**A Molecular, Spatial, and Regulatory Atlas of the *Hydra vulgaris* Nervous System**

Hannah Morris Little[a*], Abby S. Primack[a*], Jennifer Tsverov[a*], Susanne Mühlbauer[b], Ben D.

Cox[a], Christina Busse[b], Sandra Schneid[b], Amber Louwagie[b], Jack F. Cazet[a], Charles N. David[b],

Jeffrey A. Farrell[b], Celina E. Juliano[a**]

[a] Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616

[b] Department of Biology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, 82152 Martinsried, Germany

[c] Division of Developmental Biology, *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health

and Human Development, Bethesda, MD 20814, USA

*These authors made equal contributions

**Corresponding Author

Email: cejuliano@ucdavis.edu

**Summary Statement**

*Hydra vulgaris* is a model for regenerative and functional neuroscience. This study identifies

fifteen neuron subtypes using scRNA-seq, maps spatial distributions, explores regulatory

mechanisms, and provides an accessible web portal.

**Abstract**

*Hydra vulgaris*, a cnidarian with a simple nerve net, is an emerging model for developmental, regenerative, and functional neuroscience. Its genetic tractability and capacity for whole-system imaging make it well suited for studying neuron replacement, regeneration, and neural circuit function. Here, we present the most comprehensive molecular and spatial characterization of the *H. vulgaris* nervous system to date. Using single-cell RNA sequencing, we identified eight neuron types, each defined by distinct neuropeptide expression, and further resolved these into fifteen transcriptionally distinct subtypes with unique spatial distributions and morphologies. To investigate the gene regulatory networks underlying neuronal differentiation, we applied trajectory inference, identified key transcription factors, and performed ATAC-seq on sorted neurons to map chromatin accessibility. All datasets are available through an interactive, user-friendly web portal to support broad use by the research community. Together, these resources provide a foundation for uncovering molecular mechanisms that govern nervous system development, homeostasis, and regeneration in *H. vulgaris*.

**Introduction**

The small freshwater cnidarian *Hydra vulgaris* (**Fig. 1A**) is a classic model for studying regeneration due to its ability to regenerate its entire body, including the nervous system (Bode et al., 1988; Rentzsch et al., 2019; Trembley et al., 1744; Vogg et al., 2019b). Even in uninjured animals, neurogenesis pathways remain continuously active, enabling constant neuron replacement and providing easy experimental access to study the molecular mechanisms of neurogenesis (David and Gierer, 1974; David and Murphy, 1977; Siebert et al., 2019). Recently, *H. vulgaris* has also gained recognition as a valuable model in functional neuroscience, with the identification of neural circuits that drive specific behaviors (Dupre and Yuste, 2017; Giez et al., 2023; Yamamoto and Yuste, 2023). Building on this foundational research, *H. vulgaris* now serves as a robust model for regenerative neuroscience, offering tools to investigate the complete regeneration of an adult nervous system, from molecules to behavior.

The *H. vulgaris* body is formed by two epithelial monolayers, an outer ectodermal layer and an inner endodermal layer (**Fig. 1A**). Its nervous system consists of approximately 3,000–5,000 neurons (around 3-5% of total body cells), organized into two distinct nerve nets, one within

each epithelial layer (Bode et al., 1973; Keramidioti et al., 2024). *H. vulgaris* neurons are part of the interstitial cell lineage, and their replacement during both homeostasis and regeneration is supported by multipotent adult interstitial stem cells (ISCs) located among the ectodermal epithelial cells (**Fig. 1A**) (David and Gierer, 1974; David and Murphy, 1977). Due to passive tissue displacement toward the extremities, which leads to ongoing cell loss, ISCs continuously replenish neurons even in the absence of injury (Campbell, 1967; David and Gierer, 1974; Hager and David, 1997). The constant activity of neurogenesis pathways in uninjured adult polyps allows for the detailed profiling of differentiation states using single-cell RNA sequencing (scRNA-seq) (Siebert et al., 2019).

In addition to exhibiting continual, widespread neuronal regeneration, *H. vulgaris* are amenable to tests of gene function, such as gene knock-down through the expression of RNA hairpins or the electroporation of siRNAs (Juliano et al., 2014a; Lommel et al., 2017; Vogg et al., 2019a). Additionally, creating stable transgenic *H. vulgaris* lines is straightforward using cell-type-specific promoters (Siebert et al., 2008; Siebert et al., 2019; Wittlieb et al., 2006). This has enabled the expression of fluorescent calcium reporters like GCaMP to monitor neuronal activity and the use of nitroreductase to selectively ablate specific neurons (Dupre and Yuste, 2017; Giez et al., 2023; Noro et al., 2021). Together, these attributes make *H. vulgaris* an accessible model for investigating the molecular mechanisms underlying nervous system development and regeneration, from cellular differentiation to the formation of neural circuits driving behavior. Additionally, as a member of Cnidaria, the sister group to bilaterians, *H. vulgaris* provides a unique opportunity to explore the evolution of the molecular processes involved in nervous system development, regeneration, and function.

Decades of research have established a foundational framework for studying the *H. vulgaris* nervous system. Our basic understanding includes the source of new neurons, the relative distribution of neurons along the oral-aboral axis, and neurogenesis rates in an uninjured *H. vulgaris* (Bode et al., 1973; Bode et al., 1988; David, 2012; David and Gierer, 1974). In our previous work, where we created a whole-animal single-cell expression map, we transcriptionally profiled *H. vulgaris* neurons and largely analyzed in situ hybridization patterns of marker genes from existing literature to estimate their spatial distribution (Siebert et al.,

2019). However, due to the relatively small number of neurons sequenced (~3,500) in that study,

there was a possibility of missing some neuron populations. Additionally, we did not capture

enough intermediate states of neuronal differentiation to fully resolve the transcriptional changes

occurring as neurons develop from ISCs. Another study used single-cell SMART-seq2 to

sequence 1,152 *H. vulgaris* interstitial cells, including 384 neurons (Klimovich et al., 2020).

Although this method provided deeper sequencing, it did not substantially increase the number of

neurons available for analysis.

We addressed previous limitations by sequencing 10-fold as many neurons, generating ~35,000

single-cell transcriptomes of neurons and neural progenitors. This enhanced dataset allowed us to

confirm the twelve neuron subtypes identified in our original study (Siebert et al., 2019) and to

identify three previously unrecognized subtypes. Using fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH),

in situ hybridization chain reaction (HCR), and immunostaining, we refined the spatial map of

the *H. vulgaris* nervous system, revealing how neuron subtypes are organized into established

circuits characterized by shared neuropeptide expression. To further dissect the regulatory

underpinnings of neural differentiation, we performed URD trajectory inference and ATAC-seq

(Assay for Transposase-Accessible Chromatin using Sequencing) on sorted neurons to

characterize the regulatory landscape during nervous system differentiation (Buenrostro et al.,

2015; Farrell et al., 2018) and we demonstrate how these data can be used to formulate

hypothetical gene regulatory networks (GRNs) for future testing. To support broad use and

accelerate discovery in *H. vulgaris* neurobiology and regeneration, all data and tools are freely

available through an interactive, user-friendly web portal.

**Results**

**Expansion of the neuronal single cell transcriptome dataset for *Hydra vulgaris***

In our previous study, we used Drop-seq to create a single cell atlas of the adult *H. vulgaris*

polyp, which included approximately 3,500 single-cell transcriptomes of differentiated neurons

and cells undergoing neurogenesis (Macosko et al., 2015; Siebert et al., 2019). To build on this

initial study, we aimed to increase the number of neural single-cell transcriptomes to uncover

any additional molecular diversity in the *H. vulgaris* neuron repertoire that may have been

missed due to the relatively small number of cells sequenced. To accomplish this, we performed

scRNA-seq using the 10x Genomics platform to expand our dataset. To enrich for neurons and

neural progenitors, we used Fluorescent Activated Cell Sorting (FACS) to collect cells from two

different transgenic lines (**Fig. S1, Table S1**): (1) *Tg(actin1:GFP)*[rs3-in], a previously published

line in which GFP is expressed in all differentiated neurons, neural progenitors, and ISCs

(Keramidioti et al., 2024), and (2) *Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)*[cj1-gt], a line created for this study in

which mNeonGreen is expressed under the control of the pan-neuronal gene *tba1c* and is

therefore predicted to be expressed in all differentiated neurons (see Material and Methods for

explanation of transgenic line naming scheme). However, we observed that certain neuron

subtypes were underrepresented in the scRNA-seq data collected from this line, suggesting that

our cloned promoter conferred some neuronal subtype specificity, possibly due to incomplete

coverage of the *tba1c* regulatory region in our transgenic construct. (**Figs. S1, S2**).

We combined our new data with previously collected neuronal single-cell transcriptomes from

our earlier study for downstream analysis (**Table S2**) (Siebert et al., 2019). Sequencing reads

from all libraries were mapped to the *H. vulgaris* strain AEP gene models and processed

following standard protocols (**Fig. S3**) (Cazet et al., 2023; Siebert et al., 2019). The expression of

the pan-neuronal marker *elav2* was used to determine neuron identity and therefore remove non-

neurons from the data set (Siebert et al., 2019). After filtering, we recovered 35,071 single-cell

neural transcriptomes, expanding our dataset tenfold. We detected a median of 1371.5 genes and

2887.5 UMIs per cell (**Table S2**), a substantial improvement compared to the median of 563.5

genes and 1,082 UMIs per cell detected in the neuron-enriched Drop-seq libraries from our

previous study (Siebert et al., 2019). To identify distinct neuron subtypes in our dataset, we used

Seurat to perform Louvain clustering and visualized the results using Uniform Manifold

Approximation and Projection (UMAP) (**Fig. 1B, Fig. S4, Table S3**) (Hao et al., 2021; McInnes

et al., 2018; Satija et al., 2015; Stuart et al., 2019). Fifteen clusters of putative differentiated

neurons were identified based on their high expression of *tba1c* and the absence of stem and

progenitor gene expression (**Fig. S5**). As detailed below, all fifteen of these clusters were

confirmed to consist of differentiated neurons. We performed non-negative matrix factorization

(NMF) (Kotliar et al., 2019) to identify groups of co-expressed genes ("metagenes"), and we

recovered metagenes for the fifteen neuron clusters, and stem and progenitor cells (**Fig. S6**).

**An integrated cell-type atlas of the *Hydra vulgaris* nervous system**

This expanded scRNA-seq dataset provides a valuable resource for studying nervous system development, regeneration, and function in *H. vulgaris*. In this section, our goal is to present a comprehensive description of the *H. vulgaris* nervous system by integrating our new data with previously published work, including recent work by Keramidioti et al. (2024) using a novel pan-neural antibody (PNab) to provide a detailed anatomical description of the *H. vulgaris* nerve net. We begin by revisiting and expanding the neuron naming scheme originally proposed in Siebert et al., 2019, which defined eight neuron types further subdivided into subtypes. For each type/subtype, we describe roles in known neural circuits where applicable, determine neuropeptide expression patterns, and use FISH or HCR to characterize the spatial localization of subtypes, and in some cases identify novel subtypes (**Fig. 2, Fig. 3**). These integrated data provide a detailed classification of neuron subtypes within the *H. vulgaris* nervous system.

*Classification scheme for H. vulgaris neurons*: To systematically classify *H. vulgaris* neurons, we developed a hierarchical and expandable naming scheme that can accommodate future insights into neuronal function, morphology, and spatial organization. The *H. vulgaris* nervous system is comprised of two nerve nets, one embedded in the ectoderm and one in the endoderm (Keramidioti et al., 2024). The ectodermal nerve net extends from the basal disk to the tentacle tips, with higher neuron density at the oral (tentacle and hypostome) and aboral (peduncle and basal disk) regions as compared to the body column (Keramidioti et al., 2024). Along the length of the animal, ectodermal neurons project neurites that form bundles and communicate laterally through gap junctions (Keramidioti et al., 2024). Two major non-overlapping circuits, contraction burst (CB) and rhythmic potential 1 (RP1), run along the axis in the ectoderm and regulate behaviors such as longitudinal contractions and somersaulting (Dupre and Yuste, 2017; Yamamoto and Yuste, 2023). The endodermal nerve net is distributed along the body in the endodermal layer but is absent in the tentacles (Keramidioti et al., 2024). The rhythmic potential 2 (RP2) neural circuit, which is involved in feeding behavior, is part of the endodermal nerve net (Dupre and Yuste, 2017; Giez et al., 2023; Keramidioti et al., 2024; Siebert et al., 2019).

Building on our previous work, we first assigned neurons to either the ectodermal ("ec") or endodermal ("en") nerve nets, using expression of the endodermal marker gene *budhead* to guide

this distinction (**Fig. 1D, Fig. S5**) (Siebert et al., 2019). Our prior classification grouped

ectodermal neurons into five types (ec1-ec5); here, we confirm and extend this framework by

showing that each type has a unique neuropeptide expression profile (**Fig. 1C, Table S4**). This

neuropeptide-based strategy is consistent with approaches used to classify neuron types in *C.*

*elegans*, mice, and humans (Das Gupta et al., 2021; Taylor et al., 2021; Zhong et al., 2022). As

described in detail below, we further subdivided the five ectodermal types into twelve

transcriptionally and spatially distinct subtypes (**Fig. 1C, Fig. 2, Fig. 3A,B**). In contrast, the

endodermal nerve net is less complex, consisting of three transcriptionally distinct clusters that

show moderate variation in neuropeptide expression (**Fig. 1C**). As described in detail below,

these clusters correspond to three neuron types (en1-en3) (**Fig. 1C**). Overall, this classification

extends the original ec1-ec5 and en1-en3 scheme described in Siebert et al. (2019) and provides

a robust framework for future refinement as additional data emerge.

