



**University of Dundee**

## **Robo signaling regulates the production of cranial neural crest cells**

Li, Yan; Zhang, Xiao-Tan; Wang, Xiao-Yu; Wang, Guang; Chuai, Manli; Münsterberg, Andrea

*Published in:*  
Experimental Cell Research

*DOI:*  
[10.1016/j.yexcr.2017.10.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yexcr.2017.10.002)

*Publication date:*  
2017

*Licence:*  
CC BY-NC-ND

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Li, Y., Zhang, X.-T., Wang, X.-Y., Wang, G., Chuai, M., Münsterberg, A., & Yang, X. (2017). Robo signaling regulates the production of cranial neural crest cells. *Experimental Cell Research*, 361(1), 73-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yexcr.2017.10.002>

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Link to final version DOI: 10.1016/j.yexcr.2017.10.002

## **Robo signaling regulates the production of cranial neural crest cells**

*Yan Li<sup>1,2#</sup>, Xiao-tan Zhang<sup>1#</sup>, Xiao-yu Wang<sup>1</sup>, Guang Wang<sup>1</sup>, Manli Chuai<sup>3</sup>, Andrea Münsterberg<sup>4</sup>, Xuesong Yang<sup>1\*</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup>Division of Histology & Embryology, Key Laboratory for Regenerative Medicine of the Ministry of Education, Medical College, Jinan University, Guangzhou 510632, China*

*<sup>2</sup>The key Laboratory of Assisted Circulation, Ministry of Health, The First Affiliated Hospital of Sun Yat-sen University, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, 510080, China*

*<sup>3</sup>Division of Cell and Developmental Biology, University of Dundee, Dundee, DD1 5EH, UK*

*<sup>4</sup>School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK*

*<sup>#</sup>Contributed to this work equally*

*\*Corresponding author: Xuesong Yang (yang\_xuesong@126.com) Tel: +86(20)85228316*

### **Abstract**

Slit/Robo signaling plays an important role in the guidance of developing neurons in developing embryos. However, it remains obscure whether and how Slit/Robo signaling is involved in the production of cranial neural crest cells. In this study, we examined Robo1 deficient mice to reveal developmental defects of mouse cranial

frontal and parietal bones, which are derivatives of cranial neural crest cells. Therefore, we determined the production of HNK1<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells in early chick embryo development after knock-down (KD) of Robo1 expression. Detection of markers for pre-migratory and migratory neural crest cells, PAX7 and AP-2 $\alpha$ , showed that production of both was affected by Robo1 KD. In addition, we found that the transcription factor slug is responsible for the aberrant delamination/EMT of cranial neural crest cells induced by Robo1 KD, which also led to elevated expression of E- and N-Cadherin. N-Cadherin expression was enhanced when blocking FGF signaling with dominant-negative FGFR1 in half of the neural tube. Taken together, we show that Slit/Robo signaling influences the delamination/EMT of cranial neural crest cells, which is required for cranial bone development.

**Key words:** cranial neural crest; Slit/Robo; EMT; delamination; intramembranous ossification

## Introduction

In both invertebrate and vertebrate development Slit/Robo signaling exerts a fundamental role in axon guidance at the midline of the central nervous system through repulsing axons away from the midline{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. Slit was initially identified in the *Drosophila* central nervous system as a secreted protein which modulates the growth and migration of glia cells{ ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Rothberg</Author><Year>1988</Year><RecNum>4</RecNum><DisplayText>[3]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>4</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">4</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Rothberg, J. M.</author><author>Hartley, D. A.</author><author>Walther, Z.</author><author>Artavanis-Tsakonas, S.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Department of Biology, Yale

University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520.</auth-address><titles><title>slit: an EGF-homologous locus of *D. melanogaster* involved in the development of the embryonic central nervous system</title><secondary-title>Cell</secondary-title><alt-title>Cell</alt-title></titles><pages>1047-59</pages><volume>55</volume><number>6</number><keywords><keyword>Alleles</keyword><keyword>Amino Acid Sequence</keyword><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Base Sequence</keyword><keyword>Central Nervous System/\*embryology</keyword><keyword>Chromosome Mapping</keyword><keyword>Drosophila melanogaster</keyword><keyword>Epidermal Growth Factor/\*genetics</keyword><keyword>Immunohistochemistry</keyword><keyword>Molecular Sequence Data</keyword><keyword>Molecular Weight</keyword><keyword>Mutation</keyword></keywords><dates><year>1988</year><pub-dates><date>Dec 23</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0092-8674 (Print)&#xD;0092-8674

(Linking)</isbn><accession-num>3144436</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url><http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3144436></url></related-urls></urls></record>

</Cite></EndNote>}. The mammalian Slit family is composed of three members, Slit1, Slit2 and Slit3, which are expressed in the neural tube during neurulation. Slit1 is principally expressed in the nervous system, and Slit2 and Slit3 are also present in tissues outside of the nervous system{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. The receptors for Slit/ Robo transmembrane proteins, including Robo1, Robo2, Robo3/RIG-1 and Robo4, are predominately expressed on axon growth cones in the central nervous system { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA } } { HYPERLINK \l "\_ENREF\_6" \o "Seeger, 1993 #7" }. In addition to its role in neuron development, Slit/Robo signaling also functions in the development of the lung, kidney, heart, muscle and reproductive system{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. Furthermore, Slit/Robo has been implicated in a variety of pathological conditions, such as cancer and inflammation{ ADDIN EN.CITE {

ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. The role of Slit/Robo signaling in the regulation of cranial neural crest cell (cNCC) production remains poorly understood, although there have been reports on Slit/Robo dependent interactions of cNCC with ectodermal placodes during cranial ganglia formation { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. Many investigations have focused on Slit/Robo functions in trunk neural crest{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. In this study, we address the function of Slit/Robo signaling during cranial neural crest production since cNCC generation is different from that of trunk NCC.

Neural crest cells (NCCs) derive from the dorsal side of the neural tube during early embryo development. NCCs are a population of multipotent cells, which undergo the process of induction, delamination, epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT), migration, and eventually give rise to cellular components in almost every organ system in vertebrates { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Hall</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>431</RecNum><DisplayText>[20]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>431</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">431</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Hall, B. K.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Department of Biology,Dalhousie University, Halifax NS Canada, B3H 4J1. bkh@dal.ca</auth-address><titles><title>The neural crest and neural crest cells: discovery and significance for theories of embryonic organization</title><secondary-title>J Biosci</secondary-title><alt-title>Journal of biosciences</alt-title></titles><pages>781-93</pages><volume>33</volume><number>5</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Biological Evolution</keyword><keyword>Chick Embryo</keyword><keyword>Developmental Biology/history</keyword><keyword>History, 19th Century</keyword><keyword>History, 20th Century</keyword><keyword>History, 21st Century</keyword><keyword>Neural

Crest/\*cytology</keyword><keyword>Research/history</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2008</year><pub-dates><date>Dec</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0250-5991 (Print)&#xD;0250-5991 (Linking)</isbn><accession-num>19179766</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19179766</url></related-urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}. The induction of neural crest at the border of the neural plate relies on signaling molecules from the surrounding neuroepithelium, neural plate and underlying mesoderm { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. The signaling molecules produced by these tissues include bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs), Wnts, fibroblast growth factors (FGFs) and retinoic acid (RA){ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. An initial BMP gradient activity specifies the neural crest cells at the border of neural plate. The concerted action of Wnt proteins, fibroblast growth factors (FGFs) and retinoic acid (RA) then convert the cells of neural plate border into neural crest cells{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. EMT in neural crest cells is modulated by a number of transcription factor families, including slug, sox, and endothelins (Ets) gene families. These transcription factors regulate cell–cell and cell–matrix adhesion and the detachment of neural crest cells from the neuroepithelium{ ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Theveneau</Author><RecNum>259</RecNum><DisplayText>[14]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>259</rec-number><foreign-keys><key key="EN" db-id="awwv559rixwr5bevsl590ftztsaz0trrx5">259</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Theveneau, E.</author><author>Mayor, R.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Cell and Developmental Biology Department, University College London, London, UK.</auth-address><titles><title>Neural crest migration: interplay between chemorepellents, chemoattractants, contact inhibition, epithelial-mesenchymal transition, and collective cell migration</title><secondary-title>Wiley Interdiscip Rev Dev Biol</secondary-title><alt-title>Wiley interdisciplinary

reviews</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Wiley Interdiscip Rev Dev  
 Biol</full-title><abbr-1>Wiley interdisciplinary  
 reviews</abbr-1></periodical><alt-periodical><full-title>Wiley Interdiscip Rev Dev  
 Biol</full-title><abbr-1>Wiley interdisciplinary  
 reviews</abbr-1></alt-periodical><pages>435-45</pages><volume>1</volume><nu  
 mber>3</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>\*Cell  
 Movement</keyword><keyword>Chemotactic  
 Factors/\*metabolism</keyword><keyword>\*Contact  
 Inhibition</keyword><keyword>\*Epithelial-Mesenchymal  
 Transition</keyword><keyword>Humans</keyword><keyword>Neural  
 Crest/\*cytology</keyword></keywords><dates><pub-dates><date>May-Jun</date>  
 </pub-dates></dates><isbn>1759-7692  
 (Electronic)</isbn><accession-num>23801492</accession-num><urls><related-urls>  
 <url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMe  
 d&dopt=Citation&list\_uids=23801492  
 </url></related-urls></urls><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>  
 }.

