Cis-regulatory analysis of Onecut1 expression in fate-restricted retinal progenitor cells

Sruti Patoori[1,2], Nathalie Jean-Charles[2], Ariana Gopal[2], Sacha Sulaiman[2], Sneha Gopal[2,3], Brian Wang[2], Benjamin Souferi[2,4], Mark M. Emerson[1,2,5]

[1] Biology PhD Program, The Graduate Center, The City University of New York, New York, NY, 10016
[2] Department of Biology, The City College of New York, The City University of New York, New York, NY, 10031
[3] Present Address: Doctoral program in Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, Center for Biotechnology and Interdisciplinary Studies, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy , NY 12180
[4] Present Address: Touro College of Osteopathic Medicine, New York, NY 10027
[5] Biochemistry PhD Program, Graduate Center, City University of New York, NY 10016

*Corresponding author: memerson@ccny.cuny.edu

Email addresses:

Sruti Patoori: spatoori@gradcenter.cuny.edu
Ariana Gopal: ariana.gopal@macaulay.cuny.edu
Sacha Sulaiman: ssulaim000@citymail.cuny.edu
Nathalie Jean-Charles: nathaliejcharles@gmail.com
Sneha Gopal: sneha.gopal94@gmail.com
Brian Wang: brianwangmhc@gmail.com
Benjamin Souferi: benjaminsouferi@gmail.com
Mark Emerson: memerson@ccny.cuny.edu

Running title: Retinal fate-restricted cis-regulatory elements

Keywords: retinal progenitor cells, multipotent, fate-restricted, cone photoreceptors, basic helix-loop-helix, chicken, electroporation

44
45
46
47
Background: The vertebrate retina consists of six major classes of neuronal cells. During
development, these cells are generated from a pool of multipotent retinal progenitor cells
(RPCs) that express the gene Vsx2. Fate-restricted RPCs have recently been identified, with
limited mitotic potential and cell fate possibilities compared to multipotent RPCs. One
population of fate-restricted RPCs, marked by activity of the regulatory element ThrbCRM1,
gives rise to both cone photoreceptors and horizontal cells. These cells do not express Vsx2, but
co-express the transcription factors (TFs) Onecut1 and Otx2, which bind to ThrbCRM1. The
components of the gene regulatory networks that control the transition from multipotent to
fate-restricted gene expression are not known. This work aims to identify and evaluate cis-
regulatory elements proximal to Onecut1 to identify the gene regulatory networks involved in
RPC fate-restriction.
59
Method: We identified regulatory elements through ATAC-seq and conservation, followed by
reporter assays to screen for activity based on temporal and spatial criteria. The regulatory
elements of interest were subject to deletion and mutation analysis to identify functional
sequences and evaluated by quantitative flow cytometry assays. Finally, we combined the
enhancer::reporter assays with candidate TF overexpression to evaluate the relationship
between the TFs, the enhancers, and early vertebrate retinal development. Statistical tests
included ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis, or unpaired t-tests.
67
Results: Two regulatory elements, ECR9 and ECR65, were identified to be active in
ThrbCRM1(+) restricted RPCs. Candidate bHLH binding sites were identified as critical
sequences in both elements. Overexpression of candidate bHLH TFs revealed specific enhancer-
bHLH interactions. Nhlh1 overexpression expanded ECR65 activity into the Vsx2(+) RPC
population, and overexpression of NeuroD1/NeuroG2/NeuroD4 had a similar effect on ECR9.
Furthermore, bHLHs that were able to activate ectopic ECR9 reporter were able to induce
endogenous Otx2 expression.
75
76   **Conclusions:** This work reports a large-scale screen to identify spatiotemporally specific
77   regulatory elements near the Onecut1 locus. These elements were used to identify distinct
78   populations in the developing retina. In addition, fate-restricted regulatory elements responded
79   differentially to bHLH factors, and suggest a role for retinal bHLHs upstream of the Otx2 and
80   Onecut1 genes during the formation of restricted RPCs from multipotent RPCs.
81

 Introduction:

The vertebrate retina is comprised of six main classes of neuronal cells and one class of glial

cells, organized into three discrete nuclear layers and two plexiform layers. These

morphologically and functionally diverse cells have been characterized in multiple vertebrate

species to originate from multipotent retinal progenitor cells (RPCs) (Turner and Cepko, 1987;

Fekete et al., 1994). The vertebrate retina is therefore a valuable model to study neuronal cell

fate choice. The process of retinal development is highly conserved throughout the vertebrate

subphylum, with regards to the birth order of the various cell types (Young, 1985; Wong and

Rapaport, 2009) and the developmental regulatory networks involved. However, the gene

regulatory networks (GRNs) that mediate the generation of specific restricted RPCs from

multipotent RPCs are largely unknown, as are the networks that function in restricted RPCs to

define their fate potential.

One restricted RPC type that has been identified across zebrafish, chick, and mouse models

preferentially generates cones and horizontal cells (HCs) and has been identified in zebrafish

and chick through regulatory elements associated with the Thrb and Olig2 genes (Emerson et

al., 2013; Hafler et al., 2012; Suzuki et al., 2013). For example, analysis in zebrafish and mouse

RPCs showed that the same RPC can give rise to both cone and horizontal cell precursor cells

(Hafler et al., 2012; Suzuki et al., 2013). Endogenous Thrb expression has been observed in

Otx2-expressing early RPCs in the chick, suggesting that reporters driven by regulatory

elements correspond to *in vivo* regulatory events in the retina (Trimarchi et al., 2008). While

Otx2 expression is involved in multiple cell fates during retinal development, it has been shown

that the combination of Otx2 and Onecut1 activates ThrbCRM1, which is a specific Thrb cis-

regulatory element (CRE) active in cone/HC restricted RPCs (RPC[CH]) (Emerson et al., 2013).

Loss-of-function mutations in Otx2 and Onecut1 affect early cone gene expression, cone

number, cone type, and horizontal cell genesis (Nishida et al., 2003; Sapkota et al., 2014; Wu et

al., 2013), suggesting that these transcription factors (TFs) are critical in the gene regulatory

networks of ThrbCRM1 restricted RPCs.

The population of restricted RPCs marked by ThrbCRM1 have been shown to be molecularly

distinct from multipotent RPCs. ThrbCRM1(+) RPCs downregulate multipotent RPC genes such

as Vsx2 while Onecut1 is upregulated (Buenaventura et al., 2018). Onecut1 expression is further

upregulated in the HC progeny of these cells but is downregulated in the cone photoreceptor

progeny. However, it is not known how Onecut1 expression is activated in the ThrbCRM1 RPC

population or what distinguishes it from other Onecut1(+) cell populations.

The regulatory module that connects Otx2 and Onecut1 to Thrb expression demonstrates the

importance of both cis- and trans- regulatory elements in directing retinal cell fate. Cell fate

specification and fate restriction require the combinatorial expression of multiple

developmental transcription factors. As such, cell-type specific cis-regulatory elements can

define the intermediate/restricted RPCs that may be difficult to identify through only the

transient expression of developmental transcription factors that are often involved in the

specification of multiple retinal cell types. These regulatory elements can be used to facilitate

imaging, lineage tracing, and molecular analysis, while also providing insights into the

relationships between RPC populations.

We sought to identify the cis-regulatory elements upstream of Onecut1 expression in cone/HC

restricted RPCs and to determine the transcription factors that occupy these elements. To this

end, we conducted a multi-step screen to identify Onecut1-associated non-coding DNA

elements capable of driving reporter transcription in early retinal RPCs that give rise to cones

and horizontal cells in the early embryonic chick retina. The candidate regulatory elements that

emerged from the screen were then bioinformatically analyzed for transcription factor binding

sites. Mutational analyses facilitated the functional evaluation of these predicted TF binding

sites and overexpression experiments were used to determine the relationship between the

predicted transcription factors and Onecut1 expression. We identified two regulatory elements,

ECR9 and ECR65, upstream of the Onecut1 coding region. These both contain predicted binding

sites for bHLH transcription factors, which are known to be functionally important for retinal

development. We show that both of these elements require the predicted bHLH binding sites

for their activity and that each element responds to distinct bHLH factors, the transcripts of

which are enriched or present in the ThrbCRM1 population. Finally, we show that NeuroD1,

NeuroG2, and NeuroD4 are sufficient to induce expression of Otx2 and that all four TFs

including Nhlh1 are able to induce the activity of their corresponding regulatory elements in

Vsx2(+) multipotent RPCs. Ultimately, this work further clarifies components of the gene

regulatory network leading to the early retinal cell fates of cone photoreceptors, horizontal

cells, and retinal ganglion cells.

Results:

Regulatory Element Identification:

Two methods were employed to identify candidate cis-regulatory elements for Onecut1 (Figure

1A,B). We first examined the intergenic region 5' of the chicken Onecut1 coding region and 3' of

WDR72, as well as a short stretch of the intergenic region 3' of the Onecut1 coding region for

evolutionarily conserved regions (ECRs). As not all cis-regulatory sequences are strongly

conserved and as ECRBrowser (Ovcharenko et al., 2004) utilizes an older chick genome

assembly, we also used chromatin accessibility as a means of candidate enhancer identification.

