A characterization of adult retinal neurogenesis in the Pacific hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*) to elucidate the evolutionary origins of the vertebrate retina

by

Sarah N. Bradshaw

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

in

Physiology, Cell, and Developmental Biology

Department of Biological Sciences

University of Alberta

© Sarah N. Bradshaw, 2023

Abstract

The vertebrate retina is a vital sensory structure that has a murky evolutionary origin. Living vertebrates possess a strikingly complex retina and eye with highly conserved development and physiology. In contrast, the photoreceptive organs of the closest non-vertebrate relatives are comparatively simple clusters of pigment cells and photoreceptors. No extant vertebrates possess characters that are suggestive of a 'transitional state' that could help guide interpretations of how the eye or retina may have initially formed. However, the early-branching jawless vertebrates (Cyclostomata - hagfishes and lampreys) are in an ideal phylogenetic position to shed light upon the origin of the vertebrate eye.

The eyes of cyclostomes are vastly understudied compared to the eyes of jawed vertebrates (Gnathostomata). The available literature has revealed that both hagfish and lamprey eyes contain unique features not present in other vertebrates. Hagfish eyes are particularly notable as the eye (and retina) is small and rudimentary in form. The hagfish eye lacks pigment and a lens. The retinal layers are also more disorganized than in other vertebrates. These observations have led to the interpretation that the hagfish eye could represent the ancestral vertebrate eye condition. Recent morphological and molecular studies, including data in this thesis, now suggest that many of these features in the hagfish eye are due to secondary loss rather than retention of ancestral traits. However, further investigation of the cyclostome retina will be crucial for inferring the state of the ancestral vertebrate (proto-vertebrate) eye.

Although several studies have investigated the morphology of cyclostome eyes, data on development of the eye and retina are extremely limited. This is particularly true for hagfish, whose embryos are notoriously difficult to acquire. Neurodevelopmental data could provide new insights on eye evolution where morphological data from extant organisms or fossil data are

ii

lacking. Here, I provide genomic and RNA sequencing data that suggest many genes critical for gnathostome retinal development are also expressed in the hagfish eye. In addition, recent work suggests adult Pacific hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*) have continued retinal growth past embryonic development. Therefore, in this thesis I have begun to characterize the mechanisms driving retinal development in the Pacific hagfish (*E. stoutii*) by taking advantage of a putative proliferative zone in the adult retina.

To achieve this, I applied a brief pulse of EdU to several hagfish to label proliferating cells, if any, in the retina. I also utilized bioinformatics and *in situ* hybridization to assess if homologs of gnathostome retinal genes also drive retinogenesis in this jawless vertebrate. I observed EdU positive cells within the retinal periphery of the hagfish (a region reminiscent of the ciliary marginal zone of gnathostomes) and within the central retina. I also found evidence that hagfish possess homologs of several key genes required for retinal neurogenesis in other vertebrates and that these genes are expressed within the hagfish eye. Finally, through *in situ* hybridization I demonstrated that two of these genes, *OtxA* and *Rx* (retinal homeobox), are expressed in the hagfish retina (including at the proliferative retinal periphery). This work has revealed candidate genes and mechanisms that may be involved in hagfish retinogenesis. This establishes a starting point for future studies to dissect the pathways of retinal neurogenesis in jawless vertebrates. Further efforts comparing retinal development between cyclostomes and gnathostomes are warranted, as this work has also uncovered evidence for deeply conserved mechanisms for retinogenesis within the vertebrate lineage.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Sarah N. Bradshaw.

This study was conducted under the approval of the Biosciences Animal Care and Use Committee (Animal use protocol number: AUP00000077) which adheres to the Canadian Council for Animal Care guidelines. Animals were collected and held according to a Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada collection permit (XR 225 2021) and the animal use protocol approved by the Bamfield Marine Sciences Center (BMSC) (RS-21-06).

The majority of thesis chapter 1 was published as part of an invited review article submitted to Evolutionary Developmental Biology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology, Bradshaw SN and Allison WT (2022), "Hagfish to Illuminate the Developmental and Evolutionary Origins of the Vertebrate Retina". This publication was written by SNB and edited by WTA.

Emily Dong generated the *Eptatretus stoutii* RNA sequencing dataset referenced in Chapter 2 and the *E. stoutii* RNA used to prepare the *in-situ* hybridization riboprobes in Chapter 2.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the members of the Allison lab for their support and guidance throughout this project. My supervisor Dr. Ted Allison has been a wonderful mentor during both my undergraduate and graduate degrees. He has helped me to develop my skills as a new scientist and has given me incredible opportunities. I am also very thankful to my fellow lab members who have always been welcoming and kind. I am grateful for all the people who took the time to share their knowledge and skills with me. A special thank you to Dr. Paul Chrystal and Gavin Neil who both helped me gain the skills I needed to tackle this project. I am also very grateful to Emily Dong as her hagfish research is what made my own work possible.

I would also like to thank those outside of the Allison lab who supported me and/or contributed to the project. Thank you to the BMSC staff who initially collected and cared for the hagfish used in this study and Dr. Juhno Eom (UBC) for aiding me in performing the EdU injections. Thank you to my supervisory committee Dr. Zachary Hall and Dr. Tamzin Blewett for your advice and guidance throughout my degree. Thank you to members of the Goss lab, Voronova lab and the Waskiewicz lab for donating hagfish tissue and reagents. Thank you to Dr. Guobin Sun at the Cross Cancer Institute Imaging facility and to Dr. Kacie Norton at the Advanced Microscopy unit for your technical support for light and confocal microscopy. Thank you to the Department of Biological Sciences for providing me with funding and teaching opportunities and to NSERC for funding 1 year of my degree. Finally, thank you to my family for all of your support and encouragement throughout this project.

| Table | of | Contents |
|-------|----|----------|
| raute | U1 | Contents |

| Chap Verte | ter 1: Hagfish to Illuminate the Developmental and Evolutionary Origins of the brate Retina |
|---------------------|---|
| 1.1 | Abstract |
| 1.2 | Introduction |
| 1 | .2.1 The vertebrate eye is a vital sensory structure with mysterious origins |
| 1 | .2.2 Organization of the retina is complex and highly coordinated7 |
| 1 | .2.3 The eye is formed by a network of developmental pathways |
| 1.3 evo | Cyclostome eyes provide important perspective for understanding vertebrate eye lution |
| 1 v | .3.1 Hagfish exhibit a rudimentary eye and retinal phenotype that is unique among ertebrates |
| 1 | .3.2 The structure of the lamprey eye shares many similarities with the gnathostome eye 14 |
| 1 | .3.3 Chordate photoreceptive organs: a window to the state of the ancestral vertebrate eye? |
| 1.4 | Adult retinal neurogenesis – a source of new retinal cells throughout ontogeny23 |
| 1 | .4.1 The ciliary marginal zone and Müller glia: pools of retinal stem cells in gnathostomes |
| 1 | .4.2 Evidence for adult retinal growth in the cyclostomes |
| 1.5 | Models of vertebrate eye evolution26 |
| 1 | .5.1 Hagfish eyes as the ancestral state |
| 1 | .5.2 Hagfish eyes as a product of regressive evolution |
| 1 | .5.3 Hagfish eye regression via paedomorphosis |
| 1 e ⁻ | .5.4 Hagfish are at a vital phylogenetic position to unravel mysteries behind vertebrate eye volution |
| 1.6 | Objectives and purpose of study |

| retin |
|-------|
| 5 |
| |
| |
| |
| s |
| press |
| |
| |

| Chapter 3: Discussion | 108 |
|---|---------------------|
| 3.1 The organization of the hagfish retina is not representative of the ancestr vertebrate condition, but other aspects of this structure (i.e., development) co | ral uld still be |
| informative for the study of eye and retinal evolution across vertebrates | |
| 3.2 Proliferation in the hagfish retina | 110 |
| 3.2.1 The ciliary marginal zone may be an ancestral vertebrate trait | 110 |
| 3.2.2 Do hagfish have Müller glia? | |
| 3.2.3 Could paedomorphosis be linked to continued retinal growth? | 112 |
| | |