Massive delamination from the neuroepithelium is characteristic for cranial  
 neural crest cells { ADDIN EN.CITE  
 <EndNote><Cite><Author>Theveneau</Author><RecNum>260</RecNum><Displa  
 yText>[27]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>260</rec-number><foreign-keys><  
 key db-id="awwv559rixwr5bevszl590ftztsaz0trrx5">260</key></foreign-keys><ref-typ  
 e name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Theveneau,  
 E.</author><author>Mayor,  
 R.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Department of Cell and  
 Developmental Biology, University College London, United  
 Kingdom.</auth-address><titles><title>Collective cell migration of the cephalic  
 neural crest: the art of integrating  
 information</title><secondary-title>Genesis</secondary-title></titles><periodical><

full-title>Genesis</full-title></periodical><pages>164-76</pages><volume>49</vol  
 ume><number>4</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>  
 Bone and Bones/embryology</keyword><keyword>Cell  
 Communication/physiology</keyword><keyword>Cell  
 Movement/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Embryonic  
 Development/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Humans</keyword><keyword>Ma  
 xillofacial  
 Development/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Metalloproteases/metabolism</key  
 word><keyword>Neural Crest/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Peripheral  
 Nervous System/embryology</keyword><keyword>Skull/anatomy &  
 histology/\*embryology</keyword></keywords><dates><pub-dates><date>Apr</date  
 ></pub-dates></dates><isbn>1526-968X (Electronic)&#xD;1526-954X  
 (Linking)</isbn><accession-num>21157935</accession-num><urls><related-urls><  
 url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed  
 &dopt=Citation&list\_uids=21157935  
 </url></related-urls></urls><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>

}, however the timing for cranial neural crest production varies between chick, mouse  
 and Xenopus{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. In chick embryos,  
 NCC delaminate concomitantly with the fusion of the neural folds, whereas in mouse  
 and Xenopus NCC depart when the neural plate is still open{ ADDIN EN.CITE {  
 ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. P53 is a crucial factor controlling the timing of  
 delamination/EMT of cephalic neural crest cells by repressing the transcription factors,  
 slug and Ets1, which then promotes EMT { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN  
 EN.CITE.DATA }}. The regulation of delamination of cNCC is governed by different  
 mechanisms, in part due to specific morphological characteristics: cNCC are not  
 adjacent to somitic mesoderm as trunk NCC are, instead they receive signals from  
 cranial mesenchyme. Cranial neural crest cells (cNCC) contribute to craniofacial  
 skeleton, cranial ganglia of the sensory nervous system, enteric nervous system,  
 Schwann cells, the wall of the aorta and cardiac septa{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN  
 EN.CITE.DATA }}. The abnormal development of neural crest can result in

congenital malformations, such as neural tube defects (NTD), atrioventricular septal defects, persistent ductus arteriosus and Waardenburg syndrome{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}{ HYPERLINK \l "\_ENREF\_31" \o "Bergeron, 2016 #8" }{ HYPERLINK \l "\_ENREF\_31" \o "Weston, 1981 #442" }.

Slit/Robo signaling has been shown to be involved in the guidance of cranial neural crest cell migration. For example, Slit/Robo signaling is indispensable for organizing neural crest cells and placode-derived neurons to form the trigeminal ganglion { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Shiau</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>444</RecNum><DisplayText>[16]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>444</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">444</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Shiau, C. E.</author><author>Bronner-Fraser, M.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Division of Biology 139-74, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA.</auth-address><titles><title>N-cadherin acts in concert with Slit1-Robo2 signaling in regulating aggregation of placode-derived cranial sensory neurons</title><secondary-title>Development</secondary-title><alt-title>Development</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Development</full-title><abbr-1>Development</abbr-1></periodical><alt-periodical><full-title>Development</full-title><abbr-1>Development</abbr-1></alt-periodical><pages>4155-64</pages><volume>136</volume><number>24</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Cadherins/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Cell Adhesion/physiology</keyword><keyword>Chick Embryo</keyword><keyword>Gene Expression Regulation, Developmental</keyword><keyword>Nerve Tissue Proteins/\*metabolism</keyword><keyword>Neural Crest/cytology/physiology</keyword><keyword>Neurogenesis/physiology</keyword><keyword>Receptors, Immunologic/\*metabolism</keyword><keyword>Sensory

Receptor Cells/cytology/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Signal Transduction</keyword><keyword>Trigeminal Ganglion/cytology/embryology/\*physiology</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2009</year><pub-dates><date>Dec</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>1477-9129 (Electronic)&#xD;0950-1991 (Linking)</isbn><accession-num>19934013</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19934013</url></related-urls></urls><custom2>2781051</custom2><electronic-resource-num>10.1242/dev.034355</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote>}. Slit/Robo signaling is also involved in preventing neuronal and glial neural crest cells from entering the dorsolateral route and the gut { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA } }. However, our experimental data indicated that Slit/Robo signaling might be involved in regulating earlier events during cNCC production. In this study, we employed *Robo1*<sup>+/-</sup>*Robo2*<sup>+/-</sup> double-heterozygous mice (*Robo1/2*<sup>+/-</sup>) and combined this with *Robo1* gain-of-function approaches in early chick embryos to investigate the molecular mechanism of cNCC production.

## Materials and Methods

### *Mouse experiments and alizarin red s staining of whole embryos*

*Robo1*<sup>+/-</sup> *Robo2*<sup>+/-</sup> double-heterozygous mice were purchased from MMRRC/University of Missouri. They were crossed to obtain *Robo1*<sup>+/+</sup> *Robo2*<sup>+/+</sup> wild-type and *Robo1*<sup>+/-</sup> *Robo2*<sup>+/-</sup> double-heterozygous controls, as well as *Robo1*<sup>-/-</sup> *Robo2*<sup>-/-</sup> double-knock-out embryos, which were analyzed at E15.5.

To visualize the vertebrate skeleton, the 15.5-day mouse embryos were stained with alizarin red dyes as previously described { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Solloway</Author><Year>1998</Year><RecNum>446</RecNum><DisplayText>[36]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>446</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">446</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Solloway, M.

J. Dudley, A. T. Bikoff, E.  
K. Lyons, K. M. Hogan, B.  
L. Robertson, E.

Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. Mice lacking Bmp6 function

Developmental

genetics 321-39 22 4

Animals Bone Morphogenetic Protein 6 Bone Morphogenetic Proteins/deficiency/genetics Chimera

Clone Cells/physiology Embryonic and Fetal Development/physiology Gestational

Age Male Mice Mice, Mutant

Strains Mutation Osteogenesis Phenotype Signal

Transduction/physiology Stem

Cells/physiology Sternum/embryology 1998 0192-253X (Print) 0192-253X

(Linking) 9664685 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9664685>

10.1002/(SICI)1520-6408(1998)22:4<321::AID-DVG3>3.0.CO;2-8

}. Briefly, embryos were fixed in 95% ethanol for 3 days, skin and viscera were carefully removed and embryos were post-fixed for 1 week. Next, embryos were stained in 0.1% alizarin red (Solarbio, Beijing, China) dyes in 70% ethanol for 1 week and then cleared in 25% glycerol/1% KOH for 3 days. Finally, embryos were treated in a graded series of glycerol. The skeletons were dissected and photographed using a stereomicroscope

(Olympus MVX10, Japan). For each genotype replicates of at least 6 embryos were examined and 6 sections were counted for each embryo. All animal experiments were performed according to relevant national and international guidelines and approved by the Medical Research Animal Ethics Committee of Jinan University.

### ***Chick embryos and gene transfection***

Fertilized leghorn eggs were acquired from the Avian Farm of South China Agriculture University. They were incubated in a humidified incubator (Yiheng Instruments, Shanghai, China) set at 38°C with 70% humidity. The eggs were incubated until *chick* embryos reached the desired developmental stage (according to Hamburger and Hamilton 1992).

Empty vector pMES was generously supplied by Catherine Krull. The shRNA-Robo1, used for silencing Robo1 expression, was purchased from Open Biosystems. FL-Robo1, a full length rat Robo1 cDNA ligated into pMES, was used for over-expressing Robo1 expression. HH3 (Hamburger and Hamilton stage 3){

ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Hamburger</Author><Year>1992</Year><RecNum>37  
</RecNum><DisplayText>[37]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>37</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="z2spttrpmvdp5derz9nvdvakffvzte5twa9x">37</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Hamburger, V.</author><author>Hamilton, H. L.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Department of Zoology, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.</auth-address><titles><title>A series of normal stages in the development of the chick embryo. 1951</title><secondary-title>Dev Dyn</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Dev Dyn</full-title></periodical><pages>231-72</pages><volume>195</volume><number>4</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Blastocyst</keyword><keyword>Branchial Region/embryology</keyword><keyword>Chick

Embryo/\*embryology</keyword><keyword>Extraembryonic  
 Membranes/embryology</keyword><keyword>Extremities/embryology</keyword><  
 keyword>Eye/embryology</keyword><keyword>Feathers/embryology</keyword><  
 keyword>Gastrula</keyword><keyword>History, 20th  
 Century</keyword></keywords><dates><year>1992</year><pub-dates><date>Dec<  
 /date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>1058-8388 (Print)&#xD;1058-8388  
 (Linking)</isbn><accession-num>1304821</accession-num><urls><related-urls><ur  
 l>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&amp;db=PubMed&a  
 mp;dopt=Citation&amp;list\_uids=1304821  
 </url></related-urls></urls><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>  
 } chick embryos were prepared for early chick culture, according to methods  
 previously described { ADDIN EN.CITE  
 <EndNote><Cite><Author>Chapman</Author><Year>2001</Year><RecNum>448<  
 /RecNum><DisplayText>[38]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>448</rec-numbe  
 r><foreign-keys><key app="EN"  
 db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">448</key></foreign-keys><ref-type  
 name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Chapman, S.  
 C.</author><author>Collignon, J.</author><author>Schoenwolf, G.  
 C.</author><author>Lumsden,  
 A.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>MRC Centre for  
 Developmental Neurobiology, King's College London, Guy's Hospital,  
 London, United Kingdom.  
 susan.chapman@kcl.ac.uk</auth-address><titles><title>Improved method for chick  
 whole-embryo culture using a filter paper carrier</title><secondary-title>Dev  
 Dyn</secondary-title><alt-title>Developmental dynamics : an official publication of  
 the American Association of  
 Anatomists</alt-title></titles><pages>284-9</pages><volume>220</volume><numb  
 er>3</number><keywords><keyword>Agar</keyword><keyword>Albumins</keyw  
 ord><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Chick  
 Embryo/\*embryology</keyword><keyword>Culture

