A gradient border model for cell fate decisions at the neural plate border

Alexandre Thiery[1], Ailin Leticia Buzzi[1], Eva Hamrud[1], Chris Cheshire[2], Nicholas Luscombe[2#],
James Briscoe[2], Andrea Streit[1*]

1 Centre for Craniofacial and Regenerative Biology, Faculty of Dentistry, Oral and Craniofacial Sciences, King's College London, London, UK.

2 Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Laboratory, The Francis Crick Institute, 1 Midland Road, London, UK.

Current address: Genomics and Regulatory Systems Unit, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University, Japan.

*Corresponding author: andrea.streit@kcl.ac.uk

Abstract

The vertebrate 'neural plate border' is a transient territory located at the edge of the neural plate containing precursors for all ectodermal derivatives: the neural plate; neural crest; placodes; and epidermis. Elegant functional experiments in a range of vertebrate models have provided an in-depth understanding of gene regulatory interactions within the ectoderm. However, these experiments conducted at tissue level raise seemingly contradictory models for fate allocation of individual cells. Here, we carry out single cell RNA sequencing of chick ectoderm from primitive streak to neurulation stage, to explore cell state diversity and heterogeneity. We characterise the dynamics of gene modules containing key factors known to regulate ectodermal cell fates, allowing us to model the order in which these fates are specified. Furthermore, we find that genes previously classified as neural plate border specifiers typically exhibit dynamic expression patterns and are biased towards either placodal or neural crest fates, revealing that the neural plate border should be seen as an anatomical region of the ectoderm and not a discrete transcriptional state. Through co-expression of placodal and neural crest markers, we identify a population of border located unstable progenitors (BLUPs) which gradually reduces in size as fate segregation occurs. Considering our findings, we propose a 'gradient border' model for cell fate choice at the neural plate border, with the probability of cell fate allocation closely tied to the spatiotemporal positioning of cells.

Introduction

The vertebrate nervous system is arguably the most complex organ of our body. During development, it arises from only three progenitor populations: the neural plate generates the entire central nervous system, while neural crest and sensory placodes jointly form the peripheral nervous system. Placode derivatives are confined to the head contributing to sense organs and cranial ganglia, while neural crest cells form along the entire body axis to generate various cell types including neurons and glial as well as parts of the craniofacial skeleton, cartilage and teeth (for review: Baker & Bronner-Fraser, 1997a; Baker & Bronner-Fraser, 2001; Grocott et al., 2012; Patthey et al., 2014; Pla & Monsoro-Burq, 2018; Prasad et al., 2019; Simoes-Costa & Bronner, 2015).

The neural plate becomes morphologically distinct shortly after gastrulation, although neural, neural crest and placode precursors continue to be intermingled at its edge, in a territory termed the neural plate border (NPB). The NPB has been characterised by the co-expression of neural and non-neural markers as well as so-called NPB specifiers (Pla & Monsoro-Burq, 2018; Roellig et al., 2017; Streit, 2002; Thiery et al., 2020). As the neural plate invaginates, placode precursors remain in the surface ectoderm, while neural crest cells are largely incorporated into neural folds from where they delaminate and migrate extensively. Although the induction of these three fates has been studied for decades, some of the most fundamental questions remain unresolved. For example, we do not know when and how these lineages segregate, whether they do so in a specific order and how individual cells make these decisions.

Modulation of different signalling pathways plays a crucial role in controlling the fate of all ectodermal cells. FGF signalling is required for the specification of neural, neural crest and placode precursors and for positioning the NPB (Ahrens & Schlosser, 2005; Litsiou et al., 2005; Londin et al., 2005; Monsoro-Burq et al., 2003; Streit et al., 2000; Streit & Stern, 1999; Stuhlmiller & García-Castro, 2012; Wilson et al., 2000; Yardley & Garcia-Castro, 2012). While BMP signalling must be inhibited for neural development (Hemmati-Brivanlou et al., 1994; Linker & Stern, 2004; Londin et al., 2005; Sasai et al., 1995), it is necessary for placode precursor formation at gastrulation, but must be switched off thereafter (Ahrens & Schlosser, 2005; Kwon et al., 2010; Litsiou et al., 2005). Likewise, neural crest cells need BMP activity early, but unlike placodes continue to do so as they are specified (Barth et al., 1999; Kwon et al., 2010; Liem et al., 1995; Marchant et al., 1998; Steventon et al., 2009). Finally, Wnt activity is required for neural crest cell induction (Garcia-Castro et al., 2002; Steventon et al., 2009) but must be inhibited for neural and placode precursors to form (Heeg-Truesdell & LaBonne,

2006; Litsiou et al., 2005; Patthey et al., 2008). These signals activate different transcription

factor networks in a temporally and spatially controlled manner, which in turn are thought to

impart cell identity and have therefore been termed fate 'specifiers'. For example, *Msx1* and

Pax3 have been implicated as NPB specifiers (Milet et al., 2013; Monsoro-Burq, 2015;

Plouhinec et al., 2014), while *Pax7* (Basch et al., 2006) and *Six1* (Brugmann et al., 2004; Chen

et al., 2009; Christophorou et al., 2009; Ozaki et al., 2004) are involved in neural crest and

placode precursor specification, respectively. These factors appear to act in feed forward

loops, upregulating their own expression while simultaneously repressing factors that specify

alternative fates (for review: Grocott et al., 2012; Thiery et al., 2020).

Based on these studies combined with tissue transplantation experiments, two apparently

contradictory models for the segregation of neural, neural crest and placodal fates have

emerged (for review: Schlosser, 2006, 2014; Thiery et al., 2020). The 'binary competence

model' suggests that an initial step in lineage segregation entails a subdivision of the ectoderm

into neural/neural crest and placode/epidermal territories (Ahrens & Schlosser, 2005; Pieper

et al., 2012; Schlosser, 2014). This implies a closer relationship of neural crest cells with the

central nervous system and of placodes with the epidermis. In contrast, the 'NPB model'

suggests that cells at the border of the neural plate have mixed identity and retain the ability

to generate all ectodermal derivatives until after neurulation begins (Baker & Bronner-Fraser,

1997b; Roellig et al., 2017; Streit & Stern, 1999). Studies in *Xenopus* have taken this idea a

step further, revealing that unlike other ectodermal cells, cells at the NPB retain pluripotency

markers which is key for their multipotency (Buitrago-Delgado et al., 2015; Prasad et al.,

2012). In support of this idea, the NPB region is initially characterised by co-expression of

neural and non-neural markers (for review: Grocott et al., 2012; Pla & Monsoro-Burq, 2018;

Thiery et al., 2020). Fate specifier genes are activated within this territory in partially

overlapping patterns and resolve into distinct domains as neurulation begins. While both

models are attractive and provide working hypotheses, the underlying experiments were

analysed at cell population, rather than at single cell level. They therefore do not address how

individual cells at the NBP make decisions, nor whether they are multipotent or a population

of mixed progenitors that are already biased towards their later identity. Recent findings have

proposed that prior to fate commitment, cells show increasing levels of heterogeneity in gene

expression and do not exhibit a definitive transcriptional signature (Soldatov et al., 2019). It is

therefore possible that cells at the NPB include such undetermined progenitor cells.

Studies in chick have begun to characterise cell heterogeneity at the NPB at a single cell level

revealing that factors previously thought to be fate-specific are co-expressed in individual cells

even at late neural tube stages (Roellig et al., 2017; Williams et al., 2022). Furthermore,

lineage tracing using a 'neural-specific' Sox2 enhancer shows that Sox2$^+$ cells can contribute

not only to neural tissue but also to neural crest and epidermis (Roellig et al., 2017). However,

these studies only surveyed a relatively small number of ectodermal cells and, focusing on

neural crest cells, did not include data for definitive placodal cells. It is therefore challenging

to assess how these fates segregate. Nevertheless, these findings suggest that cell fate

allocation at the NPB occurs over a much longer developmental period than previously thought

and that NPB cells retain plasticity until early neurulation. However, the underlying molecular

mechanisms of how individual cells make decisions at the NBP remain poorly understood.

Here, we explored the transcriptional changes as cells transit from the neural plate border at

early primitive streak to definitive neural, neural crest and placodal fates at single cell level (for

analysis workflow see Figure 1). In total we present single cell RNAseq (scRNAseq) data for

17,992 high quality cells. Rather than using 2-3 molecular markers to assign cell identity, we

established a binary knowledge matrix using previously published *in situ* hybridisation

expression data. This allows us to classify cells at each developmental stage, despite the high

levels of heterogeneity observed. We find that prior to head fold stages cells do not fall into

transcriptional distinct groups but are characterised by graded and partially overlapping gene

expression. An early cell population located at the NPB (eNPB) can be identified by co-

expression of neural and non-neural genes prior to the upregulation of fate specifiers. As

development proceeds, ectodermal cell diversity increases, with a division of neural and non-

neural fates becoming apparent at the first somite stage together with the emergence of neural

crest cells. By the 8-somite stage, neural, neural crest and placodal cells are largely

segregated, although even at this late stage we find cells with heterogenous expression

profiles.

Using a gene module approach, we identify dynamic changes in groups of genes that are

characteristic for neural, neural crest and placodal fates. Comparing co-expression of whole

gene modules (rather than individual transcripts) reveals that many cells at the NPB co-

express gene modules which later become restricted to placodal or neural crest lineages.

These cells may have the potential to give rise to both (or more) fates and we therefore refer

to them as 'Border-Located Unstable Progenitors' (BLUPs). Interestingly, as progenitors

segregate into their respective fates, we no longer identify NPB clusters but continue to find

BLUPs. BLUPs connect segregating cell populations, resembling previously characterised

bridge cells in the differentiating murine neural crest which exhibit high heterogeneity prior to

segregation (Soldatov et al., 2019). Here, we propose that BLUPs continue to be plastic until

neural tube closure, maintaining the ability to contribute to different fates. Overall, our analysis

highlights that although the NPB demarcates an anatomical region, it is not a discrete

transcriptional state. Instead, we identify BLUPs which we predict to be in an undetermined
state and to retain the potential to contribute towards alternative ectodermal fates.

<u>Results</u>

Classification of ectodermal cells using a binary knowledge matrix of known marker
genes

Neural, neural crest and placode cells arise from the embryonic ectoderm. However, how
individual progenitors acquire their terminal fates and the sequence and timing of their
segregation remain to be elucidated. To capture cells during this process, we carried out 10x
Genomics single-cell mRNA sequencing (scRNAseq) on cells taken from a broad region of
the chick epiblast at six developmental stages: HH4$^-$/4 (primitive streak), HH5 (head process),
HH6 (head fold), HH7 (1 somite), somite stage (ss) 4 and ss8 (Figure 2A). These stages were
chosen because they encompass the initial formation of the neural plate to the beginning of
neurulation when these fate decisions are thought to take place. After integration across
batches, stringent quality control and removal of contaminating cell populations (see methods
and Figure 2–figure supplement 1A-I), we captured a total of 17,992 high quality cells with
approximately 2500-4000 cells per stage and an average of 3924 genes per cell.
Dimensionality reduction and UMAP embedding reveals that cells at later stages displayed
higher cell diversity compared with earlier stages where most cells were transcriptionally
similar (Figure 2B-E and Figure 3A-D).

Typically, scRNAseq cell states are classified using a small number of definitive marker genes
which exhibit mutually exclusive expression patterns. However, this approach is difficult to
apply to the NPB for several reasons. Firstly, the early NPB cannot be classified using
definitive markers as it emerges in the region of overlap between neural and non-neural genes.
Secondly, cells at the NPB are thought to be in a transitory state before they acquire their
definitive ectodermal fate (neural, neural crest, placodal and epidermal). Finally, cells at the
NPB appear to be highly heterogeneous, with precursors for the different fates found
intermingled, even at late stages of neurulation (Bhattacharyya et al., 2004; Roellig et al.,
2017; Streit, 2002; Williams et al., 2022). To overcome these challenges, we categorised cells
using a binary knowledge matrix based on expression data obtained from the literature
(Supplementary File 1). We examined available *in situ* hybridisation data of 76 genes with
known regionalised expression patterns and binarized their expression within each defined
cell state. This allowed us to define a total of 24 cell states spanning primitive streak to neural
tube stages. Using this approach, we classify NPB cells not only by the expression of NPB

specifiers *Pax7* and *Tfap2a*, but also by the overlapping expression of early neural and non-
neural genes.

We first unbiasedly clustered cells from each developmental stage at a high resolution to
ensure capturing the full diversity of cell states (Figure 2–figure supplement 1J). Clusters were
then classified based on the similarity between their gene expression and the knowledge
matrix (see methods). This classification approach successfully identified 22 distinct cell states
within the ectoderm across all developmental stages. Early NPB and early neural cell
populations can already be identified at primitive streak stages, while placode progenitor and
neural crest states emerge at head process and ss4, respectively (Figure 2B and Figure 3A-
B).

Cell states emerging from primitive streak to head fold stages

To explore the temporal changes in cell diversity within the embryonic ectoderm, we compared
cell states present at different stages and identified the time point when each emerged. We
first examined stages HH4-HH6 to characterise events as the neural plate is established and
placodal and neural crest cells are thought to be specified.

