Supplementary Methods

Strains and reporter transgenes

N2 Bristol wild-type \(^1\) and CB4856 Hawaiian wild-type isolates \(^2\) were used. The transgenic animals used were \(vtls1 [dat-1::gfp]\) \(^3\) in the manual screen and \(vtls1\) plus \(vsls33 [dop-3::rfp]\) \(^4\) for the worm sorter screen.

Screening process

In all screens, animals were mutagenized with EMS according to standard protocols \(^1\). Worms were kept at 25°C at all times. In the manual screen 5 parental (P0) mutagenized animals were placed in each of 10 founder P\(_0\) plates. Three days later, 400 F\(_1\) progeny of the mutagenized P\(_0\) animals were singled. Their ensuing progeny (F\(_2\) and F\(_3\) generation) were screened under a stereomicroscope equipped with a fluorescent light source.

In the worm sorter screen, 5 large (150 mm) founder P\(_0\) plates were each seeded with 5 to 10 mutagenized P\(_0\) worms. After 6 days the F\(_2\)/F\(_3\) generation was directly screened by rinsing the 5 P\(_0\) plates and passing half of the worm population through the COPAS biosorter.

The sorting process for 5 P\(_0\) plates lasted on average 5 hours. The work involved mostly waiting time during sample sorting and short washing steps in between plates. The reported total time of 25 days for performing the worm sorter screen includes all stages of the procedure, i.e., mutagenesis, worm handling, actual sorting, manually inspecting the sorted animals and lastly mutant handling (confirm the heritability of the phenotype, filing and freezing). The worm sorter screened all larval and adult stages.

In total we screened in the worm sorter screen 110 plates that translate to over 2,000,000 worms. Mutants were recovered in 21 of the plates. The mutants presented here are all independent isolates, i.e. mutants coming from different plates or mutants coming from the same plate showing different phenotype. When multiple mutants of the same phenotype were retrieved from the same P\(_0\) plate they were considered as multiple isolates of the first isolated mutant and
are not reported in this paper. Note that this may lead to a slight underestimation of the number of mutants retrieved from the screen. The number of genomes screened with the worm sorter was estimated based on the initial number of $P_0$ worms used (5 to 10) and the average number of $F_1$ progeny our strain produced after mutagenesis (about 50). Therefore we estimated that we screened 500 to 1000 haploid genomes per $P_0$ plate depending on whether the initial number of $P_0$ worms was 5 or 10 respectively.

To calculate the false-positive and false-negative rates of recovering non-gfp animals from a vtIs1 population (presented in Supplementary Table 1) we mixed 50 N2 individuals with 10,000 vtIs1 worms. For comparison we made the same experiment using a transgene that carries vsIs33 in the background. The results are summarized in Supplementary Table 1.

In our experimental setup we would get on average 60 false positives from each plate of 25,000 $F_2$s sorted. It would take us about 5 minutes to go through this number of worms under the dissecting scope and this would add a total of 30 minutes in the daily sorting routine; this number is included in the overall time effort calculation shown in Table 2.

**Worm sorter settings**

The sorting process was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions and (Union Biometrica). The worms were gated to exclude eggs, small L1s and debris using as gating parameters Time of Flight vs. Extinction. Then they were sorted based on fluorescence parameters, in particular Red Peak Height vs. Green Peak Height. We set the parameters for the fluorescence signal amplification as follows:

- **Full scale:** Tof 2048, Ext 2048, RedPH 65536, GreenPH 65536
- **Gains (Signal):** Ext 3, Green 4, Red 4 Trigger: Ext
- **Thresholds:** Singal 30, TOF Minimum: 10
- **PMT Control:** Green 750, Red 750

For the test runs in which we determined the efficiency of sorting non-gfp animals when rfp transgene (vsIs33) was present or not present in the
background (Supplementary Table 1), we used as sorting parameters Tof vs. GreenPH.

**Mapping and allele identification**

We first tested mutants for linkage to the X chromosome by crossing them with wild-type males and examining a potential mutant phenotype in hemizygous, male F₁ cross-progeny. If a phenotype was observed in the F₁ male progeny, it was tested whether this is due to dominance rather than to X-linkage.