3.3 Hagfish retinal development appears to be conserved (to a degree) with gnathostomes

| gnathostomes | 113 |
|--|-----|
| 3.3.1 The (limited) gene expression data available suggests hagfish retinal cell types may specified through the same pathways as other vertebrates, but further characterization of | be |
| hagfish retinal development is needed | 113 |
| 3.3.2 Absence vs. secondary loss of retinal genes and pathways in the hagfish eye | 115 |

| 3.4 | Conclusion | 116 |
|-----|------------|-----|
| | | |

| Literature Cited | |
|------------------|--|
| Appendices | |

List of Tables

| Table 1-1. Presence of retinal homeobox genes across representative vertebrates |
|---|
| Table 1-2. Presence of retinal bHLH genes across representative vertebrates |
| Table 2-1. Gene block sequence for the Rx (plasmid based) riboprobe |
| Table 2-2. Primer sequences used to generate the OtxA (PCR based) riboprobe 103 |
| Table 2-3. In situ hybridization conditions per each riboprobe 103 |
| Table 2-4. Best tBlastn results for various vertebrate <i>Rx</i> homologs to the <i>Eptatretus stoutii</i> transcriptome dataset |
| Table 2-5. Best tBlastn results for various vertebrate Six3 and Six6 homologs to the Eptatretus stoutii transcriptome dataset 105 |
| Table 2-6. Best tBlastn results for various vertebrate <i>Otx</i> homologs to the <i>Eptatretus stoutii</i> transcriptome dataset |
| Table 2-7. Relative expression of select <i>Eptatretus stoutii</i> gene transcripts in eye vs. brain tissue |
| Supplementary Table 1 (Appendix A). Gene block sequence for the <i>Six3</i> (plasmid based) riboprobe |
| Supplementary Table 2 (Appendix A). Primer sequences used to generate the <i>OtxD</i> (PCR based) riboprobe |
| Supplementary Table 3 (Appendix B). Accession Numbers for Rx homologs (protein sequences) |
| Supplementary Table 4 (Appendix B). Accession Numbers for Six3/6 homologs (protein sequences) |
| Supplementary Table 5 (Appendix B). Accession Numbers for Otx homologs (transcript (red) and protein (blue) sequences) |

List of Figures

| Figure 1-1. Evolutionary origins of the vertebrate eye and the appearance of other photoreceptive organs across Chordata |
|---|
| Figure 1-2. Retinal organization across cyclostomes and gnathostomes provides a backdrop for alternative hypotheses of vertebrate eye evolution |
| Figure 1-3. Structure of the ciliary marginal zone (CMZ) in gnathostomes and |
| cyclostomes |
| Figure 1-4. Alternative models of vertebrate eye evolution |
| Figure 2-1. EdU (5-ethynyl-2'-deoxyuridine) incorporation reveals proliferating cells in the post- embryonic hagfish retina |
| Figure 2-2. Quantification of EdU-positive (EdU+) cells in the hagfish retina suggests proliferating cells are concentrated at the peripheral retina |
| Figure 2-3. Sox2 immunohistochemistry (IHC) labels the zebrafish retina but not the hagfish retina |
| Figure 2-4. Hagfish retinal homeobox (Rx) protein shares low sequence identity with gnathostome Rx |
| Figure 2-5. Hagfish have three Six3/6 paralogs which share some protein sequence identity with gnathostome Six3 and Six6 sequences |
| Figure 2-6. Hagfish have four Otx paralogs which share low overall protein sequence identity with other vertebrate Otx homologs90 |
| Figure 2-7. Maximum likelihood tree of cyclostome and gnathostome Otx protein sequences shows vertebrate sequences cluster together |
| Figure 2-8. Homology of <i>Otx1</i> to <i>OtxC</i> and <i>Otx2</i> to <i>OtxA/OtxD</i> is supported by a comparison of the genomic arrangement of mouse <i>Otx</i> paralogs and surrounding genes to cyclostome and gnathostome genomes |
| Figure 2-9. Homology between gnathostome $Otx1$ and cyclostome $OtxC$ is suggested by a synteny analysis of mouse $Otx1$ to cyclostome genomes |
| Figure 2-10. Synteny analysis of mouse <i>Otx2</i> to cyclostome genomes supports homology of gnathostome <i>Otx2</i> to cyclostome <i>OtxA</i> and <i>OtxD</i> |
| Figure 2-11. Synteny analysis of mouse <i>Crx</i> (<i>Otx5</i>) to cyclostome genomes does not support homology between gnathostome <i>Otx5</i> and cyclostome <i>Otx</i> homologs |

| Figure 2-12. <i>OtxA</i> is expressed throughout multiple cell types in the Pacific hagfish (<i>Eptatretus stoutii</i>) retina |
|---|
| Figure 2-13. <i>Rx</i> is expressed in the inner nuclear layer and (perhaps) the periphery of the hagfish (<i>Eptatretus stoutii</i>) retina |
| Figure 3-1. Two hypotheses for the evolution of the ciliary marginal zone (CMZ) within the vertebrate lineage |
| Supplementary Figure 1 (Appendix A). The <i>Six3 in situ</i> hybridization probe very weakly labels the inner nuclear layer of the hagfish (<i>Eptatretus stoutii</i>) retina |
| Supplementary Figure 2 (Appendix C). Protein alignment for 36 <i>Otx</i> sequences (used to construct the phylogenetic tree in figure 2-7) |

List of Abbreviations

BCIP - 5-Bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl phosphate

bHLH - basic helix-loop-helix proteins

BLAST - Basic Local Alignment Search Tool

BMSC - Bamfield Marine Sciences Center

BSA - bovine serum albumin

cDNA - complementary DNA

CMZ - ciliary marginal zone

Crx - cone-rod homeobox gene

CRALBP - cellular retinaldehyde-binding protein

DAPI - 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole, dihydrochloride

DIG - digoxigenin

dNTP - deoxynucleoside triphosphates

E. burgeri - *Eptatretus burgeri*

EdU - 5-ethynyl-2'-deoxyuridine

E. stoutii - Eptatretus stoutii

EtOH - ethanol

FGF - fibroblast growth factor

FISH - fluorescent in situ hybridization

FPKM - fragments per kilobase of transcript per million mapped reads

GCL - ganglion cell layer

IDT - Integrated DNA Technologies

INL - inner nuclear layer

LSM - laser scanning microscopy

MS-222 - tricaine methanesulfonate

NBT- nitro blue tetrazolium

NCBI - National Center for Biotechnology Information

OCT - optimal cutting temperature compound

- ONL outer nuclear layer
- Otx orthodenticle homeobox gene
- Pax6 paired box gene 6
- **PBS-T** phosphate buffered saline + 0.1% Tween
- pH3 phosphohistone 3
- PCNA proliferating cell nuclear antigen
- PCR polymerase chain reaction
- PFA paraformaldehyde
- P. marinus Petromyzon marinus
- POD horseradish peroxidase
- RGC retinal ganglion cell
- RNase ribonucleases
- RNAseq RNA sequencing
- RnPE retinal (non)-pigmented epithelium
- **RPE** retinal pigmented epithelium
- **Rx** retinal homeobox gene
- Shh Sonic hedgehog
- Six3 sine oculis homeobox transcription factor gene 3
- Six6 sine oculis homeobox transcription factor gene 6
- SNCG synuclein gamma gene
- SSC saline-sodium citrate buffer
- tBLASTn translated nucleotide BLAST search
- TEA triethanolamine

Chapter 1

Hagfish to Illuminate the Developmental and Evolutionary Origins of the Vertebrate Retina.

Part of this chapter contains work previously published in: Bradshaw SN and Allison WT (2022). Hagfish to Illuminate the Developmental and Evolutionary Origins of the Vertebrate Retina. Front. Cell Dev. Biol. 10:822358. doi: 10.3389/fcell.2022.822358. *Written by SNB*. *Edited by WTA*.

1.1 Abstract

The vertebrate eye is a vital sensory organ that has long fascinated scientists, but the details of how this organ evolved are still unclear. The vertebrate eye is distinct from the simple photoreceptive organs of other non-vertebrate chordates and there are no clear transitional forms of the eye in the fossil record. To investigate the evolution of the eye we can examine the eyes of a group of early-branching extant vertebrates, the hagfish and lamprey. These jawless vertebrates are in an ideal phylogenetic position to study the origin of the vertebrate eye, but data on eye and retina development in these organisms is limited. New genomic and gene expression data from hagfish and lampreys suggest they have many of the same genes for eye development and retinal neurogenesis as jawed vertebrates. However, functional work to determine if these genes operate in retinogenesis similarly to other vertebrates is missing. In addition, hagfish express a marker of proliferative retinal cells (*Pax6*) near the margin of the retina and adult retinal growth is apparent in some species. Finding evidence of

eye growth late into hagfish ontogeny is unexpected given the degenerate hagfish eye phenotype. Further studies dissecting retinal neurogenesis in jawless vertebrates would allow for comparison of the mechanisms of retinal development between cyclostome and gnathostome eyes and provide insight into the evolutionary origins of the vertebrate eye.

