

A**Cas9 guide sequence [P8]**

mir-1 genomic: GATATGGAATGTAAGAAGTATGTAGAACCGGGGTGGTAGT
Repair template: GATATGGAATGTAAGAAGTAT**T**TAGAACCGGGGTGGTAGT
 * **PAM**

UGG -A AUGUAA A GAAGUAUG UA
 ACC UACAUU C CUUCAUAC
 AU CG

wild-type miR-1 duplex

UGG -A AUGUAA A GAAGUAU **U**UA
 ACC UACAUU C CUUCAUA C
 AU CG

UY477: mir-1(zen208)**B****Cas9 guide sequence [P2]**

mir-84 genomic: TACTATTCATCATACGTCTGCCTGTGGCATCTGAGGTAGT
Repair template: TACTATTCATCATACGTCTGCCTGTGGCATC**C**GAGGTAGT
 * **PAM**

G A U AGA
 UGAG UAGU UG AAUAUUGU
 GCUC AUCA AC UUGUAACA
 CG A - U C

wild-type miR-84 duplex

G A U AGA
 CGAG UAGU UG AAUAUUGU
 GCUC AUCA AC UUGUAACA
 CG A - U C

UY459: mir-84(zen194)

Figure S1: Examples of CRISPR-generated alleles using single nucleotide substitutions in the guide-binding region. (A) Partial alignment of the ssODN repair template used to mutate *mir-1* compared to the wild-type *mir-1* genomic sequence (Top). The resulting strain (UY477) carries a single nucleotide change of the 8th nucleotide from the 3' end of the guide sequence. (Bottom) Comparison of the wild-type *mir-1* duplex and the UY477 mutated *mir-1* duplex. (B) Partial alignment of the ssODN repair template used to mutate *mir-84* compared to the wild-type *mir-84* genomic sequence (Top). The resulting strain (UY459) contains a single nucleotide change at the 2nd nucleotide from the 3' end of the guide sequence. (Bottom) Comparison of the wild-type *mir-84* duplex and the UY459 mutated *mir-84* duplex. (A-B) Changes to the wild-type sequence are indicated by red text. The PAM sequence is double underlined, and the guide sequence is highlighted by a gray box. Asterisk indicates the 5' nucleotide of the mature microRNA guide strand. Duplexes were derived from www.mirbase.org.

Table S1. List of Strains Used in This Study

Strain	Genotype	Information
FX30240	<i>tmc24</i> [F23D12.4(<i>tmls1240</i>)] X	Dejima et al., 2018
N2	wild-type	From CGC
UY352	<i>tra-2(zen142)</i> II	PAM + <i>Rsal</i>
UY356	<i>tra-2(zen145)</i> II	<i>Rsal</i> only, no blocking
UY362	<i>tra-2(zen151)</i> II	P2 + <i>Rsal</i>
UY364	<i>tra-2(zen153)</i> II	P11 + <i>Rsal</i>
UY370	<i>tra-2(zen157)</i> II	P20 + <i>Rsal</i>
UY386	<i>let-7(zen162)/tmc24</i> X	PAM
UY389	<i>let-7(zen165)/tmc24</i> X	No blocking
UY392	<i>let-7(zen168)/tmc24</i> X	<i>let-7(n2853-equivalent)</i>
UY440	<i>ndf51</i> V; <i>let-7(zen171)</i> <i>mir-84(n4037)/tmc24</i> X	<i>let-7</i> family mutant
UY459	<i>mir-84(zen194)</i> X	P2, see Figure S1
UY477	<i>mir-1(zen208)</i> I	P8, see Figure S1
VT1066	<i>ndf51</i> V; <i>mir-84(n4037)</i> X	Abbott et al., 2005

Table S2. List of Oligonucleotides Used in This Study

Oligonucleotide	Sequence (5'-3')
<i>tra-2</i> crRNA	AUUUUACUAACAGAUAAUAA
<i>let-7</i> crRNA	UGUGGAUCCGGUGAGGUAGU
<i>dpy-10</i> crRNA	UUCUGCUGUCUUGAUUGACG
<i>tra-2</i> PAM ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTTACGATATTATTT TACTAACAGATAATA <u>ATCGT</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> No-Block ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTTACGATATTATTT TACTAACAGATAATA <u>ATGGT</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> P2 ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTTACGATATTATTT TACTAACAGATA <u>ATGGT</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> P2+PAM ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTTACGATATTATTT TACTAACAGATA <u>ATCGT</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> P5 ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTTACGATATTATTT TACTAACAGA <u>TATAATGGT</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG

