

Statistical Tables supplementary Figures

Table A

S2 Fig

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 (E) % glial cells EdU+ <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (10) (29.02 \pm 0.98)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+ ;GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (10) (34.83 \pm 1.7)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	0.0083
Graph (F) % PH3 glial cells <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (24) (1.16 \pm 0.13)	vs	<i>UAS-rpr/+ ; GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} UAS-GFP</i> (35) (1.79 \pm 0.1)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	0.0011

Table B

S3 Fig

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 (E) Glia proliferation <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (20) (0.00025 \pm 2.4e-005)	vs	T0 <i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4, tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (14) (0.00047 \pm 4.7e-005)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001

<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (20) (0.00025±2.4e-005)	vs	T1 <i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (10) (0.00044±2.08e-005)	One-way ANOVA	0.0018
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (20) (0.00025±2.4e-005)	vs	T2 <i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (10) (0.00015±2.99e-005)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.12)

Table C

S4 Fig

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 cells migration WG <i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+</i> (18) (-0,44±0.18)	vs	<i>GMR-QF/+; UAS-GFP Mz97-Gal4/+; QUAS-rpr /+</i> (16) (-5±0.2)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	<0.0001

Table D

S10 Fig

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 (D) n° glial cells / Area				
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.0003)	vs	<i>hep^{R75}</i> (32) (0.0058 \pm 0.00026)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.0003)	vs	<i>eiger¹/eiger³</i> (17) (0.009 \pm 0.0006)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.35)
Graph (E) % PH3 glial cells				
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (24) (1.16 \pm 0.13)	vs	<i>hep^{R75}</i> (12) (1.62 \pm 0.38)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.31)
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (24) (1.16 \pm 0.13)	vs	<i>eiger¹/eiger³</i> (11) (1.89 \pm 0.18)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.069)
Graph (F) % glial cells EdU+				
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (10) (29 \pm 0.98)	vs	<i>hep^{R75}</i> (9) (27.08 \pm 1.38)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	ns (0.48)

Table E

S13 Fig

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) n° glial cells / Area <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} UAS-hep^{CA}</i> (15) (0.011 \pm 0.00043)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0329
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} UAS-hep^{CA} UAS micro^{RGH}</i> (10) (0.01 \pm 0.00045)	One-Way ANOVA	ns(0.9)
<i>UAS-rpr/+ GMR-Gal4, tub-Gal80^{ts/+}</i> (39) (0.019 \pm 0.00043)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} UAS-hep^{CA} UAS micro^{RGH}</i> (10) (0.01 \pm 0.00045)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
Graph (J) n° glial cells / Area <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>repo-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} UAS-hep^{CA}</i> (13) (0.01 \pm 0.00059)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	ns (0.57)
Graph (K) Glial migration <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}</i> (27) (-3.44 \pm 0.32)	vs	<i>repo-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts} UAS-hep^{CA}</i> (13) (-2.76 \pm 0.36)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	ns (0.15)

Table F

S17 Fig

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 (A) Glial density				
<i>UAS-rpr/+;GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (39) (0.019 \pm 0.00045)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr dpp^{RNAi2} hh^{RNAi}</i> (10) (0.0166 \pm 0.0004)	One-Way ANOVA	0.01
<i>UAS-rpr/+;GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (39) (0.019 \pm 0.00045)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr dpp^{RNAi Int} hh^{RNAi}</i> (17) (0.0162 \pm 0.00049)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0003
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>GMR> dpp^{RNAi2} hh^{RNAi}</i> (9) (0.009 \pm 0.0006)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	ns (0.41)
Graph (B) % PH3 glial cells				
<i>UAS-rpr/+;GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (34) (1.8 \pm 0.1)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr dpp^{RNAi2} hh^{RNAi}</i> (10) (1.5 \pm 0.19)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.48)
<i>UAS-rpr/+;GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (34) (1.8 \pm 0.1)	vs	<i>GMR>rpr dpp^{RNAi Int} hh^{RNAi}</i> (10) (1.2 \pm 0.2)	One-Way ANOVA	0.03
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-GFP</i> (24) (1.2 \pm 0.13)	vs	<i>GMR> dpp^{RNAi2} hh^{RNAi}</i> (9) (1.02 \pm 0.1)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	ns (0.33)
Graph (C) Glial density				
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (27) (0.018 \pm 0.0004)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo>-Cf^{RNAi}</i> (12) (0.0172 \pm 0.008)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.79)