Chick E5 retinae were electroporated with ThrbCRM1::GFP and UbiqC::TdT, cultured for 18-22

hours *ex vivo* and sorted into two populations: ThrbCRM1(+) cells, which were marked by both

reporters and ThrbCRM1(-), which were marked by only TdT. These cells were then processed

for ATAC-seq (Buenrostro et al., 2013), aligned against the galGal5 assembly and the data was

visualized in the UCSC Genome Browser (Kent et al., 2002) to identify accessible chromatin

regions (ACRs) as potential cis-regulatory elements. In total, we screened 98 ECRs and ACRs

near Onecut1 (Additional File 1, Additional File 2) for their ability to drive reporter activity in

the developing retina.

The first criterion of our screen was that the non-coding elements should be capable of driving

reporter expression at E5 in the chick retina. To this end, we used a sensitive alkaline

phosphatase (AP) reporter assay. Each potential cis-regulatory region was amplified from chick

genomic DNA and cloned into Stagia3 (Billings et al., 2010), a dual GFP and AP reporter vector.

Retinae at E5 (HH26) were electroporated with the reporter construct along with CAG::mCherry

as the co-electroporation control. These retinae were cultured for approximately 18-22h and

then fixed before the AP stain was developed.

Previously identified Thrb reporters served as positive controls as they are known to be active

in the E5 chick retina (Emerson et. al., 2013). The empty Stagia3 vector served as the negative

control to demonstrate the baseline levels of transcription when no cis-regulatory element is

present. At this time point, the majority of the candidate sequences tested did not drive

reporter expression above the baseline level defined by the negative control. The active

elements that were initially chosen based on evolutionary conservation were largely found to

have open chromatin states in the within the ATAC-Seq datasets. All active cis-regulatory

elements (Figure 1C, Additional File 3) were categorized as weak, moderate, or strong (Figure

1B) and further examined for activity in cone/HC RPCs.

Regulatory Activity within the Cone/HC Restricted RPC population:

The second criterion of the screen was specificity to the population of fate-restricted early

retinal RPCs that express Onecut1. The ThrbCRM1 element is active in the cone/HC restricted

RPC population that expresses Onecut1 and Otx2 (Emerson et al., 2013). It has been previously

reported that at 20 hours post-electroporation, 30% of ThrbCRM1(+) cells are in S-phase or

G2/M (Buenaventura et al., 2018). Therefore, to determine which active elements drove

transcription in the same restricted RPC population, we co-electroporated the CRE::GFP

reporter constructs with a ThrbCRM1::AU1 reporter into the chick retina at E5 and cultured

overnight for approximately 20 hours. Retinal sections were stained for AU1 and GFP and

qualitatively evaluated with regards to the specificity of each active enhancer to the Onecut1(+)

restricted RPC population marked by the AU1 reporter (Figure 2, Additional File 4).

Many of the active CREs drove reporter expression in both the ThrbCRM1(+) and ThrbCRM1(-)

populations, such as ECR42, ECR46 and ACR10-C (Additional File 4). ACR10-B (Additional File 4)

activity appears to be distributed throughout the retina with no specific preference for

ThrbCRM1(+) cells. Though the populations marked by these CREs overlap with our population

of interest, they do not meet the criterion for specificity. Despite driving robust reporter

expression in E5 chick retinae, ACR8 and ACR10-A (Figure 2, Additional File 4) appear biased

towards ThrbCRM1(-) cells. It is difficult to assess the specificity ECR26, ECR29, and ECR35 to

the ThrbCRM1 RPC population due to the weak activity of these enhancers (Additional Files 3

and 4).

ACR2 does not exhibit activity in many cells, but most observed ACR2-positive cells are

ThrbCRM1-positive (Figure 2). ECR65 appears to be highly active in ThrbCRM1-positive cells and

was qualitatively the most specific enhancer to the ThrbCRM1 population. Likewise, ECR9

activity is highly biased to the ThrbCRM1(+) RPC population but drives reporter activity in some

ThrbCRM1(-) cells.

This assay indicates that the active enhancers display a wide range in specificity to the

ThrbCRM1(+) cell population (Figure 2A, Additional File 4). ECR 65, ECR 9 and ACR 2 are the

most promising candidates for a regulatory element that contains the regulatory information

sufficient to promote Onecut1 expression in RPC[CH]s. ECR9 and ECR65 were further assessed

for specificity to this restricted RPC cell population as they demonstrated more robust reporter

expression than ACR2.

To quantify the specificity of each enhancer to the Onecut1(+) restricted RPCs, E5 chick retinae

were electroporated with ECR9:: or ECR65::GFP reporters, ThrbCRM1::AU1, and a co-

electroporation control. It was observed that 86.80% of ECR65(+) cells and 70.73% of ECR9(+)

cells were also marked by ThrbCRM1 (Figure 2C). However, the ThrbCRM1(+) cell population

does not consist of only RPCs. To determine the extent to which each enhancer was active in

RPCs, E5 chick retinae electroporated with CRE::GFP constructs were pulsed with EdU for one

hour prior to harvest. Approximately 30% of ECR9(+) and ECR65(+) cells are marked by EdU

(Figure 2B, 2C), which is comparable to the proportion of EdU(+) cells within the ThrbCRM1 cell

population (Buenaventura et al., 2018). Overall, these data provide evidence that the two

regulatory elements ECR65 and ECR9 are active in ThrbCRM1 RPCs.

History of ECR 9 and ECR 65 Activity in Early-born Retinal Cell Types

To further test if these regulatory elements label RPCs which produce cells with the same fates

that develop from the ThrbCRM1(+) RPC population, we used a PhiC31 lineage tracing system.

In this system, a cis-regulatory element is used to drive the expression of PhiC31, which can

activate a GFP responder vector through site-specific recombination to label cells with a history

of cis-regulatory activity (Schick et al., 2019). We combined this lineage trace system with

immunohistochemistry and cell-specific markers to determine which cell types develop from

RPCs marked by ECR65 and ECR9. For comparison, and to demonstrate that not every active

regulatory element lineage traces to the same populations at this time point, we also lineage

traced ACR2 and ECR42.

It was observed that approximately 40% and 5.5% of ECR9-lineage traced cells were cone

photoreceptor (Visinin) and horizontal cell (Lim1) fates, respectively. However, not all ECR9-

lineage traced cells correspond to one of these two cells types. Some cells in the ECR9 lineage

exhibit long axonal projections which appear to originate from GFP-positive cells in the

innermost retina, suggesting that ECR9 is active at some point in the formation of retinal

ganglion cells (RGCs). 4.37% of all GFP(+) cells were positive for pan-Brn3, suggesting the

presence of RGCs arising from ECR9(+) cells. This may indicate that ECR 9 participates in the

gene regulatory network responsible for generating cones, HCs, and RGCs. It is worth nothing

that the ThrbCRM1 lineage-trace also includes a similar percentage of pan-Brn3(+) cells as

ECR9, despite the lack of inner retinal projections seen with ThrbCRM1 and previous *in ovo*

lineage tracing of ThrbCRM1 that detected only a small number of RGCs (Schick et al., 2019) .

This is potentially due to the antibody's specificity – it may not mark all Brn3(+) RGC

populations or it may be marking cells outside of the target population, including other inner

retinal cells such as horizontal or amacrine cells.

Under the same experimental conditions, ECR65::PhiC31 marked overall fewer cells. However,

the cell types with a history of ECR65 appeared biased towards the outer retina (Figure 3A).

63.3% of GFP-positive cells were also marked by Visinin (Figure 3B) , confirming that ECR65-

positive RPCs are capable of giving rise to cone photoreceptors. Surprisingly, very few ECR65-

positive cells are marked by Lim1 despite the clear presence of GFP in inner retinal cells (Figure

3A) and reported data that the ThrbCRM1 population gives rise preferentially to Lim1-positive

HCs (Schick et al., 2019). To determine whether these cells may be RGCs or Isl1-positive HC, we

stained with pan-Brn3 and Isl1. There were few pan-Brn3(+) GFP(+) cells. However, 5.9% of all

GFP-positive cells were marked by Isl1. Lineage tracing of ThrbCRM1 yields similar results, with

6.16% of GFP(+) cells also positive for Isl1 (Figure 3B).

ACR 2 does not lineage trace to very many cells, but is nearly exclusive to the outer retinal cells

marked by Visinin, indicating that ACR2's role in retinal development is specific to

photoreceptors, which are predicted to be cones at this timepoint. The lineage tracing of ECR

42 illustrates that this enhancer's activity is not limited to the cone and horizontal cell fate and

marks a much broader RPC population, as evidenced by the pan-retinal distribution of cells with

a history of this regulatory element (Additional File 5).