Techniques/instrumentation/\*methods</keyword><keyword>Paper</keyword></key  
words><dates><year>2001</year><pub-dates><date>Mar</date></pub-dates></date  
s><isbn>1058-8388 (Print)&#xD;1058-8388  
(Linking)</isbn><accession-num>11241836</accession-num><urls><related-urls><  
url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11241836</url></related-urls></urls><elec  
tronic-resource-num>10.1002/1097-0177(20010301)220:3<lt;284::AID-DVDY1102  
&gt;3.0.CO;2-5</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote> } . The  
embryos were transfected with plasmid vectors encoding Control-*GFP*,  
*shRAN-Robo1-GFP* or *PMES-Robo1-GFP* gene by electroporation. Briefly, 0.5 µl  
plasmid DNA (1.5 mg/ml) was microinjected into the space between the vitelline  
membrane and the epiblast of *chick* embryos during gastrulation. The electroporation  
parameters used were as previously described { ADDIN EN.CITE  
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Yang</Author><Year>2002</Year><RecNum>449</Rec  
Num><DisplayText>[39]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>449</rec-number><f  
oreign-keys><key app="EN"  
db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwlp5a5x29rpsva">449</key></foreign-keys><ref-type  
name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Yang,  
X.</author><author>Dormann, D.</author><author>Munsterberg, A.  
E.</author><author>Weijer, C.  
J.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Division of Cell and  
Developmental Biology, Wellcome Trust Biocentre, University of Dundee, Dundee  
DD1 5EH, Scotland, United Kingdom.</auth-address><titles><title>Cell movement  
patterns during gastrulation in the chick are controlled by positive and negative  
chemotaxis mediated by FGF4 and FGF8</title><secondary-title>Dev  
Cell</secondary-title><alt-title>Developmental  
cell</alt-title></titles><pages>425-37</pages><volume>3</volume><number>3</nu  
mber><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Cell  
Lineage</keyword><keyword>Cell Movement</keyword><keyword>Cells,  
Cultured</keyword><keyword>Chemotaxis/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Chic  
k Embryo/\*growth & development</keyword><keyword>Fibroblast Growth

Factor 8</keyword><keyword>Fibroblast Growth  
 Factors/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Gastrula/cytology/\*physiology</keyword  
 ><keyword>Green Fluorescent  
 Proteins</keyword><keyword>Head/embryology</keyword><keyword>Luminescen  
 t Proteins/metabolism</keyword><keyword>Models,  
 Biological</keyword><keyword>Morphogenesis</keyword><keyword>Notochord/e  
 mbryology</keyword><keyword>Signal  
 Transduction</keyword><keyword>Transplants</keyword></keywords><dates><ye  
 ar>2002</year><pub-dates><date>Sep</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>1534-580  
 7 (Print)&#xD;1534-5807  
 (Linking)</isbn><accession-num>12361604</accession-num><urls><related-urls><  
 url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12361604</url></related-urls></urls></rec  
 ord></Cite></EndNote>}. For one-sided gene transfection, the polarity of the pulses  
 was kept constant. After electroporation, the embryos were incubated for 30 hours.  
 The embryos were photographed and fixed for immunofluorescent staining and *in situ*  
 hybridization. All experiments were performed in replicates of at least 14 embryos.

### ***Immunostaining***

Immunofluorescent staining was performed on whole-mount embryos using HNK1, PAX7, AP-2 $\alpha$ , E-Cadherin and N-Cadherin antibodies, as previously described { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. Briefly, embryos were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) at 4°C overnight and then washed with PBS. Unspecific immunoreactions were blocked using 2% Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) + 1% Triton-X + 1% Tween 20 in PBS for 2 hours at room temperature. The embryos were washed in PBS and incubated with primary monoclonal antibody raised against PAX7 (1:100, DSHB), N-Cadherin (1:100, 6B3, DSHB), HNK1 (1:200, Sigma) and E-Cadherin (1:100, BD), overnight at 4°C on a shaker. Following extensive washing, the embryos were incubated in goat anti-mouse IgG secondary antibody conjugated to Alexa Fluor 555 (1:1000, Invitrogen) overnight at 4°C. All embryos were counterstained with DAPI (4'-6-Diamidino-2-phenylindole, 1:1000,

Invitrogen) for 30 min at room temperature. All immunofluorescent staining was performed in replicates of at least 6 embryos.

After immunofluorescent staining, the whole-mount embryos were photographed by using a stereo-fluorescence microscope (Olympus MVX10; OLYMPUS, Tokyo, Japan) and processed with Olympus software package Image-Pro Plus 7.0. Then, the embryos were sectioned into 15- $\mu$ m thick slices by using a cryostat microtome (Leica CM1900; LEICA, Solms, Germany) and photographed by using an epi-fluorescent microscope (Olympus IX51, Leica DM 4000B) at a magnification of 200  $\times$  or 400  $\times$ . The images were analyzed and processed by using a CW4000 FISH Olympus software package.

### *In situ hybridization*

Whole-mount in situ hybridization of *chick* embryos was performed according to previously described protocols { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Henrique</Author><Year>1995</Year><RecNum>452</RecNum><DisplayText>[42]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>452</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">452</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Henrique, D.</author><author>Adam, J.</author><author>Myat, A.</author><author>Chitnis, A.</author><author>Lewis, J.</author><author>Ish-Horowicz, D.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Developmental Genetics Laboratory, University of Oxford, UK.</auth-address><titles><title>Expression of a Delta homologue in prospective neurons in the chick</title><secondary-title>Nature</secondary-title><alt-title>Nature</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Nature</full-title><abbr-1>Nature</abbr-1></periodical><alt-periodical><full-title>Nature</full-title><abbr-1>Nature</abbr-1></alt-periodical><pages>787-90</pages><volume>375</volume><number>6534</number><keywords><keyword>Amino Acid Sequence</keyword><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Base

Sequence</keyword><keyword>Cell Differentiation</keyword><keyword>Central Nervous System/cytology/\*embryology/metabolism</keyword><keyword>Chick Embryo</keyword><keyword>\*Gene Expression Regulation, Developmental</keyword><keyword>Intracellular Signaling Peptides and Proteins</keyword><keyword>Membrane Proteins/biosynthesis/chemistry/\*genetics</keyword><keyword>Molecular Sequence Data</keyword><keyword>Neurons/cytology/\*metabolism</keyword><keyword>Receptors, Cell Surface/genetics</keyword><keyword>Receptors, Notch</keyword></keywords><dates><year>1995</year><pub-dates><date>Jun 29</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0028-0836 (Print)&#xD;0028-0836 (Linking)</isbn><accession-num>7596411</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7596411</url></related-urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.1038/375787a0</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote>}. Digoxigenin-labeled antisense RNA probes were synthesized against *Slug* { *HYPERLINK \l "\_ENREF\_63" \o "Leslie, 2007 #453" }* } { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA } }. The whole-mount stained embryos were photographed and 15 µm sections were prepared on a cryostat microtome (Leica CM1900).

### ***RNA isolation and RT-PCR***

Total RNA was isolated from embryonic cranial tissues using Trizol kit (Invitrogen, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. First-strand cDNA was synthesized in a final volume of 25µl using SuperScript III First-Strand (Invitrogen, USA). Following reverse transcription, PCR amplification was performed using specific primers for *chick PAX7* (5'-GCTTACTGAAGAGGTCCGACTGTG-3' and 5'-ACAAGTTGATGCGAGGTGGAAGG-3'), *slug* (5'-CTGCCTTCAAATGCCAC-3' and 5'-TCTCTCTTAGGTCAGGTT-3' ) , *E-Cadherin* (5'-CGCTTCCCCGTGTTGGT-3' and 5'-GGCCGTTTTGTTGAGACGAC-3' 60°C), *Robo1* (5'-AAGCACCAAACGAGAAGGC-3' and 5'-TCTCCCTCCTGATCCTCTCG-3') and *GAPDH* (5'-GAGAACGGGAACTTGTCAT-3' and

5'-GGCAGGTCAGGTCAACAA-3'). PCR was performed in a Bio-Rad S1000™ Thermal cycler (Bio-Rad, USA). cDNAs were amplified for 30 cycles. One round of amplification was performed at 98°C for 10 sec, at 60°C for 15 sec and at 72°C for 30 sec (TaKaRa, Japan). The PCR products (20 µl) were resolved on 1% agarose gels (Biowest, Spain) in 1× TAE buffer (0.04 M Tris-acetate and 0.001 M EDTA), and GeneGreen Nucleic Acid Dye (TIANGEN, China). Reaction products were visualized using a trans illuminator (SYNGENE, UK) and a computer-assisted gel documentation system (SYNGENE).

### *Data analysis*

We define the phenotypes of inhibition, no effect, and promotion mainly based on the analysis of sections from per embryo. Immunofluorescent staining was quantified from at least five sections which are at midbrain level per embryo, and five embryos were at least chosen from per group. Sections were randomly selected and analyzed under blinded conditions. All immunofluorescent analyses were repeated at least three times and the representative images were presented eventually.