***ec3 neurons:*** The RP1 circuit is composed of ec3 neurons, which express a suite of

neuropeptides, most prominently *Hym-355* and products of the *GLWamide* gene (**Fig. 1C**)

(Keramidioti et al., 2024; Leviev et al., 1997; Yamamoto and Yuste, 2023). To visualize the

architecture of this circuit, we performed co-immunostaining using an antibody recognizing

GLWamide peptides (Koizumi et al., 2015) and PNab (stains all neurons), revealing ec3 neurons

extending throughout the length of the body column (**Fig. 3A-D**). ec3 neurons also uniquely

express *innexin 6* and *innexin 14,* which likely contribute to gap junction formation and electrical

coupling within the RP1 circuit (**Fig. S9B,C**) (Keramidioti et al., 2024).  Consistent with our

previously published data set, the ec3 neuron population forms a transcriptional continuum that

can be divided into three clusters, each enriched for different marker genes (**Fig. 1B, Fig. S5**)

(Siebert et al., 2019). We used fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH) to map spatial

distributions of these neuronal clusters and observed distinct localization along the oral-aboral

axis, supporting classification as three ec3 subtypes. ec3A neurons are found in the basal disk,

ec3B neurons are found in the body column and hypostome, and ec3C neurons are found in the

tentacles (**Fig. 1B,D**, **Fig. 2G, I, K, Fig. 3A,B**).

***ec1 and ec5 neurons:*** Together, ec1 and ec5 neurons comprise the CB circuit, which drives

longitudinal contractions (Dupre and Yuste, 2017; Escobar et al., 2024; Noro et al., 2019; Noro

et al., 2021). Both ec1 and ec5 neurons express *innexin-2*, a gap junction gene that facilitates

communication between cells within the circuit (**Fig. S9A**) (Keramidioti et al., 2024; Siebert et

al., 2019; Takaku et al., 2014). ec1 neurons express *FRamide* and members of the *Hym176*

neuropeptide family, including *Hym176B* (**Fig. 1C**). We visualized ec1 neurons using a

transgenic reporter line expressing GFP under the *Hym176B* promoter (Noro et al., 2019),

combined with GFP and PNab co-immunostaining. This revealed the distribution of the ec1

neurons in the CB circuit, extending from just above the peduncle to the hypostome and tentacle

base (**Fig. 3A,B,G,H**). Co-immunostaining the *Hym176B* promoter line with PNab and

GLWamide, a marker for ec3 neurons, confirmed that the body column ectodermal nerve net

contains only ec1A and ec3B neurons (**Fig. 3A,B, Fig. S8**). ec5 neurons complete the CB circuit

and share a similar neuropeptide expression profile with ec1, with additional expression of

*Hym176C* and *RFamideA* (**Fig. 1C**). We confirmed their location in the peduncle using FISH for

*Hym176C* (**Fig. 2J**) and RFamide immunostaining (**Fig. 3A,B,I,J**), noting that RFamide is also

expressed in ec4 neurons (Koizumi et al., 2015).

In our previous study, we identified two distinct ec1 subtypes, ec1A and ec1B, based on distinct

molecular markers (Siebert et al., 2019) (**Fig. S5**). Using FISH, we now confirm that ec1A

neurons localize to the body column, whereas ec1B neurons are restricted to the tentacles,

supporting their classification as separate subtypes (**Fig. 2E,H**). In our current dataset, we

identified three additional clusters expressing *FRamide* and *Hym176* family neuropeptides,

consistent with ec1 identity (**Fig. 1B, C**). FISH or HCR with cluster-specific marker genes

confirmed three new neuron subtypes: ec1C, ec1D, and ec1E (**Fig. 2A,B,L, Fig. S5**). ec1C

neurons form a ring around the mouth, potentially resembling the nerve ring previously

described in *Hydra oligactis* (**Fig. 2A, Fig. S7C**) (Grimmelikhuijzen, 1985). ec1E neurons are

located just above ec1C in the lower hypostome, while ec1D neurons localize to the basal disk

(**Fig. 2B,L**).

Previous studies reported only a single neuronal population in the basal disk (Dupre and Yuste,

2017; Siebert et al., 2019). Therefore, to distinguish ec1D from ec3A neurons, we performed

double FISH using subtype-specific markers, confirming their separation (**Fig. 4A-C**). Co-

staining with GLWamide and PNab further supported the presence of a second, non-ec3A

neuronal population in the basal disk, as we observed PNab-positive cells lacking GLWamide
expression (**Fig. 4D-F**). In summary, the CB circuit is composed of six neuronal subtypes, ec5
and ec1A-E, which span the entire body axis from the basal disk (ec1D) to the tentacles (ec1B).
240
241  For both the RP1 and CB circuits, the potential functional roles of the distinct neuronal subtypes
242  remain unclear. However, differential gene expression within our dataset may provide insights
243  into their specialization. Given the spatial restriction of these subtypes, observed gene expression
244  differences may also reflect positional cues mediated by the Wnt signaling gradient originating
245  from the oral end.
246
***ec2 and ec4 neurons:*** In our previous work, we found that ec2 and ec4 neurons are localized to
the oral end and likely do not participate in the RP1 or CB circuits (Keramidioti et al., 2024;
Siebert et al., 2019). These neurons express distinct, non-overlapping sets of neuropeptide genes
(**Fig. 1C**). The ec4 cluster can be further subdivided into two transcriptionally distinct subtypes:
ec4A and ec4B (**Fig. 1B, Fig. S5**). FISH analysis revealed that ec4A neurons are in the tentacles,
while ec4B neurons are in the hypostome (**Fig. 2C,D, Fig. S8A,B**). Thus, four ectodermal
neuron subtypes are in the hypostome (ec1C, ec1E, ec3B, and ec4B) and four are in the tentacles
(ec1B, ec2, ec3C, and ec4A) (**Fig. 2**). The increased neuronal complexity at the oral end likely
reflects the demands of coordinating tentacle and hypostome activity during behaviors such as
feeding and locomotion.
257
We visualized the architecture of the hypostomal nerve net using immunostaining for RFamide
(ec4), LWamide (ec3), and GFP in the *Hym176B* reporter line (ec1) (**Fig. 4G-L**). The tentacular
nerve net remains less well resolved; however, ec2 neurons are likely sensory neurons embedded
in the battery cell complex, an ectodermal epithelial cell that contains embedded nematocytes
and the sensory neuron responsible for triggering nematocyte discharge (Hobmayer et al., 1990).
In our whole-animal scRNA-seq dataset, ectodermal battery cells were sequenced along with
their associated neurons, and we detected strong expression of the ec2 marker *RFamideC*, further
supporting this interpretation (Siebert et al., 2019).
266

***en1, en2, and en3 neurons:*** Compared to ectodermal neurons, endodermal neurons express
fewer neuropeptide genes. en1 neurons express *GLWamide*, while en2 and en3 neurons have no
strong neuropeptide expression (**Fig. 1C**). Immunostaining with the GLWamide antibody shows
that en1 neurons form a ganglion-like network which constitutes the RP2 circuit (**Fig. 3A,E,F**).
en1 neurons can communicate through gap junctions formed by *innexin 2* (**Fig. 9A**) (Dupre and
Yuste, 2017; Keramidioti et al., 2024; Siebert et al., 2019). In our previous study, we identified
en2 neurons as sensory cells using a transgenic reporter line; these neurons are characterized by a
short apical sensory cilium projecting into the gastric cavity and a longer basal neurite that
connects with the en1 neuron network (Keramidioti et al., 2024; Siebert et al., 2019). en2 cells
express *innexin 15* (**Fig. S9 D**) and could form gap junctions but do not appear to form a neural
circuit. To investigate the identity of en3 neurons, we generated a transgenic line expressing
mNeonGreen under the control of the en3-specific gene *G022927* regulatory region. Confocal
imaging of this reporter line revealed that en3 neurons are an additional type of sensory neuron
(**Fig. S10**). Notably, a scanning electron microscopy study from four decades ago described two
types of endodermal sensory neurons with unique morphologies, likely corresponding to the en2
and en3 neuron types in our data set (Westfall and Epp, 1985). Taken together with their
different transcriptional profiles, these morphological differences support the classification of
en2 and en3 as separate neuron types.

**Developmental trajectory inference of the homeostatic *H. vulgaris* nervous system**

The *H. vulgaris* nervous system undergoes continuous renewal, with complete neuronal turnover
approximately every three weeks (Bode et al., 1988). As a result, scRNA-seq of homeostatic
adult *H. vulgaris* captures a dynamic mixture of stem cells, differentiated neurons, and cells in
various stages of differentiation (Siebert et al., 2019). Given the increased number of neuronal
progenitors captured in our new data set which provide information about the developmental
relationships between neuronal cell types, we reconstructed developmental trajectories under
steady-state conditions to describe the molecular events as these diverse neuron types are
specified and differentiate. To achieve this, we applied URD, a diffusion-based algorithm that
infers developmental trajectories as branching trees (**Fig. 5A, Fig. S11**) (Farrell et al., 2018),
using ISCs as the root, defined by the marker *Hy-icell1* (G002332) (Siebert et al., 2019), and
terminal tips defined by neuron subtype-specific markers and absence of progenitor markers

(**Fig. S5**). Our analysis predicted the relationship between ISCs and eleven terminal branches of

neurons. Limitations of the analysis are that ec4A and ec4B were collapsed into a single group,

as trajectory connections to ISCs could not be resolved separately, and the newly described

ec1C-E subtypes were excluded because progenitors that link them to ISCs were seemingly not

captured.

We previously showed that ISCs transitioning to neuronal fates express the transcription factors

*myc3* and *myb*, which are downregulated upon terminal differentiation (Siebert et al., 2019).

Here, our trajectory analysis identified three early-branching populations expressing both *myc3*

and *myb* (**Fig. S12**). Two populations are multi-potent progenitors, one of which gives rise to

endodermal neurons (en1, en2, en3), and the other of which gives rise to most ectodermal neuron

types (ec1–ec4) (**Fig. 5A**). Notably, ec5 neurons appear to differentiate directly from ISCs,

though this may reflect incomplete capture of intermediate states (**Fig. 5A**). Together, these

findings suggest that endodermal and ectodermal neurons each arise from distinct progenitor

pools that become progressively fate-restricted during differentiation, ultimately generating the

full diversity of *H. vulgaris* neuron subtypes.

The progressive specification and differentiation of neuronal subtypes predicted here will be

accompanied by a cascade of transcriptional events that regulate each step. As proof of principle,

we used our trajectory analysis to visualize the expression dynamics of transcription factors and

terminal marker genes that belong to one such cascade during ec3A differentiation. Plotting the

expression of *myb*, *bhlha15*, *gata3, hym355*, and ec3A marker *G021930* shows their sequential

expression accompanied by transition states with temporary co-expression (**Fig. 5B**). To validate

these predicted transition states, we performed double fluorescent *in situ* hybridization (FISH)

using pairs of genes with overlapping expression domains across three predicted transition states

(**Fig. 5C-U**). For gene pair, *bhlha15* and *gata3* (**Fig. 5C-G**), *gata3* and *hym355* (**Fig. 5H-L**), and

*hym355* and *G021930* (**Fig. 5M-Q**), we identified cells expressing each gene individually as well

as cells co-expressing both genes, consistent with our predicted differentiation trajectory.

Notably, most neurons co-express the terminal marker genes *hym355* and *G021930* in the basal

disk (**Fig. 5M, R-U**), which aligns with the expected localization of terminally differentiated

ec3A neurons (**Fig. 2K**). These findings validate our trajectory analysis and demonstrate its

ability to accurately identify gene expression dynamics during the differentiation of neuronal

subtypes in *H. vulgaris*. This trajectory analysis is available as part of our online portal to enable

visualization of similar gene expression cascades during the specification of each *H. vulgaris*

neuronal subtype.

**Characterizing the chromatin landscape in the *H. vulgaris* nervous system**

Our work establishes *H. vulgaris* as one of the few adult organisms in which the nervous system

has been transcriptionally defined, including a trajectory analysis describing the molecular

changes that occur during neuronal differentiation. This provides a unique opportunity to identify

the GRNs that describe the differentiation of all neurons in an adult nervous system. To advance

this goal, we analyzed the expression of transcription factors (TFs) in our data set. We previously

used phylogenetic analysis to identify 811 putative TFs, defined as genes with predicted DNA

binding domains, with detectable expression in *H. vulgaris* (Cazet et al., 2023). We identified the

expression patterns of these TFs across our neuronal cell types, finding that 665 of those 811 TFs

are expressed within the nervous system, and we used weighted gene co-expression network

analysis (WGCNA) to cluster them based on average expression in each cell type (**Fig. S13**)

(Langfelder and Horvath, 2008). Most neuronal subtypes are characterized by the unique

expression of at least a dozen TFs, and most broader classes of neurons (e.g. ec1A/B/C/D/E) are

also characterized by a few TFs with shared expression across the class.

