1

Extrinsic repair of injured dendrites as

a paradigm for regeneration by fusion

Meital Oren-Suissa[1,2], Tamar Gattegno[1], Veronika Kravtsov[1], and Benjamin

Podbilewicz[1†]

[1] Department of Biology, Technion- Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000,

Israel

[†] Author for correspondence (podbilew@tx.technion.ac.il)

Additional footnotes:

[2] Present address: Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Columbia University, Department of

Dept. of Biological Sciences, New York, 10027, USA

Short title: Dendritic tree remodeling by fusion proteins

Abstract

Injury triggers regeneration of axons and dendrites. Research identified factors

required for axonal regeneration outside the CNS, but little is known about

regeneration triggered by dendrotomy. Here we study neuronal plasticity triggered by

dendrotomy and determine the fate of complex PVD arbors following laser surgery of

dendrites. We find that severed primary dendrites grow towards each other and

reconnect via branch fusion. Simultaneously, terminal branches lose self-avoidance

and grow towards each other, meeting and fusing at the tips via an AFF-1-mediated

process. Ectopic branch growth is identified as a step in the regeneration process

required for bypassing the lesion site. Failure of reconnection to the severed dendrites

results in degeneration of the distal end of the neuron. We discover pruning of excess

branches via EFF-1 that acts to recover the original wild-type arborization pattern in a

cell-autonomous process. In contrast, AFF-1 activity during dendritic auto-fusion is

derived from the lateral seam cells and not autonomously from the PVD neuron. We

propose a model in which AFF-1-vesicles derived from the epidermal seam cells fuse

neuronal dendrites from without. Thus, EFF-1 and AFF-1 fusion proteins emerge as

new players in neuronal arborization and maintenance of arbor connectivity following

injury in *C. elegans*. Our results demonstrate that there is a genetically determined

multi-step pathway to repair broken dendrites in which EFF-1 and AFF-1 act on

different steps of the pathway. Intrinsic EFF-1 is essential for dendritic pruning after

injury and extrinsic AFF-1 mediates dendrite fusion to bypass injuries.

Author summary

Neurons in the central nervous system have very limited regenerative ability, they fail

to remodel following amputation and only in some invertebrates, axons can repair

themselves by fusion. Some genetic pathways have been identified for axonal

regeneration but few studies exist on dendrite regeneration following injury. To

determine how neurons regenerate dendrites following injury we study the *C. elegans*

PVD polymodal neurons that display an arborized pattern of repetitive menorah-like

structures. We injure dendrites by laser microsurgery, follow their fate and show that

broken primary dendrites often regenerate via fusion. We describe how PVD

dendrites regenerate and present roles for EFF-1 and AFF-1 proteins in fusion and

remodeling of menorahs. Menorahs lose self-avoidance and AFF-1 fuses them,

bypassing the injury site. Branch sprouting, EFF-1-mediated pruning, and arbor

simplification completes regeneration. When auto-fusion fails the distal arbor

degenerates. Surprisingly, AFF-1 acts non-cell autonomously to mediate dendrite

fusion. We propose that extracellular vesicles derived from the lateral epidermis fuse

severed dendrites in a process reminiscent of enveloped virus-mediated cell fusion

without infection.

Introduction

Sensory perception relies on networks of neurons that monitor and modify behavior to assure that animals are able to locate food, sense their environment and avoid predators or other threats [1]. This perception depends on the integrity and spatial-coverage of the receptive field [2]. Axonal and dendritic trees play an essential role in processing and transducing information to ultimately evoke the appropriate response of the organism. In the central nervous system (CNS) of adult mammals axon regeneration following injury is limited [3]. Therefore, the regenerative process following axon severing has been the focus of numerous studies [3-5]. It is believed that the main reasons why axons fail to regenerate are a reduction in neuronal growth capacity and inhibitory extrinsic factors. However, the molecular mechanisms of regeneration are not well understood. Recent studies have suggested that modulation of intrinsic neuronal activity by mammalian target of rapamycin (mTOR) and G-protein-coupled receptor (GPCR) signaling promote axon regeneration [4, 6]. In parallel there is evidence for a molecular pathway for axonal degeneration that affects regeneration [7]. The molecular mechanisms required for regeneration by regrowth following axonal injury are actively studied and numerous pathways have been identified [3-5, 8-12]. In contrast to regeneration by regrowth, a different strategy for axonal regeneration that has been observed in diverse invertebrates is reconnection by fusion of severed axons [13-18].

The nematode *C. elegans* is a powerful model to study neuronal regeneration after injury [19]. It has been recently found that injured axons of motor- and mechanosensory-neurons regrow and in some cases fuse after *in vivo* severing using laser surgery [15, 16, 18-21]. Moreover, screens for genes with roles in axon regrowth identified many genes required for axon regeneration [15, 22, 23].

Compared to axonal regeneration and degeneration pathways, much less is

known about dendritic regeneration following injury [24-28]. Recent studies have

identified the PVD and FLP neurons as highly branched bilateral neurons in *C.*

elegans, which display a stereotypic arborization pattern composed of repetitive

structural units known as menorahs (**Figures 1A and 1B**)[29-37]. The PVD is highly

polarized with a single axon ventral to the cell body and complex but stereotyped

dendritic arbors [33, 37] making it an ideal system to study different aspects of the

generation, maintenance, regeneration and degeneration of dendritic trees. The PVD

neurons are two polymodal nociceptors, responsible for an avoidance response

generated after harsh mechanical stimuli to the main body or exposure to cold

temperatures [1, 38, 39]. Animals in which PVD neurons are laser-ablated fail to

respond to harsh touch [38]. Recent studies uncovered the degenerin ion channels

DEG/ENaC, MEC-10 and DEGT-1 that sense harsh-touch, and the TRPA-1 channels

that respond to cold temperatures [35, 40]. Moreover, researchers have identified

numerous genetic pathways involved in dendritic arborization and maintenance of the

PVD structure [33, 41-47].

The dynamic pathway of PVD arborization revealed an unexpected function of

EFF-1 fusogenic protein in sculpting neuronal trees [33]. EFF-1 mediates epithelial

and muscle cell-to-cell fusion [48-53], auto cell fusion in the digestive tract [54],

axonal fusion following injury [15, 17, 18, 21] and acts in the PVD neurons to trim

menorahs [33]. *eff-1* mutants have hyperbranched disorganized menorahs and EFF-1

cell-autonomous expression is sufficient to reduce the number of branches and to

rescue disorganized menorahs [33]. EFF-1 controls dendritic plasticity via retraction

of excess branches, by fusing branches and by forming loops that restrict further

growth [33]. AFF-1, a paralog of EFF-1, mediates fusion of the anchor cell to form

the utse/hymen, fuses the lateral epidermal seam cells and merges some embryonic

epithelial cells [55]. In addition, AFF-1 is induced by Notch to auto-fuse a

myoepithelial toroid [54], and fuses the excretory duct cell to form a single-cell tube

[56, 57]. Here we determine a cellular pathway for dendritic remodeling following

injury. We uncover the functions of two fusion proteins, EFF-1 and AFF-1, in

different stages of the regeneration of dendritic arbors of the PVD polymodal neuron

in *C. elegans*.

Results

Dissection of dendritic regeneration in *C. elegans* mechanosensory neurons

The regenerative ability of axons following injury has been previously described in

vertebrates and invertebrates [14, 19, 58-61]. The morphological and molecular

changes that occur following dendritic amputation remain mostly unexplored [24-27,

33, 62, 63]. To study the process of regeneration of the PVD dendrites following

amputation we performed dendrotomy of arborized neurites using a femtosecond laser

[8, 15, 16, 20]. A successful regeneration was defined as a process in which the

severed branch was able to reconnect with its target [64]. Failure to rejoin the two

parts of the severed primary dendrite results in degeneration of the distal part and in

some cases a complete degeneration without regrowth of the multi-menorah dendritic

tree. Temporal analysis of PVD dendrite dynamics following injury revealed several

overlapping steps in arbor regeneration (**Fig 1C**). PVD dendrites showed robust

regeneration when severed at the L4 stage. We found that severed primary dendrites

grew towards each other (**Movies 1 and 2)** and in around 40% of the animals were

able to reconnect the distal end to the soma via fusion (**Fig 1D and 1E**).

Fig 1. Dendrite regeneration of multibranched PVD neurons following laser microsurgery in *C. elegans*

(A) A wild-type animal expressing *DES-2::GFP*, illustrating the PVD neuron
elaborate branching pattern (inverted image). Branches of one menorah are numbered
primary to quaternary (1ry to 4ry), and color-coded: blue, purple, red, and green,
respectively [33], c= cell body.

(B) Schematic model of hypodermal cells and PVD menorahs in a young adult, left
view. The wild-type PVDs grow between the hypodermis (outer cylinder, light blue)
and the basement membrane of the hypodermis (not shown), extending processes that
branch out to form the menorah structures. In light red is the left hypodermal seam
syncytium. Modified from [33], se= seam cells, c= cell body.

(C) Cartoon summarizing the different stages in PVD regeneration following injury.
Two-photon dendrotomy (see Materials and methods) of the primary process (red
arrowhead) leads to dynamic changes in the PVD arbor: loss of branch self-avoidance
and growth is followed by primary branch fusion (blue arrowhead), menorah-menorah
fusion (pink bracket), or both. There is an additional phase of dynamic growth and
pruning, leading to arbor refinement. When the branches fail to fuse, the distal end
undergoes degeneration.

(D-E) Primary and menorah-menorah fusion following dendrotomy. L4 animal just
after surgery **(D)** and 16 hr post-surgery **(E)**. Red arrowhead marks the site of
dendrotomy. Blue arrowhead marks reconnection site of dendrotomy.

(E) The severed distal and proximal ends of the primary branch reconnected (blue
arrowhead). Distal and proximal menorahs fused to form an additional connection
between the soma and distal end (Pink arrows and bracket).

(F) Percentage of primary branch fusion during regeneration in wild type (n=14), *eff-*
1(ok1021) (n=13) and *aff-1(tm2214)* (n=12) dendrotomized animals. Differences are
not statistically significant (Fischer's Exact test).

