Regulation of Neurogenesis by FGF Signaling and Neurogenin in the Invertebrate Chordate Ciona
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Neurogenesis is a complex sequence of cellular processes and behaviors driven by the coordinated expression of conserved effectors. The bipolar tail neurons (BTNs) of Ciona develop according to a highly dynamic, yet highly stereotyped developmental program and thus could serve as an accessible model system for neurogenesis, including underlying cell behaviors like neuronal delamination, migration, and polarized axon outgrowth. Here we investigate both the upstream events that shape BTN neurogenesis through spatiotemporal regulation of the conserved proneural factor Neurog, spatiotemporal, and the gene expression profile of differentiating BTNs downstream of Neurog activity. We show that, although early FGF signaling is required for Neurog expression and BTN specification, Fgf8/17/18 is expressed in tail tip cells at later stages and suppresses sustained Neurog expression in the anterior BTN (aBTN) lineage, such that only one cell (the one furthest from the source of Fgf8/17/18) maintains Neurog expression and becomes a neuron. Curiously, Fgf8/17/18 might not affect neurogenesis of the posterior BTNs (pBTNs), which are in direct contact with the Fgf8/17/18-expressing cells. Finally, to profile gene expression associated with BTN neurogenesis we performed RNAseq of isolated BTN lineage cells in which BTN neurogenesis was enhanced or suppressed by perturbing Neurog function. This allowed us to identify several candidate genes that might play conserved roles in neurogenesis and neuronal migration in other animals, including mammals.
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INTRODUCTION

In spite of an emerging picture of the molecular mechanisms of cell fate specification and morphogenesis in neurodevelopment, it is not well understood how these pathways are regulated in different developmental contexts. The simple embryos of the invertebrate chordate Ciona are tractable for high-resolution functional genomics (Reeves et al., 2017; Horie et al., 2018; Racioppi et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2019) and in vivo imaging (Cota and Davidson, 2015; Hashimoto et al., 2015; Veeman and Reeves, 2015; Mizotani et al., 2018; Bernadskaya et al., 2019), and have been increasingly used to investigate the regulation of cell behaviors in development (Bernadskaya and Christiaen, 2016). Furthermore, their classification in the tunicates, the sister group to the...
vertebrates (Delsuc et al., 2006), means they share with vertebrates many chordate-specific gene families, cell types, organs, and developmental processes (Ermak, 1977; Ogasawara and Satoh, 1998; Christiaen et al., 2002; Hervé et al., 2005; Dufour et al., 2006; Kugler et al., 2008; Stolfi et al., 2010, 2011, 2015; Razy-Krajka et al., 2012; Tolkin and Christiaen, 2012; Abitua et al., 2015), particularly their larval central nervous system (CNS), a miniaturized but typically chordate CNS containing only 177 neurons (Figure 1a; Ryan et al., 2016). Ciona are thus model organisms well-suited to the study of potentially conserved, chordate-specific gene regulatory networks controlling neurogenesis and associated cell behaviors during neurodevelopment.

To study these processes in Ciona neurons, we have focused on the Bipolar Tail Neurons (BTNs, Figures 1b,c). The BTNs are two bilateral pairs of neurons located along the tail nerve cord and derive their name from the two long processes they extend in opposite directions along the anterior-posterior axis. Each left/right pair is comprised of a GABAergic anterior BTN (aBTN) and a cholinergic posterior BTN (pBTN) that arise from separate but adjacent lineages (Figure 1d). The BTNs are proposed homologs of vertebrate dorsal root ganglia (DRG) neurons, based on their developmental origin from the neural crest-like cells, their early expression of Neurogenin (Neurog) family of proneural transcription factors, their morphogenesis, and their role in relaying peripheral sensory information to the CNS (Stolfi et al., 2015). Like neural crest-derived DRG neurons in vertebrates, BTNs delaminate from the dorsal midline ectoderm and migrate along paraxial mesoderm as a simple chain comprised of the aBTN followed by the pBTN (Figure 1d), achieving their unique morphology by first extending a neurite anteriorly (Figure 1e), then reversing polarity and extending a neurite posteriorly (Figure 1f).

It was previously shown that FGF/ERK signaling regulates BTN lineage specification and cell fate choice (Stolfi et al., 2015). Early treatment (5 h post-fertilization, or hpf, at 20°C, equivalent to the St.12 mid-gastrula stage) with the MEK inhibitor U0126 abolished Neurog expression and BTN specification. In contrast, later treatment (7 hpf 20°C, St.16 late neurula) with U0126 paradoxically resulted in ectopic, sustained Neurog expression within the BTN lineage, resulting in the specification of supernumerary BTNs at the expense of other cells in the lineage. The roles of other signaling pathways in specifying BTN fate are not yet clear. For instance, Delta/Notch perturbation does not appear to affect BTN specification or differentiation (Stolfi et al., 2015).