A minimum of four experimental animals and controls were evaluated in all experiments. Data analyses and construction of statistical charts were performed using Graphpad Prism 5 software (Graphpad Software, CA, USA). Results were presented as mean value ( $\{ \text{EMBED Equation.3} \} \pm \text{SE}$ ). The data of frequency was analyzed using nonparametric tests, the other data were analyzed using ANOVA, which was employed to establish whether there was any difference between control and experimental data. \*P<0.05, \*\*P<0.01 and \*\*\*P<0.001 indicate significant difference between experimental and control embryos.

## **Results**

### *Development of the mouse craniofacial skeleton is affected in absence of Robo1*

To determine the role of Robo1 and Robo2 for the formation of the craniofacial skeleton, we used an available strain of Robo1/2 knock-out mice. We found that E15.5 double-knock-out *Robo1*<sup>-/-</sup>; *Robo2*<sup>-/-</sup> mice were smaller (11.34±0.11 mm, N=12,

P<0. 05) compared to E15.5 wild type (*Robo1*<sup>+/+</sup> *Robo2*<sup>+/+</sup>) (12.03±0.13 mm, N=12) or double-heterozygous (*Robo1*<sup>+/-</sup> *Robo2*<sup>+/-</sup>) (11.91±0.12 mm, N=12) mice (Fig. 1a-d). In addition, double-knock-out *Robo1*<sup>-/-</sup>; *Robo2*<sup>-/-</sup> mice exhibited internal hemorrhaging. Alizarin Red staining of E15.5 mouse embryonic heads revealed a defect in parietal and frontal bone development (Fig. 1e'-g' arrows) in 66.7% (Fig. 1h) of *Robo1*<sup>-/-</sup>; *Robo2*<sup>-/-</sup> mice in comparison to wild-type *Robo1*<sup>+/+</sup>; *Robo2*<sup>+/+</sup> mice. There was no apparent defect observed in *Robo1*<sup>+/-</sup>; *Robo2*<sup>+/-</sup> double-heterozygous mice. These data suggest that loss of *Robo1/2* during development led to defects in the craniofacial skeleton.

In addition, we used function blocking R5 antibody to suppress Slit/Robo signaling{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. After injection of R5 antibody into neural tubes of HH10 chick embryos, and incubation until E15, the treated embryos were smaller and had defects in parietal and frontal bone development in comparison to control embryos (Fig. S1). The phenotypes observed were quantified (Fig. S1e) and the majority of embryos showed the effect.

### ***Manipulation of Robo1 expression levels in chick embryos altered the generation of cranial neural crest cells***

Cranial neural crest cells (cNCC) gives rise to cartilage and bone of the face and skull { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Santagati</Author><Year>2003</Year><RecNum>455</RecNum><DisplayText>[44]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>455</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">455</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Santagati, F.</author><author>Rijli, F. M.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Institut de Genetique et de Biologie Moleculaire et Cellulaire, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Universite Louis Pasteur, BP 10142-67404 Illkirch Cedex, CU de Strasbourg, France.</auth-address><titles><title>Cranial neural crest and the building of the

vertebrate head</title><secondary-title>Nat Rev  
Neurosci</secondary-title><alt-title>Nature reviews.  
Neuroscience</alt-title></titles><pages>806-18</pages><volume>4</volume><num  
ber>10</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Body  
Patterning/physiology</keyword><keyword>Cell  
Movement/physiology</keyword><keyword>\*Embryonic and Fetal  
Development</keyword><keyword>\*Gene Expression Regulation,  
Developmental</keyword><keyword>Genes,  
Homeobox/physiology</keyword><keyword>Head/\*embryology</keyword><keywo  
rd>Mitogens/metabolism</keyword><keyword>Neural  
Crest/cytology/\*embryology</keyword><keyword>Signal  
Transduction/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Species  
Specificity</keyword><keyword>Transcription  
Factors/metabolism</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2003</year><pub-dates>  
<date>Oct</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>1471-003X (Print)&#xD;1471-003X  
(Linking)</isbn><accession-num>14523380</accession-num><urls><related-urls><  
url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14523380</url></related-urls></urls><ele  
ctronic-resource-num>10.1038/nrn1221</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite>  
</EndNote>}. To determine the developmental origin of the defects observed in  
parietal and frontal bones of *Robo1*<sup>-/-</sup>; *Robo2*<sup>-/-</sup> double-knock-out mice, we examined  
the function of Robo1 in the early stage of neural crest generation. Both knock-down  
and over-expression experiments were performed in chick embryos. Plasmids  
encoding either shRNA-Robo1-GFP or PMES-Robo1 were transfected into half of the  
neural plate at HH3. Embryos were further incubated for 30 hours. RT-PCR analysis  
showed that Robo1 was expressed in cranial and trunk neural tubes of HH10 chick  
embryos (Fig. 2a), and Robo1 expression was slightly decreased after  
shRNA-Robo1-GFP transfection and slightly increased after PMES-Robo1  
transfection in chick neural tube (Fig. 2b). Cranial migratory neural crest cells were  
detected by whole-mount HNK1 immunofluorescent staining{ ADDIN EN.CITE {  
ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. Control embryos were transfected with empty vector,

Control-GFP (Fig. 2c-e). Whole mount embryos (Fig. 2d) and sections (Fig. 2e-e'') illustrate that gene transfection was successful and the procedure itself did not affect HNK1<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cell production (Fig. 2c-e, l). However, after Robo1 knock-down using shRNA-Robo1-GFP transfection the production of HNK1<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells was inhibited in 68.6% of embryos as shown in whole mount and in sections, compared to 19.05% in Control-GFP group (n= 24/35, P<0.001) (Fig. 2f-h, l). Targeted over-expression of Robo1 using transfection of PMES-Robo1-GFP promoted the production of HNK1<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells (n=12/21, P<0.01) (Fig. 2i-k, l). Higher magnifications of transverse sections allow comparisons between the transfected and control sides of embryos (Fig. 2e-e'', h-h'', k-k'') and counting of HNK1<sup>+</sup> cells. Also, there were significantly less HNK-1<sup>+</sup> cells in the shRNA-Robo1-GFP embryos (17.97±1.60%, n=8, P<0.001), while significantly more HNK-1<sup>+</sup> cells were presented in the PMES-Robo1 embryos (62.32±2.48%, n=7, P<0.01) compared to control (52.12±0.86%, n=8, Fig. 2m). Taken together, manipulation of Robo1 function *in vivo* implicates Slit2/Robo1 signaling in the regulation of cranial neural crest cell production.

Next, we determined the production of PAX7<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells after Robo1 gain- or loss-of-function using transfection of either shRNA-Robo1 or PMES-Robo1 in neural tubes of HH10 chick embryos (Fig. 2). PAX7 is expressed in pre-migratory (dorsal neural tube) and migratory neural crest cells during neurulation{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA } }. Transfection of Control-GFP had no effect on production of PAX7<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells, which are shown in whole mount embryos and transverse sections (Fig. 2n, n'). However, 50% of embryos after shRNA-Robo1 transfected in neural tube restricted the production of PAX7<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells (n=9/18, P<0.05) (Fig. 2o, o', q), while elevated Robo1 expression promoted the production of PAX7<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells in 71.43% of embryos after PMES-Robo1 transfection (n=10/14, P<0.01) (Fig. 2p, p', q). We quantified the results obtained by counting the number of GFP<sup>+</sup> and PAX7<sup>+</sup> cells in transverse sections of transfected embryos (Fig. 2n' , o' p' ). This showed a decrease in

GFP<sup>+</sup>/PAX7<sup>+</sup> cells ( $54.54 \pm 1.71\%$ , n=5) following Robo1 KD ( $29.66 \pm 4.08\%$ , n=5, P<0.01) and an increase following Robo1 over-expression ( $68.12 \pm 3.63\%$ , n=5, P<0.01, Fig. 2r). RT-PCR data demonstrated reduced levels of PAX7 transcripts after KD and increased levels of PAX7 transcripts in dissected dorsal neural tubes (Fig. 2s). This was consistent with PAX7 immunostaining and confirmed observations of HNK1 staining of cranial neural tubes.

***Robo1 KD resulted in down-regulation of slug expression in chick neural tube.***

Pre-migratory neural crest cells undergo epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition (EMT) to become migratory and to emerge from the dorsal neural tube. The transcription factor, Slug, can induce EMT in neural epithelial cells. Therefore, we examined if Slug expression was affected by Robo1 KD in developing neural tubes (Fig. 3). GFP expression indicates successful transfection and merged images of Control-GFP or shRNA-Robo1 (Fig.3b, f) with slug *in situ* hybridization are shown (Fig. 3a, e). To confirm the negative effect of Robo1 KD on cNCC production, we carried out HNK1 immunostaining in the same transfected embryos (Fig. 3c-d, g-h). The number of HNK1<sup>+</sup> cNCCs was reduced as before. The quantitative analysis of the observed phenotypes is shown in Fig. 3i (n=28/36, P<0.01). RT-PCR data showed that slug gene expression in the dissected dorsal/cranial neural tube was reduced following transfection of shRNA-Robo1 (Fig. 3j). The results suggest that inhibitory effects on migratory cNCC and EMT might be due to reduced slug expression induced by Robo1 KD in neural tubes.