<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (27) (0.018± 0.0004)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo>-dad</i> (13) (0.01± 0.0037)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (27) (0.018± 0.0004)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo> Ci^{RNAi} dad</i> (15) (0.0091± 0.00079)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo>-dad</i> (13) (0.01± 0.0037)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo> Ci^{RNAi} dad</i> (15) (0.0091± 0.00079)	Mann-Whitney U-Test	0.0043
<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo-Gal4/+</i> (23) (0.0094± 0.00037)	vs	<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo>-Ci^{RNAi}</i> (10) (0.0067± 0.00031)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo-Gal4/+</i> (23) (0.0094± 0.00037)	vs	<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo>-dad</i> (13) (0.0051± 0.00028)	One-Way ANOVA	<0.0001
Graph (D) % PH3 glial cells				
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (13) (2.3± 0.23)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo>-Ci^{RNAi}</i> (11) (2.25± 0.27)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (13) (2.3± 0.23)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo>-dad</i> (11) (1.07± 0.29)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0099
<i>GMR-QF/+; QUAS-rpr repo-Gal4/+</i> (13) (2.3± 0.23)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo> Ci^{RNAi} dad</i> (16) (1.098± 0.22)	One-Way ANOVA	0.005
<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo>-dad</i> (13) (1.07± 0.29)	vs	<i>GMR-QF>rpr repo> Ci^{RNAi} dad</i> (16) (1.098± 0.22)	One-Way ANOVA	ns(0.99)
<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo-Gal4/+</i> (23) (1.64± 0.11)	vs	<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo>Ci^{RNAi}</i> (10) (1.72± 0.17)	One-Way ANOVA	ns(0.95)
<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo-Gal4/+</i> (23) (1.64± 0.11)	vs	<i>tub-Gal80^{ts} repo>dad</i> (13) (0.98± 0.31)	One-Way ANOVA	0.04

Table G**S18 Fig**

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 (E) NO. glial cells / Area <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; UAS-dpp/+</i> (15) (0.0122 \pm 0.00045)	One-way ANOVA	0.0039
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP</i> (13) (0.0099 \pm 0.00028)	One-way ANOVA	>0.99
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+</i> (47) (0.0099 \pm 0.00034)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP; UAS-dpp/+</i> (14) (0.0145 \pm 0.00079)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; UAS-dpp/+</i> (15) (0.0122 \pm 0.00045)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP</i> (13) (0.0099 \pm 0.00028)	One-way ANOVA	0.038
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; UAS-dpp/+</i> (15) (0.0122 \pm 0.00045)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP; UAS-dpp/+</i> (14) (0.0145 \pm 0.00079)	One-way ANOVA	0.0461
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP</i> (13) (0.0099 \pm 0.00028)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP; UAS-dpp/+</i> (14) (0.0145 \pm 0.00079)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001

Graph (F) % PH3 glial cells				
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (24) (1.16±0.1387)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP; UAS-dpp/+</i> (9)	One-way ANOVA	0.0003
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}}</i> (24) (1.16±0.1387)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}; UAS-dpp/+}</i> (15)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.57)
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}}</i> (24) (1.16±0.1387)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP</i> (13)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.86)
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}; UAS-dpp/+}</i> (15) (1.4±0.2356)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP; UAS-dpp/+</i> (9)	One-way ANOVA	0.0186
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP</i> (13) (1.34±0.0913)	vs	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP; UAS-dpp/+</i> (9)	One-way ANOVA	0.0087

Table H

S20 Fig

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) % glia cells expressing pucZ2B				
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}; pucZ2B}</i> (13) (17.39±1)	vs +	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hh ;pucZ2B</i> (5) (21.03±2.9)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.56)
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts/+}; pucZ2B}</i> (13)	vs +	<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+ ;pucZ2B/UAS-dpp</i> (9)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0036

(17.39±1)	(25.9±1.9)		
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; pucZ2B</i> (13) (17.39±1)	vs + <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hh ;pucZ2B/UAS-dpp</i> (12) (24.29±1.6)	One-Way ANOVA	0.012
High levels			
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; pucZ2B</i> (11) (5.4±0.99)	vs + <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hh ;pucZ2B</i> (5) (7.6±0.95)	One-Way ANOVA	ns (0.8)
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; pucZ2B</i> (11) (5.4±0.99)	vs + <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+ ;pucZ2B/UAS-dpp</i> (9) (11.02±1.67)	One-Way ANOVA	0.047
<i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/+; pucZ2B</i> (11) (5.4±0.99)	vs + <i>GMR-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hh ;pucZ2B/UAS-dpp</i> (11) (14.90±1.7)	One-Way ANOVA	0.0002

Table I

S22 Fig

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) NO. glial cells <i>Control hh-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (43) (100.2±4.5)	vs	<i>hep^{r75}</i> (26) (75.23±4.59)	One-way ANOVA	0.026

Control <i>hh-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (43) (100.2±4.5)	vs	<i>rpr; hh-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (12) (163±18.73)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>rpr; hh-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (12) (163±18.73)	vs	<i>hep^{r75}; rpr; hh-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (11) (96.91±8.87)	One-way ANOVA	0.0001