To build GRNs underlying nervous system development in *H. vulgaris*, it is essential to identify

the cis-regulatory elements (CREs) bound by neuronal transcription factors. As a foundational

step towards this goal, we performed ATAC-seq on FACS-isolated neurons from the

*Tg(actin1:GFP)*[rs3-in] and *Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)*[cj1-gt] transgenic lines (**Table S5**). These neuron-

specific datasets were of high quality and showed strong replicate concordance, meeting

ENCODE standards (**Fig. S14, Table S6**) (Landt et al., 2012). Importantly, the data quality

matched that of our previously published whole-animal ATAC-seq from *H. vulgaris*, indicating

that FACS isolation did not compromise chromatin integrity (Cazet et al., 2023). We observed

significantly increased accessibility near neuronal genes in the neuron-specific libraries

compared to whole-animal data (p < 0.001 for each line; **Fig. 6A, B**). Moreover, this approach

uncovered accessible regions at neuronal loci that were not detected in whole-animal, while

confirming a lack of accessibility at non-neuronal genes such as *wnt3* (**Fig. 6C-H**) (Cazet et al.,

2023). These findings provide an essential resource for defining the regulatory architecture of *H.*

*vulgaris* neurogenesis.

**Gene regulatory network inference demonstrated with ec4 neuron specification**

To illustrate the utility of the data presented in this study for hypothesis generation, we

constructed a putative GRN describing the differentiation of the oral neuron type ec4 (**Fig. 7**).

Reasoning that oral neurons might share core regulatory features, we first identified transcription

factors expressed during the differentiation of ec1B, ec2, ec3C, and ec4 neurons, and visualized

their expression dynamics along pseudotime using spline plots (**Fig. 7A, Fig. S15A**). As

observed previously, *Myb* and *Myc3* are activated early during neurogenesis across all neuronal

subtypes, marking the onset of neuronal specification (Siebert et al., 2019). Here we show that

*Sox2* is expressed broadly across oral neuron subtypes (**Fig. 7B, Fig. S15B**) and that open

chromatin near the *Sox2* locus has both *Myb* and *Tcf* binding sites, consistent with the possibility

that Sox2 expression within oral neurons is directly regulated by *Myb* and receives inputs from

the Wnt signals emanating from the oral organizer (**Fig. 7H, Fig. S15C**).

As differentiation progresses, the oral neurons separate into two groups: ec1B/ec2/ec4, which

express *Zic4*, and ec3C, which express *Gata3* (**Fig. 7C,E, Fig. S15D,F**). Previous studies have

described antagonism between *Zic4* and *Gata3* in the ectodermal epithelium, a similar mutual

antagonism may regulate this cell fate decision during neurogenesis (Ferenc et al., 2024; Vogg et

al., 2022). Following *Zic4* expression, the ec4 neuronal identity becomes increasingly refined,

first when *Arx* is jointly expressed in both ec2 and ec4, which is subsequently followed by the

differential expression of *Litaf* in ec2 and *Gsx1/2* in ec4 (**Fig. 7D,F, Fig. S15E,G**).

Although the mechanism driving *Gsx1/2* expression specifically in ec4 neurons is not yet clear,

our data suggest a regulatory interaction between *Gsx1/2* and the transcription factor *Noto* that

may be key to stabilizing ec4 fate. *Noto* is expressed relatively early in the differentiation of oral

neurons, and accessible binding sites for both *Myc3* and *Tcf* suggest possible upstream inputs

(**Fig. 7A,G,I**). Interestingly, *Noto* expression declines in ec4 neurons as *Gsx1/2* expression

increases (**Fig. 7A,G, Fig. S15H**). Given that the *Noto* locus contains an accessible *Gsx2*-binding

site (**Fig. 7I**), and that *Gsx1/2* TFs can function as repressors when acting as monomers

(Salomone et al., 2021), we propose that *Gsx1/2* represses *Noto* in ec4 neurons to reinforce ec4

identity. In contrast, *Noto* remains expressed in differentiated ec2 and ec3C neurons (**Fig. 7F,G,**

**Fig. S15I**). Based on the observations described in this section, we constructed a testable GRN

model for ec4 neuron specification (**Fig. 7J**).

**A broad community resource**

Our results for ec4 neurons support the value of the data presented here for generating testable

hypotheses to understand neuronal development in *Hydra vulgaris*. To support on-going and

future research in *Hydra* neuroscience, we have made our datasets accessible through interactive

web portals. Our scRNA-seq data can be explored via a user-friendly browser

(https://research.nhgri.nih.gov/HydraAEP/SingleCellBrowser/), which allows researchers to

visualize gene expression across neuron types using UMAP projections, dot plots, and trajectory

branching trees and spine plots; examples of plots derived from our portal are shown in figures 7

and S15. The portal also includes functional annotations and conversion tools for matching gene

IDs across *H. vulgaris* genomic and transcriptomic references. In parallel, we have integrated our

neuron-specific ATAC-seq data into our existing *H. vulgaris* AEP genome browser

(https://research.nhgri.nih.gov/HydraAEP/), enabling visualization of chromatin accessibility

near neural genes. Easy access to our portals is provided through the community Resource Hub

(openhydra.org), which offers centralized links to these high-resolution datasets. These tools are

designed to facilitate broad data accessibility and accelerate discovery in *Hydra* neuroscience.

**Discussion**

The number of research organisms used in neuroscience has grown significantly in recent years,

driven by advances in single cell transcriptomics that enable the exploration of neuronal diversity

across a broad range of species, including less conventional research organisms (Chari et al.,

2021; Cole et al., 2024; Fincher et al., 2018; Hulett et al., 2024; Sebé-Pedrós et al., 2018a; Sebé-

Pedrós et al., 2018b). Despite this progress, comprehensive transcriptional characterizations of

adult nervous systems remain limited. Here, we present a detailed molecular map of the adult *H.*

*vulgaris* nervous system based on ~35,000 single-cell transcriptomes, including differentiated

neurons and cells undergoing neurogenesis. In addition to confirming the twelve neuron subtypes

described previously (Siebert et al., 2019), we identified three novel subtypes in the ectodermal

nerve net. For each ectodermal neuron subtype, we defined unique cell markers and determined

their spatial distribution, providing the first high-resolution map of the *H. vulgaris* ectodermal

nerve net. Our study also confirmed the presence of the three previously described endodermal

neuron subtypes (Siebert et al., 2019) and we identify the en3 subtype as having sensory neuron

morphology. We propose a nomenclature scheme for *H. vulgaris* neuronal subtypes, designed to

evolve with future discoveries.

*H. vulgaris* offers numerous experimental advantages, including small size, optical transparency,

and accessible transgenic tools, which have accelerated efforts to link neural circuits to behavior.

In a landmark study, the first use of GCaMP in *H. vulgaris* revealed three distinct longitudinal

circuits (CB, RP1, RP2) that coordinate basic behaviors (Dupre and Yuste, 2017). Building on

this work, others have linked specific neuron types and circuits to behaviors such as

somersaulting and feeding (Giez et al., 2023; Yamamoto and Yuste, 2023), while innovative

tools now allow precise sensory stimulation and automated behavior tracking (Badhiwala et al.,

2018; Badhiwala et al., 2021; Escobar et al., 2024; Gonzales et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2024;

Tzouanas et al., 2021). The transcriptional and spatial map presented here complements and

expands this functional toolkit. By identifying subtype-specific markers and chromatin

accessibility patterns, our dataset will facilitate targeted genetic manipulation and help to

uncover the molecular mechanisms underlying neuronal function.

*H. vulgaris* is also a unique model for nervous system development and regeneration. In

uninjured adults, ISCs continuously replace neurons, supporting a dynamic state of homeostasis.

ISCs also enable complete nervous system regeneration following catastrophic injury, with a

single ISC capable of regenerating the entire nervous system (David and Murphy, 1977). These

features provide an opportunity to compare homeostatic and regenerative neurogenesis within a

single organism and uncover regulatory mechanisms specific to either process. Using trajectory

inference, we mapped the gene expression programs driving ISC differentiation into neuron

subtypes under steady-state conditions, establishing a foundation for future comparisons with

regeneration. Future research should aim to connect the molecular events driving neuronal

differentiation with the acquisition of neural circuit synchronization and the recovery of

behaviors during regeneration. In recent work, we correlated the timing of ec5 neuron

differentiation with re-synchronization of the CB circuit during behavioral recovery, highlighting

the value of integrating molecular and functional readouts (Escobar et al., 2024). This approach

will be essential for understanding how circuits are reassembled and behaviors restored after

injury.

In summary, we provide an unparalleled molecular characterization of the *H. vulgaris* nervous

system, including newly identified neuron subtypes, a spatial map of ectodermal neurons, and a

framework for building GRNs to study neuronal differentiation. These resources advance *H.*

*vulgaris* as a powerful model for nervous system biology and are publicly available through user-

friendly web portals to support broad use by the research community and inspire new

investigators to explore this regenerative system.

**Materials and Methods**

*Hydra vulgaris* **Strains and Culturing Conditions**

All *Hydra vulgaris* strains used in this study were cultured in *Hydra* medium (0.38mM $CaCl_2$,

0.32 mM $MgSO_4$ X 7H2O, 0.5 mM $NaHCO_3$, 0.08 mM $K_2CO_3$) at 18°C with a 12 hr light-dark

cycle. *Hydra* were fed freshly hatched, premium grade *Artemia nauplii*

(https://www.brineshrimpdirect.com) 2-4 times a week and were transferred into fresh *Hydra*

medium 4-8 hours after feeding. Animals were starved for at least 48 hours prior to

experimentation.

**Generation of transgenic strains**

Transgenic *Hydra* lines *Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)*[cj1-gt] and *Tg(G022927:mNeonGreen)*[cj1-i] were

generated using established protocols (Juliano et al., 2014b; Klimovich et al., 2019; Wittlieb et

al., 2006). Promoter regions of 1901 bp (*tba1c*) and 1576 bp (*G022927*) upstream of their

respective transcription start sites were PCR-amplified from *Hydra vulgaris* (strain 105) genomic

DNA using Phusion™ High-Fidelity DNA Polymerase (ThermoFisher Scientific, #F530S), with

a 55°C annealing and 60°C extension temperature. BamH1 and Xba1 restriction sites were added

via the forward and reverse primers for cloning into the reporter plasmid upstream of

mNeonGreen (**Table S7**).

PCR products were gel-purified, digested at 37°C for 10 minutes using BamH1 and Xba1

FastDigest enzymes (ThermoFisher Scientific, #FD0054 and #FD0684), and purified with the

Zymo DNA Clean & Concentrator Kit (#D4003). Digested fragments were ligated into the

BsAmp_mNG_tdT_backbone plasmid using Promega 10X Fast Ligase buffer (#M1801) for 4

hours at room temperature. Ligation products were transformed into DH5α-competent E. coli,

followed by plasmid miniprep (Qiagen, #27106) and Sanger sequencing for insert verification.

Final plasmids were amplified via maxiprep (Qiagen, #12162) and eluted in autoclaved Milli-Q

water for microinjection.

Microinjections were performed into 1-cell stage *Hydra vulgaris* AEP embryos as previously

described (Juliano et al., 2014b), with the following modifications: (1) the injection solution

consisted of 1 µL of 0.5% phenol red (Sigma #P0290-100ML) mixed with 6 µL of plasmid

DNA, followed by centrifugation; (2) embryos were fertilized for 1–2 hours before injection.

Embryos were injected using an Eppendorf FemtoJet 4x and InjectMan NI 2 microinjector under

a Leica M165 C stereo microscope. Transgenic animals were propagated asexually. Germline

transmission was confirmed by crossing male and female Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)cj1-in animals

to produce an F1 population.

**Naming scheme for transgenic lines**

We have established a standardized naming convention modeled after the zebrafish community

guidelines to ensure that each transgenic Hydra line has a unique and informative identifier. The

format is: **Tg(promoter:gene_or_reporter)^lab#-lineage**, where **Tg** designates the line as

transgenic. The **promoter** indicates the regulatory element driving expression, and

**gene_or_reporter** specifies the transgene product (e.g., GFP or a specific gene). The **lab** field

uses the initials of the principal investigator to denote the lab of origin (e.g., "cj" for the Juliano

lab, "rs" for the Steele lab), followed by a unique allele number to distinguish independent

integration events. The **lineage** suffix indicates the cell lineage in which the transgene is

integrated—**ec** for ectoderm, **en** for endoderm, **in** for interstitial—or **gt** if the transgene has been

germline transmitted. Using this naming scheme, we have renamed the transgenic line previously

described in both Siebert et al., 2019 and Keramidioti et al., 2024 as *Tg(actin1:GFP)*$^{rs3-in}$. In this

line, GFP is driven by the actin1 promoter and is integrated into the interstitial lineage. However,

likely due to positional effects of the integration site, GFP expression is largely restricted to

neurons and neuronal progenitors.

