

Tables statistical analysis

Table A

Fig 1

Graph (panel) assay Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean \pm Std Error M)		vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean \pm Std Error M)	Test	p Value
Graph (G) Glial density					
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.0003)		vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (39) (0.019 \pm 0.00045)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
Graph (H) Glial migration					
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (27) (-3.44 \pm 0.32)		vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (39) (0.61 \pm 0.22)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001

Table B**Fig 2**

Graph (panel) assay Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean ± Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean ± Std Error M)	Test	p Value
Graph (I) Glial density				
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (28) (0.01±0.00033)	vs	T0 <i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (11) (0.015±0.0009)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (28) (0.01±0.00033)	vs	T1 <i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (7) (0.014±0.00033)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0062
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (28) (0.01±0.00033)	vs	T2 <i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (10) (0.016±0.0013)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
Graph (J) Glial density				
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (11)	vs	T0 <i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (9)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	
Apical (0.00±0.00)		(0.0012±0.00011)		<0.0001
Middle (0.00±0.00)		(0.0043±0.00033)		<0.0001
Basal (0.01±0.00054)		(0.0094±0.00068)		ns (0.294)
Total (0.01±0.00054)		(0.015±0.00094)		0.0042
Graph (K) Glial density				
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (9)	vs	T1 <i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (7)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	

Apical	(0.00±0.00)		(0.0078±0.00058)		<0.0001
Middle	(0.00±0.00)		(0.0045±0.00032)		<0.0001
Basal	(0.0092±0.00027)		(0.0078±0.00058)		ns (0.549)
Total	(0.0092±0.00027)		(0.014±0.00033)		0.0002
Graph (L) Glial density					
	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (10)	vs	T2 <i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (10)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	
Basal	(0.011±0.0006)		(0.016±0.00132)		0.0005
Total	(0.011±0.0006)		(0.016±0.00132)		0.0005
Graph (O) eye size					
	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (7)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (7)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	ns (0.053)
	(146805±2784)		(136685±3249)		

Table C

Fig 3

Graph (panel) assay					
Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean ± Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean ± Std Error M)		Test	p Value
Graph (E) Glial density					
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (47)	vs	<i>repo>rbf_{24hrs} tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (8)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
(0.0099±0.00034)		(0.001±0.00035)			
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (24)	vs	<i>GMRQF>rpr repo-Gal4>rbf_{24hrs}</i> (11)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
(0.0178± 0.0004)		(0.0049± 0.001)			
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (24)	vs	<i>GMRQF>rpr repo-Gal4>rbf_{72hrs}</i> (10)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
(0.0178± 0.0004)		(0.0027± 0.0002)			
<i>repo>rbf_{24hrs} tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (8)	vs	<i>GMRQF>rpr repo-Gal4>rbf_{24hrs}</i> (11)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	0.02
(0.001±0.00035)		(0.0049± 0.001)			

<i>repo>rbf_{24hrs} tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (8) (0.001±0.00035)	vs	<i>GMRQF>rpr repo-Gal4>rbf_{72hrs}</i> (10) (0.0027±0.002)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	0.011
Graph (H) % PH3 glial cells				
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (24) (1.16±0.13)	vs	<i>repo>rbf_{24hrs} tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (8) (0±0.0)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (13) (2.3±0.23)	vs	<i>GMRQF>rpr repo-Gal4>rbf_{24hrs}</i> (11) (0.48±0.2)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	0.0004
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (13) (2.3±0.23)	vs	<i>GMRQF>rpr repo-Gal4>rbf_{72hrs}</i> (9) (0±0.0)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001

Table D

Fig 4

Graph (panel) assay Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean ± Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean ± Std Error M)	Test	p Value
Graph (Q) Ratio of Wrapping and PN glial cells				
n° wrapping glial cells / total glial <i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+</i> (22) (0.3125±0.015)	vs	<i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+; QUAS-rpr/+</i> (17) (0.149±0.006386)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
n° Perineurial glial cells / total glial				

<i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+</i> (22) vs <i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+; QUAS-rpr/+</i> (17)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
(0.68±0.016)		(0.85±0.006386)	
Graph (R) Glial density			
n° wrapping glial cells / Area			
<i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+</i> (21) vs <i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+; QUAS-rpr /+</i> (17)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
(0.004±0.00024)		(0.0026±9.7e-005)	
n° perineurial glial cells / Area			
<i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+</i> (21) vs <i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+; QUAS-rpr /+</i> (17)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
(0.009±0.0004)		(0.015±90.00064)	
Graph (S) Nuclei size			
Wrapping glial			
<i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+</i> (127) vs <i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+; QUAS-rpr /+</i> (93)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
(41±0.69)		(49.9±1.3)	
Perineurial glial			
<i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+</i> (76) vs <i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+; QUAS-rpr /+</i> (50)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	0.0082
(30±0.09)		(34.4±0.12)	