1.2 Introduction

1.2.1 The vertebrate eye is a vital sensory structure with mysterious origins

To survive in adverse environments organisms must be able to perceive and respond to their surroundings. One of the most complex and remarkable sensory systems utilized in the animal kingdom is vision. Through specialized cells (photoreceptors) animals can make use of light information to sense their environment (Arendt, 2003). Across Metazoa, photoreception abilities range from simple light detection to the ability to form images. Organization of photoreceptors into a light-detecting organ (an eye) allows for sophisticated processing of light signals. Representatives of Cnidaria, Mollusca, Annelida, Onychophora, Arthropoda and Chordata are examples of organisms that have developed complex eyes, often associated with image formation (Zuker, 1994). Amazingly, despite these groups being phylogenetically distant, their eye structures appear to have independently evolved to perform similar functions (often through similar mechanisms) reinforcing the importance of visual information across organisms (Fernald, 2000; Nilsson, 2013). With rare exception, vertebrates possess a complex camera-style eye that is remarkably conserved in form and function throughout the group. The retina of the vertebrate eye is specialized to form detailed images, detect motion, enhance contrast and/or perceive color (Yokoyama, 2000; Stenkamp, 2015; Morshedian and Fain, 2017). This allows vertebrates to find food and mates, avoid predation and navigate their surroundings across a variety of habitats.

Despite the eye and retina being of primary importance to vertebrate ecology, a comprehensive appreciation of their evolutionary origins is lacking. Contributing to the struggle to understand vertebrate eye evolution is the complexity of the organ itself. To receive light signals the retina contains highly specialized photoreceptor cells for light detection (these cells require a mechanism for light transduction and supporting cells to maintain their function) (Lamb et al., 2007; Fain et al., 2010). The light signals must then be transmitted to (and subsequently processed within) the brain for an animal to perceive the environment within their visual field. The communication and processing of this information requires an extremely complex neural network. Vertebrates employ multiple neuronal cell types to transmit and initiate processing of light signal information within the visual system (Stenkamp, 2015). In addition, the structure of the camera-style eye is also optimized to direct light onto the retina (to increase visual acuity). Structures such as the pupil and lens focus incoming light onto the retinal photoreceptors, pigment provides directionality for light signals and extraocular muscles allow vertebrates to shift their eye position. Many scientists, including and prior to Darwin, have pondered how these individual components may have arisen and come together through evolution to produce such a multiplex/sophisticated sensory organ (Fernald, 2004; Gehring and Seimiya, 2010). Another factor confounding a complete understanding of eye evolution is how abruptly the eye appears within the vertebrate phylogeny and the lack of transitional states (Lamb et al., 2007) (Figure 1-1A). Almost all extant vertebrates possess a complete camera-style eye with a clearly laminated retina (Figure 1-1B). In contrast, the closest living relatives of the vertebrates, the cephalochordates (amphioxus) and urochordates (tunicates) do not have visual structures resembling a camera-style eye (Figures 1-1C, D). Instead, these groups possess comparatively

simple clusters of photoreceptive cells associated with pigment cells (Vopalensky et al., 2012; Esposito et al., 2015). This leaves a gap around the chordate/vertebrate transition where eyes may have arisen (Figure 1-1A). Assuming the last common ancestor of vertebrates and other chordates had simple unpaired photoreceptive organs similar to extant non-vertebrate chordates, emergence of the vertebrate eye would have required numerous evolutionary innovations. This includes the development of structures to receive photic stimuli with increased resolution (i.e., a lens), directionality (i.e., the retinal pigmented epithelium) and image formation (i.e., complex photoreceptors) abilities (Nilsson, 2009). Without obvious intermediate stages, we can only hypothesize how these innovations may have taken place in the ancestral vertebrate. Some groups have examined fossil evidence from extinct species to try to find a transitional or early form of the vertebrate eye. However, many types of delicate tissue (such as the eye) do not fossilize well, making fossil data difficult to interpret (Clements et al., 2016; Gabbott et al., 2016). A promising avenue for exploring the origin of vertebrate eyes is to study an obscure but evolutionarily important group, the jawless vertebrates (Agnatha).

The jawless vertebrates consist of two extant groups of anguilliform (elongate, eel-like in body form and swimming style) fishes, the lampreys and hagfish. These organisms are unique among extant vertebrates for lacking jaws and paired fins and possess many distinct features which are considered "primitive" or ancestral compared to jawed vertebrates; whether these features truly represent the ancestral condition for vertebrates or are derived traits that arose in the cyclostome lineage is still a matter of debate (Kuratani and Ota, 2008b; Shimeld and Donoghue, 2012). Lampreys are fishes that begin life as sediment dwelling filter feeders (Osório and Rétaux, 2008). Depending on the species, after metamorphosis lamprey can either become parasitic, feeding on the blood and tissue of aquatic organisms, or non-parasitic (generally do not feed as adults). Lampreys occur in both fresh and saltwater environments. In contrast, hagfish are marine scavengers that live in the ocean depths and feed mostly on dead or dying animals (although some sources suggest they may be more predatory than traditionally thought) (Martini, 1998). Various molecular and morphological studies agree that these groups comprise their own monophyletic clade, Cyclostomata, forming a sister group to the jawed vertebrates (Gnathostomata) (Mallatt and Sullivan, 1998; Kuraku et al., 1999; Heimberg et al., 2010; Ota et al., 2011; Miyashita et al., 2019). The cyclostomes diverged from other vertebrates around 600 mya, placing the group at a unique phylogenetic position that may be useful for unravelling the origins of the vertebrate eye and retina, especially when contrasted against the gnathostome condition (Figure 1-1A) (Blair and Hedges, 2005).

Despite the importance of these species to appreciating the evolutionary origins of the vertebrate eye, development of the eye in cyclostomes has been poorly studied. The morphology of lamprey and hagfish eyes are important points of comparison for the eyes of other vertebrates. Adult lampreys have well-developed camera-style eyes that are similar to those found in jawed vertebrates (gnathostomes) (Lamb et al., 2007). There are some nuanced differences in retinal organization and retinal cell morphology, but many elements of the visual system of lampreys and gnathostomes appear conserved (Fain, 2020). In contrast, hagfish eyes are strikingly rudimentary. Their small eyes are buried under a layer of skin or muscle depending on the genera (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975). Hagfish eyes also lack a lens and pigment (features found in the eyes of almost all other living vertebrates). Recently it has been shown that in at least some hagfish the retina contains all the cellular layers seen in other vertebrates (Dong and Allison, 2021), but this had been obscured because the retina is poorly laminated (compared to the four clearly defined retinal layers of gnathostomes) (Lamb, 2013; Dong and Allison, 2021). In addition, the hagfish eye was shown to grow throughout ontogeny with a proliferative region at the margin of the retina, similar to the ciliary marginal zone of gnathostomes (discussed in Section 1.4) (Dong and Allison, 2021). These findings have raised questions about whether the hagfish and lamprey could represent two distinct phases of vertebrate eye evolution, with hagfish showing a more ancestral vertebrate eye form and the lamprey possessing a more derived form. However, others have suggested that hagfish may have once possessed more complex eyes that regressed due to living as scavengers in dim-light environments (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975; Dong and Allison, 2021). Under this theory, the hagfish eye could have become reduced to its current state (due to lack of use) after the hagfish began living in the deep ocean, similarly to the loss of eyes in other vertebrates living in dim-light environments (i.e., troglobionts such as the cavefish (Astyanax mexicanus)) (Sifuentes-Romero et al., 2020). Another related model suggests that the hagfish eye condition is rudimentary because it is neotenic/paedomorphic (retains larval features). This idea is based on the observation that in lampreys, adult animals have complex eyes whereas lamprey larvae possess simpler eye structures (with the larval lamprey eye spot being compared to the hagfish eye) (Lamb et al., 2007; Suzuki and Grillner, 2018). Under the paedomorphosis model, hagfish would have undergone a heterochronic shift resulting in loss of the transition from a larval/juvenile to adult eye condition. Based on the available evidence it is difficult to rule out any of these possibilities.

To gain insight into the evolution of the vertebrate eye, we can take advantage of the available morphological, genetic and developmental information on eye formation in the cyclostomes. However, this type of information, especially that of retinal development, is lacking for both lampreys and hagfish. Both groups are non-model organisms and present unique challenges for study. Several studies have characterized the morphology and cell types within the lamprey eye (including the transition from larval to adult eye) but few studies have examined ocular gene expression during eye development (Meyer-Rochow and Stewart, 1996; Suzuki and Grillner, 2018; Fain, 2020). Further characterization of retinal and eye developmental pathways within lampreys could be used to strengthen (or refute) the comparisons made between lamprey and gnathostome eyes. There is even more unknown about hagfish eyes. In addition to many species being deep-water, marine animals, historically hagfish embryos have been difficult to attain making development difficult to study in this group (Gorbman, 1997). However, several groups have begun to successfully breed hapfish in a laboratory setting, opening future opportunities to study the embryonic hagfish eye (Holland, 2007; Ota and Kuratani, 2008). Within the current literature, studies have characterized the morphology of adult hagfish eyes and photoreceptors (Holmberg, 1970; Holmberg, 1971; Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975). More recently, hagfish retinal cell types have been studied via gene expression markers (Dong and Allison, 2021). Yet, information on how the hagfish eye develops is still highly lacking. To compare the cyclostome eye condition to the gnathostome condition, more data on cyclostome eye and retina development are necessary.