For placing the mutants into complementation groups, we first grouped them into phenotypic categories. Then we performed complementation tests among mutants of the same phenotypic category. Subsequently we mapped at least one -and in most cases more than one- mutant per complementation group, using a rapid SNP mapping procedure. Last, we complemented mutants of different phenotypic categories that mapped in the same region.

The two retrieved mutants that showed no gfp expression (ot344 and ot373) are likely array mutations based on the following analysis: mutant animals were crossed with N2 males and the cross progeny showed no recovery of the gfp expression indicating either a mutation on the array or a dominant mutation. Then mutants were crossed with wild-type vtls1 males. The cross progeny were not "off" for gfp as we would expect in the case of a dominant mutation but showed normal fluorescence levels.
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Supplementary Fig. 1: Phenotypes of isolated dopy mutants. Micrographs of representative animals and quantification of aberrant dat-1::gfp expression patterns are shown.

**a** wild type

| % animals with gfp expression in: | CEPVs | CEPDs | ADEs | n |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|------|---|
| ot340                            | 100   | 100   | 0    | 00 |
| ot345                            | 0     | 20    | 20   | 40 |
| ot406                            | 0     | 57    | 0    | 71 |

**b** dopy-2

| % animals with gfp expression in: | CEPVs | CEPDs | ADEs | n |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|------|---|
| ot340                            | 100   | 100   | 0    | 00 |
| ot345                            | 0     | 20    | 20   | 40 |
| ot406                            | 0     | 57    | 0    | 71 |

**c** dopy-3

| % animals lacking gfp expression in: | CEPVs | CEPDs | ADEs | n |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|---|
| ot337                               | 80    | 100   | 68   | 90 |

**d** dopy-4

| % animals with gfp expression in: | fewer PDEs | more PDEs | n |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|
| ot260                             | 28         | 15        | 40 |

**e** dopy-5

| % animals with gfp expression in fewer CEPDs: | n |
|-----------------------------------------------|---|
| ot283                                         | 58 |
| ot284                                         | 0  |
| ot296                                         | 43 |
| ot298                                         | 39 |

**f** dopy-6

| % animals with gfp expression in: | fewer PDEs | more PDEs | n |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|
| ot263                             | 49         | 3         | 158 |

**g** dopy-7

| % animals with gfp expression in: | no CEPs | no PDEs | n |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---|
| ot399                             | 77      | 52      | 61 |
| ot347                             | 25      | 64      | 38 |

Supplementary Fig. 1: Phenotypes of isolated dopy mutants. Micrographs of representative animals and quantification of aberrant dat-1::gfp expression patterns are shown.
Supplementary Figure 2  Molecular identity of mutant alleles of known genes retrieved from screens. Names of alleles isolated from our screens are in blue, previously described reference alleles are in black. Lines indicate deletions. For quantification see Supplementary Tables 1 to 3.

a  LIN-32

b  HAM-1

C  VAB-3
Supplementary Table 1: False positive/negative rates

### Efficiency of sorting non-gfp (non-\textit{vtls1}) animals

| Input   | Recovery | Rates          |
|---------|----------|----------------|
| # of \textit{vtls1} animals | # of N2 animals | # worms sorted | N2 recovered | False positive worms | % false negative (N2 \textit{not} recovered) | % false positive |
| 10,000  | 50       | 63             | 38            | 25           | 24\% (12/50)         | 40\% (25/63) |

### Efficiency of sorting non-gfp (non-\textit{vtls1}) animals with \textit{rfp} transgene (\textit{vsls33}) in the background

| Input   | Recovery | Rates          |
|---------|----------|----------------|
| # \textit{vtls1};\textit{vsls33} animals | # \textit{vsls33} animals | # worms sorted | \textit{vsls33} recovered | False positive worms | % false negative (\textit{vsls33} \textit{not} recovered) | % false positive |
| 10,000  | 50       | 71             | 50            | 21           | 0\% (0/50)           | 30\% (21/71) |
Supplementary Table 2: Quantification of defects in *lin-32* mutants.