**Dissociation of *Hydra* into Single Cells for Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorting (FACS)**

Forty to forty-five asexual, starved *Hydra* polyps were washed three times in sterile *Hydra*

medium and transferred to 1.5 mL Eppendorf tubes. Medium was replaced with ~75 U/mL

Pronase E (VWR, E629-1G) in 1 mL of room temperature Dissociation Medium (DM; 5 mM

$CaCl_2 \cdot 2H_2O$, 1 mM $MgSO_4 \cdot 7H_2O$, 2.8 mM KCl, 11 mM HEPES, 0.67 mM $Na_2HPO_4$, 0.44 mM

$KH_2PO_4$, 5 mM sodium pyruvate, and 5 mM sodium citrate$\cdot 2H_2O$; pH 6.9–7.0). Polyps were

dissociated for 90 minutes at 22–24°C with gentle agitation. Dissociated cells were transferred to

a small Petri dish in 2 mL DM, gently pipetted up and down 5–10 times using a 1000 µL pipette,

and filtered through a pre-soaked 70 µm Corning® strainer (Sigma #CLS431751) into a 50 mL

conical tube containing 1 mL DM. The Petri dish and strainer were rinsed with an additional 1

mL DM. Cells were centrifuged at 300 g for 5 minutes (brake off), resuspended in 2 mL DM,

and re-spun under the same conditions. The pellet was resuspended in 1 mL DM and filtered

through a pre-soaked 40 µm Corning® strainer (Sigma #CLS431750) into a fresh conical tube.

**Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorting (FACS)**

FACS was used to collect fluorescent cells from transgenic *Hydra* lines

*Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)*[(cj1−f1)] and Tg(*actin1:GFP*)[(rs3−in)] for both scRNA-seq and ATAC-seq. For

scRNA-seq, one library was prepared from bud-free *Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)* [(cj1−f1)] animals, and

three libraries from *Tg(actin1:GFP)* animals, one from bud-free and two from budding animals.

For ATAC-seq, two libraries were generated from bud-free *Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)* [(cj1−f1)]

animals and four from non-budding *Tg(actin1:GFP)*[(rs3−in)] animals. In all cases, fluorescent cells

were sorted using a 100 µm nozzle on a MoFlo Astrios EQ Cell Sorter (Beckman Coulter) into

400 µL dissociation medium (DM) supplemented with 0.01% BSA. For ATAC-seq, sorting was

performed into DNA LoBind® tubes (Eppendorf #0030122348), and 1 mL of additional DM

was added prior to sorting to bring the final volume to 2 mL. Cells were pelleted at 300 g for 5

minutes and resuspended in 50 μL DM + 0.01% BSA for scRNA-seq, or counted using Hoechst

staining and a Fuchs-Rosenthal hemocytometer (InCyto DHC-F01-5) for ATAC-seq. FACS

gating used *Tg*(*actin1:GFP*)[(rs3−in)] and *Hydra vulgaris* AEP as positive and negative controls,

respectively, and followed Siebert et al. (2019).

**10x Genomics Single Cell RNA Library Preparation, Sequencing, and Analysis**

A step-by-step description of the scRNA-seq cluster analysis, including all relevant code, is

provided in the markdown document *01_hydraNeuronAtlas* available at

https://github.com/cejuliano/neuron_single_cell.

scRNA-seq libraries were built using the Chromium Next GEM Single Cell 3' Kit v3.1 (10x

Genomics) at the UC Davis Genome Center with a target recovery of 10,000 cells. Final cell

counts were: 11,183 for *Tg*(*tba1c:mNeonGreen*)[(cj1−f1)], and 7,988, 7,374, and 6,124 for the three

*Tg*(*actin1:GFP*)[(rs3−in)] libraries. scRNA-seq libraries generated with the 10x Genomics Chromium

platform were processed using Cell Ranger v4.0.0 following the manufacturer's instructions and

aligned to the *Hydra vulgaris* AEP transcriptome (Cazet et al., 2023). The average alignment rate

across libraries was 59.9%, with individual alignment rates of 62.5% (*Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)*[cj1-

gt]), 58.6% (*Tg(actin1:GFP)*[rs3] non-budding), 60.4% (budding1), and 58.1% (budding2).

Previously published scRNA-seq data from Siebert et al. (2019), mapped against the same AEP

reference, were subsetted to include interstitial stem cells, neuronal progenitors, and

differentiated neurons based on cluster identity. All downstream analyses were conducted using

Seurat v4.0.5 (Butler et al., 2018; Hao et al., 2021; Satija et al., 2015; Stuart et al., 2019).

Individual Seurat objects were generated per library and filtered to retain cells with 300–7,000

detected genes, 500–50,000 transcripts, and <5% mitochondrial reads (Satija et al., 2015; Siebert

et al., 2019). Data quality was assessed with violin plots (**Fig. S3**). For Tg(actin1:GFP)[rs3-in]

libraries, which contain a minor population of gland cells and nematocytes, clustering was

performed and clusters expressing canonical markers for these cell types were identified and

excluded (Siebert et al., 2019). To account for technical variation, module scores were calculated

for a curated set of "stress markers" and regressed during dataset integration.

An initial dataset integration was performed using the SCTransform workflow (Hafemeister and

Satija, 2019), incorporating twelve previously published whole-animal Drop-seq libraries

(subsetted for interstitial stem cells, neurons, and neural progenitors), two published Drop-seq

libraries of sorted neurons from the Tg(actin1:GFP)[(rs3)] line, and the four newly generated 10X

Genomics libraries in this study. SCTransform was first used to normalize the datasets, with

regression against stress marker module scores and the percentage of mitochondrial RNA reads.

Integration was performed with Seurat::SelectIntegrationFeatures (nfeatures = 3000),

PrepSCTIntegration, FindIntegrationAnchors, and IntegrateData. Dimensionality reduction was

carried out with Seurat::RunPCA. The number of principal components (PCs) retained was based

on the point where the percent variance change between PCs dropped below 0.1%. A preliminary

clustering and UMAP was generated using the Louvain approach [Seurat::*FindClusters*,

(*dims.use* = 1:25), Seurat::*FindNeighbors* (*resolution* = 0.8), Seurat::*RunUMAP*, (*dims.use* =

1:25)]. One cluster expressing stress markers, mitochondrial genes, or non-neuronal lineage

markers was excluded.

Following removal of the non-neuronal and high-stress cluster, datasets were reintegrated using

the same SCTransform workflow. PCA was repeated, and clustering was performed with 21 PCs

(resolution = 0.8). A new UMAP was generated using RunUMAP (min.dist = 0.25, spread =

0.7). Clusters were annotated based on expression of known markers for neuron subtypes,

progenitors, and ISCs. Of the resulting clusters, four could not be definitively identified. Marker

expression from these clusters was cross-referenced with whole-animal scRNA-seq datasets

(Cazet et al., 2023; Siebert et al., 2019). One unknown cluster was enriched for stress genes and

excluded. The remaining three expressed markers associated with ec1A, ec1B, and ec5 neurons

and were retained. We ran Seurat::FindAllMarkers() to identify molecular markers for the 3

remaining novel clusters and validated these novel subtype markers by FISH (see below).

**ATAC-seq Library Preparation, Sequencing, and Analysis**

Neuron-enriched ATAC-seq libraries were generated using a modified OMNI-ATAC protocol

(Cazet et al., 2023; Corces et al., 2017; Siebert et al., 2019). FACS-isolated cells (described

above) were pelleted at 1,000 g for 5 min at 4°C and resuspended in 50 μL freshly prepared,

chilled resuspension buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.4, 10 mM NaCl, 3 mM $MgCl_2$) supplemented

with 0.1% Tween-20, 0.1% NP-40, and 0.01% digitonin. After 3 minutes on ice, lysis was

quenched with 1 mL chilled RSB + 0.1% Tween-20, inverting tubes 3x to mix. Nuclei were

pelleted at 500 g for 10 min at 4°C and resuspended in tagmentation mix [1x TD buffer (Illumina

#20034197), 33% PBS, 0.01% digitonin, 0.1% Tween-20, 5 µL TDE1 (Illumina)]. Samples were

tagmented for 30 min at 37°C in a ThermoShaker (1,000 RPM), quenched with 250 µL Qiagen

PB buffer (MinElute Kit #28004), and stored at -20°C.

Tagmented DNA was purified using the Qiagen MinElute Kit, eluted in 21 µL EB buffer, and

amplified with NEBNext 2X Master Mix (NEB M0541S). PCR cycle numbers were determined

by qPCR (Buenrostro et al., 2015) (**Table S5**). Libraries were subjected to two rounds of size-

selected (100–700 bp) using AMPure XP beads[HM1]  (Beckman Coulter #A63881), quantified

with Qubit dsDNA HS Assay (ThermoFisher #Q32851), and assessed with a Bioanalyzer High-

Sensitivity DNA Kit (Agilent #5067-4626) at the UC Davis DNA Core. Based on concentration

and trace quality, two of five Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)cj1-gt replicates and four of six

Tg(actin1:GFP)rs3-in replicates were selected for sequencing. Libraries were pooled and

sequenced using 2×150 bp reads on an Illumina HiSeq 4000 (*Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)cj1-gt*) or

HiSeq X Ten (*Tg(actin1:GFP)rs3-in*).

A step-by-step description of the ATAC-seq analysis, including all relevant code, is provided in

the markdown document *03_hydraNeuronRegulation* available at

https://github.com/cejuliano/neuron_single_cell.

To analyze the ATAC-seq data collected from whole strain AEP *H. vulgaris* polyps, we first

filtered the raw reads using Trimmomatic (Bolger et al., 2014) to remove stretches of low-

quality base-calls and contaminating adapter sequence. The filtered reads were then aligned to

the AEP assembly using Bowtie2 (Langmead and Salzberg, 2012). To remove mitochondrial

reads, we also aligned the ATAC-seq data to the *H. vulgaris* mitochondrial genome (Voigt et al.,

2008) and subsequently discarded any reads that aligned to the mitochondrial and nuclear

genome references using Picard Tools (broadinstitute.github.io/picard/). We next identified and

removed PCR duplicates from the aligned data using Samtools (Li et al., 2009) and Picard Tools.

Peaks were called using a pipeline adapted from Cazet et al. (2023), originally based on the

ENCODE ATAC-seq workflow (Landt et al., 2012). We called peaks for each ATAC-seq

biological replicate using MACS2 (Zhang et al., 2008). To generate a consensus peakset of

biologically reproducible ATAC-seq peaks, we first calculated irreproducible discovery rate

(IDR) (Li et al., 2011) peak scores for each pairwise combination of biological replicates. We

defined a reproducible peak as one that received an IDR score ≤ 0.1 for at least two pairwise

comparisons between biological replicates. TSS enrichment, self-consistency, and rescue ratios

were computed for quality control (Cazet et al., 2023; Siebert et al., 2019). Neuron-enriched

libraries were of comparable quality to whole-animal ATAC-seq libraries (Cazet et al., 2023)

(**Table S5**).

To identify differentially accessible regions, read counts across all peaks were quantified using

DiffBind and annotated to the nearest transcription start site (TSS) with UROPA (Kondili et al.,

2017). Differential accessibility between *Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)cj1-gt*, *Tg(actin1:GFP)rs3-in*,

and AEP whole animal datasets (Cazet et al., 2023) was assessed using edgeR (Robinson et al.,

2010). Results were saved as RData objects and summary tables, and genomic tracks were

visualized using Gviz (Hahne and Ivanek, 2016). To assess whether neuron-enriched ATAC-seq

libraries show greater accessibility near the TSS of neuronal genes, we first identified genes

enriched (NeuroG) or depleted (nonNeuroG) in differentiated neurons using Seurat analysis of

*H. vulgaris* whole-animal scRNA-seq data (Cazet et al., 2023). ATAC peaks associated with

these genes were extracted from edgeR comparisons between *Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)cj1-gt*

/whole animal AEP and *Tg(actin1:GFP)rs3-in* /whole animal AEP datasets. Log fold changes

for NeuroG- and nonNeuroG-associated peaks were visualized using ggplot2 and compared

using a two-sided t-test to evaluate statistical significance.

**Generation of Developmental Trajectories**

A step-by-step description of the developmental trajectory analysis, including all relevant code,

is provided in the markdown document *02_hydraNeuronTree* available at

https://github.com/cejuliano/neuron_single_cell.

To reconstruct neuronal differentiation trajectories in Hydra, we used URD (Farrell et al., 2018)

to trace the emergence of 11 neuron subtypes from interstitial stem cells (ISCs). Initial analyses

revealed strong batch effects between 10x Genomics and Drop-seq datasets that impaired proper

cell-to-cell transition mapping. Given that the Drop-seq data represented a minority of cells

(~5,400), we excluded it from trajectory inference and focused solely on the higher-resolution

10x scRNA-seq data. We used the SeuratToURDv3 function to generate an URD object, and

manually added in the integrated data from our Seurat object (urd.obj@logupx.data <-

seurat.obj@assays$integrated@data). Next, we used the URD::urdSubset function to eliminate

the Drop-seq data and cell clusters that pilot analyses demonstrated lacked clear intermediate

progenitors linking them back to the ISCs (ec1C, ec1D, and ec1E clusters).