Table E**Fig 5**

Graph (panel) assay					
Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean \pm Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean \pm Std Error M)		Test	p Value
Graph (I) % glia cells expressing pucZ2B					
Low levels					
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; pucZ2B</i> (13) (17.39 \pm 1.03)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+ ;pucZ2B</i> (11) (17.26 \pm 1.5)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	ns (0.94)
Graph (J) % glia cells expressing pucZ2B (High)					
High levels					
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; pucZ2B</i> (11) (30.13 \pm 4.5)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; pucZ2B</i> (11) (43.91 \pm 3.8)		Mann-Whitney U-Test	0.02

Table F**Fig 6**

Graph (panel) assay					
Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean \pm Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean \pm Std Error M)		Test	p Value
Graph (H) n° glial cells / Area					
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+ (47)</i> (0.0099 \pm 0.0003)	vs	<i>UAS-bsk^{DN}/+ ;GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+ (13)</i> (0.009 \pm 00068)		One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.95)

<i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+ (39)</i> (0.019± 0.00045)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr/UAS-bsk^{DN} GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} (20)</i> (0.015± 0.0006)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+ (39)</i> (0.019± 0.00045)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; UAS eiger^{RNAi} (10)</i> (0.0177± 0.0016)	One-Way ANOVA	ns(0.68)
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+ (24)</i> (0.0178± 0.0004)	vs	<i>GMR-QF/+; eiger¹/eiger³; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+ (12)</i> (0.0173± 0.0007)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
Graph (I) % PH3 glial cells				
<i>UAS-rpr/+; GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+ (35)</i> (1.75±0.11)	vs	<i>UAS-bsk^{DN}/UAS-rpr ; GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} /+ (10)</i> (1.49±0.37)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0. 89)
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+ (13)</i> (2.3± 0.23)	vs	<i>GMR-QF/+; eiger¹/eiger³; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+ (13)</i> (1.7± 0.24)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.33)
Graph (N) Glial density				
<i>repo-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} /+ (23)</i> (0.0094±0.0003)	vs	<i>UAS-bsk^{DN}/+ ;repo-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} /+ (17)</i> (0.0063±0.0004)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+ (24)</i> (0.0178± 0.0004)	vs	<i>GMR-QF/UAS-bsk^{DN}; tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+ (21)</i> (0.015± 0.0004)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001
Graph (O) (% PH3 glial cells)				
<i>repo-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+ (23)</i> (1.64 ±0.11)	vs	<i>UAS-bsk^{DN}/+; repo-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} /+ (9)</i> (1.35±0.46)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	ns (0.09)
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+ (13)</i> (2.3± 0.23)	vs	<i>GMR-QF/UAS-bsk^{DN}; tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+ (17)</i> (2.24±0.23)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	ns(0.57)

Table G

Fig 8

Graph (panel) assay Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean \pm Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean \pm Std Error M)	Test	p Value
Graph (G) Glial density				
<i>UAS-rpr/+; GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (39) (0.019 \pm 0.00045)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr dpp^{RNAi33} hh^{RNAi}</i> (18) (0.015 \pm 0.00039)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>GMR>rpr 2UAS</i> (15) (0.018 \pm 0.00096)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr dpp^{RNAi33} hh^{RNAi}</i> (18) (0.015 \pm 0.00039)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0059
<i>UAS-rpr/+; GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (39) (0.019 \pm 0.00045)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr dpp^{RNAi33}</i> (13) (0.0185 \pm 0.001)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.94)
<i>UAS-rpr/+; GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (39) (0.019 \pm 0.00045)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+; GMR>rpr hh^{RNAi}</i> (10) (0.019 \pm 0.00088)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>GMR> dpp^{RNAi33} hh^{RNAi}</i> (12) (0.0089 \pm 0.00044)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.53)
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>GMR> dpp^{RNAi33}</i> (12) (0.0088 \pm 0.00035)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.39)
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>GMR> hh^{RNAi}</i> (8) (0.0095 \pm 0.00086)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.95)

