 driver line balanced by CyO (*yw; Act5CGal4, w+/CyO,y+)*. We allowed F1 embryos to develop for two to three weeks into adults. Two morphological markers were used to distinguish RNAi and control F1s: red eye, normal-winged offspring were recognized as RNAi F1s, and yellow (or orange) eye, curly winged offspring were recognized as non-RNAi control F1s. We scored approximately 100 flies for each vial of each line crossed and followed the canonical definition of lethality as described previously (*S7, S9*). The ratio of RNAi:control F1s was expected to be 1:1 if the RNAi F1s were fully viable; it was expected to be 0:1 if the RNAi was completely lethal. For a gene targeted by Act5C-Gal4 RNAi, we classified it as lethal if no RNAi F1 hatched into adults or only a few (<5%) RNAi F1 hatched into adults but died very early in adulthood; we classified a gene as semi-lethal if less than 20% of the RNAi F1s hatched into adults. With respect to the sex of lethality, "male lethal" meant that lethality was specific to male flies; "female lethal" meant that lethality was specific to female flies, while "both" meant that lethality occurred in both male and female flies. For the

lines that showed lethal phenotypes, more than four replicate crosses were performed to confirm lethality. As a pilot experiment, we tested genes known to be essential (*Caf40, RpS15Ab) (S10)* or non-essential *(S7)* for viability. As expected, silencing of known essential genes was lethal, whereas silencing of non-essential genes was viable. We then carried out crosses for all young genes and controls in parallel.

Second Gal4 driver verification of RNAi silencing

We used a second constitutive Gal4 driver line, *yw;; TubP-Gal4,w+/Tm3,Sb*, which was crossed with the Act5C-Gal4 lethal RNAi lines. Lethal phenotyping was carried out similar to that performed for the *yw; Act5C-Gal4,w+/CyO,y+* driver line, with the exception of balancer marker (*Tm3,Sb*) recognition.

Determining developmental stages of lethality

We examined the stages in which lethality occurred with two methods: (I) direct observation / dissection and (II) gene inactivation/silencing with fluorescence tracking. These two methods showed consistent results, while each has its own advantage.

In the first method, we allowed all larvae and pupae to develop for two additional weeks to exclude the effect of slow development. If all control F1 pupae hatched and (a) all RNAi F1 pupae (approximately 50% of total pupae) died (necrosis, color became darker), thus failing to form adults, we classified the gene as "pupal lethal;" (b) all RNAi F1s died before starting pupation, we classified the gene as "before pupal lethal"; (c) some RNAi F1s died before pupation, while some died in the pupal case, we classified the gene as "mixed stage lethal." For each case, we verified the developmental stage by examining adults and pupae in multiple vials under a stereoscope (Olympus, Center Valley, PA). For those pupal lethal cases, we dissected out the multiple individual pupal case cuticles to examine their morphological features, especially the formation of rudimentary head structures, early wing structures and leg structures, to determine the developmental stage of the aborted pupae (Fig. S3). We imaged these individuals using an Olympus dissecting microscope with a digital camera DP70 (Olympus, Center Valley, PA).

In the second method, we first recombined the Act5C-Gal4 driver with a green fluorescence reporter UAS-mCD8-GFP to generate a line Act5C-Gal4,UAS-mCD8-GFP with CyO balancer. We used this line to cross to UAS-IR lines for constitutive RNAi, where the GFP reporter allows tracking of the development of the RNAi animal by fluorescence stereoscope, as shown with genotypes:

Act5C-Gal4,UAS-mCD8GFP/CyO X UAS-RNAi

RNAi F1 animal: Act5C-Gal4,UAS-mCD8GFP>>UAS-RNAi

Control F1 animal: CyO/(;)UAS-RNAi

These two methods are consistent in lethal stage classification. Furthermore, we observed that the "before pupal lethal" cases with the first method are all larval lethals, with no embryonic lethals.