Outliers, cells with poor connectivity, were removed based on k-nearest neighbor distances using

URD::knnOutliers with parameters: x.max = 86, slope.r = 0.12, int.r = 79, slope.b = 1.1, and

int.b = 7.75 (209 cells removed). Doublets were identified based on high co-expression of

mutually exclusive gene modules (Siebert et al., 2019). NMF module scores were scaled between

0-1, and visualized on the UMAP to confirm cell-type specificity (**Fig. S6**). Doublets were called

using URD::NMFDoubletsDetermineCells with parameters: module.expressed.thresh = 0.2,

frac.overlap.max = 0.07, frac.overlap.diff.max = 0.15. This process flagged 1,257 potential cell

doublets, which were subsequently removed.

Pseudotime trajectories were computed using a diffusion map (URD::CalcDM, with knn = 100,

sigma.use = local, distance = cosine), optimized for high progenitor–differentiated cell

connectivity and low noise across unrelated terminal branches. The ISC population (identified by

Hy-icell1 marker G002332) was designated as the root (Siebert et al., 2019). Terminal tips were

defined using Infomap-Jaccard clustering (URD::graphClustering, num.nn = 120), and selected

based on late pseudotime and differential gene expression.

Pseudotime was calculated using URD::floodPseudotime (n = 50, minimum.cells.flooded = 2),

and transition matrix bias was tuned with optimal.cells.forward = 0, max.cells.back = 200 to

allow transitions through densely populated differentiated states. Biased random walks were

performed (n.per.tip = 50,000, root.visits = 1), and visitation patterns were checked on UMAPs.

In cases of multiple tips per subtype, they were merged using URD::combineTipVisitation. Final

tree construction was carried out with URD::buildTree using: divergence.method = "preference",

save.all.breakpoint.info = TRUE, cells.per.pseudotime.bin = 25, bins.per.pseudotime.window =

8, p.thresh = 1e-6, and min.cells.per.segment = 10.

To examine the temporal dynamics of gene expression during differentiation, we used spline-

based modeling. Genes expressed in at least 1% of cells were considered. Expression profiles

across pseudotime were fit and visualized with URD::geneSmoothFit (spar = 0.875) within

lineage-specific segments.

**Identification of gene modules using non-negative matrix factorization (NMF)**

To identify gene co-expression modules (i.e., metagenes) in our neuronal scRNA-seq dataset, we

performed non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) using the cNMF package (Kotliar et al.,

2019) (Kotliar et al., 2019). We used raw read counts from all neuronal and interstitial stem cell

transcriptomes across both 10x Genomics and Drop-seq libraries. Prior to factorization, data

were normalized and filtered using the 'prepare' function to exclude genes with low variability

across cells. Because the optimal number of modules ($k$) must be empirically determined, we

used the 'factorize' function to perform independent NMF analyses for $k$ values ranging from 5

to 100 in increments of 5. For each $k$, 200 independent runs were performed to assess metagene

reproducibility. Results were compiled using the 'combine' function and evaluated for

robustness and accuracy with the '$k$_selection_plot' function. This initial screen suggested that

the most stable solutions fell between $k = 25$ and 35. To refine our selection, we repeated the

analysis for all individual k values within that range. Based on this finer-grained analysis, we

selected $k = 27$ as the optimal number of modules. We then used the 'consensus' function to

generate a final set of 27 consensus metagenes by filtering out runs that deviated most from the

majority of independent solutions.

**Probe Generation for Fluorescent in Situ Hybridization**

To generate labeled RNA probes, PCR products (**Table S7**) were amplified from oligo-dT-

primed cDNA derived from *Hydra vulgaris* AEP. Reverse primers included T7 or SP6 promoters

(Qiagen #28506). Amplicons were cloned into the Invitrogen Zero Blunt vector (#K2700-20),

and correct inserts were confirmed by colony PCR and Sanger sequencing. Plasmids were

amplified via miniprep (Qiagen #27106) and used as templates for a second round of PCR to

generate transcription templates. Approximately 250 ng of gel-purified product was used as a

transcription template for the Roche DIG RNA Labeling Kit (Sigma #11175025910) with DIG-

U-11 or FITC-U-12 labeling mix (Sigma #11685619910). RNAse-free conditions were

maintained using Ambion RNAse-in, and resulting RNA probes were purified with the Zymogen

RNA Clean & Concentrator-25 kit (Zymo Research #R1017), diluted to 750 ng in 7.5 μL $H_2O$,

and stored at –80°C.

**Fluorescent in Situ Hybridization**

<u>Fixation and Bleaching (Day 1)</u>: Starved *Hydra vulgaris* AEP polyps were washed in *Hydra*

medium (HM), relaxed in 2% urethane in HM for one minute, then fixed in 4%

paraformaldehyde (PFA) in HM for 1 hour at room temperature (RT) with rocking. After

fixation, samples were washed 3 × 10 min in PBT (0.1% Tween-20 in PBS) and dehydrated in a

stepwise methanol series to 100% MeOH, followed by bleaching overnight at –20°C in fresh

100% MeOH. <u>Rehydration, Permeabilization, and Probe Hybridization (Day2)</u>: Samples were

rehydrated through 66% and 33% MeOH/PBT washes, followed by 3 × 5 min washes in PBT.

Tissue was permeabilized with 10 μg/mL proteinase K in PBT for 5 minutes, quenched in 4

mg/mL glycine, and washed 3 × 5 min in PBT. Samples were then washed sequentially in 0.1 M

triethanolamine in PBT ± acetic anhydride (3 and 6 μL/mL), refixed in 4% PFA (1 hour), washed

in PBT, and equilibrated in 2× SSC. Samples were prehybridized in 50% 2× SSC/50%

hybridization solution (HS: 50% formamide, 5× SSC, 1× Denhardt's, 100 μg/mL heparin, 0.1%

Tween-20, 0.1% CHAPS), first at RT then at 56°C. They were incubated for 2 hours in HS with

10 μL/mL sheared salmon sperm DNA. For sample, ~180 ng of DIG- and/or FITC-labeled RNA

was denatured at 85°C for 5–10 min, cooled to 56°C, and added to 400 μL HS. Samples were

hybridized in 450 μL total probe mix at 56°C for ~65 hours, with gentle mixing once every 24

hours. <u>Probe Washes and Antibody Staining (Day3)</u>: Samples were washed at 56°C with

decreasing HS/SSC concentrations (100%, 75%, 50%, 25%) followed by 2 × 30 min washes in

2× SSC + 0.1% CHAPS (first at 56°C, then RT). Samples were washed 4 × 10 min in MABT

(100 mM maleic acid, 150 mM NaCl, 0.1% Tween-20, pH 7.5), then blocked in MABT + 1%

BSA for 1 hour and in blocking buffer (80% MABT + 1% BSA / 20% sheep serum) for 2 hours

at 4°C. Anti-FITC-POD (Sigma #11426346910) or Anti-DIG-POD (Sigma #11207733910) was

added at 1:2000 in blocking buffer and incubated overnight at 4°C. <u>Tyramide Detection and</u>

<u>Second Antibody Application (Day 4)</u>: After returning to RT, excess antibody was removed with

$2 \times 20$ min MABT-BSA and $5 \times 20$ min MABT washes. Samples were washed $2 \times 5$ min in 100

mM borate buffer + 0.1% Tween, then stained with 75 µL tyramide solution (100 mM borate

buffer, 2% dextran sulfate, 0.1% Tween-20, 0.003% $H_2O_2$, 0.15 mg/mL 4-iodophenol, 1:100

Alexa Fluor 488 or 594 tyramide) for 25 minutes. The reaction was stopped with $4 \times$ PBT

washes and quenched in 100 mM glycine (pH 2.0) for 10 minutes, then washed $5 \times 5$ min in

PBT. At this point, samples could either be mounted for imaging (see below) or processed for

double FISH. For double labeling, samples were blocked for 2 hours at 4°C in blocking buffer

(80% MABT + 1% BSA / 20% sheep serum), then incubated overnight at 4°C in 1:2000 Anti-

DIG-POD (Sigma #11207733910) in blocking buffer, protected from light. <u>Second Tyramide</u>

<u>Detection and Mounting (Day 5)</u>: Following antibody incubation, samples were washed and

processed for the second round of tyramide detection as described above, using the alternate

fluor. After staining, samples were again quenched in 100 mM glycine (pH 2.0) and washed $5 \times$

5 minutes in PBT. To prepare for imaging, tissues were stained with 1:1000 Hoechst for 30

minutes, then dehydrated through a graded series of glycerol (30%, 50%, 80% in PBT) for at

least 1 hour in each step. Specimens were mounted in 80% glycerol and stored at 4°C until

imaging. Confocal images were acquired using the Zeiss 980 LSM with Airyscan 2 confocal

microscope. For whole animal images, max projections were stitched together using ImageJ.

**In Situ Hybridization Chain Reaction**

The ec1E cluster could not be identified using traditional FISH and instead required detection via

In Situ Hybridization Chain Reaction (HCR) (Choi et al., 2018). <u>Probe Design and Synthesis</u>:

probes were designed using the in situ_probe_generator tool

(<u>https://github.com/guttalab/in_situ_probe_generator</u>) (Kuehn et al., 2022). Probes were

designed to target transcripts of interest and synthesized by IDT. <u>Sample Preparation, Fixation,</u>

<u>and Permeabilization</u>: *Hydra* were washed twice in sterile *Hydra* Medium (HM) and relaxed in

2% urethane in HM for 1 minute. Samples were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) in HM for

1 hour with gentle rocking. Fixed samples were washed three times for 10 minutes each in

phosphate-buffered saline with Tween (PBT), followed by gradual dehydration through 5-minute

washes in increasing concentrations of methanol (MeOH) in PBT: 33%, 66%, and 100%.

Samples were then washed twice for 30 minutes in 100% MeOH and stored in fresh 100%

MeOH at -20°C overnight. <u>Probe Hybridization</u>: Samples were rehydrated by sequential 5-

minute washes in 66% MeOH in water and 33% MeOH in PBT, followed by three 5-minute

washes in PBT. Samples were then incubated in 1ml of 50% probe hybridization buffer in PBT

for 5 minutes, followed by incubation in 300µl of 100% probe hybridization buffer for 1 hour at

37°C. Probes (1–2 pmol each) were diluted into pre-warmed hybridization buffer (250µl total

volume), and samples were incubated in this hybridization mix overnight at 37°C. <u>Probe</u>

<u>Detection and Signal Amplification</u>: Following hybridization, samples were washed four times

for 15 minutes each with 500µl of probe wash buffer pre-warmed to 37°C. Samples were then

washed three times for 5 minutes each in 5x SSC with 0.1% Tween-20 (SSCT) at room

temperature, followed by a 5-minute wash in PBT. Samples were equilibrated in 300µl of

amplification buffer for 30 minutes. Meanwhile, hairpin amplifiers were prepared by heating

each pair of hairpins separately to 95°C for 90 seconds, followed by cooling to room temperature

in the dark for 30 minutes. The hairpins (15 pmol each) were then combined in amplification

buffer (250µl total volume), and samples were incubated in the hairpin mix overnight in the dark.

<u>Post-Amplification Washes and Mounting</u>: Following amplification, samples were washed twice

for 5 minutes and twice for 30 minutes in 5x SSCT. DAPI was optionally added during the first

30-minute wash. Samples were stored in 5x SSCT at 4°C until imaging. Prior to imaging,

samples were washed twice for 5 minutes in PBS and mounted in ProLong Glass mounting

medium. Confocal images were acquired using the Zeiss 980 LSM with Airyscan 2 confocal

microscope.

**Immunofluorescence**

*Hydra* polyps were anesthetized in 2% urethane in *Hydra* medium for 4–5 minutes, then fixed in

4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) in 1× *Hydra* PBS (120 mM NaCl, 40 mM K2HPO4, 12 mM

NaH2PO4; pH 7.2-7.4) for 1 hour at room temperature. Following fixation, animals were washed

three times with 1× *Hydra* PBS for 10 minutes each on a shaker. Fixed animals were then cut as

needed and permeabilized in 0.5% Triton X-100 in 1× *Hydra* PBS for 15 minutes in the dark.

Blocking solution was prepared by dissolving 0.05 g BSA and 50 µL 10% Triton X-100 in 4950

µL 1× *Hydra* PBS, and animals were incubated in this solution for 20 minutes in the dark.

Primary antibodies were diluted in blocking solution and applied at the following concentrations:

pan-neural antibody (1:1000, raised in rabbit) (Keramidioti et al., 2024), anti-GFP (1:500, raised

in chicken, Aves Labs, GFP-1020), anti-mNeonGreen (1:50, raised in mouse, Chromotek, 32f6),

anti-GLWa (1:10, raised in mouse) (Koizumi et al., 2015), and anti-RFa (1:50, raised in mouse)

(Koizumi et al., 2015). 100 µL of the appropriate antibody dilution was added per well (one

animal per well), and samples were incubated overnight at 4 °C. The following day, animals

were washed three times in 1× *Hydra* PBS for 10 minutes each on a shaker in the dark.

