SyNPL: Synthetic Notch pluripotent cell lines to monitor and manipulate cell
interactions *in vitro* and *in vivo*.

Running title: Engineering cell interactions

Mattias Malaguti[1,‡], Rosa Portero Migueles[1], Jennifer Annoh[1], Daina Sadurska[1,2], Guillaume Blin[1],
Sally Lowell[1,‡]

1. Centre for Regenerative Medicine, Institute for Stem Cell Research, School of Biological
7   Sciences, University of Edinburgh, 5 Little France Drive, Edinburgh EH16 4UU, UK
8   2. Current address: Sir William Dunn School of Pathology, University of Oxford, Oxford, United
9   Kingdom

‡   Authors for correspondence: mattias.malaguti@ed.ac.uk sally.lowell@ed.ac.uk

Keywords: Cell interaction; SynNotch; pluripotent stem cells; cell engineering, patterning.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Optimised Synthetic Notch circuitry in mouse pluripotent stem cells provides a modular tool to
monitor cell-cell interactions and program synthetic patterning of cell fates in culture and in
embryos.

17
18
19

ABSTRACT

Cell-cell interactions govern differentiation and cell competition in pluripotent cells during early
development, but the investigation of such processes is hindered by a lack of efficient analysis tools.
Here we introduce SyNPL: clonal pluripotent stem cell lines which employ optimised Synthetic Notch
(SynNotch) technology to report cell-cell interactions between engineered "sender" and "receiver"
cells in cultured pluripotent cells and chimaeric mouse embryos. A modular design makes it
straightforward to adapt the system for programming differentiation decisions non-cell-
autonomously in receiver cells in response to direct contact with sender cells. We demonstrate the
utility of this system by enforcing neuronal differentiation at the boundary between two cell
populations. In summary, we provide a new tool which could be used to identify cell interactions and
to profile changes in gene or protein expression that result from direct cell-cell contact with defined
cell populations in culture and in early embryos, and which can be adapted to generate synthetic
patterning of cell fate decisions.

INTRODUCTION

During embryogenesis, pluripotent cells undergo a series of cell fate decisions that are controlled by
interactions between epiblast cells, their early differentiated derivatives, and the surrounding
extraembryonic tissues (Arnold and Robertson, 2009; Nowotschin and Hadjantonakis, 2010; Rossant
and Tam, 2009). The transcriptional changes that accompany exit from pluripotency and
differentiation into specific cell types have been extensively characterised, and the long-range signals
that control these changes are now well understood (De Los Angeles et al., 2015; Kinoshita and Smith,
2018; Pera and Tam, 2010; Posfai et al., 2021; Tam and Loebel, 2007). Less is known about how early
developmental decisions are influenced by direct interactions of cells with their neighbours. It is well
established that cell-cell interactions play a key role in development (Dias et al., 2014; Gurdon, 1987;
Johnson and Ziomek, 1983; Schultz, 1985), but until recently there has been a paucity of molecular
and technological tools available to study these processes in detail in relevant settings (Nishida-Aoki
and Gujral, 2019; Yang et al., 2021).

Quantitative image analysis can be used to identify and infer the effect of neighbours on the properties
of cells of interest in fixed samples (Blin et al., 2018; Fischer et al., 2020; Forsyth et al., 2021; Toth et
al., 2018). We have recently developed a software suite for automated neighbour identification during
live imaging (Blin et al., 2019), which provides researchers with a further dimension to study the
effects on cell-cell interactions on cell fate decisions. Whilst live image analysis provides high-
resolution visual information, this approach is labour-intensive and only leads to neighbour
identification *a posteriori*.

The nascent field of Synthetic Developmental Biology (Davies, 2017; Ebrahimkhani and Ebisuya, 2019;
Ho and Morsut, 2021; Santorelli et al., 2019; Schlissel and Li, 2020) seeks to understand the
mechanisms of patterning and cell differentiation through the engineering of genetic circuits (Cachat
et al., 2016; Matsuda et al., 2015; Sekine et al., 2018). By re-engineering the Notch/Delta signalling
cascade (Figure 1A), Lim and colleagues generated a synthetic circuit capable of reporting and
manipulating cell-cell interactions in real time (Morsut et al., 2016). In this system, a "sender" cell
presenting an extracellular membrane-bound antigen of interest is recognised by a "receiver" cell
expressing a chimaeric Synthetic Notch (SynNotch) receptor, composed of an extracellular antigen-
recognition domain, the Notch1 core transmembrane domain containing proteolytic cleavage sites,
and an intracellular synthetic effector domain (Fig. 1B-D). Thanks to the modularity of the SynNotch

circuitry, it is therefore possible to interrogate and manipulate the effects of interactions between cell
types of interest.

SynNotch technology has been used for monitoring cell-cell interactions, generating synthetic
patterns, generating synthetic morphogen gradients, inducing contact-mediated gene editing, and
generating custom antigen receptor T-cells (Cho et al., 2018; Choe et al., 2021; He et al., 2017; Huang
et al., 2020; Roybal et al., 2016; Sgodda et al., 2020; Toda et al., 2018; Toda et al., 2020; Wang et al.,
2021). SynNotch technology has been established in *Drosophila* (He et al., 2017) as well as in
immortalised cell lines and differentiated cell types, but its potential in the study of mammalian
developmental events remains largely untapped.

Mouse embryonic stem cells (ESCs) can be differentiated into any cell type of interest *in vitro*, can give
rise to chimaeric embryos and can be used to establish transgenic mouse lines (Bradley et al., 1984;
Evans and Kaufman, 1981; Martin, 1981). Adapting the SynNotch system for use in mouse ESCs would
therefore permit monitoring and manipulation of cell-cell interactions in a developmental context
both *in vivo* and *in vitro*. The original system designed by (Morsut et al., 2016) used lentiviral
transduction of immortalised and primary cell lines, where transgene expression was driven from the
retroviral SFFV promoter. Lentiviral transduction can lead to multiple copy transgene integration in
mouse ESCs (Pfeifer et al., 2002), and the SFFV promoter is prone to silencing in mouse pluripotent
cells and their derivatives (Herbst et al., 2012; Pfaff et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2011), making this system
suboptimal for mouse ESCs.

In this study, we made a number of adaptations to the original SynNotch system (Morsut et al., 2016)
in order to establish clonal modular SynNotch pluripotent cell lines (SyNPL). We characterised the
properties of this SyNPL system by monitoring interactions between EGFP-expressing sender cells and
mCherry-inducible receiver cells *in vitro*, then showed that this system can report interactions
between neighbouring cells *in vivo* in chimaeric mouse embryos, that it can be used for synthetic
patterning, and that its flexible and modular design can be exploited to conveniently manipulate cell-
cell interactions and drive contact-mediated synthetic cell fate engineering.

RESULTS

Design of SyNPL ESCs

We set out to adapt the SynNotch system, which was previously established through viral transduction
of immortalised mouse L929 fibroblasts and K562 erythroleukaemic cells (Morsut et al., 2016), for use
in mouse ESCs. In this system, sender cells are labelled with membrane-tethered extracellular EGFP
(Fig. 1B). Receiver cells constitutively express a SynNotch receptor composed of an anti-GFP nanobody
(LaG17) (Fridy et al., 2014), the mouse Notch1 minimal transmembrane core (Uniprot: Q01705,
residues 1427-1752), and a tetracycline transactivator (tTA) (Gossen and Bujard, 1992), and contain a
tetracycline response element (TRE) promoter capable of driving *mCherry* expression in response to
tTA binding (Fig. 1C). Interaction of EGFP on sender cells with the anti-GFP nanobody on receiver cells
leads to cleavage of the Notch1 core, releasing the tTA which can translocate to the nucleus, bind to
the TRE promoter and drive *mCherry* expression (Fig. 1D). In addition, we constitutively labelled
receiver cells with a tagBFP-3xNLS construct (Fig. 1C,D) to conveniently identify them by fluorescence
microscopy and flow cytometry even in the absence of a contact-dependent mCherry signal.

Our aims when adapting the SynNotch system were to generate ESC lines with low cell-cell variability,
robust and sustained transgene expression, and a modular design to allow convenient transgene

exchange. In order to avoid cell-cell variability we elected to generate clonal cell ESC lines with stable
genomic integration of the SynNotch system components, delivering transgenes by electroporation
rather than lentiviral transduction (Boggs et al., 1986; Charrier et al., 2011; Pfeifer et al., 2002;
Smithies et al., 1985). We sought to ensure uniform levels of transgene expression by screening clonal
lines and/or targeting transgenes to specific genomic locations, and by replacing the silencing-prone
SFFV retroviral promoter used by (Morsut et al., 2016) with CAG (Niwa et al., 1991) or mouse *Pgk1*
(McBurney et al., 1991) promoters, which have been extensively characterised in mouse ESCs (Chen
et al., 2011; Hong et al., 2007). Finally, we set out to introduce modularity to our system by generating
a "landing platform" master cell line to allow recombination-mediated cassette exchange (RMCE) of
transgenes of interest.

Generation of extracellular membrane-tethered EGFP-expressing sender ESCs

We first generated clonal sender cell lines expressing membrane-tethered extracellular EGFP. The CAG
and mouse *Pgk1* promoters are both silencing-resistant promoters commonly used to drive ubiquitous
transgene expression in ESCs (Herbst et al., 2012; Liew et al., 2007). We set out to determine which of
these promoters can generate viable sender cells with strong and uniform expression of membrane
EGFP. We also wished to explore whether EGFP molecules with HA and Myc protein tags can retain
"sender" function in pluripotent cells.

We electroporated mouse ESCs with four sender constructs, containing either CAG or mouse *Pgk1*
promoters driving expression of either untagged or HA- and Myc-tagged EGFP fused to a membrane-
tethering domain (Fig. 2A-D). We isolated and expanded 64 clonal lines derived from stable genomic
integration of the four constructs, and screened them by flow cytometry, analysing median EGFP
intensity (Fig. 2E,F), percentage of EGFP-positive cells (Fig. 2G,H) and EGFP distribution (Figs. S1, S2).
Both CAG and *Pgk1* promoters are capable of driving high uniform expression of EGFP, and, as
expected, there is considerable variability in EGFP expression between clonal lines.

We selected one untagged EGFP sender clone (CmGP1) and one HA- and Myc-tagged EGFP sender
clone (CHmGMP19), exhibiting high, uniform and similar levels EGFP expression (Fig. 2I) for further
analysis. For both clones, the pattern of EGFP expression appeared to be consistent with membrane
localisation, and, in the case of the HA- and Myc-tagged CHmGMP19 clone, the pattern of HA and Myc
expression appeared to coincide with that of EGFP (Fig. 2J).

Generation of a safe harbour site landing pad master ESC line

To facilitate convenient and repeated modification of the genome, we generated a clonal ESC line
carrying a "landing pad" targeted to the *Rosa26* locus, a safe harbour site in the mouse genome
(Friedrich and Soriano, 1991). This landing pad contains a splice acceptor, the *Neo* (G418/geneticin
resistance) gene, and a CAG promoter driving expression of *mKate2-3xNLS*, which encodes a red
fluorescent protein with no evident phenotypic effect in mouse embryos (Malaguti et al., 2013;
Shcherbo et al., 2009). This entire cassette is flanked by two *attP50* sites, which allows for φC31
integrase-mediated recombination with cassettes flanked by two *attB53* sites (Huang et al., 2009;
Tosti et al., 2018) (Fig. S3A). After confirming insertion at the correct genomic locus (Fig. S3B), we
verified that all cells express high and uniform levels of mKate2-3xNLS (Fig. S3C,D). We named this cell
line EM35.

An "all-in-one" design fails to generate fully functional mCherry inducible receiver cells

We first set out to investigate whether it would be possible to target all transcriptional units required
for receiver cell activity to the *Rosa26* landing pad in EM35 ESCs, and whether this would lead to the

generation of functional receiver ESCs. The design and characterisation of the resulting cell lines is
explained in detail in Supplementary Methods and Figs. S4-S9. Briefly, we found that mCherry could,
as expected, be induced by subpopulations of tagBFP-positive receiver cells in response to interaction
with EGFP-positive sender cells, but that this particular receiver cell design was hampered by variable
levels of tagBFP, variable inducibility of mCherry, and low levels of the SynNotch receptor. We
conclude that the SynNotch receptor construct and *TRE-mCherry* cassette can function as expected in
ESCs, but that further modifications to the design are required to obtain a reliable contact-reporting
system.

A multi-step design produces fully functional mCherry-inducible receiver ESCs

We hypothesised that two independent events may be affecting mCherry inducibility during our initial
attempts to generate "all-in-one-locus" receiver cells (Figs. S4-S9). Firstly, we speculated that *mCherry*
and *tagBFP* transgenes may have been lost from the genome due to mitotic recombination (Stern,
1936) or due to errors in replication at similar DNA sequences in close proximity (*Pgk1* promoters,
bGHpA signals). Secondly, we suspected that the expression levels of the SynNotch receptor were not
sufficient for efficient mCherry induction (Fig. S9).

We planned to circumvent the issue of potential loss of DNA by physically separating the three
transcriptional units through random genomic integration of the SynNotch receptor cassette and of
the *tagBFP-3xNLS* cassette, and by removing identical DNA sequences. To attempt to increase levels
of SynNotch receptor and to obtain uniform levels of tagBFP-3xNLS, we added an internal ribosome
entry site (IRES) followed by *Ble* (zeocin resistance gene) downstream of the SynNotch receptor
sequence, and an IRES followed by *Hph* (hygromycin B resistance gene) downstream of the *tagBFP-*
3xNLS sequence (Fig. 3A).

