Title: Single Cell Sequencing Provides Clues about the Developmental Genetic Basis of Evolutionary Adaptations in Syngnathid Fishes

Running title: Novel Syngnathid Developmental Atlas

Hope M. Healey[1]*, Hayden B. Penn[1], Clayton M. Small[1,2], Susan Bassham[1], Vithika Goyal[1], Micah A. Woods[1], and William A. Cresko[1,3]*

1. Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Oregon
2. School of Computer and Data Science, University of Oregon
3. Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact, University of Oregon

*Corresponding authors

ORCID IDs

Hope M. Healey: 0000-0001-9978-1553
Hayden B. Penn: 0009-0000-3090-5423
Clayton M. Small: 0000-0003-1615-7590
Susan Bassham: 0000-0002-7309-2095
Vithika Goyal: 0009-0009-8601-8474
Micah A. Woods: 0009-0004-2156-3352
William A. Cresko: 0000-0002-3496-8074

Author Contributions: Hope Healey: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing – Original Draft, Review, and Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Funding acquisition, **Hayden Penn:** Investigation, Writing – Review and Editing, **Clayton Small:** Methodology, Investigation, Writing – Review and Editing, **Susan Bassham:** Methodology, Writing – Review and Editing, **Vithika Goyal:** Investigation, Writing – Review and Editing, **Micah Woods:** Investigation, Writing – Review and Editing, Visualization, **William Cresko:** Conceptualization, Resources, Writing – Review and Editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition

Keywords: Evolution of Development, Syngnathid, Evolutionary Novelty, scRNAseq, Non-traditional Model

Impact Statement: The production of a single cell atlas for developing syngnathid fish permits study of their unique traits.

Abstract

Seahorses, pipefishes, and seadragons are fishes from the family Syngnathidae that have evolved extraordinary traits including male pregnancy, elongated snouts, loss of teeth, and dermal bony armor. The developmental genetic and cellular changes that led to the evolution of these traits are largely unknown. Recent syngnathid genome assemblies revealed suggestive gene content differences and provide the opportunity for detailed genetic analyses. We created a single cell RNA sequencing atlas of Gulf pipefish embryos to understand the developmental basis of four traits: derived head shape, toothlessness, dermal armor, and male pregnancy. We completed marker gene analyses, built genetic networks, and examined spatial expression of select genes. We identified osteochondrogenic mesenchymal cells in the elongating face that express regulatory genes *bmp4, sfrp1a*, and *prdm16*. We found no evidence for tooth primordia cells, and we observed re-deployment of osteoblast genetic networks in developing dermal armor. Finally, we found that epidermal cells expressed nutrient processing and environmental sensing genes, potentially relevant for the brooding environment. The examined pipefish evolutionary innovations are composed of recognizable cell types, suggesting derived features originate from changes within existing gene networks. Future work addressing syngnathid gene networks across multiple stages and species is essential for understanding how their novelties evolved.

Introduction

Seahorses, pipefishes, and seadragons are extraordinary fishes in the family Syngnathidae with diverse body plans, coloration, and elaborate structures for paternal brooding. The syngnathid clade comprises over 300 diverse species that vary in conservation status, distribution, ecology, and morphology (Leysen et al., 2011; Manning et al., 2019; Schneider, Woltering, et al., 2023; Stiller et al., 2022). Syngnathids have numerous highly altered traits, trait losses, and evolutionary novelties. They have elongated snouts bearing small, toothless jaws (Leysen et al., 2011) specialized for capture of small zooplankton (Van Wassenbergh et al., 2009). Additionally, syngnathids are distinctly

protected by a bony dermal armor rather than scales (Jungerson, 1910). Other skeletal

differences include a lack of ribs and pelvic fins, and an expansion in the number of

vertebrae (Schneider, Woltering, et al., 2023). Finally, syngnathids exhibit male pregnancy,

which has involved the evolution of specialized brooding tissues and structures

(Whittington & Friesen, 2020). Paternal investment varies among lineages; for example,

seadragons tether embryos externally to their tails while seahorses and some pipefishes

have enclosed brood pouches proposed to support embryos through nutrient transfer and

osmotic regulation (Carcupino, 2002; Melamed et al., 2005; Ripley & Foran, 2006).

72   Despite advances in understanding the ecology and evolution of syngnathid

novelties, the developmental genetic basis for these traits is largely unknown. The recent

production of high quality syngnathid genome assemblies (Qu et al., 2021; Ramesh et al.,

2023; Small et al., 2022; Wolf et al., 2024) provides initial clues for the developmental

genetic basis of some evolutionary changes. Studies have found that syngnathids lack

several genes with deeply conserved roles in vertebrate development, including

pharyngeal arch development (*fgf3*), tooth development (*fgf3*, *fgf4*, and *eve1*, and most

Scpp genes), fin development (*tbx4*), and immune function (MHC pathway components)

(Lin et al., 2016; Qu et al., 2021; Small et al., 2016; Small et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2020).

Though these gene losses are highly suggestive of leading to unique changes, exploration of

the actual developmental consequences of their losses is needed.

83   To fill this gap in knowledge, we used single cell RNA sequencing (scRNAseq) to

investigate how these striking genomic changes have affected the developmental genetic

and cellular basis of syngnathids' derived traits. The Gulf pipefish (*Syngnathus scovelli*) is

an attractive model for this study (Figure 1A). This species has a high-quality reference

genome annotated by NCBI and is amenable to laboratory culture (Anderson & Jones, 2019;

Ramesh et al., 2023). Furthermore, species from the *Syngnathus* genus are used worldwide

to address questions about syngnathid evolution in microbial, developmental, functional

morphological, histological, transcriptomic, ecotoxicological, and genomic studies

(Berglund et al., 1986; Carcupino, 2002; Fuiten & Cresko, 2021; Harada et al., 2022; Harlin-

Cognato et al., 2006; Partridge et al., 2007; Ripley & Foran, 2006; Rose et al., 2023; Roth et

al., 2012; Small et al., 2016; Small et al., 2013). In this paper, we focus on a subset of unique

syngnathid traits, including their elongated head, toothlessness, dermal armor, and
development of embryos inside the brood pouch. These traits represent the diversity of
evolutionary changes observed in the syngnathid clade (highly altered, lost, and novel
traits); hypotheses from studies of model organisms suggest developmental pathways
involved in their evolution (Lin et al., 2016; Roth et al., 2020; Small et al., 2016; Small et al.,
2022).

scRNAseq atlases are a powerful complement to genomic analyses (Shema et al.,
2019; Ton et al., 2020). They can provide crucial insights into types of cells present, genes
that distinguish cell types (marker genes), active gene networks, and a means to identify
expression of genes of interest within predicted cell types (Farnsworth et al., 2020; Farrell
et al., 2018; Williams et al., 2019). Specifically, scRNAseq captures RNA expression profiles
from individual cells, allowing cell types to be inferred *post-hoc*. scRNAseq has successfully
been applied to syngnathid adult kidneys (Parker et al., 2022), but there are no published
syngnathid developmental atlases.

Here we report the first developmental scRNAseq atlas for syngnathids from late
embryogenesis staged Gulf pipefish. We delineate the overall structure of this atlas, which
describes 38 cell clusters composed of 35,785 cells, and use these data to make inferences
about the morphological evolution of several syngnathid innovations. In addition to
inferring present cell types and their underlying genetic networks, we detail spatial
expression patterns using *in situ* hybridization experiments of select marker and other
candidate genes in pipefish embryos and juveniles. We found genes of conserved signaling
pathways expressed during craniofacial development but did not detect evidence of tooth
primordia. The embryonic dermis and epidermis, respectively, expressed genes for the
dermal armor development (bone development pathways) and genes potentially involved
in interaction with the male brood pouch (e.g., nutrient acquisition genes). Overall, this
atlas provides a deeper understanding of the development of Gulf pipefish and identifies
gene candidates for understanding the development of syngnathid evolutionary
innovations. In addition to these discoveries, this atlas provides a significant resource for
researchers studying syngnathid evolution and development.

Results

Valuable scRNAseq atlas for studying syngnathid development

We produced the first developmental scRNAseq atlas for a syngnathid from two
samples comprising 20 similarly staged embryos from pregnant, wild-caught Gulf pipefish
(*Syngnathus scovelli*) males. The samples represent a late organogenesis developmental
stage (Figure 1B-H). These embryos had a primarily cartilaginous skeleton with minimal
mineralization, including jaw cartilages that were at the onset of mineralization and
ethmoid elongation. The embryos also possessed cartilaginous dorsal fin pterygiophores
but had no signs of dermal armor mineralization. This stage is referred to as "frontal jaws"
in the literature on syngnathids (Sommer et al., 2012).

The atlas included 35,785 cells (19,892 and 15,893 cells from each sample; S1:S2),
which formed 38 cell clusters (Figure 2A, Supplementary File 1, 2). We classified cells into
4 different broad tissue types – epithelial, connective, neural, and muscle – using Seurat-
identified marker genes and published model organism resources (S3:S57). We next used
Seurat identified marker genes to pinpoint single marker genes that were most unique to
each cluster (Figure S58, Supplementary File 3, 4, 5). We completed *in situ* hybridization
using Gulf and bay pipefish embryos for cell clusters for which examining gene expression
would help hone and validate cluster annotations (Figure S59:S71).

In total, our atlas contained 13,027 connective tissue cells (excluding cells from
blood, immune, and the digestive system) from 14 clusters, 10,112 nervous system cells
from ten clusters, 4,363 muscle cells from five clusters, 4,133 blood cells from three
clusters, 650 immune cells from two clusters, 432 pigment cells from one cluster, 370
epidermal cells from one cluster, and 137 gut cells from one cluster. Within the connective
tissue cell types, we also identified cartilage (302 cells), developing bone (442 cells), fins
(253 cells), and notochord (693 cells). The number of recovered cells per identity may not
necessarily represent organismal cellular proportions because of potential variability in
dissociation success for different cell types (Denisenko et al., 2020; Venema et al., 2022).

Discovery of cell cluster function and state using KEGG analysis

To affirm identities and discover potential properties of each cluster, we completed

a KEGG pathway analysis for each cluster using Seurat's marker genes (Figure S72, Figure

2B). For eight of the clusters (1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 15, 19, and 24), we did not find any significantly

enriched pathways, possibly due to similar gene expression profiles across cell types that

reduced the number of identified markers. However, we found one or more significantly

enriched pathways for the other 29 cell clusters. We observed enriched pathway terms that

supported cluster annotations. For example, 'phototransduction' in the retina cluster,

'melanogenesis' in the pigment cluster, 'cardiac muscle contraction' in muscle clusters, and

'neuroactive ligand receptor interaction' in neuronal clusters.

The inferred KEGG pathways demonstrated some commonalities across the

different tissue types, including in signaling pathways and cell states. Notably, our

identified KEGG terms delineated progenitor and differentiated cell clusters. Based on their

KEGG terms, we classified clusters 8, 10, and 16 as possible neural, muscle, and connective

tissue progenitor cells, respectively. We also detected expression of *pax3a* and *pax3b*,

muscle primordia markers, in cluster 10, supporting this annotation. These clusters had

enriched KEGG terms associated with cell division ('cell cycle', 'DNA replication',

'nucleotide excision repair', and 'homologous recombination'), and lacked enrichment for

KEGG pathways present with differentiated cell types of their lineage. Specifically, cluster 8

lacked the neural KEGG term 'neuroactive ligand receptor interaction', cluster 10 lacked

muscle KEGG terms 'adrenergic signaling in cardiomyocytes', 'calcium signaling pathways',

and 'cardiac muscle contraction', and cluster 16 lacked connective tissue term 'ECM

receptor interaction'. To complement these findings, we completed a cell differentiation

analysis using CytoTRACE for neural, muscle, and connective clusters (Figure S73). Clusters

8, 10, and 16 had the lowest scores in each respective comparison, which indicated

undifferentiated cell states. Thus, it is likely that clusters 8, 10, and 16 represented

undifferentiated cells within the major lineages of neural, muscle, and connective cells.

Commonalities of cell clusters, unique networks, and elusive cell types identified

in network analysis

We built gene networks/modules from 3,000 variable genes using weighted gene
network correlation analysis (WGCNA; Langfelder & Horvath, 2008). This produced 43
gene modules in total (Supplementary File 8, 9), assessed for each cluster-module pair for
their strength of association (Figure 3A, Supplementary File 10, 11) and every module's
dependence on each cluster for their network connectivity (Figure S74, Supplementary File
12, 13). Using the genes from each network, we completed a KEGG pathway analysis to
identify whether gene modules indicated specific cellular pathways or states (Figure 3B).
We initially explored whether these network-cluster associations could reveal
commonalities between cell clusters or identify whether particular clusters contained
multiple cell identities.

First, we asked whether gene modules that associate with three or more cell clusters
signify commonalities between clusters that have similar cell types. We identified seven
gene modules (6, 7, 21, 14, 17, 41, and 42) that each associate with three or more cell
clusters. These gene modules do connect clusters of similar identities or cell states. For
example, Modules 6 and 7 associate with connective tissue cells. Module 6, the larger of the
two modules, contains numerous other KEGG pathways found in most connective cell
clusters, such as 'cytokine-cytokine receptor interaction' (Figure 3C). Interestingly, module
21, associated with clusters 8, 10, 16, and 25, contains genes from KEGG pathways related
to the 'cell cycle' and 'cellular senescence', supporting the results found in our cluster based
KEGG pathway analysis (Figure 3D). Module 21 also contained 'Notch signaling' genes,
possibly due to similar correlations with cell cycle genes; however, these were only
expressed in the neural cell clusters (8 and 25).

Where one cell cluster is associated with multiple gene networks, we wondered if
multiple cell identities existed within the cell cluster. We explored this possibility by
examining the pigment cell cluster (cluster #20) and whether the five different correlated
gene modules (#34, 35, 36, and 37, and 38) are expressed in distinct subgroups of cells
within the cluster (S75). We found cases of more than one genetic network (modules 35
and 38) expressed in the same cells. Modules 35 and 38 included conserved pigment genes,
pmela, *mlana*, and *dct* in module 35 and *tryp1b* and *pmel* in module 38, that mark
melanocytes (Figure S6; Du et al., 2003; Johnson et al., 2011; Lamason et al., 2005; Thisse &

Thisse, 2004).However, we also found non-overlapping expression of networks, notably
modules 36 and 37. We inferred that module 36 is associated with xanthophores and
xanthoblasts due to the presence of *plin6* and *scarb1*, genes involved with lipid binding and
activity in xanthophores (Ahi et al., 2020). On the other hand, module 37 likely represents
iridophores and iridoblasts because it contains *pnp4a,* which is involved in purine-
nucleoside phosphorylase activity in iridoblasts (Kimura et al., 2017).

Conserved signaling pathways are active during syngnathid craniofacial development

The specialized pipefish feeding apparatus is composed of an elongate, tubular
snout, toothless mandible and pharyngeal jaws, large tendons, and associated muscles.
Therefore, numerous cell types contribute to their distinct faces: cartilage, bone, tendon,
muscle, and connective tissues as well as their progenitors. We sought to identify markers
of these cell types and signaling pathways active in them.