An early NPB population is identified at primitive streak stages prior to the expression of fate
specifiers
By primitive streak stage, mediolateral (M-L) gradients of molecular markers demarcate pre-
neural and non-neural territories within the chick epiblast (Pera et al., 1999; Rex et al., 1997;
Sheng & Stern, 1999; Streit et al., 2000; Streit et al., 1998). At HH4, unbiased clustering clearly
organises cells in a pattern reminiscent of this M-L axis (Figure 2B; from left to right) as
evidenced by the expression of node (*ADMP*), pre-neural (*Yeats4, Sox3, Sox11*) and non-
neural (*Dlx5/6*, *Bmp4, Msx1, Tfap2a*) genes (Figure 2E and Figure 2–figure supplement 2A).
Cell states can be broadly characterised based on combinatorial gene expression (Figure 2E)
and we identify five cell states: node, early neural (eN), early neural plate border (eNPB), non-
neural ectoderm (NNE) and extraembryonic ectoderm (EE) (Figure 2B). While some genes
are shared between many cells, early neural plate cells are defined by high levels of pre-neural
transcripts while the non-neural and extraembryonic ectoderm are characterised by increased
non-neural gene expression. Notably, we identify that an early NPB population which co-
expresses both neural and non-neural genes. Thus, early NPB cells are already apparent prior
to the differential upregulation of genes previously characterised as NPB specifiers (*Msx1,*
Pax7, Tfap2a, Dlx5/6, Pax3) (Basch et al., 2006; Ezin et al., 2009; Hong & Saint-Jeannet,

2007; McLarren et al., 2003; Rothstein & Simoes-Costa, 2020; Streit & Stern, 1999) (for

review: Simoes-Costa & Bronner, 2015; Thiery et al., 2020).

The first emerging NPB and PPR cells have regional identity

At HH5, cell positions in the UMAP continue to reflect organisation along the M-L axis in the

embryo (Figure 2C), but new transcriptional states emerge. Whilst non-neural ectoderm cells

display a similar expression profile at HH5 compared to HH4, neural plate cells differ from

early neural cells in their expression of definitive neural (e.g., *Sox2*) and regional markers

(Figure 2E; Figure 2–figure supplement 2B). Like at HH4, many cells continue to co-express

neural and non-neural transcripts (Figure 2–figure supplement 2B). Within the latter cell group,

we observe the upregulation of PPR genes (*Six1*, *Eya2*; Figure 2C, E: aPPR, anterior PPR)

and for the first time NPB specifiers (*Msx1*, *Pax3, Pax7*; Figure 2C, E: pNPB, posterior NPB).

These observations correlate well with gene expression in the embryo. *Msx1* is initially

expressed in the extraembryonic and non-neural ectoderm, and together with *Pax7* begins to

be upregulated at the NPB thereafter (Basch et al., 2006; Streit & Stern, 1999), while PPR

markers are first expressed at HH5. Notably, the NPB initially has a posterior character, while

placode precursors have anterior identity based on their expression of *Gbx2* and *Six3*,

respectively (Figure 2E; see also below).

Anteroposterior organisation of cells at head process and head fold stages

Cells with distinct anteroposterior (A-P) character are first observed at HH5 through the

restricted expression of various homeobox transcription factors. *Rax* and *HoxB1* are highly

confined to distinct cell groups, whilst in contrast *Six3* and *Gbx2* exhibit broader negatively

correlated expression gradients across cell clusters with some degree of overlap (Figure 2E

and Figure 2–figure supplement 2B). The organisation of cells within the UMAP reflects the A-

P expression gradients of these genes in the embryo (Chapman et al., 2002; Hidalgo-Sanchez

et al., 2005; Ohuchi et al., 1999; Paxton et al., 2010). The overlap of A-P factors was used to

distinguish different NP, PPR and NPB regions during unbiased cell state classification

(Supplementary File 1).

Within the NP we can distinguish intermediate neural plate (iNP) states from the anterior and

posterior neural plate (aNP, pNP) and from early caudal neural (eCN) states. However, within

the PPR and NPB we identify only anterior (aPPR; *Six3*+) and posterior (pNPB; *Gbx2*+) cell

states, respectively. While in UMAPs, aPPR cells are located between the NNE and anterior

NP, the pNBP cluster resides between the iNP and pPPR clusters (Figure 2C, E Figure 2–

figure supplement 2C), reflective of both its A-P and M-L position *in vivo*.

Between HH5 and HH6, posterior *Gbx2*⁺ PPR (pPPR) cell states emerge (Figure 2D), as do
PPR cells that appear to lack regional identity. At this stage, *Otx2* and *Gbx2* expression
domains in the embryo abut (Steventon et al., 2012), suggesting that cells with generic PPR
character might be intermingled with those already biased towards axial identity and either
retain the potential to contribute to multiple axial levels or will later become intermediate PPR
cells.

Together, our data show that the emergence of cells with divergent transcriptional profiles
resembles patterning of the ectoderm *in vivo*. However, unbiased cell clustering forces cells
into discrete clusters which may not fully reflect heterogeneity in gene expression and cell
diversity. Indeed, our single cell data reveal the heterogenous nature of gene expression:
markers are broadly expressed and are not confined by cluster boundaries or by neighbouring
expression domains (Figure 2F-J, Figure 2–figure supplement 2C). Despite this heterogeneity,
our cell classification approach successfully identifies increased ectodermal cell diversity over
time, with neural, posterior NPB and anterior PPR cells emerging when the definitive neural
plate forms. Importantly, the relative positions of these cell states in the UMAPs reflect their
location in the embryo.

Increasing cell diversity from 1-somite to 8-somite stages

At HH7, the neural folds begin to elevate indicating the start of neurulation, while during early
somitogenesis neural crest cells start to migrate and placode precursors begin to diversify.
We therefore sought to characterise the transcriptional changes at single cell level as neural,
neural crest and placodal fates emerge.

Following clustering, we identified two major superclusters at HH7, one containing neural tube
and neural crest and the other placodal and future epidermal clusters (Figure 3A). These
superclusters appear to be largely separate, both by their UMAP embedding and the restricted
expression of definitive fate markers (Figure 3A, D). Whereas at earlier stages many cells co-
express non-neural and neural markers (Figure 2E, F, J), at HH7 cells expressing non-
neural/placodal (*Dlx5/6*, *Six1*) and neural transcripts (*Sox21*, *Sox2*) are largely confined to
their respective supercluster (Figure 3–figure supplement 1A). It is at this stage that anterior
NPB cells can first be identified transcriptionally, and together with posterior NPB cells they
connect the two superclusters (Figure 3A; aNPB, pNPB).

The neural crest begins to be specified at early neurulation

Adjacent to the NPB clusters, we observe a neural crest cell cluster expressing early definitive
neural crest markers including *Tfap2b*, *Snai2* and *Axud1* (*Csrnp1*) alongside NPB markers
(*Msx1*, *Pax7* and *Tfap2a*) (Figure 3D; NC and Figure 3–figure supplement 1A). Thus, neural
crest cells first emerge as a distinct cell population at HH7. Although many genes are shared
between the NPB and neural crest cell clusters, NPB cells also express PPR and non-neural
markers (*Six1*, *Eya2* and *Dlx5/6*) which are in turn downregulated in neural crest cells (Figure
3D and Figure 3–figure supplement 1A). Furthermore, we find that *Msx1* and *Pax7* are not
strongly expressed within placodal cell clusters. It is therefore possible that these markers do
not represent NPB specifiers, but rather an early bias towards neural crest fate.
301
Neural, placodal and neural crest lineages are largely segregated by ss4
At ss4 and ss8, a NPB cell cluster can no longer be identified using the above criteria. Instead,
we observe an increasing diversity of cells classified as placodal, neural crest or neural (Figure
3B, C, E). Within the neural cell population, forebrain, midbrain, and hindbrain (FB, MB, HB)
clusters are clearly distinguishable. *Six3* and *Gbx2* expression define cells with fore- and
hindbrain identity, respectively, whilst the upregulation of the dorsal midbrain marker *Wnt4*
(Hollyday et al., 1995) and mid/hindbrain boundary marker *Pax2* (Hidalgo-Sanchez et al.,
1999) highlights midbrain-like cells (Figure 3D and Figure 3–figure supplement 1B, C). As
development progresses, neural, neural crest and placode cells become increasingly distinct,
with neural crest cells beginning to express a suite of definitive neural crest markers, including
Sox10 in the delaminating neural crest (dNC) cluster (Figure 3D).
313
Despite the apparent segregation of neural, neural crest and placodal fates at ss4 and ss8,
small cell populations connect PPR, neural crest, forebrain and midbrain clusters, in a four-
way pattern reflecting their A-P and M-L segregation *in vivo* (Figure 3B, C). To predict the
directionality of transcriptional change within these populations, and hence their potential
developmental trajectory, we performed RNA velocity analysis (Bergen et al., 2020; La Manno
et al., 2018). This analysis predicts that they move away from cluster boundaries, towards
definitive cell states (Figure 3F, G).
321
Together our data show that whereas cell states at HH4-HH6 exhibit broad overlapping gene
expression, definitive fate markers are upregulated from HH5 onwards and subsequently gene
expression is refined at the boundaries between cell clusters. At HH7 and ss4, placodal, neural
crest and neural fates begin to segregate. However, even as the neural tube closes, cells
continue to straddle cluster boundaries; these cells may be transcriptionally unstable and
therefore still actively undergoing fate decision processes.
328

Figure 3. Increased cell diversity and lineage segregation from HH7 to ss8. (A-C) UMAP
plots for cells collected at HH7 (1 somite stage), ss4 (4 somite stage) and ss8 (8 somite stage).
Cell clusters are coloured and labelled based on their semi-unbiased cell state classifications
(binary knowledge matrix available in Supplementary File 1). **(D)** Dot plots displaying the
average expression of key marker genes across cell states at HH7, ss4 and ss8. The size of
the dots represents the number of cells expressing a given gene within each cell population.
(E) Feature plots depicting the lineage restricted expression of neural (*Sox21*), placodal (*Six1,*
Dlx5, Tfap2a) and neural crest (*Pax7, Tfap2a, Tfap2b*) markers. **(F-G)** UMAP plots for ss4 and
ss8 overlaid with RNA velocity vectors depicting the predicted directionality of transcriptional
change. Cells are coloured by cell state classification (shown in B and C). Schematics
summarise the key fate segregation events taking place at these stages predicted by RNA
velocity analysis.

Dynamic changes in gene module expression over time

Many transcriptional regulators and their interactions have been implicated in cell fate

decisions as the ectoderm is specified and differentiates into its derivatives. However, studies

have largely taken a gene candidate approach. To explore the full transcriptional dynamics of

both known and new transcriptional regulators during the specification of neural, neural crest

and placodal cells, we modelled the dynamics of whole gene modules rather than individual

candidate genes. This allows us to investigate transcriptional dynamics in an unbiased manner

whilst simultaneously minimising the loss of potentially important factors.

Defining neural, neural crest and placodal gene modules

To investigate the segregation of neural, neural crest and placode fates, we grouped together

cells from all developmental stages (Figure 4A, B) and sought to identify gene modules that

characterise each cell lineage. Gene modules are groups of genes that display similar

expression profiles across a dataset. We calculated gene modules using the Antler R package

(Delile et al., 2019), which iteratively clusters genes hierarchically based on their gene-gene

Spearman correlation. This approach reveals 40 modules each showing highly correlated

gene expression across all stages (HH4-ss8). To focus on gene modules which may include

candidates for fate segregation, we included only those that are differentially expressed

between any cell state and the rest of the dataset, and then filtered to remove those with

differential expression between sequencing batches. Finally, since our data show that the

segregation of neural, neural crest and placodal cell states is almost complete at ss8 (Figure

3C), we kept those gene modules that show differential expression between at least one of

the three fates at ss8 (see methods). This resulted in nine modules that were considered

further (Figure 4–figure supplement 1A and Figure 4–Source Data 1). Of these, four gene

modules (GM21-24) are specifically expressed in the PPR at ss8, one (GM13) in neural crest

cells, and the remaining four (GM7, 9, 11, 20) are upregulated primarily in neural clusters

(Figure 4–figure supplement 1A).

When examining the genes within each module, we noticed that GM20 and GM22 include

genes with widespread expression or expression in the lateral mesoderm and/or the

extraembryonic region (*Epas1, Nkx2-5, Tnnc1, Pgk1*) (Adams et al., 2008; Bell et al., 2004;

Liberatore et al., 2000; Ota et al., 2007) (Figure 4–Source Data 1). We therefore removed

these modules from subsequent analysis. GM7 contains well characterised anterior markers

including *Otx2, Six3* and *Pax6*, whilst GM11 contains midbrain/hindbrain markers including

Pax2, Nkx6-2 and *Wnt4* (Figure 4–Source Data 1). We find that at ss4 and ss8 these gene

modules are indeed upregulated in the forebrain/aPPR and midbrain/hindbrain, respectively

(Figure 4–figure supplement 1A). To focus our analysis on the segregation of neural, neural

crest and placodal cells rather than on A-P patterning, A-P restricted modules were removed.