At the conclusion of our screen, eighteen active regulatory elements were identified in the

retina, two of which drove GFP reporter expression in a spatial pattern that excluded

ThrbCRM1(+) cells. ACR 10.B was found to drive expression non-specifically throughout the

retina and three elements, ECR 26; ECR 29; and ECR 35, drove expression too weakly to

determine their specificity. ECR 22 was found to mark a population that excludes cone

photoreceptors (Gonzalez and Schick et. al., in preparation). ACR2, ECR9, and ECR65 best met

the criteria for our screen. These elements are either specific or strongly biased to the

ThrbCRM1(+) population, mark early retinal RPC cells expressing Onecut1, and are active in cells

that give rise to three early retinal fates: cone photoreceptors; horizontal cells; and RGCs. As

the lineage marked by ACR2 is largely specific only to a smaller population of cone

photoreceptors, the remainder of this study is focused on evaluation of ECR 9 and ECR 65.

Bioinformatic Analysis of Regulatory Element Sequences:

Though reporter assays indicate that ECR65 and ECR9 drive transcription in the ThrbCRM1(+)

population during the cone and HC specification windows in the chick retina, we do not know

what role these regulatory elements play in the GRN that gives rise to cone photoreceptors and

horizontal cells.

To determine which transcription factors bind to ECR 65 and ECR 9, we first attempted to

identify conserved motifs present within the sequence. We used UCSC Blat (Kent, 2002) to find

homologous sequences to the originally identified chick ECR 65 sequence from the golden

eagle, barn owl, American alligator, thirteen-lined ground squirrel, northern treeshrew,

chimpanzee, and human. ECR 65 is well-conserved among all of the avian species as well as the

American alligator and is conserved between avians and mammals.

When searching for the 515 bp chick sequence in the mouse genome, UCSC BLAT returned a

214 bp homologous stretch (Additional File 6A). This 214 bp mouse sequence contained a 58 bp

stretch that did not align to the chick sequence. In contrast with chick ECR 65, which is wholly

located within accessible chromatin, only 150 bp of the homologous mouse sequence are in

accessible chromatin region. The accessible chromatin extends past the homologous sequence.

Mouse ECR 65 (mECR65), as defined by chromatin accessibility, is 295 bp long (Additional File

6A). In summary, ECR 65 demonstrated both a large sequence divergence and an apparent shift

in chromatin accessibility between avian and mammalian species.

To assay this 295 bp mECR65 element for activity, we cloned it into the Stagia3 vector. When

mECR65::GFP was electroporated into the chick retina at E5 along with ThrbCRM1::AU1,

mECR65(+) cells were observed in the ThrbCRM1 population, which suggests that despite the

sequence divergence, mECR65 has retained the regulatory information for activity in these

cells. MEME motif analysis (Bailey and Elkan, 1994) of the various species-specific ECR 65

sequences revealed that three motifs appeared conserved between avian and mammalian

species (Additional File 6B). It is therefore likely the TF binding sites important for ECR 65

activity are within the conserved Motifs 1, 5, and 2 (Figure 4).

The ECR 9 sequence is within accessible chromatin in both chick and mouse early retinal cells.

The ECR 9 sequence used was cloned out of the mouse genome and as seen above, is able to

drive transcription of a reporter in chick retinal cells during the peak of cone and horizontal cell

development. Though the sequence tested is over 400bp long, only a ~270 bp span is conserved

between mouse and chick. Motif analysis of this enhancer through MEME returns seven motifs,

of which six are conserved between birds and mammals (Figure 4, Additional Files 6C and 7).

Deletions and Mutations of Regulatory Element Sequences:

To take an unbiased approach to determine which regions of ECR 65 are functional, five serial

deletions of the chick ECR 65 sequence were tested for their ability to drive reporter activity

(Figure 4, Additional File 7). The full-length/wild type version of ECR65 driving TdTomato was

compared against the truncated versions driving GFP using flow cytometry. To ensure that any

observed effects were not due to changes in the proximity between TF binding sites and the

TATA box, all deletions were oriented such that the distance of all remaining sequence to the

TATA box was preserved and these deletion constructs were compared to the full-length

enhancer in the same orientation. To determine the effect of each deletion, we calculated the

percent of GFP(+) cells relative to the amount of TdT(+) cells. WT ECR65::GFP marks about 56-

65% as many cells as WT ECR65::TdT (Additional File 8). When these control values were

normalized to 100%, ECR 65 Deletions 1-3 respectively marked 33.62%, 42.05% and 8.2% as

many cells as the control WT ECR65::GFP (Figure 4A). When deletions were made on the other

end of the regulatory element, GFP driven by ECR65 Deletion 4 or Deletion 5 respectively marks

10.82% and 5.68% as many cells as WT ECR 65. Region 4 also encompasses MEME-predicted

Motif 2. The severe loss of GFP expression upon deleting the 80 bp Region 4 suggests that

Region 4 of ECR 65 contributes significantly to the activity of this regulatory element.

ECR 65 Motif 2 within Region 4 contains a potential binding site for a bHLH transcription factor.

bHLH binding sites, known as E-boxes, typically follow the sequence CANNTG. Mutation of this

potential E-box sequence resulted in a significant loss of enhancer activity (Figure 4C, Additional

Files 7 and 8). This result suggests that the functional sequence within Region 4 may be this 6-

bp motif, predicted by TOMTOM (Gupta et al., 2007) to bind the transcription factor

NHLH1/NSCL1. Another mutation within Region 4 encompassing a predicted homeobox TF

binding site resulted in some loss of GFP reporter activity (Figure 4C, Additional File 8).

A similar deletion strategy was used to investigate ECR 9 and reporter constructs were tested

which removed the ECR9 sequences on either side of the MEME-identified motifs as well as

Motif 1, 2, 3, and 7 (Figure 4, Additional File 7). As a control, we calculated the percent of

GFP(+) cells relative to the amount of TdT(+) cells marked by full length versions of ECR9

(Additional File 8). Once again, we ensured that deletions were orientated away from the TATA

box and compared only to full-length ECR9 of the same orientation. Deletions of Region R,

Motif 3, and Motif 7 did not result in a significant change to ECR9 activity. However, deletions

of Motif 2, Motif1 and Region F all resulted in a decrease of ECR9 activity as compared to the

full-length enhancer. Examination of the sequence for putative TF binding sites led to four

predicted bHLH sites (Figure 4, Additional File 7). Site 1 and Site 2 are located in Region F and

Motif 2, respectively. Sites 3 and 4 are both located within Motif 3. We hypothesized that if any

of these sites were important for ECR9 function, mutation of one or more of them directly

would result in a change in reporter expression. Mutation of Site 4, located within Motif 3,

resulted in a 97.5% loss of ECR9 activity (Figure 4D, Additional Files 7 and 8).

Interactions with bHLH Transcription Factors:

Our screen for cis-regulatory elements that could regulate Onecut1 expression in early

restricted RPCs led to ECR9 and ECR65, which appear to be active in overlapping populations of

early RPCs that give rise to distinct subsets of retinal cell types. The tested serial deletions and

mutations suggest that both of these elements have critical regulatory input from bHLH family

transcription factors. In addition to the bioinformatically predicted Nhlh1 binding site in ECR65,

bulk RNA-seq indicated that NeuroD1, NeuroD4, NeuroG2, and Atoh7 transcripts were enriched

in the ThrbCRM1(+) population (Buenaventura et. al., 2018) and therefore also candidates to

interact with these two cis-regulatory elements. To explore these possibilities, each of the five

bHLH factors was overexpressed under the control of the ubiquitous CAG promoter in the E5

chick retina along with ECR65 and ECR9.

Under control conditions in which CAG did not drive any open reading frame, we calculated the

percent of ECR9(+) or ECR65(+) cells out of the total electroporated population. Overexpression

of either NeuroD1, NeuroG2, and NeuroD4 induced an increase in ECR9 reporter output, while

Nhlh1 and Atoh7 did not. Confocal microscopy showed that the increase in ECR9(+) cells upon

overexpression NeuroD1, NeuroG2, and NeuroD4 was predominantly in the inner retina (Figure

5B). However, individual overexpression of these three bHLH factors is not sufficient to increase

activity of the ECR9 Site 4 mutation (Figure 5D).

We detected no change to the ECR65 reporter output upon misexpression of NeuroD1,

NeuroD4, NeuroG2, or Atoh7 (Figure 5A). However, overexpression of Nhlh1 led to a significant

increase in the number of GFP(+) cells. Confocal microscopy data showed that the population

marked by ECR65 appears to expand towards the inner retina upon Nhlh1 overexpression, with

the morphology of some cells resembling multipotent RPCs marked by Vsx2 (Figure 5A, 5B).

Furthermore, Nhlh1 overexpression was unable to rescue the loss of GFP activity seen in

ECR65bHLH Mut1::GFP, suggesting that the site CATCAG within ECR65 is not only required for

regulatory activity, but possibly mediates the interaction between ECR65 and Nhlh1 (Figure 5C).

Despite their effects on ECR9 and ECR65 activity, none of the four candidate bHLH factors were

able to increase GFP reporter output driven by ThrbCRM1 (Figure 5A) or drive any changes in

the spatial activity of the enhancer in the chick retina at E5 (Figure 5B). In addition, none of the

bHLH genes were sufficient to ectopically induce ThrbCRM1 activity in the P0 mouse retina,

suggesting that these genes were not sufficient to induce Onecut1 expression at this time

(Additional File 9). These results suggest that either ECR9 and ECR65 activation may occur after

ThrbCRM1 activation or that the interactions between the bHLH factors and enhancers are not

sufficient to induce Onecut1 expression.