|          | % animals with dat-1::gfp expression: | % animals showing any phenotype | n |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
|          | missing in CEPVs | missing in CEPDs | missing in ADEs | missing in PDEs | in extra cells near ADEs |
| wild type | 0          | 0                      | 0                      | 0                      | 0                      | 0  | 100 |
| ot259    | 0          | 61                     | 0                      | 77                     | 7                      | 95 | 55  |
| ot297    | 0          | 94                     | 17                     | 100                    | 74                     | 100| 42  |
| ot341    | 0          | 84                     | 1                      | 99                     | 93                     | 100| 38  |
| ot343    | 0          | 71                     | 4                      | 100                    | 14                     | 100| 38  |
| ot338    | 0          | 100                    | 7                      | 100                    | 60                     | 100| 30  |
| ot366    | 0          | 100                    | 20                     | 100                    | 76                     | 100| 42  |
| tm2044   | 1          | 81                     | 31                     | 100                    | 33                     | 100| 80  |
| tm1446   | 0          | 100                    | 8                      | 100                    | 95                     | 100| 42  |
| u282     | 49         | 100                    | 40                     | 100                    | 2                      | 100| 34  |

*lin-32(u282)* was used as reference allele. The *tm* alleles are putative null alleles (deleting parts of the bHLH domain; [www.wormbase.org](http://www.wormbase.org)) and were provided by the *C. elegans* knockout consortium in Japan.
Supplementary Table 3: Quantification of defects in vab-3 mutant.

|                  | % animals with *dat-1::gfp* expression: |
|------------------|----------------------------------------|
|                  | in extra cells | in 1 extra cells | in 2 extra cells | in 3 extra cells | in 4 extra cells | missing in 1 CEPD | n    |
| wild type        | 0              | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0    |
| *ot346*          | 30             | 22               | 8                | 0                | 0                | 21               | 52   |
| *u648*           | 88             | 40               | 21               | 17               | 4                | 0                | 48   |
### Supplementary Table 4: Quantification of defects in *ham-1* mutants.

|                  | % animals with *dat-1::gfp* expression: |
|------------------|----------------------------------------|
|                  | missing in 1 or 2 CEPDs | missing in 1 or 2 ADEs | missing in 1 or 2 PDEs | any phenotype | n   |
| wild type        | 0                        | 0                       | 0                      | 0             | 0   | 100 |
| *ot253*          | 23                       | 13                      | 0                      | 95            | 0   | 98  | 40  |
| *ot257*          | 40                       | 14                      | 0                      | 80            | 0   | 94  | 50  |
| *ot342*          | 47                       | 17                      | 0                      | 83            | 0   | 23  | 90  | 30  |
| *ot361*          | 17                       | 0                       | 3                      | 90            | 0   | 30  | 93  | 30  |
| *ot367*          | 40                       | 0                       | 3                      | 90            | 0   | 20  | 100 | 30  |
| *ot339*          | 47                       | 20                      | 3                      | 90            | 0   | 13  | 97  | 30  |
| *ot371*          | 40                       | 10                      | 3                      | 73            | 27  | 6   | 100 | 30  |
| *ot364*          | 45                       | 13                      | 0                      | 80            | 0   | 26  | 94  | 31  |
Supplementary Table 5: Calculating the degree of saturation of the worm sorter screen.

| Model         | Maximum likelihood | ΔAICc | Weight | % saturation | 95% credible interval [lower - upper] |
|---------------|--------------------|-------|--------|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Poison        | 1.46x10^-5         | 0     | .817   | 93.3%        | 77.9%-98.6%                          |
| Gamma         | 1.84x10^-5         | 4.53  | .085   | 84.1%        | 51.4%-97.7%                          |
| 2 Class       | 2.11x10^-5         | 4.27  | .097   | 80.7%        | 42.1%-99.7%                          |
| 3 Class       | 2.29x10^-5         | 14.10 | .000   | 76.8%        | 72.5%-99.9%                          |
| 4 Class       | 2.22x10^-5         | 14.10 | .000   | 73.8%        | 85.1%-99.9%                          |
| 2 Class Variable | 2.21x10^-5       | 14.17 | .000   | 79.8%        | 65.1%-99.6%                          |