The remaining five modules show broadly pan-neural (GM9), pan-placodal (GM21, GM23,

GM24) or neural crest cell (GM13) expression at ss4 and ss8 (Figure 4E).

Latent time analysis suggests late emergence of neural crest cells

Given the cellular heterogeneity observed at early timepoints, discrete developmental stages

do not necessarily accurately represent the developmental progression of individual cells

towards a given fate. In contrast, latent time can measure the biological clock of individual

cells as they differentiate and thus represents the order of cells along a developmental

trajectory. To explore the expression dynamics of the five selected gene modules as neural,

neural crest and placodal fates emerge, we first ordered cells across latent time using scVelo

for the entire dataset (Figure 4C and Figure 4–figure supplement 1B). To investigate the

segregation of all three fates, three separate trajectories need to be distinguished. To do this

we calculated the probability of each cell to transit towards one of three terminal states (Figure

4–figure supplement 1C). These probabilities were obtained using CellRank (Lange et al.,

2022), which leverages RNA velocity and transcriptomic similarity information to predict

transitions between cells. Visualising the fate probabilities across the full dataset shows that

cells with low latent time values (i.e., early cells) have low probabilities of becoming neural,

neural crest or placodal cells (Figure 4D, see Figure 4A for stage reference). As cells 'age' the

fate probability increases as they become transcriptionally similar to the terminal state. Unlike

placodal and neural fates, neural crest fate probabilities are only high in 'late' cells (Figure

4D), reflecting the fact that defined neural crest cell clusters only appear at HH7.

Gene module dynamics reveals key differences in the activation of the transcriptional

programmes associated to neural, neural crest and PPR specification

Having predicted the developmental trajectory of cells using scVelo and CellRank, we next
modelled the expression of the five selected gene modules as a function of latent time with
the aim to characterise their dynamics. Gene expression dynamics were modelled using
generalised additive models (GAMs). GAMs were chosen because gene expression is highly
dynamic and does not change linearly over time. For each gene module we fitted three
separate GAMs, one for each fate (Figure 4E; left). The three fates were distinguished using
the previously calculated fate absorption probabilities. This modelling approach reveals
dynamic changes of gene expression. Three gene modules – GM9, GM13, GM23 – are initially
inactive and are upregulated at different points across latent time in cells with neural, neural
crest and placodal character, respectively.

GM9 becomes upregulated in all neural clusters and includes neural markers like *Lmo1* and
Sox21 (Figure 4E 'Neural GM9', Figure 4–Source Data 1). Although the expression of different
genes within this module correlates broadly, there is some gene-gene variation. For example,
Lmo1 is the first gene to be expressed and exhibits highly dynamic expression over time. It is
first found at HH5 within the eCN, pNP and iNP, before being upregulated across the entire
neural plate at HH7 and ss4. At ss8, *Lmo1* is specifically downregulated within the MB. In
contrast, *Sox21* is first upregulated at HH5/6 and is consistently expressed throughout all
neural cell clusters.

In contrast, modelling reveals that GM13 is upregulated in cells with neural crest identity.
Indeed, it contains well known neural crest markers *Pax7*, *Snai2*, *Sox10* and *Tfap2b* (Figure
4E 'NC GM13', Figure 4–Source Data 1) and is initially broadly activated in NPB and neural
crest clusters at HH7. At ss4 and ss8, this module remains strongly expressed within neural
crest and delaminating neural crest clusters. Within GM13 individual genes are activated at
different time points: *Pax7* is the first gene to be expressed in the pNPB at HH5, while *Sox10*
starts to be expressed only from ss4 onwards.

Finally, modelling the expression dynamics of GM23 shows that it is activated early and
becomes upregulated in cells with placodal character across latent time. This prediction is
supported by the fact that GM23 is highly expressed in PPR clusters at ss8 and contains *bona*
fide placodal genes like *Six1* and *Eya2* (Figure 4E 'Placodal GM23', Figure 4–Source Data 1).
At HH4, most GM23 genes are not expressed, but are broadly activated at HH5 in PPR, non-
neural and NPB clusters, where they remain active until becoming restricted to PPR cells at
ss4. Comparing the onset of activation of these three gene modules across latent time reveals
a clear temporal order with the placodal module being activated first, followed by the neural
and neural crest gene modules.

In contrast to these modules, modelling of GM24 and GM21 shows that they are initially expressed in all three cell populations before being rapidly downregulated within neural crest and neural cells (Figure 4E 'Epiblast GM21' and 'Epiblast GM24'). Indeed, genes in GM24 are broadly expressed across the epiblast at HH4, and then become gradually restricted to PPR, non-neural and NPB clusters at HH6/7, and to PPR cells at ss4/8 (Figure 4A). GM21 displays similar dynamics but is restricted to non-neural clusters earlier at HH5. Although some genes within these epiblast modules have been described as non-neural/PPR specific based on *in situ* hybridisation (*Tfap2c*, *Bambi*, *Homer2*, *Tspan13*) (Bell et al., 2004; Hintze et al., 2017; Mehdizadeh et al., 2021; Reichert et al., 2013; Rothstein & Simoes-Costa, 2020), others are found to be expressed within the early neural territory (*Epcam*, *Sall4*, *Cited4*) (Barembaum & Bronner-Fraser, 2007; Bell et al., 2004; Trevers et al., 2021) (Figure 4–Source Data 1).

Figure 4. Gene module dynamics reveal key differences between the segregation of the PPR, neural crest and neural fates. (A) UMAP plot for the full dataset (HH4-ss8 combined) coloured and labelled by stage. **(B)** UMAP plot for the full dataset coloured by cell state classifications. Cell state classifications were calculated independently for each stage and transferred across for visualisation of the full dataset. **(C)** UMAP plot of the full dataset (HH4-ss8) showing cell latent time values. **(D)** UMAP plots of the full dataset showing the fate absorption probabilities of each cell towards one of the three defined terminal states: neural

crest, neural and placodal. **(E)** Left: Gene module dynamics plots displaying GAMs of scaled
gene module expression across latent time. GAMs are weighted by the fate absorption
probability of each cell towards one of the three terminal states (placodal, neural crest and
neural). Right: Heatmap of gene modules that display fate-specific expression (full list of gene
modules available in Figure 4-Source Data 1). Gene modules were first unbiasedly filtered
based on their differential expression between cell states (see methods and Figure 4-figure
supplement 1A). Gene modules were further manually filtered based on expression patterns
described in the literature (see results section: *Defining neural, neural crest and placodal gene*
modules). Key genes of interest are highlighted on the right (for full gene list see Figure 4-
Source Data 1).
475
In summary, modelling the expression dynamics of selected gene modules provides new
insight into the sequential activation of fate-specific developmental programmes, as well as
proposing key differences in the mechanism by which neural, neural crest and placodal cells
are specified. We show, using an unbiased gene module approach, that a placodal gene
module is activated first, followed by neural and neural crest modules. While neural and neural
crest modules are specifically activated in the relevant cell clusters alone, two modules that
are later restricted to the PPR are initially broadly expressed across the epiblast. We therefore
propose that the specification of neural and neural crest states may require the downregulation
of epiblast modules which later become confined to placodal cells.
485
486 **Spatially restricted co-expression of genes at the NPB**
487
Previously, the NPB has been defined based on the expression of so-called NPB specifiers,
however our transcriptome analysis suggests that these markers have either a placodal or
neural crest bias (Figure 3D). The question remains as to where NPB specifiers are co-
expressed; are they co-expressed throughout the border, or are putative unstable progenitors
spatially restricted? To investigate this, we sought to model the expression of 'NPB specifiers'
across the mediolateral axis, before validating their spatial expression *in vivo* using *in situ*
hybridisation chain reaction (HCR).
495
We chose to model the spatial expression of 'NPB specifiers' using our HH7 scRNAseq data
as this stage marks the start of placodal and neural crest segregation (Figure 3A). Principal
component analysis reveals that HH7 cells are ordered along the inverse of principal
component (PC) 1 based on their M-L position *in vivo*; PC1 therefore provides an axis through
which we can model spatial gene expression (Figure 5A). Smoothed expression profiles
across PC1 were modelled using GAMs calculated for each NPB specifier (Figure 5B).
502
Our models predict that *Msx1* and *Pax7* are upregulated medially relative to *Dlx6* and *Six1*, in
line with their roles in neural crest and placodal specification, respectively (Basch et al., 2006;

Brugmann et al., 2004; Christophorou et al., 2009; McLarren et al., 2003; Monsoro-Burq et al.,

2005). Interestingly, *Pax7* and *Six1*, which are upregulated later than either *Msx1* and *Dlx6*

(Figure 3E), are predicted to exhibit a smaller region of co-expression with each other than

with either *Msx1* or *Dlx6* (Figure 5C). This highlights that *Pax7* and *Six1* have a significant bias

towards either neural crest/placodal fates. *Tfap2a,* which is required for both placodal and

neural crest specification (Bhat et al., 2013; Rothstein & Simoes-Costa, 2020), is predicted to

overlap extensively with both *Pax7* and *Six1*.

HCR at the same stage validates the predicted levels of co-expression across the M-L axis *in*

vivo (Figure 5C-E). We quantified M-L expression by taking intensity measurements at three

different A-P positions (Figure 5C; yellow horizontal lines). The intensity measurements for

each gene were Z-scored across all three axial levels to allow for comparative relative

measurements of gene expression (Figure 5D). We note a striking correlation in the

expression intensity measurements taken from the intermediate axial level (Figure 5D;

Intermediate) and the predicted M-L expression patterns from our scRNAseq data (Figure 5B),

which represent an aggregate of all A-P regions.

Taken together, both our scRNAseq and HCR analysis reveal segregation of neural crest and

placodal markers across the M-L axis, with considerable heterogeneity in gene co-expression

depending upon the NPB markers in question. Importantly, there are striking differences of

gene expression and co-expression along the A-P axis. While *Dlx6* and *Six1* are strongly

expressed anteriorly, *Pax7* and *Msx1* show increased expression levels posteriorly (Figure

5D). Thus, cells within the anterior NPB may be biased towards placodal fates, whereas cells

located posteriorly may be biased towards neural crest cells. These findings suggest that only

a small subset of cells at the NPB are in an unstable state. Furthermore, while the NPB can

be defined as a territory adjacent to the developing neural plate, a unique NPB cell state

coinciding with this territory cannot be defined transcriptionally using previously established

criteria.

Figure 5. HCR validates spatial restriction of classical NPB specifiers. (A) Distribution of cells at HH7 from major ectodermal cell lineages across the inverse of principle component 1 (PC 1), revealing medio-lateral patterning across this axis. **(B)** Spatial gene expression modelling of key placodal and neural crest specifiers at HH7 across the inverse of PC 1. GAMs were fitted for each gene to predict their medio-lateral pattern of expression in the embryo. **(C)** Whole mount *in situ* HCR images at HH7 for combinations of markers modelled in B. Overlayed dotted boxes in the merged image show the region of interest displayed for each separated colour channel; yellow lines indicate the line where intensity measures in D were taken **(D)** Fluorescent intensity measurements taken at anterior 'A', intermediate 'I' and posterior 'P' regions depicted by the yellow bars in C. Intensity measurements were scaled for each gene across the three axial levels to allow for relative comparisons between different axial regions. **(E)** Virtual cross sections taken from the intermediate region, highlighting expression of each marker within the embryonic ectoderm.

BLUPs: multi-potent progenitors at the NPB?

Given the cell heterogeneity at the NPB, we sought to define an approach that did not depend on the expression of definitive NPB specifiers to identify and label transcriptionally unstable progenitors. Transcription factors that specify neural crest and placodal fates are known to cross-repress one another whilst enhancing their own expression (for review: Thiery et al., 2020). Therefore, cells that co-express placodal and neural crest genes may represent unstable progenitors which retain plasticity; we term these co-expressing cells 'Border-Located Unstable Progenitors' (BLUPs).

Defining neural crest and placode specific gene modules

To locate BLUPs within the ectoderm, we identified gene modules that are restricted to either

neural crest or placodal cells at late stages (ss8) and investigated their co-expression at earlier

stages. 15 modules were differentially expressed in at least one cell state (Figure 6–figure

supplement 1A and Figure 6–Source Data 1). GM9-13 and GM16-17 are characteristic for

neural cells with different A-P identities. Seven gene modules are absent from neural

populations but expressed in placodal cells (GM4-6), neural crest (GM1-2) or both (GM7-8).

GM5 contains well characterised placodal markers including *Six1*, *Homer2* and *Znf385c* and

is expressed in both aPPR and pPPR clusters. This module was therefore selected as a pan-

placodal module. GM2 is expressed in both neural crest and delaminating neural crest clusters

and contains neural crest specifiers like *FoxD3*, *Snai2*, *Sox9*, *Pax7* and *Msx1*, as well as the

Wnt ligands *Wnt1* and *Wnt6*. GM2 thus represents a *bona fide* neural crest specific module.