1.2.2 Organization of the retina is complex and highly coordinated

The vertebrate eye is an organ that is highly conserved (in structure, function, physiology and development) throughout the vertebrates from fishes to mammals (Lamb, 2013). The eyes of cyclostomes and gnathostomes share the same basic organization and neural wiring, although the hagfish eye is lacking some elements seen in the eyes of other vertebrates (i.e., the lens). In the typical vertebrate camera-style eye, the cornea and lens focus light onto the retina at the back of the eye where light detection (and the initial processing/transmission of light information) occurs (Lamb et al., 2007; Koenig and Gross, 2020). The retina consists of four distinct cellular layers

in jawed vertebrates (Figure 1-2A). The outer nuclear layer (ONL) contains photoreceptors (rod cells for dim-light detection and cone cells for bright light photoreception) (Stenkamp, 2015). The inner nuclear layer (INL) contains the cell bodies of various interneurons (bipolar cells, amacrine cells and horizontal cells) involved in the initial processing of light information and transmitting the information from photoreceptors to the ganglion cell layer. The inner nuclear layer also contains Müller glia (cells that provide a supporting role to retinal neurons and a source of stem cells after retinal damage) (Stenkamp, 2015). The retinal ganglion cells (RGC's) of the ganglion cell layer (GCL) transmit light signals to the brain (the axons of the RGC's form the optic nerve). Some RGCs contain melanopsin and are intrinsically photosensitive (ipRGC's) (Ecker et al., 2010; Schmidt et al., 2011). The fourth cellular layer is the retinal pigmented epithelium (RPE) which is adjacent to (and interdigitated with) the photoreceptors. The cells of the RPE provide a supporting role to the photoreceptors by absorbing stray light, phagocytosing dying photoreceptor segments and aiding in the retinoid cycle (Bharti et al., 2006). The retina also contains two synaptic layers with the outer plexiform layer consisting of the synapses between photoreceptors, bipolar cells, and horizontal cells and the inner plexiform layer forming from synapses between the bipolar cells, amacrine cells and retinal ganglion cells (Centanin and Wittbrodt, 2014; Stenkamp, 2015). This is the almost universal retinal organization found in jawed vertebrates, but the retinal layers of cyclostomes differ (see Section 1.3).

1.2.3 The eye is formed by a network of developmental pathways

To gain a clearer understanding of the origins of the vertebrate retina, we can study the development of the retina in the jawless vertebrates. Elements of retinogenesis pathways that are missing in the cyclostomes (compared to gnathostomes) may have arisen after the jawless vertebrates diverged from the jawed vertebrates (or were lost from cyclostomes after the lineages

split). Alternatively, if elements of the retinogenesis pathways are similar in both cyclostomes and gnathostomes, this would support that the retinal organization seen in gnathostomes arose before the split between the two groups. Despite their critical phylogenetic position, eye and retina development in the cyclostomes has not been heavily studied. There are several papers that have examined eye/retinal development within the lamprey and very few studies on hagfish. Comparatively, there have been numerous studies investigating retinal development within the gnathostomes (summarized below) which have allowed us to begin to appreciate the impressive complexity of vertebrate retinal development. Increasing our understanding of cyclostome retinogenesis would allow us to develop a more comprehensive evolutionary perspective on how this complex neural structure (and the developmental mechanisms that produce it) arose.

In gnathostomes, the retina arises as an extension of the forebrain (diencephalon). During neurulation the anterior portion of the neural tube is specified as the presumptive eye field via the expression of several transcription factors (*Pax6*, *Otx2*, *Six3*, *ET*) (Zuber et al., 2003). Hedgehog signalling from the ventral midline specifies *Pax6* to be expressed laterally, allowing for the development of two separate eyes (Yang, 2004). Once the eye field forms, the tissue that will develop as the eye forms from two outpocketings of the ventral forebrain known as the optic vesicles (Cardozo et al., 2019). As the vesicles grow outwards and contact the overlying epidermis, signals from this tissue and the surrounding mesenchyme induce the vesicles to invaginate and form the optic cup (Steinfeld et al., 2013). The optic cup is a bilayered structure with the inner layer becoming the neural retina and the outer layer becoming the non-neural retinal pigmented epithelium (RPE). The patterning of the optic cup into distinct territories (i.e., eye stalk, RPE, neural retina) is mediated by extrinsic signals such as hedgehog, Wnt and FGF's (fibroblast growth factor) (Yang, 2004; Steinfeld et al., 2013; Cardozo et al., 2019).

The early neural retina consists of a homogenous population of undifferentiated progenitor cells (Centanin and Wittbrodt, 2014). To form into a mature retina with the seven retinal cell types organized into distinct cellular layers, these cells must proliferate and differentiate in a manner that is tightly regulated spatially and temporally. External signals such as FGFs and Shh (sonic hedgehog) help to control whether cells remain in a multipotent proliferative state or begin to differentiate into a particular fate (Yang, 2004). FGFs (FGF3 and FGF8) from the optic stalk region initiate differentiation of RGC's in the retina by activating expression of the transcription factor Atoh7 (Martinez-Morales et al., 2005). Hedgehog signalling promotes the expansion of cellular differentiation from the center to the periphery of the retina (neurogenic wave) (Neumann and Nuesslein-Volhard, 2000). Newly differentiated retinal ganglion cells begin to express hedgehog as well, propagating hedgehog signaling within the developing eye (Wang et al., 2005). Notch signaling is critical for maintaining proliferative progenitor cells during retinogenesis (Ahmad et al., 1995; Jadhav et al., 2006; Riesenberg and Brown, 2016). As retinal cells mature, Notch signalling is downregulated, and the effect of intrinsic transcription factor programs (see below) allows the cells to take on new fates (Perron and Harris, 2000). The activity of Gdf6A and retinoic acid also contributes to a proper balance of proliferating and committed cells within the early retina, ensuring the developing retina generates the correct number of cells (Valdivia et al., 2016). Transcription factor networks establish the differentiation pathways that retinal cells will follow to take on their final fates. Retinal ganglion cells are the first cell type to form in the retina by activation of Atoh7 (Martinez-Morales et al., 2005). Atoh7 subsequently promotes the expression of additional transcription factors, such as *Pou4f2* and Isl1, to specify the retinal ganglion cell fate (Mu et al., 2005). Activation of other cell specification programs is initiated after RGCs begin to form. For most retinal cell types, a major

(or several major) transcription factors initiate the pathway for a particular fate and subsequently activate downstream transcription factor networks to complete specification/differentiation. For example, the production of photoreceptors is initiated by a network of transcription factors including the homeobox genes *rx* (retinal homeobox gene) and *crx* (cone-rod homeobox gene) and the bHLH genes *NeuroD* and *Maf/Nrl* (specifically for rod cells) (Chen et al., 1997; Yan and Wang, 1998; Mears et al., 2001; Nelson et al., 2009b; Oel et al., 2020). *Chx10* drives bipolar cell specification (activates *Mash1* and *Math3*) (Hatakeyama et al., 2001). *Ptfla*, *Prox1* and *Foxn4* promote horizontal cell fate, whereas a combination of *Ptfla*, *Foxn4*, *Math3* and *NeuroD* expression produces amacrine cells (Inoue et al., 2002; Fujitani et al., 2006; Ohsawa and Kageyama, 2008). Finally, Müller glia fate is dependent upon the expression of *Rax* (*Rx*), *Hes1*, *Hes5*, *Hesr2* and *Lhx2* (Furukawa et al., 2000; Satow et al., 2001; Melo et al., 2016). These seven cell types initially appear during embryonic retinal development, but in several gnathostome groups (and possibly cyclostomes—**see Section 1.4.2**) production of new retinal cells continues throughout ontogeny at the periphery of the retina (the ciliary marginal zone).