Graph (H) % PH3 glial cells				
<i>UAS-rpr/+; GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (34)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr dpp^{RNAi33} hh^{RNAi}</i> (16)	One-Way ANOVA	0.01
(1.8 _± 0.1)		(1.23 _± 0.12)		
<i>UAS-rpr/+; GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (34)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr dpp^{RNAi33}</i> (12)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.45)
(1.8 _± 0.1)		(1.53 _± 0.18)		
<i>UAS-rpr/+; GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (34)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+; GMR>rpr hh^{RNAi}</i> (10)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.73)
(1.8 _± 0.1)		(0.16 _± 0.2)		
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (23)	vs	<i>GMR>dpp^{RNAi33} hh^{RNAi}</i> (14)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
(1.21 _± 0.13)		(1.23 _± 0.22)		
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (23)	vs	<i>GMR>dpp^{RNAi33}</i> (14)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.32)
(1.21 _± 0.13)		(0.88 _± 0.11)		
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (23)	vs	<i>GMR>hh^{RNAi}</i> (8)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.28)
(1.2 _± 0.13)		(0.79 _± 0.15)		
Graph (O) Glial density				
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (27)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr; repo>patch</i> (9)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.98)
(0.018 _± 0.0004)		(0.0176 _± 0.001)		
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (27)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr; repo>brk</i> (20)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
(0.018 _± 0.0004)		(0.0067 _± 0.007)		
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (27)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr; repo>patched brk</i> (12)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
(0.018 _± 0.0004)		(0.004 _± 0.0007)		
<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo>UAS-brk</i> (20)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr; repo>patched brk</i> (12)	One-Way ANOVA	0.047

	(0.0067±0.007)		(0.004±0.0007)		
<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo-Gal4/+</i> (23)	vs		<i>repo>patch</i> (23)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0011
(0.0094±0.0003)			(0.0069±0.0002)		
<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo-Gal4/+</i> (23)	vs		<i>repo>brk</i> (21)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
(0.0094±0.0003)			(0.0036±0.00026)		
<i>repo>brk</i> (21)	vs		<i>repo>patch brk</i> (22)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.4)
(0.0036±0.00026)			(0.003±0.00011)		
Graph (P) % PH3 glial cells					
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (13) vs			<i>GMR-QF>rpr; repo>patched</i> (9)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.98)
(2.3±0.23)			(2.16±0.26)		
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (13) vs			<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo>brk</i> (12)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
(2.3±0.23)			(0.58±0.25)		
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (13) vs			<i>GMR-QF>rpr; repo>patched brk</i> (12)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
(2.3±0.23)			(0.54±0.28)		
<i>GMR-QF>rpr; repo>UAS-brk</i> (12)	vs		<i>GMR-QF>rpr; repo>patched brk</i> (12)	One-Way ANOVA	ns(0.99)
(0.58±0.25)			(0.54±0.28)		
<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo-Gal4/+</i> (23)	vs		<i>repo>patch</i> (12)	One-Way ANOVA	ns(0.87)
(1.64±0.11)			(1.42±0.22)		
<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo-Gal4/+</i> (23)	vs		<i>repo>brk</i> (10)	One-Way ANOVA	0.003
(1.64±0.11)			(0.52±0.22)		
<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo-Gal4/+</i> (23)	vs		<i>repo>patch brk</i> (13)	One-Way ANOVA	0.018
(1.64±0.11)			(0.79±0.33)		

Table H

Fig 9

Graph (panel) assay Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean \pm Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean \pm Std Error M)	Test	p Value
--	----	---	------	---------

Graph (G) Glial density <i>Control repo>Gal4</i> (23) (0.0094 \pm 0.00037)	vs	<i>repo>ihog</i> (17) (0.01 \pm 0.0005)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.89)
<i>Control repo>Gal4</i> (23) (0.0094 \pm 0.00037)	vs	<i>repo>ci^{m1-3}</i> (11) (0.006 \pm 0.0003)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.15)
<i>Control repo>Gal4</i> (23) (0.0094 \pm 0.00037)	vs	<i>repo>tkv^{QD}</i> (18) (0.012 \pm 0.0004)	One-Way ANOVA	0.04
<i>Control repo>Gal4</i> (23) (0.0094 \pm 0.00037)	vs	<i>repo>ihog tkv^{QD}</i> (22) (0.019 \pm 0.001)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Control repo>Gal4</i> (23) (0.0094 \pm 0.00037)	vs	<i>repo>tkv^{QD} ci^{m1-3}</i> (11) (0.012 \pm 0.0005)	One-Way ANOVA	0.037
<i>Control repo>Gal4</i> (23) (0.0094 \pm 0.00037)	vs	<i>hep^{R75} repo>ihog tkv^{QD}</i> (13) (0.012 \pm 0.0009)	One-Way ANOVA	0.02
<i>repo>ihog tkv^{QD}</i> (22) (0.019 \pm 0.001)	vs	<i>repo>tkv^{QD}</i> (18) (0.012 \pm 0.0004)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>repo>ihog tkv^{QD}</i> (22) (0.019 \pm 0.001)	vs	<i>hep^{R75} repo>tkv^{QD} ihog</i> (13) (0.012 \pm 0.0009)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001