Timeline of Regulatory Element Activity:

ECR65::TdT and ECR9::GFP were electroporated with ThrbCRM1::GFP or ThrbCRM1::TdT

respectively into retinas that were then cultured for 8 hours to assess whether the two

regulatory elements activated at the same time as ThrbCRM1. ECR65, ECR9, and ThrbCRM1 are

all able to drive reporter expression 8 hours after electroporation. At this early time point,

similar to the 18-22 hour time point, all ECR65(+) cells are ThrbCRM1(+). ECR9 activity at 8

hours is also similar to its activity at 18-22 hours, as there are both ThrbCRM1(+) and

ThrbCRM1(-) cells in this population (Figure 6A). Some of the ECR9(+) ThrbCRM1(-) cells in the

inner part of the developing retina also appeared to be Vsx2(+) or EdU(+) (Figure 6B, 6C). These

results indicate that onset of ECR9 and ECR65 activity is not later than or dependent on

ThrbCRM1 activation.

Molecular Events Upstream of ThrbCRM1 Activity:

We then sought to determine whether any of the bHLH factors which impact ECR9 and ECR65

activity affected one or more of the factors upstream of ThrbCRM1 such as Onecut1 and Otx2,

or affected expression of the multipotent gene Vsx2. Overexpression of NeuroD1, NeuroD4, or

NeuroG2 individually resulted in an increase of electroporated Otx2(+) cells (Figure 7A).

Together with the increase in ECR9::GFP(+) cells, this would suggest that the newly GFP(+) cells

are expressing Otx2 and indeed there is no change in the proportion of GFP(+) Otx2(+) cells

upon overexpression of each bHLH factor (Figure 7A). We then examined whether this

enhancer-marked population shared a relationship with the Vsx2(+) multipotent RPC

population. Vsx2, shown to be largely absent in the ThrbCRM1(+) restricted RPC population,

marks 48.8% of all electroporated cells after one day in culture while ECR9(+) Vsx2(+) comprise

less than 1% of all electroporated cells. Overexpression of bHLH factors led to an increase in

ECR9(+)Vsx2(+) cells. There was a trend for Vsx2(+) cells within the electroporated population

to decrease upon bHLH overexpression but this was not statistically significant (Figure 7A).

Overexpression of Nhlh1 does not result in any change to electroporated Otx2(+) cells nor to

those cells positive for both Otx2 and ECR65::GFP. Staining with Vsx2 confirmed that there is an

increase in ECR65(+) Vsx2(+) cells upon overexpression of Nhlh1 (Figure 7B), as suggested by

the data from Figure 5, though the overall percent of Vsx2(+) cells out of the total

electroporated population does not change. This result may indicate that Nhlh1 overexpression

induces some ECR65 activity within the Vsx2(+) cell population.

Onecut1 staining was used to qualitatively assess the relationship between the enhancers

ECR65 and ECR9, the four candidate bHLH factors, Vsx2, and Onecut1. ECR9(+) Onecut1(+) cells

appear biased towards the outer retina, where ECR9(+) ThrbCRM1(+) cells are also observed

(Figure 2A), whereas ECR9(+) Vsx2(+) cells are more common towards the inner retina (Figure

7C). This does not change when NeuroD1, NeuroD4, or NeuroG2 are overexpressed. However,

it appears that many of the strongly GFP-pos cells that appear in the inner retina in response to

bHLH overexpression are neither Onecut1(+) nor Vsx2(+).

We observed that under control conditions ECR65 activity overlaps greatly with Onecut1

expression and there are very few ECR65(+) cells which express both OC1 and Vsx2 (Figure 7D).

However, ECR65(+) cells which express Vsx2 but not Onecut1 appeared more frequently upon

Nhlh1 overexpression.

Relationship Between bHLH Factors and Early-born Retinal Cell types

We investigated the possibility of these factors affecting retinal cell types developing from E5 to

E7. Previously it has been shown that overexpression of Onecut1 in the postnatal mouse retina

can induce an increase in cones and horizontal cells while suppressing the rod photoreceptor

fate (Emerson et al., 2013). Here, we overexpressed the four candidate bHLH factors, cultured

for two days to mirror the lineage tracing experiments, and stained for the same cell-type

specific markers (Additional File 10) to determine whether these bHLHs play a role in the

development of the cell types marked by the lineage tracing of ECR65 and ECR9.The lineage

tracing of ECR9 in conjunction with the data from overexpression of NeuroD1, NeuroD4, and

NeuroG2 suggests that these one or more of these transcription factors may play a role in the

development of Lim1(+) horizontal cells or RGCs. However, no conclusive increase of these cell

types was observed upon bHLH overexpression. Consistent with previously reported data (Li et

al., 1999) overexpression of Nhlh1 was not sufficient to induce an increase in Isl1(+) cells. Lastly,

none of the four candidate bHLH factors had an effect on photoreceptors marked by Visinin.

Discussion:

The work presented here is intended to serve as a step towards understanding the distinction

between cell fate multipotency and restriction. The expression of multipotent RPC genes such

as Vsx2 and genes such as Onecut1 that mark the ThrbCRM1(+) fate-restricted RPC population

appear to be mutually exclusive (Buenaventura et al., 2018). It is not understood what gene

regulatory networks are involved in the establishment of these two populations. We therefore

sought to identify cis-regulatory elements specific to the RPC[CH] population that function

upstream of Onecut1 and may be involved in the restriction process.

Our large-scale, multi-step screen for regulatory elements resulted in the identification of three

regulatory elements that drove a spatial expression pattern biased to the cone/HC restricted

RPC population. In addition to ECR9 and ECR65, we found multiple regulatory elements which

drove expression in non-specific expression patterns and two which completely excluded the

population of interest. These two regulatory elements, ACR8 and ACR10-A, may be involved in

generation or maintenance of the multipotent RPC population that gives rise to a broader range

of mature cell types as well as the restricted RPC populations. It may also be that the more

broadly-acting or ThrbCRM1(-) elements from this screen require further genomic context to

act specifically in Onecut1(+) restricted RPCs. Our reporter assay is demonstrably effective in

finding minimal elements that can drive specific spatiotemporal expression patterns, but we

cannot be certain that we replicate the genomic function of every assayed element given the

importance of chromatin state and the surrounding sequences. Our assay does capture some

aspects of genomic context as every active element is found within accessible chromatin

regardless of sequence conservation. Highly conserved elements located within closed

chromatin in E5 chick retinal cells were not found to be active. Despite this, differential

chromatin accessibility may not be a strong indicator of enhancer specificity in cell populations

at the same developmental time point. ECR65 in particular is accessible in both ThrbCRM1(+)

and ThrbCRM1(-) cells, yet under normal conditions is only active in the ThrbCRM1(+)

population, demonstrating that appropriate combinations of transcription factors are still

required to confer specific activity to regulatory elements.

The regulatory elements ECR9 and ECR65 mark distinct but overlapping populations of

developing chick retinal cells from E5-E6, which includes RPCs (Figure 2). ECR65 has also been

identified through DNaseI hypersensitivity in the mouse retina as "OC1 A" (Nadadur et al.,

2019) but has not been further characterized. Here, we report that the ECR65(+) population

overlaps almost entirely with the ThrbCRM1(+) population of cone/HC RPCs (Figure 2) and

excludes the Vsx2(+) multipotent RPC population (Figure 7). By combining bioinformatic

analyses of the active enhancer sequences with functional tests and previously published RNA-

seq data, we were able to connect the activity of ECR9 and ECR65 to bHLH transcription factors.

The overexpression assays demonstrate specificity in the interactions between the four

candidate bHLH factors and the two candidate enhancers. The involvement of these

transcription factors in retinal development and specifically in retinal cell fate choice has also

been well-documented (Cepko, 1999; Hatakeyama and Kageyama, 2004; Dennis et al., 2019).

For example, Nhlh1 RNA is known to be present in Isl1(+) RGCs (Li et al., 1999) and has been

observed in scRNA-seq from chick retinal cells to mark a cone photoreceptor subtype (Ghinia-

Tegla et al., 2019). When overexpressed alongside both candidate enhancers, Nhlh1 is only able

to affect the activity of ECR65 (Figure 5A, 5B) which lineage traces to an Isl1(+) population

(Figure 3). However, further investigation is required to identify and characterize Nhlh1(+)

developing cone photoreceptors and determine whether they develop from the ECR65(+)

population. Similarly, NeuroG2 has been found to be important for RGC genesis (Hufnagel et al.,

2010; Maurer et al., 2018) and involved in HC fate choice (Akagi et al., 2004). This role may

underlie its interaction with ECR9 (Figure 5A, 5B), which lineage traces to horizontal cells and

morphologically characteristic RGCs (Figure 3).