Tissue-specific gene silencing and electron microscope (EM) imaging

We crossed representative RNAi lines with constitutive RNAi lethals to the following tissue-specific Gal4 driver lines:

w,Bx-(ms)1096-Gal4,w+; UAS-dcr2,w+ ,

w,UAS-dcr2,w+; bbg(C96)-Gal4,w+ w,UAS-dcr2,w+; pannier-Gal4,w+/TM3,Ser

We then examined multiple individual F1s under a dissecting microscope for the presence of morphological/developmental defects. To image detailed morphological defects at high resolution, we mounted cuticles of RNAi flies on sample holders (Ted Pella, Redding, CA) coated with a Pt/Pd alloy with a sputter coater (Cressington, UK) and imaged them using a scanning electron microscope (FEI, Hillsboro, OR).

Expression analysis of essential young genes

We retrieved updated expression data over the course of the *D. melanogaster* life cycle from http://flybase.org/reports/FBrf0205914.html (*S11, S12*). For a gene of interest, the two channels of fluorescence intensity values corresponded to the mRNA abundance of the sample at a particular time point and the sample of all pooled time points. The log ratio of these two values (M value) was used to measure the relative gene expression levels across all of the 66 time points. We mapped probes to genes based on chromosomal coordinates and discarded those that mapped to different genes. We generated a heatmap of 59 young essential genes (Fig. S4) using the gplots package of the Bioconductor platform (*S13*).

Sequence evolution and population genetics

Orthologous sequences were parsed out from the multiple-species alignment from UCSC. Protein alignments were built and then converted to codon-based alignments (*S14, 15*). *Ka/Ks* ratios were estimated with a free ratio model using the CODEML program (*S14*).

Polymorphism and divergence data were retrieved from DPGP (*S16, S17*). We used the version 1.0 of DPGP containing polymorphism data of 37 lines of *D.melanogaster* and performed population genetic analysis using a similar pipeline to previous work (*S1*). In brief, for each gene, the chromosomal coordinates for the longest coding open reading frame were retrieved from the flyBaseGene table of UCSC genome browser (*S2*). Coding sequences together with flanking 1,000 base pairs were extracted with nucleotides showing low quality score $\langle 20 \text{ or } 21\%$ sequencing error rate) masked as "N". Given existence of "N" and deletions or insertions, genewise (*S18*) was used to conceptually translate each coding sequence with the annotated reference protein as the template. Orthologous *D. simulans* coding regions were extracted from UCSC syntenic genome alignment, which was similarly fed into genewise. Conceptual translations for 37 lines together with the orthologous protein of *D. simulans* were aligned with the linsi function of MAFFT package (*S19*). Strains with indels or "N" contributing to more than half of the alignment were filtered out. Then, codon based alignments were reverse translated based on this protein alignment using the PAL2NAL package (*S20*).

Based on the alignments, we then used the PGEToolbox package (*S21*) to count number of synonymous polymorphism (Ps), number of non-synonymous polymorphism (Pn), number of synonymous divergence (Ds) and number of non-synonymous Divergence (Dn), respectively. A maximum-likelihood based package (DOEF(*S22*)) was implemented to estimate group level α . Likelihood ratio tests were performed in the DOEF package.

Calculation of the proportion of essential genes in the old gene group

Data on Act5C-Gal4 RNAi lethality were retrieved from Supplementary Table 1 and Table 4 from (*S7*). We chose the lines belonging to the "random set" and Cross-Ref with CG numbers according to the latest FlyBase annotation. We found 443 genes with CG ID, construct ID and transformation ID that were consistent between all lines and tables. We then applied the same RNAi linefiltering criteria (off-target, position effect) as were used for the young genes. After filtering, we narrowed our set to 300 genes, of which 275 were covered in our branch assignment and age dating and 245 were old genes $(branch = 0, age > 40 Myr)$. Among these genes, 86 were Act5C-RNAi lethal. The numbers of genes with lethality at different stages were counted according to the information of "lethal stage" in (*S7*).

Modeling interaction network of young essential genes

Gene-gene interaction data, including protein-protein interactions, genetic interaction, microRNA-target gene interactions, were retrieved from IntAct *(S23)*, BioGrid *(S24)* and miRBase *(S25)*. Direct interactions of young essential genes identified in this study were used to draw interaction network model.