The dynamic, opposing roles of FGF/ERK signaling in controlling BTN specification and differentiation is consistent with several observations on the paradoxical roles of FGF in regulating vertebrate neurogenesis (Diez del Corral and Morales, 2017), as well as other tissues in Ciona, for instance the heart (Davidson et al., 2006; Razy-Krajka et al., 2018). For instance, early FGF signaling is required for specification of neuromesodermal precursors (Storey et al., 1998; Boulet and Capecchi, 2012; Sasai et al., 2014). However, sustained FGF signaling in these cells later promotes a mesoderm fate over neuronal fate (Boulet and Capecchi, 2012; Henrique et al., 2015), as it does in the Ciona neuromesodermal “A9.32” blastomeres that give rise to motor neurons and paraxial tail muscles (Hudson et al., 2007; Navarrete and Levine, 2016). Similarly, FGF signaling is required for neural crest specification (Sasai et al., 2014), but sustained FGF signaling in the dorsal neural tube keeps cells in an uncommitted, non-neural
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cresta state (Martinez-Morales et al., 2011). Thus, the regulated downregulation of FGF signaling in these cells promotes delamination and migration of neural crest cells, including those that will give rise to DRG neurons (Martinez-Morales et al., 2011). Finally, downregulation of FGF signaling has been shown to be crucial for mitotic exit and neuronal differentiation in both vertebrates (Diez del Corral et al., 2002) and Ciona (Stolfi et al., 2011).

It was also previously shown that sustained expression of Neurog is necessary and sufficient for BTN specification, delamination, and migration, as supernumerary BTNs generated by ectopic Neurog overexpression engage in these same stereotyped behaviors (Stolfi et al., 2015). In vertebrates, Neurog2 is activated in delaminating mammalian neural crest cells, long before commitment to a neuronal fate (Soldatov et al., 2019). Neurog1/Neurog2 are also expressed in committed DRG progenitors as they migrate through somatic mesoderm and begin to differentiate into their bipolar (more accurately pseudounipolar) shape to transmit sensory information from peripheral tissues to the CNS (Ma et al., 1999). Therefore, Neurog factors might be activating conserved regulatory “programs” for migration, polarization, and axon outgrowth of neural plate border-derived sensory neurons that are shared between tunicates and vertebrates. Since Neurog family factors are expressed in many other differentiating neurons throughout the CNS, it is thought that many of their direct and indirect transcriptional targets might also be shared among various different neuron types and conserved throughout metazoan evolution. However, these targets have not been profiled in detail in migrating sensory neuron precursors.

In this study, we investigated the role of FGF signaling in regulating Neurog expression and subsequent BTN neurogenesis. Although it has been shown that Fg9/16/20 is required to specify neural plate border cells (Roure et al., 2014), from which both aBTN and pBTN lineages arise, here we demonstrate that later Fg8/17/18 from tail tip cells controls neural differentiation in the aBTN (but not pBTN) lineage. More specifically, we show that tail-tip Fg8/17/18 is required to suppress sustained Neurog expression in the majority of the aBTN lineage-derived cells, resulting in the eventual differentiation of only two BTNs per side. However, pBTNs appear unaffected by manipulating either Fg8/17/18 function or inhibiting FGF signaling in general.

Additionally, we use RNAseq to profile migrating BTNs under Neurog gain- or loss-of-function conditions, dissociated, and isolated from synchronized embryos using fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS). By analyzing BTN transcriptome profiles under these conditions, we identified, and validated by in situ hybridization, a core set of candidate “effector” genes downstream of BTN fate choice, many of them highly conserved in vertebrate neurogenesis. This and other genes encode a diverse set of intracellular and extracellular proteins that provide an entry point to studying the molecular pathways that control BTN neurogenesis, delamination, migration, and morphogenesis. Thus, our work in characterizing gene regulatory mechanisms acting both upstream and downstream of the critical determinant of BTN fate, Neurog, sets a foundation for the dissection of a potentially conserved, and chordate-specific transcriptional network for morphogenetic cell behaviors in neurogenesis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Distinct FGFs Control BTN Lineage Specification and Cell Fate Decisions

Because treatment with the MEK inhibitor U0126 has opposing effects on BTN specification depending on timing (Stolfi et al., 2015), we reasoned that different FGF signaling events might be controlling (1) initial Neurog expression and BTN lineage specification between 5 and 7 hpf and (2) later restriction of Neurog within the BTN lineage, after 7 hpf. Fg8/16/20 is the earliest Fgf family gene expressed (starting at the 16-cell stage onwards) and has been previously shown to be required for the specification of the posterior neural plate borders and for the activation of the conserved neural plate border regulatory gene Msx (Roure et al., 2014). Msx in turn has been shown to be required for BTN specification and differentiation (Li et al., 2017).

Therefore, Fg9/16/20 signaling is required for initial BTN lineage specification, which is consistent with the complete loss of Neurog expression upon early U0126 treatment. However, this activating function is at odds with the later effect of U0126 treatment, which results in ectopic Neurog expression and supernumerary BTNs instead. We therefore sought to understand more clearly how this later FGF signaling component might function.