In order to generate these cells, we first randomly integrated the SynNotch receptor construct into
the genome of EM35 landing pad ESCs (Fig. S10A). We screened 87 clones for Myc expression, and
selected two clones (35SRZ9, 35SRZ86) with high, uniform Myc expression (Fig. S10B). The levels of
Myc in these clones were higher than those observed in receiver cells generated with an all-in-one
design (clones SNCB+4 and SNCB-6) and higher than those observed in Myc-tagged sender cells
(CHmGMP19) (Fig. S10C). We then randomly integrated the *tagBFP-3xNLS* transgene into the genome
of these two clones (Fig. S10D). We screened a total of 36 clones and selected one for each parental
line with high, uniform expression of tagBFP-3xNLS (PSNB-A clone 10, PSNB-B clone 3) (Fig. S10E,F).
We renamed these lines PSNB (Parental SynNotch tagBFP) clones A and B respectively.

Next, we performed RMCE at the *Rosa26* landing pad in PSNB cells to replace the *mKate2* transgene
with one of three constructs: the *TRE-mCherry* cassette present in the SCNB construct, a *tetO-mCherry*
cassette with more tTA binding sequences elements in the inducible promoter (to test whether this
led to improved mCherry induction), or an empty vector cassette to generate tagBFP-positive mKate2-
and mCherry-negative control cell lines (Fig. S11A). We verified that integration of the empty vector
cassette led to loss of mKate2 expression, and used these control cell lines to confirm that tagBFP
signal was able to unambiguously identify receiver cells (Figs. 3B,C, S11B).

We then set out to test whether the new receiver cell lines containing inducible mCherry cassettes
expressed mCherry in response to co-culture with sender cells. We screened 27 clones for tagBFP and
mCherry expression by culturing them in the presence or absence of sender cells for 24 hours (Fig.
S11C-G). We observed that all genetically identical clones behaved very similarly, suggesting we were
not experiencing silencing or loss of DNA. Clones containing the larger *tetO-mCherry* cassette
exhibited high levels of mCherry leakiness in the absence of sender cells. Co-culture with sender cells

led to significant mCherry induction, but the distributions in the presence and absence of sender cells
overlapped significantly (Fig. S11D,F,G). Clones containing the smaller *TRE-mCherry* cassette exhibited
mCherry leakiness in the absence of sender cells, however co-culture with sender cells led to an
increase in mCherry expression to levels which displayed minimal overlap with those seen in cells
cultured in the absence of sender cells (Fig. S11C,E,G). Leakiness in the absence of sender cells can be
reduced, but not abolished, by treatment of cells with the γ-secretase inhibitor DAPT (which inhibits
cleavage of the SynNotch receptor) or with doxycycline (which inhibits tTA-driven transcription) (Fig.
S12A,B).

We selected three clones with minimal leakiness and high inducibility for downstream analysis
(PSNBA-TRE1, PSNBB-TRE10, PSNBB-TRE9). We renamed these cells STC (for SynNotch-TRE-mCherry)
clones A1, B1 and B2 respectively. We verified that these receiver lines could induce mCherry following
cell-cell interaction with sender cells by co-culturing sender and receiver cells together for 24 hours.
We observed specific induction of mCherry by tagBFP-positive receiver cells in contact with EGFP-
positive sender cells (Fig. 3D). We used flow cytometry to confirm that mCherry is robustly induced in
the majority of tagBFP-positive receiver cells following co-culture with 9-fold excess of CmGP1 sender
cells at confluence (Fig 3B,C,E,F).

These observations suggest that physical separation of the three transcriptional units in the genome
of receiver cells, coupled to the use of internal ribosome entry sites and selectable markers within the
units, can lead to the generation of receiver ESC lines which exhibit clear and specific induction of
mCherry upon interaction with EGFP-expressing sender cells.

214　Extracellular membrane-tethered EGFP is required for contact-mediated transgene induction in
215　receiver cells

It would be useful to make use of existing GFP fluorescent reporter ESCs (for example, cell-state
reporters or signalling reporters) to act as sender cells, in order to test how particular cell states may
influence direct neighbours. However, many such cell lines make use of non-membrane-tethered GFP,
which is unlikely to interact with the anti-GFP nanobody on STC receiver cells. We therefore wished
to test whether membrane tethering of EGFP to the extracellular space was absolutely necessary for
effective neighbour-labelling.

We profiled mCherry levels in STC receiver cells by flow cytometry following 24 hours of co-culture
with "sender" cells carrying different transgenes (Fig. 3E-H). We cultured STC receiver cells alone (Fig.
3E), in the presence of CmGP1 sender cells (Fig. 3F), in the presence of a control cell line expressing
untagged intracellular EGFP (E14GIP1) (Fig. 3G), or in the presence of CmGP1 sender cells containing
an extra untagged intracellular EGFP transgene (CmGP1GH1) (Fig. 3H). We found that E14GIP1 cells,
which do not express membrane-tethered EGFP, did not induce mCherry above baseline levels in in
co-cultured STC receiver cells (Fig. 3E-G). Furthermore, we observed that mCherry is induced to similar
levels following co-culture with either CmGP1 or CmGP1GH1 sender cells (Fig. 3F,H), suggesting that
the additional untagged EGFP transgene in CmGP1GH1 cells does not interfere with mCherry induction
by the extracellular EGFP transgene. We conclude that cells containing intracellular GFP would not be
capable of functioning as sender cells unless supplemented with extracellular membrane tethered
EGFP.

234　tagBFP-3xNLS lineage label allows identification of EGFP cross-labelled receiver cells

In other cell types, a membrane-tethered anti-GFP nanobody can bind and internalise membrane-
tethered GFP on neighbouring cells (Tang et al., 2020). We find that this is also the case in ES cells (Fig.
S12B): punctuate EGFP signal is visible in mCherry-expressing activated receiver cells (Fig. S12C). It

could therefore be difficult to unambiguously separate of STC receiver cells from CmGP1 sender cells
by flow cytometry based on EGFP expression alone (Fig. S12D). This problem is overcome by making
use of the tagBFP-3xNLS lineage label in STC receiver cells. Furthermore, separation of sender and
receiver cells based on EGFP alone can be achieved if using CmGP1GH1 sender cells, which contain a
second EGFP transgene, leading to increased separation between sender cells and cross-labelled
receiver cells (Fig. S12F,G).

Increasing sender:receiver cell ratios leads to increased transgene induction in receiver cells

We next asked how differing sender:receiver cell ratios affect the efficiency of neighbour-labelling.
We co-cultured STC receiver cells with different proportions of sender cells for 24 hours (Fig. S13). We
observed that as few as 20% of sender cells were sufficient to induce mCherry in approximately half
of STC receiver cells, and that 90% sender cells could induce mCherry in over 90% of STC receiver cells
(Fig. S13A,B). mCherry fluorescence follows a bimodal distribution in receiver cells exposed to "non-
saturating" numbers of sender cells, and a unimodal distribution in receiver cells exposed to
"saturating" numbers of sender cells (Fig. S13C-H). This suggests that STC receiver cells which have
come into contact with sender cells can uniformly induce high levels of mCherry expression, as
observed by immunofluorescence when co-culturing cells at a 9:1 sender:receiver cell ratio (Fig. S13I-
K).

HA- and Myc-tags on EGFP do not affect sender cell function

An epitope tag fused to EGFP could be helpful for unequivocally identifying and isolating sender cells,
but carries the risk of interfering with sender function. Having generated sender cells with HA- and
Myc-tagged (CHmGMP19) and untagged (CmGP1) EGFP molecules, we sought to understand whether
tagged and untagged EGFP differed in their ability to induce transgene expression in receiver cells. We
therefore compared the ability of each sender line to induce mCherry expression in the previously
described experiment, where we cultured STC receiver cells with CmGP1 or CHmGMP19 sender cells
at varying sender:receiver cell ratios (Fig. S13). Both CmGP1 and CHmGMP19 sender cell lines can
drive mCherry induction to similar extents (Fig. S13A-H), suggesting that the LaG17 nanobody on the
SynNotch receptor can recognise both untagged and HA- and Myc-tagged EGFP, and that these tags
do not compromise sender function.

Kinetics of contact-dependent transgene induction in receiver cells

We next performed time-lapse microscopy. In order to capture a range of behaviours, we co-cultured
CmGP1GH1 sender cells with STC receiver cells at a 1:1 sender:receiver ratio at moderate density, and
filmed cells for 24 hours (Fig. 4A, Movie 1). mCherry first became visible 5-6 hours after initial sender-
receiver contact (Fig. 4A, yellow arrowheads). We observed STC receiver cells which did not make
contact with sender cells and remained mCherry-negative (Fig. 4A, magenta arrowheads), and an STC
receiver cell that made contact with a sender cell 2 hours before the cells were fixed at the 24-hour
timepoint for immunofluorescence, and which remained mCherry-negative (Fig. 4A, cyan
arrowheads).

We then quantified the kinetics of mCherry induction. We co-cultured 10% STC receiver cells with 90%
sender cells at high density in order to ensure interaction of almost every receiver cell with at least
one sender cell (Fig. 4B, Movie 2), and analysed mCherry expression in receiver cells by flow cytometry
over the course of 72 hours (Figs. 4C-E, S14A,B), and by live imaging over the course of 24 hours (Figs.
4B,F,G, S14C-H). mCherry is first induced at low levels at the 5-hour timepoint, and its expression
keeps increasing until the 48-hour timepoint (Figs. 4D-G, S14). We verified that mCherry signal

increases over time in receiver cells not only at the population level (Figs. 4D-F, S14A-E), but also within
individually tracked cells (Figs. 4G, S14F-H).

Minimum time of contact required for transgene induction

Relying on direct detection of mCherry (Fig 4C-G) is likely to overestimate the minimum duration of
cell contact required for mCherry induction because mCherry protein maturation will introduce a
time-lag between initiation of mCherry transcription and the detection of mCherry fluorescence. For
example, when analysing further time-lapse experiments (Fig. 5A, Movie 3), we noticed an example
of an STC receiver cell which remained in contact with a sender cell for 8 hours, lost contact for 12
hours following a cell division, but kept increasing its levels of mCherry in the meantime (Fig. 5A, white
arrowheads).

We designed an experimental strategy to overcome this problem. We co-cultured 10% STC receiver
cells with 90% CmGP1 sender cells for various time points between 0 and 24 hours, then added
doxycycline to the culture medium for a further 16 hours (Fig. 5B). Doxycycline prevents tTA from
binding to *TRE* sequences (Gossen and Bujard, 1992), hence we expect doxycycline administration to
halt *mCherry* transcription in receiver cells while still allowing time for mCherry protein to mature.
This means that any mCherry signal observed after doxycycline administration should be ascribable to
cell-contact-dependent transcription that took place during the initial period of co-culture in
doxycycline-free medium. In this experimental setting, we observed low but detectable induction of
mCherry when cells had experienced only 2 hours of doxycycline-free co-culture (Figs. 5C,D, S15).

These data collectively suggest that 2 hours of sender-receiver contact may be sufficient for induction
of low levels of mCherry, and that mCherry levels will keep increasing in receiver cells for a period of
time following the loss of sender-receiver contact. This neighbour-labelling system can therefore
identify receiver cells that have had relatively brief interactions with sender cells or which have
recently lost contact with sender cells.

Kinetics of contact-dependent mCherry perdurance in receiver cells

We next established how long mCherry signal persisted following loss of tTA-mediated *mCherry*
transcription. We co-cultured 10% STC receiver cells with 90% CmGP1GH1 cells for 24 hours, then
added doxycycline to the culture medium (to block the activity of tTA and halt mCherry transcription)
and filmed the cells over 48 hours (Fig. S16A,B, Movies 4,5). We observed little change in mCherry
fluorescence for the initial 8-12 hours, then a gradual decrease in signal until its extinguishment
around 38-40 hours after doxycycline addition (Fig. S16A,B). In order to quantify this process, we co-
cultured 10% STC receiver cells with 90% CmGP1 sender cells for 24 hours, then added doxycycline to
the culture medium and analysed mCherry fluorescence by flow cytometry at various timepoints (Fig.
S16C). No reduction of mCherry signal was observed for the initial 8 hours following doxycycline
administration, with median mCherry expression decreasing by approximately half by 16 hours, and
mCherry signal returning to background levels within 48 hours (Fig. S16D-F). Quantification of live
imaging data at hourly timepoints broadly confirmed these observations, with mCherry levels halving
after approximately 20-24 hours, and mCherry signal returning to background levels around 48 hours
(Fig. S16G).

Taken together, these results suggest that induction of mCherry occurs more rapidly than loss of
mCherry signal, presumably due to the high stability of this fluorescent protein, further confirming the
utility of this system for identifying recent as well as current cell-cell interactions.

The SyNPL SynNotch cell-cell interaction reporter is functional in early mouse embryos

Having comprehensively characterised the SynNotch system in clonal mouse ESC lines, we set out to test whether the system could also function *in vivo* in early mouse embryos. We aggregated wild-type morulae with CmGP1GH1 sender cells and/or STC receiver cells, and cultured these to the blastocyst stage (Fig. 6). As expected, all chimaeric blastocysts (80/80) containing both sender and STC receiver cells induced expression of mCherry, whereas no wild-type blastocysts nor blastocysts containing only sender cells displayed mCherry expression (Fig. 6A,B). 18 out of 19 chimaeras containing STC receiver cells alone did not express readily detectable levels of mCherry (Fig. 6B), in line with the low proportion of mCherry-high cells observed *in vitro* in STC receiver cells cultured alone. Treatment of chimaeric embryos with the γ-secretase inhibitor DAPT suppressed mCherry induction, and withdrawal of DAPT allowed mCherry upregulation (Fig. S17), confirming that SynNotch receptor cleavage is required for mCherry induction.