Supplemental Figures

Figure S 1. Schematic representation of young gene identification, age dating and chimeric structure analysis **(A)** schematic representation of young gene identification and age dating; *Drosophila* phylogeny is shown on the left; genome synteny alignment is shown on the right; genomes from each species were shown as purple solid lines; grey blocks represent aligned regions; orange boxes represent orthologous genes existing in the melanogaster subgroup but not the outgroups; orange star denotes the origination event on the phylogeny; evolutionary time estimates are shown under the phylogeny (not drawn to scale); **(B)** An example of chimeric young gene *CG11639 (TfIIA-S-2)* in a UCSC-genomebrowser- based figure; Between-species genomic alignment (Net) tracks show that *CG11639* is present in the melanogaster subgroup revealed by a syntenic chain, but not in the other *Drosophila* species; **(C)** similar to (**B**) the black alignment track shows where the parental gene aligns with *CG11639*. The parental gene contributes to the coding region, but the new copy recruited local sequence to generate its new UTR region.

Figure S 2. Schematic representation of the screening for lethal phenotypes in young genes under constitutive RNAi by Act5C-Gal4 driver; GOI, gene-of interest. Genotypes of the starting parents (F0) and offsprings (F1) were shown in black; phenotypic markers to distinguish F1 were shown in green.

Figure S 3. Representative lethal phenotypes of young essential genes at different developmental stages examined by dissection **(A)** Normal pharate adults dissected from developing pupae of control animals; **(B-E)** dead individuals following constitutive silencing of young essential genes by Act5C-RNAi, with developmental halt at different stages; **(B)** mixed-stage lethals; **(C)** prepupal or early stage pupal lethals; **(D)** pharate or eclosion stage lethals; and **(E)** late pupal or pharate stage lethals. The annotation symbol (CG number) of each young essential gene is labeled above each image; arrowheads point to developing head structures. The images with higher resolution are available upon request.

Figure S 4. Expression profiles of young essential genes during the life cycle of *D. melanogaster* Each row represents one gene; Log-ratio of expression of a particular time point to that of the whole-life-cycle-pool sample is shown in each cell; Color key and histogram were shown on the bottom-right corner; (Raw array data from (*12*)); the developmental stage of lethality of each gene was shown with color coding illustrated at bottom left; abbreviations of stages: L2, second instar larva; L3, third instar larva; P, pupae, PP, prepupae, EP, early pupa; PH, pharate (late pupa); A, adult.

Figure S 5. Chromosomal distribution of young and old genes essential for Viability; The barplot shows proportion of genes being essential for viability across five major chromosomal arms in young or old age groups; autosomal data were shown in grey or black bars, X-chromosome data were shown in orange bars.

Figure S 6. A simplified interaction network map of young essential genes **(A)** core components of young essential gene (YEG) interaction network complex that are linked by primary connections; **(B)** peripheral components that are not linked to the core with existing data.

Figure S 7. Molecular evolutionary rates of young essential genes and their parental genes; (**A-B)** Comparison of *Ka/Ks* ratios between young essential genes and their parental genes with pairwise x-y plot (**A**) and (**B**) Boxplot; Wilcoxon rank test *p* value for comparison between these two gene groups is shown in the panel; **(C-D)** Phylogenetic representation of sequence evolution of representative young essential genes; **(C)** a *de novo* young essential gene (*CG31882*) and **(D)** a duplication-generated young essential gene (*RpS28a*); Number of non-synonymous substitutions, number of synonymous substitutions and *Ka/Ks* (if available) are shown above the related evolutionary branches; On branches where no number is shown, no substitutions occurred. Young essential gene lineages are shown in red, parental gene (if applicable) lineages are shown in blue.

Figure S 8. Natural selection on essential genes; α values and their 95% confidence intervals were plotted for five gene groups: branch 4-5 young essential genes (6~11 Myr), parental genes of branch 4-5 young essential genes, branch 2-3 young essential genes (11~35 Myr), parental genes of branch 2-3 young essential genes and old essential genes $(>40$ Myr).

Supplemental Tables

Table S1. Phenotype of young essential genes by constitutive silencing;

A Transf_ID is the transformation ID of an RNAi line; Act5C-Gal4 RNAi lethality is scored according to materials and methods and schemed in Fig. S2; lethality sex is the particular sex that is lethal under Act5C-Gal4 RNAi; in these cases (female or male lethal), one sex is completely lethal, while the other sex is semilethal or viable; Pupal lethal phenotype class definition: Class I, pharate lethal; Class II, early pupal stage lethal; Class III, mixed pupal stage lethal.