<i>tra-2</i> P8 ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTCGATATTATTT TACTAAC <u>C</u> ATAATAATGG <u>T</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> P11 ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTCGATATTATTT TACTA <u>T</u> CAGATAATAATGG <u>T</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> P11+PAM ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTCGATATTATTT TACTA <u>T</u> CAGATAATAAT <u>CG</u> <u>T</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> P14 ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTCGATATTATTT <u>TAG</u> TAACAGATAATAATGG <u>T</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> P17 ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTCGATATTATT <u>ATA</u> CTAACAGATAATAATGG <u>T</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAAT AAACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> P20 ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTCGATATT <u>TTT</u> TACTAACAGATAATAATGG <u>T</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>tra-2</i> P20+PAM ssODN	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTCGATATT <u>TTT</u> TACTAACAGATAATAAT <u>CG</u> <u>T</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>let-7</i> PAM ssODN	GATTGGTGGACGGTCTACACTGTGGATCCGGTGAGGTAGT <u>AC</u> GTTGTATAGTTGGAATTACCACCGGTGAACATGCA

<i>let-7</i> no-Block	GATTGGTGGACGGTCTACACTGTGGATCCGGTGAGGTAGT
ssODN	AGGTT <u>C</u> TATAGTTGGAATATTACCACCGGTGAACTATGCA
<i>let-7(n2853)</i> ssODN	GATTGGTGGACGGTCTACACTGTGGATCCGGTGAG <u>A</u> TAGT AGGTTGTATAGTTGGAATATTACCACCGGTGAACTATGCA
<i>tra-2</i> Rsal Reversion	CCTACAAATTATTTGAGTAATATTTTATTTACGATATTATTT
ssODN	TACTAACAGATAATA <u>ATGG</u> <u>A</u> ACAATGAAATTGAAATACAATA AACTTCTCGTTCGGTGG
<i>dpy-10(cn64)</i> ssODN	CACTTGAACTTCAATACGGCAAGATGAGAATGACTGGAAAC CGTACCGCATGCGGTGCCTATGGTAGCGGAGCTTCACATG GCTTCAGACCAACAGCCTAT

Table S3 (Related to Figure 2). Editing Rates of *tra-2* in F2 Generation Dumpy (top) and Non-dumpy (bottom) Animals.

	Blocking	HDR Edited (%)	Indel (%)	Not Edited (%)
	Mutation			
Genotypes of F2 Dumpy	No-blocking	19 (21.8)	8 (9.2)	60 (69.0)
	PAM	42 (95.4)	1 (2.3)	1 (2.3)
	P2	40 (80.0)	1 (2.0)	9 (18.0)
	P2+PAM	45 (93.8)	0 (0.0)	3 (6.2)
	P5	50 (75.8)	1 (1.5)	15 (22.7)
	P8	22 (67.6)	4 (11.8)	7 (20.6)
	P11	28 (75.7)	3 (8.1)	6 (16.2)
	P11+PAM	31 (88.6)	2 (5.7)	2 (5.7)
	P14	39 (59.1)	8 (12.1)	19 (28.8)
	P17	23 (54.8)	5 (11.8)	14 (33.4)
	P20	28 (66.6)	4 (9.6)	10 (23.8)
	P20+PAM	34 (89.5)	0 (0.0)	4 (10.5)
Genotypes of F2 non-Dumpy	No-blocking	2 (2.3)	6 (6.9)	79 (90.8)
	PAM	3 (6.8)	6 (13.6)	35 (79.6)
	P2	7 (14.0)	9 (18.0)	34 (68.0)
	P2+PAM	5 (10.4)	5 (10.4)	38 (79.2)
	P5	4 (6.1)	5 (7.6)	57 (86.3)
	P8	2 (5.9)	2 (5.9)	30 (86.4)

P11	5 (13.5)	1 (2.7)	31 (83.8)
P11+PAM	5 (14.3)	4 (11.4)	26 (74.3)
P14	1 (1.5%)	7 (10.6)	58 (87.9)
P17	3 (7.2%)	7 (16.6)	32 (76.2)
P20	6 (14.3)	6 (14.3)	30 (71.4)
P20+PAM	6 (15.8)	6 (15.8)	26 (68.4)

Table S4 (Related to Figure 2D). Paired-Genotype Analysis of F2 Dumpy and Non-dumpy Animals from Single F1 Rollers.