We found marker genes uniquely expressed in the face, genes that mark cell types
important to craniofacial development, and markers with potentially relevant functions for
craniofacial development using *in situ* hybridizations of cell cluster marker genes. For
instance, we observed the marker for osteochondro-mesenchymal cells (cluster #6), *elnb*,
specifically expressed at the intersection between the ethmoid plate and palatoquadrate as
well as on the Meckel's cartilage (Figure 4B). Although *elnb* is observed in the zebrafish
cranial skeleton, it is primarily studied for its proposed role in teleost heart evolution
(Miao et al., 2007; Moriyama et al., 2016).

Other genes identified here as cell markers were not uniquely craniofacial but
provide insights into the cell types that comprise the face. For example, *tnmd* expression
marked tendons and ligaments (cluster #9) throughout the face and body (Figure 4C;
Figure S65). Our finding is consistent with *tnmd's* role in tenocyte development in model
systems, namely zebrafish and mouse (Chen & Galloway, 2014; Docheva et al., 2005).
Identifying tenocyte cells is particularly relevant in syngnathid fishes where tendons are
enlarged and store elastic energy necessary for their specialized feeding (Van Wassenbergh
et al., 2007).

The last category of markers contained genes with regulatory roles important for
craniofacial development such as *prdm16,* the marker for osteochondro-mesenchymal cells
(cluster #5). The gene *prdm16* mediates the methylation of histones and regulates gene
expression, key for promoting craniofacial chondrocyte differentiation (Ding et al., 2013;
Kaneda-Nakashima et al., 2022; Lomeli Carpio Shull et al., 2020). We found *prdm16*
expressed in mesenchymal cells directly above the ethmoid plate and in fins (Figure 4D;
Figure S61). Comparison of pipefish with a related, short snouted fish (stickleback)
identified similarity in fin expression, but differences in craniofacial staining (S76).
Stickleback expressed *prdm16* in the hindbrain, gill arches, and lower jaw, consistent with
published zebrafish data (Ding et al., 2013), but staining was additionally detected in the
ethmoid region in pipefish.

We next examined signaling pathways active in craniofacial development. Our KEGG
pathway analysis revealed that MAPK, Wnt, and TGF-beta signaling pathways were
significantly enriched in one or more craniofacial contributing cell clusters (module #6;
Figure 2B, Figure 3C, Figure 4A). In addition to these KEGG findings, expression of ligands
and receptors that are members of these pathways (Fgf, a MAPK pathway, Wnt, and Bmp, a
TGF-beta pathway) was observed in cell clusters of both differentiated and
undifferentiated states (Figure 4A). We chose three genes, one from each major pathway,
for *in situ* hybridizations: *fgf22* (a Fgf ligand present in the actively dividing cells' module),
bmp4 (a Bmp ligand present in the largest connective tissue module), and *sfrp1a* (a Wnt
pathway enabler present in a cartilage gene module). Although mouse and zebrafish
studies identified *fgf22* expression only in the nervous system (Miyake & Itoh, 2013;
Umemori et al., 2004), we found *fgf22* is expressed at the tip of the palatoquadrate and
Meckel's cartilage, the gill arches, fins, and brain in pipefish (figure 4E; S77). These same
expression patterns were observed in stickleback, suggesting a surprising co-option of fin
and craniofacial expression in percomorph fish.

We observed *bmp4* and *sfrp1a* expressed above the ethmoid plate and along the
ceratohyal in pipefish (figure 4F-G). The gene *bmp4* has a conserved role in craniofacial
development, particularly important at later stages for driving chondrocyte differentiation
(Wang et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2013). However, the specificity of *bmp4* expression to

mesenchyme around the ceratohyal and ethmoid was not observed in stickleback fish,

which had broad craniofacial expression (including the jaws, tooth germs, and gill arches;

S78). Interestingly, *sfrp1a* expression has not been observed in the palate of mice or

ethmoid region of zebrafish, but *sfrp1a* craniofacial expression was identified in stickleback

(lower jaw and gill arches; S79) and has been observed in other fishes (Ahi et al., 2014;

Schneider, Gunter, et al., 2023; Schilling & Kimmel, 1997; Swartz et al., 2011; Wang et al.,

2024).

Gulf pipefish retain tooth development genes but likely lack onset of tooth development

Previous papers have identified possible candidate genes for the loss of teeth in

syngnathid fishes including those from genes that initiate tooth bud formation (*fgf4, eve1*),

regulate tooth morphogenesis (*fgf3, fgf4*), and synthesize tooth minerals (*scpp4, scpp7,*

scpp9, odam, and *scpp5*; Lin et al., 2016; Qu et al., 2021; Small et al., 2016; Small et al., 2022;

Zhang et al., 2020). However, it is unknown whether syngnathid tooth development

initiates then halts or whether it never begins. We searched for signs of early tooth

primordia within our atlas to ask whether tooth development might initiate in syngnathids.

Additionally, we examined whether genes present in mature teeth are still expressed in

syngnathids and what types of cells express them.

Our thorough examination of cell clusters for identity annotation did not find a tooth

primordium cluster. We therefore searched for tooth primordia by examining expression of

specific odontogenesis marker genes (*aldh1a2, bmp4, dlx2a, dlx3b, lef1, lhx6a, lhx8, msx1a,*

msx2, and *wnt10a*; Figure 5A). We observed several primordium genes expressed in our

atlas. However, there was no cluster with every marker gene expressed in over 10% of

cells. Several markers (*dlx3b, lef1, msx1a, msx2*, and *wnt10a*) were expressed in cluster #28,

a fin cluster distinguished by *hoxa13a* and *hoxa13b* expression. Since we previously noted

that cluster #16 seems to be a primordial connective tissue cluster, we wondered if it could

contain tooth primordial cells. In this cluster, we found the following percentage of

expression of each gene in the cells: *bmp4* in 46%, *aldh1a2* in 29%, *lef1* in 24%, *dlx2a* in

18%, *dlx3b* in 16.4%, *eda* in 12.7%, *msx1a* in 10.6%, *pitx2* in 10%, *lhx6a* in 8%, *wnt10a* in

4.6%, *msx2* in 2.65%, *lhx8* in 1.8%, and *shha* in 1%.

We suggest that, given the low expression of most tooth marker genes, cluster #16

is unlikely to contain tooth primordial cells. To test this hypothesis, we examined spatial

gene expression using *in situ* hybridization of *bmp4*, *pitx2*, *lhx6a*, *dlx2a*, and *dlx3b* in

pipefish to ask whether the two definitive cell types are present, namely the dental

epithelium (marked by *pitx2* and *bmp4*) and dental mesenchyme (distinguished by *dlx2a*,

dlx3b, and *lhx6a*; Figure 5B-F; Gibert et al., 2019; A. Tucker & Sharpe, 2004). Tooth-specific

expression of *dlx2a* is observed solely in the dental mesenchyme in zebrafish and mice,

however, it is also expressed in the dental epithelium in medaka (Stock et al., 2006). For

this study, we labelled *dlx2a* as a mesenchyme marker, though it could be expressed in both

dental tissues in a syngnathid outgroup. We found expression of all genes except *dlx2a* in

the developing jaws. However, *bmp4*, *pitx2*, *lhx6a*, and *dlx3b* were expressed throughout

the face rather than in the punctate pattern observed in tooth primordia development.

We next investigated *scpp* genes (*enam*, *scpp1*, and *spp1*), which are expressed in

late tooth development and tooth maintenance in other vertebrates (Figure 5A). These

genes also have some expression outside of teeth such as in dental bone (*scpp1*, *spp1*;

Kawasaki, 2009) and fins (*enam;* Jain et al., 2007). We identified *spp1* and *scpp1* expression

in 54.5% and 24% of bone cells, respectfully, and sparse *spp1* expression (<3%) in other

connective tissue cell types. We found minimal expression of *enam* (in 11.4%) in epidermal

cells and in less than 8% of muscle cells. In whole mount *in situ* hybridization, we found

that *scpp1* is expressed in all developing pipefish bones, both endochondral and dermal

(Figure 5G). Since *scpp* gene losses observed in syngnathids have been hypothesized to be

responsible for their tooth loss (Lin et al., 2016; Qu et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2020), we

explored *scpp* gene family content in the close, tooth-bearing relative to syngnathids, the

blue spotted cornetfish, and we found several gene losses (*scpp4*, *scpp7*, and *scpp9*) and a

likely pseudogene (*scpp5*) (Figure S80; Hughes et al., 2018; Stiller et al., 2022).

Exploration of additional tooth maturation genes (*col1a1b, col4a1, col5a1, sparc*, and

mmp20b) similarly found that these genes were expressed in non-tooth derivatives,

including connective tissue, smooth muscle, and neural cells.

Tooth and skeletal genes are expressed during dermal armor development

Syngnathid dermal armor is mineralized dermal bone underneath the skin (Figure
6D, G, H). It is unknown when dermal armor primordia initiate and how they are patterned.
Spatial expression analysis of *pitx2* and *dlx3b* in search of tooth primordia instead revealed
expression of these genes in possible dermal armor primordia (Figure 6A,B, E,F). We found
pitx2 staining localized dorsally to striated muscle underneath developing dermal armor.
The gene *dlx3b* is expressed in a repeating pattern along the body in the epidermal and
dermal tissues. Both staining patterns were in discrete regions of the muscle and epidermal
layers rather than being continuously expressed across the tissues. We did not observe the
expression of other tooth primordium genes (*bmp4, lhx6a*, and *dlx2a*) in this region.

Because the embryos from our atlas had not begun dermal armor mineralization,
the atlas cannot be directly used for discovery of genes active in dermal armor. However,
the atlas contains osteoblasts from craniofacial bones which we used to create osteoblast-
specific gene networks. We therefore asked whether these osteoblast genes were present
in mineralizing dermal armor at later stages. *In situ* hybridization expression analysis
revealed that *scpp1*, an osteoblast and tooth mineralization gene, and *ifitm5*, an osteoblast
gene, were expressed in the dermal armor at the onset of mineralization (Figure 6C; Figure
S68).

Epithelial expression of immune and nutrient-processing genes may facilitate embryo-paternal
interactions in the brood pouch

Within the brood pouch, embryos could interact with male placenta-like tissues, the
male brood pouch epithelium, and/or the pouch microbiome. Once the thin chorion is shed,
the embryos' epidermis is directly exposed to the pouch environment. We therefore asked
if the embryonic epidermal cells expressed nutrient acquisition and/or immune genes that
would indicate active transfer of nutrients and immune response.

Within our larger KEGG analysis, we asked whether nutrient absorption and
immune KEGG terms were among the enriched pathways for the epidermal cells. We
identified 106 enriched genes in the 'endocytosis' pathway (p-value=.036; Figure 7A). Four
metabolism pathways ('galactose', 'glutathione', 'sphingolipid', and 'starch and sucrose')
are also enriched. No immune-related KEGG terms were enriched in the epidermis. For

comparison, we investigated whether these KEGG terms are also enriched in epidermal

cells of non-brooding fishes. We completed a KEGG pathway analysis on a comparably

staged zebrafish single cell RNA sequencing atlas (3 days post fertilization; Lange et al.,

2023). The 3dpf zebrafish epidermal cells did not have a significant enrichment of the

'endocytosis' pathway (23 up-regulated genes, p-value=.99) or any metabolism pathway.

However, there are 11 endocytosis genes up-regulated in both zebrafish and pipefish

epidermal cells, suggesting conserved expression of these genes in pipefish.

We next examined pipefish epidermal gene networks for presence of nutrient

absorption or immune genes. We found that the largest epidermal gene network (#16)

contained a striking enrichment of C type lectin genes, carbohydrate binding proteins that

possess antimicrobial properties (Figure 7B). This network contained 14 total lectin genes

expressed in the epidermal cells: five galactose-specific lectin nattectin, 2 alpha-N-

acetylgalactosamine-specific lectins, one L-rhamnose-binding lectins, four ladderlectin, one

C-type lectin 37Dd-like, and one C-type lectin domain family 4 member G-like. Through

examining lectin gene expression in the entire dataset, we found that these genes were

specific to epidermal cells. Interestingly, previous literature has identified an upregulation

of C-type lectins in brood pouch tissues throughout different stages of syngnathid

pregnancy (Roth et al., 2020; Small et al., 2013; Whittington et al., 2015).

We did not find any expression of C-type lectin genes in zebrafish epidermal cells

(Figure S81), unlike in pipefish. However, it is possible there are unannotated C-type lectin

genes in zebrafish that remained cryptic in the atlas. Interestingly, the 'C-type lectin

receptor signaling pathway' was significantly enriched in zebrafish epidermal cells (13

genes, p-value=.04) but not in pipefish epidermal cells (34 genes, p-value=.4). Although

these results seem paradoxical, the KEGG term 'C-type lectin signaling pathway' does not

include any of the C-type lectin genes themselves. Overall, these data suggest that the

expression of C-type lectin genes in the pipefish embryonic epidermis is potentially unique

and warrants further investigation.

Discussion

Our study examines the development of syngnathids, with a particular focus on
novel and adaptive characters, using single cell RNA sequencing of Gulf pipefish embryos
coupled with *in situ* experiments of gene expression. Our single cell atlas represents early
craniofacial skeleton development in Gulf pipefish, at a stage when the cartilages of the
head skeleton were formed but the face has not elongated. We used the atlas to explore
craniofacial and dermal armor development and to investigate potential interactions
between the embryos and the brood pouch environment. Our dataset is both an
opportunity to explore the developmental genetic underpinnings of syngnathid
innovations, and a resource for teleost researchers for future studies in this fascinating
lineage.

Our atlas represents a novel resource for Evo-Devo research

Developmental single cell atlases have elucidated cell identities and genetic
pathways active in model organisms such as zebrafish, mice, and chick (Farnsworth et al.,
2020; Farrell et al., 2018; Feregrino et al., 2019; Morrison et al., 2017; Soldatov et al., 2019;
Wagner et al., 2018; Williams et al., 2019). In less traditional models, the majority of
scRNAseq atlases are produced from adult tissues, allowing investigations into cell types,
population differences, and genetic networks (Chari et al., 2021; Fuess & Bolnick, 2023;
Hain et al., 2022; Hong et al., 2023; Koiwai et al., 2023; Parker et al., 2022; Potts et al., 2022;
Royan et al., 2021; Songco-Casey et al., 2022; Vonk et al., 2023; Woych et al., 2022).
Creation of developmental scRNAseq atlases in non-model organisms is just beginning to
accelerate, but many emerging models still lack such a resource, limiting our understanding
of their development (Healey et al., 2022; Salamanca-Díaz et al., 2022; Steger et al., 2022;
Ton et al., 2023). Our single cell atlas is one of the first created to understand the
development of derived traits in a non-model organism.

For syngnathids specifically, this atlas represents an important step towards
understanding the genetic nature of unique syngnathid traits. Numerous developmental
genetic changes can lead to evolutionary innovations, including the evolution of novel
genes, gene duplications, gene losses, gene family expansions or contractions, evolution of
regulatory elements, co-option of gene regulatory networks, re-wiring of gene networks,

assembly of novel gene networks, and/or the emergence of novel cells (Arendt et al., 2016;

Cãestro et al., 2007; Teichmann & Babu, 2004; Wagner, 2011; Wagner & Lynch, 2010).

Considering these possibilities, we examined select syngnathid traits and speculated on

developmental genetic mechanisms influencing their evolution. Continuing to investigate

these proposed mechanisms through expanded scRNAseq atlases and other studies will be

critical for understanding syngnathid evolution.