Starting at 7 hpf, a different Fgf family gene, Fg8/17/18, is expressed in tail tip cells adjacent to the pBTNs (Figure 2a). According to our previous work on BTN lineage studies, these Fg8/17/18 + cells are likely derived from the same immediate lineage as the pBTNs (Stolfi et al., 2015). At this moment, Neurog expression has become restricted to the anteriormost cell in the aBTN lineage on either side of the midline, furthest from the tail tip, the source of Fg8/17/18 (Figures 2b,c). The expression of Fg8/17/18 in tail tip cells that are touching the pBTNs suggested that FGF signaling might not have a negative effect on Neurog expression in these cells. However, the tail tip localization of Fg8/17/18 is more consistent with a role for restricting aBTN fate, through a posterior-to-anterior concentration gradient. To assay FGF signaling levels in the region, we performed dpERK antibody staining at 7 hpf, which revealed a posterior-to-anterior gradient of ERK phosphorylation along the dorsal midline (Figure 2d).

We observed highest levels of phosphorylation (and presumably, FGF signaling activity) in more posterior cells closest to the tail tip, and lowest levels in the presumptive aBTN cell which is furthest from the tail tip. FGF signaling in other Ciona cell fate decision events has mostly been observed as the result of direct cell-cell contacts (Hudson et al., 2007; Imai et al., 2009; Guignard et al., 2018). We therefore asked whether we could find Fg8/17/18 localized at a longer distance from its source. When we expressed an Fg8/17/18:GFP fusion protein in the tail tip under the control of the endogenous Fg8/17/18 promoter, we found that most GFP signal was localized to the cell with the earliest FGF signaling activity) in more posterior cells closest to the tail tip, the source of Fg8/17/18 (Figures 2b,c). The expression of Fg8/17/18 in tail tip cells that are touching the pBTNs suggested that FGF signaling might not have a negative effect on Neurog expression in these cells. However, the tail tip localization of Fg8/17/18 is more consistent with a role for restricting aBTN fate, through a posterior-to-anterior concentration gradient. To assay FGF signaling levels in the region, we performed dpERK antibody staining at 7 hpf, which revealed a posterior-to-anterior gradient of ERK phosphorylation along the dorsal midline (Figure 2d).
FIGURE 2 | BTN and the FGF signaling pathway. (a) Two-color in situ hybridization at 7 hpf showing Fgf8/17/18 and Neurog expression in pBTN lineage (magnified inset). (b) Same embryo as in (a), but viewed at a more dorsal focal plane, showing Neurog expression in the aBTN lineage and relative position of the aBTNs and Fgf8/17/18 expression in the tail tip (magnified inset). (c) Two-color in situ hybridization at 8 hpf showing migrating aBTN and pBTN cells on one side of the embryo. (d) Immunohistochemical staining for phosphorylated ERK (dpERK, magenta) in a 7 hpf embryo, showing posterior-to-anterior gradient in the aBTN lineage (magnified inset). aBTN lineage is labeled with Neurog[BTN]>H2B:GFP reporter plasmid expression (green nuclei). (e) Embryo electroporated with Fgf8/17/18>Fgf8/17/18:GFP plasmid, showing Fgf8/17/18:GFP (green) emanating from the tail tip cells, spreading around the tip of the notochord. MG: Motor Ganglion. Not.: Notochord.

whether this represents secreted, extracellular Fgf8/17/18, or if is carried by filopodia, cytonemes, or extra-cellular vesicles, etc. However, this distribution is consistent with the proposed action of Fgf8/17/18 at a distance from the tail tip. Alternatively, it is possible that Fgf8/17/18 acts only over cell-cell contact very early on, with later anterior/posterior differences in dpERK and Neurog activity arising through asymmetric propagation of downstream, intracellular signaling as the cells in the lineage divide and proliferate. Either way, Neurog expression in the aBTN lineage is inversely correlated with distance from the source of Fgf8/17/18, suggesting a negative effect of late FGF signaling on BTN specification. To test whether FGF signaling is restricting BTN specification, we first expressed a truncated, dominant-negative FGF receptor (Davidson et al., 2006) in BTN lineages using the Neurog[BTN] driver (Stolfi et al., 2015; Neurog > dnFGFR). This resulted in supernumerary BTN in a substantial proportion of larvae (Figures 3a,b). Using the Asic reporter to visualize differentiated BTN fate, a majority (>90%) of embryos had fewer than 4 BTN labeled in control embryos expressing an inert lacZ transgene (Neurog > lacZ), which is expected due to mosaic uptake of the reporter. However, in the dnFGFR condition, a majority (>70%) had 4 or more BTN labeled, and half had more than 5 BTN labeled, clearly indicating an excess number of BTN. This mimics the previously published U0126 result and further demonstrates a cell-autonomous requirement for FGF signaling in BTN precursors to limit BTN differentiation.