Table S2. Origin and evolution of young essential genes

Footnotes:

(a) NA, not available

(b) Most genes listed are parental gene of the young gene, for a few cases where the parental-child relationship is ambiguous, closest paralogs are listed. In brief, we built a self-chained genome alignment by following UCSC's strategy. We aligned *D. melanogaster* against itself and built a series of homology blocks to look for the most similar paralogous genomic regions for one gene of interest.

(c) Origination mechanism, $D = DNA$ -based duplication, $R = RNA$ -based retroposition, $A = de novo origination.$

(d) "C" and "R" indicate chimerism and structural re-organization, respectively. In the former case, the young gene recruits the adjacent regions as a new functional element such as 3'UTR. In the later case, the young gene has similar sequence organization to parental gene, but its gene structure is different involving at least one introns gain/loss event. For chimerism, we required at least of 10% of region in the young gene that are not alignable with the parental gene.

(e) N, no structural renovation

(f) Divergence of protein sequences of young gene - parental gene pair

(g) In the case of *CG13559*, there is only one intron loss between parental gene and the young gene. It is difficult to infer whether this is a DNA-level duplication or retroposition with high divergence.

Table S3. Phenotype of constitutive silencing of all young genes tested;

Table S4. Representative F1 adult counting in lethal RNAi crosses Brief cross scheme: Act5C-Gal4/CyO X UAS-RNAi; detail cross scheme in Fig. S2; # : number greater than 100; * : these RNAi F1s are very sick, died in a few days after hatching.

Table S5. Lethality stage examination with fluorescence tracking; Brief cross scheme: Act5C-Gal4,UAS-mCD8GFP/CyO X UAS-RNAi; All GFP animals are Act5C-Gal4,UAS-mCD8GFP>>UAS-RNAi; while all non-GFP animals are controls $CyO(.)UAS-RNAi; * Developmental stage abbreviations: E = embryo, L1 = 1st$ instar larva, $L2 = 2$ nd instar larva, $L3 = 3$ rd instar larva, PP = prepupa, EP = early pupa, $PH =$ pharate, A= adult, na, not available; lethal stage call: $L2/L3$: lethal at the transition between L2 and L3, similar for L3/PP, PP/EP, EP/PH, PH/A; MIX: mix stage lethal,

called according to dissection; P: pupal stage lethal, where lethality occurs at mixed pupal sub-stages or sub-stage unclear.

Table S6. Viability phenotype consistency of representative young genes; Part (I) Viability phenotype consistency between independent Gal4 driver constructs, where the phenotypes of two constitutive drivers, i.e. TubP-Gal4 and Act5C-Gal4 were compared using the same UAS-IR lines; Part (II) Viability phenotype consistency between independent UAS-IR lines, where the phenotypes of different UAS-IR lines were compared using the same Gal4 driver (in this case Act5C-Gal4).

Table S7. Tissue-specific RNAi phenotype of representative young essential genes; UAS-IR RNAi lines for representative young essential genes were crossed to wingspecific Gal4 driver Bx(ms)1096-Gal4 and notum midline specific Gal4 driver Pnr-Gal4, UAS-dicer2 was used for all these crosses and morphological abnormalities were observed under dissecting scope (details in materials and methods); * : nd: not determined; # : Representative phenotypes were imaged using EM and shown in Fig. 3.

Table S8. Peptide evidence for young essential genes

Data retrieved from PeptideAtlas (materials and methods), source of sample according to Sample_ID legends:

- 46 Heads from adult flies, soluble proteins
- 47 Heads from adult flies, soluble proteins
- 49 S2 cells, nuclear fraction
- 50 Kc cells membrane fraction
- 51 S2 cells; membrane fraction
- 52 Heads from adult flies, membrane fraction
- 54 Fatbodies from 20%sucrose-treated and untreated larvae
- 55 Fatbodies from rapamycin-treated and untreated larvae
- 56 Heamolymph from adult flies
- 57 Embryos up to the blastoderm stage (2hours after egg laying)
- 60 Cytoplasmic fractions (soluble proteins) from Adult Drosophila heads
- 61 Kc cells, Chromatin fraction
- 62 Membrane fraction from total larval extract
- 64 Peptides for S2 cells cytoplasmic fraction separated by FFE
- 67 Larval Haemolymph
- 68 Cytoplasmic fractions (soluble proteins) from Adult Drosophila heads
- 69 Golgi fraction from Kc cells
- 71 S2 cells nuclear fraction
- 74 S2 cells membrane fraction
- 76 Dm_S2_nuc_FFE
- 77 Adult flies Membrane
- 78 Embryos 0-24h AEL
- 80 Embryos 0-24h AEL
- 82 Total Larvae, Protein FFE
- 83 Total Larvae, Peptide FFE
- 86 Gelfiltration of exponentially growing Kc-cell total lysate
- 88 S2cells cytoplasmic fraction
- 89 Total Larvae, Protein FFE
- 91 Heads from adult flies, nuclear fraction

Table S9. Proportion of essential genes arisen by different mechanisms; A statistical summary table for Table S3.

Table S10. Phenotype of parental genes of young essential genes;

Cross scheme for phenotypic characterization of parental genes was identical to that of young genes; the phenotype of related young gene for each parental gene was shown at the last two columns in the same row of the parental gene for comparison.

Table S11. Essential-Nonessential relationship summary table for young gene - parental gene pairs; this is a summary statistic table with data generated from this study (Table S10, where 16 pairs are both essential, 9 pairs are parental gene nonessential young gene essential), pooled with data from (*7*), where the available data include 1 pair both essential, 5 pairs parental gene essential young gene nonessential, and 6 pairs both nonessential. Statistical independence between rows and columns were tested by twotailed fisher's exact test.

Supplemental References:

- S1. Y. Zhang, M. D. Vibranovski, B. H. Krinsky, M. Long, *Genome Res. gr.107334.110; Published in Advance August 26, doi: 10.1101/gr.107334.110* (2010).
- S2. R. M. Kuhn *et al.*, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **35**, D668 (Jan, 2007).
- S3. Y. Bai, C. Casola, C. Feschotte, E. Betran, *Genome Biol* **8**, R11 (2007).
- S4. Q. Zhou *et al.*, *Genome Res.* **18**, 1446 (Sep, 2008).
- S5. W.-H. Li, *Molecular evolution*. (Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Mass., 1997), pp. xv, 487 p.
- S6. F. Desiere *et al.*, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **34**, D655 (Jan 1, 2006).
- S7. G. Dietzl *et al.*, *Nature* **448**, 151 (Jul 12, 2007).
- S8. M. Ashburner, K. G. Golic, R. S. Hawley, *Drosophila : a laboratory handbook*. (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y., ed. 2nd, 2005), pp. xxviii, 1409 p.
- S9. N. Perrimon, A. Lanjuin, C. Arnold, E. Noll, *Genetics* **144**, 1681 (Dec, 1996).
- S10. G. Goshima *et al.*, *Science* **316**, 417 (Apr 20, 2007).
- S11. M. N. Arbeitman *et al.*, *Science* **297**, 2270 (Sep 27, 2002).
- S12. Z. Gauhar *et al.*, Flybase, Ed. (2008).
- S13. R. C. Gentleman *et al.*, *Genome Biol* **5**, R80 (2004).
- S14. Z. Yang, *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **24**, 1586 (Aug, 2007).
- S15. M. Suyama, D. Torrents, P. Bork, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **34**, W609 (Jul 1, 2006).
- S16. D. J. Begun *et al.*, *PLoS Biol.* **5**, e310 (Nov 6, 2007).
- S17. www.dpgp.org
- S18. E. Birney, M. Clamp, R. Durbin, *Genome Res.* **14**, 988 (2004).
- S19. K. Katoh, H. Toh, *Brief. Bioinform.* **9**, 286 (Jul, 2008).
- S20. M. Suyama, D. Torrents, P. Bork, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **34**, W609 (Jul 1, 2006).
- S21. J. J. Cai, *J. Hered.* **99**, 438 (Jul-Aug, 2008).
- S22. N. Bierne, A. Eyre-Walker, *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **21**, 1350 (2004).
- S23. H. Hermjakob *et al.*, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **32**, D452 (Jan 1, 2004).
- S24. C. Stark *et al.*, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **34**, D535 (Jan 1, 2006).
- S25. S. Griffiths-Jones, *Methods Mol Biol* **342**, 129 (2006).