Secondary antibodies were diluted in blocking solution and included Alexa Fluor 488 donkey

anti-chicken (1:400, Dianova, 703-546-155), Cy3 donkey anti-rabbit (1:400, Dianova, 711-165-

152), Alexa Fluor 488 donkey anti-mouse (1:300, Dianova, 715-545-150), Cy3 donkey anti-

mouse (1:200, Dianova, 715-166-151), and Alexa Fluor 647 donkey anti-mouse (1:300, Dianova,

715-605-150). 100 µL of secondary antibody solution was added per well and samples were

incubated for 2 hours at room temperature in the dark, followed by three 10-minute washes in 1×

*Hydra* PBS. DAPI (Sigma) was used to stain nuclei at a dilution of 1:1000 in 1× *Hydra* PBS,

incubating 100 µL per well for 7 minutes. After a final 5-minute wash in 1× *Hydra* PBS, the

stained specimens were mounted on microscope slides using VECTASHIELD HardSet Antifade

Mounting Medium to preserve fluorescence. Bee wax was applied around the edges of the

coverslip to prevent compression of the specimens, and the coverslip was sealed with transparent

nail polish. Preparations were stored at 4°C until imaging. Fluorescent confocal microscopy was

performed on a Leica SP5 scanning confocal microscope (Leica Microsystems, Heidelberg,

Germany). Z-shift correction and RGB stack generation were performed using the StackGroom

plugin in ImageJ with the "3channels" command. The resulting RGB stacks were further

processed in ImageJ, and all images were generated as maximum intensity projections using the

"Image > Stack > Z Project" function.

**Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank Rob Steele for providing the *Tg(actin1:GFP)*[rs3-in] line, which was

foundational to this study; the Juliano lab, Farrell lab, and David lab for invaluable discussions

and feedback; Bruce Draper, Rob Steele, and Stefan Siebert for manuscript review and feedback;

Clara Stuligross for analysis help and moral support; Shun Hamada and Osam Koizumi for

providing GLWa and RFa antibodies; Yohana Berhe for help with confocal images used in Fig.

S2; Diana Burkart-Waco, Siranoosh Ashtari, and Emily Kumimoto from the DNA Technologies

and Expression Analysis Core at the UC Davis Genome Center (supported by NIH Shared

Instrumentation Grant 1S10OD010786-01) for technical advice and assistance with library

preparation and sequencing; Bridget McLaughlin and Jonathan Van Dyke from the UC Davis

Flow Cytometry Shared Resource Laboratory for technical advice and assistance with FACS

[(supported by NCI P30 CA093373 (Comprehensive Cancer Center), S10 OD018223 (Astrios

Cell Sorter), S10 RR 026825 (Fortessa Cytometer), and NIH NCRR C06-RR12088 (Tupper Hall

room 3425 sorting suite renovations)].

**Competing Interests**

No competing interests declared.

**Funding**

This work was supported by a National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant (R35 GM133689) and a

W. M. Keck Foundation grant to C.E.J., and by the NICHD Intramural Research Program to

J.A.F. (ZIAHD008997). H.M.L., A.S.P., and J.T. were supported by an NIH T32 predoctoral

training program (T32 GM007377). H.M.L. was also supported by an NIH F31 fellowship (F31

GM149176), and J.T. was also supported by a second NIH T32 predoctoral training program

(T32 GM153586).

**Data and resource availability**

The raw sequencing data in this study have been submitted to the NCBI BioProject database

(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/) under accession number PRJNA1261600. Step-by-

step descriptions of all computational analyses conducted as part of this study, including all

relevant code, formatted both as markdown and HTML documents, are available at GitHub

(https://github.com/cejuliano/neuron_single_cell).

**Figures**

**A**

Oral
Hypostome (Mouth)

Head

Tentacles

Body Column

Peduncle

Basal Disk

Aboral

Endoderm  Ectoderm

Migrating intermediate progenitor

Migrating intermediate progenitor

Interstitial stem cell (ISC)

Endodermal neurons

Ectodermal neurons

**B**

en2

en1

en3

en prec.

ISC

progen1

ec3A    ec3B    ec3C

ec3 prec.

progen2

ec2 prec.

ec2

ec1 prec.

ec1B

ec5    ec1A    ec1E

ec1C

ec1D

ec4A

ec4B

UMAP2

UMAP1

**C**

Average Expression

Percent Expressed

ISC
progen1
progen2
ec1 prec.
ec1A
ec1B
ec1C
ec1D
ec1E          **ec1**
ec2 prec.
ec2          **ec2**
ec3 prec.
ec3A
ec3B
ec3C          **ec3**
ec4A
ec4B          **ec4**
ec5          **ec5**
en prec.
en1
en2
en3

FRamide precursor (G021114)
Hym176A (G016173)
Hym176B (G016170)
Hym176D (G016171)
Hym176E (G016169)
Hym176C (G016165)
RFamide C (G017220)
GLWamide (G018128)
Hym355 (G004115)
Neuropeptide F (G016204)
Hym-355I-1 (G004106)
RFamide B (G017227)
RFamide D (G017226)
RFamide A (G017228)

**D**

Neurons
(*elav* positive)

Non-neurons
(*elav* negative)

Ectodermal Neurons
(*budhead* negative)

Endodermal Neuron Types
(*budhead* positive)

Ectodermal Types
(neuropeptide expression)

ec1    ec2    ec3    ec4    ec5

en1    en2    en3

Ectodermal Subtypes
(spatial segregation)

ec1A  ec1B  ec1C  ec1D  ec1E

ec3A  ec3B  ec3C

ec4A  ec4B

**Figure 1. Single cell RNA sequencing reveals fifteen transcriptionally distinct neuron**
**subtypes comprising the *Hydra vulgaris* nervous system. (A)** The *Hydra* body is a radially
symmetric, hollow tubular animal arranged around an oral-aboral axis. The oral end consists of
the hypostome and tentacles (collectively referred to as the "head"), while the aboral end
comprises the peduncle and basal disk. The body is formed by two epithelial monolayers, the
endoderm and ectoderm, separated by an extracellular matrix. Neurons reside within the
interstitial spaces between epithelial cells, forming two distinct nerve nets: one in the ectodermal
layer and another in the endodermal layer (Keramidioti et al., 2024). Interstitial stem cells
(ISCs), which give rise to neurons, are confined to the ectoderm, but intermediate neural
progenitors migrate to generate endodermal neuron subtypes. **(B)** Single-cell RNA sequencing
(scRNA-seq) was performed using two methods: Chromium Single-Cell Gene Expression (10x
Genomics) (29,671 cells from this study) and Drop-Seq (5,400 cells from Siebert et al., 2019). A
UMAP representation displays cell clusters annotated by their respective cell states: ISC
(interstitial stem cell), progen (progenitor) prec (precursors), ec (ectodermal neurons), and en
(endodermal neurons). **(C)** Dot plot showing the expression of neuropeptide genes across *Hydra*
*vulgaris* neuron clusters. Dot color represents the average expression level of each gene within a
cluster, while dot size indicates the percentage of cells in the cluster expressing the gene. The
ec1, ec2, ec3, ec4, and ec5 neuron types have distinct neuropeptide expression patterns.
**(D)** Schematic outlining the classification process for *H. vulgaris* neurons. First, neurons were
identified in the scRNA-seq dataset by the expression of *elav*. Cells were further categorized into
either the ectodermal or endodermal nerve net based on the expression of the endodermal marker
*budhead*. Ectodermal neuron types were defined by distinct neuropeptide expression profiles,
and ectodermal neuron subtypes were classified based on spatially restricted domains (see main
text for detailed information on the classification scheme).

**Figure 2. Spatial organization of ectodermal neuron subtypes in revealed by fluorescence in**

**situ hybridization (FISH).** Confocal images show FISH labeling of twelve distinct ectodermal

neuron subtypes using subtype-specific molecular markers. **(A–G)** Oral neuron subtypes: ec1C

(*G007791*), ec1E (*G003886*), ec4A (*RFamide C*, *G017226*), ec4B (*RFamide B*, *G017227*), ec1B

(*G016169*), ec2 (*G010335*), and ec3C (*G026484*). Arrow in panel G indicates expression in the

tentacles. **(H–I)** Body column neuron subtypes: ec1A (*G026993*) and ec3B (G004106). **(J–L)**

Aboral neuron subtypes: ec5 (Hym176C, G016165), localized to the peduncle (arrow), and ec3A

(G021930) and ec1D (G004200), localized to the basal disk (arrows). See Fig. S7 for whole

animal images of ec4A, ec4B, and ec1C FISH experiments. Nuclei are counterstained with

Hoechst (blue). All panels show standard FISH labeling except panel B, in which ec1E neurons

required localization using hybridization chain reaction (HCR).

**A**

Tentacles
ec1B - Hym176
ec3C - GLWa
ec2 - RFa
ec4A - RFa

Hypostome
ec1E - Hym176
ec3C - GLWa
ec4B - RFa

Base of Hypostome
ec1C - Hym176

Body Column
Endoderm
en1 - GLWa
en2
en3

Body Column
Ectoderm
ec1A - Hym176
ec3B - GLWa

Circuits
Key:
CB
RP1
RP2

Basal Disk
ec1D - Hym176
ec3A - GLWa

Peduncle
ec5 - Hym176, RFa

**B**

| Location | Neuron subtypes | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tentacles | 2  4A  1B | | |
| Hypostome | 4B  1C  1E | 3C | |
| Body column | 1A | 3B | 1  2  3 |
| Peduncle | 5 | | |
| Basal Disk | 1D | 3A | |

Ectoderm (ec)    Endoderm (en)

**C**

GLWa (G018128)

UMAP_2

ec3A  ec3B  ec3C

en1

UMAP_1

**D**

GLWa    Pan-neuronal    Merge

**E**

Ectoderm (ec3 - RP1)
ECM
Endoderm (en1 - RP2)

**F**

Ectoderm
Endoderm

**G**

Hym176B (G016170)

UMAP_2

ec5  ec1A  ec1E  ec1B
ec1C
ec1D

UMAP_1

**H**

Hym176 B transgenic    Pan-neuronal    Merge

**I**

RFa-A (G017228)

UMAP_2

ec4A  ec4B

ec5

UMAP_1

**J**

RFa    Pan-neuronal    Merge

**Figure 3. Neuropeptide expression delineates distinct neural circuits in *Hydra vulgaris*. (A, B)** Schematics illustrate the spatial distribution of neuron subtypes along the *Hydra* body column. **(C)** The RP1 circuit comprises ec3A–C neurons, which express neuropeptides from the GLWa family. The RP2 circuit includes endodermal en1 neurons, which also express GLWa. **(D)** Immunostaining using an antibody against GLWa (green) reveals the RP1 circuit extending from the basal disk to the tentacles. **(E, F)** GLWa immunostaining in body column rings shows endodermal en1 neurons of the RP2 circuit. **(G)** The CB circuit includes ectodermal neuron subtypes ec1A–D and ec5, which express Hym176 neuropeptides. **(H)** GFP immunostaining (green) in the *Hym176B* reporter line marks CB circuit neurons along the body column. **(I)** The RFa-A neuropeptide is expressed in ec4 and ec5 neurons, the latter being part of the CB circuit. **(J)** Immunostaining with an antibody against RFa (green) reveals ec5 neurons in the peduncle and ec4 neurons near the oral end. In all immunostaining panels (D, F, H, J), co-labeling with PNab (magenta) highlights the full structure of the nervous system. Scale bars: 200 µm. The lower images in panel D and the upper images in panel H are reproduced from Keramidioti et al., 2024.

**Figure 4. Localization of neuron subtypes in the basal disk and hypostome.**

**(A–C)** Double FISH using probes for *G021930* (magenta, ec3A) and *G004200* (green, ec1D)

confirms that these neuron subtypes are distinct populations in the basal disk. Nuclei are

counterstained with Hoechst (blue) **(D–F)** Immunofluorescence with antibodies against GLWa

(green, ec3) and PNab (magenta, pan-neuronal) reveals GLWa-negative/PNab-positive neurons

in the basal disk, consistent with ec1D identity. **(G–I)** Co-immunostaining in the *Hym17B-GFP*

reporter line using anti-GFP (green) and anti-GLWa (magenta) shows the spatial relationship of

ec1 and ec3 neurons in the hypostome. **(J–L)** Co-immunostaining in the Hym17B-GFP reporter

line with anti-GFP (green) and anti-RFa (magenta) illustrates the positioning of ec1 and ec4B

neurons in the hypostome.