(G) Live imaging of an injured young-adult animal in which reconnection was
unsuccessful, and degeneration of the distal arbor occurred. Time after injury is
indicated in minutes. Red arrowhead– site of injury. Arrow– degenerating arbor.
Images are taken from **Movie 3**. Posterior is up and dorsal is left. Scale bars represent
20 μm in (A) and 10 μm in (D-E).

(H) Percentage of animals with degenerating distal end following dendrotomy in wild
type (n=14), *eff-1(ok1021)* (n=13) and *aff-1(tm2214)* (n=12) animals. Differences are
not statistically significant (Fischer's Exact test).

It was shown that following axotomy of the PLM mechanosensory neuron,

reconnection of the axon to the distal branch is dependent upon EFF-1, but not AFF-1

activity [17, 18, 21]. In contrast, we found that primary dendrotomies in *eff-1* or *aff-1*

single null mutants were repaired and regeneration via primary branch fusion

occurred (**Fig 1F**). Due to the sub-viability of *eff-1aff-1* double mutants [55], we were

unable to test whether there is redundancy between these genes in primary branch

fusion. It is conceivable that there is redundancy in the fusion machinery that fixes

broken neurites or that an unidentified fusogen is required for postembryonic primary

dendrite auto-fusion after microsurgery. Failure to reconnect following dendrotomy

resulted in degeneration of the distal end and took place within 12 hr in about 20% of

the operated animals (**Fig 1G**, arrow, **1H** and **Movie 3**). Thus, following primary

branch microsurgery the two ends grow towards each other, the tips meet, connect

and the integrity of the distal arbors is maintained.

Dendrotomy reveals menorah plasticity and causes loss of self-avoidance

The dendritic architecture of the PVDs is maintained by a contact-dependent self-

avoidance mechanism. The tertiary branches withdraw upon contact of a neighboring

branch, maintaining the menorah architecture [34, 43]. To test whether self-avoidance

is maintained after injury, we explored the spatial dynamics of regenerating dendrites.

Two hours after injury, we observed tertiary branches from neighboring menorahs

that contacted each other and extended far from their initial location, resulting in a

structure of overlapping menorahs (**Fig 1D and 1E**, bracket). Some of these overlaps

extended and occurred between menorahs originating from both sides of the lesion

(**S1 Fig, brackets and Movies 1 and 2**). These overlapping structures persisted even

48 hr after the injury (**S1F Fig**). Dendrotomy at earlier stages, such as the L3 stage,

showed similar results; animals exhibited loss of avoidance-mechanisms and branch

overlap (data not shown). These results suggest that upon injury the avoidance

mechanisms are lost, making it more likely that a new connection will form to

compensate for the injury.

Menorah-menorah fusion bypasses the severed primary dendrites

We have previously shown that during wild type development PVD and FLP terminal

quaternary branches can auto-fuse with one another to maintain menorah structure

and to limit further growth [33]. To determine whether fusion of terminal dendrites is

part of the regeneration process, we analyzed the overlapping branches after injury

and found that most of the reconnections bypassed the injury site through menorah-

menorah fusion, resulting in giant menorahs (**Fig 2A-2D, and S2B Fig,** brackets). To

judge the connectivity of the tertiary branches we verified that the distal processes do

not degenerate, and analyzed GFP-signal continuity using confocal microscopy and

live imaging (**Fig 2D**, **Movies 1, 2 and 4**). In addition we used a photoconvertible

Kaede cytoplasmic reporter expressed in the PVD [65] to demonstrate that the

menorahs have fused and therefore have connected to bypass the lesion site (**S3 Fig**).

We found that in animals where menorah-menorah fusion took place the distal

fragment did not degenerate, regardless of primary-primary branch reconnection

(n=23). Thus, terminal branch auto-fusion acts as a mechanism to bridge the gap

between the PVD soma and the distal end to maintain connectivity and avoid

degeneration.

Fig 2. The dynamic pathway of PVD dendrite regeneration after injury

(A-C) Dendrotomy of an L4 animal resulted in menorah-menorah fusion.

(A) Just prior to the injury separate menorahs can be seen (pink arrow in inset). Red arrowhead points to the lesion site.

(B) Schematic showing the site of injury (marked with an X).

(C) Formation of giant menorahs (pink bracket) and ectopic sprouting (asterisks)
within 24 hr. Pink arrow points to the site of loss of self-avoidance. Blue arrowhead
points to the site of 1ry-1ry fusion. Pruning of secondary branches also occurs (black
arrow, dotted lines, also marked in (**A**)).

(D) Intensity values view of images from a time-lapse movie of injured L4 wild-type
worm (**Movie 4**). Time after injury is shown at the upper right corner in minutes.
Arrowheads point to injury site and pruning of branches. Brackets mark two
menorahs from distal and proximal ends bypassing the break and contacting one
another.

(E) *eff-1* null animal before and 24 hr after dendrotomy. There is a successful
reconnection of the severed primary branch (arrowhead) and pruning failure (the
arbor does not undergo simplification). Scale bars represent 10 μm.

(F) Dendrotomy-induced phenotypes in *eff-1(ok1021)* animals. Menorah-menorah
fusion, percentage of animals that contained fused giant menorahs; ectopic sprouting,
fraction of animals showing growth of additional processes; pruning, percentage of
animals in which PVD underwent branch refinement after fusion. In *eff-1(ok1021)*
mutants there is excess branching and disorganized branch structure [33], thus we
could not determine (ND) whether menorah-menorah connections and ectopic
sprouting occurred. ***$P<0.001$, Fisher's exact test. n values: 14, 13 animals for wild-
type and *eff-1(ok1021),* respectively.

Sprouting, pruning, and arbor simplification complete regeneration

We observed that the PVD dendrites appeared highly dynamic after injury, showing

ectopic growth of terminal branches. These results suggested that growth is not

restricted to a subset of branches, and can occur throughout the neuron, allowing for

massive regeneration (**Fig 2C and S1 Fig**; asterisks). To verify that growth is

stimulated specifically due to the dendrite injury and not because of laser damage, we

examined mock-injured animals for PVD morphology changes. We injured animals

near the PVDs, at the same focal plane, but without hitting any dendrite. PVD mock-

operated animals showed normal growth with no excess sprouting or changes in the

PVD morphology (data not shown). These results demonstrate that dendrite severing

specifically induced terminal branch reconnection by fusion, ectopic sprouting and

regeneration (**Fig 1C**, **Movies 1 and 2**).

277    Interestingly, some of the distal secondary stems were eliminated following

278 the reconnection, leaving just one or two secondary stems per giant menorah (**Fig 2C**

279 **and S2B Fig**; arrows). These dendritic rearrangements persisted even 48 hr after

280 surgery, leading to simplification of the dendritic trees and leaving mainly giant

281 menorahs. Thus, active elimination of excess branches occurs in order to recreate a

282 pattern resembling wild-type menorahs. Analysis of time-lapse movies showed that

283 excess branches were eliminated, and pruning occurred concomitantly with growth

284 around the injury site (**Fig 2D** and **Movie 4**). Taken together, the PVD dendrites are

285 able to successfully regenerate following dendrotomy, inducing dynamic remodeling

286 by branch growth and elimination (**Fig 1C**).

287 **EFF-1 is essential for pruning excess branches after dendrotomy**

288 The central function of EFF-1 in PVD developmental arborization is in quality control

289 trimming of excess and abnormal branches [33]. To determine whether EFF-1 acts in

290 simplification following injury we amputated primary dendrites in *eff-1* mutants and

291 followed the repair process. We found that *eff-1* mutants maintained hyperbranched

292 and disorganized menorahs and failed to simplify the dendritic tree following injury

293 (**Fig 2E**). These phenotypes suggest that *eff-1* acts in branch retraction and

294 simplification induced by severing of the primary branch. We were not able to

295 determine whether *eff-1* participates in menorah-menorah fusion because the

296 hyperbranched and severely disorganized arbors prevented us from identifying

297 menorah fusion and additional ectopic sprouting (**Fig 2F**). In contrast, both uncut and

298 dendrotomized *eff-1* mutants showed no pruning, demonstrating that *eff-1* is required

299 for branch simplification following dendrotomy. In addition, cell-autonomous

300 expression of EFF-1 in the PVD resulted in excess pruning [33, 66]. Thus, EFF-1 acts

cell autonomously to simplify excess sprouting following dendrotomy and is

sufficient to trim branches and simplify arbors.

AFF-1 is required to bypass cut dendrites via menorah-menorah fusion

Since the *C. elegans* known fusogens, EFF-1 and AFF-1, are essential and sufficient

to fuse cells in *C. elegans* and heterologous cells in culture [50, 51, 55, 67, 68], we

hypothesized that they may be required to regenerate broken neurites by homotypic

fusion.

Because EFF-1 prunes dendrites by branch retraction [33, 66] we decided to

determine a possible role for *aff-1* following dendrotomy, we asked whether menorah-

menorah fusion occurs in *aff-1* injured-mutants. We found that while in *aff-1* mutants

dendrite development was normal (**Fig 3A**), following dendrotomy most of the

reconnections were between the re-growing primary dendrite and its distal fragment,

rather than through menorah fusion as in wild-type animals (**Fig 3D**). This

observation suggests a fusogenic function for AFF-1 in terminal branch fusion. In *aff-*

1 mutant animals we found some exceptions in which some menorahs overlapped, but

we did not observe fusion between menorahs followed by secondary stem

degeneration (**Fig 3D**). In dendrotomized *aff-1* animals failure to rejoin the dendritic

trees resulted in degeneration of the distal part of the arbor (**Fig 3A and 3D**). Thus,

while *aff-1* has no apparent role in normal PVD arborization, it is required for

terminal branch fusion following dendrotomy.

1ry-1ry Fusion

Menorah-Menorah Fusion

Menorah-Menorah Fusion & 1ry-1ry Fusion

Degeneration

Fig 3. *aff-1* **dendritic reconnection patterns are rescued cell non-autonomously**

(A) Dendrite regeneration following PVD nanosurgery in *aff-1(tm2214)* mutant animal. PVD is shown before and after nanosurgery (t=0 and 3.5 hr). In non-injured *aff-1* mutant animals PVD branching pattern is unaffected. After injury, fusion does not occur and the distal processes undergo degeneration (t=3.5 hr).