All three STC clonal lines reliably induced mCherry within chimaeric embryos that also contained CmGP1GH1 sender cells (Fig. 5B, Fig. S18A), with mCherry generally appearing within 20h of aggregation (Movie 6). As expected, some receiver cells remain unlabelled when given limited access to sender cells within chimeric blastocysts (aggregations performed with eight receiver cells and only one sender cell: Fig. S18B), in keeping with the contact-dependent nature of SynNotch activation. Post-implantation chimaeras containing both sender and receiver cells displayed mCherry induction throughout the body axis (Fig. S18C). These results suggest that the SyNPL neighbour-labelling system is functional, efficient and reliable *in vivo*.

Spatial confinement of sender and receiver cells leads to synthetic patterning

SynNotch technology has been successfully employed to generate synthetic patterns. Strategies to achieve this include co-culturing cells in a low sender:receiver cell ratio in order to create 2-dimensional activated receiver cell rings surrounding a clone of sender cells (Morsut et al., 2016), creating self-organising cell aggregates through contact-mediated induction of adhesion molecules (Toda et al., 2018), and recreating morphogen gradients through the use of anchor proteins to capture diffusible receiver cell-activating signal (Toda et al., 2020).

We set out to test whether our clonal ESC lines could be used to generate a synthetic pattern: a stripe of transgene expression at the region of contact between sender and receiver cells. To this end, we plated CmGP1 sender and STC receiver cells in separate chambers of a removable multi-chamber cell culture insert and allowed them to reach confluence. We then removed the insert, allowing cells to grow in the space between chambers, make contact and induce transgene expression in receiver cells (Fig. 7A; a detailed description of stripe generation and characterisation can be found in Supplementary Methods and in Fig. S19). We assessed expression of mCherry 24 hours after initial sender:receiver contact, and observed a distinct stripe of mCherry expression at the sender:receiver border (Fig. 7B). This result suggest that SynNotch technology can be successfully employed in mouse ESCs to generate synthetic patterns of gene expression.

Harnessing modularity of SyNPL SynNotch ESCs to synthetically alter cell fate

One advantage of introducing modularity to our SyNPL SynNotch system design is that we can generate clonal receiver cell lines with inducible expression of any gene of interest. Having characterised the system in mCherry-inducible STC receiver cells, we wished to test whether we could alter receiver cell fate following interaction with sender cells by generating Neurog1-inducible receiver cells.

The transcription factor Neurog1 (Neurogenin 1) is necessary for neural development in mice, where
it drives neuronal differentiation of progenitor cells (Cau et al., 2002; Ma et al., 1998; Yuan and Hassan,
2014). Ectopic expression of Neurog1 has been shown to lead to neuronal differentiation both in
ectoderm and, surprisingly, in mesoderm (Cai et al., 2000; Ma et al., 1996; Perez et al., 1999). This
ability of Neurog1 to induce differentiation in non-permissive conditions was exploited to drive
neuronal differentiation of mouse ESCs in pluripotent culture conditions (Velkey and O'Shea, 2013).
We therefore set out to ask whether contact-mediated induction of a *Neurog1* transgene could induce
neuronal differentiation specifically in receiver cells that come into contact with EGFP-expressing
sender cells.

Firstly, we generated STN (SynNotch TRE-Neurog1) receiver cells by performing RMCE at the *Rosa26*
landing pad in PSNB cell lines to replace the *mKate2-3xNLS* transgene with a *TRE-3xFlag-Neurog1*
cassette (Figs. 7C, S20A). We then tested whether we could drive contact-mediated induction of the
Neurog1 transgene by co-culturing STN receiver cells with CmGP1 senders cells for 48 hours, the
timepoint at which we observed maximum mCherry induction in STC receiver cells (Figs. 4C,D, S14A,B).
We confirmed this resulted in robust induction of 3xFlag-Neurog1 in STN receiver cells compared to
STN receiver cells cultured alone (Fig. S20B), which suggests that PSNB landing pad cell lines can be
used to generate receiver cells harbouring inducible transgenes other than mCherry.

We then set out to test whether we could induce contact-mediated neuronal differentiation of
receiver cells in pluripotent culture conditions, and whether we could engineer differentiation to occur
in a synthetic pattern. To this end, we repeated the synthetic stripe patterning experiment described
above (Fig. 7A,B), using STN receiver cells in place of STC receiver cells. We assessed the expression of
the neuronal marker Tubb3 96 hours after initial sender:receiver contact, and observed evident
induction of Tubb3 and acquisition of neuronal morphology by STN receiver cells at the
sender:receiver border (Fig. 7D). We verified that E14GIP1 cytoplasmic EGFP control cells were unable
to induce neuronal differentiation at the border with STN receiver cells (Fig. S21A). We observed that
Neurog1 is induced shortly after initial sender:receiver cell contact (Fig. S21B), and that Tubb3
induction first occurs 48 hours after initial interaction between sender and STN receiver cells (Fig.
S21C).

We conclude that the interaction between EGFP-expressing sender cells and STN receiver cells can
lead to contact-mediated *Neurog1* induction and neuronal differentiation of receiver cells in non-
permissive culture conditions. This demonstrates that the SyNPL system can be readily used to
generate clonal ESC lines for contact-mediated induction of transgenes of interest, and that these cell
lines can in turn be used to manipulate cell-cell interactions in order to program synthetic cell fate
decisions in response to contact with a particular cell population at desired locations in space.

DISCUSSION

Engineering SynNotch machinery (Morsut et al., 2016) into pluripotent cells opens up many
opportunities for understanding how direct cell-cell interactions between neighbouring cells can
control differentiation decisions, mediate cell competition (Sancho et al., 2013) and orchestrate
morphogenesis (Gorfinkiel and Martinez Arias, 2021) as cells differentiate in 2D or 3D culture. Mouse
ES cells have the unique ability to contribute to chimaeric embryos, meaning that appropriately
engineered cell lines can also be used to understand and control cell-cell interactions during early
embryonic development. There are however particular challenges associated with engineering
existing SynNotch technologies into pluripotent cells. Here we describe how we overcame these

challenges to generate the SyNPL system: a set of clonal SynNotch "sender" and "receiver" mouse ES
cells engineered with optimised and modular SynNotch technology. We demonstrate the utility of the
SyNPL system for monitoring cell-cell interactions both in culture and in early mouse embryos, and
show that we can use this system to engineer contact-dependent cell fate decisions at the boundary
between two populations of pluripotent cells.

Properties of sender cells

We generated sender cell lines expressing high and uniform levels of extracellular membrane-tethered
EGFP. This transgenic construct was previously used for SynNotch sender cells (Morsut et al., 2016;
Sgodda et al., 2020), and comprises EGFP fused to an N-terminal mouse IgGK signal sequence and a C-
terminal human PDGFRB transmembrane domain. The addition of HA and Myc tags at the N- and C-
termini of EGFP did not affect the ability of sender cells to induce mCherry expression in STC receiver
cells (Fig. S13), suggesting that the antigenic region of EGFP recognised by the LaG17 anti-GFP
nanobody component of the SynNotch receptor is not masked by the HA and Myc protein tags.
Furthermore, the LaG17 anti-GFP nanobody can also bind to *Aequorea victoria* YFP, CFP and BFP, and
Aequorea macrodactyla CFP (Fridy et al., 2014), raising the interesting possibility that transgene
induction in our receiver cells could be induced by sender cells expressing different membrane-
tethered fluorophores.

Mouse ESCs and mouse lines labelled with lipid anchor-tethered GFP constructs have previously been
described (Kondoh et al., 1999; Nowotschin et al., 2009; Rhee et al., 2006; Shioi et al., 2011). It would
be interesting to test if these lines could function as SynNotch sender cells; this would require
extracellular GFP localisation and generation of sufficient tensile force upon receptor interaction
(Morsut et al., 2016). GPI anchors GFP to the outer leaflet of the plasma membrane (Rhee et al., 2006;
Sevcsik et al., 2015); GFP-GPI-labelled cells should therefore be capable of acting as sender cells. This
does indeed appear to be the case in *Drosophila* (He et al., 2017).

"All-in-one" locus receiver cells display suboptimal functionality

Our initial attempts at generating "all-in-one" *Rosa26*-targeted receiver cells (termed SNCB+ and
SNCB- cells) were unsuccessful. The large variation in tagBFP expression and low proportion of
mCherry-inducible ESCs we saw within all of our purportedly genetically identical clonal lines suggests
that either widespread transgene silencing or loss of DNA occurred at the *Rosa26* safe harbour locus
in pluripotent cells. Furthermore, the observation that rederivation of clonal lines following
fluorescence-activated cell sorting of single SNCB+ and SNCB- cells led to re-establishment of the initial
heterogeneous distributions of fluorophore expression (Figs. S7, S8) suggests that the all-in-one design
is not optimal for use in pluripotent cells. We were able to overcome these problems by switching to
a random-integration strategy, but it is possible that inclusion of IRES-antibiotic resistance cassettes
and/or insulator sequences may provide an alternative route towards generating a reliable system
without sacrificing the all-in-one-locus approach.

Landing pad ESCs provide system modularity

Targeting of a landing pad to the *Rosa26* safe harbour locus has been previously characterised as an
efficient strategy for the rapid generation of multiple cell lines through RMCE (Seibler et al., 2005;
Tchorz et al., 2012; Tosti et al., 2018). We found this to be true for our cell lines harbouring a *Rosa26-*
attP50-Neo-mKate2-attP50 landing pad, which we used to generate several different cell lines with
ease. The advantage of such a system is the ability to target different transgenes to the same genomic
locus in the same parental cell line. Our parental PSNB lines harbouring the *Rosa26* landing pad
allowed us to initially test the functionality of SynNotch in ESCs with an inducible *mCherry* transgene

in STC receiver cells, prior to generating genetically equivalent STN receiver cells with a *Neurog1*
transgene in place of *mCherry*. This modular design therefore makes it possible to readily switch
between using SyNPL for monitoring and profiling the consequences of defined cell-cell interactions
(based on contact-dependent mCherry expression) and using SyNPL for engineering contact-
dependent cell behaviours (based on contact-dependent expression of any cell behaviour-
determinant).

Describing the properties of the SyNPL system

We characterised various aspects of the SyNPL system that will help inform the experimental design
for users of these cells.

Previous studies have co-cultured senders and receiver cells at different ratios (ranging from 1:50 to
5:1), and for varying times (ranging from 10 minutes to several days) (Cho et al., 2018; Choe et al.,
2021; He et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2019; Matsunaga et al., 2020; Morsut et al., 2016;
Roybal et al., 2016; Sgodda et al., 2020; Srivastava et al., 2019; Toda et al., 2018; Toda et al., 2020;
Wang et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2020). We analysed transgene induction in STC receiver cells at 11
different sender:receiver cell ratios (ranging from 1:19 to 9:1), and observed that higher proportions
of sender cells in culture result in a higher proportion of receiver cells inducing mCherry. This is in line
with the results obtained by (Sgodda et al., 2020) when comparing three different sender:receiver cell
ratios, and with the observations of (Morsut et al., 2016), who exposed receiver cells to varying
concentrations of sender ligand. By finely varying the concentrations of sender ligand, Lim and
colleagues described the transgene induction response as sigmoidal (Morsut et al., 2016), which was
not evident in our data. It is however possible that by testing lower sender:receiver cell ratios this
might hold true in our SynNotch system too.

When analysing transgene expression within single samples, we found that mCherry distribution
follows a bimodal on/off response, indicative of the presence of receiver cells which do not interact
with sender cells at low sender:receiver cell ratios. This bimodal pattern of transgene induction is also
evident in data from Cantz and colleagues (Sgodda et al., 2020). The ability of individual sender cells
to induce mCherry induction in STC receiver cells (as seen in Movies 1 and 3) implies that this system
can be effectively employed to study the effect of interactions between receiver cells and individual
and/or rare sender cells in relevant model systems.

We performed a high-resolution study of the kinetics of mCherry induction and downregulation in STC
receiver cells. We observed low levels of mCherry induction in STC receiver cells following 2 hours of
co-culture with sender cells, provided we allowed time for subsequent protein maturation, and
observed maximum mCherry induction following 48 hours of co-culture. Previous studies making use
of lentiviral-delivered transgenes suggest that 10 minutes may be sufficient for transgene activation
in HEK293 receiver cells, and that 1 hour may be sufficient for transgene induction in L929 receiver
cells, as long as protein maturation time is allowed (Morsut et al., 2016; Sgodda et al., 2020). This is
significantly faster than what we observed in this study, and may be ascribable to lentiviral
transduction leading to higher levels of SynNotch receptor and/or integration of multiple transgene
copies compared to our clonal mouse ESC lines.

In our system, mCherry downregulation did not commence for at least 8 hours following simulated
loss of sender:receiver cell contact, with full loss of signal occurring after more than 40 hours. This is
in line with previous observations in L929 receiver cells, where inducible GFP transgene expression
was lost between 24 and 50 hours after sender cells were removed from culture (Morsut et al., 2016).

The kinetics of mCherry induction and downregulation suggest that this SynNotch system is suited for
the study of cell-cell interactions with a temporal range of hours rather than minutes, and that
"memory" of such interactions will persist for a few days. mCherry signal intensity will be influenced
not only by the duration of contact but also, where cells have moved apart, by the time elapsed since
last contact: this may complicate interpretation of data from this system for some applications. Should
this persistence of mCherry signal prove inconvenient for the study of particular processes, the PSNB
landing pad parental cell lines can be used to readily generate cell interaction reporter receiver cells
harbouring destabilised inducible transgenes with short half-lives.