***Robo1 KD promoted expression of adhesion molecules in chick neural tube.***

During EMT, epithelial cells lose their cell-cell adhesion and acquire individual migratory properties. Thus, we next determined whether reduced slug expression after Robo1 KD correlated with a change in expression of adhesion molecules. E-Cadherin was expressed in the neural tube of HH9 embryos (Fig. 4a, c), the cranial neural tube and neural crest in embryos transfected with Control-GFP or shRNA-Robo1 (Fig.

4a-a''', b-b''', c-c''') and transfection of Control-GFP had no effect on production of HNK1<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells, which are shown in whole mount embryos and transverse sections (Fig. 4a-a''', d). However, Robo1 KD in neural tube increased the expression of E-Cadherin in a majority of embryos (n=15/22, P<0.001) (Fig. 4b-b''', c-c''', d). RT-PCR showed that E-Cadherin expression was enhanced after shRNA-Robo1 transfection in chick cranial neural tube (Fig. 4e).

Next, we detected the expression of N-Cadherin following the transfection of shRNA-Robo1 into one half of the neural tube (Fig. 5c-d). In comparison to Control-GFP control (Fig. 5a-b), N-Cadherin expression was enhanced in the shRNA-Robo1 transfected side of the neural tube and migrating NCCs (Fig. 5c-d). The numbers of different phenotype are shown in Fig. 5h (n=15/19, P<0.001). To confirm the importance of N-Cadherin expression for neural crest EMT we determined the effect of manipulating N-Cadherin expression on cranial neural crest production. We transfected either wild-type N-Cadherin (Wt-N-Cad) (Fig. 5f-f'') or dominant negative N-Cadherin (Dn-N-Cad) (Fig. 5g-g'') into one half of the neural tube, Control-GFP transfection served as control (Fig. 5e-e''). Over-expression of wt-N-Cad resulted in reduced production of HNK1<sup>+</sup> cNCCs compared to the control side (n=12/18, P<0.01) (Fig. 5f-f'', i), whilst Dn-N-Cad transfection led to enhanced HNK1<sup>+</sup> cNCC production (n=15/24, P<0.01) (Fig. 5g-g'', i).

Next, we determined whether the effect of Robo1 KD could be reversed by co-transfecting Robo1-shRNA-GFP with Dn-N-Cad-GFP into one side of the neural tube. HNK1 expression was restored to normal in these embryos (Fig. 6d-f). Co-transfection of Control-GFP-GFP with Dn-N-Cad-GFP served as control (Fig. 6a-c) and the phenotype of these embryos was similar to those transfected with Dn-N-Cad-GFP alone (Fig. 5g-g''). The phenotypes observed were quantified (Fig. 6g) and in a majority of embryos cNCC production was rescued (n=12/22, P<0.01). The data indicate that the Robo1-shRNA-induced phenotype - reduced HNK1<sup>+</sup> cNCC production, was rescued by interfering with N-Cadherin function suggesting Robo1 may negatively regulate N-Cadherin expression.

### ***FGF signaling regulates N-cadherin mediated EMT during cNCC production***

FGF signaling has been shown to affect production of trunk NCCs through regulating EMT{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. To investigate whether disruption of FGF signaling can affect expression of N-Cadherin in cranial neural tube, we transfected dominant negative FGFR1 (Dn-FGFR1) (Fig. 7b-b''). The empty vector, Control-GFP, served as transfection control (Fig. 7a-a''). N-Cadherin immunostaining showed that Control-GFP transfection did not affect its expression in neural tube (Fig. 7a'-a''). In contrast, blocking FGF signaling with Dn-FGFR1 transfection increased N-Cadherin expression in transfected neural tube compared to control side (n=17/24, P<0.001) (Fig. 7b'-b'',g). Furthermore, fewer PAX7<sup>+</sup> migratory cNCCs were observed on the Dn-FGFR1-GFP transfected side of the cranial neural tube (25.68±0.90%, n=6, P<0.001, Fig. 7d'-d'', f'-f'') compared to control neural tubes (55.89±1.90%, n=6, Fig. 7d'-d'', e'-e'', h). The empty vector, Control-GFP, serves as transfection control (Fig. 7c-c''). This shows that FGFR signaling is required for the production of cranial NCC and indicates a possible interaction of FGF and Robo1 during cNCC production.

### **Discussion**

Although there are differences between cranial and trunk neural crest production, both of these populations are determined by a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors include genetic networks and extrinsic factors define the microenvironment during neural crest induction, delamination and migration. Therefore, understanding how these factors are involved in regulating the delamination/EMT and migration of NCCs is essential to comprehend the mechanism of their production { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Kuriyama</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>428</RecNum><DisplayText>[15]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>428</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">428</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Kuriyama,

S. </author><author>Mayor,  
R. </author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Department of Anatomy and  
Developmental Biology, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E  
6BT, UK.</auth-address><titles><title>Molecular analysis of neural crest  
migration</title><secondary-title>Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol  
Sci</secondary-title><alt-title>Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of  
London. Series B, Biological  
sciences</alt-title></titles><pages>1349-62</pages><volume>363</volume><numb  
er>1495</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Body  
Patterning/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Cell  
Differentiation/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Cell  
Movement/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Cell  
Polarity/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Neoplasm  
Metastasis/\*physiopathology</keyword><keyword>Neural  
Crest/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Signal  
Transduction/\*physiology</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2008</year><pub-  
dates><date>Apr 12</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0962-8436  
(Print)&#xD;0962-8436  
(Linking)</isbn><accession-num>18198151</accession-num><urls><related-urls><  
url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18198151</url></related-urls></urls><cus  
tom2>2610123</custom2><electronic-resource-num>10.1098/rstb.2007.2252</electr  
onic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p>

In HH4 chick embryos, Slit is expressed in the Hensne’s node, and it appears in the prechordal plate, the notochord, and the somites at HH8 stage of chick embryo. In HH 10 stage of chick embryo, Slit expresses in the prechordal plate, the floor plate (FP), the roof plate (RP) and notochord, as well as in the early neural tube and muscle [14]. Robo1, the Slit receptor, is also expressed in the developing neural tube and proximal somites in the early stages of chick embryo development [15,16]. The neural crest cells delaminate at the edge of the neural plate, where there is not expression of Slit/Robo in vertebrates. In this study, we reveal that Slit/Robo signaling influences

on the delamination/EMT of neural crest, which extends an earlier regulative role of Robo1 in the development of neural crest cells.

As we know, many adverse nutritional or environmental factors that occur during critical periods of fetal development may have a permanent effect on organ morphology, metabolism and function at the time of adulthood{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. And Slit-Robo signaling is deemed to be involved in the regulation of cell migration, cell death and angiogenesis and so on. Mathilda T.M. et al. have demonstrated the Robo signal also played an important role during embryonic cardiogenesis. Their study reveals that the embryos without robo1 displayed the lack part of the pericardium and systemic venous return defects. In addition, the reduction of the Slit3 protein in the absence of Robo1, resulting in damaged heart neural crest, adhesion and migration, is the basis of cardiac defects{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. Slit-Robo signaling plays important roles in the axon guidance, axon branching, neuronal migration and morphological differentiation. Furthermore, SRGAP genes, originally identified as a downstream mediator of Slit and Robo receptor, may be linked to some neurodevelopmental disorders such as mental retardation, schizophrenia and so on { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Ma</Author><Year>2013</Year><RecNum>7</RecNum><DisplayText>[12]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>7</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="09rtfze9mpaes0epxwcrfp50sevp5w5dwsr">7</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Ma, Y.</author><author>Mi, Y. J.</author><author>Dai, Y. K.</author><author>Fu, H. L.</author><author>Cui, D. X.</author><author>Jin, W. L.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Shanghai Jiao Tong Univ, Sch Life Sci & Biotechnol, Shanghai 200030, Peoples R China&#xD;Shanghai Jiao Tong Univ, Inst Micronano Sci & Technol, Dept Bionanosci & Engn, Shanghai 200030, Peoples R China&#xD;Xian Med Univ, Lab Cell Biol & Translat Med, Xian, Peoples R China</auth-address><titles><title>The Inverse

F-BAR Domain Protein srGAP2 Acts through srGAP3 to Modulate Neuronal Differentiation and Neurite Outgrowth of Mouse Neuroblastoma Cells  
Plos One  
PLoS One

8  
3  
gtpase-activating proteins  
migration  
slit  
complex  
genes  
expression  
membrane  
nucleus  
schizophrenia  
protrusions  
2013  
Mar

7  
1932-6203  
WOS:000318334500036  
Go  
ISI&gt;://WOS:000318334500036  
ARTN

e57865&#xD;10.1371/journal.pone.0057865  
English  
}. Volker Endris et al. have confirmed that the lack of MEGAP srGAP3, the direct intracellular portion of this signal transduction pathway, may inhibit the normal migration of neural progenitor cells to their ultimate location in the nervous system  
}. In summary, dysfunction of Slit-Robo signaling contributes to the congenital cardiac and nervous system diseases.