329 **(B)** Dendrite regeneration following PVD nanosurgery in *aff-1(tm2214); grd-10p::aff-*
330 *1* animals. PVD is shown before and after nanosurgery (t=0, 2, and 24 hr). PVD
331 reconnection occurred through fused menorahs (pink bracket). Red arrowhead marks
332 site of injury. Primary branches did not fuse (red arrowhead).
333
334 **(C)** Dendrite regeneration following PVD nanosurgery in *aff-1(tm2214); grd-*
335 *10p::aff-1* animals. PVD is shown before and after nanosurgery (t=0 and 1.5 hr). PVD
336 reconnection occurred through primary fusion (blue arrowhead).
337
(D) PVD post-injury outcomes displayed in color coded pie graphs as Magenta–
Menorah-Menorah fusion, Blue– primary-primary fusion, Magenta and Blue–
Menorah-Menorah fusion and primary-primary fusion, Black– degeneration. Wild
type n=22, *aff-1(tm2214)* n=32, *aff-1(tm2214);des-2p::aff*-n=11, *aff-1(tm2214); grd-*
10p::aff-1 n=13. ** *P*<0.01; * *P*<0.05; NS *P*>0.05. Dendrotomy site – red arrowhead,
fused menorah – pink bracket, primary fusion – blue arrowhead. Scale bars represent
20 μm. Statistics was calculated using the Freeman-Halton extension of the Fisher
exact probability test for a two-rows by four-columns contingency table,
http://vassarstats.net/fisher2x4.html.
347

AFF-1-mediated membrane fusion of terminal branches emerges as the main

mechanism by which dendritic repair occurs in *C. elegans*. We were not able to detect

aff-1 expression in the PVD neither before nor after dendrotomy. To determine

whether AFF-1 acts extrinsically to the PVD to reconnect dendrites we attempted to

rescue menorah-menorah fusion in *aff-1* mutant using expression of *grd-10p*::AFF-1

in the epithelial seam cells. We found induced recovery of reconnection and reduced

degeneration to wild-type levels (**Fig 3B-3D**). In contrast, we found that PVD

expressing *des-2p*::AFF-1 was not able to rescue the menorah-menorah fusion failure

phenotype (**Fig 3D**). Expression of *dpy-7p::aff-1* from the hypodermis was toxic in

aff-1 homozygous mutants and did not significantly improved PVD regeneration in

heterozygous *aff-1/+* animals, suggesting that non-autonomous expression only from

epithelial seam cells is sufficient to improve the ability of the PVD to rejoin the

branches by fusion (**S4 Fig**). The non-cell autonomous activity of AFF-1 in PVD

regeneration by auto-fusion was unexpected since for cell-cell fusion AFF-1 acts

homotypically in both fusing plasma membranes [68].

AFF-1-containing extracellular vesicles may repair the PVD by fusing with it

To determine AFF-1 expression and localization before and after dendrotomy we

imaged AFF-1 in worms expressing mCherry in the PVD, using a 30kb fosmid-based

GFP reporter [69]. We could not detect AFF-1 in the PVD at any stage during

development or following dendrotomy. Instead, AFF-1 is strongly expressed on the

plasma membrane, filopodia and internal puncta in the lateral seam cells. This was

expected since the seam cells fuse homotypically between the L4 and adult molt via

AFF-1-mediated fusion [55]. Using structured illumination microscopy we found

extracellular puncta containing AFF-1::GFP that apparently were derived from the

seam cells (**Fig 4A,** arrowheads). Using live spinning disk confocal microscopy we

found that the vesicles containing AFF-1::GFP were observed outside the seam cells

in control animals that were not dendrotomized (**Fig 4B, Movies 5, 6 and 9**).

Following dendrotomy the AFF-1::GFP signal in the seam cells was brighter (**Fig 4C**)

and there was a five-fold increase in the mobility and number of extracellular vesicles

(**Fig 4D-4F, Movies 7, 8, 10 and 11**). Thus, taken together our results show that AFF-

1 regenerates severed PVD dendrites in a surprisingly non-cell autonomous way from

the seam cells.

Fig 4. AFF-1 protein dynamics during PVD dendrite regeneration

(A) Superresolution structured illumination microscopy (SIM) image of aligned *AFF-1::GFP* (green) vesicles in the seam cells (left, white arrows) and *AFF-1::GFP* extracellular vesicles derived from the seam cells (right, white arrowheads) in intact wild type animals. c, cell body. PVD is labeled in red.

(B) Spinning disk confocal images of *AFF-1::GFP* expression inside and outside the seam cells (Se), and in the vulva (V) of an intact L4 animal (left). *AFF-1::GFP* (cyan) expression in the seam cells and in vesicles near the seam cells is shown in a two channels merged image (right; PVD in magenta; **Movie 5**). Inset shows magnification of a single *AFF-1::GFP* vesicle near the seam cells (left, black arrowhead, numbered 1; **Movie 6**).

(C) *AFF-1::GFP* expression inside and outside the seam cells (Se), in the anchor cell (AC) and in the vulva (V) of a reconnected PVD L4 animal (left) is shown 2 hr post-dendrotomy in a spinning disk confocal image. *AFF-1::GFP* is expressed in vesicles inside and outside of the seam cells, in the anchor cell (AC) and in VulA ring (see **Movie 7;** right, blue arrowhead, site of reconnection). Inset shows magnification of area with multiple vesicles, two are labeled (2,3) and shown in panels **(D-E).**

(D) Two *AFF-1::GFP* vesicles, numbered 2 and 3, are moving near the seam cells in a PVD-dendrotomized animal. Four time points are shown (0, 20, 60 and 80 sec; **Movie 8**).

(E) Vesicles dynamics (1, 2 and 3) is demonstrated in a color-coded graph during 340 seconds for vesicles 2 and 3 and 620 seconds for vesicle number 1. The plot illustrates vast differences between *AFF-1::GFP* vesicles movements in animals with an intact PVD versus *AFF-1::GFP* vesicles in PVD dendrotomized animals (**Movies 6 and 8)**.

(F) Dot Plot of the number of *AFF-1::GFP* vesicles outside *aff-1* expressing organs in animals with intact PVD versus in animals with dendrotomized PVD. The graph demonstrates statistical significant difference between the mean number of *aff-1::GFP* vesicles outside *aff-1* expressing organs such as seam cells, vulva, anchor cell and the uterus. $P=0.001$, statistics was calculated using the nonparametric Mann-Whitney test.

Discussion

Hypothesis: AFF-1-extracellular vesicles merge injured neurons from without

Cell-cell fusion from within occurs when a fusogenic protein (e.g. a viral fusion

protein following infection) or an endogenous cellular fusion protein (e.g. EFF-1) is

expressed intrinsically in cellular compartments, including the plasma membrane.

Fusion from without occurs when a viral particle fuses target cells without infecting

them [70-72]. Here we discovered an example of fusion from without during neuronal

regeneration. We propose that epidermal seam cells shed extracellular vesicles that

travel 1000 nm or less to reach the PVD severed dendrites and the menorahs. These

vesicles contain AFF-1 and can fuse dendrites from without (**S5 Fig**). AFF-1-

containing vesicles derived from the lateral epidermal seam cells mediate fusion of

severed dendrites and menorah auto-fusion to bypass the injury and to maintain

dendritic tree structure and function. Extracellular vesicles (EVs, microvesicles,

exosomes and ectosomes) from different sub-cellular and tissue origins have been

proposed as vehicles for cell-cell communication during normal physiology,

participate in the immune response, control coagulation and promote metastatic

cancer [73]. These extracellular vesicles have been shown to exist in bacteria, archea,

plants, fungi and animals [74-78]. In *C. elegans* EVs derived from ciliated neurons

affect mating behavior and communication between animals [79]. Signaling EVs

derived from the sperm activate oogenesis and ovarian muscle contraction [80]. EVs

also participate in engulfment of dead cells [81] and morphogenesis of the embryo

[82].

EVs are probably universal but diverge in size, shape and place of origin.

They contain lipid bilayers, transmembrane proteins and nucleic acids. One of the

characteristics of these EVs is their ability to fuse to target cells and deliver RNAs,

plasmids, toxins and signaling molecules. However, the fusion proteins necessary to

deliver and merge the diverse EVs have not been identified and characterized in any

system. Mammalian cells transfected with *C. elegans* AFF-1 produce extracellular

vesicles that have been biochemically and ultrastructurally characterized [68, 83].

Moreover, AFF-1-containing vesicles and pseudotyped particles are able to fuse to

mammalian cells expressing EFF-1 or AFF-1. Thus, AFF-1 can mediate fusion of

extracellular vesicles to cells expressing EFF-1 on the plasma membrane in a tissue

culture system [68, 83]. Here we provide the initial evidence for a proposed

mechanism that can fuse EVs to target neuronal cells in vivo. Surprisingly, these EVs

can cause auto-fusion from without mediated by AFF-1 transmembrane fusion protein

on their surface. Moreover, in our working model, these AFF-1-EVs derived from the

C. elegans lateral epithelia can fuse neurons in vivo, thus directly promoting

regeneration (**S5 Fig**).

Neurodevelopmental genetic stages in dendrite repair after injury

The primary mechanism of PVD dendritic regeneration can be divided into five

stages: (1) reattachment at site of injury, (2) loss of self-avoidance between adjacent

menorahs, (3) menorah-menorah fusion to bypass lesions, (4) sprouting of

compensatory branches and (5) pruning of excess branches (**Fig 1C**).

The interplay between two effector fusogens revealed a genetic pathway that

links membrane remodeling during normal development and following neuronal

injury. Here we focused on two cellular stages: Extrinsic stage (3) AFF-1-mediated

menorah-menorah fusion from without and intrinsic stage (5) EFF-1-mediated

trimming of excess branches from within. (**Figs 1C** and S**5**).

AFF-1 merges terminal branches to bypass broken dendrites

Axonal fusion after injury is crucial for reestablishing synaptic contacts, to prevent

degeneration, and for regaining neurological functionality [19, 64]. Although *eff-1*

mutants failed to fuse broken axons [21], *eff-1* mutants succeed to merge injured

dendrites. We tested the two known *C. elegans* fusogens, EFF-1 and AFF-1, as well

as the EFF-1 paralog, C26D10.7 ([51, 84] and Oren-Suissa and Podbilewicz,

unpublished results). We found that terminal-branch fusion following dendrotomy

was significantly reduced in *aff-1* mutants compared to wild-type. However, none of

these genes was independently required for primary dendrite fusion following an

injury, suggesting either redundancy or that yet another *C. elegans* fusogen awaits

identification. Based on these observations, we conclude that *aff-1* is required to heal

dendritic wounds, specifically via menorah-menorah fusion.