Exploring the roles of cell-cell interactions *in vivo* and *in vitro*

We demonstrated that our clonal mouse ESC lines can be used *in vivo* in chimaeric embryos. The ability
to conveniently switch between *in vitro* and *in vivo* experimentation was a key reason for us to
establish SynNotch technology in mouse ESCs. Both the receiver lines we generated and the parental
PSNB landing pad cell lines offer the power and flexibility to address questions we have so far been
unable to answer in *in vitro* and *in vivo* settings. For example, the system could be employed in cell
competition studies: STC receiver cells could be used to identify and isolate the direct neighbours of
EGFP-tagged "loser" cells, and profiled to study what changes are induced upon interaction with loser
cells in order to bring about their elimination. Receiver cells could also be engineered to express
candidate fitness-altering transgenes in response to interaction with EGFP-tagged wild-type sender
cells, as successfully demonstrated in *Drosophila* by (He et al., 2017).

The establishment of this system in mouse ESCs also allows to monitor and manipulate the effects of
cell-cell interactions in specific cell types obtained through directed differentiation. We also
demonstrated that our cell lines can be used to generate synthetic patterns of gene expression,
resulting in spatially-defined programming of cell fate. The combination of directed differentiation of
ESCs, spatial confinement of sender and receiver cells, and contact-mediated cell fate engineering
provides many possibilities for the study of cell-cell interactions in any developmental process of
interest.

Concluding remarks

Cell-cell interactions are a shared feature of the development of all multicellular organisms. Whilst the
particulars of these interactions vary greatly amongst eukaryotic supergroups, it is clear that they play
an essential role in development (Armingol et al., 2021). The Synthetic Biology field has recently
developed several applications to monitor cell communication, such as SynNotch (Morsut et al., 2016)
and derivative systems (Zhu et al., 2021), direct transfer of fluorophores to neighbouring cells
(Ombrato et al., 2019; Tang et al., 2020), reconstitution of a fluorophore following interaction
between different cell types carrying non-fluorescent fluorophore fragments (Kinoshita et al., 2020).
We have here demonstrated how SynNotch technology can be used to monitor and manipulate cell-
cell interactions in mouse ESCs and in mouse embryos. We hope that the SyNPL system will prove a
useful and adaptable tool for the mouse Stem Cell and Developmental Biology community.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Reagents

REAGENT	SOURCE	IDENTIFIER	CONCENTRATION
Antibodies and nuclear counterstain			

Mouse monoclonal anti-Flag	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# F3165; RRID: AB_259529	1:1000
Chicken polyclonal anti-GFP	Abcam	Cat# ab13970; RRID: AB_300798	1:1000
Goat polyclonal anti-Myc	Abcam	Cat# ab9132; RRID: AB_307033	1:1000
Mouse monoclonal anti-Myc AlexaFluor 488 conjugate	Santa Cruz	Cat# sc-40 AF488; RRID: AB_2892598	1:200
Rabbit polyclonal anti-LaminB1	Abcam	Cat#ab16048; RRID: AB_443298	1:1000
Rat monoclonal anti-mCherry	Invitrogen	Cat# M11217; RRID: AB_2536611	1:1000
Mouse monoclonal anti-Nup107 (NPC)	Abcam	Cat# ab24609; RRID: AB_448181	1:1000
Rabbit polyclonal anti-tRFP (tagBFP)	Evrogen	Cat# AB233; RRID: AB_2571743	1:1000
Mouse monoclonal anti-Tubb3	Biolegend	Cat# 801201; RRID: AB_2313773	1:1000
DRAQ7	Abcam	Cat# ab109202	1μM (IF); 300nM (flow cytometry)
DAPI	Biotium	Cat# 40043	1μM
Chemicals and solutions			
2-Mercaptoethanol	Gibco	Cat# 31350010	100nM
Accutase	Sigma-Aldrich	A6964	
Benzyl alcohol	Alfa Aesar	Cat# 100-51-6	
Benzyl benzoate	Sigma	Cat# B9550	
Chorulon (hCG)	Intervet	Cat# CH-475-1	100 IU/ml
DAPT	Abcam	Cat# ab120633	100μM
DMEM, high glucose, no glutamine, no phenol red	Gibco	Cat# 31053028	
Donkey serum	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# D9663	3% v/v
Doxycycline hyclate	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# D9891	1μg/ml
Dulbecco's phosphate buffered saline (PBS)	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# D8537	
Fibronectin from bovine plasma solution	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# F1141	
Foetal calf serum	Life Technologies	Cat# 10270106	10% v/v
Formaldehyde 37-41%	Fisher Scientific	Cat# F/1501/PB08	4% w/v
Gelatin	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# G1890	0.1% w/v

Geneticin (G418)	Gibco	Cat# 11811031	200µg/ml
Glasgow Minimum Essential Medium	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# G5154	
Hygromycin B	Gibco	Cat# 10687010	200µg/ml
L-Glutamine	Thermo Scientific	Cat# 25030024	2mM
Lipofectamine 3000 transfection reagent	Life Technologies	Cat# L3000008	
M2 medium	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# M7167	
MEM Non-essential amino acids solution (100X)	Gibco	Cat# 11140050	1X
Penicillin/streptomycin	Gibco	Cat# 15140122	100 U/ml
PMSG	ProSpec	Cat# HOR-272	100 IU/ml
Prolong Gold Antifade Mountant	Thermo Fisher	Cat# P36930	
Puromycin dihydrochloride	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# P8833	2µg/ml
Sodium pyruvate	Gibco	Cat# 11360039	1 mM
Triton X-100	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# X100	0.1% v/v
Trypsin EDTA 0.25%	Gibco	Cat# 25200072	0.05% w/v
Tyrode's solution, acidic	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# T1788	
Zeocin	Gibco	Cat# R25001	100µg/ml
Cell culture substrates and inserts			
3 well silicone culture insert	Ibidi	Cat# 80369	
µ-Slide 8 Well	Ibidi	Cat# 80826	
µ-Slide 4 Well	Ibidi	Cat# 80426	
µ-Plate 96 Well Black	Ibidi	Cat# 89626	
µ-Slide Angiogenesis, uncoated	Ibidi	Cat# 81501	
Glass coverslip, 24mm diameter	VWR	Cat# 631-1583	
Plastic flasks and plates for routine cell culture	Corning	Various	
DNA constructs			
pHR_EGFPligand	(Morsut et al., 2016)	Addgene 79129	
pHR_SFFV_LaG17_synNotch_TetRVP64	(Morsut et al., 2016)	Addgene 79128	
pDisplay-EGFP-TM	(Han et al., 2004)		
pHR_TRE-mCherry-PGK-tagBFP-WPRE	Elise Cachat, University of Edinburgh		
CAG-φC31 integrase	(Monetti et al., 2011)	Similar plasmid available: Addgene 62658	
pRosa26-DEST-1lox	(Tosti et al., 2018)		
pENTR-2xAttP50	(Tosti et al., 2018)		
pENTR-2xAttB53	(Tosti et al., 2018)		
pPyCAG-EGFP-TM-IRES-Pac	This study	Addgene 183603	
pPyPGK-EGFP-TM-IRES-Pac	This study	Addgene 183604	
pPyCAG-HA-EGFP-Myc-TM-IRES-Pac	This study	Addgene 183605	

pPyPGK-HA-EGFP-Myc-TM-IRES-Pac	This study	Addgene 183606	
pPyPGK-Myc-LaG17-Notch1TM-tTA-IRES-Ble	This study	Addgene 183607	
pPyCAG-tagBFP-3xNLS-IRES-Hph	This study	Addgene 183608	
pmROSA26-attP50-Neo-mKate2-3xNLS-attP50	This study	Addgene 183609	
attB53-Pac-attB53	This study	Addgene 183610	
attB53-Pac-TRE-mCherry-attB53	This study	Addgene 183611	
attB53-Pac-tetO-mCherry-attB53	This study	Addgene 183612	
attB53-Pac-TRE-3xFlag-Neurog1-attB53	This study	Addgene 183613	
attB53_SNCB+_attB53	This study	Addgene 183614	
attB53_SNCB-_attB53	This study	Addgene 183615	
Cell lines			
E14Ju09 mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	(Hamilton and Brickman, 2014)		
CmGP1 sender mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
CHmGMP19 sender mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
CmGP1GH1 sender mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
E14GIP1 mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
EM35 mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
SNCB+ receiver mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
SNCB- receiver mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
35SRZ mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
PSNB mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)			
PSNB-E mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
PSNB-tetO receiver mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
STC receiver mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		
STN receiver mouse ESCs (129/Ola, male)	This study		

Animal care and use

Animal experiments were performed under the UK Home Office project license PEEC9E359, approved by the Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Panel of the University of Edinburgh and within the conditions of the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986.

Chimaera generation

C57BL/6 female mice (Charles River) were superovulated (100 IU/ml PMSG and 100 IU/ml hCG intraperitoneal injections 48 hours apart) and crossed with wild-type stud male mice. Pregnant mice were culled at embryonic day 2.5 (E2.5) by cervical dislocation, ovaries with oviducts were dissected and collected in pre-warmed M2 medium. Oviducts were flushed using PBS and a 20-gauge needle

attached to a 1ml syringe and filled with PB1 (Whittingham, 1974). E2.5 embryos were collected and
washed in PB1, their zona pellucida was removed using acidic Tyrode's solution, and they were
transferred to a plate with incisions where two clumps of approximately 8 sender and 8 receiver cells
were added to each embryo. Embryos were then incubated at 37°C in 5% CO_2 for 48 hours prior to
fixation, or for 24 hours prior to transfer to pseudopregnant females for the generation of post-
implantation chimaeras. For DAPT treatment experiments, DAPT was equilibrated for several hours at
37°C prior to addition to embryos in order to avoid precipitation. Embryos subject to DAPT withdrawal
were washed twice before being placed in DAPT-free medium. The sex of embryos used in this study
was not determined.

Mouse ESC culture

Mouse embryonic stem cells were routinely maintained on gelatinised culture vessels (Corning) at
37°C and 5% CO_2 in Glasgow Minimum Essential Medium (GMEM) supplemented with 10% foetal calf
serum (FCS), 100U/ml LIF (produced in-house), 100nM 2-mercaptoethanol, 1X non-essential amino
acids, 2mM L-Glutamine), 1mM Sodium Pyruvate (medium referred to as "ES cell culture medium" or
"LIF+FCS"). The medium was supplemented with 200µg/ml G418, 2µg/ml puromycin, 200µg/ml
hygromycin B and/or 100µg/ml zeocin as appropriate.
For live imaging, GMEM was replaced with phenol red-free Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium
(DMEM), with all other components of the culture medium used at identical concentrations.

DNA constructs

pHR_SFFV_LaG17_synNotch_TetRVP64 (Addgene plasmid #79128) (Morsut et al., 2016) and
pHR_EGFPligand (Addgene plasmid #79129) (Morsut et al., 2016) were kind gifts from Dr Wendell Lim
(UCSF) and Dr Leonardo Morsut (USC). pDisplay-GFP-TM (Han et al., 2004) was a kind gift of Dr Luis
Ángel Fernández (CNB-CSIC). CAG-φC31 integrase (Monetti et al., 2011) was a kind gift of Dr Andras
Nagy (Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute). pHR_TRE-mCherry-PGK-tagBFP-WPRE was a kind
gift of Dr Elise Cachat (The University of Edinburgh). pRosa26-DEST-1lox, pENTR-2xAttP50 and pENTR-
2xAttB53 (Tosti et al., 2018) constructs were kind gifts of Dr Keisuke Kaji (The University of Edinburgh).

Untagged transmembrane EGFP constructs were generated by digesting pHR_EGFPligand with
XhoI+NotI, and ligating the *IgGK signal-EGFP-PDGFRB TMD* cassette into XhoI+NotI-digested *pPyCAG-*
IRES-Pac (Malaguti et al., 2019) or *pPyPGK-IRES-Pac* (Rao et al., 2020) vector backbones. HA- and Myc-
tagged EGFP constructs were generated by PCR-amplifying an *IgGK signal-HA-EGFP-Myc-PDGFRB TMD*
cassette flanked by PspXI and NotI sites from pDisplay-GFP-TM, digesting the amplicon with
PspXI+NotI, and ligating the insert into XhoI+NotI-digested *pPyCAG-IRES-Pac* or *pPyPGK-IRES-Pac*
vector backbones.

The *pPyPGK-CD8a signal-Myc-LaG17-Notch1 minimal transmembrane core-tTA-IRES-Ble* SynNotch
receptor construct was generated by PCR-amplifying a *CD8a signal-Myc-LaG17-Notch1 minimal*
transmembrane core-tTA cassette flanked by XhoI and Bsu36I sites from
pHR_SFFV_LaG17_synNotch_TetRVP64, digesting the amplicon with XhoI+Bsu36I, and ligating the
insert into a XhoI+Bsu36I-digested *pPyPGK-IRES-Ble* vector backbone. The mouse Notch1 minimal
transmembrane core consists of residues 1427-1752 (Uniprot: Q01705).

The *pPyCAG-tagBFP-3xNLS-IRES-Hph* construct was generated by PCR-amplifying a *tagBFP* cassette
flanked by XhoI and KasI sites from pHR_TRE-mCherry-PGK-tagBFP-WPRE, digesting the amplicon with
XhoI+KasI, and ligating the insert into a XhoI+NotI-digested *pPyCAG-IRES-Hph* backbone (Malaguti et
al., 2019) alongside oligonucleotides annealed to generate a *3xNLS* fragment with KasI and NotI
overhangs (Malaguti et al., 2013).

