



Figure S1: Cross scheme for collecting large numbers of *Blm* mutant mothers. Due to the severe maternal-effect lethality observed in *Blm* females, (90-95% of embryos from *Blm* mothers fail to hatch) we used a scheme to make it easier to collect large numbers of *Blm* mothers, which makes it possible to produce sufficient numbers of progeny in order to carry out our experiments. We utilized the following cross, based on a similar scheme from McMahan et. al (2013) to achieve

this aim. Virgin female flies containing the *Blm^{NI}* null allele were crossed to male flies containing the *Blm^{D2}* null allele, both of which were maintained over a balancer chromosome to prevent recombination. Most of the progeny classes from this cross inherit the yeast transcriptional activator GAL4 as well as the GAL4 DNA recognition sequence, UAS, attached to the pro-apoptotic gene *rpr* (this includes all classes of male flies, which inherit the UAS::*rpr* construct on the Y chromosome). The combination of the GAL4 and UAS::*rpr* genetic elements in the same cell activates expression of Rpr and is lethal (Wang *et al.* 1999). One additional progeny class inherits two copies of the *Stubble (Sb)* allele, which is lethal. Shaded boxes indicate a genotype class of flies that does not survive. Only female progeny inheriting both the *Blm^{NI}* and the *Blm^{D2}* alleles survive (white box). Red arrows indicate the cause of lethality in each class of flies, where applicable.

References

- McMahan S., K. P. Kohl, and J. Sekelsky, 2013 Variation in meiotic recombination frequencies between allelic transgenes inserted at different sites in the drosophila melanogaster genome. *G3 Genes, Genomes, Genet.* 3: 1419–1427. <https://doi.org/10.1534/g3.113.006411>
- Wang S. L., C. J. Hawkins, S. J. Yoo, H. A. J. Müller, and B. A. Hay, 1999 The Drosophila caspase inhibitor DIAP1 is essential for cell survival and is negatively regulated by HID. *Cell* 98: 453–463. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674\(00\)81974-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674(00)81974-1)

Table S1: Statistical Results from Figure 2

Tests for normal distribution			
Cross	Shapiro Wilks test statistic		p-value
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>w</i> ¹¹¹⁸	0.95794		0.2921
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>C(1;Y)3/O</i>	0.97992		0.9414
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>C(1;Y)6/Y</i>	0.99062		0.9672
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>Dp(1;Y)B^S</i>	0.93479		0.09062
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>Dp(1;Y)y⁺</i>	0.88919		0.004615*
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>In(1)sc^{4L}sc^{8R}</i>	0.97212		0.8544
<i>Blm</i> x <i>w</i> ¹¹¹⁸	0.90824		0.0008018*
<i>Blm</i> x <i>C(1;Y)3/O</i>	0.77813		< 0.0001*
<i>Blm</i> x <i>C(1;Y)6/Y</i>	0.8243		< 0.0001*
<i>Blm</i> x <i>Dp(1;Y)B^S</i>	0.96559		0.008321*
<i>Blm</i> x <i>Dp(1;Y)y⁺</i>	0.98927		0.6342
<i>Blm</i> x <i>In(1)sc^{4L}sc^{8R}</i>	0.9737		0.02033
t-tests comparing observed proportion of female progeny to expected (0.5)			
Cross	t-statistic	Degrees of freedom	p-value
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>w</i> ¹¹¹⁸	0.10861	28	0.9143
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>C(1;Y)3/O</i>	2.707	18	0.01444
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>C(1;Y)6/Y</i>	1.6151	46	0.1131
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>Dp(1;Y)B^S</i>	2.7044	26	0.01191
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>Dp(1;Y)y⁺</i>	0.16313	29	0.8715
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>In(1)sc^{4L}sc^{8R}</i>	2.0157	16	0.06095
<i>Blm</i> ⁻ x <i>w</i> ¹¹¹⁸	13.041	50	< 0.0001
<i>Blm</i> ⁻ x <i>C(1;Y)3/O</i>	35.02	106	< 0.0001
<i>Blm</i> ⁻ x <i>C(1;Y)6/Y</i>	67.759	106	< 0.0001
<i>Blm</i> ⁻ x <i>Dp(1;Y)B^S</i>	42.147	103	< 0.0001