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

**Figure 5. Trajectory reconstruction of neurogenesis reveals distinct developmental pathways for ectodermal and endodermal neurons. (A)** Differentiation trajectories for eleven *Hydra* neuron subtypes were reconstructed using URD from single-cell transcriptomics data (Farrell et al., 2018). Interstitial stem cells (ISCs) were set as the "root" or starting point, and each neuron subtype served as a "tip" or endpoint. The tree is colored by pseudotime (developmental progression), with earlier pseudotime at the top (blue) and later pseudotime at the bottom (red). The boxed region highlights areas detailed in panels C, H, and M. Asterisks indicate segments corresponding to early differentiation events from ISCs into ectodermal or endodermal neuronal progenitors. **(B)** Spline plot showing expression trends for five genes during ec3A differentiation. The x-axis represents pseudotime (earlier on the left, later on the right), and the y-axis represents scaled gene expression levels. Each point is the average expression for five cells. **(C-U)** Double FISH validates predicted transition states during ec3A differentiation. Expression states in FISH images are indicated by arrow types: closed arrows for cells expressing only the first gene, open arrows for cells expressing only the second, and double arrows for cells co-expressing both genes. **(C-G)** Validation of early ec3A transition states co-expressing *bhlha15* and *gata3*. **(C)** Visualization of *bhlha15* and *gata3* expression on the URD trajectory. Co-expressing cells (orange) are indicated with arrowheads; black represents cells expressing neither gene. **(D-G)** Confocal microscopy of double FISH for early transitions: **(D)** Body region imaged, **(E)** *bhlha15* expression (red), **(F)** *gata3* expression (yellow), and **(G)** Overlay with Hoechst-stained nuclei (gray). **(H-L)** Validation of mid ec3A transition states co-expressing *hym355* (magenta) and *gata3* (yellow). **(H)** Visualization of *hym355* and *gata3* expression on the URD trajectory. Co-expressing cells (orange) are highlighted with arrowheads. **(I-L)** Confocal microscopy of double FISH for mid transitions: **(I)** Body region imaged, **(J)** *hym355* expression (red), **(K)** *gata3* expression (yellow), and **(L)** Overlay with Hoechst-stained nuclei (gray). **(M-U)** Validation of late ec3A transition states co-expressing *hym355* (magenta) and ec3A marker *G021930* (yellow). **(M)** Visualization of *hym355* and *G021930* expression on the URD trajectory. Co-expressing cells (orange) are marked with arrowheads. **(N-U)** Confocal microscopy of double FISH for late transitions: **(N, R)** Body region imaged, **(O, S)** *hym355* expression (red), **(P, T)** *G021930* expression (yellow), and **(Q, U)** Overlay with Hoechst-stained nuclei (gray). Scale bars: 50 µm. Pink dotted lines in microscopy images (G, L, Q, U) indicate the boundary between the body column and peduncle, determined by nuclei morphology.

**A** Average Accessibility Change
in Gene-Proximal Peaks

***

Tg(actin1:GFP)^rs3-in vs Whole Animal ATAC-seq

Neuronal Genes    Non-neuronal Genes

**B** Average Accessibility Change
in Gene-Proximal Peaks

***

Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)^cj1-gt vs Whole Animal ATAC-seq

Neuronal Genes    Non-neuronal Genes

**C** Normalized ATAC-seq Read Density

Whole Animal Rep 1 AEP
Whole Animal Rep 2 AEP
Whole Animal Rep 3 AEP
Neuron Enriched Rep 1 Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)^cj1-gt
Neuron Enriched Rep 2 Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)^cj1-gt
Neuron Enriched Rep 1 Tg(actin1:GFP)^rs3-in
Neuron Enriched Rep 2 Tg(actin1:GFP)^rs3-in
Neuron Enriched Rep 3 Tg(actin1:GFP)^rs3-in
Neuron Enriched Rep 4 Tg(actin1:GFP)^rs3-in

Gene Model    Chr-11
Genome Coordinates    5' 3'    *tba1c G019559*    3' 5'
5.954 mb    5.956 mb    5.958 mb    5.96 mb    5.962 mb    5.964 mb

**D** *tba1c G019559*

ec4A
ec3B ec3C    ec4B
ec3A    ec2
en1
en2    ec1B
en3
ec5    ec1E
ec1A ec1C
ec1D
UMAP2 UMAP1

**E**
en3
en1
ec4
ec3
en2
ec1/5
ec1    ec2

**F** Normalized ATAC-seq Read Density

Whole Animal Rep 1 AEP
Whole Animal Rep 2 AEP
Whole Animal Rep 3 AEP
Neuron Enriched Rep 1 Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)^cj1-gt
Neuron Enriched Rep 2 Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)^cj1-gt
Neuron Enriched Rep 1 Tg(actin1:GFP)^rs3-in
Neuron Enriched Rep 2 Tg(actin1:GFP)^rs3-in
Neuron Enriched Rep 3 Tg(actin1:GFP)^rs3-in
Neuron Enriched Rep 4 Tg(actin1:GFP)^rs3-in

Gene Model    Chr-6
Genome Coordinates    5' 3'    *wnt3 G010730*    3' 5'
9.54 mb    9.541 mb    9.542 mb    9.543 mb    9.544 mb    9.545 mb    9.546 mb

**G** *wnt3 G010730*

ec4A
ec3B ec3C    ec4B
ec3A    ec2
en1
en2    ec1B
en3
ec5    ec1E
ec1A ec1C
ec1D
UMAP2 UMAP1

**H**
en3
en1
ec4
ec3
en2
ec1/5
ec1    ec2

**Figure 6. Characterization of the neuronal chromatin landscape using ATAC-seq.**

(**A-B**) Neuron-enriched ATAC-seq libraries were generated from six samples: two from the *Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)$^{cj1-gt}$* transgenic line (green) and four from the *Tg(actin1:GFP)$^{rs3-in}$* transgenic line (pink) (Keramidioti et al., 2024). To assess neuronal peak enrichment, three previously published whole-animal ATAC-seq libraries (AEP1-3; Cazet et al., 2023) were used as a reference. Panels (**A**) and (**B**) show the average accessibility changes in gene-proximal peaks for *Tg(actin1:GFP)$^{rs3-in}$* and *Tg(tba1c:mNeonGreen)$^{cj1-gt}$*, respectively, compared to whole-animal data sets. Neuronal genes exhibit significant peak enrichment within 10,000 base pairs of the transcription start site relative to non-neuronal genes ($p < 0.001$, t-test). (**C**) ATAC-seq tracks for the *alpha tubulin* locus (*tba1c*, *G019559*) show peaks in the neuron-enriched libraries that are absent in the whole animal libraries. (**D**) UMAP visualization of the neuron-enriched scRNA-seq dataset shows that *tba1c* is ubiquitously expressed in neurons. (**E**) UMAP visualization of the whole-animal scRNA-seq dataset shows that *tba1c* expression is restricted to neurons (Cazet et al., 2023; Siebert et al., 2019). (**F**) ATAC-seq tracks for the *wnt3* locus (*G010730*) show peaks in the whole-animal libraries that are absent in the neuron-enriched libraries. (**G**) UMAP visualization of the neuron-enriched scRNA-seq dataset shows no expression of *wnt3* in neurons. (**H**) UMAP visualization of the whole animal scRNA-seq dataset shows that *wnt3* is expressed in the oral ectodermal and endodermal epithelium (Cazet et al., 2023; Siebert et al., 2019).

**Figure 7. A putative gene regulatory network (GRN) underlying ec4 neuron specification.**

**(A)** Spline plots showing transcription factor expression dynamics during ec2 and ec4

differentiation. **(B)** *Sox2* (*G009896*) is broadly expressed in oral neuron subtypes ec3C, ec1B,

ec2, and ec4. **(C)** *Zic4* (*G004456*) is expressed in ec1B, ec2, and ec4. **(D)** *Arx* (*G021458*) is

restricted to ec2 and ec4. **(E)** Co-expression trajectory tree of *Gata3* (*G022640*, magenta) and

*Zic4* (*G004456*, green) show mutually exclusive expression. **(F)** Co-expression trajectory tree of

*Litaf* (*G007969*, magenta) and *Gsx1/2* (*G023503*, green) reveals subtype-specific expression in

ec2 and ec4 neurons. **(G)** Co-expression trajectory tree of *Gsx1/2* (magenta) and *Noto* (G003891,

green) shows mutually exclusive expression in ec4. **(H)** ATAC-seq tracks at the *Sox2* locus

reveal open chromatin regions containing *Tcf*, *Sox2*, and *Myb* binding motifs. (I) ATAC-seq

tracks at the Noto locus highlight peaks containing *Tcf*, *Sox2*, *Myc*, and *Gsx2* binding motifs. (J)

A proposed GRN model summarizing transcriptional regulators and regulatory relationships

involved in ec4 neuron specification in *Hydra vulgaris*. Plots in this figure are made using the

scRNA-seq portal (https://research.nhgri.nih.gov/HydraAEP/SingleCellBrowser/).

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

## References

**Badhiwala, K. N., Gonzales, D. L., Vercosa, D. G., Avants, B. W. and Robinson, J. T.** (2018). Microfluidics for electrophysiology, imaging, and behavioral analysis of Hydra. *Lab Chip* **18**, 2523–2539.

**Badhiwala, K. N., Primack, A. S., Juliano, C. E. and Robinson, J. T.** (2021). Multiple neuronal networks coordinate Hydra mechanosensory behavior. *Elife* **10**, e64108.

**Bode, H., Berking, S., David, C. N., Gierer, A., Schaller, H. and Trenkner, E.** (1973). Quantitative analysis of cell types during growth and morphogenesis in Hydra. *Wilhelm Roux Arch Entwickl Mech Org* **171**, 269–285.

**Bode, H. R., Heimfeld, S., Koizumi, O., Littlefield, C. L. and Yaross, M. S.** (1988). Maintenance and Regeneration of the Nerve Net in Hydra. *American Zoologist* **28**, 1053–1063.

**Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M. and Usadel, B.** (2014). Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114–2120.

**Buenrostro, J., Wu, B., Chang, H. and Greenleaf, W.** (2015). ATAC-seq: A Method for Assaying Chromatin Accessibility Genome-Wide. *Curr Protoc Mol Biol* **109**, 21.29.1-21.29.9.

**Butler, A., Hoffman, P., Smibert, P., Papalexi, E. and Satija, R.** (2018). Integrating single-cell transcriptomic data across different conditions, technologies, and species. *Nat Biotechnol* **36**, 411–420.

**Campbell, R. D.** (1967). Tissue dynamics of steady state growth in Hydra littoralis. II. Patterns of tissue movement. *J Morphol* **121**, 19–28.

**Cazet, J. F., Siebert, S., Morris Little, H., Bertemes, P., Primack, A. S., Ladurner, P., Achrainer, M., Fredriksen, M. T., Moreland, R. T., Singh, S., et al.** (2023). A chromosome-scale epigenetic map of the Hydra genome reveals conserved regulators of cell state. *Genome Res* gr.277040.122.

**Chari, T., Weissbourd, B., Gehring, J., Ferraioli, A., Leclère, L., Herl, M., Gao, F., Chevalier, S., Copley, R. R., Houliston, E., et al.** (2021). Whole-animal multiplexed single-cell RNA-seq reveals transcriptional shifts across Clytia medusa cell types. *Science Advances* **7**, eabh1683.

**Choi, H. M. T., Schwarzkopf, M., Fornace, M. E., Acharya, A., Artavanis, G., Stegmaier, J., Cunha, A. and Pierce, N. A.** (2018). Third-generation in situ hybridization chain reaction: multiplexed, quantitative, sensitive, versatile, robust. *Development* **145**, dev165753.

**Cole, A. G., Steger, J., Hagauer, J., Denner, A., Ferrer Murguia, P., Knabl, P., Narayanaswamy, S., Wick, B., Montenegro, J. D. and Technau, U.** (2024). Updated

single cell reference atlas for the starlet anemone Nematostella vectensis. *Frontiers in Zoology* **21**, 8.

Corces, M. R., Trevino, A. E., Hamilton, E. G., Greenside, P. G., Sinnott-Armstrong, N. A., Vesuna, S., Satpathy, A. T., Rubin, A. J., Montine, K. S., Wu, B., et al. (2017). An improved ATAC-seq protocol reduces background and enables interrogation of frozen tissues. *Nat Methods* **14**, 959–962.

Das Gupta, R. R., Scheurer, L., Pelczar, P., Wildner, H. and Zeilhofer, H. U. (2021). Neuron-specific spinal cord translatomes reveal a neuropeptide code for mouse dorsal horn excitatory neurons. *Sci Rep* **11**, 5232.

David, C. N. (2012). Interstitial stem cells in Hydra: multipotency and decision-making. *Int J Dev Biol* **56**, 489–497.

David, C. N. and Gierer, A. (1974). Cell Cycle Kinetics and Development of Hydra attenuata. III. Nerve and nematocyte differentiation.

David, C. N. and Murphy, S. (1977). Characterization of interstitial stem cells in hydra by cloning. *Dev Biol* **58**, 372–383.

Dupre, C. and Yuste, R. (2017). Non-overlapping Neural Networks in Hydra vulgaris. *Curr Biol* **27**, 1085–1097.

Escobar, A., Kim, S., Primack, A. S., Duret, G., Juliano, C. E. and Robinson, J. T. (2024). Terminal differentiation precedes functional circuit integration in the peduncle neurons in regenerating Hydra vulgaris. *Neural Dev* **19**, 18.

Farrell, J. A., Wang, Y., Riesenfeld, S. J., Shekhar, K., Regev, A. and Schier, A. F. (2018). Single-cell reconstruction of developmental trajectories during zebrafish embryogenesis. *Science* **360**, eaar3131.

Ferenc, J., Bonvin, M., Papasaikas, P., Ferralli, J., Nuninger, C. and Tsiairis, C. D. (2024). A transcription factor toggle switch determines differentiated epidermal cell identities in Hydra. 2024.12.10.627691.

Fincher, C. T., Wurtzel, O., de Hoog, T., Kravarik, K. M. and Reddien, P. W. (2018). Cell type transcriptome atlas for the planarian Schmidtea mediterranea. *Science* **360**, eaaq1736.