Our data support a model in which *aff-1* and *eff-1* expression is highly

regulated in the PVD. Following dendrotomy *eff-1* expression appears to be repressed

allowing ectopic sprouting of terminal branches and loss of self-avoidance

culminating with AFF-1-mediated menorah-menorah fusion via a surprising non-

autonomous mechanism of fusion from without (**S5 Fig**).

EFF-1 retracts and simplifies excessive branching following injury

The development of the nervous system includes the formation of many new

branches, yet some of them are later eliminated. This process is termed pruning and is

crucial for the formation of stable connections [85-90]. In the central and peripheral

nervous systems, axons that are severed from their cell bodies degenerate by the

genetically active process of Wallerian degeneration (WD) [7]. WldS mutant mice

present slow WD and the persistent axon fragments appear to prevent regeneration by

regrowth [7]. In addition, the ubiquitin/proteasome system acts to regulate axon

degeneration in Drosophila, in vitro and in mice [91]. Thus, failure to remove axon

debris following injury may physically block regeneration by regrowth of severed

axons and WD appears to be required for efficient regeneration by regrowth [92].

Developmental pruning occurs in *C. elegans* AIM interneurons, and this process is

regulated by the helix-turn-helix transcription factor MBR-1 [93] and Wnt-Ror kinase

signaling [86]. Here, we demonstrated a novel mechanism of branch pruning

following injury. We have previously shown that significant refinement is required to

maintain the complex web of dendrites in the final state of perfectly sculpted PVD

menorahs [33]. This dynamic nature persists following dendrotomy, and many new

branches sprout around the injury site to ensure a successful connection will occur.

This burst of growth is followed by the elimination of excess branches, and the arbor

is simplified to resemble the original tree. This process is normally repressed probably

by transcriptional mechanisms. Following injury and a stimulation of ectopic

branching, *eff-1* is activated to simplify the arbors and regenerate a normal structure

of menorahs. These results suggest that there is conservation of the molecular

machinery for neurite refinement, and that the ability to alter existing morphologies is

a key component in the development and survival of nervous systems.

Is auto-fusion an alternative pathway to repair severed neurons?

Fusion of severed axons occurs in invertebrates for example in Aplysia [13],

crayfish[14] and *C. elegans* [15-18] but rarely in vertebrates [6, 94]. Why is this the

case and how can our study help us understand this? Invertebrates and vertebrates do

have conserved pathways to regenerate injured branches via regrowth [3, 4, 9, 15, 95-

97]. However, it appears that fusion of broken neurites or bypassing the injured site

using fusion instead of rebuilding complex trees is a more energetically economical

process. The use of extracellular vesicles could be a useful strategy to stimulate repair

of injured branches in the CNS of vertebrates that usually cannot regenerate.

Severed neurites can reconnect by suspending self-repulsion mechanisms

We have found that in *C. elegans* PVD, following dendrotomy there is a transient loss

of self-avoidance between the menorahs (tertiary branches) that allows the

reconnection by merging the menorahs and bypassing the site of injury, thus

maintaining the dendritic trees. This is consistent with studies in leech embryos

showing that laser microbeam severing of neurites of mechanosensory neurons result

in that the detached branch stopped being avoided by the rest of the cell. This is

consistent with a mechanism that controls self-avoidance and that requires physical

continuity between the neurites [98]. In *C. elegans* this mechanism appears to involve

netrins [43]. In contrast, in zebrafish detached fragments continue to repel the parent

arbor [92]. Thus in zebrafish and probably in other vertebrates it is required to have a

WD-like mechanism to remove fragments of sensory neurites before the process of

regrowth can occur. It would be useful to find ways to induce merging of the severed

neurites as occurs in some invertebrates.

Spinal cord injuries, experimental axotomies, surgical accidents, and diverse

forms of neurodegeneration are all conditions that currently cannot be generally

repaired [3, 6, 60, 61, 99]. Unveiling the mechanism of intrinsic *eff-1*-mediated

dendritic simplification and extrinsic *aff-1*-mediated neuronal auto-fusion from

without may pave the way for overcoming neurodegenerative diseases or injuries. The

dynamic dendritic plasticity of the PVD neurons and the power of genetics in *C.*

elegans along with its amenability for RNAi-based analysis and genome editing will

uncover genetic pathways that will enable the study of additional mechanisms

involved in PVD arborization during development and following injuries. In *C.*

elegans AFF-1-containing vesicles derived from epithelia appear to fuse dendrites

emerging as a potential effector that could repair broken neurons in heterologous

systems.

Materials and Methods

Strains and transgenic animals

All nematode strains were maintained according to standard protocols [100, 101]. In addition to the wild-type strain N2, the following mutations, transgenes and strains were used: BP601 *aff-1(tm2214)/mIn1[dpy-10(e128) mIs14] II* [55], MF190 *hmIs4[DES-2::GFP, pRF4]*, BP328 *eff-1(ok1021) II; hmIs4*, BP450 *hyEx30[myo-2::gfp, DES-2::GFP, KS]*, BP431 *eff-1(hy21) II; hmIs4* [33], NC1841 (*wdIs52, F49H12.4::gfp*; *rwIs1*, *pmec-7::*RFP) [34], CHB392 *[hmnEx133(ser-2prom3::kaede)]*, kindly provided by Candice Yip and Max Heiman [65]. Germline transformation was performed using standard protocols [102]. The KS bluescript plasmid was used as carrier DNA. Transgenic lines include: BP709 *[hmnIs133 (ser-2prom3::kaede)]*, BP1014 *aff-1/mln1; dzIs53[pF49H12.4::mCherry]Is* was created by crossing *aff-1/ mln1*with *pF49H12.4::mCherry* (kindly provided by Salzburg Y.). BP1015 *aff-1/mln1; hmnIs133[ser-2prom3::kaede]; hyEx66 [KS , pCFJ90 (myo-2::mcherry), pME4(des-2::AFF-1)]*. BP1017 *aff-1/mln1; hmnIs133[ser-2prom3::kaede]; hyEx350[KS ,pCFJ90 myo-2::mcherry, pTG5 dpy-7p::aff-1]*, BP1052 *aff-1/mln1; hmnIs133[ser-2prom3::kaede]; hyEx355[KS, pCFJ90 myo-2::mcherry, pTG4 grd-10p::aff-1]*, BP1055 *dzIs53[F49H12.4p::mCherry]; hyEx66[pRF4, AFF-1fosmid::GFP, KS]*, BP1056 *dzIs53[F49H12.4p::mCherry]; hyEx68[pRF4, AFF-1 fosmid::GFP, KS]*.

Molecular Biology

We used RF cloning to insert the *grd-10* promoter upstream to the *aff-1* gene [103], and Gateway cloning [104] to clone *aff-1* into a plasmid containing the *dpy-7* promoter fragment (pDest Dpy7 and pDONR™221). Phusion Hot Start II High-

569   Fidelity DNA polymerase (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, MA) was used to facilitate

570   the cloning process.

Confocal microscopy and live imaging *of C. elegans*

Nematodes were mounted on 3% agar pads mixed with 10 mM NaN_3 in M9 buffer.

For time-lapse analysis, worms were anesthetized with 0.1% tricaine and 0.01%

tetramisol in M9 solution [105-107]. Animals were analyzed by Nomarski optics and

fluorescence microscopy, using Zeiss LSM 510 META confocal, the Zeiss LSM 700

confocal or Nikon eclipse Ti inverted microscope equipped with Yokogawa CSU-X1

spinning disk (Yokogawa, Tokyo, Japan) and a sCMOS (Andor, Belfast, UK) camera.

Z-stacks were taken with PlanApochromat 60x oil NA=1.4 objective using the SDC

or 63x NA=1.4 objective using the LSM. When using the sCMOS (Andor) camera z-

stacks were taken with ~0.35 μm z-step. When the LSM 510 meta was used, z-step

was ~0.8 μm. Image acquisition was done using Andor iQ or Metamorph software

(Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA) when using the spinning disk confocal (SDC),

and Zen software when using the LSM 510 meta microscope or Zeiss LSM 700.

Multidimensional data was reconstructed as projections using the ImageJ and

Metamorph softwares. Figures were prepared using ImageJ, Adobe Photoshop CS5

and Adobe Illustrator CS6.

Quantifying PVD branching phenotypes and statistics

Quantification was done as previously described [33]. Using confocal microscopy, at

least five sequential z-series pictures were taken from each worm. Each z-section was

analyzed separately. The results from each worm were normalized to a longitudinal

length of 100 μm in all relevant experiments. Significant differences between mutants

and wild-type were determined by the two-tailed unpaired t-test, the nonparametric

Mann-Whitney test or Fischer's exact test. For each group we observed >20 additional

animals that were not recorded by z series on the confocal microscope and that

showed similar phenotypes.

Laser surgery

Microsurgery was done using the LSM 510 META and a tunable multiphoton

Chameleon Ultra Ti-Sapphire laser system (Coherent, Santa Clara, CA), that produces

200-fs short pulses with a repetition rate of 113 MHz and 5 nJ energy at a wavelength

of 820 nm. 0.5-2 μm^2 selected rectangular ROIs of GFP-labeled PVD neurons were

cut and successful surgery was confirmed by visualizing targets immediately after

exposure. We evaluated the ability of severed neurons to reconnect by analyzing z-

stack images of GFP-labeled branches. Dendrotomy was performed on the primary

longitudinal process, and the morphological changes were followed for 2 to 72 hours

after the surgery. Imaging before and after surgery was done as described above,

using the 488 nm line of the Argon laser of the LSM microscope or using the spinning

disk confocal system. After surgery, animals were recovered to an agar plate and

remounted 5-72 hours after surgery. Recovered worms were analyzed for

regeneration, fusion between processes, and ectopic sprouting. At least 10 individuals

were observed for each experiment. For all worms the primary dendrite was injured

anterior to cell body. Animals were imaged and a z-stack was collected immediately

after injury to confirm a successful injury.