The ECR9(+) population also distinguishes itself with a subpopulation that does not overlap with

ThrbCRM1 activity. However, this ECR9 (+) ThrbCRM1(-) population that includes RPCs also

does not overlap strongly with the multipotent Vsx2(+) population(Figure 6, Figure 7). Though

NeuroD1, NeuroG2, and NeuroD4 were considered candidate TFs largely due to their

enrichment in the ThrbCRM1(+) population (Buenaventura et. al., 2018), our data did not

indicate that overexpression of individual candidate bHLH factors affected ThrbCRM1 activity

on the timescale that we examined. Both the quantitative and qualitative assessment along

with the visible increase in both Otx2(+) and ECR9(+) cells in the inner retina suggest that

NeuroD1, NeuroD4, and/or NeuroG2 mediate ECR9 activity in a population of Otx2(+) cells

distinct from the ThrbCRM1(+) restricted RPC population.

It has been hypothesized that an intermediate restricted RPC, marked by ThrbICR, gives rise to

ThrbCRM1(+) restricted RPCs (Schick et al., 2019). Lineage tracing of ThrbICR, which is bound

by NeuroD1 (Liu et al., 2008), shows that the cells marked by that element can give rise to RGCs

as well as cones and horizontal cells (Schick et al., 2019). In conjunction with the ECR9 lineage

tracing data and NeuroD1 overexpression data, ECR9 activity in cells which are neither

ThrbCRM1(+) nor Vsx2(+) suggests that ECR9 could also label this intermediate population,

referred to as RPCs[CHG] (Figure 8A).

The regulatory elements uncovered in this and previous screens can therefore be used to mark

distinct developing populations in the early vertebrate retina. OC1 ECR65 and ThrbCRM1 are

both active in the restricted RPC[CH], while OC1 ECR9 and ThrbICR activity may be marking the

hypothesized RPC[CHG] which is distinct from multipotent RPCs characterized by the activity of

VSX2 ECR4 (Buenaventura et al., 2018). Other elements found in the screen, such as ACR2

(Figure 2, Additional File 5) and ECR22 (Gonzalez and Schick et. al., in preparation), may be

more specific to either the cone photoreceptor precursors or horizontal cell precursors,

respectively, from the ThrbCRM1 lineage (Figure 8A). Though ECR9(+) and ECR65(+) cell

populations overlap with each other and other CREs such as ThrbCRM1 and potentially ThrbICR,

the two enhancers characterized here are unique in their responses to the bHLH factors

described above. We hypothesize that the interactions between ECR9 and ECR65 and their

respective bHLHs play a role in the transition from multipotent RPCs to the fate-restricted

RPC[CH] population (Figure 8B). It may be that one or more of the bHLH factors shown to

interact with ECR9 may play a role in coordinating Vsx2 downregulation and activation of

Onecut1 expression and ThrbCRM1 activity (Figure 8B).

While we have not determined which factor(s) among NeuroD1, NeuroD4 and NeuroG2

interact with ECR9 *in vivo*, the ability of all three factors to increase ECR9 activity is consistent

with a previous study demonstrating their functional redundancy during retinogenesis (Akagi et

al., 2004). As ECR9 has multiple putative E-box sites, it may be that some combination of two or

all three factors is required for the correct regulatory output of this enhancer. Of the ECR9

bHLH sites, Sites 2-4 all vary in sequence but all three sites and their flanking sequences are

highly conserved between mouse, chick and human (Additional File 7). It is also worth noting

that while the ECR65 bHLH site shares the same sequence as ECR 9 Site 3, the two enhancers

still differ in their ability to respond to Nhlh1 overexpression. This may be due to the

differences in their flanking sequences. Previous work has shown that some bHLH factors are

able to utilize each other's binding sites (Mao et al., 2013) and that the sequence flanking the

core E-box may also be important for binding affinity (Gordân et al., 2013).

Our results do not suggest that any of these bHLH factors individually are capable of inducing or

suppressing any of the early-born cell fates in the chick retina. Previous studies using Xenopus

were able to yield an increase in photoreceptors upon overexpression of NeuroD1 and

NeuroD4 (Wang and Harris, 2005). In chick, NeuroD1 has been reported to induce more

photoreceptors when virally overexpressed in the chick retina at E2 and cultured until E8.5/E9

(Yan and Wang, 1998). Our lack of a similar result may be due to differences in the

experimental timepoints, as our experimental conditions included a maximum culture time of

48 hours. Though we were also not able to induce horizontal cell or RGC fates, it may be

because the overexpressed factors require the co-expression of other TFs in order to specify or

induce particular cell fates. For instance, the prediction of a homeobox TF binding site so close

to the bHLH binding site in ECR65 may suggest that both Nhlh1 and a homeobox factor are

required to induce the cell fates observed from lineage tracing ECR65. Future studies are

required in which bHLH factors are overexpressed in combination with each other and with

homeobox factors to determine which factors are sufficient to drive early retinal cell fates in

chick.

Conclusions: This study examined the upstream regulatory events of the Onecut1 gene that

occur in chick RPCs. Guided by both sequence conservation and chromatin accessibility, we

identified two regulatory elements near the Onecut1 gene, ECR9 and ECR65, that are

preferentially active in Onecut1-expressing ThrbCRM1(+) RPCs. We find that both of these

elements are predicted to contain bHLH transcription factor binding sites, which are required

for activity of these elements. Overexpression of specific bHLH members leads to ectopic

activity of ECR9 and ECR65 in Vsx2(+) RPCs. These bHLH factors are able to upregulate

endogenous Otx2 expression, a protein normally expressed in fate-restricted RPCs. Taken

together, these results suggest a role for bHLH factors in promoting the formation of fate-

restricted RPCs from multipotent RPCs through the activation of Onecut1 and Otx2.

Abbreviations:

GRN – gene regulatory network

RPC – retinal progenitor cell

HC – horizontal cell

RPC[CH] – restricted retinal progenitor cell that gives rise to cones, horizontal cells

RPC[CHG] – restricted retinal progenitor cell that gives rise to cones, horizontal cells, retinal

ganglion cells

CRE – cis-regulatory element

TF – transcription factor

GFP – green fluorescent protein

609   TdT – TdTomato

611   **Declarations:**

612   **Acknowledgements:**

Funding:

Support was provided to ME by a National Science Foundation grant 1453044 and a Sloan

Foundation Junior Faculty Research Award in Science and Engineering. BS was supported by

NSF DBI 1156512 to CCNY and core facility usage by 3G12MD007603-30S2 to CCNY.

Availability of Data and Materials:

ATAC-seq data generated from chick retinal cells has been submitted to GEO as data set

XXXXXX and will be available upon publication. ATAC-seq data generated from mouse retinal

cells is not currently available as it is part of another study but can be made available upon

request.

Authors Contributions:

ME and SP generated the ATAC-seq libraries, planned and conducted experiments and wrote

the manuscript. NJC led the initial screen shown in Figure 1 and Additional Files 1 and 2. AG, SG,

BW, and BS generated plasmids and processed tissue for Figures 1 and 2 and Additional Files 1

and 2. BS also generated mutagenized plasmids for Figure 4. SS generated plasmids and

processed tissue for Figures 4 and 5.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The City College of New York Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee approved all animal

procedures under protocol 932.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Methods:

Animals

Fertilized chick eggs were acquired from Charles River and stored at 16 °C room for a maximum

of ten days. Embryonic days were counted from E0 when eggs were moved to a 38 °C

humidified incubator for five days.

ATAC-seq

ATAC-seq libraries were collected and amplified as outlined by Buenrostro et al., 2013. Mouse

retinas were collected from embryonic day 12.5 (plug morning equal to time 0.5) embryos, and

dissociated using manual douncing. Libraries were analyzed for quality control on Bioanalyzer

and Qubit and then sequenced at a depth of 37.5 million reads per sample. Sequenced libraries

were prepared for analysis using FASTQGroomer (Blankenberg et al., 2010) on default settings

and then analyzed using Bowtie for Illumina (Langmead et al., 2009) with default settings

except -X 2000 and – m 1, through the usegalaxy.org (Afgan et al., 2018) web platform.

Resulting SAM files were converted to the BAM format (Li et al., 2009) and the BigWig (Kent et

al., 2010) format.

Electroporation

Retinae were electroporated ex vivo as previously described (Schick et al., 2019). CAG::reporter

plasmids were used at a concentration of 0.1ug/uL with the exception of CAG::mCherry, which

was used at a concentration of 0.04 ug/uL. Reporter plasmids under the control of a tissue-

specific enhancer (ex: ThrbCRM1, ECR9, ACR2, etc) were used at a concentration of 0.16 ug/uL

For lineage tracing experiments, all plasmids (recombinase, responder plasmid, co-

electroporation control) were used at a concentration of 0.1 ug/uL. Recombinase and

responder plasmids are described in Schick et. al., 2019. Plasmids used in initial identification

screen for cis-regulatory elements used miniprep scale DNA purification (Zymo Research, D4020

or 5 prime/Eppendorf, FastPlasmid kit) and all subsequent experiments used midiprep scale

DNA purification (Qiagen, 12145 or 12243).

Alkaline Phosphatase Staining

Retinas were harvested from culture and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA), washed 3X in

PBS, and incubated in 1 mL NTM (pH 9.5) buffer for 15 minutes while shaking at a low speed

before addition of 1mL NTM with NBT(0.25 mg/mL) and BCIP (0.125 mg/mL). Retinae were

incubated with the AP substrates in the dark for 2-3 hours until the positive control was well-

stained.