Although GM1 contains multiple neural crest markers (*Ets1*, *Sox10*, *Sox8*; Figure 6–Source

Data 1), it is only expressed in delaminating neural crest cells and was therefore excluded for

further analysis. Thus, GM5 and GM2 were considered as pan-placodal and pan-neural crest

module and used for co-expression analysis (Figure 6A).

BLUPs co-express placodal and neural crest lineage specifiers

To investigate the co-expression of these modules in NPB cells and their derivatives, we first

selected NPB (aNPB, pNPB), neural crest (NC, dNC) and PPR (aPPR, pPPR, PPR) cell

clusters from HH5-ss8 (Figure 6–figure supplement 1B, red cells; thereafter referred to as

NPB subset). Next, we re-clustered this subset of cells (Figure 5B). UMAP analysis highlights

a bifurcation of neural crest and placodal fates between HH7 and ss4, with the NPB located

at the boundary between neural crest and aPPR cell clusters (Figure 6B, C).

To examine the relative expression of pan-placodal and pan-neural crest modules within the

NPB subset, we ordered cells according to the expression ratio of both modules and grouped

them into 10 evenly sized bins (Figure 6D and Figure 6–figure supplement 2). Cells at the

extreme ends exclusively express the pan-neural crest (Bin 1) or the pan-placodal gene

module (Bin 10). As expected, these cells represent mostly delaminating neural crest or

placodal cells, respectively. However, cells in Bin 3 show equal expression levels of both

modules and contain a mixture of NPB, PPR and neural crest cells (Figure 6D). Mapping Bin

3 cells back to the UMAP revealed that BLUPs are located specifically between PPR and

neural crest cell clusters (Figure 6E).

To evaluate the distribution of BLUPs at different developmental timepoints, we mapped Bin

3 cells back to the UMAPs of individual stages (Figure 6–figure supplement 1C). We find at

HH5 and HH6, Bin 3 cells map to aPPR and pNPB clusters, whilst they map predominantly to

neural crest and NPB clusters at HH7. At ss4, there is a sharp reduction in the number of Bin 3 cells. Interestingly, although there is no cluster classified as NPB at this stage, BLUPs are still located at the boundary between neural crest and PPR clusters and are predicted to be in an undetermined transcriptional state by RNA velocity (Figure 3G). Once placodal and neural crest fates are largely segregated at ss8, only very few scattered cells express similar levels of pan-neural crest and pan-placodal modules.

The analysis above focuses on cells expressing similar levels of pan-placodal and pan-neural crest modules. Next, we visualised cells that co-express these modules at different levels. We calculated pan-neural crest and pan-placodal module co-expression per developmental stage and filtered cells below a minimum heuristic threshold of 0.3 (Figure 6H). At HH5/6 almost all cells classified as NPB and placodal cells co-express both modules above the threshold. However, this changes at HH7, when co-expressing BLUPs are largely restricted to the NPB and neural crest clusters. By ss4, only a small population of BLUPs found between placodal and neural crest clusters continue to co-express alternative fate markers. Over time, we note a striking shift in the distribution of co-expression between cells (Figure 6I). At early stages (HH5-7) most cells co-express pan-placodal and pan-neural crest gene modules at similar levels, whilst at later stages (ss4 and ss8) only a small subset of cells retain high relative levels of co-expression (Figure 6I, boxes). This shift in distribution in the number of highly co-expressing cells suggests that placodal/neural crest segregation takes place from around HH7 until ss8.

This analysis highlights that BLUPs are transcriptionally unstable, co-expressing gene modules that characterise both neural crest and placodal cells. This expression profile is likely to endow them with the potential to give rise to both, if not all NPB fates. The NPB demarcates an anatomical region surrounding the neural plate, however it lacks a definitive transcriptional signature highlighting that it is transcriptionally heterogeneous. Given the previously characterised cross repressive interactions between placodal and neural crest specifiers (for review: Thiery et al., 2020), we propose that unstable NPB progenitors (BLUPs) are better defined based on the co-expression of alternate gene modules. The proportion of these cells decreases over time, but a small population at ss4 retains this characteristic and is therefore likely to retain bi- or multipotency even as the neural tube closes. We have shown that BLUPs are likely in an unstable transcriptional state, however how this transcriptional heterogeneity is resolved requires further exploration.

Figure 6. Border-Located Unstable Progenitors' (BLUPs) co-express placodal and neural crest gene modules. (A) Heatmap displaying pan-placodal (GM5) and pan-neural crest (GM2) at ss8 which have been subset from gene modules in Figure 6-figure supplement 1A. **(B)** UMAP plot of the NPB subset coloured by cell state. **(C)** UMAP plot of the NPB subset coloured by developmental stage. **(D)** Average normalized expression of placodal and neural crest gene modules (GM5 and GM2, respectively) identified at ss8 (see Figure 5). Cells are ordered by their expression ratio of these two modules and coloured by cell state. Cells were grouped into 10 evenly sized bins (background shaded regions). Three bins (1, 3 and 10) are overlaid to highlight cells with high neural crest/low placodal (bin 1), equivalent levels of both (bin 3) and high placodal/low neural crest (bin 10) gene expression. **(E)** UMAP plots of the NPB subset displaying the cells captured within bins 1, 3 and 10. **(F-H)** UMAP plots from each developmental stage, displaying only cells in the NPB subset (equivalent to red cells in Figure 6-figure supplement 1B). **(F)** Cells are coloured by cell state. **(H)** Co-expression analysis of the pan-neural crest and pan-placodal modules (see methods). Cells which co-express both

649 modules above 0.3 are coloured. **(I)** Histograms revealing the distribution of co-expression of
650 the pan-neural crest and pan-placodal modules at each developmental stage. At later stages
651 (ss4-ss8), the distribution of co-expression shifts from a normal to a negative binomial
652 distribution.
653

655 **Identifying a temporal gene expression hierarchy regulating the specification of neural**
656 **crest and placodal fates**
657

To investigate how BLUPs segregate towards neural crest and placodal fates, we modelled
gene module dynamics across the NPB subset (for workflow explanation see Figure 4–figure
supplement 2). We previously characterised gene expression dynamics (Figure 4E) across
the whole dataset and uncovered sequential activation of placodal, neural and neural crest
gene programmes. However, focusing on the NPB subset alone provides a higher resolution
of the gene expression hierarchy regulating the segregation of placodes and neural crest.
664

To model gene expression dynamics during lineage segregation at the NPB, we performed
scVelo analysis on the NPB subset (Figure 7A) and used CellRank to determine the probability
that each cell will become neural crest or placodal (Figure 7A-D). We then identified putative
lineage specifiers by calculating gene modules which are differentially expressed between
placodes and the neural crest. These 10 differentially expressed gene modules were further
filtered to include only those that contained genes expressed in neural crest, delaminating
neural crest or PPR cell states (as defined in the binary knowledge matrix). This analysis
identified three modules (GM12-14) upregulated in placodal and four in neural crest cells
(GM40 and GM42-44) between HH7 and ss8 (Figure 7E, Figure 7–Source Data 1). Using our
latent time and lineage probability measurements, we model the dynamics of these 7 gene
modules during the segregation of the placodes and neural crest (Figure 7E; left).
676

Of the placodal modules, GM14 and GM12 are expressed as early as HH5. GM12 is
expressed throughout both aPPR and pNPB and contains early non-neural/PPR markers like
Gata2/3 (Figure 7E, Figure 7–Source Data 1). At HH6, GM12 is downregulated in the NPB
and remains confined to the PPR clusters until ss8. Unlike GM12, GM14 is initially restricted
to the PPR and only activated in the NPB at HH7. At ss4 and ss8 its expression is confined to
the PPR, with a higher expression in anterior cells. This module contains pan-placodal genes
Dlx5/6 as well as anterior markers *Six3* and *Pax6*. GM13 is the last placodal module to be
activated and contains the definitive placodal transcripts *Six1* and *Eya2*. It is first expressed
at low levels at HH6 before being broadly activated across the PPR at HH7 through to ss8.
We also observe weaker expression of this module at the NPB cells at HH7. To visualise the

sequential activation of these modules across latent time, gene expression of each cell was
weighted based on its placodal fate probability. This analysis shows that GM12 is activated
before GM14 and GM13 in latent time. Whilst the expression of GM12 and GM14 does not
change dramatically, GM13 is highly upregulated over latent time within the placodal cells
(Figure 7E and Figure 7-figure supplement 1A).

The four neural crest gene modules each contain *bona fide* neural crest transcriptional
regulators including *Msx1*, *Zic1*, *Zeb2*, *Lmx1b* (GM40), *Pax7*, *Snai2*, *Axud1*, *Foxd3*, *Tfap2b*,
Sox9 (GM42), *Sox5*, *Id1/2* (GM44) and *Sox10*, *Ets1*, *Lmo4* and *Sox8* (GM43) (Figure 7E and
Figure 7–Source Data 1). Our analysis groups these factors unbiasedly into four modules;
modelling their expression across latent time weighted by neural crest fate probability shows
a clear sequential activation from GM40 to GM42, GM44 and GM43 (Figure 7–figure
supplement 1). GM40 is activated first, initially broadly across aPPR and pNPB clusters at
HH5 and HH6, before becoming restricted to neural crest and NPB clusters from HH7
onwards. By ss8, it is downregulated in the delaminating neural crest population. GM42 and
GM44 are highly upregulated only in neural crest and delaminating neural crest cells, with
GM42 first expressed at HH7 and GM44 at ss4. Lastly, GM44 is activated specifically within
the delaminating neural crest cells at ss4 where it is further upregulated at ss8 (Figure 7E).
This order suggests a hierarchical relationship between these factors in the neural crest gene
regulatory network.

While gene module selection was based on prior knowledge of marker genes, this analysis
also allows us to predict novel factors with similar expression profiles. We selected *Ass1* and
Olfml3 to validate the expression of novel placodal and neural crest markers, respectively,
using HCR (Figure 7F, G). Like the placodal specifiers *Six1* and *Eya1, Ass1* is found in GM13.
HCR confirms that *Ass1* and *Six1* are co-localised within the lateral NPB at HH7 and ss4, and
in the otic placode at HH11 (Figure 7G). However, we also note a greater degree in co-
expression of *Pax7/Ass1* than *Pax7/Six1* (Figure 7G; HH7 and ss4), as expected given our
gene expression dynamics predicts that *Ass1* is initially upregulated in both placodal and early
neural crest cells before it is downregulated in the neural crest (Figure 7H, I). *Olfml3* was
chosen as a novel neural crest marker, as it is found in GM44 which is predicted to be
upregulated within the neural crest in between GM42 (Pax7) and GM43 (*Sox10*) (Figure 7H).
HCR confirmed the predicted sequential temporal expression of these markers, with *Pax7*
active in the posterior NPB at HH7, *Pax7* and *Olfml3* co-expressed at NPB at ss4, and all three
markers expressed within the neural crest at HH11 when the neural crest is undergoing
delamination (Figure 7F).

In summary, analysing gene module dynamics across the NPB subset reveals the sequential activation of different co-regulated genes in placodal and neural crest cells. Many genes within these modules have been previously characterised and are known to form part of the neural crest or placode gene regulatory network (for review: Grocott et al., 2012; Pla & Monsoro-Burq, 2018; Schlosser, 2006, 2014; Simoes-Costa & Bronner, 2015; Thiery et al., 2020). This unbiased approach groups these factors and predicts a hierarchical order, as well as identifying new candidate factors which may play important roles in the segregation of the neural crest and placodal fates.

Figure 7. NPB gene module analysis reveals temporal hierarchy of gene expression during the specification of neural crest and placodes. (A) UMAP plot with cells coloured by cell state classifications and overlaid with RNA velocity vectors depicting the predicted directionality of transcriptional change. **(B)** UMAP plot of the NPB subset with cells coloured by latent time. **(C-D)** UMAP plots showing the fate absorption probabilities of each cell towards the specified terminal states (neural crest or placodes). **(E)** Left: Gene module dynamics plots displaying GAMs of scaled gene module expression across latent time. GAMs are weighted by the fate absorption probability of each cell towards either placodal or neural crest terminal states. Right: Heatmap showing gene modules calculated across the NPB subset (full list of

gene modules available in Figure 7-Source Data 1). To identify gene modules potentially involved in placodal or neural crest specification, gene modules were filtered to include those that show differential expression between placodal and neural crest cell states (see methods). Genes specified as neural crest or placodal in our binary knowledge matrix (Supplementary File 1) were selected as bait genes to further filter the gene module list for visualisation. Known and novel placodal and neural crest markers highlighted in red were validated by *in situ* HCR (F-G). **(F)** Whole mount *in situ* HCR at HH7, ss4 and HH11 validating the expression of *Olfml3* at the NPB and delaminating neural crest. **(G)** Whole mount *in situ* HCR at HH7, ss4 and HH11 validating the expression of *Ass1* in the pre-placodal region. **(H)** Gene dynamics displaying GAMs of scaled gene expression across latent time. GAMs are weighted by the fate absorption probability of each cell towards either placodal or neural crest lineages. **(I)** Feature plots for genes validated by *in situ* HCR on the HH7 stage UMAP.