Table S1. Phenotype of young essential genes by constitutive silencing

Table S2. Origin and evolution of young essential genes

Gene					
Age			Act5C-Gal4	Parental	Origination
(Myr)	CG	TID	RNAi lethality	gene	mechanism
$25 - 35$	CG13477	KK109920	viable	NA	A
$25 - 35$	CG14835	KK100402	semilethal	NA	A
$25 - 35$	CG15263	KK102663	viable	NA	Α
$25 - 35$	CG16741	KK103236	viable	NA	A
$25 - 35$	CG2665	KK103004	viable	NA	A
$25 - 35$	CG9024	KK107536	viable	NA	A
$25 - 35$	CG9284	KK102235	lethal	NA	A
$25 - 35$	CG11598	KK103262	viable	CG18530	D
$25 - 35$	CG11833	KK102870	viable	CG3373	D
$25 - 35$	CG12780	KK101969	viable	CG13422	D
$25 - 35$	CG13091	KK100943	viable	CG10097	D
$25 - 35$	CG1349	KK103336	viable	CG6646	D
$25 - 35$	CG14957	KK102784	lethal	CG32284	D
$25 - 35$	CG16960	KK101137	lethal	CG16961	D
$25 - 35$	CG17637	KK102424	viable	CG18281	D
$25 - 35$	CG18324	KK105401	lethal	CG18327	D
$25 - 35$	CG1840	KK108492	lethal	CG1844	D
$25 - 35$	CG18530	KK108503	viable	CG11598	D
$25 - 35$	CG1946	KK108495	viable	CG1942	D
$25 - 35$	CG31508	KK106379	viable	CG31509	D
$25 - 35$	CG31524	KK100877	lethal	CG9720	D
$25 - 35$	CG33223	KK106782	viable	CG32713	D
$25 - 35$	CG33342	KK100826	semilethal	CG17784	D
$25 - 35$	CG33483	KK102589	viable	CG33923	D
$25 - 35$	CG33920	KK103447	viable	CG33654	D
$25 - 35$	CG4052	KK109160	viable	CG2341	D
$25 - 35$	CG33350	KK105947	lethal	CG33351	D
$25 - 35$	CG11261	KK105927	viable	CG1877	D
$25 - 35$	CG13463	KK108170	lethal	CG5784	D
$25 - 35$	CG13738	KK104508	viable	CG6912	D
$25 - 35$	CG15461	KK103441	viable	CG34200	D
$25 - 35$	CG15616	KK105778	viable	CG8626	D
$25 - 35$	CG16710	KK100054	viable/semilethal	CG18754	D
$25 - 35$	CG17673	KK109175	lethal	CG33495	D
$25 - 35$	CG18557	KK107357	viable	CG6639	D
25~35	CG18748	KK109017	viable	CG18746	D
25~35	CG30395	KK105198	lethal	CG15040	D
$25 - 35$	CG31313	KK102741	viable	CG8066	D
$25 - 35$	CG31335	KK108029	viable	CG31336	D
$25 - 35$	CG31493	KK101611	viable	CG31248	D
$25 - 35$	CG32115	KK108451	viable	CG32107	D
$25 - 35$	CG32186	KK106262	semilethal/viable	CG1718	D
$25 - 35$	CG32228	KK104148	viable	CG3996	D
$25 - 35$	CG32243	KK101716	viable	CG8588	D
$25 - 35$	CG33109	KK107240	viable	CG16826	D
$25 - 35$	CG33458	KK105451	viable	CG30090	D
$25 - 35$	CG33459	KK105903	lethal	CG30090	D
$25 - 35$	CG3347	KK100453	lethal	CG17440	D
$25 - 35$	CG34041	KK103005	semilethal	CG31013	D
$25 - 35$	CG34235	KK109077	semilethal	CG30058	D