1.3 Cyclostome eyes provide important perspective for understanding vertebrate eye evolution

1.3.1 Hagfish exhibit a rudimentary eye and retinal phenotype that is unique among vertebrates

Compared to gnathostome eyes, the hagfish eye must be considered very rudimentary. Their diminutive eyes are covered by a layer of semi-transparent skin (Genus *Eptatretus*) or a layer of muscle (Genus *Myxine*) (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975). Most studies have concluded the hagfish eye does not contain a lens, although there is a report of a lens from one species, *Myxine*

garmani (Kobayashi, 1964); this report has not subsequently been supported by other studies. The hagfish retina is more disorganized (lamination between the layers is less clear) than in gnathostomes, but it does appear to contain all the constituents of cellular layers seen in the retinae of other vertebrates (Dong and Allison, 2021) (Figure 1-2D). Hagfish of the genus Eptatretus have photoreceptors, but they are difficult to distinguish as rods or cones morphologically (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975). Hagfish species from the genus Myxine have photoreceptors that are even more different from those seen in gnathostomes (the cells have a whorled morphology) (Holmberg, 1970; Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975; Lamb, 2013). The photoreceptor cells of *Eptatretus stoutii* express *rhodopsin*, supporting their similarity to gnathostome photoreceptors (Dong and Allison, 2021). Interestingly, physiological studies have demonstrated that hagfish eyes do respond to light, but if hagfish eyes are removed a response to light signals still occurs (Kobayashi, 1964). This indicates hagfish may also utilize extra-ocular photoreceptors (i.e., photoreceptors in the skin) for light detection (Kobayashi, 1964; Patzner, 1978). In situ hybridization data suggests the hagfish retina contains bipolar, horizontal and amacrine cells (Dong and Allison, 2021). *PKC-\alpha* (a marker of rod bipolar cells) and *CALBINDIN* (a marker for horizontal cells) is expressed within the interneuron layer of the hagfish retina. The hagfish retina also has expression of Pax6 (a marker for retinal ganglion cells and amacrine cells) and *melanopsin* (a marker of intrinsically photosensitive retinal ganglion cells) (Dong and Allison, 2021). In contrast, Müller glia have not been identified (as of yet) in the hagfish retina. The RPE layer of hagfish (retinal non-pigmented epithelium or RnPE for hagfish from here on) is distinct from that of other vertebrates as it does not contain any pigment (pigment allows for the detection of light direction and pigment cells are usually associated with photoreceptors throughout Animalia) (Bharti et al., 2006). The RnPE might participate in other traditional

functions of the RPE such as removal of cellular debris (evidence of phagocytosis of an outer segment) and retinoid cycling (the RnPE expresses genes for several enzymes that drive retinoid cycling) (Dong and Allison, 2021). The impact of having a non-pigmented retinal epithelium on hagfish vision needs to be investigated further. Whether the unique characteristics of the hagfish eye represent an ancestral state of vertebrate eyes or is due to loss has been debated, and possible evolutionary scenarios will be outlined in **Section 1.5**. Despite its rudimentary characters, the hagfish retina appears to share more similarities with the gnathostome eye than traditionally thought, but more work needs to be done to characterize the cell types within the hagfish retina and to determine if they develop using the same mechanisms as in other vertebrates. Comparing the retinogenesis pathways in hagfish, lampreys and gnathostomes may elucidate how the vertebrate retina evolved.

Very little is known about retinal neurogenesis in hagfish, partially due to the difficulty of acquiring hagfish embryos. Examining genomic data for *Eptatretus burgeri* on Ensembl, hagfish appear to have homologs for critical eye transcription factors such as *Pax6*, *Otx2*, *Six3/6* (Table 1-1) and retinal neurogenesis genes such as *Ascl1*, *NeuroD* and *Neurogenin* (Table 1-2). They also appear to have homologs of lamprey *OtxB* (*OtxB* is supported as homologous to gnathostome *Crx* by Yamamoto et al., (2020)) and *rx/rax* (Kon and Furukawa, 2020). This suggests that hagfish may have some of the basic genetic machinery utilized by other vertebrates for eye/photoreceptor development. Without data on where these genes are being expressed and how they interact with other potential components of the eye/retina developmental pathways, it is difficult to firmly conclude whether retinogenesis in hagfish proceeds similarly to retinal development in gnathostomes. These types of studies would ideally be performed on embryonic hagfish (a group in Japan has had success acquiring hagfish embryos, creating exciting

opportunities for future research (Ota and Kuratani, (2008))). Another way to study hagfish retinal development in the absence of embryos would be to focus on the ciliary margin (a source of post-embryonic retinogenesis in most other vertebrates, especially teleost fishes and amphibians—see Section 1.4). Several pieces of evidence suggest the hagfish retina contains a proliferative ciliary marginal zone (CMZ). Photoreceptor cells located near the ciliary margin have an immature morphology (missing outer segments) whereas cells located closer to the center of the retina appear fully differentiated (Dong and Allison, 2021). Additionally, *Pax6* (a gene known to be expressed in the CMZ of other vertebrates) is expressed in the peripheral hagfish retina. This data, along with the fact that hagfish eyes grow larger over ontogeny, suggests the hagfish retina may still be proliferative throughout ontogeny despite the reduced/degenerate appearance of the eyes and retina (Dong and Allison, 2021). Further characterization of hagfish retinal development would be very insightful for studying the conservation of the retinogenesis pathway in vertebrates. Elements of the retinogenesis pathway missing in cyclostomes could point to elements that did not arise until later (after the jawedjawless vertebrate split) in the vertebrate lineage.

1.3.2 The structure of the lamprey eye shares many similarities with the gnathostome eye

The eyes of adult lampreys share many morphological and physiological similarities with gnathostome eyes. In lampreys, the adult retina forms the same four cellular layers seen in the gnathostome retina (Figure 1-2B). All six retinal neuron types characterized in gnathostomes have also been identified in lamprey retinae, as well as Müller glia (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008; Suzuki and Grillner, 2018; Govardovskii et al., 2020). Adult lampreys have bipolar, amacrine and horizontal cells, based on immunocytochemical data (Villar-Cerviño et al., 2006; Abalo et al., 2008). All lamprey species studied to date also have at least two distinct morphological

classes of photoreceptors, "long" and "short" (some species have multiple subtypes of long photoreceptors) (Dickson and Graves, 1979). Morphologically both long and short photoreceptors appear cone-like (based on features used to classify gnathostome rods and cones) (Fain, 2020). However, the short photoreceptors are physiologically similar to gnathostome rod cells and are sensitive to single photons of light (Morshedian and Fain, 2015). The long photoreceptors behave like gnathostome cone cells and function best at higher intensities of light. The lamprey retina contains a layer of retinal ganglion cells, but these cells are organized differently than in jawed vertebrates. In gnathostomes the axons of RGC's travel next to the inner limiting membrane (adjacent to the GCL) whereas in lampreys the RGC axons travel between the IPL and the INL (Fain, 2020). The cell bodies of the retinal ganglion cells lie either in the inner nuclear layer or the inner plexiform layer (the ganglion cell bodies do not lie in a distinct layer). It is currently unknown why the wiring of RGC's is different in lampreys and how this could affect visual function. The RPE layer appears to be functional in adult lampreys and contributes to debris removal (via phagocytosis) and retinoid cycling as in gnathostomes (Meyer-Rochow and Stewart, 1996).

One important factor to consider when discussing the lamprey retina is that the lamprey eye undergoes dramatic changes throughout ontogeny. In early lamprey larvae, the eye is buried under a layer of skin and only a small central region of the retina differentiates: the central retina produces one type of photoreceptor, bipolar cells and retinal ganglion cells (Dickson and Collard, 1979; Suzuki and Grillner, 2018) (Figure 1-2C). As the lamprey matures, more of the retina undergoes differentiation. In late larvae an additional region peripheral to the central retina differentiates (producing retinal ganglion cells) (Cornide-Petronio et al., 2015). Finally, during metamorphosis retinal differentiation is completed across the most peripheral parts of the retina

and amacrine cells and horizontal cells appear (Rubinson and Cain, 1989; Meyer-Rochow and Stewart, 1996; Abalo et al., 2008). The RPE does not appear to be functional in the larval lamprey (Meyer-Rochow and Stewart, 1996). Outside of the retina, other features of the eye also change throughout lamprey metamorphosis (i.e., the lens completes development during metamorphosis and is only fully functional in adult lampreys) (Meyer-Rochow and Stewart, 1996).

In cyclostomes the mechanisms for retinogenesis are still mostly unknown. In lampreys the eye undergoes a dramatic transformation during metamorphosis. Prior to metamorphosis the lamprey retina contains two distinct regions: a smaller central retina (adjacent to the optic nerve) with cells that are differentiated, and an expansive undifferentiated peripheral region (remains proliferative) (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008). During metamorphosis the central differentiated region expands at the expense of the peripheral region and additional retinal cell types (i.e., amacrine and horizontal cells) appear (Rubinson and Cain, 1989; Villar-Cerviño et al., 2006; Abalo et al., 2008). Interestingly, in adult lampreys the adult eye does not appear to have a proliferative peripheral zone (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008). Compared to gnathostomes, there have been relatively few studies to investigate gene expression in the developing lamprey eye. For example, the signals that initiate retina formation in larval lampreys and the switch from the larval eye state to the adult eye state are still unknown (do FGFs, Wnt and hedgehog signaling drive retinal proliferation and differentiation in lampreys as they do in gnathostomes?). Expression of FGF receptors have been identified in the eyes of early lamprey larvae but further work is required to determine what (if any) role these receptors play in eye development (Guérin et al., 2009).