Discussion

The regulation of cell fate specification at the NPB has been extensively studied in a range of model systems, giving rise to a wealth of knowledge regarding transcriptional regulators and their interactions. Nevertheless, our understanding as to how individual cells undergo cell fate decisions has been limited by our inability to study transcription and gene regulation at a single cell level. Single cell immunohistochemistry has demonstrated that in contrast to what was previously thought, cells co-express markers that specify either placodal, neural or neural crest fates, even at late neurulation (Roellig et al., 2017). A recent single cell RNAseq analysis has attempted to characterise transcriptional heterogeneity in the ectoderm, and proposed that a definitive NPB is not established until early neurulation (HH7), at which point placodal and neural crest lineages gradually segregate (Williams et al., 2022). However, an absence of definitive placodal cells collected at late neurulation, as well as a low number of ectodermal cells sampled limits the overall characterisation of ectodermal heterogeneity and makes conclusions about placodal and neural crest segregation problematic. Nevertheless, newly characterised cellular heterogeneity requires us to revisit models for cell fate specification at the NPB and to reconsider our definition of the NPB itself.

In this study, we characterise ectodermal cell states and cellular heterogeneity from primitive streak stages though to late neurulation in chick. We demonstrate that although significant transcriptional differences are apparent between cells at primitive streak stages, due to high levels of heterogeneity, cells do not cluster into discrete cell states exhibiting restricted expression patterns until early neurulation (HH7). Instead, cell states are initially characterised by the overlapping expression of broad early neural and non-neural genes, as well as axial markers. We identify increased cell state diversification during neurulation, and segregation of neural, neural crest and placodal lineages taking place across 1-somite to 8-somite stages. High resolution transcriptional analysis of cells at the NPB reveals that by the 4-somite stage, placodal and neural crest lineages have largely segregated. However, despite this

segregation, we continue to identify high levels of co-expression of placodal and neural crest

genes within BLUPs which are predicted to be in a dynamic transcriptional state.

Specification of neural and neural crest cell lineages requires downregulation of broad epiblast

modules

Although specification networks for the neural, neural crest and placodal lineages are well

established (for review: Betancur et al., 2010; Grocott et al., 2012; Pla & Monsoro-Burq, 2018;

Stundl et al., 2021; Thiery et al., 2020), the order in which these lineages are specified remains

unclear. Our unbiased gene module analysis has identified groups of genes which correlate

and are specifically upregulated within each cell fate. Our gene modules support the

specification networks established in previous studies. *Pax7*, *Tfap2b*, *Snai2* and *Sox10* cluster

together and are upregulated in neural crest states, while *Six1*, *Eya2*, *Gata2/3* and *Dlx5/6* are

activated within placodal states and *Lmo1* and *Sox21* in neural states.

We also find putative novel regulators of these cell states that are co-regulated with known

fate specifiers, as well as the order in which these cell fates are specified. Placodal, neural

and neural crest specific gene modules are activated sequentially, suggesting that these

states are specified in that order. However, there is also asynchrony in the initiation of cell

lineage specification; although we classify placodal cells as early as HH5, we also identify

transcriptionally unstable BLUPs at ss4. This suggests cell fate allocation at the NPB is a

gradual process, with the number of unspecified progenitors decreasing over time as they

commit to a given lineage.

Alongside characterising placodal, neural and neural crest gene modules, we observe the

expression of two modules which exhibit initial broad pan-epiblast expression at primitive

streak stages, but which are confined to placodal cell states at the 4 and 8-somite stages.

Within these epiblast modules, unsurprisingly we note the expression of important placodal

and non-neural genes *Tfap2c*, *Homer2* and the BMP inhibitor *Bambi*. In addition, we also find

the pluripotency marker *Sall4* and *Tspan13*, with the latter shown to be positively regulated by

Six1 (Mehdizadeh et al., 2021). A recent study in chick suggests that based on transcriptional

profiling a 'pre-border' state can already be defined prior to gastrulation. *In vitro* experiments

show that the pre-gastrula epiblast is specified as NPB; once cells have acquired a 'pre-border'

state they can become neural and placodal precursors depending on the signalling input

(Trevers et al., 2018). Given that the expression of epiblast modules becomes confined to the

placodes, we speculate that the specification of the neural crest and neural states might

require the downregulation of these modules.

Identifying BLUPs at the neural plate border based on the co-expression of competing gene modules

Members of Zic, Tfap2, Pax, Msx and Dlx transcription factor families have previously been
termed NPB specifiers (for review: Stundl et al., 2021; Thiery et al., 2020). Tfap2a has been
identified as a pioneer factor which triggers the expression of other NPB specifiers and is
required but not sufficient for both neural crest and placodal cell fates (Bhat et al., 2013;
Rothstein & Simoes-Costa, 2020). The cell fate switching role of Tfap2a depends upon its
association with its co-factors, Tfap2b and Tfap2c. Tfap2c is necessary for the induction of
NPB specifiers *Msx1*, *Pax7* and *Zic1*, whilst Tfap2b is later required for downstream neural
crest specification (Rothstein & Simoes-Costa, 2020).

Gene module analysis across the neural plate border highlights the sequential activation and
restriction of previously characterised NPB specifiers to neural crest cells. Early NPB
specifiers *Msx1* and *Zic1* are initially broadly expressed across pNPB and aPPR cells at HH5,
but later become downregulated in placodal cells and upregulated in the neural crest. The
gene module containing *Pax7* is activated slightly later and contains other NPB specifiers
Axud1 and *Tfap2b*, as well as definitive neural crest markers *FoxD3* and *Snai2*. Unlike the
Msx1 module, which is initially upregulated in both aPPR and pNPB clusters at HH5, the *Pax7*
module is specifically restricted to the NPB and subsequent neural crest clusters (Figure 7E).
This analysis reveals that despite these markers having been previously characterised as NPB
specifiers, their expression becomes restricted to the neural crest. In contrast, *Dlx5/6* and
Tfap2a are both found within a gene module that is later restricted to the placodes (Figure 4E).

Although *Tfap2a* is grouped in the same module as placodal specifiers *Six1* and *Eya2*, it is
expressed in both placodal and neural crest cell states, even at later stages (Figure 3D, E).
This expression reflects the key role of *Tfap2a* as a pioneer factor in both neural crest and
placodal specification, however its expression alone is not sufficient to classify putative multi-
potent progenitors at the NPB. At HH5, although *Tfap2a* is expressed within the pNPB cluster
alongside other NPB specifiers, it is also expressed within aPPR cells which never express
NPB specifiers including *Pax7*, *Pax3* and *Tfap2b* (Figure 2E).

To classify the NPB as a discrete state, NPB markers need to be uniformly upregulated in
NPB cells which give rise to neural, non-neural ectoderm, neural crest and PPR fates. Given
the non-uniform expression of previously characterised NPB specifiers (Basch et al., 2006;
Ezin et al., 2009; Hong & Saint-Jeannet, 2007; McLarren et al., 2003; Rothstein & Simoes-

Costa, 2020; Streit & Stern, 1999), and the expression of *Tfap2a* in the early aPPR cells which

are unlikely to give rise to other fates, we propose that the NPB cannot be accurately classified

using just these previously established genes. Instead, the NPB is an anatomical region

surrounding the neural plate within which putative unstable progenitors (BLUPs) reside.

BLUPs can be identified through the co-expression of gene modules which regulate the

specification of alternative cell fates.

Gradient border model resolves the neural plate border and binary competence dilemma

The 'binary competence' and 'neural plate border' models have provided useful frameworks

for understanding cell fate determination during neural, neural crest and placodal segregation

(Figure 8A, B) (for review: Schlosser, 2006, 2014; Thiery et al., 2020). The binary competence

model suggests that the ectoderm is subdivided into non-neural/placodal and neural/neural

crest domains (Ahrens & Schlosser, 2005; Pieper et al., 2012), whilst the neural plate border

model suggests cells at the border remain multi-potent and can differentiate into all ectodermal

fates (Baker & Bronner-Fraser, 1997b; Roellig et al., 2017; Streit & Stern, 1999). Due to the

limitations of studying cell fate competence at a population level, transplantation experiments

have failed to resolve these two models.

Our co-expression analysis of pan-neural crest and pan-placodal gene modules revealed that

most cells in the early NPB can be classified as BLUPs, as they co-express these modules at

similar levels. At later stages, we see a divergence in the level of co-expression between cell

populations, with the highest co-expressing cells located at the branching points between the

neural crest and placodal lineages (Figure 6H and I). In summary, we find that over time, the

BLUP population reduces in size until it is restricted to only a small number of cells at the

boundary between placodal and neural crest cell clusters at the 4-somite stage. Cell fate

allocation within BLUPs is likely to be driven via transcription factor cross-repression, given

the previously characterised cross-repressive interactions taking place between placodal,

neural crest and neural specifiers (Brugmann et al., 2004; Christophorou et al., 2009;

Schlosser et al., 2008; Wakamatsu et al., 2004).

Following these findings, we propose a 'gradient border' model for cell fate allocation (Figure

8C). This model suggests that cell fate allocation is probabilistic and intimately linked to a cells

spatiotemporal positioning. In accordance with the binary competence model, cells located

within the lateral NPB will give rise to epidermal and placodal fates, whilst those found medially

give rise to neural and neural crest fates. However, instead of a binary segregation of the NPB

into neural/neural crest and non-neural/placodal domains, we suggest that BLUPs at the NPB

are kept in an indeterminate state whilst they continue to co-express factors involved in the specification of alternative lineages. Both our co-expression analysis and previous documentation of heterogeneity at the NPB support this model.

Figure 8. Gradient border model resolves conflicting models of lineage segregation at the neural plate border. (A) Schematic illustrating the neural plate border model. This model illustrates that cells at the neural plate border are multipotent and able to give rise to neural, neural crest, placodal and non-neural ectoderm (NNE) lineages. **(B)** Schematic illustrating the dual competence model. This model suggests that the neural plate border is first defined into non-neural/placodal and neural crest/neural competence domains prior to further subdivision into each of the final four cell lineages. **(C)** Schematic illustrating the gradient border model. This model proposes a probabilistic model of cell fate allocation which is intrinsically linked to the spatiotemporal positioning of a cell. We suggest that cells located within the medial neural plate border (yellow cell lineage) will give rise to neural and neural crest, cells within the lateral neural plate border (blue cell lineage) to non-neural ectoderm and placodes, whilst subsets of cells (including BLUPs) will remain in an indeterminate state and continue to give rise to all four lineages even at late stages of neurulation (green cell lineage). Shaded background colours represent the cell state space.

Materials and Methods

Data collection and alignment

Single cell dissociation and 10X single-cell mRNA sequencing

Fertilised chicken eggs were incubated at 38°C for 24-32 hours depending upon the
developmental stage collected. Embryos were pinned and had the endoderm and mesoderm
removed using dispase (10mg/ml) before dissecting the ectodermal region of interest (Figure
2A). Multiple embryos from the same stage were pooled prior to dissociation. Samples were
then dissociated in 250µl pre-heated FACSmax cell dissociation solution (Amsbio, T200100)
with papain (30U/ml; Sigma, P3125) for 20 minutes at 37°C. Samples were gently pipetted
every 5 minutes to facilitate dissociation. After dissociation, 250µl resuspension solution was
added to prevent any further dissociation (HBSS; non-acetylated BSA (1mg/ml; Invitrogen,
10743447); HEPES (0.01M); non-essential amino acids (1x; Thermo Fisher Scientific,
11140050); rock inhibitor Y-27632 (10µM; Stemcell Technologies). Cells were passed through
a 20µm cell strainer (Miltenyi Biotech, 130-101-812) to remove any debris, before pelleting
and resuspending in 500µl resuspension buffer. To remove any dead or dying cells as well as
any remaining doublets, 1µl 0.1mg/ml DAPI was added to the cell suspension before FAC
sorting. Given the low number of cells obtained from each embryo, samples for each stage
were collected over multiple days and stored in 90% MeOH with 10% resuspension solution
after FAC sorting. Prior to sequencing, samples from the same stage were pooled and
resuspended in DPBS with 0.5% non-acetylated BSA and 0.5U/µl RNAse inhibitor (Roche
3335399001).

Cells underwent single-cell mRNA sequencing at the Francis Crick Institute, London. Library
preparation was carried out using the 10x 3' single-cell mRNA v3 kit (10x Genomics), before
sequencing on the HiSeq 4000 (Illumina) to a target depth of 50k reads/cell. Samples were
sequenced in two batches (batch 1: HH4, HH6, ss4, ss8; batch 2: HH5, HH6, HH7, ss4), with
two stages (HH6 and ss4) sequenced in both batches to allow for the correction of any
potential batch effects. Data from the first batch has previously been used for the
characterisation of neural induction (Trevers et al., 2021) (ArrayExpress accession number:
E-MTAB-10408).

Read alignment

A custom pipeline was developed in Nextflow (v20.07.1) (Di Tommaso et al., 2017) to handle
all GTF processing and read alignment whilst maintaining full reproducibility.