To test whether Fgf8/17/18 is necessary for BTN fate restriction, we used CRISPR/Cas9 to knock this gene out specifically in the animal-pole derived ectoderm (a-/b-lineages), which gives rise to the tail tip. No other cells derived from these lineages express Fgf8/17/18 at the tailbud stage, and Fgf8/17/18 in other cells was not disrupted thanks to the use of Fog > Cas9 to restrict Cas9 expression to the animal pole (Gandhi et al., 2017). In embryos electroporated instead with a non-specific “control” single-chain guide RNA (sgRNA), we detected fewer than 4 BTN labeled in over 85% of embryos (Figure 3c). In contrast, knocking out Fgf8/17/18 in the tail-tip resulted in over 40% of embryos with 4 or more BTN, and over 25% of embryos with more than 5 BTN (Figures 3c,d). Although the effect was not as pronounced as the dnFGFR overexpression, these data are consistent with a role for Fgf8/17/18 ligand emanating from the tail tip to restrict BTN specification after initial Neurog activation has been initiated in the lineage.
FIGURE 3 | Perturbing FGF signaling in the BTN lineages. (a) Quantification of number of Asic > Unc-76:GFP + BTNs seen in larvae, showing expansion of BTNs upon dnFGFR overexpression. Only larvae with both Unc-76:GFP and BTN lineage-specific Neurog[BTN] > H2B:mCherry expression were scored. (b) Representative image of a larva showing many supernumerary BTNs (arrowheads) upon dnFGFR overexpression in the BTN lineages. (c) Quantification of BTN specification as in (a) but for tissue-specific CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of Fgf8/17/18, using Asic > H2B::GFP as the BTN fate marker. (d) Representative image of a larva showing supernumerary BTN nuclei (arrowheads) upon tail tip-specific knockout of Fgf8/17/18. (e) Quantification of BTN specification as in (a) using Asic > Unc-76:GFP, but for overexpression of CA-Mras. In this case, H2B:mCherry + larvae with zero BTNs were also counted. (f) Quantification of larvae with GAD > Unc-76:GFP-labeled aBTNs upon CA-Mras overexpression.

To test whether FGF/ERK signaling is sufficient to restrict BTN fate specification, we overexpressed a constitutively active form of Mras (CA-Mras), which transduces FGF signaling upstream of MEK/ERK (Razy-Krajka et al., 2018). We overexpressed CA-Mras in the BTN lineages by electroporating the embryos with Neurog[BTN] > CA-Mras and assayed its effect on Asic reporter plasmid expression. Although there was a reduction in average number of Asic > Unc-76:GFP-labeled
BTNs in CA-Mras-expressing larvae (Figure 3e), there were few larvae that had no visible BTNs at all. We supposed this might be due to the fact that sustained FGF/ERK might restrict only aBTN (but not pBTN) fate specification, as predicted by the Fgf8/17/18 expression pattern. To further test this hypothesis, we repeated the CA-Mras overexpression while assaying expression of the Glutamate decarboxylase (GAD) reporter plasmid (Zega et al., 2008), that labels only the differentiated aBTNs, not pBTN (see Figure 1). Indeed, CA-Mras overexpression greatly suppressed aBTN differentiation (Figure 3f). Unfortunately, we were unable to use a similar pBTN reporter to assay pBTN specification exclusively. Although the Vesicular acetylcholine transporter (VACHT) reporter (Yoshida et al., 2004) is active in the pBTN but not aBTN (Figures 1b,c), it also often expressed in other tail neurons and Motor Ganglion (MG) neuron axons that extend throughout the tail, making pBTN specification very difficult to assay. Therefore, assaying the activity of a more specific pBTN reporter in both gain-of-function CA-Mras and loss-of-function (Fgf8/17/18 CRISPR) conditions will be needed to fully assess the role of late FGF signaling on this sub-lineage. However, taking the above results together with the direct contact between Fgf8/17/18-expressing tail tip cells and the differentiating pBTN (Figure 2a), we suggest that Fgf8/17/18 is key for restricting the number of aBTN, but not pBTN. We summarize our current model of FGF signaling and BTN neurogenesis using a diagram (Figure 4).

RNAseq Profiling of Potential Effectors of Neurogenesis in Isolated BTN Progenitors

Because Neurog overexpression is sufficient to specify ectopic differentiated BTNs that all delaminate and migrate (Stolfi et al., 2015), we sought to identify those genes that are upregulated downstream of Neurog, as some may encode effectors of BTN neurogenesis and cell behaviors. Although Neurog is a transcription factor, it is important to note that not all of these effectors are expected to be direct transcriptional targets of Neurog. However, we still consider these to be “downstream” of Neurog.

To identify these direct or indirect downstream genes, we turned to transcriptome profiling using FACS-RNAseq (Figure 5a). We profiled cells labeled with a Neurog[BTN] fluorescent reporter under different experimental conditions, isolated from synchronized embryos at 9.5 hs post-fertilization (hpf) at 20°C. In the “control” condition (Neurog > lacZ) only 4 cells per embryo become BTN, while the rest of the BTN lineage is initially specified as broadly epidermis (~15–16 cells at mid-tailbud), with various epidermal sensory neurons specified later (Figure 5b; Stolfi et al., 2015). In parallel, we sorted cells from embryos in which wild-type Neurog was overexpressed (Neurog > Neurog), or a dominant-repressor form of Neurog (Neurog > Neurog:WRPW). Neurog > Neurog specifies all cells as supernumerary BTN, while Neurog > Neurog:WRPW abolishes BTN fate (Figure 5b). cDNA libraries were prepared from isolated cells, with each condition represented by two biologically independent replicates.