Conserved pathways may contribute to derived syngnathid heads

Syngnathids have highly derived heads including an elongated ethmoid region,

uniquely shaped hyoid, and altered muscles and tendons to support specialized "pivot

feeding". The developmental underpinnings of these derived traits have remained

underexplored. In our atlas, we identified cell types present in the developing pipefish head

and genetic pathways active in those cell types. We identified numerous cells that were

present in the developing face: cartilage, bone, tendons, ligaments, osteochondrogenic

mesenchyme, fibroblasts, and unclassified connective tissue cells. Overall, we did not find

any unrecognizable cell types, suggesting that genetic modifications within conserved cell

types may drive craniofacial modifications.

We next investigated signaling pathways expressed in these cells to determine

whether and to what extent developmental genetic reorganization might have occurred.

Specifically, we examined the expression of one gene each from three different highly

conserved signaling pathways: Wnt (*sfrp1a*), TGF-beta (*bmp4*), and MAPK (*fgf22*). Using *in*

situ hybridizations, we found *sfrp1a* and *bmp4* expressed dorsal of the elongating ethmoid

plate and surrounding the ceratohyal, suggesting that Wnt and Bmp signaling may be active

in the lengthening structures. These two genes are proposed to influence the development

of elongated and broadened craniofacial morphologies in other species (Ahi et al., 2014;

Schneider, Gunter, et al., 2023; Tucker et al., 2000). Pipefish *prdm16* is similarly expressed

dorsal to the elongating ethmoid plate. Since *prdm16* regulates Wnt and TGF-beta signaling

and these genes regulate chondrocyte differentiation (Bjork et al., 2010; Kaneda-

Nakashima et al., 2022; Shull et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2024), their co-expression might

suggest a prolonged period of chondrocyte differentiation along the pipefish ethmoid

region. Future studies investigating this testable hypothesis would clarify whether

prolonged chondrocyte differentiation broadly underlies craniofacial diversity.

We found *fgf22* expressed in the mandible, gill arches, and fins using *in situ*

hybridizations, but not in the elongating regions of the head. Interestingly, *fgf22* expression

has not been reported in craniofacial development of any other species (Miyake & Itoh,

2013), but we found similar craniofacial and fin expression in stickleback fish. Fgf signaling,

however, is a conserved and essential pathway for craniofacial development (Crump et al.,

2004; Leerberg et al., 2019; McCarthy et al., 2016; Szabo-Rogers et al., 2008; Walshe &

Mason, 2003; Woronowicz & Schneider, 2019), raising the possibility that *fgf22* has been

co-opted into a role played by different *fgf* genes in other species. Future work should

consider a relationship between the novel craniofacial expression of *fgf22* and the loss of

Fgf ligands *fgf3* and *fgf4* in syngnathids. If *fgf22* is active in existing gene networks,

particularly those where *fgf3* or *fgf4* is active in other species, then its novel expression

may indicate evolved genetic redundancy prior to the gene losses.

Our analysis suggests ways in which unique syngnathid craniofacial structure could

have evolved through genetic network evolution. Unusual expression location (e.g., *fgf22*)

and specificity (e.g., *sfrp1a*, *bmp4*, and *prdm16*) in pipefish compared to zebrafish and

stickleback suggests that changes in signaling gene deployment and/or content within

craniofacial gene networks, particularly genes from Wnt, Fgf, or TGF-beta families, could

underly the exceptionally elongated syngnathid face.

Early, not late, tooth development is likely at the root of evolutionary tooth loss

Tooth loss has occurred independently in numerous lineages and has often been

studied to understand the developmental basis of character loss. For instance, research in

birds and turtles found that tooth programs initiate but are subsequently truncated,

explaining toothlessness in mature animals (Chen et al., 2000; Tokita et al., 2013).

Additional studies in birds have found losses in tooth maturation genes (specifically *scpp*

genes; Sire et al., 2008). Since numerous primordium and maturation genes are lost in

syngnathids (Lin et al., 2016; Qu et al., 2021; Small et al., 2016; Small et al., 2022; Zhang et

al., 2020), we asked if syngnathids begin tooth development at all.

We found that early tooth development genes were still expressed in pipefish, which

is unsurprising given their pleiotropic roles, but found no convincing evidence either in the

atlas or in spatial gene expression analysis of tissues for tooth primordia. The possibility

remains, however, that a transient cell population could fall at a different developmental

time than assayed here. Barring this caveat, syngnathid *fgf3* and *fgf4* losses could have

resulted in insufficient Fgf signaling from the oral epithelium to the dental mesenchyme,

causing failure of tooth initiation (Small et al., 2022; Stock et al., 2006).

If our finding of the loss of earliest stages of tooth development is consistent across

developmental stages and syngnathids, why then have syngnathids retained some

members of the *scpp* tooth maturation gene cluster? Since studies in birds propose *scpp*

gene losses can occur from relaxed selection (Sire et al., 2008), we speculated syngnathids

lost *scpp* genes with expression limited to teeth and retained genes with ancestrally

pleiotropic expression patterns. In Gulf pipefish, we found the retained genes *scpp1*, *spp1*,

and *enam,* are expressed in structures outside of tooth development, suggesting

developmental pleiotropic constraint. Specifically, we found *spp1* and *scpp1* expressed in

osteoblasts which is consistent with zebrafish (Bergen et al., 2022; Kawasaki, 2009; Liu et

al., 2016) and *enam* expressed in the epidermis which has not been reported in zebrafish

(Goldsmith et al., 2003; Jain et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2016). Through examining the

conservation of the *scpp* genes in close syngnathid relatives, we found that most *scpp* gene

losses (*scpp4*, *scpp7*, and *scpp9* and a functional *scpp5*) are shared with a tooth-bearing

outgroup to the family, and likely occurred prior to the loss of teeth in syngnathids. Overall,

our analysis favors the hypothesis that pleiotropic *scpp* genes were retained in syngnathids

while other, more tooth-specific *scpp* genes were lost due to relaxed selection.

Redeployment of the bone gene network to build dermal armor

The syngnathid dermal armor is a type of evolutionary novelty, which can arise

through either differentiation of serially repeated elements or *de novo* origination, derived

from either the redeployment of existing gene networks, rewiring of existing gene

networks, or the assemblage of new gene networks (Wagner & Lynch, 2010). Currently,

there is no understanding of the developmental genetic underpinnings of the syngnathid
dermal armor.

We identified *dlx3b* and *pitx2* expression in tissues where the dermal plates
mineralize later in development. Using *in situ* hybridizations, we showed that epithelial and
dermal layers expressed *dlx3b* and underlying muscle cells expressed *pitx2*. In some
species, dermal bone, plate, or denticle development occurs from the re-deployment of
tooth gene regulatory networks (Mori & Nakamura, 2022). However, this does not appear
to be the case in syngnathids because the dermal armor lacks the characteristic epithelial–
mesenchyme interactions distinguished by *pitx2* expression in the epithelia.

Instead, dermal armor might originate from the co-option of existing bone
development gene regulatory networks. Expression of the gene *dlx3b* has been observed in
epithelia and mesenchyme during dermal and perichondral bone development in zebrafish
(Verreijdt et al., 2006). In addition to *dlx3b*, we observed bone development genes *scpp1*
and *ifitm5* expressed in the ossifying dermal armor. Future studies could test our
hypothesis that the dermal armor evolved through re-deployed osteoblast networks by
examining osteoblast gene network expression over time.

Signatures of embryonic interactions within the novel pouch environment

Syngnathid embryos are reared within the brood pouch, a novel structure and
environment composed of male-derived tissues (epithelium and placental-like tissues that
include specialized cell types) that harbors a pouch microbiome (Stölting & Wilson, 2007).
During pregnancy, the male brood pouch undergoes numerous changes including increased
vascularization and altered expression of immune genes (Harada et al., 2022; Ripley et al.,
2010; Roth et al., 2020; Small et al., 2013; Whittington et al., 2015). Researchers predict
that these changes relate to nutrient and waste transfer and prevention of embryonic
rejection and bacterial infection (Dudley et al., 2021; Whittington & Friesen, 2020).
However, there are few studies that examine whether and how embryos interact with the
brood pouch environment (Kvarnemo et al., 2011; Ripley & Foran, 2006). To consider
whether embryos have specializations for life in this brood pouch environment, we asked
about cell type-specific expression of nutrient acquisition and/or immune genes.

Pipefish embryos uptake paternally derived carbohydrates, proteins, and lipids
(Kvarnemo et al., 2011; Ripley & Foran, 2006). Our data suggest that this uptake could
occur through the embryonic epidermis. Specifically, we noticed an enrichment of
endocytosis and metabolism genes in epidermal cells. Epidermal absorption of maternally
derived nutrients has been suggested in viviparous fishes (Tengfei et al., 2021; Wourms,
1981). Interestingly, microvilli, a type of cellular projection, have been observed on the
anal fin of developing seahorses (Wetzel & Wourms, 2004). In light of our findings in
pipefish, possibly these seahorse microvilli could be functionally equivalent to those on the
small intestine, maximizing nutrient absorption from the environment.

During pregnancy, the male brood pouch increases expression of C-type lectin genes
(Roth et al., 2020; Small et al., 2013; Whittington et al., 2015). These genes are
transmembrane or secreted receptors that sense self or non-self and are primarily studied
for their role in innate and adaptive immunity (Brown et al., 2018). We identified 14 C-type
lectin genes expressed in the embryonic epidermis. Our work suggests that lectin genes are
produced by both the father and the embryos, but their function is still unclear. Syngnathid
research has primarily suggested that lectin genes are produced to prevent bacterial
infection (Melamed et al., 2005), though they could be important for male-embryo
recognition.

Overall, our findings suggest that pipefish embryos have evolved to be specialized
for development within the brood pouch by expressing genes related to nutrient
acquisition and immunity. Future studies could provide insights into when nutrient
acquisition and lectin genes are expressed in development, their functional role, and how
their expression varies across syngnathid lineages that have exposed versus enclosed
embryos, for example, to examine how embryonic development has been impacted by the
brood pouch.

Conclusions

Our study represents the first scRNAseq developmental atlas in syngnathids, and
one of the first non-model developmental scRNAseq atlases, providing a major step
forward for evo-devo research. We used our atlas to begin addressing questions on the

evolution and development of syngnathid innovations including their unique craniofacial
structure, loss of teeth, dermal armor, and development within the male brood pouch. By
combining scRNAseq analysis with spatial expression data from *in situ* hybridization, we
made important discoveries in cell type identity and distribution as well as spatial
expression of marker and signaling genes. We found that syngnathids express conserved
signaling pathways during craniofacial development, suggesting that alterations within
these pathways may be important for the evolution of their craniofacial skeletons. We did
not find evidence for tooth primordia within syngnathids and propose that genetic changes
early in tooth development could have led to their loss of teeth. We propose that the re-
deployment of bone gene networks, but probably not tooth gene networks, could play a
role in the dermal armor development. Finally, we observed an enrichment of endocytosis
genes and many C-type lectin genes in epidermal cells, which suggests ways these cells
might interact with the brood pouch environment. Our atlas advances our understanding of
syngnathid development and evolution and provides resources for developmental genetic
analysis in nascent evo-devo model species.

Methods
571

Single Cell RNA Sequencing Libraries Preparation
572

We created scRNAseq atlases from embryos of wild caught Gulf pipefish
(*Syngnathus scovelli,* acquired from collaborator Emily Rose using collection permit SAL-
21-0182-E), and all work was performed under an approved IACUC protocol. We harvested
20 embryos per pouch from two wild caught male pipefish. The embryos were at a stage
before the tubular face was fully elongated, and while the head skeleton is cartilaginous
with minimal signs of mineralization of superficial intramembranous bones. This
corresponds to a stage termed "frontal jaws" in a recent description of pipefish
development (Sommer et al., 2012).

We dissociated the embryos using 460ul of .25% trypsin in water and 40ul 100
mg/mL collagenase I (Sigma C0130-200mg) for 16 minutes. We filtered cells using a 40uM

cell strainer (Thomas Scientific #1181X52). We quantified cell concentrations using the

TC20 Automated Cell Counter (Biorad) then diluted the samples to 800 cells/ul in .04%

BSA in PBS. The University of Oregon Genomics and Cell Characterization Core (GC3F;

https://gc3f.uoregon.edu) prepared single cell libraries for each sample using 10X

Genomics Single Cell 3' Genome Expression mRNAseq kit with NextGEM v3.1 chemistry.

We sequenced these libraries on an S4 lane on the NovaSeq 6000 at the GC3F. To improve

the 3' UTR genome annotations, we also prepared scISOrSeq libraries from the first

embryonic sample and from dissociated pouch cells from pregnant and nonpregnant males.

These libraries were produced in accordance with (Healey et al., 2022). Embryonic,

pregnant pouch and non-pregnant pouch libraries were sequenced separately on PacBio

Sequel II - SMRT Cells 8M.

To turn the scISOrSeq reads into gene models, we followed the pipeline from Healey

et al. 2022. We ran the script (scISOr_Seq_processing.py from

https://github.com/hopehealey/scISOseq_processing) to remove barcodes, identify cell

barcodes, and demultiplex with the single cell flag and appropriate barcodes (5'

CCCATGTACTCTGCGTTGATACCACTGCT and 3' CTACACGACGCTCTTCCGATCT). We aligned

the reads to the 2022 Gulf pipefish genome (GenBank: GCA_024217435.2) using minimap

v2.9 (Li, 2018). We filtered the reads using cDNA cupcake to remove duplicate transcripts

(Tseng, 2021). We used SQANTI3 to identify gene models and filter them (Tardaguila et al.,

2018). We merged the SQANTI3 annotations with the Gulf pipefish genome (NCBI

GenBank: GCF_024217435.2) using TAMA merge (Kuo et al., 2017). Since the Gulf pipefish

genome does not contain mitochondrial genes, we appended the annotation and fasta files

with the Gulf pipefish mitochondrial genome (NCBI RefSeq: NC_065499.1).

Single Cell Atlas Construction

We ran Cell Ranger (10X Genomics 3.0.2) using our scRNAseq reads, the Gulf

pipefish genome assembly with mitochondrial genome, and the modified gene annotations.

Cell Ranger estimated 20,733 cells for sample one, 23,682 genes expressed, and 21,039

mean reads per cell. For sample two, Cell Ranger predicted 17,626 cells, 23,740 genes

expressed, and 29,804 mean reads per cell. We analyzed Cell Ranger's output using Seurat

(v4.1.0) on R (v4.0.2; Butler et al., 2018; Hafemeister & Satija, 2019).

To remove extraneous RNA counts from the dataset, we used SoupX (v1.5.2; Young

& Behjati, 2020). We identified doublet scores for our dataset using scrublet (v0.2.3). The

doublet removal step reduced the first sample by 114 cells (from 20,733 cells to 20,619

cells) and second sample by 167 cells (from 17,626 cells to 17,459 cells). We finally

removed cells with less than 500 features, greater than 9000 features, greater than 1E5

RNA counts, with a scrublet score greater than the detected threshold (.76 for sample 2 and

.21 for sample 2), or greater than 10% mitochondrial reads. The second filtering step

removed 727 cells from sample one (20,619 cells to 19,892 cells) and 1,566 cells from

sample two (from 17,459 cells to 15,893 cells).