$Blm^- \times Dp(1;Y)y^+$	36.013	95	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times In(1)sc^{4L}sc^{8R}$	29.125	117	< 0.0001
t-tests comparing observed proportions of female progeny			
Cross comparisons	t-statistic	Degrees of freedom	p-value
$Blm^+ \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^- \times w^{1118}$	11.49	71.706	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ \times C(1;Y)3/O$ vs. $Blm^- \times C(1;Y)3/O$	40.441	93.376	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ \times C(1;Y)6/Y$ vs. $Blm^- \times C(1;Y)6/Y$	18.418	40.202	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ \times Dp(1;Y)B^S$ vs. $Blm^- \times Dp(1;Y)B^S$	29.49	93.556	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ \times Dp(1;Y)y^+$ vs. $Blm^- \times Dp(1;Y)y^+$	21.624	63.984	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ \times In(1)sc^{4L}sc^{8R}$ vs. $Blm^- \times In(1)sc^{4L}sc^{8R}$	11.705	25.674	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^- \times In(1)sc^{4L}sc^{8R}$	2.6689	81.915	0.009172
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^- \times Dp(1;Y)y^+$	5.1182	77.964	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^- \times Dp(1;Y)B^S$	8.0738	78.557	< 0.0001

Table S2: Statistical Results from Figure 3

Tests for female proportion throughout development		
Comparison	z-test statistic	p-value
Embryo vs. 1 st instar larvae	3.1416	0.00168
Embryo vs. 3 rd instar larvae	3.7332	0.0002
Embryo vs. adult	3.7191	0.0002
1 st instar larvae vs. 3 rd instar larvae	1.0314	0.30302
1 st instar larvae vs. adult	1.0338	0.30302
3 rd instar larvae vs. adult	0.0164	0.98404

Table S3: Statistical Results from Figure 5

Test for normal distribution of data			
Data Set	Shapiro Wilks test statistic	p-value	
w^{1118} fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , and Blm^{N2} mothers)	0.97998	0.06055	
B^{SY} fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , and Blm^{N2} mothers)	0.90465	< 0.0001 [#]	
$C(1:Y)6$ fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , and Blm^{N2} mothers)	0.86422	< 0.0001 [*]	
Tests for differences in proportion of females based on maternal genetic background			
Data Set	ANOVA test statistic	df	p-value
w^{1118} fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , and Blm^{N2} mothers)	68.095	2	< 0.0001
B^{SY} fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , and Blm^{N2} mothers)	404.85	2	< 0.0001
$C(1:Y)6$ fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , and Blm^{N2} mothers)	786.62	2	< 0.0001
Post-hoc comparisons of proportion female			

Comparison	t-statistic	df	p-value
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^{N2} \times w^{1118}$	8.879	122	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^+ \times w^{1118}$	10.560	122	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^{N2} \times w^{1118}$	2.687	122	0.0222
$Blm^- \times B^{SY}$ vs. $Blm^{N2} \times B^{SY}$	23.568	166	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times B^{SY}$ vs. $Blm^+ \times B^{SY}$	21.035	166	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ \times B^{SY}$ vs. $Blm^{N2} \times B^{SY}$	0.302	166	0.9511
$Blm^- \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^{N2} \times C(1:Y)6$	24.778	190	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^+ \times C(1:Y)6$	36.758	190	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^{N2} \times C(1:Y)6$	8.300	190	< 0.0001
# Nonparametric tests due to non-normally distributed data *sample size >30, so parametric tests appropriate			
Data Set	Kruskal-Wallis result	df	p-value
B^{SY} fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , and Blm^{N2} mothers)	119.04	2	< 0.0001
Post-hoc comparisons of proportion female			
Comparison	Wilcoxon ran sum test	p-value	
$Blm^- \times B^{SY}$ vs. $Blm^{N2} \times B^{SY}$	3947	< 0.0001	
$Blm^- \times B^{SY}$ vs. $Blm^+ \times B^{SY}$	2808	< 0.0001	
$Blm^+ \times B^{SY}$ vs. $Blm^{N2} \times B^{SY}$	525	0.8783	