Under these conditions, 522 genes (of a total of 11,777 analyzed) were upregulated by Neurog (LogFC > 0.6, p < 0.05) and 176 downregulated by Neurog:WRPW (LogFC < -0.6, p < 0.05), with 76 genes in both categories (p < 1.291e-56 using the hypergeometric test, Figure 5c and Supplemental Table 1). The larger number of genes upregulated by Neurog overexpression was expected, given that many more ectopic BTN are specified in Neurog > Neurog than the number of BTN lost in Neurog > Neurog:WRPW (Stolfi et al., 2015). However, this could also be an artifact due to lower statistical support as a result of vastly different numbers of cells sorted between Neurog > Neurog:WRPW replicates (2418 cells and 114 cells). Although there were reported whole-mount in situ hybridization (ISH) images for 33 of these 76 genes on the ANISEED tunicate expression database (Brozovic et al., 2018), we were able to infer clear BTN expression from such database images for only 10 genes. These included the marker gene Asic previously used to assay BTN specification (Coric et al., 2008), and additional genes such as alpha-Tubulin (KH.C8.892), Rgs19/20 (KH.C1.314), Sl35g2 (KH.L141.43), Bassoon-like (KH.C5.481), Oncu1, and others with no substantial homology to known proteins. Because several other known BTN markers were not represented, we relaxed our criteria. More specifically, we looked at genes that were upregulated by Neurog (1444) and downregulated by Neurog:WRPW (1303) with no p-value cutoff. This increased the overlapping set, and thus our candidate target gene list, to 372 genes (Figure 5d). This overlap was still statistically significant (p < 6.332e-65), suggesting this expanded list is likely to include bona fide BTN-specific genes downstream of Neurog.

To further test whether we were measuring meaningful BTN-specific gene expression, we cross-referenced these data to a previously published single-cell RNAseq data set comprising the top 100 genes enriched in the BTN relative to other cell types at 12 hpf at 18°C (Horie et al., 2018; Supplemental Table 2), with the exception of two genes: KH.S155.52 (which was not present in our dataset), and Neurog (due to confounding reads from the electroporated plasmids). We found that all 98 top BTN genes in the scRNAseq dataset were positively regulated by Neurog overexpression (LogFC > 0, Figure 5e). Similarly, 91 of 98 top genes were negatively regulated by Neurog:WRPW overexpression (LogFC < 0, Figure 5f). This confirmed that Neurog positively regulates BTN fate, and that our strategy was able to detect differential gene expression in the BTNs downstream of Neurog activity, though statistical support might be lacking for many BTN markers at the embryonic stages that were sequenced.

Validation of BTN Genes by in situ Hybridization

Because the above results suggested our differential expression analysis criteria might (1) be too stringent to detect all real BTN-specific genes downstream of Neurog and (2) might contain false-positives associated with leaky expression of the Neurog driver in other tissues, we decided to validate a large set of potential BTN markers by fluorescent ISH (Supplemental Table 3). We successfully prepared probes for 137 genes, from a mixture of
cDNA clones, RT-PCR, and synthetic DNA templates (see section “Materials and Methods” for details, and Supplemental Table 3 for all probe template sequences). Of these, 49 were confirmed to be upregulated in the migrating BTNs (Figure 6). For another 30, it was not clear if they were expressed in BTNs or not, due to low signal or obscuring signal from neighboring tissues. Most are likely true positives, but confirming them will require better probes or higher resolution imaging. 15 genes showed CNS-specific expression, but in other neurons, 15 showed expression mainly in non-neural tissues, and 29 were true “negatives” with
neuronal, BTN-specific, or aBTN/pBTN-specific, highlighting indirectly regulate overlapping sets of genes that can be broadly MG and brain. Thus, Neurog is likely to directly and of Neurog in these other CNS neurons, especially in the addition to BTNs. Such genes are potentially downstream CNS neurons where Neurog regulate both targets but in separate aBTN/pBTN contexts.

Indeed, targeting Neurog in this way resulted in dramatic loss of Asc > Unc-76:GFP reporter expression in F0 embryos, compared to embryos electroporated with the control sgRNA (Figures 7a,b). We observed a similar loss of GAD > Unc-76:GFP expression upon targeting Neurog (Figures 7c,d), suggesting that Neurog is necessary for both pan-BTN and aBTN-specific gene expression. It was not clear if Neurog CRISPR completely abolished BTN fate or if it only affected BTN reporter expression. However, these data further support the conclusion that Neurog is required for BTN specification and effector gene expression during neurogenesis.
Discussion of Predicted BTN Effector Gene Functions