We normalized the datasets with SCTransform (v0.3.3). We used Seurat's

integration tools, `SelectIntegrationFeatures` using 3,000 feature genes,

`FindIntegrationAnchors` using SCT normalization, and `IntegrateData` using SCT

normalization, to integrate the two datasets. After integration, our combined atlas had

35,785 cells (Supplementary File 1,2). We then used the integrated dataset to complete

PCA analysis. We tested using a variety of principle components for further analysis and

chose 30 PCs for our analysis based on the clear delineation of major cell types. We next

clustered the cells using 30 PCs and plotted the data on a UMAP with Seurat.

Single Cell Atlas Cluster Identification

To identify cluster identities, we used the RNA assay of the scRNAseq data to find

cluster markers with Seurat's `FindAllMarkers` command with the parameters only.pos =

TRUE and logfc.threshold = 0.25, requiring markers to be upregulated in the cluster and

have a log fold change of at least .25. We found a second set of cluster markers through our

custom function which searched through all genes and identified genes uniquely expressed

in greater than 60% of cells in the cluster and in less than 10% of cells in every other

cluster using Seurat's DotPlots. We searched for our identified markers in available

zebrafish datasets (Fabian et al., 2022; Farnsworth et al., 2020; Lange et al., 2023), ZFIN

(Howe et al., 2013), NCBI, medlineplus.gov, and genecards to give the clusters initial

annotations. For each cluster, we examined multiple genes using DotPlots and FeaturePlots

to propose the cluster identity.

Next, we identified one gene for each cluster which marked the cluster best

(expressed in the most cells in the focal cluster and expressed in as few of the other

clusters as possible) through consulting the two marker gene lists and examining markers

with Dot Plots (Supplementary File 3, 4, 5). Using these markers, we completed a set of *in*

situ hybridizations to hone our cluster annotations. Due to challenges culturing Gulf

pipefish, we used both embryos and larvae from *Syngnathus leptorhynchus*, a pipefish from

the same genus that lives in Oregon coastal habitats and allowed for easy collection, and

from cultured Gulf pipefish for the cluster annotation *in situ* experiments. We caught

pregnant male *Syngnathus leptorhynchus* using a beach seine near Coos Bay, Oregon under

Oregon Department of Fisheries and Wildlife permit number 26987.

Syngnathus scovelli used for *in situ* experiments were purchased from Alyssa's

Seahorse Saavy and Gulf Specimens Marine Lab then reared in our facility at 25 degrees C

water and 25-28 PPT Salinity. We designed probes using NCBI Primer Blast with the Gulf

pipefish genome assembly and produced these probes using Gulf pipefish embryonic cDNA

pools. To create the probes, we completed two rounds of PCR. The first round used a gene

specific forward primer with a reverse gene specific primer that had 10 nucleotides of T7

promotor sequence attached. PCR products were cleaned with Zymo clean and

concentrator DNA kit and eluted in 15 ul of elution buffer. Round two of PCR used the same

gene specific forward primer with a modified T7 promoter sequence

(TGGACTAATACGACTCACTATAGGG) as the reverse primer, and finally the product was

cleaned again with Zymo clean and concentrator DNA kit and eluted in 15 ul of elution

buffer.

Round one PCR conditions are as followed: 95 degrees Celsius for 3:00 minutes, 40

cycles of denaturation (95 degrees for 30 seconds), annealing (30 seconds, annealing

temperature varied by probe), and extension (72 degrees for 1:00 minute), and a final

extension step of 3:00 minutes. Round two PCR conditions are as followed: 98 degrees

Celsius for 30 seconds, 30 degrees for 10 seconds, 72 degrees for 50 seconds, then 35

rounds of denaturation (98 degrees for 10 seconds), annealing (50 degrees for 10 seconds),

and extension (72 degrees for 50 seconds), and a final extension step of 10 minutes at 72

degrees. For round two PCRs with multiple bands (specifically, *ifitm5*), the band of the

expected size was excised with a razorblade and DNA was extracted with Zymoclean gel

DNA recovery kit.

The round two PCR product was sanger sequenced to confirm identity. All the

marker genes primers and successful PCR conditions are in Supplementary File 6.

Alignments of the probes to the unpublished *Syngnathus leptorhynchus* genome assembly

are included in Supplementary File 7. The probes were transcribed with T7 polymerase for

2-6 hours then cleaned with Zymo RNA clean and concentrator and eluted into 30 ul of

water. For the *in situ* hybridizations, we selected embryos and newly spawned larvae close

to the developmental stage used in the atlas. We completed *in situ* hybridizations in

keeping with (Thisse & Thisse, 2007), leaving the embryos in stain until background was

observed. For spawned larvae, we completed a bleaching step (1% H2O2 and .5% KOH for

8 minutes) prior to the proteinase K digest. After imaging, we used the levels tool in Adobe

Photoshop (v23.4.2) to white balance the pictures.

Single Cell KEGG Analysis

To identify pathways upregulated in cell clusters, we completed a KEGG analysis.

We downloaded Gulf pipefish KEGG pathways (https://www.kegg.jp). For the KEGG

analysis, we used the marker genes identified from our `FindAllMarkers` list as the input

genes. We converted these gene ids using `keggConv` to KEGG ids. We used a Wilcoxon

enrichment test to ask whether cluster marker genes were enriched for each KEGG

pathway.

Differentiation State Analysis

To assess whether proposed primordial cell clusters were composed of

undifferentiated cells relative to other clusters from their lineages, we completed a

differentiation analysis using CytoTRACE (v0.3.3, Gulati et al., 2020). Clusters from similar

lineages (neural: 0, 3, 7, 8, 12, 22, 25, 33, and 35; muscle: 2, 10, 17, and 37; connective: 4, 5,

6, 9, 15, 16, 18, 24, 27, 28, and 29) were isolated using subset. Cell counts were gathered

using as.Matrix(GetAssayData), then CytoTRACE was run on these counts. Data was plotted

on a VlnPlot to show the variability.

Single Cell Atlas Network Analysis

To identify genetic networks present in our atlas, we completed a weighted gene

network correlation analysis using WGCNA (v1.72-1, Langfelder & Horvath, 2008). We

selected 3,000 variable features from the integrated assay of the single cell dataset for the

WGCNA. We created an adjacency matrix from the data using bicor with a maxPOutliers of

.05. To decide on a beta value or the soft threshold power, we created an adjacency matrix

plot using pickSoftThreshold and picked the threshold where the scale free topology

model fit leveled off. We selected the value of two. Then, we raised the adjacency matrix to

the power of two.

We calculated the dissimilarity matrix by calculating TOM similarity of the

adjacency matrix and subtracting it from one. We then created a gene tree through hclust

of the dissimilarity matrix with the average method. From the gene tree, we created

modules using cutreeDynamic with deepSplit of two and the minClusterSize of 15 (setting

the smallest cluster size to 15). We calculated module eigengenes using moduleEigengenes

of the adjacency matrix then calculated the dissimilarity of the module eigengenes with cor

of the module eigengenes subtracted from one and clustered the module eigengenes with

hclust. We then chose a dissimilarity of 35% as the cut off for merging modules; however,

no modules had dissimilarity scores with each other below 40%. Since the module

eigengenes are calculated for each cell in the dataset, we used these values to calculate the

t-statistic for each cell cluster (considered each sample) in the module (all of the module

eigengene scores were used as the population).

We next tested the hypothesis that certain cell clusters were strongly associated

with specific gene modules through a two-way permutation test (1000 permutations) and

corrected p-values to control the False Discovery Rate (FDR). Additionally, we tested

whether specific cell clusters drove underlying gene network structure by measuring

network connectivity. The network connectivity was first calculated using the entire

dataset, then each cell cluster was progressively dropped from the dataset and the

connectivity was remeasured. This resulted in change in connectivity scores for each

module-cluster pair. To assess whether these changes were significant, we completed 1000

permutations whereby cells were randomly dropped (the number of cells dropped was

equal to the cell cluster size of the focal cluster), connectivity measured, and the change in

connectivity recorded. The p-value is the number of instances where the change in

connectivity is greater in the permutations than in the focal cell cluster run. P-values were

corrected to control the FDR.

Using the module gene lists, we identified the number of genes from each module

that were found in each KEGG pathway. Since the KEGG modules do not have p-values

associated with the genes, we could not complete a Wilcoxon enrichment test. We instead

removed any pathways where there were less than three genes present for any pathway

and note that there is no statistical test run on these KEGG results. We visualized the

networks using Cytoscape (v3.10.0).

In situ Hybridization

For genes chosen for further follow up analysis, we completed *in situ* hybridizations

in Gulf pipefish (*Syngnathus scovelli*) or bay pipefish (*Syngnathus leptorhynchus*). Primer

sequences were designed using NCBI Primer Blast with the Gulf Pipefish genome and

synthesized using Gulf pipefish embryonic cDNA. The *sfrp1a* probe was synthesized using

the PCR based probe preparation protocol described in the Single Cell Identification

section. All other probes (*bmp4*, *dlx2a*, *dlx3b*, *fgf22*, *lhx6a*, *pitx2*, and *scpp1*) were prepared

using TOPO cloning. Probe primer sequences as well as the species used for the *in situ*

experiments are described in Supplementary file 6. Pregnant male bay pipefish were

caught as described above. For Gulf pipefish embryos, we allowed the fish to mate in our

facility then harvested embryos once they reached the appropriate stages. Fish were reared

in 25 degrees C water with 25-28 ppt salinity. Embryos and larvae were fixed in 4% PFA,

dehydrated through a series of PBT/MeOH washes, and stored in MeOH at -20C. 5-12

embryos were used for each probe. We completed *in situ* hybridizations in keeping with

(Thisse & Thisse, 2007), leaving the embryos in stain until background was observed. After

imaging, we used the levels tool in Adobe Photoshop (v23.4.2) to white balance the
pictures.

Bone and Cartilage Staining

We used alcian and alizarin stains to mark cartilage and bones. Specifically, we
assayed cartilage and bone development in siblings of the scRNAseq samples. These
embryos were fixed in 4% PFA then stored at -20C in MeOH. We followed the protocol from
Walker and Kimmel (2007) with minor alterations. We stored samples in 50%
glycerol/0.1% KOH at 4C and imaged them in 100% glycerol. After imaging, we white
balanced the photographs using Photoshop (v23.4.2) levels tool.

Gene Cluster Analysis

To examine close syngnathid outgroups, we downloaded the 2023 mandarin
dragonet genome (GenBank assembly accession: GCA_027744825.1) and the 2024
cornetfish genome assembly (GenBank assembly accession: GCA_037954325.1) from NCBI.
Since these genomes were unannotated, we manually identified *scpp* genes. We searched
for *scpp* genes using BLASTN with medaka and additional fish sequences as the query. We
also searched for these genes with mVISTA plots across conserved gene synteny regions
(LAGAN alignment using translated anchoring) with medaka as the focal species. To
identify *scpp* genes in additional species, we gathered cluster information from NCBI and
ensembl. Additionally, we used mVISTA plots to further search for unannotated *scpp* genes.

Acknowledgements:

We are indebted to Emily Rose for her collection of the Gulf pipefish specimens for
the single cell libraries. We are grateful for everyone in the Cresko Lab for their ideas and
participation in early morning pipefish collection trips. We are additionally thankful for
Emily Beck for her assistance collecting pipefish. In particular, we are immensely
appreciative of Mark Currey and Tiffany Thornton's valiant efforts to culture Gulf pipefish.
Additionally, we are grateful for Balan Ramesh and Adam Jones for collaborating with the

Cresko Lab to produce new Syngnathiformes genomes. We thank Tina Arredondo from the UO GC3F for her preparation of our single cell RNA sequencing libraries. This work was funded by the National Science Foundation Grant OPP-2015301 (to WAC, SB, and CMS), University of Oregon Research Excellence funds (WAC) and National Institute of Health Fellowship F31DE032559-02 (to HMH). Additionally, HMH was supported by the Genetics Training Program (NIH T32GM007413). Finally, VG received funding and mentorship from the Hui Undergraduate Research Scholars and MW was supported by the Knight Campus Undergraduate Scholars program at the University of Oregon.

Data Availability statement

All raw sequencing data associated with this study are published via NCBI (PRJNA1168967). The integrated single cell RNA sequencing atlas is also available through NCBI (GSE278814). The fasta file and updated Gulf pipefish annotation are stored on Dryad (10.5061/dryad.f7m0cfz60). Code used for the analysis is available on github (https://github.com/hopehealey/ssc_emb_atlas_scripts).

Figure captions:

Figure 1: Gulf pipefish exemplify syngnathid derived traits. Gulf pipefish have elongate snouts, have lost teeth on their oral and pharyngeal jaws, possess dermal armor, and have brood pouches in males (A-B). Cartilage (alcian) and bone (alizarin) stained clutch siblings of embryos from the two scRNAseq samples are shown in panels C-H. Embryos have cartilaginous craniofacial skeletons (panels B, C, F; E marks the (Mes)ethmoid cartilage, C indicates the Ceratohyal, H shows the Hyosymplectic cartilage, M marks the Meckel's cartilage, Q indicates the quadrate, B shows the Basihyal, and P marks the palatoquadrate) with the onset of ossification in the jaw. They have cartilaginous fin radials in the dorsal fin (D and G; F indicates fin radials and N denotes the notochord). The embryos do not have signs of ossification in the trunk where the exoskeleton will form later (panels E and H; PD

shows the region where dermal armor primordia will arise). Panels C, D, F, and G, scale bar

200 μm; E, H scale bar 100 μm.

Figure 2: Gulf pipefish single cell atlas contains cells from the entire embryo and

identifies genetic pathways active in different cell types. The UMAP plot (panel A)

shows all of the cell clusters and their identities reduced to the first two UMAP dimensions.

The graph in panel B displays results of the KEGG pathway analysis in cell clusters

identified as connective tissue (excluding blood, pigment, digestive, and immune cells). The

number of Seurat identified marker genes for each cluster that was a part of each pathway

is displayed on the y axis. Bars are colored and labeled by cell cluster.

Figure 3: Weighted Gene Network Analysis (WGCNA) identifies gene modules that

define and unite cell clusters. A) The strength of association between the gene modules

and cell clusters is shown in panel A with dendrogram clustering illustrating the distance

between modules and cell clusters. Gene modules are represented by rows and cell clusters

by columns. The modules and clusters are clustered using the Pearson distance method.

The number of genes in each gene module are shown in the right hand bar plots. Cell

clusters are colored based on their identity. The asterisks indicate the module-cluster

relationships that have a p-value less than .05 from a two-sided permutation test after

correction for multiple tests (FDR). The heatmap is colored by t-statistics in a range of -10

to 10, with highly positive values in yellow and highly negative values in black. B) The

identified gene modules possess genes from KEGG pathways. The bars are labeled with the

gene module and the size of each bar corresponds to the number of genes from the KEGG

pathway in the module. Since WGCNA modules do not have p-values, only KEGG pathways

with more than two genes included in the gene module are shown on the plot. C) Identified

gene modules contain similar KEGG pathways as the cell clusters that correlated with them.

These relationships are shown in Upset plots where each row is a cell cluster or gene

module, each column represents KEGG pathways shared by the modules and clusters

(shared condition is shown filled in black dots connected by lines), the interaction size is

the number of pathways in common between the set of modules and clusters, and the set

size is the number of pathways that are enriched in each cluster and module. Panel C1

highlights that 'cytokine-cytokine receptor interaction' and 'ECM receptor interaction' are

present in module 6 as well as 6 and 4 connective cell clusters respectively. Panel C2 shows

that 'cell cycle' and 'senesence' are present in module 21 as well as clusters 8 and 16,

'Notch signaling' genes are present in clusters 8 and 25 as well as module 21, and 'DNA

replication' is present in clusters 8, 10, and 16.