There have been a few studies exploring the role of transcription factors in lamprey eye development. Three *Pax6* paralogs have been identified in the lamprey genome and are

expressed in the eye (Ravi et al., 2019) (Table 1-1). Yamamoto et al., (2020) identified OtxA (homolog to gnathostome Otx2—critical for photoreceptor and bipolar cell development), OtxB (homolog to gnathostome Crx—specifies photoreceptors) and Chx10 (expressed in gnathostome bipolar cells) expression in the adult lamprey retina. Compared to mice, the lamprey Crx and Chx10 homologs appear to have similar expression profiles to that of gnathostomes (expressed in the photoreceptors of the ONL and interneurons of the INL respectively). However, the majority of OtxA expression occurred in lamprey photoreceptors whereas gnathostomes also have strong Otx2 expression in bipolar neurons. The authors suggest Otx2 function may have shifted between agnathans and gnathostomes, with Otx2 gaining a role in bipolar cell specification later in gnathostome eye evolution. Investigation of other retinal development genes could allow us to dissect which elements of the vertebrate retinal system may be ancestral for all vertebrates and which arose later in specific lineages. Examining genomic data available in Ensembl and NCBI (National Center for Biotechnology Information), the lamprey genome possesses homologs for other homeobox genes critical for (gnathostome) eye development such as Six3/6 and Rx/Rax(Table 1-1). Lampreys also have genes necessary for retinal neurogenesis in other vertebrates such as neurodifferentiation factor (NeuroD1), neurogenin, Ascl1 and Atoh7 (Häming et al., 2011; Lara-Ramirez, 2013 (unpublished); Lara-Ramírez et al., 2015; Higuchi et al., 2019) (Table 1-2). Ascl1 expression has not been explored closely in the lamprey retina but has been identified in the lens of larval lampreys (Häming et al., 2011). If and how these genes are expressed in the retina is unknown. More detailed expression studies (including experiments manipulating gene expression) are needed to establish if the above genes coordinate lamprey retinogenesis similarly to gnathostome retinal development. If retinogenesis pathways are conserved between lampreys

and gnathostomes, this would support that the basic mechanism(s) for vertebrate retinal development evolved in the ancestor of cyclostomes and gnathostomes.

1.3.3 Chordate photoreceptive organs: a window to the state of the ancestral vertebrate eye?

To explore the origins of the vertebrate eye and retinal neurogenesis, one must contextualize the data against visual sensory organs of their closest invertebrate relatives: the nonvertebrate chordates. This group is composed of the lancelet or amphioxus (cephalochordates) and the tunicates (urochordates) (Figure 1-1A). Both groups have photoreceptive cells, but neither possesses the complex, paired eye structures of the vertebrate visual system (Lamb, 2013). Whether the visual/light sensitive cells of the non-vertebrate chordates are related to vertebrate eyes has been debated (see below). In addition to work examining the morphology and function of these organs, several studies have begun to examine the development of amphioxus and tunicate photoreceptive organs, allowing for comparisons to be made to retinal neurogenesis in vertebrate eye, they could be used to study the early transitional stages leading to the vertebrate eye. The developmental processes driving neurogenesis in non-vertebrate chordates could also provide evolutionary context for retinogenesis in vertebrates.

It has been suggested that the vertebrate ancestor (proto-vertebrate) may have had photosensitive organs resembling those seen in the extant non-vertebrate chordates. The cephalochordates (amphioxus) and urochordates (tunicates) only possess simple photoreceptive cells/organs (not organized into an eye) used for simple light-guided behavior (i.e., phototaxis). Amphioxus possesses four distinct regions that carry photosensitive properties: the frontal eye, lamellar body, Joseph cells and dorsal ocelli (Pergner and Kozmik, 2017). The frontal eye and the lamellar body are of particular interest as they contain ciliary photoreceptors (vertebrate

photosensory organs also contain ciliary photoreceptors). Several studies have proposed homology between the frontal eye of amphioxus and the lateral eyes of vertebrates on the basis that both structures contain similar cell types and gene expression profiles. The frontal eye contains a pigment cell directly adjacent to a row of photoreceptors that express two distinct amphioxus ciliary opsins (op1 and op3) (Vopalensky et al., 2012) (Figure 1-1B). This organization has been compared to the photoreceptors and adjacent RPE layer of the vertebrate retina. In addition, developing amphioxus pigment cells express *Mitf* and *tyrosinase* (as does the developing vertebrate RPE) and amphioxus photoreceptors express Otx2 and potentially amphioxus-rx (similar to the gene expression profile of vertebrate photoreceptors) (Vopalensky et al., 2012). Although the dorsal eye does not possess a layered retinal structure as seen in vertebrates, there are several adjacent groups of neuronal cells that have been hypothesized to be homologous to other retinal cell types seen in vertebrates. One group of neurons within the frontal eye expresses a combination of pax4/6 and rx, which has led to these cells being compared to vertebrate interneurons (Vopalensky et al., 2012). A separate set of frontal eye neurons have been suggested to be retinal ganglion cells or bipolar cells (or at least share a similar function) based on their projection to the amphioxus cerebral vesicle (homologous to vertebrate forebrain/midbrain). Based on this developmental data, the cell types in the amphioxus frontal eye have been proposed to be homologous to cell types in the vertebrate retina, although the photoreceptors themselves are not as complex nor is the frontal eye organized like the vertebrate retina (Vopalensky et al., 2012; Pergner and Kozmik, 2017; Lacalli, 2018). In addition, amphioxus have homologs of genes involved in the vertebrate phototransduction cascade and the retinoid cycle (Albalat, 2012; Lamb and Hunt, 2017).

Ascidian (tunicate) larvae also possess a photosensitive structure, the ocellus (Figure 1-1C). This organ consists of a pigment cell associated with multiple photoreceptor cells and lens cells (the tunicate lens cells are not believed to be homologous with the lens of the vertebrate eye) (Eakin and Kuda, 1971; Kusakabe et al., 2001; Horie et al., 2005; Esposito et al., 2015). Ascidian photoreceptors are ciliary (as are vertebrate photoreceptors) and express a homolog of opsin Ciopsin1 (Eakin and Kuda, 1971; Kusakabe et al., 2001). The tunicate homolog of Rx helps to form the ocellus and *Onecut* and *Neurogenin* are also expressed in the ocellus (vertebrate homologs of these genes contribute to retinal development) (D'Aniello et al., 2006; Esposito et al., 2015). These features support tunicate photoreceptors may be homologous to vertebrate lateral eye photoreceptors. Tunicate pigment cells have also been compared to the RPE cells of the vertebrates, and as with amphioxus pigment cells they express homologs of Mitf and tyrosinase (Sato and Yamamoto, 2001; Yajima et al., 2003). Finally, as with amphioxus, the tunicate genome contains homologs of several genes required for phototransduction and retinoid cycling in vertebrates (Kusakabe and Tsuda, 2007; Esposito et al., 2015). The function of these genes within the amphioxus frontal eye and tunicate ocellus would need to be assessed further to support a conserved function between cephalochordates/urochordates and vertebrates, but at the very least certain genetic elements employed to form the vertebrate retina may have existed in the chordate lineage prior to the emergence of the vertebrates.

Overall, characterization of cell types and gene expression profiles within the photosensitive structures of extant chordates suggest the basic cell types that contribute to the vertebrate retina may have already arisen within the last common ancestor of all (vertebrate and non-vertebrate) chordates. The vertebrate eye is presumed to have developed from a simpler structure composed of several photoreceptor cells aggregated together and associated with pigment cells (an ancient

arrangement that occurs in photoreceptive organs throughout Metazoans) (Arendt, 2003; Fain et al., 2010). The vertebrate retina, tunicate ocellus, and the amphioxus frontal eye each consist of pigment cell(s) associated with ciliary photoreceptors (contrasting rhabdomeric photoreceptors that underpin vision in many invertebrates). Therefore, the state of photoreceptive organs in amphioxus and tunicates represents a plausible idea of what the early form of the vertebrate eye may have been. However, the laminated vertebrate retina is highly complex and there must have been many modifications to get from a "chordate-like" proto-vertebrate photoreceptive organ to the vertebrate retina (and eye) plan. The transitional stages that would have led from relatively simple clusters of photoreceptive cells to complex vertebrate camera-style eyes would have involved retinal (or photoreceptor associated) cell types increasing in number and variety and being arranged into distinct layers (Land and Fernald, 1992; Nilsson, 2009).