We calculated the degree of saturation based on the allele frequencies for the worm sorter isolated mutants *dopy*-3 (3 alleles), *dopy*-3 (1 allele), *dopy*-7 (2 alleles), *lin*-32 (4 alleles), *ham*-1 (6 alleles) and *vab*-3 (1 allele). Summary of Maximum Likelihood, AICc (Aikaike Information Criterion) values and weights are shown. Poisson, multiple rates, and gamma distribution-based predictions for this mutagenesis were obtained as described (Pollock and Larkin, 2004). AICc, a measure of the quality of fit to an estimated statistical model, accounts for smaller data sets and therefore was used in this study to ascertain best fit to the given models (Akaike, 1978). ΔAIC represents the difference between the AIC for each model and the lowest AIC. The weight of evidence in favor of each model being the best fit is given as 'weight.' The "95% credible interval" indicates the upper and lower bounds of the saturation estimates and were determined by removing the highest and lower 2.5% of saturation values computed by SatMut. The Poisson model assumes an equal rate of mutability. The 2-, 3- and 4-class models are multiple rate models that assume two to four mutation rate classes which occur at equal frequencies, i.e., an equal number of genes that are highly mutable as are lowly mutable. The 2-class variable frequency models are multiple rate models which assume two to four mutation rate classes that occur at two frequencies throughout the genome, i.e., a few genes highly mutable and many lowly mutable. The Poisson model (shaded in grey) best fits this data.
**Supplementary Table 6: Mutants retrieved from genetic screens**

| Gene name | Molecular identity | Manual screen | Sorter screen | Allele names | Affected cells | Dom/Rec | Visible pleiotropies | Location |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------|----------------------|----------|
| *dopy*-2  | unknown            | 0 alleles     | 3 alleles     | *ot340, ot345 ot406* | CEPs, CEPDs, ADEs | R       | -                    | III:−7 to −1 |
| *dopy*-3  | unknown            | 0 alleles     | 1 allele      | *ot337*      | CEPs, ADEs     | D       | -                    | I:+14 to +26 |
| *dopy*-4  | unknown            | 1 allele *    | 0 alleles     | *ot260*      | PDEs           | R       | -                    | I: left of −6 |
| *dopy*-5  | unknown            | 4 alleles **  | 0 alleles     | *ot283, ot284, ot296, ot298* | CEPDs | R       | sterile             | III:−7 to −1 |
| *dopy*-6  | unknown            | 1 allele *    | 0 alleles     | *ot263*      | PDEs           | R       | -                    | X:−17 to −8 |
| *dopy*-7  | unknown            | 0 alleles     | 2 alleles     | *ot399, ot347* | CEPs, PDEs     | R       | sick                | X: left of −4 |
| *lin*-32  | bHLH               | 2 alleles     | 4 alleles     | *ot259, ot297, ot341, ot343, ot338, ot366* | CEPDs, ADEs, PDEs | R       | -                    | X:−16.01 |
| *ham*-1   | no homologies      | 2 alleles     | 6 alleles     | *ot253, ot257, ot342, ot361, ot367, ot339, ot371, ot364* | CEPDs, ADEs, PDEs | R       | -                    | IV:+6.02 |
| *vab*-3   | paired + homeodomain | 0 alleles  | 1 allele      | *ot346*      | unknown        | R       | notched head         | X:+2.22 |

**Total allele number**

| Genomes screened | 10 | 17 |
|------------------|----|----|
| Allele frequency per genomes screen | 1/1,100 | 1/4,700 |
| Time investment | 100 days § | 25 days § |
| Allele frequency per time | 1 allele / 10 days | 1 allele / 1.5 days |

This is a more extensive version of Table 2, shown in the main body of the paper. Dom/Rec indicates “dominant/recessive”. § These days are differentially spent. 100 days dissecting scope work mean full time work at the microscope while 25 days of worm sorting involves mainly machine running and casual observation of functioning of sorter.