Osteogenesis in the vertebrate skull is achieved through intramembranous ossification of mesenchymal cNCCs { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Santagati</Author><Year>2003</Year><RecNum>455</RecNum><DisplayText>[44]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>455</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">455</key></foreign-keys><ref-type

name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Santagati, F.</author><author>Rijli, F. M.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Institut de Genetique et de Biologie Moleculaire et Cellulaire, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Universite Louis Pasteur, BP 10142-67404 Illkirch Cedex, CU de Strasbourg, France.</auth-address><titles><title>Cranial neural crest and the building of the vertebrate head</title><secondary-title>Nat Rev Neurosci</secondary-title><alt-title>Nature reviews. Neuroscience</alt-title></titles><pages>806-18</pages><volume>4</volume><number>10</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Body Patterning/physiology</keyword><keyword>Cell Movement/physiology</keyword><keyword>\*Embryonic and Fetal Development</keyword><keyword>\*Gene Expression Regulation, Developmental</keyword><keyword>Genes, Homeobox/physiology</keyword><keyword>Head/\*embryology</keyword><keyword>Mitogens/metabolism</keyword><keyword>Neural Crest/cytology/\*embryology</keyword><keyword>Signal Transduction/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Species Specificity</keyword><keyword>Transcription Factors/metabolism</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2003</year><pub-dates><date>Oct</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>1471-003X (Print)&#xD;1471-003X (Linking)</isbn><accession-num>14523380</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14523380</url></related-urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.1038/nrn1221</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote>}. In order to investigate whether Robo signaling is involved in this process, we analyzed phenotypes of Robo1 and Robo2 double knock-out mice. This revealed that Robo1/2 double knock-out mice were smaller, had internal hemorrhaging and, importantly, abnormal development of frontal and parietal bones (Fig. 1), which are neural crest-derived and mesoderm-derived respectively. In addition, most craniofacial bones come from cranial neural crest cells{

EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}, which thus contribute to the developing face. Therefore, the potential involvement of Robo signaling in the production of cNCCs, which is a prerequisite for the formation of intramembranous bones, was investigated in early stage *chick* embryos. These are readily accessible and allow the spatiotemporal manipulation of gene expression. Targeted mis-expression or knock-down (KD) of Robo1 was achieved during cNCC production (Fig. 2). Using markers for pre-migratory (PAX7) and migratory NCCs (HNK1), we showed that KD of Robo1 expression mediated by shRNA-Robo1 significantly inhibited cNCC production on the transfected side of the neural tube (Fig. 2). In contrast, up-regulation of Robo1 expression by transfection of PMES-Robo1 increased cNCC production based on immunostaining with HNK1 and PAX7. Thus, Robo signaling is important during both pre-migratory and migratory cNCC production. This could be for multiple reasons such as effects on proliferation/apoptosis of NCCs. In this study, we focused on potential defects during neural crest delamination/EMT.

The transcription factor, Slug, plays a vital role in NCC delamination/EMT through modulating the expression of adhesion molecules{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. For example, cadherin6B is directly suppressed by Slug during EMT of the neural crest { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Taneyhill</Author><Year>2007</Year><RecNum>462 </RecNum><DisplayText>[52]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>462</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwlp5a5x29rpsva">462</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Taneyhill, L. A.</author><author>Coles, E. G.</author><author>Bronner-Fraser, M.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Division of Biology, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA.</auth-address><titles><title>Snail2 directly represses cadherin6B during epithelial-to-mesenchymal transitions of the neural crest</title><secondary-title>Development</secondary-title><alt-title>Development </alt-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Development</full-title><abbr-1>Develop

ment</abbr-1></periodical><alt-periodical><full-title>Development</full-title><abbr-1>Development</abbr-1></alt-periodical><pages>1481-90</pages><volume>134</volume><number>8</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Avian Proteins/genetics/\*metabolism</keyword><keyword>Cadherins/genetics/\*metabolism</keyword><keyword>Cell Differentiation/physiology</keyword><keyword>Chick Embryo</keyword><keyword>E-Box Elements/genetics</keyword><keyword>Epithelium/embryology/physiology</keyword><keyword>\*Gene Expression Regulation, Developmental</keyword><keyword>Mesencephalon/embryology/metabolism</keyword><keyword>Mesoderm/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Neural Crest/cytology/\*embryology/metabolism</keyword><keyword>Oligonucleotides, Antisense/metabolism</keyword><keyword>Transcription Factors/genetics/\*metabolism</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2007</year><pub-dates><date>Apr</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0950-1991 (Print)&#xD;0950-1991 (Linking)</isbn><accession-num>17344227</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17344227</url></related-urls></urls><custom2>2595139</custom2><electronic-resource-num>10.1242/dev.02834</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote>}. Here, we chose HH9 and HH11, which are the most active periods for cNCC delamination/EMT. Slug expression was repressed by Robo1 KD at both time points, shown by transverse sections (Fig. 3). This correlated with fewer HNK1<sup>+</sup> cells and enhanced expression of N-Cadherin (Figs. 3 and 4). Neural crest cell specification at the neural plate border is regulated by a series of inductive signals and transcription factors{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. After they are specified, neural crest cell undergo an epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition accompanied by dramatic changes in cell adhesion. Then they emigrate from the neural tube to reach their final destinations in the embryo{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. Many studies have

confirmed that N-cadherin has an essential role in neural cell migration{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. In addition, the crucial role of N-cadherin in cell adhesion and its interaction with Slit1-Robo2 during gangliogenesis was demonstrated in vivo { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Shiau</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>478</RecNum><DisplayText>[16]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>478</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">478</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Shiau, C. E.</author><author>Bronner-Fraser, M.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Division of Biology 139-74, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA.</auth-address><titles><title>N-cadherin acts in concert with Slit1-Robo2 signaling in regulating aggregation of placode-derived cranial sensory neurons</title><secondary-title>Development</secondary-title><alt-title>Development</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Development</full-title><abbr-1>Development</abbr-1></periodical><alt-periodical><full-title>Development</full-title><abbr-1>Development</abbr-1></alt-periodical><pages>4155-64</pages><volume>136</volume><number>24</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Cadherins/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Cell Adhesion/physiology</keyword><keyword>Chick Embryo</keyword><keyword>Gene Expression Regulation, Developmental</keyword><keyword>Nerve Tissue Proteins/\*metabolism</keyword><keyword>Neural Crest/cytology/physiology</keyword><keyword>Neurogenesis/physiology</keyword><keyword>Receptors, Immunologic/\*metabolism</keyword><keyword>Sensory Receptor Cells/cytology/\*physiology</keyword><keyword>Signal Transduction</keyword><keyword>Trigeminal Ganglion/cytology/embryology/\*physiology</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2009</year><pub-dates><date>Dec</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>1477-9129

(Electronic)&#xD;0950-1991

(Linking)</isbn><accession-num>19934013</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19934013</url></related-urls></urls><custom2>2781051</custom2><electronic-resource-num>10.1242/dev.034355</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote> }. Our observations regarding the interplay between Robo with N-cadherin during the production of cranial NCCs are consistent with these previous studies. Targeted mis-expression of Wt-N-Cadherin in neural tube led to reduced production of HNK1<sup>+</sup> cNCCs, whereas Dn-N-Cadherin transfection had the opposite effect (Fig. 5). Furthermore, the effect of Robo KD was rescued by co-transfection of Dn-N-Cadherin (Fig. 6). Our findings also suggest that reduced Slug expression resulting from Robo1 KD is at least partially responsible for the defect in cNCC delamination/EMT. This is consistent with the known expression patterns of these factors during neural development { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Dady</Author><RecNum>267</RecNum><DisplayText>[57]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>267</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN"

db-id="awwv559rixwr5bevzsl590ftztsaz0trrx5">267</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Dady, A.</author><author>Blavet, C.</author><author>Duband, J. L.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Universite Pierre et Marie Curie-Paris 6, Laboratoire de Biologie du Developpement, Paris, France.</auth-address><titles><title>Timing and kinetics of E- to N-cadherin switch during neurulation in the avian embryo</title><secondary-title>Dev Dyn</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Dev Dyn</full-title><abbr-1>Developmental dynamics : an official publication of the American Association of Anatomists</abbr-1></periodical><pages>1333-49</pages><volume>241</volume><number>8</number><keywords><keyword>Animals</keyword><keyword>Cadherins/genetics/\*metabolism</keyword><keyword>Chick Embryo</keyword><keyword>Gene Expression Regulation,

Developmental/genetics/physiology</keyword><keyword>In Situ Hybridization</keyword><keyword>Neurulation/genetics/\*physiology</keyword></keywords><dates><pub-dates><date>Aug</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>1097-0177 (Electronic)&#xD;1058-8388 (Linking)</isbn><accession-num>22684994</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list\_uids=22684994</url></related-urls></urls><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>

}. We propose that altered Robo signaling affects Slug expression and thus cNCC delamination/EMT, which is achieved via targeting adhesion molecules{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}.

It was shown previously that FGFR1 plays an important role for the development of cranial neural crest derivatives, and blocking FGF signaling with Dn-FGFR1 in NCCs leads to cleft palate in later stage embryos{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. FGFR1 mutants affect cranial crest cell differentiation and result in the activation of chondrogenesis. Furthermore, FGFR-mediated signaling is required for EMT of mesoderm cells emerging from the primitive streak during gastrulation{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. We demonstrate here that FGFR1 is also involved in regulating N-Cadherin expression and the production of PAX7<sup>+</sup> migratory cNCCs (Fig. 7) consistent with a previous report showing that inhibition of FGF signaling decreased the expression of Pax7{ ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Stuhlmiller</Author><Year>2012</Year><RecNum>479</RecNum><DisplayText>[59]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>479</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="stfsr5rv6dafwtefren59pwl5a5x29rpsva">479</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Stuhlmiller, T. J.</author><author>Garcia-Castro, M. I.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Yale Univ, Dept Mol Cellular & Dev Biol, New Haven, CT 06520