The *Rosa26* landing pad targeting vector was generated by Gateway Cloning (Invitrogen) of an *attL1-*
attP50-Neo-SV40pA-(CAG-mKate2-3xNLS-bGHpA)-attP50-attL2 cassette into the pRosa26-DEST-1lox
targeting vector. Its final structure is as follows: *Rosa26 5'HA-splice acceptor-loxP-attP50-Neo-*
SV40pA-(CAG-mKate2-3xNLS-bGHpA)-attP50-Rosa26 3'HA-PGK-DTA-bGHpA. Sequence in brackets is
on -strand.

An *attB53-Pac-attB53* "empty vector" construct for RMCE at the *Rosa26* locus was generated by
adding a *Pac-bGHpA* cassette followed by an EcoRV restriction site to pENTR-2xAttB53 by Gibson
assembly.
The attB53-TRE-mCherry-attB53 RMCE construct used to generated STC receiver cells from PSNB
landing pad lines was generated by PCR-amplifying a *TRE-mCherry-SV40pA* cassette flanked by EcoRV-
AscI and EcoRV-BamHI sites from pHR_TRE-mCherry-PGK-tagBFP-WPRE, digesting the amplicon with
EcoRV, ligating the insert into EcoRV-digested *attB53-Pac-attB53* backbone, and screening for
insertion on the -strand. The attB53-tetO-mCherry-attB53 RMCE construct used to generate PSNB-
tetO cells from PNSB landing pad lines was generated by PCR-amplifying a *tetO-mCherry-rBGpA*
cassette flanked by MluI and BamHI sites, digesting the amplicon with MluI+BamHI and ligating the
insert into AscI+BamHI-digested *attB53-Pac-TRE-mCherry-attB53*.
The attB53-TRE-3xFlag-Neurog1-attB53 RMCE construct used to generate STN receiver cells from
PSNB landing pad lines was generated by PCR-amplifying a *3xFlag-Neurog1* cassette flanked by NdeI
and MfeI sites from wild-type mouse cDNA, digesting the amplicon with NdeI+MfeI and ligating the
insert into NdeI+MfeI-digested *attB53-Pac-TRE-mCherry-attB53* backbone (in which *mCherry* is
flanked by NfeI and MfeI sites).

attB53_SNCB+_attB53 and attB53_SNCB_attB53 constructs were generated in two steps. First, the
base *attB53-Pac-bGHpA-attB53* RMCE construct was linearised with EcoRV, and ligated with a HincII-
PGK-CD8a signal-Myc-LaG17-Notch1 minimal transmembrane core-tTA-HindIII fragment (digested
from the SynNotch receptor construct described above) and a HindIII-*bGHpA*-EcoRV fragment, and
clones were screened for insertion of the SynNotch receptor on the +strand. Next, the resulting
construct was linearised with EcoRV, and ligated with an EcoRV-*TRE-mCherry-SV40pA-PGK-tagBFP-*
PacI fragment (digested from pHR_TRE-mCherry-PGK-tagBFP-WPRE) and a PacI-*bGHpA*-EcoRV
fragment. Correct assembly on the + and - strands generated the attB53_SNCB+_attB53and
attB53_SNCB-_attB53 constructs respectively.

Abbreviations: TMD: transmembrane domain; IRES: internal ribosome entry site; 5'/3' HA: 5'/3'
homology arm; SV40pA: SV40 polyadenylation signal sequence; bGHpA: bovine growth hormone
polyadenylation signal sequence; rBGpA: rabbit beta-globin polyadenylation signal sequence; NLS:
nuclear localisation signal; PGK: mouse *Pgk1* promoter; Pac: puromycin N-acetyltransferase; Hph:
hygromycin B phosphotransferase; Ble: bleomycin resistance gene (confers zeocin resistance); tTA:
tetracycline transactivator.

Plasmids that we generated for this study will be made available on Addgene.

Transfections

For electroporations, 10^7 ESCs were electroporated with 100μg DNA using a BioRad GenePulser set to
800V/3μF. For nucleofections, 5×10^5 ESCs were nucleofected with 5μg DNA with the Lonza P3 Primary
Cell Nucleofector Unit and kit, using program CG-104, and following manufacturer instructions. For
lipofections, 10^5 ESCs were lipofected with 3μg DNA mixed with 3μl Lipofectamine 3000 and 6μl P3000
solution, following manufacturer instructions. For φC31-mediated RMCE, equal masses of RMCE
constructs and CAG-φC31 vector were transfected.

Clonal ESC lines were generated by transfecting constructs of interest into ESCs, then plating cells at
low density onto gelatinised 9cm dishes in the absence of selection. Selective medium was added 48
hours post-transfection and replaced every other day. After 7-10 days, clones were manually picked,
dissociated, and replated into gelatinised 96-well culture plates. Clones were transferred to
gelatinised vessels with larger culture areas when confluent, screened as appropriate, expanded and
cryopreserved.

Cell lines

E14Ju09 ESCs are a 129/Ola male wild-type clonal line derived from E14tg2a (Hamilton and Brickman,
2014; Hooper et al., 1987).

Sender cells were generated by electroporating E14Ju09 ESCs with one of four constructs: *pPyCAG-*
IgGK signal-EGFP-PDGFRB TMD-IRES-Pac (CmGP cells), *pPyPGK-IgGK signal-EGFP-PDGFRB TMD-IRES-*
Pac (PmGP cells), *pPyCAG-IgGK signal-HA-EGFP-Myc-PDGFRB TMD-IRES-Pac* (CHmGMP cells),
pPyPGK-IgGK signal-HA-EGFP-Myc-PDGFRB TMD-IRES-Pac (PHmGMP cells). Simplified versions of the
constructs are displayed in Fig. 2. HA and Myc tags were used in CHmGMP and PHmGMP cell lines as
additional markers to identify sender cells, but are not essential given that sender cells can be
identified by GFP fluorescence. CmGP1GH1 sender cells were generated by lipofecting CmGP1 sender
cells with a *pPyCAG-EGFP-IRES-Hph* construct. E14GIP1 "cytoplasmic sender" cells were generated by
lipofecting E14Ju09 ESCs with a *pPyCAG-EGFP-IRES-Pac* construct.

EM35 landing pad cells were generated by electroporating E14Ju09 ESCs with the *Rosa26* landing pad
targeting vector described above. Correct targeting was verified by genomic DNA PCR with the
following   primers: Forward: GGCGGACTGGCGGGACTA,   Reverse:
GGGACAGGATAAGTATGACATCATCAAGG. Primer locations and expected band sizes are displayed in
Fig. S3A. This PCR strategy was modified from that described by (Mort et al., 2014) to suit the different
sequence of our *Rosa26* targeting vector.

SNCB+ and SNCB- receiver cells were generated by electroporating EM35 ESCs with the constructs
depicted in Figs. S4A, S6A, and a *CAG-φC31 integrase* construct to mediate RMCE.

35SRZ landing pad cells were generated by electroporating EM35 landing pad cells with *pPyPGK-CD8a*
signal-Myc-LaG17-Notch1 minimal transmembrane core-tTA-IRES-Ble.

PSNB landing pad cell lines were generated by nucleofecting 35SRZ ESCs with a *pPyCAG-tagBFP-3xNLS-*
IRES-Hph construct. PSNB-A cells were derived from 35SRZ clone 9 (PSNB-A clone 10 renamed PSNB
clone A), PSNB-B cells were derived from 35SRZ clone 86 (PNSB-B clone 3 renamed PSNB clone B).

STC receiver cells were generated by nucleofecting PSNB ESCs with *CAG-φC31 integrase* and the
following RMCE construct: *attB53-Pac-bGHpA-(TRE-mCherry-SV40pA)-attB53*. Sequence in brackets is
on -strand. STC clone A1 was derived from PSNB clone A, STC clones B1 and B2 were derived from
PSNB clone B.

PSNB-tetO cells were generated by nucleofecting PSNB ESCs with *CAG-φC31 integrase* and the
following RMCE construct: *attB53-Pac-bGHpA-(tetO-mCherry-SV40pA)-attB53*. Sequence in brackets
is on -strand.

PNSB-E cells were generated by nucleofecting PSNB ESCs with *CAG-φC31 integrase* and the following
RMCE construct: *attB53-Pac-bGHpA-attB53*.

STN receiver cells were generated by nucleofecting PSNB clone A ESCs with *CAG-φC31 integrase* and
the following RMCE construct: *attB53-Pac-bGHpA-(TRE-3xFlag-Neurog1-SV40pA)-attB53*. Sequence in
brackets is on -strand.

Cell lines generated in this study were routinely karyotyped by chromosome count, checked for
absence of mycoplasma infection, and are available on request.

Co-culture experiments

Sender and receiver cells were detached from culture vessels with accutase, quenched in ESC culture
medium, pelleted by spinning at 300g for 3 minutes, resuspended in ESC culture medium
supplemented with 2µg/ml puromycin and counted. Cells were plated at ratios described in figure
legends, and at empirically determined optimal densities.

For flow cytometry experiments, cells were plated onto 12-well plates coated with 7.5µg/ml
fibronectin, at the following densities: experiments carried out in the absence of doxycyline: 1h-8h:
$4x10^5$ cells/well; 16h: $2.4x10^5$ cells/well; 24h: $1.6x10^5$ cells/well; 48h: $8x10^4$ cells/well; 72h: $4x10^4$
cells/well. mCherry induction with 16h doxycycline (Fig. 4F-H): 0-4h: $2.4x10^5$ cells/well; 5-8h: $1.6x10^5$
cells/well; 24h: $8x10^4$ cells/well. mCherry downregulation experiments (Fig. S14): 0h-8h: $1.6x10^5$
cells/well; 16h: $1.2x10^5$ cells/well; 24h: $8x10^4$ cells/well; 48h: $4x10^4$ cells/well.

For immunofluorescence experiments, cells were plated on flamed 24mm glass coverslips housed in
a 6-well plate coated with 7.5µg/ml fibronectin.

For live imaging experiments using a Nikon Ti-E microscope (Movies 1,3-5), cells were plated onto an
8-well imaging slide coated with 7.5µg/ml fibronectin, at the following densities: mCherry induction
experiments: $3x10^4$ cells/well; mCherry downregulation experiments: 0-24h: $2x10^4$ cells/well; 24-48h:
10^4 cells/well. For live imaging experiments using a PerkinElmer Opera Phenix Plus microscope (Movie
2, Fig. S16G), cells were plated onto a 96-well imaging plate coated with 7.5µg/ml fibronectin, at the
following densities: mCherry induction experiments: $9.6x10^4$ cells/well; mCherry downregulation
experiments: 0-24h: $2x10^4$ cells/well; 24-48h: 10^4 cells/well. ESC culture medium was supplemented
with 2µg/ml puromycin, 200µg/ml hygromycin B and 1X penicillin/streptomycin.

To test induction of 3xFlag-Neurog1 in STN receiver cells, CmGP1 sender cells and STN receiver cells
were plated at a 9:1 ratio at a concentration of $2x10^5$ cells/well onto a 24mm flamed glass coverslip
housed in a 6-well plate coated with 7.5µg/ml fibronectin, then fixed and stained after 48 hours.

Synthetic patterning experiments

A 24mm glass coverslip housed in a 6-well plate was coated with 7.5µg/ml fibronectin, then allowed
to air dry. When fully dry, forceps were used to place a culture insert 3-well silicon chamber on top of
the coverslip; downward force was carefully exerted to secure it in place. $4x10^4$ cells were plated
overnight in 70µl culture medium in each of the three wells. Sender cells were plated in the central
well, and receiver cells were plated in the outside wells. 2ml culture medium were added outside of
the 3-well insert in order to prevent evaporation. The next day, the 2ml culture medium outside of
the 3-well insert were aspirated, and the 70µl in each of the three wells were carefully removed in
order not to dislodge the 3-well insert. Each well was quickly washed with 70µl PBS to get rid of any
remaining cells in suspension. Forceps were used to detach the 3-well insert from the glass coverslip,
and 2.5ml culture medium were added to the well. Culture medium was replaced daily. Growth of
cells into the gaps between wells were monitored daily; following contact between sender and
receiver cells, cells were kept in culture for a further 24 hours (STC receivers + CmGP1 senders) or a
further 96 hours (STN receivers + CmGP1 senders) prior to fixation and immunofluorescence. For live
imaging of mCherry stripe experiments, the 3-well insert was placed in an Ibidi µ-Slide 4 Well instead
of on a glass coverslip.

Flow cytometry

Cells were washed in PBS, then detached from culture vessels with accutase. They were resuspended
in ice-cold PBS+10% FCS, pelleted by spinning at 300g for 3 minutes, resuspended in ice-cold PBS+10%
FCS+300nM DRAQ7 and placed on ice before analysing on a BD LSRFortessa flow cytometer. Forward
and side-scatter width and amplitude were used to identify single cells in suspension, dead cells were
excluded by gating on DRAQ7-negative cells, and tagBFP, GFP and mCherry/mKate2 expression were
then analysed using V 450/50-A, B 530/30-A, Y/G 610/20-A laser/filters combinations respectively.

Immunofluorescence

Cells were plated on flamed glass coverslips coated with 7.5µg/ml fibronectin and cultured as indicated in figure legends. Cells were washed with PBS, fixed in 4% formaldehyde in PBS for 20 minutes at room temperature, then washed three times in PBS for a total of 15 minutes. Cells were blocked overnight at 4°C in blocking solution (PBS+3% donkey serum+0.1% Triton X-100). Primary antibodies diluted in blocking solution were added for 3 hours at room temperature, the coverslips were washed 3 times in PBS for a total of 30 minutes, secondary antibodies diluted in blocking solution were added for 1 hour at room temperature, the coverslips were washed 3 times in PBS for a total of 30 minutes. The coverslips were then mounted onto glass slides in Prolong Gold mounting medium. For synthetic patterning experiments and chimaera stainings, antibodies were incubated overnight at 4°C or 37°C respectively to improve penetration. Blastocysts were imaged in PBS in an imaging chamber, and scoring of mCherry-HI cells was performed manually using chimaeras containing both sender and receiver cells as a reference. Post-implantation chimaeras were were dehydrated in methanol series in PBS/0.1% Triton X-100, clarified in 50% methanol/50% BABB (benzyl alcohol:benzyl benzoate 1:2 ratio), and transferred into 100% BABB before imaging. All imaging was performed on a Leica SP8 confocal microscope with a 40X immersion lens unless otherwise indicated.