This process may be related to the emergence of sensory placodes and neural crest in the vertebrate lineage. Sensory placodes are embryonic thickenings of the head ectoderm which contribute to the formation of multiple sensory organs (Schlosser, 2006). Placodes first appeared in vertebrates (i.e., are not found in the non-vertebrate chordates) and are believed to have facilitated an increase in the complexity of vertebrate sensory organs by producing high concentrations of sensory cells clustered into particular areas (Schlosser et al., 2014). This arrangement would set up ideal conditions for the formation of sensory organs in the early vertebrates compared to the scattered sensory cells of other chordates. In vertebrates only the lens placode contributes to eye formation, and it does not directly produce sensory cells (i.e., photoreceptors), but instead forms the non-neural lens (Schlosser, 2006). However, the lens placode does interact with surrounding tissues to induce eye formation by undergoing morphogenetic movement to aid in forming the optic cup and by releasing signals to promote

formation of the neural retina (Cardozo et al., 2019). Perhaps the evolution of the lens placode in the vertebrate ancestor created a region of cells specified for a photoreceptor/interneuron fate via a similar signaling mechanism. Once photoreceptors and visual neurons began to develop in higher concentrations near the lens placode, this may have paved the way for the simpler photoreceptive neurons of chordates to become grouped into an organized retina-like structure (this organization may also have been coordinated by the early vertebrate lens placode). Neural crest cells are another vertebrate innovation. They are a population of migratory cells that contribute to multiple structures (especially within the head) in developing vertebrate embryos and are often associated with formation of sensory organs (Yu, 2010; York et al., 2020). Neural crest is important for proper morphogenesis of the developing vertebrate eye-when neural crest is lost the optic cup does not form properly (Bryan et al., 2020). In early vertebrates, neural crest may have allowed for the shift to a more complex eye structure by providing an additional set of cells to coordinate eye/optic cup formation. Ongoing proliferation late into ontogeny (postembryonic neurogenesis) is another factor that could have also contributed to evolution of the cup-like eye morphology. The photoreceptors themselves would have also needed to gain further morphological complexity and efficiency for light detection and processing (vertebrate ciliary photoreceptors are more complex structurally compared to those of tunicates or amphioxus) (Lamb et al., 2007; Pergner and Kozmik, 2017). Assuming the early vertebrate had a phototransduction cascade and elements of the retinoid cycling pathway similar to extant nonvertebrate chordates, these pathways would also require further changes to reach the state seen in extant vertebrates (Kusakabe and Tsuda, 2007; Albalat, 2012; Lamb and Hunt, 2017; Pergner and Kozmik, 2017).

Alongside the increase in complexity of visual cells, the vertebrates also have more complex visual pathways in the central nervous system. This had to be coordinated with retinal evolution to allow for the connection between light detection in the eye and visual information processing in the brain to remain linked. There are many factors that need to be considered when postulating about vertebrate eye evolution, but the current evidence suggests certain chordate photoreceptive organs/cell types may be homologous to the vertebrate eye. Therefore, a comparison of the features (and developmental processes producing those features) between the amphioxus frontal eye, tunicate ocellus and the vertebrate retina may provide a more complete image of the state of the ancestral chordate/vertebrate eye and how the photoreceptive organs of these groups arose from it.

1.4 Adult retinal neurogenesis - a source of new retinal cells throughout ontogeny

1.4.1 The ciliary marginal zone and Müller glia: pools of retinal stem cells in gnathostomes Retinogenesis is most thoroughly characterized during embryonic development but in many vertebrates retinogenesis continues robustly in adult animals. The ciliary marginal zone (CMZ) is a region of stem cells that occurs around the periphery of the neural retina in multiple vertebrate groups (Figure 1-3A). This proliferative cell population generates new retinal neurons throughout ontogeny (Johns, 1977; Fischer et al., 2014) (Figure 1-3B). Cells of the CMZ are multipotent and capable of forming any of the retinal cell classes (Raymond et al., 1988). This proliferative zone has been identified in teleost fishes, amphibians, and birds (the CMZ is relatively limited in mature birds) but is not apparent in mammals (Johns, 1977; Hitchcock et al., 2004; Fischer et al., 2014) (Figure 1-3C). Despite this it has been noted that some cell populations within the peripheral retina of mammals express markers related to retinal
progenitors and can be induced to take on a progenitor identity in cell culture (Das et al., 2005; Jian et al., 2009). The possibility of regressive evolutionary loss of the CMZ in mammals, and perhaps also in sharks (Hernández Núñez et al., 2021) lends tentative support to the speculation that lampreys have lost the CMZ, as discussed below.

Within gnathostomes, the differentiation of cells from the CMZ appears to recapitulate many of the same mechanisms as embryonic retinal development, but this is an area still under investigation (Link and Darland, 2001; Wehman et al., 2005; Xu et al., 2020). In the most peripheral region of the CMZ cells retain full stem cell characteristics and are multipotent (Raymond et al., 2006). Moving from the periphery towards the center of the retina, CMZ cells become more differentiated (begin to express neurogenic/proneural genes and ultimately become fully specified). Xu et al., (2020) have identified several groups of CMZ cells (based on gene expression markers) that are comparable to groups arising during embryonic retinal development. The most peripheral group of cells express *fabp11a*, a gene seen in early embryonic retinal stem cells. *Her4.2* expression (another gene expressed in early embryonic retinal stem cells) was found slightly more centrally. Even more centrally several genes related to the differentiation of retinal cells (i.e., atoh7-RGC's, vsx-bipolar cells, rcnphotoreceptors, etc.) are expressed. These results suggest that the cells from the CMZ pass through several competence stages across the CMZ before taking on their final differentiated state. A similar sequence of stages was documented from cells developing from the CMZ in *Xenopus* (Perron et al., 1998). It is still unknown how the CMZ functions in jawless vertebrates and whether the retinal margin of hagfish can be considered conserved (in structure and function) with the CMZ of gnathostomes. However, if the CMZ of hagfish operates similarly to gnathostomes (i.e., embryonic and adult retinogenesis occur via shared mechanisms) this would

support the adult hagfish CMZ as a valuable tissue for studying hagfish retinal development in the absence of embryos.

Müller glia are an additional source of multipotent cells for retinal regeneration in vertebrates late into ontogeny (particularly after injury) (Raymond et al., 2006; Lenkowski and Raymond, 2014). Müller glia are the only non-neural cell population within the retina and serve a supporting role for the various retinal neurons. However, Müller glia can also return to a stemcell fate to then re-differentiate into neurons after injury (Raymond et al., 1988; Bernardos et al., 2007; Fimbel et al., 2007; Goldman, 2014; Lenkowski and Raymond, 2014). The return to a multipotent state is mediated by several genetic networks including activation of *Ascl1* (Gao et al., 2021).

1.4.2 Evidence for adult retinal growth in the cyclostomes

The evolutionary origin of the CMZ is unknown but a putative CMZ has been identified in hagfish (Dong and Allison, 2021). The retinal margin of adult hagfish expresses the CMZ marker *Pax6* and contains immature photoreceptor cells. In addition, hagfish eye size increases with body size (supporting the eye grows throughout ontogeny). These findings contrast earlier assumptions that the hagfish eye is degenerate and degenerating, which would be consistent with a release from selective pressure for processing light/visual information (why maintain an eye with no purpose?). As hagfish possess a proliferative retina past embryonic development, this would suggest the eye still has biological/ecological significance despite its small size and simple organization. Interestingly, larval lampreys also possess a proliferative retinal region, but the adults do not (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008) (Figure 1-3D,E). The cells of the peripheral lamprey retina appear to stop proliferating after metamorphosis. This phenomenon has only been documented in one species (*Petromyzon marinus*), so it is unclear if all lampreys undergo loss of

retinal proliferation during ontogeny or if it is species-specific. Examining the retinae of other lamprey species and life stages would be necessary to elucidate whether any lampreys have a CMZ and post-embryonic retinal growth or if the absence of adult retinogenesis is consistent across this group. The finding that post-embryonic retinogenesis occurs in hagfish but not lampreys suggests that lampreys either have lost the CMZ during evolution, or hagfish and gnathostomes converged on the CMZ condition. Regardless, the existence of the CMZ (or a CMZ-like tissue) in hagfish is surprising. Moreover, this data suggests the hagfish eye is an actively growing tissue and the retina may still be utilized by these organisms despite their dimlight habitat. Research comparing the mechanisms driving adult retinogenesis in cyclostomes and gnathostomes could reveal whether the CMZ of hagfish and gnathostomes arose in a shared ancestor or evolved independently in each lineage.

Müller glia have been studied heavily in teleost fishes and have also been identified in the lamprey retina (Raymond et al., 2006; Fernández-López et al., 2016). However, there is no evidence for the occurrence of Müller glia in the hagfish retina and this is an area where further investigation is warranted.

1.5 Models of vertebrate eye evolution

Given the critical position of hagfish and lampreys in the vertebrate phylogeny, these groups can provide important information for uncovering the history of vertebrate eye evolution. Several scenarios have been proposed to explain how the rudimentary eyes of hagfish fit into the sequence of vertebrate eye evolution and whether the hagfish eye can be considered representative of an "ancestral" state for vertebrates. These models also need to consider that

lampreys possess sophisticated eyes (comparable to gnathostomes), yet also form a monophyletic group with hagfish. There are multiple possibilities for how the eyes of lampreys and hagfish diverged from each other and from gnathostomes (involving gain or loss of features in specific lineages). Given the existing body of evidence we articulate three alternative scenarios for how the hagfish eye may fit into the narrative of vertebrate eye evolution.