USA</auth-address><titles><title>FGF/MAPK signaling is required in the gastrula epiblast for avian neural crest induction</title><secondary-title>Development</secondary-title><alt-title>Development&#xD;Development</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Development</full-title><abbr-1>Development</abbr-1></periodical><pages>289-300</pages><volume>139</volume><number>2</number><keywords><keyword>neural crest induction</keyword><keyword>fgf</keyword><keyword>mapk</keyword><keyword>smad</keyword><keyword>neural plate border</keyword><keyword>gastrulation</keyword><keyword>pax7</keyword><keyword>chick</keyword><keyword>primitive streak formation</keyword><keyword>body axis extension</keyword><keyword>cord stem zone</keyword><keyword>chick-embryo</keyword><keyword>xenopus embryos</keyword><keyword>bmp inhibition</keyword><keyword>spinal-cord</keyword><keyword>morphogenetic movement</keyword><keyword>paraxial mesoderm</keyword><keyword>gene-expression</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2012</year><pub-dates><date>Jan 15</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0950-1991</isbn><accession-num>WOS:000298413700007</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url>&lt;Go to ISI&gt;://WOS:000298413700007</url></related-urls></urls><language>English</language></record></Cite></EndNote>}.</p>
</div>
<div data-label="Text>
<p>We showed previously that PDGF and FGF signaling influence N-Cadherin expression in migrating mesoderm cells during chick gastrulation, enabling them to migrate towards their target destinations { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. N-Cadherin might play a similar role in cNCCs migration as it does in mesoderm cells of gastrula embryos. Interestingly, Robo signaling has been shown to target E-Cadherin in colorectal cancer cells{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} and an E- to N-Cadherin switch regulates contact inhibition of locomotion migrating neural crest in Xenopus, where these adhesion molecules contribute to redistribution of forces to the extracellular matrix{ ADDIN EN.CITE {</p>
</div>
<div data-label="Page-Footer>
<p>{PAGE }</p>
</div>

ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. Thus, both E- and N-Cadherin are important for the processes of neural crest delamination and migration, and we propose that delamination/EMT of cNCCs depends on the interaction between E-Cadherin to N-Cadherin, which is regulated by Slug in response to Robo1 and FGFR signaling (Fig. 8){ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. At present it is not possible to determine how FGF and Robo1 signaling pathways interact, and further studies will be necessary to investigate whether they are dependent on each other or act in parallel.

~~As we know, many adverse nutritional or environmental factors that occur during critical periods of fetal development may have a permanent effect on organ morphology, metabolism and function at the time of adulthood{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. The Slit Robo signaling is involved in the regulation of cell migration, cell death and angiogenesis and so on. Mathilda T.M. et al. have demonstrated the Robo signal also played an important role in the development of the heart of the embryo. Their study reveals that the embryos without robo1 displayed the lack part of the pericardium and systemic venous return defects. In addition, the reduction of the Slit3 protein in the absence of Robo1, resulting in damaged heart neural crest, adhesion and migration, is the basis of cardiac defects{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}. Slit Robo signaling plays important roles in the axon guidance, axon branching, neuronal migration and morphological differentiation. Furthermore, SRGAP genes, originally identified as a downstream mediator of Slit and Robo receptor, may be linked to some neurodevelopmental disorders such as mental retardation, schizophrenia and so on { ADDIN EN.CITE~~

~~<EndNote><Cite><Author>Ma</Author><Year>2013</Year><RecNum>7</RecNum><DisplayText>[12]</DisplayText><record><rec-number>7</rec-number><foreign-keys><key><app>EN</app><db-id>09rtfze9mpaes0epxwexrfp50sevp5w5dwsr</db-id></foreign-keys><ref-type>Journal Article</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Ma, Y.</author><author>Mi, Y. J.</author><author>Dai, Y. K.</author><author>Fu, H. L.</author><author>Cui, D. X.</author><author>Jin, W.~~

L. ~~Shanghai Jiao Tong Univ, Sch Life Sci & Biotechnol, Shanghai 200030, Peoples R China~~; ~~Shanghai Jiao Tong Univ, Inst Micronano Sci & Technol, Dept Bionanosci & Engr, Shanghai 200030, Peoples R China~~; ~~Xian Med Univ, Lab Cell Biol & Translat Med, Xian, Peoples R China~~

~~The Inverse F-BAR Domain Protein srGAP2 Acts through srGAP3 to Modulate Neuronal Differentiation and Neurite Outgrowth of Mouse Neuroblastoma Cells~~

~~Plos One~~

~~PLoS One~~

~~PLoS One~~

~~8~~

~~3~~

~~gtpase-activating proteins~~

~~migration~~

~~slit~~

~~complex~~

~~genes~~

~~expression~~

~~membrane~~

~~nucleus~~

~~schizophrenia~~

~~protrusions~~

~~2013~~

~~Mar~~

~~1932-6203~~

~~WOS:000318334500036~~

~~Go to ISI~~

~~WOS:000318334500036~~

~~ARTN~~

~~10.1371/journal.pone.0057865~~

~~English~~

~~Volker Endris et al. have confirmed that the lack of MEGAP srGAP3, the direct intracellular portion of this signal transduction pathway, may inhibit the normal migration of neural progenitor cells to their ultimate location in the nervous system~~

~~In summary, dysfunction of Slit / Robo signaling contributes to the congenital cardiac and nervous system diseases.~~

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank Prof. Jian-guo Geng for providing shRNA-Robo1-GFP and PMES-Robo1 plasmids. This study was supported by NSFC grant (81571436); National Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong (2016A030311044); Science and Technology Planning Project of Guangdong Province (2014A020213008); Science and Technology Program of Guangzhou (201510010073).

## **Author contributions**

Y.L., X.Z., X.W. and G.W. performed the experiments and collected the data; G.W., M.C. and X.Y. designed the study and analyzed the data; A.M. and X.Y. wrote manuscript.

## **Compliance with Ethical Standards**


## **Competing financial interest**

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## **References**


{ ADDIN EN.REFLIST }

## Figure and Figure legends



**Figure 1** The deficiency of *Robo1* gene caused the defect of cranial osteogenesis of mouse embryos

**a-c:** The representative 15.5-day mouse images from Robo1<sup>+/+</sup>Robo2<sup>+/+</sup> (a), Robo1<sup>+/-</sup>Robo2<sup>+/-</sup> (b) and Robo1<sup>-/-</sup>Robo2<sup>-/-</sup> (c) mouse group respectively (n≥4). **d:** The bar chart showing the comparison of mouse length among Robo1<sup>+/+</sup>Robo2<sup>+/+</sup>, Robo1<sup>+/-</sup>Robo2<sup>+/-</sup> and Robo1<sup>-/-</sup>Robo2<sup>-/-</sup> mouse groups. **e-g:** Alizarin Red S staining was performed in A-C mouse embryos. Representative images of upper part of mouse body from Robo1<sup>+/+</sup>Robo2<sup>+/+</sup> (e), Robo1<sup>+/-</sup>Robo2<sup>+/-</sup> (f) and Robo1<sup>-/-</sup>Robo2<sup>-/-</sup> (g) mouse group respectively. **e'-g':** High magnification images from the sites indicated by black dotted squares in E-G respectively. **h:** Bar chart showing the comparison of the incidence of pa, fr, md, x and px developmental defects among Robo1<sup>+/+</sup>Robo2<sup>+/+</sup>, Robo1<sup>+/-</sup>Robo2<sup>+/-</sup> and Robo1<sup>-/-</sup>Robo2<sup>-/-</sup> mouse groups. Abbreviations: pa, parietal bone; fr, frontal bone; md, mandible; x, maxilla; px, premaxilla. Scale bars =1mm in a-c, 1mm in e-g, and 1mm in e'-g'. Data are represented as mean ± s.e.m. (n ≥ 4). \*P<0.05.




**Figure 2** The up- or down-regulation of *Robo1* gene expression affected the production of *HNK1*<sup>+</sup> and *PAX7*<sup>+</sup> chick cranial neural crest cells

Half-sides of HH3 chick embryos were transfected with the plasmids of Control-GFP (control), shRNA-Robo1-GFP (knock-down) and PMES-Robo1-GFP (over-expression), and the whole-mount fluorescent staining against HNK1 and PAX7 were performed after incubation for 30 hours. **a**: RT-PCR results revealed *Robo1* expression in cranial and trunk portions of HH10 chick embryos. **b**: RT-PCR results

revealed Robo1 expression down-regulated or over-expressed in chick neural tube following shRNA-Robo1 and PMES-Robo1 transfection. **The bar chart showing the ratio of shRNA-Robo1 and PMES-Robo1 expression to GAPDH in control and transfected embryos from RT-PCR data.** **c-d:** Representative bright-field (c) and merge fluorescent images (d, GFP: green, HNK1: red) of chick embryo head transfected with Control-GFP. **e:** Transverse sections at the level indicated by dotted line in d. **e'-e'':** High magnification images from the sites indicated by black dotted squares in e respectively. **f-g:** Representative bright-field (f) and merge fluorescent images (g, shRNA-Robo1-GFP: green, HNK1: red) of chick embryo head transfected with shRNA-Robo1-GFP. **h:** Transverse sections at the level indicated by dotted line in g. **h'-h'':** High magnification images from the sites indicated by black dotted squares in h respectively. **i-j:** Representative bright-field (i) and merge fluorescent images (j, PMES-Robo1-GFP: green, HNK1: red) of chick embryo head transfected with PMES-Robo1. **k:** Transverse sections at the level indicated by dotted line in j. **k'-k'':** High magnification images from the sites indicated by black dotted squares in k respectively. **l:** Bar chart showing the comparison of phenotype numbers (inhibited, unchanged and elevated production of HNK1 positive cranial crest cells) among control, shRNA-Robo1 and PMES-Robo1 transfected embryos. **m:** Bar chart showing the ratios of GFP<sup>+</sup> cell and HNK1<sup>+</sup> cell number in the transverses sections of control, shRNA-Robo1 and PMES-Robo1 transfected embryos. **n-p:** Chick embryo head transfected with Control-GFP (n), shRNA-Robo1-GFP (o) and PMES-Robo1 (p). **n'-p':** Transverse sections at the levels indicated by white dotted lines in n, o and p. PAX7 labeled neural crest cells from Control-GFP (n'), shRNA-Robo1-GFP (o') and PMES-Robo1 (p'). DAPI staining was performed for each section. **The solid line square showing the transverse section from the embryo that was transfected with Control-GFP, shRNA-Robo1-GFP or PMES-Robo1 in neural tube. The arrows show the transfected side in the neural tube.** **q:** Bar chart showing the number of experimental embryos and phenotype numbers (inhibited, unchanged and elevated production of PAX7 positive cranial crest cells) among control, shRNA-Robo1 and PMES-Robo1 transfected embryos. **r:** The bar chart showing the ratio of GFP<sup>+</sup> cell