Photoactivation using Kaede

In order to verify that dendrites fuse as response to injury we used the

photoconvertible protein Kaede driven by a PVD specific promoter *ser-2prom3* [65].

A PVD primary dendrite of *ser-2prom3::Kaede* expressing animals was

dendrotomized, animals were recovered for 23 hours and the dendrite reconnection to

its stump was assessed by Kaede photoconversion [66]. The green Kaede form in the

PVD cell body was irreversibly photoconverted to the red Kaede form using a 405 nm

laser with the Mosaic system (Andor) on the Nikon eclipse Ti inverted microscope.

Following photoconversion of the Kaede in the cell body we followed spreading to

the dendritic branches for 1 and 60 min post photoconversion. Red Kaede form,

though diluted while spreading through the dendritic tree, can be observed beyond the

reconnection site of injury in the distal part of the primary and higher ordered

dendritic branches. When the dendrites fail to reconnect or immediately after

dendrotomy the photoconverted Kaede did not cross the site of injury, revealing that

spreading of red Kaede is a reliable tool to confirm rejoining of severed dendrites.

Acknowledgements

We thank A. Fire for vectors, M. Krause for *myo-2::gfp,* the *C. elegans* knockout

consortium for the *eff-1(ok1021)* deletion allele, M. Heiman and C. Yip for CHB392,

C. Smith and D. Miller for NC1841. We also thank A. Sapir, B. Gildor, and J. Grimm

for critical comments on earlier versions of the manuscript, and E. Oren for

MATLAB advice. Some strains were provided by the CGC, which is funded by NIH

Office of Research Infrastructure Programs (P40 OD010440).

Author contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: MOS TG BP. Performed the experiments:

MOS TG VK. Analyzed the data: MOS TG BP. Wrote the paper with input from all

authors: MOS BP.

References

References

1.   Goodman MB. Sensation is painless. Trends Neurosci. 2003;26(12):643-5.
PubMed PMID: 14624845.
2.   Hall DH, Treinin M. How does morphology relate to function in sensory
arbors? Trends Neurosci. 2011;34(9):443-51. Epub 2011/08/16. doi: S0166-
2236(11)00108-1 [pii] 10.1016/j.tins.2011.07.004. PubMed PMID: 21840610;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3166259.
3.   Ruschel J, Hellal F, Flynn KC, Dupraz S, Elliott DA, Tedeschi A, et al. Axonal
regeneration. Systemic administration of epothilone B promotes axon
regeneration after spinal cord injury. Science. 2015;348(6232):347-52. doi:
10.1126/science.aaa2958. PubMed PMID: 25765066; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC4445125.
4.   Park KK, Liu K, Hu Y, Smith PD, Wang C, Cai B, et al. Promoting axon
regeneration in the adult CNS by modulation of the PTEN/mTOR pathway.
Science. 2008;322(5903):963-6. PubMed PMID: 18988856.
5.   Taylor AM, Blurton-Jones M, Rhee SW, Cribbs DH, Cotman CW, Jeon NL. A
microfluidic culture platform for CNS axonal injury, regeneration and transport.
Nat Methods. 2005;2(8):599-605. Epub 2005/08/12. doi: nmeth777 [pii]
10.1038/nmeth777. PubMed PMID: 16094385; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC1558906.
6.   Li S, Yang C, Zhang L, Gao X, Wang X, Liu W, et al. Promoting axon
regeneration in the adult CNS by modulation of the melanopsin/GPCR
signaling. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2016;113(7):1937-42. doi:
10.1073/pnas.1523645113. PubMed PMID: 26831088; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC4763730.
7.   Coleman MP, Freeman MR. Wallerian degeneration, wld(s), and nmnat. Annual
review of neuroscience. 2010;33:245-67. doi: 10.1146/annurev-neuro-060909-
153248. PubMed PMID: 20345246.
8.   Wu Z, Ghosh-Roy A, Yanik MF, Zhang JZ, Jin Y, Chisholm AD.
Caenorhabditis elegans neuronal regeneration is influenced by life stage, ephrin
signaling, and synaptic branching. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
2007;104(38):15132-7. PubMed PMID: 17848506.
9.   Yan D, Wu Z, Chisholm AD, Jin Y. The DLK-1 kinase promotes mRNA
stability and local translation in C. elegans synapses and axon regeneration.
Cell. 2009;138(5):1005-18. Epub 2009/09/10. doi: S0092-8674(09)00723-5
[pii] 10.1016/j.cell.2009.06.023. PubMed PMID: 19737525; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC2772821.
10. Hammarlund M, Jin Y. Axon regeneration in C. elegans. Curr Opin Neurobiol.
2014;27:199-207. doi: 10.1016/j.conb.2014.04.001. PubMed PMID: 24794753;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4122601.
11. Edwards TJ, Hammarlund M. Syndecan promotes axon regeneration by
stabilizing growth cone migration. Cell reports. 2014;8(1):272-83. doi:
10.1016/j.celrep.2014.06.008. PubMed PMID: 25001284; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC4127196.
12. Hammarlund M, Nix P, Hauth L, Jorgensen EM, Bastiani M. Axon regeneration
requires a conserved MAP kinase pathway. Science. 2009;323(5915):802-6.
doi: 10.1126/science.1165527. PubMed PMID: 19164707; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC2729122.

13.   Bedi SS, Glanzman DL. Axonal rejoining inhibits injury-induced long-term
changes in Aplysia sensory neurons in vitro. J Neurosci. 2001;21(24):9667-77.
PubMed PMID: 11739576; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3848312.
14.   Hoy RR, Bittner GD, Kennedy D. Regeneration in crustacean motoneurons:
evidence for axonal fusion. Science. 1967;156(772):251-2. PubMed PMID:
6021042.
15.   Ghosh-Roy A, Chisholm AD. Caenorhabditis elegans: a new model organism
for studies of axon regeneration. Dev Dyn. 2010;239(5):1460-4. Epub
2010/02/27. doi: 10.1002/dvdy.22253. PubMed PMID: 20186917.
16.   Yanik MF, Cinar H, Cinar HN, Chisholm AD, Jin Y, Ben-Yakar A.
Neurosurgery: functional regeneration after laser axotomy. Nature.
2004;432(7019):822. PubMed PMID: 15602545.
17.   Neumann B, Coakley S, Giordano-Santini R, Linton C, Lee ES, Nakagawa A, et
al. EFF-1-mediated regenerative axonal fusion requires components of the
apoptotic pathway. Nature. 2015;517:219-22.
18.   Neumann B, Nguyen KC, Hall DH, Ben-Yakar A, Hilliard MA. Axonal
regeneration proceeds through specific axonal fusion in transected C. elegans
neurons. Dev Dyn. 2011;240(6):1365-72. Epub 2011/03/19. doi:
10.1002/dvdy.22606. PubMed PMID: 21416556; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC3092806.
19.   Giordano-Santini R, Linton C, Hilliard MA. Cell-cell fusion in the nervous
system: Alternative mechanisms of development, injury, and repair. Seminars in
cell & developmental biology. 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.semcdb.2016.06.019.
PubMed PMID: 27375226.
20.   Bourgeois F, Ben-Yakar A. Femtosecond laser nanoaxotomy properties and
their effect on axonal recovery in C. elegans. Opt Express. 2007;15(14):8521-
31. PubMed PMID: 19547186.
21.   Ghosh-Roy A, Wu Z, Goncharov A, Jin Y, Chisholm AD. Calcium and cyclic
AMP promote axonal regeneration in Caenorhabditis elegans and require DLK-
1 kinase. J Neurosci. 2010;30(9):3175-83. Epub 2010/03/06. doi: 30/9/3175
[pii] 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5464-09.2010. PubMed PMID: 20203177.
22.   Nix P, Hammarlund M, Hauth L, Lachnit M, Jorgensen EM, Bastiani M. Axon
regeneration genes identified by RNAi screening in C. elegans. J Neurosci.
2014;34(2):629-45. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3859-13.2014. PubMed PMID:
24403161; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3870940.
23.   Gabel CV, Antoine F, Chuang CF, Samuel AD, Chang C. Distinct cellular and
molecular mechanisms mediate initial axon development and adult-stage axon
regeneration in C. elegans. Development. 2008;135(6):1129-36. PubMed
PMID: 18296652.
24.   Standler NA, Bernstein JJ. Degeneration and regeneration of motoneuron
dendrites after ventral root crush: computer reconstruction of dendritic fields.
Experimental neurology. 1982;75(3):600-15. PubMed PMID: 7060690.
25.   Song Y, Ori-McKenney KM, Zheng Y, Han C, Jan LY, Jan YN. Regeneration
of Drosophila sensory neuron axons and dendrites is regulated by the Akt
pathway involving Pten and microRNA bantam. Genes Dev. 2012;26(14):1612-
25. doi: 10.1101/gad.193243.112. PubMed PMID: 22759636; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC3404388.
26.   Stone MC, Albertson RM, Chen L, Rolls MM. Dendrite injury triggers DLK-
independent regeneration. Cell reports. 2014;6(2):247-53. doi:

10.1016/j.celrep.2013.12.022. PubMed PMID: 24412365; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3954604.

27. Stone MC, Nguyen MM, Tao J, Allender DL, Rolls MM. Global up-regulation of microtubule dynamics and polarity reversal during regeneration of an axon from a dendrite. Mol Biol Cell. 2010;21(5):767-77. doi: 10.1091/mbc.E09-11-0967. PubMed PMID: 20053676; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2828963.

28. Hall GF, Cohen MJ. Dendritic amputation redistributes sprouting evoked by axotomy in lamprey central neurons. J Neurosci. 1988;8(10):3598-606. PubMed PMID: 3193173.

29. White JG, Southgate E, Thomson JN, Brenner S. The structure of the nervous system of Caenorhabditis elegans. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 1986;314:1-340.

30. Halevi S, McKay J, Palfreyman M, Yassin L, Eshel M, Jorgensen E, et al. The C. elegans ric-3 gene is required for maturation of nicotinic acetylcholine receptors. Embo J. 2002;21(5):1012-20. PubMed PMID: 11867529.