Figure 4: Conserved cell types and gene pathways build unique faces of syngnathids.

Three main conserved signaling pathways are enriched in connective cell types, MAPK

signaling (including Fgf signaling), TGF-beta signaling (including Bmp signaling), and Wnt

signaling. Receptors and ligands expression patterns are shown in panel A heatmap from

all cell types with cells present in the head. This heatmap features 100 cells downsampled

from each cluster and illustrates that many genes from these families are expressed in

these cells. Yellow lines indicate high expression of a gene, while hot pink lines indicate no

expression. The pathways are boxed in black. Rows representing *fgf22, bmp4*, and *sfrp1a*

expression are marked with an asterisk and green box for each respective section of

signaling (Fgf, Bmp, and Wnt). Panels B, C, and D are *in situ* hybridizations of three marker

genes, *elnb, tnmd*, and *prdm16*. The genes *prdm16* and *elnb* mark osteochondrogenic

mesenchyme and *tnmd* marks tendons and ligaments. Panels E, F, and G, show expression

patterns of three pathway representatives *fgf22, bmp4*, and *sfrp1a*. All three genes are

expressed in the face: *fgf22* at the tip of the mandible and *bmp4* and *sfrp1a* above the

ethmoid and near the ceratohyal. Staining is circled with dashed lines. The Meckel's

cartilage (M), (mes)Ethmoid cartilage (E), Quadrate (Q), and Ceratohyal (C) are labeled.

Panel C is a dorsal view. Panels B, C, E, F, G, H, I are in lateral view. *In situ* experiments of

fgf22 were completed using 10dpf Gulf pipefish. In situ experiments of *bmp4, sfrp1a, tnmd*,

elnb, and *prdm16* were completed using wild caught bay pipefish at the onset craniofacial

elongation. Panels H and I are summary illustrations of our findings, panel H shows where

cells from various clusters were present in the developing head and panel I illustrates

where *bmp4, sfrp1a*, and *fgf22* were expressed. Panel H is colored according to cell type.

Figure 5: Pipefish do not possess identifiable tooth primordium cells, but continue to

express tooth development genes in other contexts. Panel A presents a dotplot of genes

classified by the tissue layer in which they are reported to be expressed during tooth

development in other vertebrate (Tucker and Sharpe 2004; Gilbert et al. 2019; Kawasaki

2009). The x-axis contains the assayed genes, with asterisks under the genes that were also

examined with *in situ* hybridizations. The y-axis contains all the cell clusters. The size of the

dot is representative of the percentage of cells from the cluster that express the gene. The

color of the dots is average expression of the gene in the cluster (darker purples represent

higher expression). Panel B includes *in situ* hybridizations of selected tooth primordia

markers (*bmp4, pitx2, lhx6a, dlx2a*, and *dlx3b*) and mature tooth marker (*scpp1*). *In situ*

experiments of *bmp4, pitx2, lhx6a, dlx2a*, and *dlx3b* were completed with wild caught bay

pipefish that had begun craniofacial elongation. *In situ* experiments of *scpp1* were

completed using 9dpf Gulf pipefish. The scale bars for all images represents 100 μm.

Figure 6: Tooth and bone development genes expressed during exoskeleton development.

We discovered *pitx2* (A and B) and *dlx3b* (F and E) expression during possible emergence

of exoskeletal primordium in wild caught bay pipefish. The embryos used for these *in situ*

experiments were the same stage as those from Figure 5, at the beginning of craniofacial

elongation. Figures A and F have 100 μm scale bars, figures B and F have 50 μm scale bars.

We further found *scpp1* is expressed at the mineralization front of the exoskeleton in 12dpf

Gulf pipefish (C) and has a 50 μm scale bar. Alizarin and alcian stained pipefish are shown

in panels D (12dpf Gulf pipefish), G (1dpf Gulf pipefish), and H (adult Gulf pipefish) to

illustrate how the exoskeleton forms. Panels D and G have 100 μm scale bars.

Figure 7: Gene expression signatures suggest embryonic interactions within brood

pouch environment. Epidermal cells (panel A), with pathways that suggest increased

endocytosis and metabolism pathways are in bold text. Pathways upregulated in 3dpf

zebrafish epidermal cells are in italics. Pipefish epidermal cells also express 15 lectin genes

not found in other cell types (panel B). We suggest an epidermal cell model (panel C), in

which we predict pipefish have an enrichment of nutrient processing genes and lectins in

comparison with zebrafish cells.

Supplementary figure captions:

Figure S1: Two Gulf pipefish samples have similar contributions to cell clusters. This
UMAP features cells plotted by sample (sample one in orange and sample two in cyan) in
the first two UMAP dimensions.

Figure S2: QC metrics for both Gulf pipefish samples show similar sample quality

after initial filtering. Sample quality was assessed using the number of genes identified

(nFeatureRNA), the total RNA counts (nCountRNA), the percentage of mitochondrial reads

(percentmt), and the likelihood of being a doublet (doubvalues). Gulf pipefish sample data

post-filtering is displayed for each of these metrics.

Figure S3: Zebrafish muscle cell marker genes expression patterns correspond with

annotated muscle cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish muscle cell

marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate Gulf pipefish

expression. Annotated muscle cell clusters in pipefish are distinguished by a dashed

outline.

Figure S4: Zebrafish muscle satellite cell marker genes expression patterns

correspond with annotated muscle primordia cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots

of zebrafish muscle satellite cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq

database demonstrate Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated muscle primordia cell cluster in

pipefish is distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S5: Zebrafish cardiac muscle cell marker genes expression patterns

correspond with annotated cardiac muscle cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of

zebrafish cardiac muscle cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq

database demonstrate Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated cardiac muscle cell cluster in

pipefish is distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S6: Zebrafish retinal cell marker genes expression patterns correspond with

annotated retinal cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish retinal cell

marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate Gulf pipefish

expression. Annotated retinal cell cluster in pipefish is distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S7: Zebrafish neuronal cell marker genes expression patterns correspond

with annotated neuronal cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish neuronal

cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate Gulf

pipefish expression. Annotated neuronal cell clusters in pipefish are distinguished by a

dashed outline.

Figure S8: Zebrafish chondroblast cell marker genes expression patterns correspond

with annotated chondroblast cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish

chondroblast cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database

demonstrate Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated chondroblast cell cluster in pipefish is

distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S9: Zebrafish osteoblast cell marker genes expression patterns correspond

with annotated osteoblast cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish

osteoblast cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate

Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated osteoblast cell cluster in pipefish is distinguished by a

dashed outline.

Figure S10: Zebrafish notochord cell marker genes expression patterns correspond

with annotated notochord cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish

notochord cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate

Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated notochord cell cluster in pipefish is distinguished by a

dashed outline.

Figure S11: Zebrafish fin cell marker genes expression patterns correspond with

annotated fin cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish fin cell marker genes

identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate Gulf pipefish expression.

Annotated fin cell cluster in pipefish is distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S12: Zebrafish mesenchymal cell marker genes expression patterns

correspond with annotated mesenchymal cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of

zebrafish mesenchymal cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database

demonstrate Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated mesenchymal cell clusters in pipefish are

distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S13: Zebrafish tenocyte cell marker genes expression patterns correspond

with annotated tenocyte cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish tenocyte

cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate Gulf

pipefish expression. Annotated tenocyte and ligament cell cluster in pipefish is

distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S14: Zebrafish erythrocyte cell marker genes expression patterns correspond

with annotated erythrocyte cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish

erythrocyte cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database

demonstrate Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated erythrocyte cell clusters in pipefish are

distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S15: Zebrafish endothelial cell marker genes expression patterns correspond

with annotated endothelial cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish

endothelial cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database

demonstrate Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated endothelial cell cluster in pipefish is

distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S16: Zebrafish gut and liver cell marker genes expression patterns

correspond with annotated gut and liver cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of

zebrafish gut and liver cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database

demonstrate Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated gut and liver cell cluster in pipefish is

distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S17: Zebrafish epidermal cell marker genes expression patterns correspond

with annotated epidermal cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish

epidermal cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate

Gulf pipefish expression. Annotated epidermal cell cluster in pipefish is distinguished by a

dashed outline.

Figure S18: Zebrafish glial cell marker genes expression patterns correspond with

annotated glial cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish glial cell marker

genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate Gulf pipefish

expression. Annotated glial cell cluster in pipefish is distinguished by a dashed outline.

Figure S19: Zebrafish immune cell marker genes expression patterns correspond
with annotated immune cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish immune
cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate Gulf
pipefish expression. Annotated immune cell clusters in pipefish are distinguished by a
dashed outline.

Figure S20: Zebrafish pigment cell marker genes expression patterns correspond
with annotated pigment cells in Gulf pipefish atlas. Feature plots of zebrafish pigment
cell marker genes identified from the Daniocell scRNAseq database demonstrate Gulf
pipefish expression. Annotated pigment cell clusters in pipefish are distinguished by a
dashed outline.

Figure S21: Gulf pipefish cluster 0 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 0
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S22: Gulf pipefish cluster 1 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 1
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S23: Gulf pipefish cluster 2 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 2
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S24: Gulf pipefish cluster 3 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 3
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S25: Gulf pipefish cluster 4 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 4
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S26: Gulf pipefish cluster 5 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 5
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S27: Gulf pipefish cluster 6 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 6
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S28: Gulf pipefish cluster 7 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 7
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S29: Gulf pipefish cluster 8 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 8

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S30: Gulf pipefish cluster 9 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 9

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S31: Gulf pipefish cluster 10 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 10

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S32: Gulf pipefish cluster 12 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 12

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S33: Gulf pipefish cluster 13 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 13

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S34: Gulf pipefish cluster 14 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 14

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S35: Gulf pipefish cluster 15 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 15

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S36: Gulf pipefish cluster 16 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 16

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S37: Gulf pipefish cluster 17 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 17

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S38: Gulf pipefish cluster 18 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 18

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S39: Gulf pipefish cluster 19 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 19

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S40: Gulf pipefish cluster 20 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 20

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S41: Gulf pipefish cluster 21 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 21
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S42: Gulf pipefish cluster 22 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 22
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S43: Gulf pipefish cluster 23 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 23
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S44: Gulf pipefish cluster 24 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 24
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S45: Gulf pipefish cluster 25 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 25
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S46: Gulf pipefish cluster 26 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 26
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S47: Gulf pipefish cluster 27 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 27
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S48: Gulf pipefish cluster 28 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 28
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S49: Gulf pipefish cluster 29 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 29
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S50: Gulf pipefish cluster 30 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 30
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S51: Gulf pipefish cluster 31 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 31
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S52: Gulf pipefish cluster 32 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 32
identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S53: Gulf pipefish cluster 33 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 33

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S54: Gulf pipefish cluster 34 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 34

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S55: Gulf pipefish cluster 35 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 35

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S56: Gulf pipefish cluster 36 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 36

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S57: Gulf pipefish cluster 37 markers. Feature plots of top markers for cluster 37

identified from the marker gene lists.

Figure S58: Marker genes define cell identity and are a resource for cell cluster

exploration. This dotplot shows the marker genes on the x-axis, and the cell cluster on the

y-axis. The size of each dot indicates the percentage of cells that express the gene in each

cluster. The darkness of each dot represents the average expression of the gene.

Figure S59: *slc25a4*, a marker for cluster 2, is expressed in muscle cells in bay

pipefish. Atlas expression is limited to cluster 2 (A). *In situ* hybridization experiments

revealed muscle staining of *slc25a4* in bay pipefish (B-D). Wild caught bay pipefish at the

onset of craniofacial elongation were used for the experiment. Embryos were mounted

laterally to highlight expression domains.

Figure S60: *scg2a*, a marker for cluster 3, is expressed in the brain of bay pipefish.

Atlas expression is limited to cluster 3 (A). *In situ* hybridization experiments revealed brain

staining of *scg2a* in bay pipefish (B-D). Wild caught bay pipefish at the onset of craniofacial

elongation were used for the experiment. Embryos were mounted laterally to highlight

expression domains.

Figure S61: *prdm16*, a marker for cluster 5, is expressed in the head and fins of bay

pipefish. Strong expression of prdm16 in cluster 5, osteochondrogenic mesenchyme (A). *In*

situ hybridization experiments revealed mesenchymal staining of *prdm16* in the fins and

face of bay pipefish (B-D). Wild caught bay pipefish at the onset of craniofacial elongation

were used for the experiment. Embryos were mounted laterally (B, D, E) and with a dorsal

view (C) to highlight expression domains.

Figure S62: *elnb*, a marker for cluster 6, is expressed in the head of bay pipefish.

Strong expression of *elnb* in cluster 6, osteochondrogenic mesenchyme (A). *In situ*

hybridization experiments revealed mesenchymal staining of *elnb* in the face of bay

pipefish (B-D). Wild caught bay pipefish at the onset of craniofacial elongation were used

for the experiment. Embryos were mounted dorsally to showcase the craniofacial staining

(B) and laterally (C-E) to show the lack of staining in the ceratohyal, dorsal fin, and caudal

fin.

Figure S63: *fndc9*, a marker for cluster 7, is expressed in the brain of Gulf pipefish.

Expression of *fndc9* is limited to cluster 7, brain cells, in the atlas (A). *In situ* hybridization

experiments revealed brain staining of *fndc9* in Gulf pipefish (B-C). One day post spawn

Gulf pipefish larvae were used for this experiment. Embryos were mounted to highlight

two views of the brain staining, one dorsal (B) and one lateral (C).

Figure S64: *insm1b*, a marker for cluster 8, is expressed in the brain of Gulf pipefish.

Strong expression of *insm1b* is observed in cluster 8, brain progenitor cells, in the atlas (A).

In situ hybridization experiments revealed brain staining of *insm1b* in Gulf pipefish (B).

Five day post spawn Gulf pipefish larvae were used for this experiment. Embryos were

mounted laterally to highlight the brain staining.

Figure S65: *tnmd*, a marker for cluster 9, is expressed in tendons and ligaments of

bay pipefish. Strong expression of *tnmd* is observed in cluster 9, tenocyte and ligament

cells, in the atlas (A). *In situ* hybridization experiments revealed tendon and ligament

staining of *tnmd* in bay pipefish (B-E). Wild caught embryos from bay pipefish at the onset

of craniofacial elongation were used for the experiment. Embryos were mounted laterally

(B,E) and ventrally (C,D) to showcase tendon and ligament staining.

Figure S66: *myf5*, a marker for cluster 10, is expressed in the muscle of bay pipefish.

Strong expression of *myf5* is observed in cluster 10, muscle progenitor cells, in the atlas (A).

In situ hybridization experiments revealed muscle staining of *myf5* in bay pipefish (B-D).

Wild caught embryos from bay pipefish at the onset of craniofacial elongation were used

for the experiment. Embryos were mounted laterally to highlight muscle staining.

Figure S67: *hpdb*, a marker for cluster 13, is expressed in somites of bay pipefish.

Strong expression of *hpbd* is observed in cluster 13, fibroblasts, in the atlas (A). *In situ*

hybridization experiments revealed somite staining of *hpbd* in bay pipefish (B). Wild

caught embryos from bay pipefish at the mid-somitogenesis stage were used for the

experiment. Embryos were mounted laterally to highlight muscle staining.