Prior to scRNAseq alignment, the GalGal6 ensembl 97 GTF file was modified to prefix genes
from the Z and W sex chromosomes with their respective chromosome IDs (Z- and W-).
Furthermore, we noticed several mitochondrial genes in the GTF were missing their
chromosome ID, in turn preventing accurately calculating cell percentage mitochondrial
content downstream; mitochondrial genes were therefore also prefixed in the GTF (MT-).
Finally, we annotated the key neural crest specifier Snai2 in the GTF
(ENSGALG00000030902). Reads were processed and aligned to GalGal6 using CellRanger
4.0.0 (10x Genomics).

The aligned reads from CellRanger (BAM) were re-counted using Velocyto (La Manno et al.,
2018) to generate spliced and unspliced counts for each gene, which are used in subsequent
RNA velocity analysis.

Downstream pre-processing

All downstream analysis was wrapped into a custom Nextflow pipeline to simplify re-running
the analysis by handling parallel processing of data subsets.

Data filtering
Quality control, data filtering, cell clustering, dimensionality reduction and initial data
visualisation was carried out using Seurat v4.0.5 (Hao et al., 2021). Data filtering was carried
out on each sequencing batch separately before data integration. To ensure the removal of
poor-quality cells whilst also minimising over-filtering, we first applied a medium filtering
threshold (cells expressing fewer than 1000 genes, more than 6500 genes, or had more than
15% mitochondrial content were excluded from subsequent analysis) followed by the removal
of remaining poor-quality cell clusters.

Dimensionality reduction and clustering
Linear dimensionality reduction was carried out using principal component analysis (PCA).
The number of principal components (PCs) used to construct the subsequent shared-nearest-
neighbour (SNN) graph was determined unbiasedly, using an approach developed by the
Harvard Chan Bioinformatics Core (HBC). First, we calculate the PC at which subsequent PCs
contribute less than 5% of standard deviation, and the point where the cumulative variation of
PCs exceeds 90%. The larger of these two values is selected. Second, we calculate the PC
where the inclusion of consecutive PCs contributes less than 0.1% additional variation. The
smaller value from these two steps is selected as a cut-off.

Louvain clustering was carried out with varying resolutions depending upon the data subset in question. A high clustering resolution (resolution=2) was used to identify poor quality clusters and contaminating cell states. This was to ensure that only poor-quality cells were filtered from the dataset. All other clustering was carried out using a resolution of 0.5.

Filtering of poor-quality clusters

Cell quality was measured using unique gene and UMI counts. Clusters in which both metrics fell below the 25th percentile relative to the rest of the dataset were considered poor quality and excluded from further analysis.

Data integration

After the removal of poor-quality cells, cells from the two separate batches were integrated into a single full dataset (Figure 2–figure supplement 1H-I). To avoid over-correction and removal of stage differences, we integrated the data from the two sequencing batches using STACAS v1.1.0 (Andreatta & Carmona, 2021). This R package allows for alignment of datasets containing partially overlapping cell states.

Regressing out confounding variables

Before downstream analysis, we regressed out percentage mitochondrial content, cell sex, and cell cycle. After regressing out percentage mitochondrial content, we identified a residual sex effect whereby cells clustered according to the expression of either W or Z chromosome genes. This resulted in a duplication of cell clusters, most apparent at HH4 (Figure 2–figure supplement 1A-D). Cells were k-means clustered according to their expression of W chromosome genes and classified as either male or female. This classification was used to regress out cell sex. Cell cycle was observed to have a strong effect on cell clustering and was therefore also regressed out during data scaling (Figure 2–figure supplement 1E).

Removal of contaminating clusters

We found small contaminating clusters of primordial germ cells, blood islands, mesoderm and endoderm within the dataset (Figure 2–figure supplement 1F, G). To semi-unbiasedly remove these clusters, we calculated the average expression of candidate markers for each of these cell states and removed clusters in which the median expression of any of these modules was greater than the 90th percentile relative to the rest of the dataset (Figure 2–figure supplement 1F'').

Downstream analysis

Unbiased cell classification

Cell states were classified on each stage independently using a binary knowledge matrix

(Supplementary File 1). First, the full dataset was split by stage and then re-scaled and re-

clustered as described above. Our binary knowledge matrix consists of binarized expression

of 76 genes across 24 cell states. For each gene, published *in situ* hybridisation expression

patterns were used to determine expression within each defined cell state. Given that gene

expression can vary dramatically between stages, and some cell states are known to not be

present at specific timepoints (i.e., delaminating neural crest at HH4), we restricted the

possible cell states at specific stages. At HH4 there were 7 possible cell states, including non-

neural ectoderm (NNE), node, streak, extra-embryonic (EE), early NPB (eNPB), early neural

(eN), early caudal neural (eCN). At HH5 there were 17 potential states, this included all cell

states in the binary knowledge matrix, except for the later counterparts to the earlier cell states

which are ventral forebrain (vFB), forebrain (FB), midbrain (MB), hindbrain (HB), neural crest

(NC), delaminating neural crest (dNC) and presumptive epidermis (pEpi). At HH6 we included

the same cell states as HH5 except for EE and eNPB given that no cell clusters were classified

as such at HH5. For stages HH7, ss4 and ss8 we included 17 cell states, excluding the

following states which are only found at earlier stages (NNE, node, streak, eN, eCN, eNPB,

EE).

1042

1043 For each cell, we calculated the average scaled expression of the genes expressed in each

1044 cell state according to our binary knowledge matrix. Cell clusters were then assigned a cell

1045 state, depending on which cell state exhibited the highest median expression in that given cell

1046 cluster. Assigned cell states at each of the 6 sampled developmental stages were then

1047 transferred to the full dataset.

1048

Gene module identification and filtering

To calculate groups of highly correlated genes, we first filtered genes which do not correlate

(Spearman correlation < 0.3) with at least 3 other genes. Then we calculated gene modules

using the Antler R package (Delile et al., 2019), which iteratively clusters genes hierarchically

based on their gene-gene Spearman correlation. After each iteration, gene modules were

filtered to remove gene modules which are not highly expressed (expressed in fewer than 10

cells) or which do not show consistent high expression across genes (fewer than 40% of genes

in the module are expressed after binarization). Gene modules were calculated on different

subsets of cells: the full dataset (Figure 4E and Figure 4–figure supplement 1A), ss8 (Figure

5A and Figure 5–figure supplement 1A), and the NPB subset (Figure 7E). Calculating gene

modules on different subsets allowed us to zoom in on specific aspects of ectodermal lineage
segregation.

1061

Many genes correlate across the dataset, but do not show differential expression between cell
states and therefore do not provide useful information regarding lineage segregation.
Therefore, to identify which gene modules correlate with lineage segregation, modules were
filtered to only include those in which more than 50% of their genes were differentially
expressed (logFC > 0.5, adjusted p-value < 0.001) in at least one cell state relative to the rest
of the dataset. For the NPB subset, this filtering of differential expression was just between
the neural crest (NC, dNC) and placodal (aPPR, pPPR, PPR) states rather than between all
cell states (logFC > 0.25, adjusted p-value < 0.001).

1070

1071 To remove gene modules which correlate with technical variation, we filtered those in which
1072 more than 50% their genes showed differential expression between sequencing batches
1073 (logFC > 0.25, adjusted p-value <0.001).

1074

For the gene modules calculated on the full dataset, we were particularly interested in gene
modules that segregated into one of the three lineages (neural, neural crest or placodal) at
later stages. To focus our analysis on these gene modules, we applied an additional filtering
step to only keep gene modules in which more than 50% of genes were differentially
expressed between one of the three lineages at ss8 (logFC > 0.25, adjusted p-value <0.001).
After filtering 9 gene modules remained (Figure 4–figure supplement 1A, Figure 4–Source
Data 1). Modules were further manually filtered for visualisation (Figure 4E).

1082

For the gene modules calculated on the NPB subset we wanted to focus on the co-expression
and sequential activation of gene modules that contain well-characterised neural crest and
PPR markers. We therefore further filtered NPB gene modules to include only those that had
genes that were defined within neural crest, delaminating neural crest or PPR cell states in
the binary knowledge matrix. After this final filtering step, 7 gene modules remained (Figure
7E, Figure 7–Source Data 1).

1089

Identification of undetermined cells at the NPB

To identify which cells expressed competing pan-placodal and pan-neural crest modules at
similar levels, we calculated the average expression (normalised counts) of these two gene
modules in each cell and then ordered cells by their ratio of pan-placodal to pan-neural crest
module expression. Cells were then grouped into 10 evenly sized bins and visualised on
UMAPs.

Co-expression distribution plots

To investigate the distribution of co-expression between cells, co-expression histograms were plotted (Figure 5I). Co-expression values were calculated by multiplying the average normalised expression of the pan-placodal and pan-neural crest gene modules.

Co-expression visualisation

The average normalised expression of each gene module was scaled between 0 and 1. A 100x100 two-colour matrix was created using Seurat's BlendMatrix function. Each cell was assigned a colour from this matrix based on their scaled average expression of the gene modules (Figure 5H). Only cells which express both modules above a threshold of 0.3 after scaling were visualised.

RNA velocity

Spliced and unspliced matrices obtained from Velocyto (La Manno et al., 2018) (see *Read Alignment*) were analysed using scVelo (Bergen et al., 2020) to generate cell velocity vectors. Velocyto matrices were intersected with each of the data subsets generated in Seurat. First and second order moments were then calculated for each cell across its 20 nearest neighbours using the top 20 PCs. RNA velocity was ran using the dynamical model whilst accounting for differential kinetics; this allows for differential splicing rates between genes as well as differential splicing kinetics between cell states.

Latent time was calculated and used downstream as a measure of a cell's internal clock. When calculating latent time, cells were rooted to the earliest timepoint present in the data subset; in cases where only one stage was present, the cell root was calculated automatically. For all latent time estimates, we used a diffusion weighting of 0.2.

Modelling gene expression dynamics

Lineage inference was calculated using CellRank, which uses a probabilistic approach to assign cell lineage (Lange et al., 2022). Cell transition matrices were calculated using RNA velocity (0.8 weighting) and nearest neighbour graph (0.2 weighting) kernels. A softmax scale of 4 was set to prevent transitions tending towards orthogonality. When predicting cell transitions, terminal states were specified according to the lineages which we were wanting to model gene dynamics across. For the full dataset, we predicted cell transitions towards either neural, placodal or neural crest lineages. Terminal states were specified as: delaminating neural crest and neural crest cell states at ss4 and ss8 for the neural crest lineage; hindbrain, midbrain, and forebrain cell states at ss4 and ss8 for the neural lineage; anterior PPR,

1133   posterior PPR and PPR cell states at ss4 and ss8 for the placodal lineage (Figure 4–figure

1134   supplement 1C). For our NPB subset we predicted cell transitions towards either placodal or

1135   neural crest lineages, with terminal states specified as: delaminating neural crest and neural

1136   crest cell states at ss8 for the neural crest lineage; aPPR and PPR cell states at ss8 for the

1137   placodal lineage.

1138

Gene expression dynamics were calculated by fitting general additive models (GAM), which

modelled scaled gene expression as a function of latent time using the mgcv package in R.

Lineage absorption probability obtained from CellRank were used to weight a GAM for each

of the predicted lineages. To generate a smoothed prediction of gene expression change, a

cubic spline was fitted with knots=4. When modelling the dynamics of entire gene modules,

all genes within a given module were included in the GAM.

1145

1146   *Modelling mediolateral gene expression patterns from scRNAseq data*

1147   <u>Following principal component analysis of cells at HH7, the order of cell states across the</u>

1148   <u>inverse of PC 1 were found to reflect the M-L positioning of cells *in vivo*. Genes which were.</u>

1149   <u>To model the expression of placodal and neural crest markers across the M-L axis, GAMs</u>

1150   <u>were fitted for the scaled expression of each gene across PC 1 using ggplot2::geom_smooth.</u>

1151

1152   **Fluorescent *in situ* hybridisation chain reaction**

1153

Hybridisation chain reaction v3 (HCR) was carried out as previously described (Buzzi et al.,

2022; Choi et al., 2018). Embryos were fixed in 4% PFA for 1h at room temperature,

dehydrated in a series of methanol in PBT, and stored overnight at -20°C. Samples were

rehydrated and treated with proteinase-K for 3 min (20 mg/mL). Next samples were post-fixed

in 4% PFA for 20 min and sequentially washed on ice for 5 min in PBS, 1:1 PBT/5×SSC

(5×sodium chloride sodium citrate, 0.1% Tween-20), and 5×SSC. Samples were then pre-

hybridised in hybridisation buffer for 5 min on ice, followed by 30 min at 37°C. Next, samples

were hybridised overnight at 37°C with HCR probes in hybridisation buffer (4 pmol/mL).

Excess probe was washed off with 15 min washes in probe wash buffer at 37°C, before

preamplification in amplification buffer at room temperature for 5 min. Hairpins (30 pmol) were

incubated at 95°C for 90 s and left to cool to room temperature for 30 min before being added

to the amplification buffer. Samples were then incubated with the hairpin/amplification buffer

solution overnight at room temperature. Excess hairpins were washed off with two 5 min and

two 30 min washes in 5×SSC. After a 5 min incubation in DAPI (10 mg/mL), samples were

washed 3 times for 10 min in 5×SSC before being imaged using a Leica SP5 laser scanning

confocal inverted microscope using the LAS AF software.