31. Tsalik EL, Niacaris T, Wenick AS, Pau K, Avery L, Hobert O. LIM homeobox gene-dependent expression of biogenic amine receptors in restricted regions of the C. elegans nervous system. Dev Biol. 2003;263(1):81-102. PubMed PMID: 14568548.

32. Yassin L, Gillo B, Kahan T, Halevi S, Eshel M, Treinin M. Characterization of the deg-3/des-2 receptor: a nicotinic acetylcholine receptor that mutates to cause neuronal degeneration. Mol Cell Neurosci. 2001;17(3):589-99. PubMed PMID: 11273652.

33. Oren-Suissa M, Hall D, Treinin M, Shemer G, Podbilewicz B. The Fusogen EFF-1 Controls Sculpting of Mechanosensory Dendrites. Science. 2010;328(5983):1285-8. Epub 6 May 2010. doi: 10.1126/science.1189095.

34. Smith CJ, Watson JD, Spencer WC, O'Brien T, Cha B, Albeg A, et al. Time-lapse imaging and cell-specific expression profiling reveal dynamic branching and molecular determinants of a multi-dendritic nociceptor in C. elegans. Dev Biol. 2010;345(1):18-33. Epub 2010/06/12. doi: S0012-1606(10)00805-5 [pii] 10.1016/j.ydbio.2010.05.502. PubMed PMID: 20537990; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2919608.

35. Albeg A, Smith C, Chatzigeorgiou M, Feitelson DG, Hall DH, Schafer WR, et al. C. elegans multi-dendritic sensory neurons: Morphology and function. Mol Cell Neurosci. 2011;46:308-17. Epub 2010/10/26. doi: S1044-7431(10)00246-0 [pii] 10.1016/j.mcn.2010.10.001. PubMed PMID: 20971193.

36. Pujadas L, Gruart A, Bosch C, Delgado L, Teixeira CM, Rossi D, et al. Reelin regulates postnatal neurogenesis and enhances spine hypertrophy and long-term potentiation. J Neurosci. 2010;30(13):4636-49. Epub 2010/04/02. doi: 30/13/4636 [pii] 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5284-09.2010. PubMed PMID: 20357114.

37. Maniar TA, Kaplan M, Wang GJ, Shen K, Wei L, Shaw JE, et al. UNC-33 (CRMP) and ankyrin organize microtubules and localize kinesin to polarize axon-dendrite sorting. Nat Neurosci. 2012;15(1):48-56. doi: 10.1038/nn.2970. PubMed PMID: 22101643.

38. Way JC, Chalfie M. The mec-3 gene of Caenorhabditis elegans requires its own product for maintained expression and is expressed in three neuronal cell types. Genes Dev. 1989;3(12A):1823-33. PubMed PMID: 2576011.

39. Chatzigeorgiou M, Yoo S, Watson JD, Lee WH, Spencer WC, Kindt KS, et al. Specific roles for DEG/ENaC and TRP channels in touch and thermosensation

in C. elegans nociceptors. Nature neuroscience. 2010;13(7):861-8. Epub
2010/06/01. doi: 10.1038/nn.2581. PubMed PMID: 20512132; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC2975101.

40. Chatzigeorgiou M, Schafer WR. Lateral facilitation between primary
mechanosensory neurons controls nose touch perception in C. elegans. Neuron.
2011;70(2):299-309. Epub 2011/04/28. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2011.02.046.
PubMed PMID: 21521615; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3145979.

41. Liang X, Dong X, Moerman DG, Shen K, Wang X. Sarcomeres Pattern
Proprioceptive Sensory Dendritic Endings through UNC-52/Perlecan in C.
elegans. Dev Cell. 2015;33(4):388-400. doi: 10.1016/j.devcel.2015.03.010.
PubMed PMID: 25982673; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4540606.

42. Dong X, Liu OW, Howell AS, Shen K. An extracellular adhesion molecule
complex patterns dendritic branching and morphogenesis. Cell.
2013;155(2):296-307. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2013.08.059. PubMed PMID:
24120131.

43. Smith CJ, Watson JD, VanHoven MK, Colon-Ramos DA, Miller DM, 3rd.
Netrin (UNC-6) mediates dendritic self-avoidance. Nat Neurosci.
2012;15(5):731-7. doi: 10.1038/nn.3065. PubMed PMID: 22426253; PubMed
Central PMCID: PMC3337961.

44. Aguirre-Chen C, Bulow HE, Kaprielian Z. C. elegans bicd-1, homolog of the
Drosophila dynein accessory factor Bicaudal D, regulates the branching of PVD
sensory neuron dendrites. Development. 2011;138(3):507-18. doi:
10.1242/dev.060939. PubMed PMID: 21205795; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC3014636.

45. Salzberg Y, Diaz-Balzac CA, Ramirez-Suarez NJ, Attreed M, Tecle E, Desbois
M, et al. Skin-Derived Cues Control Arborization of Sensory Dendrites in
Caenorhabditis elegans. Cell. 2013;155(2):308-20. doi:
10.1016/j.cell.2013.08.058. PubMed PMID: 24120132.

46. Taylor CA, Yan J, Howell AS, Dong X, Shen K. RAB-10 Regulates Dendritic
Branching by Balancing Dendritic Transport. PLoS Genet.
2015;11(12):e1005695. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1005695. PubMed PMID:
26633194; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4669152.

47. Dong X, Chiu H, Park YJ, Zou W, Zou Y, Ozkan E, et al. Precise regulation of
the guidance receptor DMA-1 by KPC-1/Furin instructs dendritic branching
decisions. eLife. 2016;5. doi: 10.7554/eLife.11008. PubMed PMID: 26974341.

48. Smurova K, Podbilewicz B. RAB-5- and DYNAMIN-1-Mediated Endocytosis
of EFF-1 Fusogen Controls Cell-Cell Fusion. Cell reports. 2016;14(6):1517-27.
doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2016.01.027. PubMed PMID: 26854231.

49. Podbilewicz B. Virus and Cell Fusion Mechanisms. Annual Review of Cell and
Developmental Biology. 2014;30:111-39.

50. Shemer G, Suissa M, Kolotuev I, Nguyen KCQ, Hall DH, Podbilewicz B. EFF-
1 is sufficient to initiate and execute tissue-specific cell fusion in *C. elegans*.
Curr Biol. 2004;14(17):1587-91. PubMed PMID: 15341747.

51. Mohler WA, Shemer G, del Campo J, Valansi C, Opoku-Serebuoh E, Scranton
V, et al. The type I membrane protein EFF-1 is essential for developmental cell
fusion in *C. elegans*. Dev Cell. 2002;2(3):355-62. PubMed PMID: 11879640.

52. Shinn-Thomas JH, Del Campo JJ, Wang J, Mohler WA. The EFF-1A
Cytoplasmic Domain Influences Hypodermal Cell Fusions in C. elegans But Is
Not Dependent on 14-3-3 Proteins. PLoS One. 2016;11(1):e0146874. doi:

839   10.1371/journal.pone.0146874. PubMed PMID: 26800457; PubMed Central
840   PMCID: PMC4723337.
841 53. Shinn-Thomas JH, Mohler WA. New insights into the mechanisms and roles of
842   cell-cell fusion. Int Rev Cell Mol Biol. 2011;289:149-209. Epub 2011/07/14.
843   doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-386039-2.00005-5. PubMed PMID: 21749901.
844 54. Rasmussen JP, English K, Tenlen JR, Priess JR. Notch signaling and
845   morphogenesis of single-cell tubes in the C. elegans digestive tract. Dev Cell.
846   2008;14(4):559-69. PubMed PMID: 18410731.
847 55. Sapir A, Choi J, Leikina E, Avinoam O, Valansi C, Chernomordik LV, et al.
848   AFF-1, a FOS-1-Regulated Fusogen, Mediates Fusion of the Anchor Cell in C.
849   elegans. Dev Cell. 2007;12(5):683-98. PubMed PMID: 17488621.
850 56. Stone CE, Hall DH, Sundaram MV. Lipocalin signaling controls unicellular
851   tube development in the Caenorhabditis elegans excretory system. Dev Biol.
852   2009;329(2):201-11. Epub 2009/03/10. doi: 10.1016/j.ydbio.2009.02.030.
853   PubMed PMID: 19269285; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3030807.
854 57. Soulavie F, Sundaram MV. Auto-fusion and the shaping of neurons and tubes.
855   Seminars in cell & developmental biology. 2016. doi:
856   10.1016/j.semcdb.2016.07.018. PubMed PMID: 27436685.
857 58. Bradbury EJ, Moon LD, Popat RJ, King VR, Bennett GS, Patel PN, et al.
858   Chondroitinase ABC promotes functional recovery after spinal cord injury.
859   Nature. 2002;416(6881):636-40. PubMed PMID: 11948352.
860 59. Cajal SR. Histología del sistema nervioso del hombre y de los vertebrados. 2007
861   ed. Madrid: Ministerio de Sanidad y Consumo; 1899. 649 p.
862 60. Fernandez-Gonzalez A, La Spada AR, Treadaway J, Higdon JC, Harris BS,
863   Sidman RL, et al. Purkinje cell degeneration (pcd) phenotypes caused by
864   mutations in the axotomy-induced gene, Nna1. Science. 2002;295(5561):1904-
865   6. PubMed PMID: 11884758.
866 61. Devor M. Neuroplasticity in the rearrangement of olfactory tract fibers after
867   neonatal transection in hamsters. The Journal of comparative neurology.
868   1976;166(1):49-72. PubMed PMID: 1262549.
869 62. Oren-Suissa M, Podbilewicz B. Evolution of programmed cell fusion: Common
870   mechanisms and distinct functions. Developmental Dynamics.
871   2010;239(5):1515-28. doi: 10.1002/dvdy.22284.
872 63. Nawabi H, Zukor K, He Z. No simpler than mammals: axon and dendrite
873   regeneration in Drosophila. Genes Dev. 2012;26(14):1509-14. doi:
874   10.1101/gad.198150.112. PubMed PMID: 22802524; PubMed Central PMCID:
875   PMC3404378.
876 64. Hilliard MA. Axonal degeneration and regeneration: a mechanistic tug-of-war. J
877   Neurochem. 2009;108(1):23-32. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-4159.2008.05754.x.
878   PubMed PMID: 19054282.
879 65. Yip ZC, Heiman MG. Duplication of a Single Neuron in C. elegans Reveals a
880   Pathway for Dendrite Tiling by Mutual Repulsion. Cell reports. 2016. doi:
881   10.1016/j.celrep.2016.05.003. PubMed PMID: 27239028.
882 66. Kravtsov V, Oren-Suissa M, Podbilewicz B. Cell fusion proteins can rejuvenate
883   adult dendritic trees. Preprint Available: BioRxiv. 2016. doi:
884   http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/062679.
885 67. Podbilewicz B, Leikina E, Sapir A, Valansi C, Suissa M, Shemer G, et al. The
886   C. elegans developmental fusogen EFF-1 mediates homotypic fusion in
887   heterologous cells and in vivo. Dev Cell. 2006;11(4):471-81. PubMed PMID:
888   17011487.