Immunohistochemistry

Retinas were harvested from culture, prepared for cryosectioning, and 20 micron vertical

sections were collected as outlined in Schick et al., 2019. Sections were incubated for 10

minutes in 0.1% Tween (VWR, 97062-332) in PBS (PBT) and then blocked for 1 hour in 5% serum

(Jackson ImmunoResearch, Donkey - 017-000121, Goat - 005-000-121) in PBT at room

temperature prior to incubation with primary antibodies overnight at 4 C. Sections were

washed 3X with PBT, prior to blocking at room temperature for 30 min and then incubated with

secondary antibodies overnight at 4 C. DAPI was added at 1 ug/uL in PBT while washing off the

secondary antibodies. Sections were then mounted using Flouromount-G (Southern Biotech,

0100-01) and coverslips (VWR, 48393-106). Primary antibodies are listed in the table below. All

secondary antibodies were obtained from Jackson ImmunoResearch and suitable for multiple

labelling. All Alexa-conjugated secondary antibodies were used at dilution of 1:400 and Cy3-

conjugated secondary antibodies were used at a dilution of 1:250 from secondary antibody

stocks in 50% glycerol.

Antibody; dilution	Vendor	Catalog number
Chick anti-GFP 1:2000	Abcam	ab13970
Rabbit anti-GFP 1:1000	Invitrogen	A6455
Mouse anti-AU1 1:2000	Enzo	ENZ-ABS135-0200
Chick anti-Bgal 1:1000	Abcam	ab9361
Rabbit anti-RFP 1:250	Rockland	600-401-379
Mouse anti-Onecut1 1:200	Santa Cruz	Sc-376308
Goat anti-Otx2 1:500	R&D	AF1979
Sheep anti-Vsx2 1:200	Ex Alpha	x1180p
Mouse anti-Visinin 1:250	DHSB	764-s
Mouse anti-Lim1 1:15	DHSB	4F2-C
Mouse anti-Isl1 1:50	DHSB	39.3F7
Mouse anti-panBrn3 1:100	Santa Cruz	Sc-390781

Microscopy and Cell Counting

Images of whole AP-stained retinas were acquired using a Zeiss Axiozoom V16 microscope with

a 1X objective and Zen 2 Blue 2011 software. All confocal microscopy images were acquired

using a Zeiss LSM 710 inverted confocal microscope with a 40x oil immersion objective, 488nm

laser, 561 nm laser, 633 nm laser, 405 nm laser, and Zen Black 2015 21 SP2 software at a

resolution of 1024 x 1024, acquisition speed of 6 and averaging number of 2. For all confocal

images shown, Z-stacks consisting of 8-12 Z planes were collected and are shown as maximum

intensity projections. Cells were counted in the Fiji (Schindelin et al., 2012) distribution of

ImageJ, using the Cell Counter plug-in developed by Kurt De Vos. In the lineage-tracing

experiments and for the EdU assay, all GFP(+) cells which co-localized with DAPI were counted

first and cells positive for EdU or for cell-specific markers such as Visinin were counted among

this population. In both instances, multiple images per retina were analyzed if necessary to

reach at least 45-50 GFP(+) cells. Brightness and contrast were adjusted uniformly across each

image in Affinity Designer vector editor (Serif [Europe] Ltd).

EdU Pulse and Detection

5 uL of 10mM EdU solution was added to 1 mL of culture media during the last hour of

incubation before retinas are harvested as described above. EdU was detected using the Click-iT

Plus EdU Kit for Imaging (Invitrogen, C10640). The tissue was first incubated for 15 minutes in

0.1% Tween in PBS at room temperature before incubating with the EdU Reaction Cocktail for

30 min in the dark at room temperature. The EdU Reaction Cocktail was then removed with 3

washes of PBT prior to antibody staining.

Deletions and Mutagenesis

Deletions or truncated versions of regulatory element sequences were generated through the

use of PCR primers that began internally within the sequence and excluded the portions of the

sequence to be deleted. Mutant regulatory element sequences were generated using overlap

extension PCR, in which primers included short sequence mismatches at potential TF binding

sites. A second set of primers encompassed the ends of the regulatory element sequence and

the restriction sites within the plasmid template for easy cloning of the mutant sequence into

the Stagia3 reporter vector. Site 3 and Site 4 within ECR9 were mutated to the sequences

"TTAGAC" and "AGGCCA". The bHLH site within ECR65 Region 4 was also mutated twice, to the

sequence "CTGATGAATGGCG" to include the E-box site, 4 bp upstream and 3 bp downstream

and to the sequence "TTTCCCAAAG" to include the E-box site and 4 bp upstream. (Figure 4,

Additional File 8).

MEME-suite

To identify conserved motifs within ECR65, we used MEME with settings to find a maximum of

12 motifs, with a width of 6-50 bp each and 2-9 sites per motif. For ECR9, we used settings to

find a maximum of 7 motifs, with a width of 6-50 bp each and 2-8 sites per motif. The output

from MEME was then used as input for TOMTOM under default settings.

Multiple Sequence Alignments

The alignments between the chick, mouse, and human sequences for ECR9 and ECR65

(Additional File 7) were produced in Clustal Omega (Madeira et al., 2019) version 1.2.4 with

default settings.

Plasmids

Plasmids containing coding sequences of candidate TF genes were obtained from Transomics.

Mouse Nhlh1 (Clone ID: BC051018) and mouse NeuroD4 (Clone ID: BC054391) were cloned

using EcoR1 to insert into a modified pCAG vector that allows for EcoR1 flanked insert cloning

(Emerson et al., 2013) while mouse NeuroD1 (Clone ID: BC018241), human NeuroG2 (Clone ID:

BC036847) and human Atoh7 (Clone ID: BC032621) were cloned using a combination of EcoR1

and Not1 (NeuroD1, NeuroG2, Atoh7) into pCAG::EGFP (Matsuda and Cepko, 2004) such that

each coding sequence is under the control of the CAG promoter. The following plasmids were

previously reported: CAG::OC1, ThrbCRM1::GFP, ThrbCRM1::AU1 plasmids (Emerson et al.,

2013); CAG::iRFP (Buenaventura et al., 2018); Bp::PhiC31 lineage tracing and CAaNa::GFP

responder plasmids (Schick et al., 2019); UbiC::TdTomato (Rompani and Cepko, 2008); and

TdTomato reporter plasmid (Jean-Charles et al., 2018). The CAG::mCherry and CAG::nucBgal

plasmids were constructed by Takahiko Matsuda and reported in (Wang et al., 2014) and

obtained from the Cepko lab, respectively. The ThrbCRM1::TdTomato plasmid was made by

ligating a Not1/EcoR1 fragment from ThrbCRM1::GFP into the TdTomato reporter plasmid

(Jean-Charles et al., 2018). Candidate Onecut1 cis-regulatory elements were amplified from

chick or mouse genomic DNA with Herculase II polymerase (Agilent, 600677-51), treated for 10-

30 minutes with Taq polymerase (Qiagen, 201203) to generate Adenine overhangs, and ligated

into PGemTeasy (Promega, A1360). Inserts were sequence verified by Sanger sequencing

(Genewiz) and moved into Stagia3 after EcoR1 digestion. In cases where elements contained

EcoR1 sites, the original sequences used to amplify candidate elements were used to generate

modified oligos with Xho1, Sal1, or Mfe1 restriction sites to allow for PCR-amplification of

elements from the verified PGemTeasy clones and subsequent insertion into an appropriately

digested Stagia3 plasmid. As candidate elements could be inserted into Stagia3 in two

orientations, for some elements both possible orientations were tested.

Dissociation and Flow Cytometry

Upon harvest, retinae were dissociated into single cells as described in Schick et al, 2019 using

papain (Worthington, LS003126) and an activation solution of L-cysteine (VWR, 97063-478) and

10mM EDTA at 37 C. 10% FBS (ThermoFisher, A3160602) solution in DMEM (Life Technologies,

11995-073) was used to stop the dissociation .Cells were further digested with DNaseI (Sigma,

4536282001) and subsequently washed in DMEM prior to fixing in 4% PFA. Dissociated cells

were then analyzed on a BD LSRII machine using the 488nm, 561nm, and 633nm lasers. The

collected data was analyzed using FlowJo version 10.4.2.

Statistical tests

Statistical tests were conducted using GraphPad Prism. Data sets were tested for normality

(Shapiro-Wilk) prior to ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis, or t-tests. Significant Kruskal-Wallis or ANOVA p-

values were followed up with Dunn's or Dunnett's post hoc test, respectively.