Figure S68: *ifitm5*, a marker for cluster 18, is expressed in bay pipefish osteoblasts.

Specific expression of *ifitm5* is observed in cluster 18, osteoblasts, in the atlas (A). *In situ*

hybridization experiments revealed bone staining of *ifitm5* in bay pipefish (B-E). Wild

caught embryos from bay pipefish at the onset of craniofacial elongation were used for the

experiment. Embryos were mounted laterally to highlight muscle staining.

Figure S69: *plaat4*, a marker for cluster 23, is weakly expressed in bay pipefish

epidermal cells. Specific expression of *plaat4* is observed in cluster 23, epidermal cells, in

the atlas (A). *In situ* hybridization experiments revealed epidermal staining of *plaat4* in bay

pipefish (B-D). Wild caught embryos from bay pipefish at the onset of craniofacial

elongation were used for the experiment. Embryos were mounted ventrally (B) and

laterally (C,D) to highlight epidermal staining.

Figure S70: *hyal6*, a marker for cluster 33, is strongly expressed in bay pipefish hair

cells. Specific expression of *hyal6* is observed in cluster 33, hair cells, in the atlas (A). *In situ*

hybridization experiments revealed staining of *hyal6* in bay pipefish nares and ears (B-C).

Wild caught embryos from bay pipefish from one day post spawn larvae were used for the

experiment. Embryos were mounted dorsally (B) and laterally (C) to highlight staining in

nares and ears respectively.

Figure S71: *soat2*, a marker for cluster 36, is strongly expressed in bay pipefish

muscle cells. Expression of *soat2* is observed in cluster 36, muscle cells, in the atlas (A). *In*

situ hybridization experiments revealed staining of *soat2* in bay pipefish muscle and fins

(B-E). Wild caught embryos from bay pipefish at the onset of craniofacial elongation were
used for the experiment. Embryos were mounted laterally to highlight staining in muscle
and fin.

Figure S72: KEGG analysis reveals pathways significantly enriched in cell clusters.
KEGG pathways are listed on the x-axis. For each cluster, the number of genes that belong
to the specific KEGG pathway is represented by the height of each bar. Cell clusters are
labeled by both color and their designated number. For clarity, only cell clusters with more
than three annotated genes in each pathway are shown and certain pathways involving
infection and metabolism are removed.

Figure S73: Clusters 8,10, and 16 are composed of largely undifferentiated cells.
Differentiation state of cell clusters was measured using CytoTRACE, where an output of 1
indicates an undifferentiated cell and a value of 0 suggests a cell is fully differentiated. Cells
are plotted on a violin plot with individual cell predictions shown as dots. Panels show
results from muscle (A), neural (B), and connective (C) clusters.

Figure S74: Cell clusters drive gene module connectivity. The heatmap shows the
change in gene network connectivity when individual cell clusters are removed. Cell
clusters are in the columns and gene modules are in rows. The coloration scale is based on
the change in connecitvity when a cell cluster is removed, with yellow indicating a large
change in connectivity. The modules and clusters are clustered using the Pearson distance
method. Asterisks indicate cluster-module pairs that are significant using a one way
permutation test and FDR correction. The size of the gene modules are shown to the right.

Figure S75: Gene module expression comparison with the Pigment Cluster reveals
potential elusive cell types within the cluster. Genes within the network are combined
into one feature then plotted on a feature plot. In this case, UMAP dimensions one and two
are the x and y-axis accordingly, dots represent each pigment cell, and the color of the dots
represents the expression of the module. Cells that express gene modules are either
colored red or green (when modules are plotted on separate plots). When plotted on the
same plot, cells that express both gene modules are yellow. Panels A through J show each
gene module comparison.

Figure S76: Conserved fin *prdm16* expression domains in stickleback and pipefish,

but fishes have expression in different regions of the head. The gene *prdm16*

expression was probed using *in situ* hybridization. Embryos used in this assay were

similarly staged (9dpf in threespine stickleback and mid-craniofacial elongation in bay

pipefish). Stickleback (A-C) expressed *prdm16* in the lower jaw, brain, gill arches, and fins.

Bay pipefish also have fin staining (F), but craniofacial expression is limited to the

mesenchyme above the ethmoid region.

Figure S77: Conserved expression domains of *fgf22* in pipefish and stickleback fish.

Expression of *fgf22* was probed using *in situ* hybridization. Embryos used in this assay

were similarly staged (9dpf threespine stickleback and 10dpf Gulf pipefish). Staining in the

jaws (A,E), brain (B,F), gill arches (C,G), and fins (D, H) suggests similar \\textit{fgf22}

expression domains in both species.

Figure S78: Broad *bmp4* craniofacial expression in stickleback, but *bmp4* is

restricted to ethmoid and ceratohyal regions in pipefish. Expression of *bmp4* was

probed using *in situ* hybridization. Embryos used in this assay were similarly staged (9dpf

threespine stickleback and mid-craniofacial elongation staged bay pipefish). Stickleback

have *bmp4* staining in tooth germs (A), the jaws (A-B), and gill arches (C). However, *bmp4*

expression is restricted in bay pipefish to mesenchyme above the ethmoid and ceratohyal.

Figure S79: *sfrp1a* has conserved fin expression in pipefish and stickleback, but

craniofacial expression differs between the species. Expression of *sfrp1a* was probed

using *in situ* hybridization. Embryos used in this assay were similarly staged (9dpf

threespine stickleback and mid-craniofacial elongation staged bay pipefish). Both species

had *sfrp1a* staining in the fins (D,H). However, stickleback have broad craniofacial

expression (in lower jaws, A-B, and gill arches, C) while expression is limited to

mesenchyme above the ethmoid (E), the jaw joint (F), and around the ceratohyal (G) in bay

pipefish.

Figure S80: *scpp* gene cluster analysis identifies most *scpp* losses are not unique to

syngnathids. A) denotes the Syngnathoidei lineage which contains syngnathids and blue

spotted cornetfish (among other fish) to highlight that this clade contains various tooth

alterations. Syngnathids lack teeth completely and cornetfish have small teeth limited to

the lower jaw. B) denotes solely the syngnathid clade, which completely lacks teeth. The

phylogenetic tree was time calibrated using Hughes et al. 2018 and Stiller et al. 2022.

Figure S81: 3dpf Zebrafish do not express lectin genes in epidermal cells. This dotplot

shows the marker genes on the x-axis and y-axis, organized by cell type. The size of the dot

represents the percentage of cells that express the gene in each cluster. The darkness of the

dot represents the average expression of the genes.

Supplementary file captions:

1200

SupplementaryFile1_scRNAseq_cellranger_info.csv, a table containing quality metrics

for the single cell libraries.

SupplementaryFile2_cell_cluster_identity_and_sizes. csv, a table containing the number

of cells in each cell cluster and cluster identities.

SupplementaryFile3_seurat_findallmarker_output.csv, a file containing marker genes

identified using Seurat FindAllMarkers for each cluster.

SupplementaryFile4_dotplotmethod_marker_genes.csv, a file containing marker genes

identified using the DotPlot method.

SupplementaryFile5_ select_marker_gene_detailed_information.xlsx, a file containing

additional information on the marker gene identified for every cluster.

SupplementaryFile6_insitu_probe_sequences_and_prep_information.xlsx, a list of the

in situ hybridization probes used in this study, the conditions used to prepare the probes,

and the staging/sample information for the embryos.

SupplementaryFile7_insitu_probe_alignment.zip, a zipped folder containing alignments

of *in situ* hybridization probes with the unpublished *Syngnathus leptorhynchus* genome.

SupplementaryFile8_WGCNA_module_number_to_color_translation_table.csv, genetic

networks were initially labeled with colors, we converted these labels to numeric

annotations for simplicity using this conversion table. The table also contains the number

of genes in each network.

SupplementaryFile9_WGCNA_networks_with_gene_descriptions.xlsx, a file containing

all the genetic networks, the genes inside of them, and additional information for the

genetic networks highlighted in this paper.

SupplementaryFile10_WGCNA_mod_association_wClus_tstat.csv, this file contains the t-
statistics derived for each module-cell cluster pair. The cell clusters are in the rows and the
gene modules are in the columns.

SupplementaryFile11_WGCNA_associat_mods_w_clus_tstat_pvalues_corrected.csv, p-
values for the t-statistics of the strength of association between gene modules and cell
clusters. P-values are corrected for multiple testing hypotheses using fdr. The cell clusters
are in the rows and the gene modules are in the columns.

SupplementaryFile12_WGCNA_connectivity_change.csv, the change in connectivity for
gene modules when individual cell clusters are removed. The cell clusters are in the
columns and the gene networks are in the rows.

SupplementaryFile13_Connectivity_Permutation_Pvalues_Corrected.csv, the p-values
for the change in connectivity are found in this csv. The cell clusters are in the columns and
the gene networks are in rows.

References

Ahi, E. P., Kapralova, K. H., Pálsson, A., Maier, V. H., Gudbrandsson, J., Snorrason, S. S., Jónsson, Z. O., & Franzdóttir, S. R. (2014). Transcriptional dynamics of a conserved gene expression network associated with craniofacial divergence in Arctic charr. *EvoDevo*, *5*(1), 1–19.

Ahi, E. P., Lecaudey, L. A., Ziegelbecker, A., Steiner, O., Glabonjat, R., Goessler, W., Hois, V., Wagner, C., Lass, A., & Sefc, K. M. (2020). Comparative transcriptomics reveals candidate carotenoid color genes in an East African cichlid fish. *BMC Genomics 2020 21:1*, *21*(1), 1–15.

Anderson, A. P., & Jones, A. G. (2019). Choosy Gulf pipefish males ignore age but prefer active females with deeply keeled bodies. *Animal Behaviour*, *155*, 37–44.

Arendt, D., Musser, J. M., H Baker, C. V, Bergman, A., Cepko, C., Erwin, D. H., Pavlicev, M., Schlosser, G., Widder, S., Laubichler, M. D., & Wagner, G. P. (2016). *The origin and evolution of cell types*.

Bergen, D. J. M., Tong, Q., Shukla, A., Newham, E., Zethof, J., Lundberg, M., Ryan, R., Youlten, S. E., Frysz, M., Croucher, P. I., Flik, G., Richardson, R. J., Kemp, J. P., Hammond, C. L., & Metz, J. R. (2022). Regenerating zebrafish scales express a subset of evolutionary conserved genes involved in human skeletal disease. *BMC Biology 2021 20:1*, *20*(1), 1–25.

Bergert, B. A., & Wainwright, P. C. (1997). Morphology and kinematics of prey capture in the syngnathid fishes Hippocampus erectus and Syngnathus floridae. *Marine Biology*, *127*(4), 563–570.

Berglund, A., Rosenqvist, G., & Svensson, I. (1986). *Reversed sex roles and parental energy investment in zygotes of two pipefish (Syngnathidae) species*. *29*, 209–215.

Bjork, B. C., Turbe-Doan, A., Prysak, M., Herron, B. J., & Beier, D. R. (2010). Prdm16 is required for normal palatogenesis in mice. *Human Molecular Genetics*, *19*(5), 774–789.

Brown, G. D., Willment, J. A., & Whitehead, L. (2018). C-type lectins in immunity and homeostasis. *Nature Reviews Immunology*, *18*(6), 374–380.

Butler, A., Hoffman, P., Smibert, P., Papalexi, E., & Satija, R. (2018). Integrating single-cell transcriptomic data across different conditions, technologies, and species. *Nature Biotechnology*, *36*(5), 411–420.

Cãestro, C., Yokoi, H., & Postlethwait, J. H. (2007). Evolutionary developmental biology and genomics. In *Nature Reviews Genetics* (Vol. 8, Issue 12, pp. 932–942). Nature Publishing Group.

Carcupino, M. (2002). Functional significance of the male brood pouch in the reproductive strategies of pipefishes and seahorses: a morphological and ultrastructural

comparative study on three anatomically different pouches. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *61*(6), 1465–1480.

Chari, T., Weissbourd, B., Gehring, J., Ferraioli, A., Leclère, L., Herl, M., Gao, F., Chevalier, S., Copley, R. R., Houliston, E., Anderson, D. J., & Pachter, L. (2021). Whole-animal multiplexed single-cell RNA-seq reveals transcriptional shifts across Clytia medusa cell types. *Science Advances*, *7*(48), 1683.

Chen, J. W., & Galloway, J. L. (2014). The development of zebrafish tendon and ligament progenitors. *Development*, *141*(10), 2035–2045.

Chen, Y. P., Zhang, Y., Jiang, T. X., Barlow, A. J., St. Amand, T. R., Hu, Y., Heaney, S., Francis-West, P., Chuong, C. M., & Maas, R. (2000). Conservation of early odontogenic signaling pathways in Aves. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *97*(18), 10044–10049.

Crump, J. G., Maves, L., Lawson, N. D., Weinstein, B. M., & Kimmel, C. B. (2004). An essential role for Fgfs in endodermal pouch formation influences later craniofacial skeletal patterning. *Development*, *131*(22), 5703–5716.

Denisenko, E., Guo, B. B., Jones, M., Hou, R., De Kock, L., Lassmann, T., Poppe, D., Poppe, D., Clément, O., Simmons, R. K., Simmons, R. K., Lister, R., & Forrest, A. R. R. (2020). Systematic assessment of tissue dissociation and storage biases in single-cell and single-nucleus RNA-seq workflows. *Genome Biology*, *21*(1), 1–25.

Ding, H. L., Clouthier, D. E., & Artinger, K. B. (2013). Redundant roles of PRDM family members in zebrafish craniofacial development. *Developmental Dynamics*, *242*(1), 67–79.

Docheva, D., Hunziker, E. B., Fässler, R., & Brandau, O. (2005). Tenomodulin Is Necessary for Tenocyte Proliferation and Tendon Maturation. *Molecular and Cellular Biology*, *25*(2), 699–705.

Du, J., Miller, A. J., Widlund, H. R., Horstmann, M. A., Ramaswamy, S., & Fisher, D. E. (2003). MLANA/MART1 and SILV/PMEL17/GP100 Are Transcriptionally Regulated by MITF in Melanocytes and Melanoma. *The American Journal of Pathology*, *163*(1), 333–343.

Dudley, J. S., Hannaford, P., Dowland, S. N., Lindsay, L. A., Thompson, M. B., Murphy, C. R., Van Dyke, J. U., & Whittington, C. M. (2021). Structural changes to the brood pouch of male pregnant seahorses (Hippocampus abdominalis) facilitate exchange between father and embryos. *Placenta*, *114*, 115–123.

Fabian, P., Tseng, K.-C., Thiruppathy, M., Arata, C., Chen, H.-J., Smeeton, J., Nelson, N., & Crump, J. G. (2022). Lifelong single-cell profiling of cranial neural crest diversification in zebrafish. *Nature Communications 2022 13:1*, *13*(1), 1–13.

Farnsworth, D. R., Saunders, L. M., & Miller, A. C. (2020). A single-cell transcriptome atlas for zebrafish development. *Developmental Biology*, *459*(2), 100–108.

Farrell, J. A., Wang, Y., Riesenfeld, S. J., Shekhar, K., Regev, A., & Schier, A. F. (2018). Single-
cell reconstruction of developmental trajectories during zebrafish embryogenesis.
Science, *360*(6392).

Feregrino, C., Sacher, F., Parnas, O., & Tschopp, P. (2019). A single-cell transcriptomic atlas
of the developing chicken limb. *BMC Genomics*, *20*(1), 1–15.