Giez, C., Pinkle, D., Giencke, Y., Wittlieb, J., Herbst, E., Spratte, T., Lachnit, T., Klimovich, A., Selhuber-Unkel, C. and Bosch, T. C. G. (2023). Multiple neuronal populations control the eating behavior in Hydra and are responsive to microbial signals. *Curr Biol* **33**, 5288-5303.e6.

Gonzales, D. L., Badhiwala, K. N., Vercosa, D. G., Avants, B. W., Liu, Z., Zhong, W. and Robinson, J. T. (2017). Scalable electrophysiology in intact small animals with nanoscale suspended electrode arrays. *Nat Nanotechnol* **12**, 684–691.

**Grimmelikhuijzen, C. J. P.** (1985). Antisera to the sequence Arg-Phe-amide visualize neuronal
centralization in hydroid polyps. *Cell Tissue Res.* **241**, 171–182.

**Hafemeister, C. and Satija, R.** (2019). Normalization and variance stabilization of single-cell
RNA-seq data using regularized negative binomial regression. *Genome Biology* **20**, 296.

**Hager, G. and David, C. N.** (1997). Pattern of differentiated nerve cells in hydra is determined
by precursor migration. *Development* **124**, 569–576.

**Hahne, F. and Ivanek, R.** (2016). Visualizing Genomic Data Using Gviz and Bioconductor.
*Methods Mol Biol* **1418**, 335–351.

**Hao, Y., Hao, S., Andersen-Nissen, E., Mauck, W. M., Zheng, S., Butler, A., Lee, M. J.,**
**Wilk, A. J., Darby, C., Zager, M., et al.** (2021). Integrated analysis of multimodal
single-cell data. *Cell* **184**, 3573-3587.e29.

**Hobmayer, E., Holstein, T. W. and David, C. N.** (1990). Tentacle morphogenesis in hydra: II.
Formation of a complex between a sensory nerve cell and a battery cell. *Development*
**109**, 897–904.

**Hulett, R. E., Rivera-López, C., Gehrke, A. R., Gompers, A. and Srivastava, M.** (2024). A
wound-induced differentiation trajectory for neurons. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **121**,
e2322864121.

**Juliano, C. E., Reich, A., Liu, N., Götzfried, J., Zhong, M., Uman, S., Reenan, R. A.,**
**Wessel, G. M., Steele, R. E. and Lin, H.** (2014a). PIWI proteins and PIWI-interacting
RNAs function in Hydra somatic stem cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **111**, 337–342.

**Juliano, C. E., Lin, H. and Steele, R. E.** (2014b). Generation of Transgenic Hydra by Embryo
Microinjection. *JoVE* 51888.

**Keramidioti, A., Schneid, S., Busse, C., Cramer von Laue, C., Bertulat, B., Salvenmoser,**
**W., Hess, M., Alexandrova, O., Glauber, K. M., Steele, R. E., et al.** (2024). A new
look at the architecture and dynamics of the Hydra nerve net. *Elife* **12**, RP87330.

**Kim, S., Badhiwala, K. N., Duret, G. and Robinson, J. T.** (2024). Phototaxis is a satiety-
dependent behavioral sequence in Hydra vulgaris. *J Exp Biol* **227**, jeb247503.

**Klimovich, A., Wittlieb, J. and Bosch, T. C. G.** (2019). Transgenesis in Hydra to characterize
gene function and visualize cell behavior. *Nat Protoc* **14**, 2069–2090.

**Klimovich, A., Giacomello, S., Björklund, Å., Faure, L., Kaucka, M., Giez, C., Murillo-**
**Rincon, A. P., Matt, A.-S., Willoweit-Ohl, D., Crupi, G., et al.** (2020). Prototypical
pacemaker neurons interact with the resident microbiota. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*
**117**, 17854–17863.

**Koizumi, O., Hamada, S., Minobe, S., Hamaguchi-Hamada, K., Kurumata-Shigeto, M.,**
**Nakamura, M. and Namikawa, H.** (2015). The nerve ring in cnidarians: its presence
and structure in hydrozoan medusae. *Zoology* **118**, 79–88.

**Kondili, M., Fust, A., Preussner, J., Kuenne, C., Braun, T. and Looso, M.** (2017). UROPA: a
tool for Universal RObust Peak Annotation. *Sci Rep* **7**, 2593.

**Kotliar, D., Veres, A., Nagy, M. A., Tabrizi, S., Hodis, E., Melton, D. A. and Sabeti, P. C.**
(2019). Identifying gene expression programs of cell-type identity and cellular activity
with single-cell RNA-Seq. *eLife* **8**, e43803.

**Kuehn, E., Clausen, D. S., Null, R. W., Metzger, B. M., Willis, A. D. and Özpolat, B. D.**
(2022). Segment number threshold determines juvenile onset of germline cluster
expansion in Platynereis dumerilii. *J Exp Zool B Mol Dev Evol* **338**, 225–240.

**Landt, S. G., Marinov, G. K., Kundaje, A., Kheradpour, P., Pauli, F., Batzoglou, S.,**
**Bernstein, B. E., Bickel, P., Brown, J. B., Cayting, P., et al.** (2012). ChIP-seq
guidelines and practices of the ENCODE and modENCODE consortia. *Genome Res* **22**,
1813–1831.

**Langfelder, P. and Horvath, S.** (2008). WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation
network analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics* **9**, 559.

**Langmead, B. and Salzberg, S. L.** (2012). Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nat*
*Methods* **9**, 357–359.

**Leviev, I., Williamson, M. and Grimmelikhuijzen, C. J.** (1997). Molecular cloning of a
preprohormone from Hydra magnipapillata containing multiple copies of Hydra-L
Wamide (Leu-Trp-NH2) neuropeptides: evidence for processing at Ser and Asn residues.
*J Neurochem* **68**, 1319–1325.

**Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis,**
**G. and Durbin, R.** (2009). The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools.
*Bioinformatics* **25**, 2078–2079.

**Li, Q., Brown, J. B., Huang, H. and Bickel, P. J.** (2011). Measuring reproducibility of high-
throughput experiments. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* **5**,.

**Lommel, M., Tursch, A., Rustarazo-Calvo, L., Trageser, B. and Holstein, T. W.** (2017).
Genetic knockdown and knockout approaches in Hydra. 230300.

**Macosko, E. Z., Basu, A., Satija, R., Nemesh, J., Shekhar, K., Goldman, M., Tirosh, I.,**
**Bialas, A. R., Kamitaki, N., Martersteck, E. M., et al.** (2015). Highly Parallel Genome-
wide Expression Profiling of Individual Cells Using Nanoliter Droplets. *Cell* **161**, 1202–
1214.

**McInnes, L., Healy, J., Saul, N. and Großberger, L.** (2018). UMAP: Uniform Manifold
Approximation and Projection. *Journal of Open Source Software* **3**, 861.

Noro, Y., Yum, S., Nishimiya-Fujisawa, C., Busse, C., Shimizu, H., Mineta, K., Zhang, X., Holstein, T. W., David, C. N., Gojobori, T., et al. (2019). Regionalized nervous system in Hydra and the mechanism of its development. *Gene Expr Patterns* **31**, 42–59.

Noro, Y., Shimizu, H., Mineta, K. and Gojobori, T. (2021). A single neuron subset governs a single coactive neuron circuit in Hydra vulgaris, representing a possible ancestral feature of neural evolution. *Sci Rep* **11**, 10828.

Rentzsch, F., Juliano, C. and Galliot, B. (2019). Modern genomic tools reveal the structural and cellular diversity of cnidarian nervous systems. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* **56**, 87–96.

Robinson, M. D., McCarthy, D. J. and Smyth, G. K. (2010). edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 139–140.

Salomone, J., Qin, S., Fufa, T. D., Cain, B., Farrow, E., Guan, B., Hufnagel, R. B., Nakafuku, M., Lim, H.-W., Campbell, K., et al. (2021). Conserved Gsx2/Ind homeodomain monomer versus homodimer DNA binding defines regulatory outcomes in flies and mice. *Genes Dev.* **35**, 157–174.

Satija, R., Farrell, J. A., Gennert, D., Schier, A. F. and Regev, A. (2015). Spatial reconstruction of single-cell gene expression data. *Nat Biotechnol* **33**, 495–502.

Sebé-Pedrós, A., Saudemont, B., Chomsky, E., Plessier, F., Mailhé, M.-P., Renno, J., Loe-Mie, Y., Lifshitz, A., Mukamel, Z., Schmutz, S., et al. (2018a). Cnidarian Cell Type Diversity and Regulation Revealed by Whole-Organism Single-Cell RNA-Seq. *Cell* **173**, 1520-1534.e20.

Sebé-Pedrós, A., Chomsky, E., Pang, K., Lara-Astiaso, D., Gaiti, F., Mukamel, Z., Amit, I., Hejnol, A., Degnan, B. M. and Tanay, A. (2018b). Early metazoan cell type diversity and the evolution of multicellular gene regulation. *Nat Ecol Evol* **2**, 1176–1188.

Siebert, S., Anton-Erxleben, F. and Bosch, T. C. G. (2008). Cell type complexity in the basal metazoan *Hydra* is maintained by both stem cell based mechanisms and transdifferentiation. *Developmental Biology* **313**, 13–24.

Siebert, S., Farrell, J. A., Cazet, J. F., Abeykoon, Y., Primack, A. S., Schnitzler, C. E. and Juliano, C. E. (2019). Stem cell differentiation trajectories in Hydra resolved at single-cell resolution. *Science* **365**, eaav9314.

Stuart, T., Butler, A., Hoffman, P., Hafemeister, C., Papalexi, E., Mauck, W. M., Hao, Y., Stoeckius, M., Smibert, P. and Satija, R. (2019). Comprehensive Integration of Single-Cell Data. *Cell* **177**, 1888-1902.e21.

Takaku, Y., Hwang, J. S., Wolf, A., Böttger, A., Shimizu, H., David, C. N. and Gojobori, T. (2014). Innexin gap junctions in nerve cells coordinate spontaneous contractile behavior in Hydra polyps. *Sci Rep* **4**, 3573.

**Taylor, S. R., Santpere, G., Weinreb, A., Barrett, A., Reilly, M. B., Xu, C., Varol, E.,**
**Oikonomou, P., Glenwinkel, L., McWhirter, R., et al.** (2021). Molecular topography
of an entire nervous system. *Cell* **184**, 4329-4347.e23.

**Trembley, A., Trembley, A., Pronk, C., Schley, J. van der and Lyonet, P.** (1744). *Mémoires*
*pour servir à l'histoire d'un genre de polypes d'eau douce, à bras en forme de cornes*. A
Leide: Chez Jean & Herman Verbeek.

**Tzouanas, C. N., Kim, S., Badhiwala, K. N., Avants, B. W. and Robinson, J. T.** (2021).
Hydra vulgaris shows stable responses to thermal stimulation despite large changes in the
number of neurons. *iScience* **24**, 102490.

**Vogg, M. C., Beccari, L., Iglesias Ollé, L., Rampon, C., Vriz, S., Perruchoud, C., Wenger,**
**Y. and Galliot, B.** (2019a). An evolutionarily-conserved Wnt3/β-catenin/Sp5 feedback
loop restricts head organizer activity in Hydra. *Nat Commun* **10**, 312.

**Vogg, M. C., Galliot, B. and Tsiairis, C. D.** (2019b). Model systems for regeneration: Hydra.
*Development* **146**, dev177212.

**Vogg, M. C., Ferenc, J., Buzgariu, W. C., Perruchoud, C., Sanchez, P. G. L., Beccari, L.,**
**Nuninger, C., Le Cras, Y., Delucinge-Vivier, C., Papasaikas, P., et al.** (2022). The
transcription factor Zic4 promotes tentacle formation and prevents epithelial
transdifferentiation in Hydra. *Science Advances* **8**, eabo0694.

**Voigt, O., Erpenbeck, D. and Wörheide, G.** (2008). A fragmented metazoan organellar
genome: the two mitochondrial chromosomes of Hydra magnipapillata. *BMC Genomics*
**9**, 350.

**Westfall, J. A. and Epp, L. G.** (1985). Scanning electron microscopy of neurons isolated from
the pedal disk and body column of *Hydra. Tissue and Cell* **17**, 161–170.

**Wittlieb, J., Khalturin, K., Lohmann, J. U., Anton-Erxleben, F. and Bosch, T. C. G.** (2006).
Transgenic Hydra allow in vivo tracking of individual stem cells during morphogenesis.
*Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **103**, 6208–6211.

**Yamamoto, W. and Yuste, R.** (2023). Peptide-driven control of somersaulting in Hydra
vulgaris. *Curr Biol* **33**, 1893-1905.e4.

**Zhang, Y., Liu, T., Meyer, C. A., Eeckhoute, J., Johnson, D. S., Bernstein, B. E., Nusbaum,**
**C., Myers, R. M., Brown, M., Li, W., et al.** (2008). Model-based Analysis of ChIP-Seq
(MACS). *Genome Biology* **9**, R137.

**Zhong, W., Barde, S., Mitsios, N., Adori, C., Oksvold, P., Feilitzen, K. von, O'Leary, L.,**
**Csiba, L., Hortobágyi, T., Szocsics, P., et al.** (2022). The neuropeptide landscape of
human prefrontal cortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**,
e2123146119.

1432