Figure	Exp. Condition	Dunnett p-value	Dunn p-value	Unpaired t-test
Figure 4a	ECR65 Deletion 3		0.0011	
	ECR65 Deletion 4	< 0.0001		
	ECR65 Deletion 5	< 0.0001		
Figure 4c	ECR9 Deletion F			0.0016
	ECR9 Deletion 1			0.006
	ECR9 Deletion 2			0.0025
Figure 4b	ECR65 bHLH Mut A	< 0.0001		
	ECR65 hb Mut	0.0242		
Figure 4d	ECR9 site 3 Mut	0.0007		
	ECR9 site 4 Mut	0.001		
Figure 5a	ECR65 + Nhlh1	0.046		
	ECR9 + NeuroD1	0.0019		
	ECR9 + NeuroG2	0.0085		
	ECR9 + NeuroD4	0.021		
Figure 5c	ECR65 + Nhlh1	0.046		
Figure 5d	ECR9 + NeuroD1	0.0137		
	ECR9 + NeuroD4	0.01		
	ECR9 + NeuroG2	0.0164		
Figure 7a	Nhlh1 Vsx2 + GFP			0.035
	ECR9 + NeuroD1 Otx2	0.0245		
	NeuroD1 Vsx2 + GFP	0.0287		
	ECR9 + NeuroG2 Otx2	0.0098		
	ECR9 + NeuroD4 Otx2	0.0069		
	NeuroD4 Vsx2 + GFP	0.037		

References

Afgan, E., Baker, D., Batut, B., van den Beek, M., Bouvier, D., Cech, M., Chilton, J., Clements, D.,
Coraor, N., Grüning, B.A., et al. (2018). The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible and
collaborative biomedical analyses: 2018 update. Nucleic Acids Res. *46*, W537–W544.

Akagi, T., Inoue, T., Miyoshi, G., Bessho, Y., Takahashi, M., Lee, J.E., Guillemot, F., and
Kageyama, R. (2004). Requirement of Multiple Basic Helix-Loop-Helix Genes for Retinal
Neuronal Subtype Specification. J. Biol. Chem. *279*, 28492–28498.

Bailey, T.L., and Elkan, C. (1994). Fitting a Mixture Model By Expectation Maximization To
Discover Motifs In Biopolymer. Proc. Int. Conf. Intell. Syst. Mol. Biol. *2*, 28–36.

Billings, N.A., Emerson, M.M., and Cepko, C.L. (2010). Analysis of thyroid response element
activity during retinal development. PloS One *5*, e13739.

Blankenberg, D., Gordon, A., Von Kuster, G., Coraor, N., Taylor, J., and Nekrutenko, A. (2010).
Manipulation of FASTQ data with Galaxy. Bioinformatics *26*, 1783–1785.

Buenaventura, D.F., Ghinia-Tegla, M.G., and Emerson, M.M. (2018). Fate-restricted retinal
progenitor cells adopt a molecular profile and spatial position distinct from multipotent
progenitor cells. Dev. Biol. *443*, 35–49.

Buenrostro, J.D., Giresi, P.G., Zaba, L.C., Chang, H.Y., and Greenleaf, W.J. (2013). Transposition
of native chromatin for fast and sensitive epigenomic profiling of open chromatin, DNA-binding
proteins and nucleosome position. Nat. Methods *10*, 1213–1218.

Cepko, C.L. (1999). The roles of intrinsic and extrinsic cues and bHLH genes in the determination
of retinal cell fates. Curr. Opin. Neurobiol. *9*, 37–46.

Dennis, D.J., Han, S., and Schuurmans, C. (2019). bHLH transcription factors in neural
development, disease, and reprogramming. Brain Res. *1705*, 48–65.

Emerson, M.M., Surzenko, N., Goetz, J.J., Trimarchi, J., and Cepko, C.L. (2013). Otx2 and
Onecut1 Promote the Fates of Cone Photoreceptors and Horizontal Cells and Repress Rod
Photoreceptors. Dev. Cell *26*, 59–72.

Fekete, D.M., Perez-Miguelsanz, J., Ryder, E.F., and Cepko, C.L. (1994). Clonal Analysis in the
Chicken Retina Reveals Tangential Dispersion of Clonally Related Cells. Dev. Biol. *166*, 666–682.

Ghinia-Tegla, M.G., Buenaventura, D.F., Kim, D.Y., Thakurdin, C., Gonzalez, K.C., and Emerson,
M.M. (2019). Single cell profiling of CRISPR/Cas9-induced OTX2 deficient retinas reveals fate
switch from restricted progenitors. BioRxiv 538710.

Gordân, R., Shen, N., Dror, I., Zhou, T., Horton, J., Rohs, R., and Bulyk, M.L. (2013). Genomic
regions flanking E-box binding sites influence DNA binding specificity of bHLH transcription
factors through DNA shape. Cell Rep. *3*, 1093–1104.

Gupta, S., Stamatoyannopoulos, J.A., Bailey, T.L., and Noble, W. (2007). Quantifying similarity
between motifs. Genome Biol. *8*, R24.

Hafler, B.P., Surzenko, N., Beier, K.T., Punzo, C., Trimarchi, J.M., Kong, J.H., and Cepko, C.L.
(2012). Transcription factor Olig2 defines subpopulations of retinal progenitor cells biased
toward specific cell fates. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. *109*, 7882–7887.

Hatakeyama, J., and Kageyama, R. (2004). Retinal cell fate determination and bHLH factors.
Semin. Cell Dev. Biol. *15*, 83–89.

Hufnagel, R.B., Le, T.T., Riesenberg, A.L., and Brown, N.L. (2010). Neurog2 controls the leading
edge of neurogenesis in the mammalian retina. Dev. Biol. *340*, 490–503.

Jean-Charles, N., Buenaventura, D.F., and Emerson, M.M. (2018). Identification and
characterization of early photoreceptor cis-regulatory elements and their relation to Onecut1.
Neural Develop. *13*, 26.

Kent, W.J. (2002). BLAT—The BLAST-Like Alignment Tool. Genome Res. *12*, 656–664.

Kent, W.J., Sugnet, C.W., Furey, T.S., Roskin, K.M., Pringle, T.H., Zahler, A.M., and Haussler, and
D. (2002). The Human Genome Browser at UCSC. Genome Res. *12*, 996–1006.

Kent, W.J., Zweig, A.S., Barber, G., Hinrichs, A.S., and Karolchik, D. (2010). BigWig and BigBed:
enabling browsing of large distributed datasets. Bioinformatics *26*, 2204–2207.

Langmead, B., Trapnell, C., Pop, M., and Salzberg, S.L. (2009). Ultrafast and memory-efficient
alignment of short DNA sequences to the human genome. Genome Biol. *10*, R25.

Li, C.-M., Yan, R.-T., and Wang, S.-Z. (1999). Misexpression of cNSCL1 Disrupts Retinal
Development. Mol. Cell. Neurosci. *14*, 17–27.

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

Liu, H., Etter, P., Hayes, S., Jones, I., Nelson, B., Hartman, B., Forrest, D., and Reh, T.A. (2008).
NeuroD1 Regulates Expression of Thyroid Hormone Receptor β2 and Cone Opsins in the
Developing Mouse Retina. J. Neurosci. *28*, 749–756.

Madeira, F., Park, Y.M., Lee, J., Buso, N., Gur, T., Madhusoodanan, N., Basutkar, P., Tivey,
A.R.N., Potter, S.C., Finn, R.D., et al. (2019). The EMBL-EBI search and sequence analysis tools
APIs in 2019. Nucleic Acids Res. *47*, W636–W641.

Mao, C.-A., Cho, J.-H., Wang, J., Gao, Z., Pan, P., Tsai, W.-W., Frishman, L.J., and Klein, W.H.
(2013). Reprogramming amacrine and photoreceptor progenitors into retinal ganglion cells by
replacing Neurod1 with Atoh7. Development *140*, 541–551.

Matsuda, T., and Cepko, C.L. (2004). Electroporation and RNA interference in the rodent retina
in vivo and in vitro. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *101*, 16–22.

Maurer, K.A., Kowalchuk, A., Shoja-Taheri, F., and Brown, N.L. (2018). Integral bHLH factor
regulation of cell cycle exit and RGC differentiation. Dev. Dyn. *247*, 965–975.

Nadadur, R.D., Perez-Cervantes, C., Lonfat, N., Smith, L.A., Hughes, A.E.O., Wang, S., Corbo, J.C.,
Cepko, C., and Moskowitz, I.P. (2019). Enhancer transcription identifies cis-regulatory elements
for photoreceptor cell types. BioRxiv 513598.

Nishida, A., Furukawa, A., Koike, C., Tano, Y., Aizawa, S., Matsuo, I., and Furukawa, T. (2003).
Otx2 homeobox gene controls retinal photoreceptor cell fate and pineal gland development.
Nat. Neurosci. *6*, 1255–1263.

Ovcharenko, I., Nobrega, M.A., Loots, G.G., and Stubbs, L. (2004). ECR Browser: a tool for
visualizing and accessing data from comparisons of multiple vertebrate genomes. Nucleic Acids
Res. *32*, W280-286.

Rompani, S.B., and Cepko, C.L. (2008). Retinal progenitor cells can produce restricted subsets of
horizontal cells. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *105*, 192–197.

Sapkota, D., Chintala, H., Wu, F., Fliesler, S.J., Hu, Z., and Mu, X. (2014). Onecut1 and Onecut2
redundantly regulate early retinal cell fates during development. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. *111*,
E4086–E4095.