Dpy	Non-Dpy	No- PAM	P2	P2+PAM	P5	P8	P11	P14	P17	P20	P20+PAM
Genotype	Genotype	block (%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
		(%)									
HDR	0	3	3	3	2	1	4	1	1	5	4 (10.3)
Edited	(0.0)	(7.0)	(5.4)	(5.7)	(3.0)	(2.8)	(9.3)	(1.5)	(1.8)	(10.4)	
HDR	Indel	4	1	8	4	4	0	2	5	1	2 6 (15.4)
Edited		(4.8)	(2.3)	(14.3)	(7.5)	(6.1)	(0.0)	(4.7)	(7.6)	(1.8)	(4.2)
Not Edited		16	33	32	40	42	22	28	34	19	24 24 (61.5)
		(19.0)	(76.7)	(57.1)	(75.5)	(63.6)	(61.1)	(56.1)	(51.5)	(34.5)	(50.0)
HDR	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0 (0.0)
Edited	(0.0)	(2.3)	(1.8)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(2.8)	(2.3)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	
Indel	Indel	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	2 0 (0.0)
		(1.2)	(9.3)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(2.8)	(0.0)	(1.5)	(7.3)	(4.2)	

		Not Edited	5	0	0	2	1	2	1	7	5	4	0
			(6.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(3.8)	(1.5)	(5.6)	(2.3)	(10.6)	(9.1)	(8.3)	(0.0)
	HDR		2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	1
	Edited		(2.4)	(0.0)	(3.6)	(3.8)	(1.5)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(3.6)	(2.1)	(2.6)
Not Edited	Indel		4	0	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	1
			(4.8)	(0.0)	(5.4)	(0.0)	(1.5)	(2.8)	(0.0)	(1.5)	(3.6)	(4.2)	(2.6)
	Not Edited		52	1	7	2	15	8	7	17	21	8	3
			(61.9)	(2.3)	(12.5)	3.8	(22.7)	(22.2)	(16.3)	(25.8)	(38.2)	(16.7)	(7.7)

Table S5 (Related to Figure 4A). HDR Incorporation Rates of Blocking Mutations and Non-blocking *Rsal* Restriction Site Among HDR-edited Chromosomes

Blocking Mutation	<i>Rsal</i> Only (%)	Blocking Only (%)	Blocking + <i>Rsal</i> (%)
No-blocking	21 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
PAM	1 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	44 (97.8)
P2	15 (31.9)	15 (31.9)	17 (36.2)
P2+PAM	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	52 (100.0)
P5	1 (1.8)	40 (74.1)	13 (24.1)
P8	2 (8.0)	13 (56.0)	8 (36.0)
P11	0 (0.0)	21 (63.6)	12 (36.4)
P11+PAM	0 (0.0)	10 (27.8)	26 (72.2)
P14	8 (20.5)	22 (56.4)	9 (23.1)
P17	4 (15.4)	16 (61.6)	6 (23.0)
P20	4 (12.5)	17 (53.1)	11 (34.4)
P20+PAM	0 (0.0)	11 (28.2)	28 (71.8)

Table S6 (Related to Figure 3B). Effect of Distance to Cut Site on Incorporation of Single Nucleotide Guide Substitutions.

Blocking Mutation	PAM Only (%)	Blocking Only (%)	Blocking + <i>Rsal</i> (%)
PAM	45 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
P2+PAM	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	52 (100.0)
P11+PAM	26 (72.2)	4 (11.2)	6 (16.6)
P20+PAM	28 (71.8)	0 (0.0)	11 (28.2)

Table S7 (Related to Figure 4). Blocking Efficacy of Single Nucleotide Substitutions

	Blocking Mutation	Both Reverted (%)	Heterozygous (%)	Not Reverted (%)
F1 R ₀₁	No-blocking	0 (0.0)	25 (50.0)	25 (50.0)
	PAM	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	56 (100.0)
	P2	0 (0.0)	1 (1.8)	56 (97.2)
	P11	0 (0.0)	3 (5.4)	53 (94.6)
	P20	0 (0.0)	7 (12.7)	48 (87.3)
F1 D _{py}	No-blocking	5 (10.0)	22 (44.0)	23 (46.0)
	PAM	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	50 (100.0)
	P2	0 (0.0)	3 (5.3)	53 (94.7)
	P11	0 (0.0)	3 (5.3)	53 (94.7)
	P20	1 (1.8)	12 (21.8)	42 (76.4)

Table S8 (Related to Figure 6). Editing Rates of *let-7* in F2 Generation non-Venus Animals.

Blocking Mutation	HDR Edited (%)	Indel (%)	Not Edited (%)
No-blocking	1 (3.7)	11 (40.7)	15 (55.6)
PAM	17 (60.7)	3 (10.7)	8 (28.6)
<i>n2853 [P6]</i>	17 (56.7)	7 (23.3)	6 (20.0)