numbers and total PAX7<sup>+</sup> neural crest cell numbers among control, shRNA-Robo1 and PMES-Robo1 transfected embryos. **s:** RT-PCR results revealed PAX7 expression down-regulated and over-expression in chick neural tube following shRNA-Robo1-GFP and PMES-Robo1 transfection. **The bar chart showing the ratio of Pax7 expression to GAPDH in control and transfected embryos from RT-PCR data.** Abbreviations: fb, forebrain; mb, midbrain; BF, bright-field; nt, neural tube; cnc, crest neural cell. Scale bars =500 um in c-d, f-g, i-j, n-p; 40 um in e, h, k; 20um in e'-e'', h'-h'', k'-k'', 30um in n'-p'. Data are represented as mean ± s.e.m. (n ≥ 4). \*P<0.05, \*\*P<0.01 and \*\*\*P<0.001.



**Figure 3 Down-regulating Robo1 gene level restricted slug expression in cranial neural crest cells**


Half-side neural tubes of HH3 chick embryos were transfected with the plasmids

of shRNA-Robo1-GFP (knock-down) and Control-GFP. **a-d**: Slug *in situ* hybridization and HNK1 immunofluorescent staining were performed in Control-GFP transfected chick embryos. **e-h**: Slug *in situ* hybridization and HNK1 immunofluorescent staining were performed in shRNA-Robo1-GFP transfected chick embryos. **a, e** Slug *in situ* hybridization in head region. **b, f** Image of Control-GFP and shRNA-Robo1-GFP transfected embryo. **c, g** Image HNK1 immunofluorescent staining one. **d, h** Merged image of DAPI, image b, f and c, g. **i**: Bar chart showing the number of experimental embryo and phenotype numbers (inhibited, unchanged and elevated production of slug<sup>+</sup> cranial crest cells) among control and shRNA-Robo1 transfected embryos. **j**: RT-PCR results revealed slug expression down-regulated in chick neural tube following shRNA-Robo1-GFP transfection. **The bar chart showing the ratio of slug expression to GAPDH in control and transfected embryos from RT-PCR data.** Abbreviations: nt, neural tube; cnc, crest neural cell. Scale bars = 30um in a-h. (n≥4). \*\*\*P<0.001.



**Figure 4 Down-regulating Robo1 gene level promoted E-Cadherin expression in early chick embryos**


**a:** Fluorescent images for E-Cadherin expression (red) and Control-GFP (green) transfection in chick embryonic head. **b-c:** Representative bright-field image (b) and fluorescent images for E-Cadherin expression (red) and shRNA-Robo1-GFP (green) transfection (c) in chick embryonic head. **a'-a''', b'-b''' and c'-c'''**: Transverse sections at the levels indicated by white dotted lines in a, b and c respectively showing E-Cadherin expression (a'-c'), Control-GFP and shRNA-Robo1-GFP transfected (a''-c'') and merged (a'''-c''') in chick embryonic head. **The arrows point to examples of co-localization of GFP and E-Cadherin cells (a'''-c''')**. **d:** Bar chart showing the number of experimental embryo and E-Cadherin promote expressed numbers among control and shRNA-Robo1 transfected embryos. **e:** RT-PCR results showing E-Cadherin expression in chick neural tube following shRNA-Robo1-GFP transfection. **The bar chart showing the ratio of E-Cadherin expression to GAPDH in control and transfected embryos from RT-PCR data.** Abbreviations: fb, forebrain; mb, midbrain; nt, neural tube. Scale bars = 500 um in a-c, 30 um in a'-a''', b'-b''' and c'-c'''. (n $\geq$ 4). \*\*\*P<0.001.



**Figure 5 Down-regulating Robo1 gene level also elevated N-Cadherin expression in developing neural tube**

**a-b:** Transverse sections of Control-GFP transfection showing the N-Cadherin


expression (a) and the combination with DAPI staining and GFP (b). The solid line square showing the transverse section from the embryo that was transfected with Control-GFP in half of neural tube (a). **c-d**: Transverse sections showing shRNA-Robo1 transfection (c), the N-Cadherin expression (c) and the merged image with DAPI (d) half-side neural tube. The solid line square showing the transverse section from the embryo that was transfected with shRNA-Robo1-GFP in half of neural tube (c). The arrows point to the examples of co-localization of GFP and N-Cadherin cells (c-d). **h**: Bar chart showing the number of experimental embryo and N-Cadherin promote expressed numbers among control and shRNA-Robo1 transfected embryos. **e**: Transverse section from the embryo that was transfected with Control-GFP in half-side neural tube. **e'-e''**: e' HNK1 immunofluorescent staining (red) was performed in the same transverse sections in e. e'' merged image of e, e' and DAPI. **f**: Transverse section from the embryo that was transfected with Wt-N-Cad-GFP in half-side neural tube. **f'-f''**: f' HNK1 immunofluorescent staining (red) was performed in the same transverse sections in f. f'' is the merge image of f, f' and DAPI. **g**: Transverse section from the embryo that was transfected with Dn-N-Cad-GFP in half-side neural tube. **g'-g''**: g' HNK1 immunofluorescent staining (red) was performed in the same transverse sections in g. g'' is the merge image of g, g' and DAPI. **i**: Bar chart showing the number of experimental embryo and phenotype numbers (inhibited, unchanged and elevated production of HNK1<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells) among control and either Wt-N-Cad or Dn-N-Cad transfected embryos. Abbreviations: N-Cad, N-Cadherin; Wt-N-Cad, wild type N-Cadherin; Dn-N-Cad, dominant negative N-Cadherin; nt, neural tube; cnc, cranial neural crest. Scale bars =20 um in a-d, 20 um in e-g and 20um in e'-e'', f'-f'' and g'-g''. (n $\geq$ 4). \*\*P<0.01, \*\*\*P<0.001.



**Figure 6** Simultaneously knocking down *robo1* and N-Cadherin did not affect cranial neural crest cell production in chick embryos

**a-c:** Transverse sections showing the co-transfection of Control-GFP and dn-N-Cadherin representative GFP image (a), HNK1 immunofluorescent staining image (b), and the merge images of a-b and DAPI staining (c). **d-f:** Transverse sections showing the co-transfection of shRNA-Robo1-GFP and dn-N-Cadherin representative GFP image (d), HNK1 immunofluorescent staining (e) and merged image of d-e and DAPI staining (f). **g:** Bar chart showing the percent of the number of experimental embryo and phenotype numbers (inhibited, unchanged and elevated production of HNK1+ cranial neural crest cells) among the transfection of Control-GFP, the co-transfection of Control-GFP and dn-N-Cadherin, the co-transfection of shRNA-Robo1-GFP and dn-N-Cadherin transfected embryos. Abbreviations: nt,


neural tube; cnc, crest neural cell. Scale bars = 30 um in a-f. ( $n \geq 6$ ).  $**P < 0.01$



**Figure 7 Down-regulating FGFR1 did not affect the expression of N-Cadherin in chick embryos and down-regulating FGFR1 restricted the production of PAX7<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells**

**a-b:** Half-side neural tubes were transfected with either Control-GFP (a, control) or Dn-FGFR1 (b). **a'-b':** N-cadherin immunofluorescent staining was performed in the same transverse sections in a and b respectively. **a''-b'':** Merged images of a-b and a'-b' respectively. **The arrows indicate the examples of co-localization of GFP and N-Cadherin positive cells (b'').** **c-c'':** Half-side neural tubes were transfected with Control-GFP (c), PAX7 immunofluorescent staining image (c'), and merged images of c-c' and DAPI staining (c''). **d-d'':** Half-side neural tubes were transfected with Dn-FGFR1 (d), PAX7 immunofluorescent staining image (d'), and merged images of d-d' and DAPI staining (d''). **e-f:** Transverse sections showing the control-side neural tube (e) and Dn-FGFR1 transfected side (f) in the neural tube. **e'-f':** Pax7 immunofluorescent staining was performed in the same transverse sections in e and f respectively. **e''-f'':** Merged images of e-f and e'-f', and DAPI stained in each sections. **g:** Bar chart showing the phenotype frequency (inhibited or unchanged production of N-Cadherin<sup>+</sup> cranial neural crest cells) among control and Dn-FGFR1

transfected embryos. **h**: Bar chart showing the ratio of GFP<sup>+</sup> cell numbers and total PAX7<sup>+</sup> neural crest cell numbers among control, Dn-FGFR1-GFP transfected embryos. Abbreviations: N-Cad, N-Cadherin; Dn-FGFR1, dominant negative FGFR1; cnc, cranial neural crest; ps, primitive streak; nt, neural tube. Scale bars = 20 um in a-a'', b-b'', c-c'', d-d'', e-e'' and f-f''. Data are represented as mean  $\pm$  s.e.m. ( $n \geq 4$ ), \*\*\*P<0.001.



**Figure 8** A proposed model that depicts the potential mechanisms for how knocking-down Robo1 reduced production of cranial neural crest cells