1170

Intensity measurements were calculated by taking the sum of slices from the image Z-stacks

taken at three anteroposterior levels in ImageJ. The three intensity measurements were then

independently scaled (Z-score) for each gene to allow relative measurements of gene

expression across the anteroposterior axis. Transverse virtual sections across the

anteroposterior axis were obtained using the Imaris 9.3.1 software. 10 μm sections were

generated with the orthogonal slice tool.

1177

1178

1179 **Data availability and reproducibility**

1180

1181 10x single cell RNAseq was carried out in two batches and is available under two separate

1182 accession numbers (ArrayExpress: E-MTAB-10408 and E-MTAB-1144). Our NGS alignments

1183 and downstream analysis have been wrapped into custom Nextflow pipelines allowing for full

1184 reproducibility. For the code used in this analysis, including links to our Docker containers, see

1185 our GitHub repository at https://github.com/alexthiery/10x_neural_plate_border.

1186

1187 **Acknowledgements**

1188

We thank Teresa Rayon for assistance with establishing the single cell dissociation protocol

and the Advanced Sequencing Facility at the Francis Crick Institute for the single cell RNA

sequencing. We would also like to thank Igor Adameyko and Artem Artemov for guidance on

co-expression analysis, Chantal Hubens for technical support, Alessandra Vigilante and Sami

Leino for comments on the manuscript, and Streit and Luscombe lab groups for helpful

discussions. This work was supported by the Wellcome Trust (108874/B/15/Z), the BBSRC

(BB/S005536/1; BB/R006342/1) and in part by the Francis Crick Institute which receives its

core funding from Cancer Research UK (FC001051), the UK Medical Research Council

(FC001051), and the Wellcome Trust (FC001051). For the purpose of Open Access, the

author has applied a CC BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript

version arising from this submission.

1200

1201 **Author contributions**

1202

A.S., J.B., A.T. and A.L.B. designed study. A.T., A.L.B., E.H. and A.S. collected samples and

processed for scRNAseq. A.T., C.C. developed analysis pipeline and carried out data

alignment. A.T. and E.H. carried out the downstream computational analysis of scRNAseq

data, while A.L.B. and A.T. performed HCR analysis. A.T., A.L.B., E.H., N.L., J.B. and A.S.

interpreted the results. A.T., A.L.B., E.H. and A.S. made figures and wrote the manuscript. All

authors provided feedback on the manuscript.

1209

References

Adams, M. S., Gammill, L. S., & Bronner-Fraser, M. (2008). Discovery of transcription factors and other candidate regulators of neural crest development. *Dev Dyn, 237*(4), 1021-1033. doi:10.1002/dvdy.21513

Ahrens, K., & Schlosser, G. (2005). Tissues and signals involved in the induction of placodal Six1 expression in Xenopus laevis. *Dev Biol, 288*(1), 40-59.

Andreatta, M., & Carmona, S. J. (2021). STACAS: Sub-Type Anchor Correction for Alignment in Seurat to integrate single-cell RNA-seq data. *Bioinformatics, 37*(6), 882-884. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa755

Baker, C. V., & Bronner-Fraser, M. (1997a). The origins of the neural crest. Part I: embryonic induction. *Mech Dev, 69*(1-2), 3-11. doi:10.1016/s0925-4773(97)00132-9

Baker, C. V., & Bronner-Fraser, M. (1997b). The origins of the neural crest. Part II: an evolutionary perspective. *Mech Dev, 69*(1-2), 13-29. doi:10.1016/s0925-4773(97)00129-9

Baker, C. V., & Bronner-Fraser, M. (2001). Vertebrate cranial placodes I. Embryonic induction. *Dev Biol, 232*(1), 1-61. doi:10.1006/dbio.2001.0156

Barembaum, M., & Bronner-Fraser, M. (2007). Spalt4 mediates invagination and otic placode gene expression in cranial ectoderm. *Development, 134*(21), 3805-3814. doi:10.1242/dev.02885

Barth, K. A., Kishimoto, Y., Rohr, K. B., Seydler, C., Schulte-Merker, S., & Wilson, S. W. (1999). Bmp activity establishes a gradient of positional information throughout the entire neural plate. *Development, 126*(22), 4977-4987.

Basch, M. L., Bronner-Fraser, M., & Garcia-Castro, M. I. (2006). Specification of the neural crest occurs during gastrulation and requires Pax7. *Nature, 441*(7090), 218-222.

Bell, G. W., Yatskievych, T. A., & Antin, P. B. (2004). GEISHA, a whole-mount in situ hybridization gene expression screen in chicken embryos. *Dev Dyn, 229*(3), 677-687. doi:10.1002/dvdy.10503

Bergen, V., Lange, M., Peidli, S., Wolf, F. A., & Theis, F. J. (2020). Generalizing RNA velocity to transient cell states through dynamical modeling. *Nat Biotechnol, 38*(12), 1408-1414. doi:10.1038/s41587-020-0591-3

Betancur, P., Bronner-Fraser, M., & Sauka-Spengler, T. (2010). Assembling neural crest regulatory circuits into a gene regulatory network. *Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol, 26*, 581-603. doi:10.1146/annurev.cellbio.042308.113245

Bhat, N., Kwon, H. J., & Riley, B. B. (2013). A gene network that coordinates preplacodal competence and neural crest specification in zebrafish. *Dev Biol, 373*(1), 107-117. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2012.10.012

Bhattacharyya, S., Bailey, A. P., Bronner-Fraser, M., & Streit, A. (2004). Segregation of lens and olfactory precursors from a common territory: cell sorting and reciprocity of Dlx5 and Pax6 expression. *Dev Biol, 271*(2), 403-414. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2004.04.010

Brugmann, S. A., Pandur, P. D., Kenyon, K. L., Pignoni, F., & Moody, S. A. (2004). Six1 promotes a placodal fate within the lateral neurogenic ectoderm by functioning as both a transcriptional activator and repressor. *Development, 131*(23), 5871-5881.

Buitrago-Delgado, E., Nordin, K., Rao, A., Geary, L., & LaBonne, C. (2015). Shared regulatory programs suggest retention of blastula-stage potential in neural crest cells. *Science, 348*(6241), 1332-1335. doi:10.1126/science.aaa3655

Buzzi, A. L., Chen, J., Thiery, A., Delile, J., & Streit, A. (2022). Sox8 remodels the cranial
ectoderm to generate the ear. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,*
119(28), e2118938119. doi:doi:10.1073/pnas.2118938119

Chapman, S. C., Schubert, F. R., Schoenwolf, G. C., & Lumsden, A. (2002). Analysis of spatial
and temporal gene expression patterns in blastula and gastrula stage chick embryos.
Dev Biol, 245(1), 187-199. doi:10.1006/dbio.2002.0641

Chen, B., Kim, E.-H., & Xu, P.-X. (2009). Initiation of olfactory placode development and
neurogenesis is blocked in mice lacking both Six1 and Six4. *Developmental Biology,*
326(1), 75-85.

Choi, H. M. T., Schwarzkopf, M., Fornace, M. E., Acharya, A., Artavanis, G., Stegmaier, J.,
Cunha, A., & Pierce, N. A. (2018). Third-generation in situ hybridization chain reaction:
multiplexed, quantitative, sensitive, versatile, robust. *Development, 145*(12).
doi:10.1242/dev.165753

Christophorou, N. A., Bailey, A. P., Hanson, S., & Streit, A. (2009). Activation of Six1 target
genes is required for sensory placode formation. *Dev Biol, 336*(2), 327-336.

Delile, J., Rayon, T., Melchionda, M., Edwards, A., Briscoe, J., & Sagner, A. (2019). Single
cell transcriptomics reveals spatial and temporal dynamics of gene expression in the
developing mouse spinal cord. *Development, 146*(12). doi:10.1242/dev.173807

Di Tommaso, P., Chatzou, M., Floden, E. W., Barja, P. P., Palumbo, E., & Notredame, C.
(2017). Nextflow enables reproducible computational workflows. *Nat Biotechnol, 35*(4),
316-319. doi:10.1038/nbt.3820

Ezin, A. M., Fraser, S. E., & Bronner-Fraser, M. (2009). Fate map and morphogenesis of
presumptive neural crest and dorsal neural tube. *Dev Biol, 330*(2), 221-236.
doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2009.03.018

Garcia-Castro, M. I., Marcelle, C., & Bronner-Fraser, M. (2002). Ectodermal Wnt function as
a neural crest inducer. *Science, 297*(5582), 848-851.

Grocott, T., Tambalo, M., & Streit, A. (2012). The peripheral sensory nervous system in the
vertebrate head: a gene regulatory perspective. *Dev Biol, 370*(1), 3-23.
doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2012.06.028

Hao, Y., Hao, S., Andersen-Nissen, E., Mauck, W. M., III., Zheng, S., Butler, A., Lee, M. J.,
Wilk, A. J., Darby, C., Zager, M., Hoffman, P., Stoeckius, M., Papalexi, E., Mimitou, E.
P., Jain, J., Srivastava, A., Stuart, T., Fleming, L. M., Yeung, B., Rogers, A. J.,
McElrath, J. M., Blish, C. A., Gottardo, R., Smibert, P., & Satija, R. (2021). Integrated
analysis of multimodal single-cell data. *Cell, 184*(13), 3573-3587 e3529.
doi:10.1016/j.cell.2021.04.048

Heeg-Truesdell, E., & LaBonne, C. (2006). Neural induction in Xenopus requires inhibition of
Wnt-beta-catenin signaling. *Developmental Biology, 298*(1), 71-86.

Hemmati-Brivanlou, A., Kelly, O. G., & Melton, D. A. (1994). Follistatin, an antagonist of activin,
is expressed in the Spemann organizer and displays direct neuralizing activity. *Cell,*
77(2), 283-295.

Hidalgo-Sanchez, M., Millet, S., Bloch-Gallego, E., & Alvarado-Mallart, R. M. (2005).
Specification of the meso-isthmo-cerebellar region: the Otx2/Gbx2 boundary. *Brain*
Res Brain Res Rev, 49(2), 134-149. doi:10.1016/j.brainresrev.2005.01.010

Hidalgo-Sanchez, M., Millet, S., Simeone, A., & Alvarado-Mallart, R. M. (1999). Comparative
analysis of Otx2, Gbx2, Pax2, Fgf8 and Wnt1 gene expressions during the formation
of the chick midbrain/hindbrain domain. *Mech Dev, 81*(1-2), 175-178.
doi:10.1016/s0925-4773(98)00224-x

Hintze, M., Prajapati, R. S., Tambalo, M., Christophorou, N. A. D., Anwar, M., Grocott, T., &
Streit, A. (2017). Cell interactions, signals and transcriptional hierarchy governing
placode progenitor induction. *Development, 144*(15), 2810-2823.
doi:10.1242/dev.147942

Hollyday, M., McMahon, J. A., & McMahon, A. P. (1995). Wnt expression patterns in chick
embryo nervous system. *Mech Dev, 52*(1), 9-25. doi:10.1016/0925-4773(95)00385-e

Hong, C. S., & Saint-Jeannet, J. P. (2007). The activity of Pax3 and Zic1 regulates three
distinct cell fates at the neural plate border. *Mol Biol Cell, 18*(6), 2192-2202.
doi:10.1091/mbc.e06-11-1047

Kwon, H. J., Bhat, N., Sweet, E. M., Cornell, R. A., & Riley, B. B. (2010). Identification of early
requirements for preplacodal ectoderm and sensory organ development. *PLoS Genet,*
6(9). doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1001133

La Manno, G., Soldatov, R., Zeisel, A., Braun, E., Hochgerner, H., Petukhov, V., Lidschreiber,
K., Kastriti, M. E., Lonnerberg, P., Furlan, A., Fan, J., Borm, L. E., Liu, Z., van Bruggen,
D., Guo, J., He, X., Barker, R., Sundstrom, E., Castelo-Branco, G., Cramer, P.,
Adameyko, I., Linnarsson, S., & Kharchenko, P. V. (2018). RNA velocity of single cells.
Nature, 560(7719), 494-498. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0414-6

Lange, M., Bergen, V., Klein, M., Setty, M., Reuter, B., Bakhti, M., Lickert, H., Ansari, M.,
Schniering, J., Schiller, H. B., Pe'er, D., & Theis, F. J. (2022). CellRank for directed
single-cell fate mapping. *Nat Methods*. doi:10.1038/s41592-021-01346-6

Liberatore, C. M., Searcy-Schrick, R. D., & Yutzey, K. E. (2000). Ventricular expression of tbx5
inhibits normal heart chamber development. *Dev Biol, 223*(1), 169-180.
doi:10.1006/dbio.2000.9748

Liem, K. F., Jr., Tremml, G., Roelink, H., & Jessell, T. M. (1995). Dorsal differentiation of neural
plate cells induced by BMP-mediated signals from epidermal ectoderm. *Cell, 82*(6),
969-979.