Table S3. Phenotype of constitutive silencing of all young genes tested

Table S4. Representative F1 adult counting in lethal RNAi crosses

Act5C-Gal4/CyO cross

RNAi animal survival developmental stages with GFP tracking NOTES GENE_ID TID Lethal stage_call E* L1* L2* L3* PP* EP* PH* A* CG10474 GD41455 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG10700 KK107394 PH/A na na na na na na na na CG11466 KK106779 L2/L3 + + + - - - - - CG1149 KK108034 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG11639 KK104539 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG12766 KK104031 PH/A na na na na na na na na CG12842 KK103233 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG13463 KK108170 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG13559 GD6643 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG14957 KK102784 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG15503 KK102742 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG15527 KK102725 MIX na na na na na na na na CG15636 GD13072 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG16960 KK101137 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG16992 KK108048 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG17011 KK107218 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG17031 KK105585 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG17176 KK104283 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG17240 KK100037 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG17268 KK101203 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG17673 KK109175 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG18324 KK105401 P na na na na na na na na CG1840 KK108492 MIX + + + + + + - - CG30083 KK104289 EP/PH + + + + - + - - CG30395 KK105198 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG31061 GD4398 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG31406 KK105072 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG31413 KK106151 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG31438 KK104611 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG31524 KK100877 PH/A na na na na na na na na CG31882 KK100160 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG31962 KK102716 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG32282 KK103505 MIX na na na na na na na na CG32301 GD12239 PP/EP na na na na na na na na CG32376 KK101917 PH/A + + + + + + + + CG33105 GD5843 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG33459 KK105903 L3/PP + + + + - - - - CG33462 KK106216 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG3347 KK100453 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG3640 KK100399 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG4580 KK105535 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG5348 GD1698 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG6052 KK106738 MIX + + + + + + - - CG6289 KK105515 L2/L3 + + + - - - - - CG6690 KK101104 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG7594 KK107495 PH/A + + + + + + + - CG7931 KK103516 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG8137 KK100958 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG8358 GD15161 L3/PP + + + + - - - - CG8626 KK103960 MIX + + + + + + - - CG9284 KK102235 EP/PH + + + + + + - - CG9722 KK101679 EP/PH + + + + + + - -

Table S5. Lethality stage examination with fluorescence tracking

Table S6. Viability phenotype consistency of representative young genes

Part (II) Viability phenotype consistency between independent UAS-IR lines

Table S7. Tissue-specific RNAi phenotype of representative young essential genes

Table S8. Peptide evidence for young essential genes

Table
S9.
Proportion
of
essential
genes
arisen
by
different
mechanisms

Fisher's
exact
test,
two
tailed

Table
S10.
Phenotype
of
parental
genes
of
young
essential
genes

Table S11. Essential-Nonessential relationship for young gene - parental gene pairs

Fisher's
exact
test,
two
tailed p
=
0.296

A

B C

E

Animal genotypes: Act5C-Gal4>>Gene-X-RNAi Animal genotypes: Act5C-Gal4>>Gene-X-RNAi

Developmental Stage

Row color coding scheme for stage of lethality

- RNAi lethal at the stage of L2/L3
- RNAi lethal at the stage of L3/PP
- RNAi lethal at the stage of PP/EP
- RNAi lethal at the stage of EP/PH
- RNAi lethal at the stage of PH/A
- RNAi lethal at pupal stage
RNAi lethal at mix stages
-

Proportion of genes essential for viability Proportion of genes essential for viability

A B

C_D

D.melanogaster RpS28b D.simulans RpS28b D.ananassae RpS28b D.yakuba RpS28b D.erecta RpS28b D.sechellia RpS28b D.pseudoobscura RpS28b D.willistoni RpS28b D.mojavensis RpS28b D.virilis RpS28b D.melanogaster RpS28a D.yakuba RpS28a D.erecta RpS28a D.sechellia RpS28a

D.grimshawi RpS28b

Group legends:

- 1. Old essential gene (branch 0)
- 2.. Young essential gene (branch 2~3)
- 3. Parental gene of young essential gene (branch 2~3)
- 4. Young essentia gene (branch 4~5)
- 5. Parental gene of young essential gene (branch 4~5)