Table S4: Statistical Results from Figure 6

Test for normal distribution of data			
Data Set	Shapiro Wilks test statistic	p-value	
w^{1118} fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , $Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-}$, and $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-}$ mothers)	0.95725	0.0001305 [#]	
$C(1:Y)6$ fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , $Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-}$, and $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-}$ mothers)	0.77936	< 0.0001 [#]	
Parametric tests for differences in proportion of females based on maternal genetic background			
Data Set	ANOVA test statistic	df	p-value
w^{1118} fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , $Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-}$, and $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-}$ mothers)	88.328	3	< 0.0001
$C(1:Y)6$ fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , $Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-}$, and $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-}$ mothers)	915.24	3	< 0.0001
Nonparametric post-hoc comparisons of proportion female			
Comparison	t-statistic	df	p-value
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^+ \times w^{1118}$	11.247	147	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$	10.142	147	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$	1.979	147	0.2006
$Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$	11.585	147	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^+ \times w^{1118}$	0.512	147	0.9561
$Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^+ \times w^{1118}$	12.729	147	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^+ \times C(1:Y)6$	43.319	212	< 0.0001

$Blm^- \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-} \times C(1:Y)6$	26.736	212	< 0.0001
$Blm^- \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-} \times C(1:Y)6$	6.193	212	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-} \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-} \times C(1:Y)6$	28.386	212	< 0.0001
$Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-} \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^+ \times C(1:Y)6$	2.119	212	0.1504
$Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-} \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^+ \times C(1:Y)6$	41.622	212	< 0.0001
# Nonparametric tests due to non-normally distributed data			
Data Set	Kruskal-Wallis result	df	p-value
w^{1118} fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , $Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-}$, and $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-}$ mothers)	92.01	3	< 0.0001
$C(1:Y)6$ fathers (Blm^+ , Blm^- , $Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-}$, and $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-}$ mothers)	153.33	3	< 0.0001
Nonparametric post-hoc comparisons of proportion female			
Comparison	Wilcoxon ran sum test	p-value	
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^+ \times w^{1118}$	1397	< 0.0001	
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$	1189	< 0.0001	
$Blm^- \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$	959.5	0.1238	
$Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$	6	< 0.0001	
$Blm^+ pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^+ \times w^{1118}$	397	0.5553	
$Blm^- pol\alpha^{+/-} \times w^{1118}$ vs. $Blm^+ \times w^{1118}$	1334	< 0.0001	
$Blm^- \times C(1:Y)6$ vs. $Blm^+ \times C(1:Y)6$	0.5	< 0.0001	

<i>Blm</i> ⁻ x <i>C(1:Y)6</i> vs. <i>Blm</i> ⁺ <i>polα</i> ^{+/-} x <i>C(1:Y)6</i>	1	< 0.0001
<i>Blm</i> ⁻ x <i>C(1:Y)6</i> vs. <i>Blm</i> ⁻ <i>polα</i> ^{+/-} x <i>C(1:Y)6</i>	3902	< 0.0001
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ <i>polα</i> ^{+/-} x <i>C(1:Y)6</i> vs. <i>Blm</i> ⁻ <i>polα</i> ^{+/-} x <i>C(1:Y)6</i>	765	< 0.0001
<i>Blm</i> ⁺ <i>polα</i> ^{+/-} x <i>C(1:Y)6</i> vs. <i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>C(1:Y)6</i>	289.5	0.096
<i>Blm</i> ⁻ <i>polα</i> ^{+/-} x <i>C(1:Y)6</i> vs. <i>Blm</i> ⁺ x <i>C(1:Y)6</i>	0	< 0.0001