Linker, C., & Stern, C. D. (2004). Neural induction requires BMP inhibition only as a late step,
and involves signals other than FGF and Wnt antagonists. *Development, 131*(22),
5671-5681.

Litsiou, A., Hanson, S., & Streit, A. (2005). A balance of FGF, Wnt and BMP signalling
positions the future placode territory in the head. *Development, 132*, 4051-4062.

Londin, E. R., Niemiec, J., & Sirotkin, H. I. (2005). Chordin, FGF signalling, and mesodermal
factors cooperate in zebrafish neural induction. *Dev Biol, 279*(1), 1-19.

Marchant, L., Linker, C., Ruiz, P., Guerrero, N., & Mayor, R. (1998). The inductive properties
of mesoderm suggest that the neural crest cells are specified by a BMP gradient. *Dev*
Biol, 198(2), 319-329.

McLarren, K. W., Litsiou, A., & Streit, A. (2003). DLX5 positions the neural crest and
preplacode region at the border of the neural plate. *Dev Biol, 259*(1), 34-47.
doi:10.1016/s0012-1606(03)00177-5

Mehdizadeh, T., Majumdar, H. D., Ahsan, S., Tavares, A. L. P., & Moody, S. A. (2021).
Mutations in SIX1 Associated with Branchio-oto-Renal Syndrome (BOR) Differentially
Affect Otic Expression of Putative Target Genes. *J Dev Biol, 9*(3).
doi:10.3390/jdb9030025

Milet, C., Maczkowiak, F., Roche, D. D., & Monsoro-Burq, A. H. (2013). Pax3 and Zic1 drive
induction and differentiation of multipotent, migratory, and functional neural crest in
Xenopus embryos. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 110*(14), 5528-5533.
doi:10.1073/pnas.1219124110

Monsoro-Burq, A. H. (2015). PAX transcription factors in neural crest development. *Semin*
Cell Dev Biol, 44, 87-96. doi:10.1016/j.semcdb.2015.09.015

Monsoro-Burq, A. H., Fletcher, R. B., & Harland, R. M. (2003). Neural crest induction by
paraxial mesoderm in Xenopus embryos requires FGF signals. *Development, 130*(14),
3111-3124.

Monsoro-Burq, A. H., Wang, E., & Harland, R. (2005). Msx1 and Pax3 cooperate to mediate
FGF8 and WNT signals during Xenopus neural crest induction. *Dev Cell, 8*(2), 167-
178. doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2004.12.017

Ohuchi, H., Tomonari, S., Itoh, H., Mikawa, T., & Noji, S. (1999). Identification of chick rax/rx
genes with overlapping patterns of expression during early eye and brain development.
Mech Dev, 85(1-2), 193-195. doi:10.1016/s0925-4773(99)00094-5

Ota, K., Nagai, H., & Sheng, G. (2007). Expression and hypoxic regulation of hif1alpha and
hif2alpha during early blood and endothelial cell differentiation in chick. *Gene Expr*
Patterns, 7(7), 761-766. doi:10.1016/j.modgep.2007.05.007

Ozaki, H., Nakamura, K., Funahashi, J., Ikeda, K., Yamada, G., Tokano, H., Okamura, H. O.,
Kitamura, K., Muto, S., Kotaki, H., Sudo, K., Horai, R., Iwakura, Y., & Kawakami, K.
(2004). Six1 controls patterning of the mouse otic vesicle. *Development, 131*(3), 551-
562.

Patthey, C., Gunhaga, L., & Edlund, T. (2008). Early development of the central and peripheral
nervous systems is coordinated by Wnt and BMP signals. *PLoS ONE, 3*(2), e1625.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001625

Patthey, C., Schlosser, G., & Shimeld, S. M. (2014). The evolutionary history of vertebrate
cranial placodes--I: cell type evolution. *Dev Biol, 389*(1), 82-97.
doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2014.01.017

Paxton, C. N., Bleyl, S. B., Chapman, S. C., & Schoenwolf, G. C. (2010). Identification of
differentially expressed genes in early inner ear development. *Gene Expr Patterns,*
10(1), 31-43. doi:10.1016/j.gep.2009.11.002

Pera, E., Stein, S., & Kessel, M. (1999). Ectodermal patterning in the avian embryo: epidermis
versus neural plate. *Development, 126*(1), 63-73.

Pieper, M., Ahrens, K., Rink, E., Peter, A., & Schlosser, G. (2012). Differential distribution of
competence for panplacodal and neural crest induction to non-neural and neural
ectoderm. *Development, 139*(6), 1175-1187. doi:10.1242/dev.074468

Pla, P., & Monsoro-Burq, A. H. (2018). The neural border: Induction, specification and
maturation of the territory that generates neural crest cells. *Dev Biol, 444 Suppl 1*, S36-
S46. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2018.05.018

Plouhinec, J. L., Roche, D. D., Pegoraro, C., Figueiredo, A. L., Maczkowiak, F., Brunet, L. J.,
Milet, C., Vert, J. P., Pollet, N., Harland, R. M., & Monsoro-Burq, A. H. (2014). Pax3
and Zic1 trigger the early neural crest gene regulatory network by the direct activation
of multiple key neural crest specifiers. *Dev Biol, 386*(2), 461-472.
doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2013.12.010

Prasad, M. S., Charney, R. M., & Garcia-Castro, M. I. (2019). Specification and formation of
the neural crest: Perspectives on lineage segregation. *Genesis, 57*(1), e23276.
doi:10.1002/dvg.23276

Prasad, M. S., Sauka-Spengler, T., & LaBonne, C. (2012). Induction of the neural crest state:
control of stem cell attributes by gene regulatory, post-transcriptional and epigenetic
interactions. *Dev Biol, 366*(1), 10-21. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2012.03.014

Reichert, S., Randall, R. A., & Hill, C. S. (2013). A BMP regulatory network controls ectodermal cell fate decisions at the neural plate border. *Development, 140*(21), 4435-4444. doi:10.1242/dev.098707

Rex, M., Orme, A., Uwanogho, D., Tointon, K., Wigmore, P. M., Sharpe, P. T., & Scotting, P. J. (1997). Dynamic expression of chicken Sox2 and Sox3 genes in ectoderm induced to form neural tissue. *Dev Dyn, 209*(3), 323-332. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0177(199707)209:3<323::AID-AJA7>3.0.CO;2-K

Roellig, D., Tan-Cabugao, J., Esaian, S., & Bronner, M. E. (2017). Dynamic transcriptional signature and cell fate analysis reveals plasticity of individual neural plate border cells. *Elife, 6*. doi:10.7554/eLife.21620

Rothstein, M., & Simoes-Costa, M. (2020). Heterodimerization of TFAP2 pioneer factors drives epigenomic remodeling during neural crest specification. *Genome Res, 30*(1), 35-48. doi:10.1101/gr.249680.119

Sasai, Y., Lu, B., Steinbeisser, H., & De Robertis, E. M. (1995). Regulation of neural induction by the Chd and Bmp-4 antagonistic patterning signals in Xenopus. *Nature, 376*(6538), 333-336.

Schlosser, G. (2006). Induction and specification of cranial placodes. *Dev Biol, 294*(2), 303-351. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2006.03.009

Schlosser, G. (2014). Early embryonic specification of vertebrate cranial placodes. *Wiley Interdiscip Rev Dev Biol, 3*(5), 349-363. doi:10.1002/wdev.142

Schlosser, G., Awtry, T., Brugmann, S. A., Jensen, E. D., Neilson, K., Ruan, G., Stammler, A., Voelker, D., Yan, B., Zhang, C., Klymkowsky, M. W., & Moody, S. A. (2008). Eya1 and Six1 promote neurogenesis in the cranial placodes in a SoxB1-dependent fashion. *Dev Biol, 320*(1), 199-214. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2008.05.523

Sheng, G., & Stern, C. D. (1999). Gata2 and Gata3: novel markers for early embryonic polarity and for non-neural ectoderm in the chick embryo. *Mech Dev, 87*(1-2), 213-216. doi:10.1016/s0925-4773(99)00150-1

Simoes-Costa, M., & Bronner, M. E. (2015). Establishing neural crest identity: a gene regulatory recipe. *Development, 142*(2), 242-257. doi:10.1242/dev.105445

Soldatov, R., Kaucka, M., Kastriti, M. E., Petersen, J., Chontorotzea, T., Englmaier, L., Akkuratova, N., Yang, Y., Haring, M., Dyachuk, V., Bock, C., Farlik, M., Piacentino, M. L., Boismoreau, F., Hilscher, M. M., Yokota, C., Qian, X., Nilsson, M., Bronner, M. E., Croci, L., Hsiao, W. Y., Guertin, D. A., Brunet, J. F., Consalez, G. G., Ernfors, P., Fried, K., Kharchenko, P. V., & Adameyko, I. (2019). Spatiotemporal structure of cell fate decisions in murine neural crest. *Science, 364*(6444). doi:10.1126/science.aas9536

Steventon, B., Araya, C., Linker, C., Kuriyama, S., & Mayor, R. (2009). Differential requirements of BMP and Wnt signalling during gastrulation and neurulation define two steps in neural crest induction. *Development, 136*(5), 771-779. doi:10.1242/dev.029017

Steventon, B., Mayor, R., & Streit, A. (2012). Mutual repression between Gbx2 and Otx2 in sensory placodes reveals a general mechanism for ectodermal patterning. *Dev Biol, 367*(1), 55-65. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2012.04.025

Streit, A. (2002). Extensive cell movements accompany formation of the otic placode. *Dev Biol, 249*(2), 237-254. doi:10.1006/dbio.2002.0739

Streit, A., Berliner, A. J., Papanayotou, C., Sirulnik, A., & Stern, C. D. (2000). Initiation of neural induction by FGF signalling before gastrulation. *Nature, 406*(6791), 74-78.

1441   Streit, A., Lee, K. J., Woo, I., Roberts, C., Jessell, T. M., & Stern, C. D. (1998). Chordin
1442   regulates primitive streak development and the stability of induced neural cells, but is
1443   not sufficient for neural induction in the chick embryo. *Development, 125*(3), 507-519.

1444   Streit, A., & Stern, C. D. (1999). Establishment and maintenance of the border of the neural
1445   plate in the chick: involvement of FGF and BMP activity. *Mech Dev, 82*(1-2), 51-66.

1446   Stuhlmiller, T. J., & García-Castro, M. I. (2012). FGF/MAPK signaling is required in the
1447   gastrula epiblast for avian neural crest induction. *Development, 139*(2), 289-300.
1448   doi:10.1242/dev.070276

1449   Stundl, J., Bertucci, P. Y., Lauri, A., Arendt, D., & Bronner, M. E. (2021). Evolution of new cell
1450   types at the lateral neural border. *Curr Top Dev Biol, 141*, 173-205.
1451   doi:10.1016/bs.ctdb.2020.11.005

1452   Thiery, A., Buzzi, A. L., & Streit, A. (2020). Cell fate decisions during the development of the
1453   peripheral nervous system in the vertebrate head. *Curr Top Dev Biol, 139*, 127-167.
1454   doi:10.1016/bs.ctdb.2020.04.002

1455   Trevers, K. E., Lu, H. C., Yang, Y., Thiery, A., Strobl, A. C., Pálinkášová, B., de Oliveira, N.
1456   M. M., de Almeida, I. M., Khan, M. A. F., Moncaut, N., Luscombe, N. M., Dale, L., Streit,
1457   A., & Stern, C. D. (2021). A gene regulatory network for neural induction. *bioRxiv*,
1458   2021.2004.2016.440164. doi:10.1101/2021.04.16.440164

1459   Trevers, K. E., Prajapati, R. S., Hintze, M., Stower, M. J., Strobl, A. C., Tambalo, M.,
1460   Ranganathan, R., Moncaut, N., Khan, M. A. F., Stern, C. D., & Streit, A. (2018). Neural
1461   induction by the node and placode induction by head mesoderm share an initial state
1462   resembling neural plate border and ES cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 115*(2), 355-
1463   360. doi:10.1073/pnas.1719674115

1464   Wakamatsu, Y., Endo, Y., Osumi, N., & Weston, J. A. (2004). Multiple roles of Sox2, an HMG-
1465   box transcription factor in avian neural crest development. *Dev Dyn, 229*(1), 74-86.
1466   doi:10.1002/dvdy.10498

1467   Williams, R. M., Lukoseviciute, M., Sauka-Spengler, T., & Bronner, M. E. (2022). Single-cell
1468   atlas of early chick development reveals gradual segregation of neural crest lineage
1469   from the neural plate border during neurulation. *Elife, 11*. doi:10.7554/eLife.74464

1470   Wilson, S. I., Graziano, E., Harland, R., Jessell, T. M., & Edlund, T. (2000). An early
1471   requirement for FGF signalling in the acquisition of neural cell fate in the chick embryo.
1472   *Curr Biol, 10*(8), 421-429.

1473   Yardley, N., & Garcia-Castro, M. I. (2012). FGF signaling transforms non-neural ectoderm into
1474   neural crest. *Dev Biol, 372*(2), 166-177. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2012.09.006

1475

1476