Graph (H) % PH3 glia

Control <i>repo>Gal4</i> (23) (1.64±0.11)	vs	<i>repo>ihog</i> (11) (1.19±0.17)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.28)
Control <i>repo>Gal4</i> (22) (1.64±0.11)	vs	<i>repo>ci^{m1-3}</i> (10) (1.55±0.17)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.9)
Control <i>repo>Gal4</i> (22) (1.64±0.11)	vs	<i>repo>tkv^{QD}</i> (16) (1.52±0.15)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.9)
Control <i>repo>Gal4</i> (22) (1.64±0.11)	vs	<i>repo>tkv^{QD} ci^{m1-3}</i> (12) (2.20±0.1)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.069)
Control <i>repo>Gal4</i> (22) (1.64±0.11)	vs	<i>repo>ihog tkv^{QD}</i> (11) (2.39±0.16)	One-Way ANOVA	0.005
Control <i>repo>Gal4</i> (22) (1.64±0.11)	vs	<i>hep^{R75} repo>tkv^{QD} ihog</i> (14) (2.35±0.13)	One-Way ANOVA	0.004
<i>repo>tkv^{QD}</i> (16) (1.52±0.15)	vs	<i>repo>ihog tkv^{QD}</i> (11) (2.39±0.16)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>repo>ihog tkv^{QD}</i> (11) (2.39±0.16)	vs	<i>hep^{R75} repo>tkv^{QD} ihog</i> (14) (2.35±0.13)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.9)

Graph (I) Overmigration

Overmigration wt n=20 rpr n=20 *repo tkv^{QD}*=22 *repo tkv^{QD} ihog*=18 *repo ihog*=23 *hep^{R75} repo tkvqd ihog* =20

Table I**Fig 10**

Graph (panel) assay Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean \pm Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean \pm Std Error M)	Test	p Value
Graph (K) WG Glial density				
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (21) (control) (0.004 \pm 0.00024)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr Mz97-GFP</i> (17) (0.0026 \pm 9,733e-005)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (21) (0.004 \pm 0.00024)	vs	<i>Mz97-puc</i> (10) (0.0044 \pm 0.00034)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.9)
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (21) (0.004 \pm 0.00024)	vs	<i>Mz97-bsk^{DN}</i> (10) (0.0029 \pm 0.00012)	One-Way ANOVA	0.037
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (21) (0.004 \pm 0.00024)	vs	<i>hep^{R75} Mz97-GFP</i> (12) (0.0028 \pm 0.00027)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0067
<i>GMR>rpr Mz97-GFP</i> (17) (0.0026 \pm 9,733e-005)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr Mz97>puc</i> (17) (0.003 \pm 0.00023)	One-Way ANOV	ns (0.88)
<i>GMR>rpr Mz97-GFP</i> (17) (0.0026 \pm 9,733e-005)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr Mz97>bsk^{DN}</i> (7) (0.0026 \pm 0.00019)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.99)

Graph (L) WG/Total glia				
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (22) (control) (0.31±0.015)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr Mz97-GFP</i> (17) (0.149±0.0063)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (22) (0.31±0.015)	vs	<i>Mz97-puc</i> (10) (0.35±0.022)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.34)
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (22) (0.31±0.015)	vs	<i>Mz97-bsk^{DN}</i> (10) (0.27±0.009)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.56)
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (22) (0.31±0.015)	vs	<i>hep^{R75} Mz97-GFP</i> (12) (0.25±0.019)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.068)
<i>GMR>rpr Mz97-GFP</i> (17) (0.149±0.0063)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr Mz97>puc</i> (17) (0.11±0.01)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0083
<i>GMR>rpr Mz97-GFP</i> (17) (0.149±0.0063)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr Mz97>bsk^{DN}</i> (7) (0.08±0.0052)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0001
Graph (M) Nuclei size				
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (127) (control) (41±0.69)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr Mz97-GFP</i> (93) (49.9±1.28)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (127) (41±0.69)	vs	<i>Mz97-puc</i> (91) (45.2±0.84)	One-Way ANOVA	0.008
<i>Mz97-Gal4 UAS-GFP</i> (127) (41±0.69)	vs	<i>Mz97-bsk^{DN}</i> (102) (49.9±1.03)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001

<i>GMR>rpr Mz97-GFP</i> (93) (49.9±1.28)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr Mz97>puc</i> (86) (41.3±0.92)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>GMR>rpr Mz97-GFP</i> (93) (49.9±1.28)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr Mz97>bsk^{DN}</i> (44) (39.5±1.56)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001

Table J

Fig 11

Graph (panel) assay Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean ± Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean ± Std Error M)	Test	p Value
Graph (C) NO. glial cells <i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr; hh-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (24) (161.5±8.03)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr; Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (15) (153.1±11.67)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr; Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}; UAS-GFP</i> (25) (146.2±5.94)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
Graph (D) % PH3 glial cells <i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (17) (0.4767±0.1313)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr; hh-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (15) (0.2458±0.0828)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.39)

Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} (17)
(0.4767±0.1313)

vs

UAS-rpr, Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} (15)
(0.732±0.1514)

One-way ANOVA

ns (0.32)