Flammang, B. E., Ferry-Graham, L. A., Rinewalt, C., Ardizzone, D., Davis, C., & Trejo, T.
(2009). Prey capture kinematics and four-bar linkages in the bay pipefish, Syngnathus
leptorhynchus. *Zoology*, *112*(2), 86–96.

Fuess, L. E., & Bolnick, D. I. (2023). GBE Single-Cell RNA Sequencing Reveals Microevolution
of the Stickleback Immune System. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, *15*.

Fuiten, A. M., & Cresko, W. A. (2021). Evolutionary divergence of a Hoxa2b hindbrain
enhancer in syngnathids mimics results of functional assays. *Development Genes and*
Evolution, *231*(3–4), 57–71.

Gibert, Y., Samarut, E., Ellis, M. K., Jackman, W. R., & Laudet, V. (2019). The first formed
tooth serves as a signalling centre to induce the formation of the dental row in
zebrafish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *286*(1904).

Goldsmith, M. I., Fisher, S., Waterman, R., & Johnson, S. L. (2003). Saltatory control of
isometric growth in the zebrafish caudal fin is disrupted in long fin and rapunzel
mutants. *Developmental Biology*, *259*(2), 303–317.

Gulati, G. S., Sikandar, S. S., Wesche, D. J., Manjunath, A., Bharadwaj, A., Berger, M. J., Ilagan,
F., Kuo, A. H., Hsieh, R. W., Cai, S., Zabala, M., Scheeren, F. A., Lobo, N. A., Qian, D., Yu, F.
B., Dirbas, F. M., Clarke, M. F., & Newman, A. M. (2020). Single-cell transcriptional
diversity is a hallmark of developmental potential. *Science*, *367*(6476), 405–411.

Hafemeister, C., & Satija, R. (2019). Normalization and variance stabilization of single-cell
RNA-seq data using regularized negative binomial regression. *Genome Biology*, *20*(1),
296.

Hain, D., Gallego-Flores, T., Klinkmann, M., Macias, A., Ciirdaeva, E., Arends, A., Thum, C.,
Tushev, G., Kretschmer, F., Tosches, M. A., & Laurent, G. (2022). Molecular diversity
and evolution of neuron types in the amniote brain. *Science*, *377*(6610).

Harada, A., Shiota, R., Okubo, R., Yorifuji, M., Sogabe, A., Motomura, H., Hiroi, J., Yasumasu, S.,
& Kawaguchi, M. (2022). Brood pouch evolution in pipefish and seahorse based on
histological observation. *Placenta*, *120*, 88–96.

Harlin-Cognato, A., Hoffman, E. A., & Jones, A. G. (2006). Gene cooption without duplication
during the evolution of a male-pregnancy gene in pipefish. *Proceedings of the National*
Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, *103*(51), 19407–19412.

Healey, H. M., Bassham, S., & Cresko, W. A. (2022). Single-cell Iso-Sequencing enables rapid
genome annotation for scRNAseq analysis. *Genetics*, *220*(3).

Hong, X., Wang, Y., Wang, K., Wei, C., Li, W., Yu, L., Xu, H., Zhu, J., Zhu, X., & Liu, X. (2023).
Single-Cell Atlas Reveals the Hemocyte Subpopulations and Stress Responses in Asian
Giant Softshell Turtle during Hibernation. *Biology*, *12*(7), 994.

Howe, D. G., Bradford, Y. M., Conlin, T., Eagle, A. E., Fashena, D., Frazer, K., Knight, J., Mani, P.,
Martin, R., Moxon, S. A. T., Paddock, H., Pich, C., Ramachandran, S., Ruef, B. J., Ruzicka,
L., Schaper, K., Shao, X., Singer, A., Sprunger, B., … Westerfield, M. (2013). ZFIN, the
Zebrafish Model Organism Database: Increased support for mutants and transgenics.
Nucleic Acids Research, *41*(D1), D854–D860.

Hughes, L. C., Ortí, G., Huang, Y., Sun, Y., Baldwin, C. C., Thompson, A. W., Arcila, D., Betancur,
R., Li, C., Becker, L., Bellora, N., Zhao, X., Li, X., Wang, M., Fang, C., Xie, B., Zhoui, Z.,
Huang, H., Chen, S., … Shi, Q. (2018). Comprehensive phylogeny of ray-finned fishes
(Actinopterygii) based on transcriptomic and genomic data. *Proceedings of the*
National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, *115*(24), 6249–6254.

Jain, I., Stroka, C., Yan, J., Huang, W. M., & Iovine, M. K. (2007). Bone growth in zebrafish fins
occurs via multiple pulses of cell proliferation. *Developmental Dynamics*, *236*(9), 2668–
2674.

Johnson, S. L., Nguyen, A. T. N., & Lister, J. A. (2011). mitfa is required at multiple stages of
melanocyte differentiation but not to establish the melanocyte stem cell.
Developmental Biology, *350*(2), 405–413.

Jungerson, H. F. E. (1910). *Ichthyotomical Contributions: The structure of the Aulostomidae,*
Syngnathidae, and Solenostomidae.

Kaneda-Nakashima, K., Igawa, K., Suwanruengsri, M., Naoyuki, F., Ichikawa, T., Funamoto,
T., Kurogi, S., Sekimoto, T., Yamashita, Y., Chosa, E., Yamaguchi, R., & Morishita, K.
(2022). Role of Mel1/Prdm16 in bone differentiation and morphology. *Experimental*
Cell Research, *410*(2), 112969.

Kawasaki, K. (2009). The SCPP gene repertoire in bony vertebrates and graded differences
in mineralized tissues. *Development Genes and Evolution*, *219*(3), 147–157.

Kimura, T., Takehana, Y., & Naruse, K. (2017). Pnp4a Is the causal gene of the medaka
iridophore Mutant guanineless. *G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics*, *7*(4), 1357–1363.

Koiwai, K., Kondo, H., & Hirono, I. (2023). scRNA-seq Analysis of Hemocytes of Penaeid
Shrimp Under Virus Infection. *Marine Biotechnology*, *25*(3), 488–502.

Kuo, R. I., Tseng, E., Eory, L., Paton, I. R., Archibald, A. L., & Burt, D. W. (2017). Normalized
long read RNA sequencing in chicken reveals transcriptome complexity similar to
human. *BMC Genomics*, *18*(1), 1–19.

Kvarnemo, C., Mobley, K. B., Partridge, C., Jones, A. G., & Ahnesjö, I. (2011). Evidence of
paternal nutrient provisioning to embryos in broad-nosed pipefish Syngnathus typhle.
Journal of Fish Biology, *78*(6), 1725–1737.

Lamason, R. L., Mohideen, M. A. P. K., Mest, J. R., Wong, A. C., Norton, H. L., Aros, M. C.,
Jurynec, M. J., Mao, X., Humphreville, V. R., Humbert, J. E., Sinha, S., Moore, J. L.,
Jagadeeswaran, P., Zhao, W., Ning, G., Makalowska, I., McKeigue, P. M., O'Donnell, D.,
Kittles, R., … Cheng, K. C. (2005). Genetics: SLC24A5, a putative cation exchanger,
affects pigmentation in zebrafish and humans. *Science*, *310*(5755), 1782–1786.

Lange, M., Granados, A., VijayKumar, S., Bragantini, J., Ancheta, S., Santhosh, S., Borja, M.,
Kobayashi, H., McGeever, E., Solak, A. C., Yang, B., Zhao, X., Liu, Y., Detweiler, A. M., Paul,
S., Mekonen, H., Lao, T., Banks, R., Kim, Y.-J., … Royer, L. A. (2023). Zebrahub –
Multimodal Zebrafish Developmental Atlas Reveals the State-Transition Dynamics of
Late-Vertebrate Pluripotent Axial Progenitors. *BioRxiv*, 2023.03.06.531398.

Langfelder, P., & Horvath, S. (2008). WGCNA: An R package for weighted correlation
network analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*, *9*(1), 1–13.

Leerberg, D. M., Hopton, R. E., & Draper, B. W. (2019). Fibroblast growth factor receptors
function redundantly during zebrafish embryonic development. *Genetics*, *212*(4),
1301–1319.

Leysen, H., Roos, G., & Adriaens, D. (2011). Morphological variation in head shape of
pipefishes and seahorses in relation to snout length and developmental growth.
Journal of Morphology, *272*(10), 1259–1270.

Li, H. (2018). Minimap2: Pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics*,
34(18), 3094–3100.

Lin, Q., Fan, S., Zhang, Y., Xu, M., Zhang, H., Yang, Y., Lee, A. P., Woltering, J. M., Ravi, V.,
Gunter, H. M., Luo, W., Gao, Z., Lim, Z. W., Qin, G., Schneider, R. F., Wang, X., Xiong, P., Li,
G., Wang, K., … Venkatesh, B. (2016). The seahorse genome and the evolution of its
specialized morphology. *Nature*, *540*(7633), 395–399.

Liu, Z., Liu, S., Yao, J., Bao, L., Zhang, J., Li, Y., Jiang, C., Sun, L., Wang, R., Zhang, Y., Zhou, T.,
Zeng, Q., Fu, Q., Gao, S., Li, N., Koren, S., Jiang, Y., Zimin, A., Xu, P., … Waldbieser, G. C.
(2016). The channel catfish genome sequence provides insights into the evolution of
scale formation in teleosts. *Nature Communications*, *7*.

Manning, C. G., Foster, S. J., & Vincent, A. C. J. (2019). A review of the diets and feeding
behaviours of a family of biologically diverse marine fishes (Family Syngnathidae).
Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries 2019 29:2, *29*(2), 197–221.

McCarthy, N., Sidik, A., Bertrand, J. Y., & Eberhart, J. K. (2016). An Fgf-Shh signaling
hierarchy regulates early specification of the zebrafish skull. *Developmental Biology*,
415(2), 261–277.

Melamed, P., Xue, Y., Poon, J. F. D., Wu, Q., Xie, H., Yeo, J., Foo, T. W. J., & Chua, H. K. (2005).
The male seahorse synthesizes and secretes a novel C-type lectin into the brood pouch
during early pregnancy. *The FEBS Journal*, *272*(5), 1221–1235.

Miao, M., Bruce, A. E. E., Bhanji, T., Davis, E. C., & Keeley, F. W. (2007). Differential
expression of two tropoelastin genes in zebrafish. *Matrix Biology*, *26*(2), 115–124.

Miyake, A., & Itoh, N. (2013). Fgf22 regulated by Fgf3/Fgf8 signaling is required for
zebrafish midbrain development. *Biology Open*, *2*(5), 515–524.

Mori, S., & Nakamura, T. (2022). Redeployment of odontode gene regulatory network
underlies dermal denticle formation and evolution in suckermouth armored catfish.
Scientific Reports 2022 12:1, *12*(1), 1–16.

Moriyama, Y., Ito, F., Takeda, H., Yano, T., Okabe, M., Kuraku, S., Keeley, F. W., & Koshiba-
Takeuchi, K. (2016). Evolution of the fish heart by sub/neofunctionalization of an
elastin gene. *Nature Communications 2016 7:1*, *7*(1), 1–10.

Morrison, J. A., McLennan, R., Wolfe, L. A., Gogol, M. M., Meier, S., McKinney, M. C., Teddy, J.
M., Holmes, L., Semerad, C. L., Box, A. C., Li, H., Hall, K. E., Perera, A. G., & Kulesa, P. M.
(2017). Single-cell transcriptome analysis of avian neural crest migration reveals
signatures of invasion and molecular transitions. *ELife*, *6*.

Parker, J., Guslund, N. C., Jentoft, S., & Roth, O. (2022). Characterization of Pipefish Immune
Cell Populations Through Single-Cell Transcriptomics. *Frontiers in Immunology*, *13*,
820152.

Partridge, C., Shardo, J., & Boettcher, A. (2007). Osmoregulatory role of the brood pouch in
the euryhaline Gulf pipefish, Syngnathus scovelli. *Comparative Biochemistry and
Physiology - A Molecular and Integrative Physiology*, *147*(2 SPEC. ISS.), 556–561.

Potts, H. G., Lemieux, M. E., Rice, E. S., Warren, W., Choudhury, R. P., & Mommersteeg, M. T.
M. (2022). Discordant Genome Assemblies Drastically Alter the Interpretation of
Single-Cell RNA Sequencing Data Which Can Be Mitigated by a Novel Integration
Method. *Cells*, *11*(4), 608.

Qu, M., Liu, Y., Zhang, Y., Wan, S., Ravi, V., Qin, G., Jiang, H., Wang, X., Zhang, H., Zhang, B.,
Gao, Z., Huysseune, A., Zhang, Z., Zhang, H., Chen, Z., Yu, H., Wu, Y., Tang, L., Li, C., … Lin,
Q. (2021). Seadragon genome analysis provides insights into its phenotype and sex
determination locus. *Science Advances*, *7*(34), eabg5196.

Ramesh, B., Small, C. M., Healey, H., Johnson, B., Barker, E., Currey, M., Bassham, S., Myers,
M., Cresko, W. A., & Jones, A. G. (2023). Improvements to the Gulf pipefish Syngnathus
scovelli genome. *GigaByte*, *2023*.

Ripley, J. L., & Foran, C. M. (2006). Differential parental nutrient allocation in two
congeneric pipefish species (Syngnathidae: Syngnathus spp.). *Journal of Experimental
Biology*, *209*(6), 1112–1121.

Ripley, J. L., Williams, P. S., & Foran, C. M. (2010). Morphological and quantitative changes in
paternal brood-pouch vasculature during embryonic development in two syngnathus
pipefishes. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *77*, 67–79.

Rose, E., Johnson, B. D., Armitage, V., & Jones, A. G. (2023). The response of the brood pouch transcriptome to synthetic estrogen exposure in the Gulf pipefish (Syngnathus scovelli). *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *10*(June), 1–12.

Roth, O., Klein, V., Beemelmanns, A., Scharsack, J. P., & Reusch, T. B. H. (2012). Male pregnancy and biparental immune priming. *American Naturalist*, *180*(6), 802–814.

Roth, O., Solbakken, M. H., Tørresen, O. K., Bayer, T., Matschiner, M., Baalsrud, H. T., Hoff, S. N. K., Brieuc, M. S. O., Haase, D., Hanel, R., Reusch, T. B. H., & Jentoft, S. (2020). Evolution of male pregnancy associated with remodeling of canonical vertebrate immunity in seahorses and pipefishes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 201916251.

Royan, M. R., Siddique, K., Csucs, G., Puchades, M. A., Nourizadeh-Lillabadi, R., Bjaalie, J. G., Henkel, C. V., Weltzien, F. A., & Fontaine, R. (2021). 3D Atlas of the Pituitary Gland of the Model Fish Medaka (Oryzias latipes). *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, *12*, 719843.

Salamanca-Díaz, D. A., Schulreich, S. M., Cole, A. G., & Wanninger, A. (2022). Single-Cell RNA Sequencing Atlas From a Bivalve Larva Enhances Classical Cell Lineage Studies. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, *9*, 783984.

Schneider, R. F., Gunter, H. M., Salewski, I., Woltering, J. M., & Meyer, A. (2023). Growth dynamics and molecular bases of evolutionary novel jaw extensions in halfbeaks and needlefishes (Beloniformes). *Molecular Ecology*, *32*(21), 5798–5811.