Live imaging

Cells to be imaged were allowed to adhere on culture vessels at room temperature for 15 minutes after plating, after which they were placed in a 37°C 5% CO_2 humidified chamber and imaged. For Movies 1, 3-5, imaging was performed with a widefield Nikon Ti-E microscope, 20X lens, and Hamamatsu camera; images were taken at 10-minute intervals for 24 hours, and xy coordinates were saved. Following live imaging, cells were fixed and stained for fluorophore expression, and imaged at the previously saved xy coordinates (Movies 1,3). For Movie 2, Fig. S16G and Fig. S19, imaging was performed with a PerkinElmer Opera PhenixPlus microscope, 20X lens. Images were taken at 1-hour (Movie 2, Fig. S16G) or 90-minute (Fig. S19) intervals for 24 hours. Fully automated segmentation of tagBFP-positive nuclei, tracking, and quantification of fluorescent signal intensity in live imaging experiments was performed using the PerkinElmer Harmony software.

Filming of the morula to blastocyst transition was performed with a PerkinElmer Opera PhenixPlus confocal microscope. Sender and receiver cells were placed on opposite poles of morulae, and allowed to aggregate unperturbed for approximately 4 hours prior to imaging, in order to ensure strong binding of ES cells to morulae. They were then transferred to wells of an uncoated Ibidi µ-Slide Angiogenesis imaging slide and imaged. Aside from an initial frame, it was not possible to capture tagBFP signal within the time-lapse movies as embryos were vulnerable to repeated stimulation with ultraviolet light.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Leonardo Morsut and Wendell Lim for developing the original SynNotch system, Elise Cachat and Keisuke Kaji for advice and reagents, Luis Ángel Fernández for the pDisplay-EGFP-TM plasmid, Andras Nagy for the CAG-φC31 plasmid, Dónal O'Carroll and Pedro Moreira for assistance with generating chimaeric mice, Eve Moutaux for cloning initial versions of the RMCE constructs, Alexandre Veiga and Matthew French for performing preliminary experiments with the original SynNotch constructs. We thank Justyna Cholewa-Waclaw, Matthieu Vermeren and Charles Williams for assistance with time-lapse imaging, Fiona Rossi and Claire Cryer for flow cytometry support, and

771 Theresa O'Connor, Helen Henderson and Marilyn Thomson for cell culture support. We are grateful
772 to Leonardo Morsut and members of the Lowell and Wilson labs for helpful discussions.

COMPETING INTERESTS

775 The authors declare no competing interests.

FUNDING

778 This work was funded by a Wellcome Trust Senior Fellowship to SL (WT103789AIA) and a Wellcome
779 Trust Sir Henry Wellcome Fellowship to GB (WT100133).

REFERENCES

Armingol, E., Officer, A., Harismendy, O. and Lewis, N. E. (2021). Deciphering cell–cell interactions
and communication from gene expression. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **22**, 71–88.

Arnold, S. J. and Robertson, E. J. (2009). Making a commitment: cell lineage allocation and axis
patterning in the early mouse embryo. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* **10**, 91–103.

Blin, G., Wisniewski, D., Picart, C., Thery, M., Puceat, M. and Lowell, S. (2018). Geometrical
confinement controls the asymmetric patterning of Brachyury in cultures of pluripotent
cells. *Development*.

Blin, G., Sadurska, D., Migueles, R. P., Chen, N., Watson, J. A. and Lowell, S. (2019). Nessys: A new
set of tools for the automated detection of nuclei within intact tissues and dense 3D
cultures. *PLOS Biol.* **17**, e3000388.

Boggs, S. S., Gregg, R. G., Borenstein, N. and Smithies, O. (1986). Efficient transformation and
frequent single-site, single-copy insertion of DNA can be obtained in mouse erythroleukemia
cells transformed by electroporation. *Experimental Hematology* **14**, 988–994.

Bradley, A., Evans, M., Kaufman, M. H. and Robertson, E. (1984). Formation of germ-line chimaeras
from embryo-derived teratocarcinoma cell lines. *Nature* **309**, 255–256.

Cachat, E., Liu, W., Martin, K. C., Yuan, X., Yin, H., Hohenstein, P. and Davies, J. A. (2016). 2- and 3-
dimensional synthetic large-scale de novo patterning by mammalian cells through phase
separation. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 20664.

Cai, L., Morrow, E. M. and Cepko, C. L. (2000). Misexpression of basic helix-loop-helix genes in the
murine cerebral cortex affects cell fate choices and neuronal survival. *Development* **127**,
3021–3030.

Cau, E., Casarosa, S. and Guillemot, F. (2002). Mash1 and Ngn1 control distinct steps of
determination and differentiation in the olfactory sensory neuron lineage. *Development* **129**,
1871–1880.

Charrier, S., Ferrand, M., Zerbato, M., Précigout, G., Viornery, A., Bucher-Laurent, S., Benkhelifa-
Ziyyat, S., Merten, O. W., Perea, J. and Galy, A. (2011). Quantification of lentiviral vector
copy numbers in individual hematopoietic colony-forming cells shows vector dose-
dependent effects on the frequency and level of transduction. *Gene Therapy* **18**, 479–487.

Chen, C., Krohn, J., Bhattacharya, S. and Davies, B. (2011). A Comparison of Exogenous Promoter
Activity at the ROSA26 Locus Using a PhiC31 Integrase Mediated Cassette Exchange
Approach in Mouse ES Cells. *PLOS ONE* **6**, e23376.

Cho, J. H., Okuma, A., Al-Rubaye, D., Intisar, E., Junghans, R. P. and Wong, W. W. (2018).
Engineering Axl specific CAR and SynNotch receptor for cancer therapy. *Scientific Reports* **8**,
3846.

Choe, J. H., Watchmaker, P. B., Simic, M. S., Gilbert, R. D., Li, A. W., Krasnow, N. A., Downey, K. M.,
Yu, W., Carrera, D. A., Celli, A., et al. (2021). SynNotch-CAR T cells overcome challenges of
specificity, heterogeneity, and persistence in treating glioblastoma. *Sci Transl Med* **13**,.

Davies, J. (2017). Using synthetic biology to explore principles of development. *Development* **144**,
1146–1158.

De Los Angeles, A., Ferrari, F., Xi, R., Fujiwara, Y., Benvenisty, N., Deng, H., Hochedlinger, K.,
Jaenisch, R., Lee, S., Leitch, H. G., et al. (2015). Hallmarks of pluripotency. *Nature* **525**, 469–
478.

Dias, A. S., Almeida, I. de, Belmonte, J. M., Glazier, J. A. and Stern, C. D. (2014). Somites Without a
Clock. *Science* **343**, 791–795.

Ebrahimkhani, M. R. and Ebisuya, M. (2019). Synthetic developmental biology: build and control
multicellular systems. *Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol.* **52**, 9–15.

Evans, M. J. and Kaufman, M. H. (1981). Establishment in culture of pluripotential cells from mouse
embryos. *Nature* **292**, 154–156.

Fischer, S. C., Corujo-Simon, E., Lilao-Garzon, J., Stelzer, E. H. K. and Muñoz-Descalzo, S. (2020). The
transition from local to global patterns governs the differentiation of mouse blastocysts.
PLOS ONE **15**, e0233030.

Forsyth, J. E., Al-Anbaki, A. H., Fuente, R. de la, Modare, N., Perez-Cortes, D., Rivera, I., Kelly, R. S.,
Cotter, S. and Plusa, B. (2021). IVEN: A quantitative tool to describe 3D cell position and
neighbourhood reveals architectural changes in FGF4-treated preimplantation embryos.
PLOS Biology **19**, e3001345.

Fridy, P. C., Li, Y., Keegan, S., Thompson, M. K., Nudelman, I., Scheid, J. F., Oeffinger, M.,
Nussenzweig, M. C., Fenyö, D., Chait, B. T., et al. (2014). A robust pipeline for rapid
production of versatile nanobody repertoires. *Nature Methods* **11**, 1253–1260.

Friedrich, G. and Soriano, P. (1991). Promoter traps in embryonic stem cells: a genetic screen to
identify and mutate developmental genes in mice. *Gene Dev* **5**, 1513–1523.

Gorfinkiel, N. and Martinez Arias, A. (2021). The cell in the age of the genomic revolution: Cell
Regulatory Networks. *Cells & Development* 203720.

Gossen, M. and Bujard, H. (1992). Tight control of gene expression in mammalian cells by
tetracycline-responsive promoters. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **89**,
5547–5551.

Gurdon, J. B. (1987). Embryonic induction — molecular prospects. *Development* **99**, 285–306.

Hamilton, W. B. and Brickman, J. M. (2014). Erk signaling suppresses embryonic stem cell self-
renewal to specify endoderm. *Cell Reports* **9**, 2056–2070.

Han, H.-J., Park, S.-G., Kim, S.-H., Hwang, S.-Y., Han, J., Traicoff, J., Kho, W.-G. and Chung, J.-Y.
(2004). Epidermal growth factor-like motifs 1 and 2 of Plasmodium vivax merozoite surface
protein 1 are critical domains in erythrocyte invasion. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research*
Communications **320**, 563–570.

He, L., Huang, J. and Perrimon, N. (2017). Development of an optimized synthetic Notch receptor as
an in vivo cell–cell contact sensor. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 5467–5472.

Herbst, F., Ball, C. R., Tuorto, F., Nowrouzi, A., Wang, W., Zavidij, O., Dieter, S. M., Fessler, S.,
Hoeven, F. van der, Kloz, U., et al. (2012). Extensive Methylation of Promoter Sequences
Silences Lentiviral Transgene Expression During Stem Cell Differentiation In Vivo. *Molecular*
Therapy **20**, 1014–1021.

Ho, C. and Morsut, L. (2021). Novel synthetic biology approaches for developmental systems. *Stem*
Cell Reports **16**, 1051–1064.

Hong, S., Hwang, D.-Y., Yoon, S., Isacson, O., Ramezani, A., Hawley, R. G. and Kim, K.-S. (2007).
Functional Analysis of Various Promoters in Lentiviral Vectors at Different Stages of In Vitro
Differentiation of Mouse Embryonic Stem Cells. *Molecular Therapy* **15**, 1630–1639.

Hooper, M., Hardy, K., Handyside, A., Hunter, S. and Monk, M. (1987). HPRT-deficient (Lesch–
Nyhan) mouse embryos derived from germline colonization by cultured cells. *Nature* **326**,
292–295.

Huang, J., Zhou, W., Dong, W., Watson, A. M. and Hong, Y. (2009). Directed, efficient, and versatile
modifications of the Drosophila genome by genomic engineering. *Proceedings of the*
National Academy of Sciences **106**, 8284–8289.

Huang, H., Zhang, X., Lv, J., Yang, H., Wang, X., Ma, S., Shao, R., Peng, X., Lin, Y. and Rong, Z.
(2020). Cell-cell contact-induced gene editing/activation in mammalian cells using a
synNotch-CRISPR/Cas9 system. *Protein & Cell* **11**, 299–303.

Johnson, M. H. and Ziomek, C. A. (1983). Cell interactions influence the fate of mouse blastomeres
undergoing the transition from the 16- to the 32-cell stage. *Developmental Biology* **95**, 211–
218.

Kinoshita, M. and Smith, A. (2018). Pluripotency Deconstructed. *Development, Growth &*
Differentiation **60**, 44–52.

Kinoshita, N., Huang, A. J. Y., McHugh, T. J., Miyawaki, A. and Shimogori, T. (2020). Diffusible
GRAPHIC to visualize morphology of cells after specific cell–cell contact. *Scientific Reports* **10**,
14437.

Kondoh, G., Gao, X.-H., Nakano, Y., Koike, H., Yamada, S., Okabe, M. and Takeda, J. (1999). Tissue-
inherent fate of GPI revealed by GPI-anchored GFP transgenesis. *FEBS Letters* **458**, 299–303.

Liew, C.-G., Draper, J. S., Walsh, J., Moore, H. and Andrews, P. W. (2007). Transient and Stable
Transgene Expression in Human Embryonic Stem Cells. *Stem Cells* **25**, 1521–1528.

Luo, H., Wu, X., Sun, R., Su, J., Wang, Y., Dong, Y., Shi, B., Sun, Y., Jiang, H. and Li, Z. (2019). Target-
Dependent Expression of IL12 by synNotch Receptor-Engineered NK92 Cells Increases the
Antitumor Activities of CAR-T Cells. *Frontiers in Oncology* **9**,.

Ma, Q., Kintner, C. and Anderson, D. J. (1996). Identification of neurogenin, a Vertebrate Neuronal
Determination Gene. *Cell* **87**, 43–52.

Ma, Q., Chen, Z., Barrantes, I. del B., Pompa, J. L. de la and Anderson, D. J. (1998). neurogenin1 Is
Essential for the Determination of Neuronal Precursors for Proximal Cranial Sensory Ganglia.
Neuron **20**, 469–482.

Malaguti, M., Nistor, P. A., Blin, G., Pegg, A., Zhou, X. and Lowell, S. (2013). Bone morphogenic
protein signalling suppresses differentiation of pluripotent cells by maintaining expression of
E-Cadherin. *eLife* **2**, e01197.