889 68. Avinoam O, Fridman K, Valansi C, Abutbul I, Zeev-Ben-Mordehai T, Maurer
890   UE, et al. Conserved Eukaryotic Fusogens Can Fuse Viral Envelopes to Cells.
891   Science. 2011;332(6029):589-92. Epub 24 March 2011. doi:
892   10.1126/science.1202333.
893 69. Sarov M, Schneider S, Pozniakovski A, Roguev A, Ernst S, Zhang Y, et al. A
894   recombineering pipeline for functional genomics applied to Caenorhabditis
895   elegans. Nat Methods. 2006;3(10):839-44. doi: 10.1038/nmeth933. PubMed
896   PMID: 16990816.
897 70. Clavel F, Charneau P. Fusion from without directed by human
898   immunodeficiency virus particles. J Virol. 1994;68(2):1179-85. PubMed PMID:
899   8289347; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC236557.
900 71. Bratt MA, Gallaher WR. Preliminary analysis of the requirements for fusion
901   from within and fusion from without by Newcastle disease virus. Proc Natl
902   Acad Sci U S A. 1969;64(2):536-43. PubMed PMID: 5261030; PubMed Central
903   PMCID: PMC223377.
904 72. White J, Matlin K, Helenius A. Cell fusion by Semliki Forest, influenza, and
905   vesicular stomatitis viruses. J Cell Biol. 1981;89(3):674-9. PubMed PMID:
906   6265470; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2111813.
907 73. Tkach M, Thery C. Communication by Extracellular Vesicles: Where We Are
908   and Where We Need to Go. Cell. 2016;164(6):1226-32. doi:
909   10.1016/j.cell.2016.01.043. PubMed PMID: 26967288.
910 74. Miyado K, Yoshida K, Yamagata K, Sakakibara K, Okabe M, Wang X, et al.
911   The fusing ability of sperm is bestowed by CD9-containing vesicles released
912   from eggs in mice. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2008;105(35):12921-6. PubMed
913   PMID: 18728192.
914 75. Kwon SH, Liu KD, Mostov KE. Intercellular Transfer of GPRC5B via
915   Exosomes Drives HGF-Mediated Outward Growth. Curr Biol. 2014;24(2):199-
916   204. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2013.12.010. PubMed PMID: 24412205.
917 76. Liegeois S, Benedetto A, Garnier JM, Schwab Y, Labouesse M. The V0-
918   ATPase mediates apical secretion of exosomes containing Hedgehog-related
919   proteins in Caenorhabditis elegans. J Cell Biol. 2006;173(6):949-61. doi:
920   10.1083/jcb.200511072. PubMed PMID: 16785323; PubMed Central PMCID:
921   PMC2063919.
922 77. Beveridge TJ. Structures of gram-negative cell walls and their derived
923   membrane vesicles. J Bacteriol. 1999;181(16):4725-33. PubMed PMID:
924   10438737; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC93954.
925 78. Hyenne V, Apaydin A, Rodriguez D, Spiegelhalter C, Hoff-Yoessle S, Diem M,
926   et al. RAL-1 controls multivesicular body biogenesis and exosome secretion. J
927   Cell Biol. 2015;211(1):27-37. doi: 10.1083/jcb.201504136. PubMed PMID:
928   26459596; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4602040.
929 79. Wang J, Silva M, Haas LA, Morsci NS, Nguyen KC, Hall DH, et al. C. elegans
930   ciliated sensory neurons release extracellular vesicles that function in animal
931   communication. Curr Biol. 2014;24(5):519-25. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2014.01.002.
932   PubMed PMID: 24530063; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4659354.
933 80. Kosinski M, McDonald K, Schwartz J, Yamamoto I, Greenstein D. C. elegans
934   sperm bud vesicles to deliver a meiotic maturation signal to distant oocytes.
935   Development. 2005;132(15):3357-69. doi: 10.1242/dev.01916. PubMed PMID:
936   15975936.
937 81. Mapes J, Chen YZ, Kim A, Mitani S, Kang BH, Xue D. CED-1, CED-7, and
938   TTR-52 regulate surface phosphatidylserine expression on apoptotic and

phagocytic cells. Curr Biol. 2012;22(14):1267-75. doi:
10.1016/j.cub.2012.05.052. PubMed PMID: 22727702; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC3816170.

82.   Wehman AM, Poggioli C, Schweinsberg P, Grant BD, Nance J. The P4-ATPase
TAT-5 inhibits the budding of extracellular vesicles in C. elegans embryos. Curr
Biol. 2011;21(23):1951-9. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2011.10.040. PubMed PMID:
22100064; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3237752.

83.   Fridman K. Ultrastructure and function of AFF-1 and EFF-1 in membrane
remodeling: Technion - Israel Institute of Technology; 2012.

84.   Avinoam O, Podbilewicz B. Eukaryotic cell-cell fusion families. Curr Top
Membr. 2011;68:209-34. Epub 2011/07/21. doi: B978-0-12-385891-7.00009-X
[pii] 10.1016/B978-0-12-385891-7.00009-X. PubMed PMID: 21771501.

85.   Jorgensen EM, Rankin C. Neural Plasticity. In: Riddle DL, Blumenthal T,
Meyer BJ, Priess JR, editors. C elegans II. 2nd ed. Cold Spring Harbor
(NY)1997.

86.   Hayashi Y, Hirotsu T, Iwata R, Kage-Nakadai E, Kunitomo H, Ishihara T, et al.
A trophic role for Wnt-Ror kinase signaling during developmental pruning in
Caenorhabditis elegans. Nat Neurosci. 2009;12(8):981-7. doi: 10.1038/nn.2347.
PubMed PMID: 19561603.

87.   Tessier CR, Broadie K. Drosophila fragile X mental retardation protein
developmentally regulates activity-dependent axon pruning. Development.
2008;135(8):1547-57. PubMed PMID: 18321984.

88.   Singh KK, Park KJ, Hong EJ, Kramer BM, Greenberg ME, Kaplan DR, et al.
Developmental axon pruning mediated by BDNF-p75NTR-dependent axon
degeneration. Nat Neurosci. 2008;11(6):649-58. PubMed PMID: 18382462.

89.   Schuldiner O, Berdnik D, Levy JM, Wu JS, Luginbuhl D, Gontang AC, et al.
piggyBac-based mosaic screen identifies a postmitotic function for cohesin in
regulating developmental axon pruning. Dev Cell. 2008;14(2):227-38. PubMed
PMID: 18267091.

90.   Helton TD, Otsuka T, Lee MC, Mu Y, Ehlers MD. Pruning and loss of
excitatory synapses by the parkin ubiquitin ligase. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
2008;105(49):19492-7. PubMed PMID: 19033459.

91.   Zhai Q, Wang J, Kim A, Liu Q, Watts R, Hoopfer E, et al. Involvement of the
ubiquitin-proteasome system in the early stages of wallerian degeneration.
Neuron. 2003;39(2):217-25. PubMed PMID: 12873380.

92.   Martin SM, O'Brien GS, Portera-Cailliau C, Sagasti A. Wallerian degeneration
of zebrafish trigeminal axons in the skin is required for regeneration and
developmental pruning. Development. 2010;137(23):3985-94. doi:
10.1242/dev.053611. PubMed PMID: 21041367; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC2976282.

93.   Kage E, Hayashi Y, Takeuchi H, Hirotsu T, Kunitomo H, Inoue T, et al. MBR-
1, a novel helix-turn-helix transcription factor, is required for pruning excessive
neurites in Caenorhabditis elegans. Curr Biol. 2005;15(17):1554-9. doi:
10.1016/j.cub.2005.07.057. PubMed PMID: 16139210.

94.   Paltsyn A, Komissarova S, Dubrovin I, Kubatiev A. Increased cell fusion in
cerebral cortex may contribute to poststroke regeneration. Stroke research and
treatment. 2013;2013:869327. doi: 10.1155/2013/869327. PubMed PMID:
23691431; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3649807.

95.   Yaniv SP, Issman-Zecharya N, Oren-Suissa M, Podbilewicz B, Schuldiner O.
Axon Regrowth during Development and Regeneration Following Injury Share

Molecular Mechanisms. Curr Biol. 2012;22:1774-82. Epub 2012/08/28. doi:
10.1016/j.cub.2012.07.044. PubMed PMID: 22921367.

96. Bradke F, Fawcett JW, Spira ME. Assembly of a new growth cone after
axotomy: the precursor to axon regeneration. Nat Rev Neurosci.
2012;13(3):183-93. doi: 10.1038/nrn3176. PubMed PMID: 22334213.

97. Mar FM, Bonni A, Sousa MM. Cell intrinsic control of axon regeneration.
EMBO reports. 2014;15(3):254-63. doi: 10.1002/embr.201337723. PubMed
PMID: 24531721; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3989691.

98. Wang H, Macagno ER. A detached branch stops being recognized as self by
other branches of a neuron. Journal of neurobiology. 1998;35(1):53-64. PubMed
PMID: 9552166.

99. Moritz CT, Perlmutter SI, Fetz EE. Direct control of paralysed muscles by
cortical neurons. Nature. 2008;456(7222):639-42. PubMed PMID: 18923392.

100. Brenner S. The genetics of *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Genetics. 1974;77:71-94.

101. Sulston J, Hodgkin J. Methods. In: Wood WB, editor. The Nematode
Caenorhabditis elegans. Cold Spring Harbor: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory;
1988. p. 587-606.