Schneider, R. F., Woltering, J. M., Adriaens, D., & Roth, O. (2023). A comparative analysis of the ontogeny of syngnathids (pipefishes and seahorses) reveals how heterochrony contributed to their diversification. *Developmental Dynamics*, *252*(5), 553–588.

Shema, E., Bernstein, B. E., & Buenrostro, J. D. (2019). Single-cell and single-molecule epigenomics to uncover genome regulation at unprecedented resolution. *Nature Genetics*, *51*(1), 19–25.

Shull, L. C., Lencer, E. S., Kim, H. M., Goyama, S., Kurokawa, M., Costello, J. C., Jones, K., & Artinger, K. B. (2022). PRDM paralogs antagonistically balance Wnt/β-catenin activity during craniofacial chondrocyte differentiation. *Development (Cambridge, England)*, *149*(4).

Shull, L. C., Sen, R., Menzel, J., Goyama, S., Kurokawa, M., & Artinger, K. B. (2020). The conserved and divergent roles of Prdm3 and Prdm16 in zebrafish and mouse craniofacial development. *Developmental Biology*, *461*(2), 132–144.

Sire, J. Y., Delgado, S. C., & Girondot, M. (2008). Hen's teeth with enamel cap: From dream to impossibility. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, *8*(1), 1–11.

Small, C. M., Bassham, S., Catchen, J., Amores, A., Fuiten, A. M., Brown, R. S., Jones, A. G., & Cresko, W. A. (2016). The genome of the Gulf pipefish enables understanding of evolutionary innovations. *Genome Biology*, *17*(1), 258.

Small, C. M., Harlin-Cognato, A. D., & Jones, A. G. (2013). Functional similarity and molecular divergence of a novel reproductive transcriptome in two male-pregnant Syngnathus pipefish species. *Ecology and Evolution*, *3*(12), 4092–4108.

Small, C. M., Healey, H. M., Currey, M. C., Beck, E. A., Catchen, J., Lin, A. S. P., Cresko, W. A., & Bassham, S. (2022). Leafy and weedy seadragon genomes connect genic and repetitive DNA features to the extravagant biology of syngnathid fishes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *119*(26), e2119602119.

Soldatov, R., Kaucka, M., Kastriti, M. E., Petersen, J., Chontorotzea, T., Englmaier, L., Akkuratova, N., Yang, Y., Häring, M., Dyachuk, V., Bock, C., Farlik, M., Piacentino, M. L., Boismoreau, F., Hilscher, M. M., Yokota, C., Qian, X., Nilsson, M., Bronner, M. E., … Adameyko, I. (2019). Spatiotemporal structure of cell fate decisions in murine neural crest. *Science*, *364*(6444).

Sommer, S., Whittington, C. M., & Wilson, A. B. (2012). Standardised classification of pre-release development in male-brooding pipefish, seahorses, and seadragons (Family Syngnathidae). *BMC Developmental Biology*, *12*, 12–15.

Songco-Casey, J. O., Coffing, G. C., Piscopo, D. M., Pungor, J. R., Kern, A. D., Miller, A. C., & Niell, C. M. (2022). Cell types and molecular architecture of the Octopus bimaculoides visual system. *Current Biology : CB*, *32*(23), 5031.

Steger, J., Cole, A. G., Denner, A., Lebedeva, T., Genikhovich, G., Ries, A., Reischl, R., Taudes, E., Lassnig, M., & Technau, U. (2022). Single-cell transcriptomics identifies conserved regulators of neuroglandular lineages. *Cell Reports*, *40*(12).

Stiller, J., Short, G., Hamilton, H., Saarman, N., Longo, S., Wainwright, P., Rouse, G. W., & Simison, W. B. (2022). Phylogenomic analysis of Syngnathidae reveals novel relationships, origins of endemic diversity and variable diversification rates. *BMC Biology 2022 20:1*, *20*(1), 1–21.

Stock, D. W., Jackman, W. R., & Trapani, J. (2006). Developmental genetic mechanisms of evolutionary tooth loss in cypriniform fishes. *Development*, *133*(16), 3127–3137.

Stölting, K. N., & Wilson, A. B. (2007). Male pregnancy in seahorses and pipefish: Beyond the mammalian model. *BioEssays*, *29*(9), 884–896.

Szabo-Rogers, H. L., Geetha-Loganathan, P., Nimmagadda, S., Fu, K. K., & Richman, J. M. (2008). FGF signals from the nasal pit are necessary for normal facial morphogenesis. *Developmental Biology*, *318*(2), 289–302.

Tardaguila, M., Fuente, L. de la, Marti, C., Pereira, C., Pardo-Palacios, F. J., Risco, H. del, Ferrell, M., Mellado, M., Macchietto, M., Verheggen, K., Edelmann, M., Ezkurdia, I., Vazquez, J., Tress, M., Mortazavi, A., Martens, L., Rodriguez-Navarro, S., Moreno-Manzano, V., & Conesa, A. (2018). SQANTI: Extensive characterization of long-read transcript sequences for quality control in full-length transcriptome identification and quantification. *Genome Research*, *28*(3), 396.

Teichmann, S. A., & Babu, M. M. (2004). Gene regulatory network growth by duplication. *Nature Genetics*, *36*(5), 492–496.

Tengfei, D., Yongshuang, X., Haixia, Z., Li, Z., Qinghua, L., Xueying, W., Jun, L., Shihong, X., Yanfeng, W., Jiachen, Y., Lele, W., Yunong, W., & Guang, G. (2021). Multiple Fetal Nutritional Patterns Before Parturition in Viviparous Fish Sebastes schlegelii (Hilgendorf, 1880). *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *7*, 571946.

Thisse, B., & Thisse, C. (2004). *Fast Release Clones: A High Throughput Expression Analysis*. ZFIN Direct Data Submission.

Thisse, C., & Thisse, B. (2007). High-resolution in situ hybridization to whole-mount zebrafish embryos. *Nature Protocols 2008 3:1*, *3*(1), 59–69.

Tokita, M., Chaeychomsri, W., & Siruntawineti, J. (2013). Developmental basis of toothlessness in turtles: Insight into convergent evolution of vertebrate morphology. *Evolution*, *67*(1), 260–273.

Ton, M. L. N., Guibentif, C., & Göttgens, B. (2020). Single cell genomics and developmental biology: moving beyond the generation of cell type catalogues. In *Current Opinion in Genetics and Development* (Vol. 64, pp. 66–71).

Ton, M. L. N., Keitley, D., Theeuwes, B., Guibentif, C., Ahnfelt-Rønne, J., Andreassen, T. K., Calero-Nieto, F. J., Imaz-Rosshandler, I., Pijuan-Sala, B., Nichols, J., Benito-Gutiérrez, È., Marioni, J. C., & Göttgens, B. (2023). An atlas of rabbit development as a model for single-cell comparative genomics. *Nature Cell Biology 2023 25:7*, *25*(7), 1061–1072.

Tseng, E. (2021). *cDNA cupcake* (v27.0.0).

Tucker, A. S., Headon, D. J., Schneider, P., Ferguson, B. M., Overbeek, P., Tschopp, J., & Sharpe, P. T. (2000). Edar/Eda interactions regulate enamel knot formation in tooth morphogenesis. *Development*, *127*(21), 4691–4700.

Tucker, A., & Sharpe, P. (2004). The cutting-edge of mammalian development; how the embryo makes teeth. *Nature Reviews Genetics 2004 5:7*, *5*(7), 499–508.

Uniken Venema, W. T. C., Ramírez-Sánchez, A. D., Bigaeva, E., Withoff, S., Jonkers, I., McIntyre, R. E., Ghouraba, M., Raine, T., Weersma, R. K., Franke, L., Festen, E. A. M., & van der Wijst, M. G. P. (2022). Gut mucosa dissociation protocols influence cell type proportions and single-cell gene expression levels. *Scientific Reports 2022 12:1*, *12*(1), 1–14.

Van Wassenbergh, S., Roos, G., Genbrugge, A., Leysen, H., Aerts, P., Adriaens, D., & Herrel, A. (2009). Suction is kid's play: extremely fast suction in newborn seahorses. *Biology Letters*, *5*(2), 200–203.

Van Wassenbergh, S., Strother, J. A., Flammang, B. E., Ferry-Graham, L. A., & Aerts, P. (2007). Extremely fast prey capture in pipefish is powered by elastic recoil. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, *5*(20), 285–296.

Verreijdt, L., Debiais-Thibaud, M., Borday-Birraux, V., Van Der Heyden, C., Sire, J. Y., & Huysseune, A. (2006). Expression of the dlx gene family during formation of the cranial bones in the zebrafish (Danio rerio): Differential involvement in the visceral skeleton and braincase. *Developmental Dynamics*, *235*(5), 1371–1389.

Vonk, A. C., Zhao, X., Pan, Z., Hudnall, M. L., Oakes, C. G., Lopez, G. A., Hasel-Kolossa, S. C., Kuncz, A. W. C., Sengelmann, S. B., Gamble, D. J., & Lozito, T. P. (2023). Single-cell analysis of lizard blastema fibroblasts reveals phagocyte-dependent activation of Hedgehog-responsive chondrogenesis. *Nature Communications 2023 14:1*, *14*(1), 1–20.

Wagner, A. (2011). The molecular origins of evolutionary innovations. *Trends in Genetics*, *27*(10), 397–410.

Wagner, D. E., Weinreb, C., Collins, Z. M., Briggs, J. A., Megason, S. G., & Klein, A. M. (2018). Single-cell mapping of gene expression landscapes and lineage in the zebrafish embryo. *Science*, *360*(6392), 981–987.

Wagner, G. P., & Lynch, V. J. (2010). Evolutionary novelties. In *Current Biology* (Vol. 20, Issue 2, pp. R48–R52). Cell Press.

Walshe, J., & Mason, I. (2003). Fgf signalling is required for formation of cartilage in the head. *Developmental Biology*, *264*(2), 522–536.

Wang, W., Yang, N., Wang, L., Zhu, Y., Chu, X., Xu, W., Li, Y., Xu, Y., Gao, L., Zhang, B., Zhang, G., Sun, Q., Wang, W., Wang, Q., Zhang, W., & Chen, D. (2024). The TET-Sall4-BMP regulatory axis controls craniofacial cartilage development. *Cell Reports*, *43*(3), 113873.

Wetzel, J. T., & Wourms, J. P. (2004). Embryogenesis in the Dwarf Seahorse, Hippocampus zosterae (Syngnathidae). *Gulf and Caribbean Research*, *16*(1), 27–35.

Whittington, C. M., & Friesen, C. R. (2020). The evolution and physiology of male pregnancy in syngnathid fishes. *Biological Reviews*, *95*(5), 1252–1272.

Whittington, C. M., Griffith, O. W., Qi, W., Thompson, M. B., & Wilson, A. B. (2015a). Seahorse Brood Pouch Transcriptome Reveals Common Genes Associated with Vertebrate Pregnancy. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, *32*(12), 3114–3131.

Whittington, C. M., Griffith, O. W., Qi, W., Thompson, M. B., & Wilson, A. B. (2015b). Seahorse Brood Pouch Transcriptome Reveals Common Genes Associated with Vertebrate Pregnancy. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, *32*(12), msv177.

Williams, R. M., Candido-Ferreira, I., Repapi, E., Gavriouchkina, D., Senanayake, U., Ling, I. T. C., Telenius, J., Taylor, S., Hughes, J., & Sauka-Spengler, T. (2019a). Reconstruction of the Global Neural Crest Gene Regulatory Network In Vivo. *Developmental Cell*, *51*(2), 255-276.e7.

Williams, R. M., Candido-Ferreira, I., Repapi, E., Gavriouchkina, D., Senanayake, U., Ling, I. T. C., Telenius, J., Taylor, S., Hughes, J., & Sauka-Spengler, T. (2019b). Reconstruction of

the Global Neural Crest Gene Regulatory Network In Vivo. *Developmental Cell*, *51*(2),
255-276.e7.

Wolf, M., Ferrette, B. L. da S., Coimbra, R. T. F., Jong, M. de, Nebenführ, M., Prochotta, D.,
Schöneberg, Y., Zapf, K., Rosenbaum, J., Intyre, H. A. M., Maier, J., Souza, C. C. S. de,
Gehlhaar, L. M., Werner, M. J., Oechler, H., Wittekind, M., Sonnewald, M., Nilsson, M. A.,
Janke, A., & Winter, S. (2024). Near chromosome-level and highly repetitive genome
assembly of the snake pipefish Entelurus aequoreus (Syngnathiformes: Syngnathidae).
GigaByte, *2024*, 1–13.

Woronowicz, K. C., & Schneider, R. A. (2019). Molecular and cellular mechanisms
underlying the evolution of form and function in the amniote jaw. In *EvoDevo* (Vol. 10,
Issue 1, pp. 1–21).

Wourms, J. P. (1981). *Viviparity: The Maternal-Fetal Relationship in Fishes*. *21*, 473–515.

Woych, J., Gurrola, A. O., Deryckere, A., Jaeger, E. C. B., Gumnit, E., Merello, G., Gu, J., Araus, A.
J., Leigh, N. D., Yun, M., Simon, A., & Tosches, M. A. (2022). Cell-type profiling in
salamanders identifies innovations in vertebrate forebrain evolution. *Science*,
377(6610).

Young, M. D., & Behjati, S. (2020). SoupX removes ambient RNA contamination from
droplet-based single-cell RNA sequencing data. *GigaScience*, *9*(12), 1–10.

Zhang, Y., Ravi, V., Qin, G., Dai, H., Zhang, H., Han, F., Wang, X., & Liu, Y. (2020a). Comparative
genomics reveal shared genomic changes in syngnathid fishes and signatures of
genetic convergence with placental mammals ! Phylogenomics and evolutionary rate
Transposable elements in syngnathids Expansion and contraction of gene families in t.
National Science Review, *7*(6), 964–977.

Zhang, Y., Ravi, V., Qin, G., Dai, H., Zhang, H., Han, F., Wang, X., & Liu, Y. (2020b). *Comparative
genomics reveal shared genomic changes in syngnathid fishes and signatures of genetic
convergence with placental mammals ! Phylogenomics and evolutionary rate
Transposable elements in syngnathids Expansion and contraction of gene families in t*.
56–58.

Zhou, J., Gao, Y., Lan, Y., Jia, S., & Jiang, R. (2013). Pax9 regulates a molecular network
involving Bmp4, Fgf10, Shh signaling and the Osr2 transcription factor to control
palate morphogenesis. *Development*, *140*(23), 4709–4718.

1637

1638

A

4 5 6 9 13 16 18 24 26 27 29

Fgf pathway

Bmp pathway

Wnt pathway

Expression
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5

B Cluster 6 marker: *elnb*

C Cluster 9 marker: *tnmd*

D Cluster 5 marker: *prdm16*

E Fgf pathway ligand: *fgf22*

F Bmp pathway ligand: *bmp4*

G Wnt pathway member: *sfrp1a*

H

Cluster 18: osteoblasts
Cluster 5: osteochondrogenic mesenchyme
Cluster 6: osteochondrogenic mesenchyme
Cluster 27: chondroblasts
Cluster 9: tendon and ligament cells
muscle cells

I

bmp4, sfrp1a
fgf22
bmp4, sfrp1a

A	B	C	D
pitx2	*pitx2*	*scpp1*	alizarin and alcian
E	F	G	H
dlx3b	*dlx3b*	alizarin and alcian	alizarin and alcian