Malaguti, M., Migueles, R. P., Blin, G., Lin, C.-Y. and Lowell, S. (2019). Id1 Stabilizes Epiblast Identity
by Sensing Delays in Nodal Activation and Adjusting the Timing of Differentiation. *Dev. Cell*
50, 462–477.e5.

Martin, G. R. (1981). Isolation of a pluripotent cell line from early mouse embryos cultured in
medium conditioned by teratocarcinoma stem cells. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
Sciences **78**, 7634–7638.

Matsuda, M., Koga, M., Woltjen, K., Nishida, E. and Ebisuya, M. (2015). Synthetic lateral inhibition
governs cell-type bifurcation with robust ratios. *Nat Commun* **6**, 6195.

Matsunaga, S., Jeremiah, S. S., Miyakawa, K., Kurotaki, D., Shizukuishi, S., Watashi, K., Nishitsuji,
H., Kimura, H., Tamura, T., Yamamoto, N., et al. (2020). Engineering Cellular Biosensors
with Customizable Antiviral Responses Targeting Hepatitis B Virus. *iScience* **23**,.

McBurney, M. W., Sutherland, L. C., Adra, C. N., Leclair, B., Rudnicki, M. A. and Jardine, K. (1991).
The mouse Pgk-1 gene promoter contains an upstream activator sequence. *Nucleic Acids*
Research **19**, 5755–5761.

Monetti, C., Nishino, K., Biechele, S., Zhang, P., Baba, T., Woltjen, K. and Nagy, A. (2011). PhiC31
integrase facilitates genetic approaches combining multiple recombinases. *Methods* **53**,
380–385.

Morsut, L., Roybal, K. T., Xiong, X., Gordley, R. M., Coyle, S. M., Thomson, M. and Lim, W. A.
(2016). Engineering Customized Cell Sensing and Response Behaviors Using Synthetic Notch
Receptors. *Cell* **164**, 780–791.

Mort, R. L., Ford, M. J., Sakaue-Sawano, A., Lindstrom, N. O., Casadio, A., Douglas, A. T., Keighren,
M. A., Hohenstein, P., Miyawaki, A. and Jackson, I. J. (2014). Fucci2a: A bicistronic cell cycle
reporter that allows Cre mediated tissue specific expression in mice. *Cell Cycle* **13**, 2681–
2696.

Nishida-Aoki, N. and Gujral, T. S. (2019). Emerging approaches to study cell-cell interactions in
tumor microenvironment. *Oncotarget* **10**, 785–797.

Niwa, H., Yamamura, K. and Miyazaki, J. (1991). Efficient selection for high-expression transfectants
with a novel eukaryotic vector. *Gene* **108**, 193–199.

Nowotschin, S. and Hadjantonakis, A.-K. (2010). Cellular dynamics in the early mouse embryo: from
axis formation to gastrulation. *Current Opinion in Genetics & Development* **20**, 420–427.

Nowotschin, S., Eakin, G. S. and Hadjantonakis, A.-K. (2009). Dual transgene strategy for live
visualization of chromatin and plasma membrane dynamics in murine embryonic stem cells
and embryonic tissues. *genesis* **47**, 330–336.

Ombrato, L., Nolan, E., Kurelac, I., Mavousian, A., Bridgeman, V. L., Heinze, I., Chakravarty, P.,
Horswell, S., Gonzalez-Gualda, E., Matacchione, G., et al. (2019). Metastatic-niche labelling
reveals parenchymal cells with stem features. *Nature* **572**, 603–608.

Pera, M. F. and Tam, P. P. L. (2010). Extrinsic regulation of pluripotent stem cells. *Nature* **465**, 713–
720.

Perez, S. E., Rebelo, S. and Anderson, D. J. (1999). Early specification of sensory neuron fate
revealed by expression and function of neurogenins in the chick embryo. *Development* **126**,
1715–1728.

Pfaff, N., Lachmann, N., Ackermann, M., Kohlscheen, S., Brendel, C., Maetzig, T., Niemann, H.,
Antoniou, M. N., Grez, M., Schambach, A., et al. (2013). A ubiquitous chromatin opening
element prevents transgene silencing in pluripotent stem cells and their differentiated
progeny. *STEM CELLS* **31**, 488–499.

Pfeifer, A., Ikawa, M., Dayn, Y. and Verma, I. M. (2002). Transgenesis by lentiviral vectors: lack of
gene silencing in mammalian embryonic stem cells and preimplantation embryos.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **99**, 2140–
2145.

Posfai, E., Lanner, F., Mulas, C. and Leitch, H. G. (2021). All models are wrong, but some are useful:
Establishing standards for stem cell-based embryo models. *Stem Cell Reports* **16**, 1117–1141.

Rao, C., Malaguti, M., Mason, J. O. and Lowell, S. (2020). The transcription factor E2A drives neural
differentiation in pluripotent cells. *Development*.

Rhee, J. M., Pirity, M. K., Lackan, C. S., Long, J. Z., Kondoh, G., Takeda, J. and Hadjantonakis, A.-K.
(2006). In vivo imaging and differential localization of lipid-modified GFP-variant fusions in
embryonic stem cells and mice. *genesis* **44**, 202–218.

Rossant, J. and Tam, P. P. L. (2009). Blastocyst lineage formation, early embryonic asymmetries and
axis patterning in the mouse. *Development* **136**, 701–713.

Roybal, K. T., Williams, J. Z., Morsut, L., Rupp, L. J., Kolinko, I., Choe, J. H., Walker, W. J., McNally,
K. A. and Lim, W. A. (2016). Engineering T Cells with Customized Therapeutic Response
Programs Using Synthetic Notch Receptors. *Cell* **167**, 419–432.e16.

Sancho, M., Di-Gregorio, A., George, N., Pozzi, S., Sánchez, J. M., Pernaute, B. and Rodríguez, T. A.
(2013). Competitive Interactions Eliminate Unfit Embryonic Stem Cells at the Onset of
Differentiation. *Developmental Cell* **26**, 19–30.

Santorelli, M., Lam, C. and Morsut, L. (2019). Synthetic development: building mammalian
multicellular structures with artificial genetic programs. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* **59**, 130–140.

Schlissel, G. and Li, P. (2020). Synthetic Developmental Biology: Understanding Through
Reconstitution. *Annu. Rev. Cell Dev. Biol.* **36**, 339–357.

Schultz, R. M. (1985). Roles of Cell-to-Cell Communication in Development. *Biology of Reproduction*
32, 27–42.

Seibler, J., Küter-Luks, B., Kern, H., Streu, S., Plum, L., Mauer, J., Kühn, R., Brüning, J. C. and
Schwenk, F. (2005). Single copy shRNA configuration for ubiquitous gene knockdown in
mice. *Nucleic Acids Research* **33**, e67–e67.

Sekine, R., Shibata, T. and Ebisuya, M. (2018). Synthetic mammalian pattern formation driven by
differential diffusivity of Nodal and Lefty. *Nat Commun* **9**, 5456.

Sevcsik, E., Brameshuber, M., Fölser, M., Weghuber, J., Honigmann, A. and Schütz, G. J. (2015).
GPI-anchored proteins do not reside in ordered domains in the live cell plasma membrane.
Nature Communications **6**, 6969.

Sgodda, M., Alfken, S., Schambach, A., Eggenschwiler, R., Fidzinski, P., Hummel, M. and Cantz, T.
(2020). Synthetic Notch-Receptor-Mediated Transmission of a Transient Signal into
Permanent Information via CRISPR/Cas9-Based Genome Editing. *Cells* **9**, 1929.

Shcherbo, D., Murphy, C. S., Ermakova, G. V., Solovieva, E. A., Chepurnykh, T. V., Shcheglov, A. S.,
Verkhusha, V. V., Pletnev, V. Z., Hazelwood, K. L., Roche, P. M., et al. (2009). Far-red
fluorescent tags for protein imaging in living tissues. *Biochemical Journal* **418**, 567–574.

Shioi, G., Kiyonari, H., Abe, T., Nakao, K., Fujimori, T., Jang, C.-W., Huang, C.-C., Akiyama, H.,
Behringer, R. R. and Aizawa, S. (2011). A mouse reporter line to conditionally mark nuclei
and cell membranes for in vivo live-imaging. *Genesis* **49**, 570–578.

Smithies, O., Gregg, R. G., Boggs, S. S., Koralewski, M. A. and Kucherlapati, R. S. (1985). Insertion of
DNA sequences into the human chromosomal ß-globin locus by homologous recombination.
Nature **317**, 230–234.

Srivastava, S., Salter, A. I., Liggitt, D., Yechan-Gunja, S., Sarvothama, M., Cooper, K., Smythe, K. S.,
Dudakov, J. A., Pierce, R. H., Rader, C., et al. (2019). Logic-Gated ROR1 Chimeric Antigen
Receptor Expression Rescues T Cell-Mediated Toxicity to Normal Tissues and Enables
Selective Tumor Targeting. *Cancer Cell* **35**, 489–503.e8.

Stern, C. (1936). Somatic Crossing Over and Segregation in Drosophila Melanogaster. *Genetics* **21**,
625–730.

Tam, P. P. L. and Loebel, D. A. F. (2007). Gene function in mouse embryogenesis: get set for
gastrulation. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **8**, 368–381.

Tang, R., Murray, C. W., Linde, I. L., Kramer, N. J., Lyu, Z., Tsai, M. K., Chen, L. C., Cai, H., Gitler, A.
D., Engleman, E., et al. (2020). A versatile system to record cell-cell interactions. *eLife* **9**,
e61080.

Tchorz, J. S., Suply, T., Ksiazek, I., Giachino, C., Cloëtta, D., Danzer, C.-P., Doll, T., Isken, A.,
Lemaistre, M., Taylor, V., et al. (2012). A Modified RMCE-Compatible Rosa26 Locus for the
Expression of Transgenes from Exogenous Promoters. *PLOS ONE* **7**, e30011.

Toda, S., Blauch, L. R., Tang, S. K. Y., Morsut, L. and Lim, W. A. (2018). Programming self-organizing
multicellular structures with synthetic cell-cell signaling. *Science* **361**, 156–162.

Toda, S., McKeithan, W. L., Hakkinen, T. J., Lopez, P., Klein, O. D. and Lim, W. A. (2020). Engineering
synthetic morphogen systems that can program multicellular patterning. *Science* **370**, 327–
331.

Tosti, L., Ashmore, J., Tan, B. S. N., Carbone, B., Mistri, T. K., Wilson, V., Tomlinson, S. R. and Kaji,
K. (2018). Mapping transcription factor occupancy using minimal numbers of cells in vitro
and in vivo. *Genome Research* **28**, 592–605.

Toth, T., Balassa, T., Bara, N., Kovacs, F., Kriston, A., Molnar, C., Haracska, L., Sukosd, F. and
Horvath, P. (2018). Environmental properties of cells improve machine learning-based
phenotype recognition accuracy. *Scientific Reports* **8**, 10085.

Velkey, J. M. and O'Shea, K. S. (2013). Expression of Neurogenin 1 in Mouse Embryonic Stem Cells
Directs the Differentiation of Neuronal Precursors and Identifies Unique Patterns of Down-
stream Gene Expression. *Developmental Dynamics* **242**, 230–253.

Wang, L., Long, J., Chen, H., Sun, S., Lv, K., Li, Q. and Wang, X. (2021). Manipulation of focal Wnt
activity via synthetic cells in a double-humanized zebrafish model of tumorigenesis.
International Journal of Cancer **148**, 2815–2824.

Whittingham, D. G. (1974). Embryo banks in the future of developmental genetics. *Genetics* **78**,
395–402.

Wu, G., Liu, N., Rittelmeyer, I., Sharma, A. D., Sgodda, M., Zaehres, H., Bleidißel, M., Greber, B.,
Gentile, L., Han, D. W., et al. (2011). Generation of Healthy Mice from Gene-Corrected
Disease-Specific Induced Pluripotent Stem Cells. *PLOS Biology* **9**, e1001099.

Yang, Z., Yu, Z., Cai, Y., Du, R. and Cai, L. (2020). Engineering of an enhanced synthetic Notch
receptor by reducing ligand-independent activation. *Communications Biology* **3**, 1–7.

Yang, B. A., Westerhof, T. M., Sabin, K., Merajver, S. D. and Aguilar, C. A. (2021). Engineered Tools
to Study Intercellular Communication. *Advanced Science* **8**, 2002825.

Yuan, L. and Hassan, B. A. (2014). Neurogenins in brain development and disease: An overview.
Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics **558**, 10–13.

Zhu, I., Liu, R., Hyrenius-Wittsten, A., Piraner, D. I., Alavi, J., Israni, D. V., Khalil, A. S. and Roybal, K.
T. (2021). Design and modular assembly of synthetic intramembrane proteolysis receptors
for custom gene regulation in therapeutic cells. *bioRxiv* 2021.05.21.445218.

1033

 FIGURE LEGENDS

 Figure 1. Diagram of SynNotch cell-cell interaction reporter ES cells.
(A) Interaction between a membrane-tethered ligand and the Notch receptor extracellular domain
leads to the cleavage of the Notch core transmembrane domain, which contains proteolytic cleavage
sites. In turn, this leads to the release of the Notch intracellular domain from the membrane,
allowing it to translocate to the nucleus and drive transcription of target genes. (B) Sender cells
express membrane-tethered extracellular EGFP from a ubiquitous promoter. (C) Receiver cells
contain a *TRE-mCherry* transgene, express *tagBFP-3xNLS* from a ubiquitous promoter, and express a
SynNotch receptor from a ubiquitous promoter. The SynNotch receptor is comprised of an
extracellular LaG17 anti-GFP nanobody, the core transmembrane region of Notch1, and an
intracellular tTA. (D) Upon interaction of the EGFP on a sender cell with the SynNotch receptor, the
Notch1 core domain is cleaved, releasing the tTA, which can translocate into the nucleus, bind the
TRE element, and drive *mCherry* transcription.