102. Mello C, Fire A. DNA transformation. In: Epstein HF, Shakes DC, editors.
Methods in Cell Biology *Caenorhabditis elegans*: Model Biological Analysis
of an Organism. 48. San Diego: Academic Press; 1995. p. 451-82.

103. Bond SR, Naus CC. RF-Cloning.org: an online tool for the design of restriction-
free cloning projects. Nucleic Acids Res. 2012;40(Web Server issue):W209-13.
doi: 10.1093/nar/gks396. PubMed PMID: 22570410; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC3394257.

104. Petersen LK, Stowers RS. A Gateway MultiSite recombination cloning toolkit.
PLoS One. 2011;6(9):e24531. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0024531. PubMed
PMID: 21931740; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3170369.

105. McCarter J, Bartlett B, Dang T, Schedl T. On the control of oocyte meiotic
maturation and ovulation in Caenorhabditis elegans. Dev Biol.
1999;205(1):111-28. PubMed PMID: 9882501.

106. McCarter J, Bartlett B, Dang T, Schedl T. Soma-germ cell interactions in
Caenorhabditis elegans: multiple events of hermaphrodite germline
development require the somatic sheath and spermathecal lineages. Dev Biol.
1997;181(2):121-43. PubMed PMID: 9013925.

107. Kirby C, Kusch M, Kemphues K. Mutations in the *par* genes of *Caenorhabditis*
elegans affect cytoplasmic reorganization during the first cell cycle. Dev Biol.
1990;142:203-15.

1026

1027

Supporting information captions

S1 Fig. Dendritic amputation induces hyper-branching, loss of self-avoidance and giant overlapping menorahs

(A) Wild-type animal before dendrotomy.

(B) Two laser-induced injuries of primary branches (red arrowheads, injury sites).

(C) Confocal projection and a schematic tracing of the same animal 24 hr post-surgery. Asterisks mark new sprouting from proximal and distal branches. Pink brackets, giant menorahs. Blue arrowheads, primary branch fusion.

(D) A different wild-type animal injured (red arrowhead) at the early L4 stage, recovered and analyzed 24 **(E)** and 46 hr **(F)** post-surgery. Black arrow, retrograde branch. The degenerating branches are represented as dotted lines in the schematic tracing. Scale bars represent 5 μm **(D)** and 10 μm **(A-C, E-F).**

S2 Fig. Menorah fusion and 2ry stem pruning are part of the regeneration process of the PVDs following dendrotomy

(A) Dendrotomy of L4 wild-type animal. Red arrowheads point to sites of laser surgery.

(B) Analysis 48 hr post-surgery. Giant menorah can be seen (pink bracket); arrows (and dotted lines in the schematic tracing) point to secondary branches undergoing trimming. Blue arrowheads mark primary branch fusion at the sites of dendrotomy. Scale bars represent 10 μm.

S3 Fig. PVD dendrite reconnection confirmed by Kaede photoconversion

A PVD primary dendrite of *ser-2prom3::Kaede* expressing animals was dendrotomized, the animal was recovered for 23 hr and the dendrite reconnection to its stump was assessed by Kaede photoconversion. The green Kaede form in the PVD cell body was irreversibly photo-converted to the red Kaede form using a 405nm laser with the Mosaic system and its spreading throughout the dendritic branches was followed 1 and 60 min post-photoconversion. Panels left to right are confocal reconstructions of a wild-type dendrotomized animal in the 488 green channel, 561 red channel, two channels merged view and a schematic representation of the merged view.

(A) Confocal reconstructions of the animal before dendrotomy, **(B)** immediately post dendrotomy, **(C)** 23 hr post-dendrotomy, **(D)** 1 min post Kaede photoconversion and **(E)** 60 min post Kaede photoconversion. Green Kaede (magenta in merged and schematic representation). Red Kaede form (cyan in merged and schematic representations), though diluted when spreading through the dendritic tree, can be observed beyond the reconnected site of injury in the distal part of the primary and higher ordered dendritic branches. Thus, Kaede photoconversion and diffusion beyond the injury site demonstrate fusion between the severed primary dendrite. In

animals where reconnection failed photoconverted Kaede did not spread beyond the
injury site (data not shown).
c, PVD cell body; red arrowhead, site of injury; blue arrowhead, site of primary
branch fusion. In the merged and schematic columns: magenta, green Kaede; cyan,
photoconverted red Kaede.

S4 Fig. Ectopic expression of AFF-1 does not improve PVD regeneration in heterozygous animals

(A) Regeneration by menorah-menorah fusion following PVD nanosurgery in *C. elegans aff-1(tm2214)/mln1; dpy-7p::aff-1* animals. PVD is shown before and after nanosurgery (T=0, 3, and 4 hr). PVD reconnection occurred through fused menorahs (pink bracket) and primary fusion did not occur (red arrowhead).

(B) Dendrite regeneration following PVD primary branch nanosurgery in *C. elegans aff-1(tm2214)/mln1; dpy-7p::aff-1* animals. PVD is shown before and after nanosurgery (T=0 and 2 hr). PVD reconnection occurred through primary fusion (blue arrowhead).

(C) Animals showing different PVD post injury consequences displayed in color coded pie graphs as Magenta- Menorah-Menorah fusion, Blue- primary-primary fusion, Magenta and Blue- Menorah-Menorah fusion and primary-primary fusion, Black-degeneration. Wild type n=22; *aff-1(tm2214)* n=32; *aff-1/mln1; des-2p::AFF-1* n=10, *aff-1(tm2214) /mln1; grd-10p::aff-1* n=11, *aff-1(tm2214)/mln1; dpy-7p::aff-*1 n=14. *P<0.05. P values for wild type and heterozygous genotypes are not significant (NS). Statistics was calculated using the Freeman-Halton extension of the Fisher exact probability test for a two-rows by four-columns contingency table, http://vassarstats.net/fisher2x4.html.

Dendrotomy site, red arrowhead; fused Menorah, pink bracket; primary fusion, blue arrowhead. Scale bars represent 20 μm.

S5 Fig. Model of AFF-1-mediated repair via extracellular vesicle-cell fusion
PVD (red) is in close proximity to the epithelial seam cells (blue). AFF-1 (black pins) is expressed in seam cells and additional tissues, but not in the PVD. Upon injury, AFF-1-containing extracellular vesicles (EVs) are highly released from the seam cells. Some of these EVs reach the PVD and promote fusion of severed dendrites. EFF-1 (green pins) is expressed in the PVD but it does not act to fuse severed dendrites on its own. Instead it may collaborate with AFF-1-EVs. We propose that menorah-menorah fusion is mediated by AFF-1-EVs that merge with the structurally compatible EFF-1 expressed in the PVD. EFF-1-coated pseudotyped viruses can fuse with cells expressing AFF-1 on their surface and vice versa [68].

Supplemental movies captions

Movie 1. PVD dendrites touch and fuse following dendrotomy

Time lapse recording of an L4 wild-type animal just after injury. The z series images were recorded every 6 min, marker is *F49H12.4::GFP*. Arrows mark areas of fusing menorah tertiary branches. C marks PVD cell body.

Movie 2. A pseudo-colored presentation of depth information for Movie 1

Scale bar for the position in the z axis is shown at the bottom. The movie was obtained using the Zeiss LSM image browser DepthCod function.

Movie 3. Degeneration of the distal fragment following dendrotomy

Time lapse recording of a wild-type L4 animal after a two-photon injury. Posterior PVCR and PVCL are also marked with the *DES-2::GFP* marker and can be seen at the upper right corner. See **Fig 1G**.

Movie 4. Fusion and pruning during the PVD regeneration process

Intensity-values view of a time-lapse recording of an early L4 animal. Marker is *F49H12.4::GFP*. Menorahs from proximal and distal ends meet and fuse, bypassing the break induced by the two-photon injury. At the injury site growth and pruning of dendrites can be seen. Intensity scale bar is in **Fig 2D**.

Movie 5. AFF-1::GFP expression in PVD intact animals

Time lapse recording of *AFF-1::GFP* (cyan) expression inside and outside the seam cells (sc), and in the vulva (V) of an intact L4 animal shown in a two channels merged image. The z series images were recorded every 10 sec, PVD marker is *F49H12.4p::mCherry* (magenta). Arrows mark AFF-1 vesicles. See **Fig 4B**. The trajectory of vesicle 1 is shown in **Fig 4E**. Gut marks autofluorescent gut granules, easily distinguishable from AFF-1 vesicles in size, shape, and appearance in both channels.

Movie 6. AFF-1::GFP expression in PVD intact animals (zoom in of movie 5)

A magnification of a single *AFF-1::GFP* vesicle near the seam cells, ("vesicle 1").

Movie 7. AFF-1::GFP expression in PVD primary branch of injured animals

Time lapse recording of *AFF-1::GFP* expression (cyan) inside and outside the seam

cells (sc), in the anchor cell (AC) and in the vulva (V) of a reconnected PVD L4

animal after a two-photon injury anterior to PVD cell body. T=0 is 75 min after

injury. The z series images were recorded every 20 sec, PVD marker is

F49H12.4p::mCherry (magenta). Arrows point to vesicles containing AFF-1::GFP.

Movie 8. Magnification of Movie 7

Magnification of an area with multiple vesicles, two are labeled (2,3). See **Fig 4 D-E.**

Movie 9. AFF-1::GFP expression in PVD intact animal

Time lapse recording of *AFF-1::GFP* (cyan) expression inside and outside the seam

cells (SC) of an intact L4 animal shown in a two channels merged image. The z series

images were recorded every 10 sec, PVD marker is *F49H12.4p::mCherry* (magenta).

Arrows mark AFF-1 vesicles.

Movies 10 and 11. AFF-1::GFP expression in a degraded PVD primary branch

of injured animals

Time lapse recording of *AFF-1::GFP* expression (cyan) inside and outside the seam

cells (sc) of a reconnected PVD L4 animal after a two-photon injury anterior to PVD

cell body, red arrowhead is the site of injury. T=0 is 75 min (movie10) and 150 min

(movie 11) after injury. The z series images were recorded every 2 sec, PVD marker

is *F49H12.4p::mCherry* (magenta). Arrows point to vesicles containing AFF-1::GFP.