Several genes upregulated by Neurog overexpression in the BTNs appear to be involved in neuronal function, especially neurotransmission, suggesting relatively early transcription of such genes relative to larval hatching. These include GABA receptor (Gabrd), Anoctamin 7 (Ano7), Neuronal calcium sensor (Ncs), Adrenergic receptor alpha 2 (Adra2), Synaptotagmin 7-related (Syt7-rel), the neuropeptide-encoding Ci-LF precursor (LF; Kawada et al., 2011), and others. Even the canonical
Dcx/Dclk (DCLK1/2) are represented by a single ortholog in Ciona, and vertebrates. Cdk5r1 (also known as p35) is an activator of Cdk5, and the Cdk5/Cdk5r1 is required for microtubule stabilization in neuronal migration and axon outgrowth. Microtubule stabilization has been shown to be essential for neuronal migration and differentiation by nucleating, binding, and/or stabilizing microtubules (Corbo et al., 2002; Moores et al., 2004; Ettinger et al., 2016). The closely related vertebrate Doublecortin-like kinases are also associated with microtubules (Lin et al., 2000). While Dclk1 mutant mice show few neuronal migration defects, Dclk1/Dcx double mutants show extensive cortical layering and axonal defects, suggesting some overlapping roles for these paralogs (Deuel et al., 2006). Dcx/Dclk proteins contain two DCX protein domains, as does Ciona Dcx. As a proxy for the subcellular localization of this protein, we constructed a DcxΔC:GFP fusion comprised of the two Ciona DCX domains fused upstream; Stolfi and Levine, 2011) in differentiating neurons, we observed DcxΔC:GFP enrichment in microtubule bundles extending into the leading edge of migrating BTNs at 10 h 20°C (Figure 8a). At 12 h 20°C, DcxΔC:GFP can be seen labeling a microtubule bundle spanning both proximal and distal processes (Figure 8b). This microtubule bundle localization suggests a conserved role for Dcx in Ciona.

Saxo: Stabilizer of Axonemal Microtubules
Positioning of the centrosome and associated Golgi apparatus has been shown to be an essential intrinsic cue for neuronal polarization (de Anda et al., 2010; Andersen and Halloran, 2012). However, this appears to be highly context-dependent and difficult to study in vivo due to the transient nature of centrosome position, tissue complexity in the developing CNS, and species- and cell-type-specific differences (Basto et al., 2006). Microtubule stabilization has been shown to be essential for axon specification (Witte et al., 2008), though the mechanisms underlying its local control remain largely unknown (Kapitein and Hoogenraad, 2015). Because centrosome repositioning is also driven by microtubule stabilization (Burute et al., 2017; internalize and utilize centrosome and interkinetosomal microtubules to maintain processes extending into the leading edge of migrating BTNs at 10 h 20°C (Figure 8a). At 12 h 20°C, DcxΔC:GFP can be seen labeling a microtubule bundle spanning both proximal and distal processes (Figure 8b). This microtubule bundle localization suggests a conserved role for Dcx in Ciona.

Saxo: Stabilizer of Axonemal Microtubules
Positioning of the centrosome and associated Golgi apparatus has been shown to be an essential intrinsic cue for neuronal polarization (de Anda et al., 2010; Andersen and Halloran, 2012). However, this appears to be highly context-dependent and difficult to study in vivo due to the transient nature of centrosome position, tissue complexity in the developing CNS, and species- and cell-type-specific differences (Basto et al., 2006). Microtubule stabilization has been shown to be essential for axon specification (Witte et al., 2008), though the mechanisms underlying its local control remain largely unknown (Kapitein and Hoogenraad, 2015). Because centrosome repositioning is also driven by microtubule stabilization (Burute et al., 2017;
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**FIGURE 8** Subcellular localization of candidate effectors of BTN cell behaviors. (a) Embryo electroporated with Ebf>DcxΔC::GFP and Ebf>Unc-76::mCherry plasmids, showing GFP labeling of multiple microtubule bundles in the leading edge (the presumptive proximal process) of migrating BTNs. Insets magnified in bottom subpanels. (b) Embryo electroporated as in (a) but imaged at a later time point (12 hpf), showing a GFP-labeled microtubule bundle extending through proximal and distal processes (anterior is to the left). (c) GFP-Saxo (green) labeling putative centrioles/centrosome in a BTN cell. Nucleus labeled by H2B:mCherry (magenta). (d) GFP-Saxo is also seen in the cilia of ependymal cells of the neural tube/nerve cord. (e) Gαi-related::GFP (green) is enriched at the plasma membrane and around the Golgi apparatus, which is co-labeled with GalNAcT:mCherry (magenta).

Pitaval et al., 2017), this suggests that such centrosome-associated microtubule stabilizers might function as key effectors linking centrosome position and axon outgrowth. In the BTNs, initial axon outgrowth is concurrent with migration: the leading edge of the BTNs extends and becomes the proximal (anterior) process of the axon. Thus, polarization, migration, and axon outgrowth might be tightly coupled in the BTNs.