Figure 2. Screening of clonal sender ESC lines.
(A-D) Diagram of the constructs used to generate EGFP sender cell lines. (E) Median EGFP intensity
and (G) percentage EGFP-positive cells in untagged EGFP sender cells. Parental wild-type cells are
included as a negative control. 5000 cells were analysed for each clone. (F) Median EGFP intensity
and (H) percentage EGFP-positive cells in HA- and Myc-tagged EGFP sender cells. Parental wild-type
cells are included as a negative control. 15000 cells were analysed for each clone. Analyses were
performed separately from those in (E), median intensities are not directly comparable. For panels
(E-H), n=1. (I) Comparison of EGFP distributions in parental wild-type cells, CmGP clone 1 (CmGP1)
and CHmGMP clone 19 (CHmGMP19) sender cells. 85000 cells were analysed for each sample. Data
from a single experiment, representative of 9 biological replicates. (J) Immunofluorescence of
parental wild-type, CmGP1 and CHmGMP19 sender cells. Scale bar: 30μm. Nuclei: LaminB1. A.F.U.:
arbitrary fluorescence units.

Figure 3. Generation of clonal cell-cell interaction reporter STC receiver cells.
(A) Summary of transgenes stably integrated into the genome of STC clonal ESC lines. (B-C) Flow
cytometry analysis of mCherry and tagBFP-3xNLS expression in (B) wild-type and (C) control PSNBB-E
cells containing all SyNPL receiver constructs except for the TRE-mCherry cassette. These control cell
lines were used to set gates for tagBFP- and mCherry-positivity. (D) Immunofluorescence of STC
clones A1, B1 and B2 co-cultured with CmGP1 sender cells for 24 hours (1:3 sender:receiver cell
ratio). Scale bar: 30μm. (E-H) Flow cytometry analysis of mCherry and tagBFP-3xNLS expression in
STC receiver cells cultured alone or in the presence of indicated EGFP-expressing cell lines (9:1
sender:receiver cell ratio). The mCherry-HI gate displayed in figure was set based on mCherry
distribution in STC receiver cells cultured alone. Data in these panels were acquired simultaneously
to data in panels (B,C) and can be directly compared.
For panels (B,C,E-H) percentages of cells in each gate are indicated. 11000 cells were analysed for
each sample. Data from a single experiment, representative of 4 biological replicates. Diagrams
depicting the transgenes present in each cell type and expected mCherry and tagBFP-3xNLS
expression patterns are displayed next to flow cytometry plots.

Figure 4. Kinetics of mCherry induction in STC receiver cells.
(A) Stills from Movie 1 displaying mCherry and EGFP expression in STC clone A1 receiver cells co-
cultured with CmGP1GH1 sender cells (1:1 sender:receiver cell ratio). Immuofluorescence of cells
after 24 hours of filming is displayed as a 24 hour timepoint, and includes tagBFP-3xNLS signal in
place of a brightfield image. Scale bar: 30μm. Yellow arrowheads: initial STC receiver cell contact
with sender cells, onset of mCherry expression, cell descendants at 24 hours. Magenta arrowheads:
STC receiver cell not making contact with sender cells, cell descendants at 24 hours. Cyan
arrowhead: initial STC receiver cell contact with sender cell, cell descendant at 24 hours.

(B) Stills from Movie 2 displaying tagBFP-3xNLS, mCherry and EGFP expression in STC clone A1
receiver cells co-cultured with CmGP1GH1 sender cells (9:1 sender:receiver cell ratio). Scale bar:
30µm.
(C) Experimental setup to analyse kinetics of mCherry upregulation in STC receiver cells by flow
cytometry.
(D) Percentage of mCherry-HI STC receiver cells following co-culture with CmGP1 sender cells for the
indicated amount of time (9:1 sender:receiver cell ratio). Data presented as mean ± standard
deviation of three independent experiments. A minimum of 8000 cells were analysed for each
sample. The mCherry-HI gate was set based on mCherry distribution in STC receiver cells cultured
alone.
(E) Distribution of mCherry fluorescence in STC clone A1 receiver cells following co-culture with
CmGP1 sender cells for the indicated amount of time (9:1 sender:receiver cell ratio). Data from a
single experiment, representative of three biological replicates. STC clone A1 cells cultured alone
("0h") are displayed as a shaded black histogram in all panels. 10000 cells were analysed for each
sample.
(F) Quantification of live imaging: median mCherry fluorescence intensity in STC clone A1 receiver
cells following co-culture with CmGP1GH1 or E14GIP1 cells for the indicated amount of time (9:1
sender:receiver cell ratio). Average of 3 biological replicates, 10 random fields of view/replicate,
minimum of 320 cells/replicate/timepoint. Error bars: standard deviation.
(G) Mean mCherry fluorescence intensity in individual STC clone A1 receiver cells tracked for 24
hours whilst in co-culture with CmGP1GH1 sender cells (9:1 sender:receiver ratio). Tracks are
displayed for 33 randomly selected cells for each of 3 biological replicates (99 cells total). Mean, 10th,
and 90th centile tracks are also displayed.
A.F.U.: arbitrary fluorescence units.
1106
Figure 5. Characterisation of minimal contact time required for mCherry induction in STC receiver
cells.
(A) Stills from Movie 3 displaying mCherry and EGFP expression in STC clone A1 receiver cells co-
cultured with CmGP1GH1 sender cells (1:1 sender:receiver cell ratio). Immuofluorescence of cells
after 24 hours of filming is displayed as a 24 hour timepoint, and includes tagBFP-3xNLS signal in
place of a brightfield image. Scale bar: 30µm. White arrowheads label an STC receiver cell in contact
with sender cells for 7 hours, which then loses contact with sender cells between the 8 and 20 hour
timepoints whilst its levels of mCherry keep increasing. (B) Experimental setup to analyse kinetics of
mCherry upregulation in STC receiver cells by flow cytometry, allowing time for protein maturation.
Following sender:receiver cell co-culture for 0-24 hours, 1µg/ml doxycycline (dox) was added to the
culture medium for a further 16 hours in order to inhibit tTA-mediated *mCherry* transcription, and
allow translation and folding of previously transcribed *mCherry*.
(C) Percentage of mCherry-HI STC receiver cells after co-culture with CmGP1 sender cells for the
indicated amount of time and following a further 16 hours of doxycycline treatment (9:1
sender:receiver cell ratio). Data presented as mean ± standard deviation of three independent
experiments. A minimum of 8000 cells were analysed for each sample. The mCherry-HI gate was set
based on mCherry distribution in STC receiver cells cultured alone in doxycycline for 16 hours.
(D) Distribution of mCherry fluorescence in STC clone A1 receiver cells following co-culture with
CmGP1 sender cells for the indicated amount of time and 16 hours doxycycline treatment (9:1
sender:receiver cell ratio). Data from a single experiment, representative of three biological
replicates. STC clone A1 cells plated with CmGP1 sender cells in doxycycline-containing medium for
16 hours ("0h") are displayed as a shaded black histogram in all panels. 10000 cells were analysed
for each sample.
1130
Figure 6. Contact-mediated induction of mCherry in chimaeric blastocysts.

(A) Chimaeric blastocysts containing STC clone B1 receiver cells and/or CmGP1GH1 sender cells. The
images of the three embryos were taken from the same z-plane of a confocal stack and come from a
single field of view. Nuclei were counterstained with DRAQ7. Scale bars: 30µm. (B) Quantification of
embryos containing cells expressing readily detectable levels of mCherry ("mCherry-HI") across all
experiments. Embryos containing both sender and receiver cells were used as a reference for scoring
sender-only chimaeras, receiver-only chimaeras, and wild-type embryos.

Figure 7. Contact-mediated synthetic patterning of gene expression and fate programming.
(A) Diagram illustrating synthetic patterning strategy: sender and receiver cells are grown to
confluence in separate chambers of a multi-chamber culture insert. The insert is removed and cells
are allowed to proliferate until they come into contact, which induces transgene expression in
receiver cells in a stripe pattern. (B) Synthetic striped pattern of mCherry induction in STC clone B1
receiver ESCs in contact with CmGP1 sender ESCs. EGFP, tagBFP, mCherry immunofluorescence. (C)
Summary of transgenes stably integrated into the genome of *Neurog1*-inducible STN clonal ESC lines.
(D) Synthetic striped pattern of neuronal differentiation of STN receiver ES cells in contact with
CmGP1 sender ESCs. EGFP, tagBFP, Tubb3 immunofluorescence. Scale bars: 30µm.

FIGURE 1

A Notch signalling

Cytoplasm

Nucleus

Promoter | Notch target gene

Notch ligand

Membrane-tethered ligand (e.g. Dll1)

Notch receptor

Notch extracellular domain

Minimal Notch core (mNC)

Notch intracellular domain

B SyNPL sender cells

CAG | Signal | EGFP | TM

C SyNPL receiver cells

tTA

TRE | mCherry

CAG | tagBFP-3xNLS

PGK | Signal | Myc | LaG17 | mNC | tTA

D Sender cells in direct contact with receiver cells

CAG | Signal | EGFP | TM

tTA

TRE | mCherry

CAG | tagBFP-3xNLS

PGK | Signal | Myc | LaG17 | mNC | tTA

EGFP ligand

Membrane-tethered Extracellular EGFP

SynNotch receptor

GFP Nanobody (LaG17)

Minimal Notch core (mNC)

tTA

FIGURE 2

FIGURE 3

A **STC** receiver cells (SynNotch-TRE-mCherry)

D STC receivers + CmGP1 senders

EGFP | tagBFP 3XNLS | mCherry | Merge

STC cl. A1

STC cl. B1

STC cl. B2

B Wild-type

C EV control "receivers"

Flow analysis of EGFP- cells

tagBFP (A.F.U.)

mCherry (A.F.U.)

E STC receivers

F STC receivers + CmGP1 senders

G STC receivers + E14GIP1 "senders"

H STC receivers + CmGP1GH1 senders

Flow analysis of tagBFP+ EGFP- cells

STC cl. A1 | STC cl. B1 | STC cl. B2

tagBFP (A.F.U.)

mCherry (A.F.U.)

FIGURE 4

A Movie 1: 50% CmGP1GH1 senders + 50% STC receivers 0-24h

EGFP mCherry tagBFP-3xNLS

B Movie 2: 90% CmGP1GH1 senders + 10% STC receivers 0-24h

EGFP mCherry tagBFP-3xNLS

C

Co-culture
0-72h

Analyse mCherry expression
in tagBFP+ EGFP- cells

D Flow cytometry - % mCherry induction
90% CmGP1 sender cell timecourse

Time of co-culture with sender cells (h)

% mCherry-HI receiver cells

STC cl. A1   STC cl. B1   STC cl. B2

E Flow cytometry - fluorescence profiles
STC cl. A1 + 90% CmGP1 sender cell timecourse

Number of cells

mCherry (A.F.U.)

F Live imaging - Median mCherry induction
90% CmGP1GH1 sender cell timecourse

Median mCherry fluorescence (A.F.U.)

Time of co-culture with sender cells (h)

STC cl. A1 + CmGP1GH1   STC cl. A1 + E14GIP1

G Live imaging - Single-cell tracking
90% CmGP1GH1 sender cell timecourse

Mean mCherry fluorescence (A.F.U.)
in individual STC cl. A1 receiver cells

Time of co-culture with sender cells (h)

Mean   10th centile   90th centile

FIGURE 5

A Movie 3: 50% CmGP1GH1 senders + 50% STC receivers 0-24h

EGFP mCherry tagBFP-3xNLS

B

Co-culture
0-24h

↓

16h +dox
to suppress
further labelling

↓

Analyse mCherry expression
in tagBFP+ EGFP- cells

C % mCherry induction
90% CmGP1 sender cell timecourse
+16h protein maturation (dox)

% mCherry-HI receiver cells

Time of co-culture with sender cells (h)
prior to 16h doxycyline treatment

■ STC cl. A1   ■ STC cl. B1   ■ STC cl. B2

D Flow cytometry fluorescence profiles
STC cl. A1 + 90% CmGP1 sender cell timecourse
+16h protein maturation (dox)

Number of cells

0h 1h 2h 3h 4h

5h 6h 7h 8h 24h

mCherry (A.F.U.)

Timepoints refer to initial duration of dox-free co-culture
permissive for mCherry induction prior to addition of dox for 16h

FIGURE 6

A

Chimaeric blastocysts with STC receiver + CmGP1GH1 sender cells

Nuclei EGFP tagBFP-3xNLS mCherry

B

	mCherry-HI embryos / total embryos			
	All clones	STC cl. A1	STC cl. B1	STC cl. B2
Wild-type	**0/11**	-	-	-
Senders only	**0/27**	-	-	-
Receivers only	**1/19**	1/13	0/3	0/3
Receivers+senders	**80/80**	56/56	23/23	11/11

FIGURE 7

A

Plate sender and receiver cells in separate wells of multiwell insert

Remove multiwell insert
Give cells time to proliferate

Transgene expression induced at linear interface between sender and receiver cells

B mCherry induction in STC receivers at sender-receiver border

EGFP (sender cells) | tagBFP-3XNLS (receiver cells) | mCherry | Merge

CmGP1 senders

mCherry-inducible STC receivers

C

STN receiver cells (Neurog1-inducible)

D Forced neuronal differentiation of STN receivers at sender-receiver border

EGFP (sender cells) | tagBFP-3XNLS (receiver cells) | Tubb3 | Merge

CmGP1 senders

Neurog1-inducible STN receivers