Schick, E., McCaffery, S.D., Keblish, E.E., Thakurdin, C., and Emerson, M.M. (2019). Lineage
tracing analysis of cone photoreceptor associated cis-regulatory elements in the developing
chicken retina. Sci. Rep. *9*, 1–14.

Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, I., Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch, T., Preibisch, S.,
Rueden, C., Saalfeld, S., Schmid, B., et al. (2012). Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-
image analysis. Nat. Methods *9*, 676–682.

Suzuki, S.C., Bleckert, A., Williams, P.R., Takechi, M., Kawamura, S., and Wong, R.O.L. (2013).
Cone photoreceptor types in zebrafish are generated by symmetric terminal divisions of
dedicated precursors. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *110*, 15109–15114.

Trimarchi, J.M., Harpavat, S., Billings, N.A., and Cepko, C.L. (2008). Thyroid hormone
components are expressed in three sequential waves during development of the chick retina.
BMC Dev. Biol. *8*, 101.

Turner, D.L., and Cepko, C.L. (1987). A common progenitor for neurons and glia persists in rat
retina late in development. Nature *328*, 131–136.

Wang, J.C.-C., and Harris, W.A. (2005). The role of combinational coding by homeodomain and
bHLH transcription factors in retinal cell fate specification. Dev. Biol. *285*, 101–115.

Wang, S., Sengel, C., Emerson, M.M., and Cepko, C.L. (2014). A gene regulatory network
controls the binary fate decision of rod and bipolar cells in the vertebrate retina. Dev. Cell *30*,
513–527.

Wong, L.L., and Rapaport, D.H. (2009). Defining retinal progenitor cell competence in Xenopus
laevis by clonal analysis. Development *136*, 1707–1715.

Wu, F., Li, R., Umino, Y., Kaczynski, T.J., Sapkota, D., Li, S., Xiang, M., Fliesler, S.J., Sherry, D.M.,
Gannon, M., et al. (2013). Onecut1 Is Essential for Horizontal Cell Genesis and Retinal Integrity.
J. Neurosci. *33*, 13053–13065.

Yan, R.-T., and Wang, S.-Z. (1998). neuroD induces photoreceptor cell overproduction in vivo
and de novo generation in vitro. J. Neurobiol. *36*, 485–496.

Young, R.W. (1985). Cell differentiation in the retina of the mouse. Anat. Rec. *212*, 199–205.

Figure 1. Identification and initial screening for regulatory elements active in E5 chick retinae.

(A) Generation of ATAC-seq libraries of ThrbCRM1-positive and ThrbCRM1-negative cell

populations. Chick retinae at embryonic day 5 (E5) were electroporated ex vivo with both

ThrbCRM1::GFP and UbiqC::TdT plasmids and incubated in culture for 18-22 hours prior to

dissociation. Dissociated cells were sorted via FACS into GFP and TdT double-positive cells, and

GFP-negative, TdT-positive cells. Each population was processed for ATAC-seq. (B) Visualization

of aligned ATAC-seq reads to the galGal5 genome in UCSC Genome Browser in intergenic region

between Onecut1 and WDR72 (labelled). Active regulatory elements represented by colored,

labelled lines based on activity level from alkaline phosphatase assay (C) Alkaline phosphatase

reporter assay to screen for regulatory activity. E5 chick retinae were electroporated with

CRE::AP plasmids and CAG::mCherry plasmids. Empty Stagia3 vector (No Enhancer) represents

the negative control. Scale bar in the first panel represents 500 µm and applies to all.

Figure 2 - Candidate enhancers ECR9 and ECR65 demonstrate specificity to ThrbCRM1(+)

population and overlap with mitotic progenitors. (A) Overlap between CRE::GFP expression

(cyan) and ThrbCRM1::AU1 expression (magenta) 18-22 hours after electroporation. DAPI is

shown in the last column. Electroporated retina is found above the dotted line (B) Overlap of 1

hous EdU-pulsed cells with ECR9::GFP and ECR65::GFP (cyan) 18-22 hours after electroporation.

(C) Quantification of EdU(+) and ThrbCRM1 reporter(+) cells in ECR9::GFP and ECR65::GFP cells.

Percentages of EdU(+) cells were calculated from confocal images by determining the number

of EdU and enhancer::GFP double-positive cells out of all enhancer::GFP-positive cells. Each

point represents a biological replicate with data collected from two images. Percentages of

ThrbCRM1(+) cells were calculated from a flow cytometry assay in which retinae were

electroporated with ECR9::GFP or ECR65::GFP and ThrbCRM1::TdT and the number of GFP/ TdT

double-positive cells of the total GFP(+) population was calculated. Each data point represents a

biological replicate. Error bars represent 95% confidence interval.

Figure 3. ECR65(+) and ECR9(+) cells lineage trace to similar cell fates as ThrbCRM1(+)

population. (A) E5 chick retinas were electroporated with enhancer::PhiC31 constructs and

CAG::Bgal as an electroporation control before two days of tissue culture followed by harvest

and immunohistochemistry. (A) Retinal sections were stained with GFP, Bgal, and DAPI. (B)

Markers of early retinal cell types within lineage traced populations. Sections were stained with

the markers Isl1, Visinin, Lim1, and pan-Brn3. Percentages of cells marked by these factors were

calculated out of the total number of electroporated Bgal(+) cells per retinal section. Each point

represents a biological replicate. Error bars represent 95% confidence interval.

Figure 4. Deletions and mutations reveal sites important for regulatory activity E5 chick

retinae were electroporated with full length (A) ECR65 or (B) ECR9 driving TdT along truncated

or mutated versions of the enhancers and CAG::IRFP as a co-electroporation control. Retinae

were cultured for 18-22 hours before dissociation and analysis by flow cytometry. Labelled

blocks in (A) and (B) represent the enhancer constructs labelled along the Y-axis. Grey blocks in

(C) and (D) denote putative TF binding sites. Deleted versions of enhancers were oriented in the

expression vector such that the truncated end is farther from the TATA box. Percent of

enhancer activity was calculated as a ratio between the total GFP(+) cells and the total TdT(+)

cells and scaled to the activity of the full-length enhancer. Error bars represent 95% confidence

interval. See Methods section for statistical tests.

Figure 5. Effect of overexpression of bHLH factors on regulatory activity of ECR9, ECR65, and

ThrbCRM1. (A) E5 retinae were electroporated with Nhlh1, NeuroD1, NeuroD4, NeuroG2 or

Atoh7 under the control of the CAG promoter in combination with ECR65, ECR9 or ThrbCRM1

driving either TdT or GFP. Percentages of ECR9(+), ECR65(+) and ThrbCRM1(+) cells were

calculated out of the total cells marked by co-electroporation control CAG::IRFP. **(B)** Retinae

were electroporated with ECR9::GFP or ECR65::GFP in combination with ThrbCRM1::AU1 and a

CAG::bHLH plasmid. **(C,D)** Comparison of the effect of bHLH overexpression on mutant and WT

versions of ECR9 and ECR65. Percentages were calculated out of total number of CAG::IRFP(+)

cells. Percentages of WT enhancer(+) cells in the control condition were scaled to 100% for C, D.

Percent of enhancer(+) cells in the empty CAG vector control condition were normalized to

100% for A. Error bars represent 95% confidence interval. In all graphs, each datapoint

represents a biological replicate. See Methods for statistical tests

Figure 6. Onset of ECR9 and ECR65 activity compared to ThrbCRM1 (A,B) E5 retinae were

electroporated with ThrbCRM1::TdT and either ThrbCRM1::GFP, ECR65::GFP or ECR9::GFP and

cultured for 8 hours before harvest. Immunohistochemistry was used to amplify GFP and TdT

signal. Yellow arrow in (B) indicates a cell that is ThrbCRM1::AU1(-), ECR9::GFP(+), Vsx2(+). (C)

E5 retinae electroporated with ECR9::GFP and ThrbCRM1::TdT were cultured for 8 hours and

pulsed with EdU from hour 7-8. Yellow arrow indicates a cell that is ECR9::GFP(+)

ThrbCRM1::AU1(-) EdU(+). White arrow indicates a cell that is ECR9::GFP(+) ThrbCRM1::AU1(-)

EdU(-). Scale bars in A, B, and C represent 50 μm and apply to all panels. Scale bars in B and C

insets represent 20 μm and apply to all panels.

Figure 7. Co-localization of bHLH-induced activity of ECR9 and ECR65 with early retinal

development markers. E5 retinas were electroporated with ECR9::GFP or ECR65::GFP and their

corresponding bHLH factors and cultured for 18-22 hours before harvest and

immunohistochemistry. (A) Cell quantitation derived from confocal images of retinas stained

for ECR9::GFP (enhancer), co-electroporation marker Bgal, and either Vsx2 or Otx2. Percentages

of Otx2(+) or Vsx2(+) cells as well as GFP(+)Otx2(+) or GFP(+)Vsx2(+) cells were calculated out of

the total number of Bgal(+) cells. Error bars represent 95% CI (B) Same as for (A) but for

ECR65::GFP. (C) Confocal images of retinas were stained for GFP (enhancer), Onecut1 and Vsx2.

Scale bar represents 50 μm.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7