Previous MG neuron transcriptome profiling and a follow up ISH revealed that Saxo (Stabilizer of axonemal microtubules) was expressed in the BTNs, in addition to the ddNs (Gibboney et al., 2020). Saxo is the Ciona ortholog of human SAXO1/SAXO2, formerly FAM154A/FAM154B. These genes encode a highly conserved subfamily of STOP/MAP6-related proteins that stabilize microtubules (Dacheux et al., 2015). In human cell culture, SAXO1 localizes to centrioles and cilia and mediates stabilization of cold-resistant microtubules. They do so through 7 microtubule-binding/stabilizing “Mn” domains (Dacheux et al., 2015), which are conserved in Ciona Saxo. SAXO1/2 have not been implicated in neurodevelopment or cell polarity in vivo, but depletion of related MAP6 proteins in mice results in synaptic defects and schizophrenia-like symptoms (Volle et al., 2012).

A GFP:Saxo fusion when expressed in Ciona was found to localize to centrosomes in BTN precursors (Figure 8c), and to cilia of ependymal cells (Figure 8d), also consistent with a potentially conserved role in microtubule stabilization. Given its expression in both BTNs and ddNs, and given the dynamic repositioning of the Golgi apparatus observed in both these neurons types immediately predicting direction of axon outgrowth (Stolfi et al., 2015; Gibboney et al., 2020), Saxo is one of the more intriguing candidate effectors of neuronal polarization that remain to be functionally characterized.

How might extracellular cues impinge on centrosome position in vivo? One pathway that has been implicated in this process during neuronal migration is the Semaphorin/Plexin pathway (Renaud et al., 2008). We found that Semaphorin 6 (Sem6), a class 6 Semaphorin orthologous to human SEMA6A/SEMA6B/SEMA6C (Yazdani and Terman, 2006) is expressed in migrating BTNs and broadly in other CNS neurons...
including those in the brain and MG. In mice, Sema6a and its receptor Plexin A2 control migration in granule cells of the cerebellum, through regulating centrosome position and nucleokinesis (Renaud et al., 2008). In mammals, Sema6a can inhibit Plexin in cis as a mechanism to reduce sensitivity to Sema6a in trans (Haklai-Topper et al., 2010). Perhaps its expression in developing Ciona larval neurons reflects such a mechanism.

**Gai-Related**

We identified a gene encoding a homolog of the small Gai/o protein subunit family that by in situ hybridization was observed to be upregulated in migrating BTN and notochord cells (Reeves et al., 2017). This rather divergent Gai gene (KH.C2.872, referred to simply as Gnai-related), is one of three Gai/o paralogs that seem to be Ciona- (or tunicate-) specific duplications: KH.C1.612, KH.C2.872, and KH.L96.27. Of these, KH.C1.612 seems to be the original “foundating” paralog, as it still retains exons/introns, while KH.C2.872, and KH.L96.27 are both encoded by a single exon, suggesting possible duplication by retrotransposition, followed by subfunctionalization (Ohno, 2013).

In mammalian cells, upregulation of Gai can act as a molecular “switch” to inhibit RhoA by competing with Gαi subfunctionalization (Ohno, 2013). This antagonism between Rho/Rac is also seen in delaminating neural crest cells, in which Rho inhibits Rac activity to keep cells in an epithelial state (Shoval and Kalcheim, 2012). In radial neuron migration, Gz12/13 proteins terminate migration (Moers et al., 2008), and have been shown to do so through RhoA in cultured neurospheres (Iguchi et al., 2008). Thus, transcriptional control over the relative expression levels of Gai and Gz12/13 might be a common mechanism for regulation of neuronal migration, shifting between activation of Rac1 (promoting migration) or of RhoA (inhibiting migration).

Interestingly, we found that a Gai-related:GFP fusion was enriched in or around the Golgi apparatus, in addition to the plasma membrane (Figure 8e). The localization of Gai to the Golgi has been shown to be important for vesicle trafficking and the structural organization of the Golgi stacks (Lo et al., 2015). Furthermore, Golgi-resident Gao regulates protrusive membrane activity (Solis et al., 2017). Given the dramatic reorientation of the Golgi apparatus during BTN migration and its relation to BTN neurite extension (Figures 1e,f), it will be interesting to further investigate the potential roles of Gnai-related in these processes.

**CONCLUSION**

Here, we have used the BTN of Ciona as a model in which to study the regulation of neurogenesis, both upstream and downstream of neuronal fate specification by the conserved proneural factor Neurogenin. More specifically, we have elucidated in more detail the mechanism by which FGF/MEK/ERK regulates BTN neurogenesis in Ciona, suggesting that a posteriorly localized source of Fgf8/17/18 spatially restricts sustained Neurog expression and subsequent specification of the aBTN, but possibly not that of the pBTN. This reveals close parallels with FGF-dependent regulation of neurogenesis in vertebral spinal cord and neural crest, but also suggests a potential difference between very similar neuron subtypes originating from related but distinct cell lineages. It will be an interesting topic of future investigation to understand how the regulation of pBTN neurogenesis differs from both aBTN and related neuron types in other chordates. Finally, we revealed the transcriptional dynamics of effector genes downstream of Neurog in the BTNs, identifying and validating several conserved genes that might be key for BTN delamination, migration, or polarization. Future studies will focus on the functions of these identified candidate effectors and the mechanisms by which they potentially regulate the dynamic yet invariant cell behaviors of the BTN precursors.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Embryo Handling and CRISPR/Cas9-Mediated Mutagenesis**