Table J

S25 Fig

Graph (panel) assay Control Genotype (n= discs analysed) (Mean ± Std Error M)	vs	Test Genotype (n) (Mean ± Std Error M)	Test	p Value
Graph (J) NO. glial cells <i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>dpp^{d12}/dpp^{d14}</i> (11) (47.27±4.21)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>Dll>dpp^{RNAi}</i> (16) (78.06±8.56)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.11)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>Dll>hh^{RNAi}</i> (13) (97.46±6.29)	One-way ANOVA	ns (>0.99)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>Dll>rpr dpp^{RNAi}</i> (17) (105±7.54)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>Dll>rpr hh^{RNAi} dpp^{RNAi}</i> (12) (92.42±5.89)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.99)

<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>Dll>rpr GFP</i> (25) (146.2±5.94)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>hh>rpr</i> (24) (161.5±8.03)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2±4.07)	vs	<i>hh>rpr dpp^{d12}/dpp^{d14}</i> (13) (57.85±5.9)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Dll>rpr GFP</i> (25) (146.2±5.94)	vs	<i>Dll>rpr dpp^{RNAi}</i> (17) (105±7.54)	One-way ANOVA	0.0001
<i>Dll>rpr GFP</i> (25) (146.2±5.94)	vs	<i>Dll>rpr hh^{RNAi} dpp^{RNAi}</i> (12) (92.42±5.89)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>hh>rpr</i> (24) (161.5±8.03)	vs	<i>hh>rpr dpp^{d12}/dpp^{d14}</i> (13) (57.85±5.9)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
Graph (K) % PH3 glial cells				
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (17) (0.4767±0.1313)	vs	<i>dpp^{d12}/dpp^{d14}</i> (10) (0.5865±0.3080)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (17) (0.4767±0.1313)	vs	<i>Dll>dpp^{RNAi}</i> (16) (1.104±0.02501)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.34)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (17) (0.4767±0.1313)	vs	<i>Dll>hh^{RNAi}</i> (12) (0.9294±0.3343)	One-way ANOVA	ns (>0.76)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (17) (0.4767±0.1313)	vs	<i>Dll>rpr</i> (15) (0.732±0.1514)	One-way ANOVA	ns (>0.96)

Table K

S26 Fig

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) NO. glial cells <i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2 \pm 4.07)	vs	<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}; UAS-dpp/+</i> (22) (190.6 \pm 11.37)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2 \pm 4.07)	vs	<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}; UAS-hhGFP /+</i> (14) (83.5 \pm 6.14)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.87)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2 \pm 4.07)	vs	<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}; UAS-hhGFP; UAS-dpp/+</i> (11) (199.8 \pm 27.85)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2 \pm 4.07)	vs	<i>UAS-ihog/+; repo-Gal4/+</i> (17) (111.4 \pm 6.3)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2 \pm 4.07)	vs	<i>repo-Gal4/UAS-tkv^{QD}</i> (13) (199.5 \pm 16.36)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (60) (102.2 \pm 4.07)	vs	<i>UAS-ihog/+; repo-Gal4/UAS-tkv^{QD}</i> (11) (192.3 \pm 30.77)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}; UAS-dpp/+</i> (22) (190.6 \pm 11.37)	vs	<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}; UAS-hhGFP</i> (14) (83.5 \pm 6.14)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001

<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}; UAS-dpp/+</i> (22) (190.6±11.37)	vs	<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP; UAS-dpp/+</i> (11) (199.8±27.85)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
<i>repo-Gal4/UAS-tkv^{QD}</i> (13) (199.5±16.36)	vs	<i>UAS-ihog/+; repo-Gal4/+</i> (17) (111.4±6.3)	One-way ANOVA	<0.0001
<i>repo-Gal4/UAS-tkv^{QD}</i> (13) (199.5±16.36)	vs	<i>UAS-ihog/+; repo-Gal4/UAS-tkv^{QD}</i> (11) (192.3±30.77)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
Graph (I) % PH3 glial cells				
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (17) (0.4767±0.1313)	vs	<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}; UAS-dpp/+</i> (5) (0.52±0.15)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (17) (0.4767±0.1313)	vs	<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP</i> (14) (0.42±0.17)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (17) (0.4767±0.1313)	vs	<i>Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}/UAS-hhGFP; UAS-dpp/+</i> (9) (0.42±0.17)	One-way ANOVA	ns (0.99)
<i>Control Dll-Gal4 tub-Gal80^{ts}</i> (17) (0.4767±0.1313)	vs	<i>repo-Gal4/UAS-tkv^{QD}</i> (13) (1.122±0.1332)	One-way ANOVA	0.016