Adult Ciona robusta (intestinalis Type A) were collected from San Diego, CA (M-REP). Dechorionated embryos were obtained and electroporated as previously established (Christian et al., 2009a,b). Constructs were made using previously published Neurog –3010/–773 + −600 [Neurog(BTN)] driver to express dnFGFR (Davidson et al., 2006) and CA-Mnas (Razy-Krajka et al., 2018), with an artificially inserted stop codon in front of the 3’ NotI restriction enzyme cloning site for some constructs where we wished to avoid fusion of N-terminal Neurog sequences with the transgene (e.g., dnFGFR). Cas9 and sgRNA expression vectors were constructed or used as previously described (Stolfi et al., 2014; Gandhi et al., 2017). Non-specific “Control” sgRNA sequence were constructed or used as previously described (Stolfi et al., 2014). Fgf8/17/18 sgRNAs were validated as previously described, using loss of Fgf8/17/18 > Fgf8/17/18:GFP-derived fluorescence as a non-quantitative screen for functional sgRNAs (Supplemental Figure 2). Neurog proximal promoter-targeting sgRNAs were validated by PCR amplification of the targeted region and Sanger sequencing as previously described (Supplemental Figure 3; Gandhi et al., 2018). Electroporations were performed as single biological replicates. Images were captured using Leica DM18 or DM18 LED inverted epifluorescence compound microscopes. Plasmid and primer sequences not previously published and electroporation mix recipes can be found in the Supplemental Sequences File.

**FACS and RNAseq**

Embryos were electroporated with the following combinations of plasmids: 70 µg Neurog –3010/–773 + −600 > tagBFP/tagBFP + 50 µg Neurog –3010/–773 + −600stop > Neurog (Neurog > Neurog condition). 70 µg Neurog –3010/–773 + −600 > tagBFP/tagBFP + 50 µg Neurog –3010/–773 + −600stop > Neurog:WRPW (Neurog > Neurog:WRPW condition). 70 µg Neurog –3010/–773 + −600 > tagBFP/tagBFP + 50 µg
Embryos were dissociated and FACS-isolated using a BD FACS Aria cell sorter into lysis buffer from the RNAqueous-Micro RNA extraction kit (ThermoFisher, Waltham, MA, United States) as previously established (Wang et al., 2018a,b). BFP + or RFP + cells were isolated with no counterselection. Cell numbers obtained were: Neurog > lacZ(control) replicate 1: 975 cells; Neurog > lacZ(control) replicate 2: 200 cells; Neurog > Neurog replicate 1: 284 cells; Neurog > Neurog replicate 2: 800 cells; Neurog > Neurog:WRPW replicate 1: 2418 cells; Neurog > Neurog:WRPW replicate 2: 114 cells. RNA was extracted from each sample according to the RNAqueous-Micro kit instructions. cDNA synthesis was performed as described (Wang et al., 2017), with SMART-Seq v4 Ultra Low Input RNA kit (Takara). Sequencing libraries were prepared as described (Wang et al., 2017), with Ovation Ultralow System V2 (NuGen). Libraries were pooled and sequenced by Illumina NextSeq 500 Mid output 150 Cycle v2, to generate 75 bp paired-end reads, resulting in 192,396,840 single-end reads for the 6 samples. Resulting FASTQ files were processed by STAR 2.5.2b and mapped to the C. robusta genome (Dehal et al., 2002; Satou et al., 2008). Output bam files were processed using Rsubread/featureCounts (Liao et al., 2013), with the parameter “ignoreDup = TRUE” to remove the read duplications resulting from library amplification. All reads after duplication removal that mapped to the exons of KyotoHoya (KH) gene models (Satou et al., 2008) were counted for differential expression analysis. Differential expression between Neurog > Neurog and Neurog > lacZ, and between Neurog > Neurog:WRPW and Neurog > lacZ was measured by EdgeR (Robinson et al., 2010; Supplemental Table 1). Raw and processed sequencing data are archived at NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) under accession ID GSE150913. All other processed data, scripts, and Supplementary Images can also be found at OSF at the project-specific link https://osf.io/uqfn2/.

Embryo in situ Hybridizations and dpERK Immunohistochemistry

Adult Ciona robusta (intestinalis Type A) were collected from San Diego, CA (M-REP). Dechorionated embryos were obtained and electroporated as previously established (Christiaen et al., 2009a,b). Sequences of in situ hybridization probe templates can be found in Supplemental Table 3. Neurog perturbation and control plasmids were previously published (Stolfi et al., 2015). Probes were prepared either from published clones, synthetic DNA fragments (Twist Bioscience, San Francisco, CA, United States), or directly from RT-PCR amplicons (see Supplemental Table 3 for details). Probe synthesis and fluorescent, whole-mount in situ hybridization were carried out as previously described (Beh et al., 2007; Ikuta and Saiga, 2007). dpERK staining was carried out as previously described (Stolfi et al., 2011), using 1:500 mouse monoclonal anti-dpERK antibody (Sigma #M9692), and tyramide signal amplification.
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