1.5.1 Hagfish eyes as the ancestral state

One scenario holds that the hagfish eye represents an ancestral state for the vertebrate eye. This hypothesis interprets the lack of a lens or pigment and the rudimentary features of the hagfish eye/retina as ancestral features related to an early state of eye evolution (Lamb et al., 2007), but no longer has strong support given the monophyly of hagfish and lampreys. Under this model the extant hagfish eye represents a tissue that is akin to a transitional state between the relatively simple photoreceptive cells of (non-vertebrate) chordates and the more complex eyes of other vertebrate groups (Figure 1-4A). In this evolutionary scenario, features such as the lens of the eye and pigment within the retinal epithelium would not have been present in the last common ancestor of hagfish and other vertebrates. The early vertebrate eye would have also had fewer interneurons for processing visual signals compared to later vertebrates (the hagfish condition could be seen as bridging a simpler state comparable to the chordate frontal eye and the complex retina of vertebrates). In this model the hagfish eye (and the hypothetical transitional state) could be compared to the pineal organ of other vertebrates (a photosensory organ with photoreceptors lying directly adjacent to interneurons without additional cellular layers (Lamb et al., 2007; Collin, 2010). This type of visual organ would be sufficient for detecting light but not for forming images.

Assuming the hagfish eye represents a more "primitive" form of the vertebrate eye, the next stage of eye evolution/organization would then be seen in the lamprey. Although still part of the jawless vertebrate clade, lamprey retinae possess four clearly laminated cellular layers (including the pigmented retinal epithelium) and most of the retinal cell types seen in gnathostomes (including several classes of photoreceptors) (Suzuki and Grillner, 2018). The lamprey eye also contains a lens and pigment in the retinal epithelium. This could be seen as a more derived state of the hagfish eye. In comparison, the hagfish eye may represent a more ancestral photoreceptive organ for circadian entrainment rather than image formation (Lamb et al., 2007).

Assuming the hagfish eye is a baseline/ "primitive" state, several ecological drivers could plausibly play a role in the shift towards a more complex eye state in other vertebrates. Changes to the environment and lifestyle of the early vertebrates may have required these animals to develop greater visual acuity (Collin, 2010; Davies et al., 2012). In addition, if the hagfish eye is compared to the vertebrate pineal organ this could also represent a shift from use of photoreception in vertebrates for regulating circadian rhythm to image formation and perception of the environment. The addition of a lens would improve visual acuity and photon capture by focusing light onto the retina (Gustafsson et al., 2008). Pigment within the retinal pigmented epithelium would allow for better perception of incoming light direction (perhaps related to evolving from a dim benthic habitat into environs with more light) (Bharti et al., 2006). Greater retinal lamination and organization would allow for more efficient processing and integration of visual information (Lamb et al., 2007). Finally, evolution of more complex photoreceptors and multiple opsin classes would allow vision over a breadth of light intensities to evolve (Yokoyama, 2000; Lamb et al., 2007). As deep-sea scavengers, hagfish may have not needed sophisticated vision. However, if other vertebrates took advantage of rich photic niches, good

vision would have been critical for avoiding predators and finding prey. This evolutionary pressure would ultimately lead to the formation of a functional and potentially image forming eye.

As hagfish and lampreys constitute a monophyletic clade this scenario is no longer thought to be plausible (Mallatt and Sullivan, 1998; Kuraku et al., 1999; Heimberg et al., 2010; Ota et al., 2011; Miyashita et al., 2019). Lampreys possess relatively sophisticated eyes, and this would imply a large degree of convergence between the lamprey eye state and the gnathostome eye state if the hagfish eye condition were ancestral. Thus, the last common ancestor of hagfish, lampreys and gnathostomes likely had an elaborate eye with many features familiar from extant vertebrates (Figure 1-1A). Additionally, although hagfish and lampreys are the only extant Agnathans, several fossils of early jawless vertebrates have been found, and a few studies have investigated the eyes of these specimens. Gabbott et al., (2016) argue that the fossils of both extinct hagfish and lamprey contain pigment. This is a feature that is more consistent with the eye state of extant lampreys than with hagfish and would support an earlier emergence of the "complex" vertebrate eye (i.e., the hagfish eye condition is likely not ancestral for the vertebrate lineage). One limitation of the fossil data is that ocular structures do not generally preserve well. In addition, there can be multiple interpretations for fossil eye data so ideally other lines of evidence (i.e., developmental, genetic, etc.) should be used to support an early origin of these features. The frontal eye of amphioxus and the ocellus of tunicates (argued to be potentially homologous with the vertebrate eye/retina) also contain pigment cells. If the pigment cells of amphioxus and tunicates are ancestral/homologous to the vertebrate RPE (as supported by Sato and Yamamoto, 2001; Yajima et al., 2003; Vopalensky et al., 2012), this would conflict with the hagfish RnPE being the "ancestral condition" for vertebrates (although it does not exclude the

possibility that other features of the hagfish eye, such as the absence of a lens, may be ancestral). This is an area where an exploration of retinogenesis and/or eye development in cyclostomes may be particularly useful. If the hagfish retina forms in the absence of retinal developmental pathways seen in other vertebrates, this could support the idea that the hagfish eye has ancestral elements (i.e., some features are rudimentary due to hagfish not having evolved genetic/developmental networks employed by other vertebrates).

1.5.2 Hagfish eyes as a product of regressive evolution

An alternative scenario/hypothesis is that the hagfish eye represents a degenerate state due to the hagfish adapting to a lowlight environment (the deep-sea). In this model the ancestral hagfish eye would have been similar to that of the extant lampreys or gnathostomes (containing a lens, photoreceptors and pigment) (Figure 1-4B). Due to lack of use as they adapted to a dim-light marine scavenger existence, hagfish as a group would have had their eye structures reduced resulting in smaller eyes (covered in skin or muscle), loss of the lens, loss of ocular pigment, and reduced organization/complexity of the retina. As previously mentioned, both living amphioxus and tunicates and at least once species of fossil Agnathan appears to have pigmented cells associated with photoreceptors (Yajima et al., 2003; Vopalensky et al., 2012; Gabbott et al., 2016). This would support that the ancestors of extant hagfish likely had a pigmented retinal epithelium. Fossil agnathans (classified as lamprey) possibly had a lens (Gabbott et al., 2016) and there is an (unconvincing) report of a lens in at least one extant hagfish species (Kobayashi, 1964). These findings suggest that more "complex" features may been long present in the cyclostome lineage. Fernholm and Holmberg (1975) demonstrated that even within living hagfish the state of the eye varies among species (especially between those that inhabit different light environments). Hagfish that live at greater depths (and lower light levels) have more

rudimentary eyes (eyes covered by muscle instead of transparent skin, photoreceptor morphology more divergent than in other groups). This phenomenon is not restricted to hagfish as Davies et al., (2009) also showed a light dwelling lamprey species had more complex eyes and a greater variety of photoreceptor subtypes than deeper water species.

There are several genetic and/or developmental mechanisms through which the hagfish eye may have regressed. Other organisms with regressed eyes also tend to live in dim or aphotic environments (such as subterranean and cave-dwelling animals). In these groups (and presumably in hagfish) the eye is no longer useful and therefore the selective pressure to maintain a functional eye is greatly reduced. Genetic drift can then act, resulting in the loss of functional genetic machinery to maintain the eye (Jeffery, 2009; Emerling and Springer, 2014). Additionally, the eye/retina is an energetically expensive organ (Yu et al., 2009). Allowing such a structure to become reduced or lost when it is no longer useful allows resources to be utilized on other structures that may be more beneficial for survival. In the deep-sea environment where light is limited and hagfish can rely on olfaction, a fully functional eye may not be worth maintaining (Yu et al., 2009). Finally, if vision is not vital and other structures/systems are expanded, this can result in pleiotropic effects that lead to eye loss. In cavefish (A. mexicanus) the shift from a reliance on vision to other senses (i.e., gustation, mechanoreception) and changes in feeding strategies that accompanied adaptation to an aphotic cave environment are believed to have contributed to the loss of the eyes (Yamamoto et al., 2009; Yoshizawa et al., 2012). These changes altered important signaling pathways, including those required for proper eve development. Hagfish may have undergone similar evolution: selection for improving other senses (e.g., olfaction) in a dim-light environment could have altered expression of developmental genes with "side-effects" that compromised the developmental pathway for

generating an eye/retina. Further work studying the embryonic development of hagfish and potentially manipulating the signalling pathways and genes at play could illuminate whether eye loss is intertwined with the developmental expansion of other sensory systems.

In the wild, hagfish are believed to use vision to a limited extent (if at all). Most hagfish live in deep water, although some species occur in relatively shallow areas where light can reach (Patzner, 1978; Braun, 1996; Martini, 1998). Several studies have suggested that hagfish have limited sensitivity to light. The response of hagfish eyes to light is weak and occurs slowly compared to other vertebrates (Kobayashi, 1964; Patzner, 1978). Interestingly, a behavioural response to light still occurs even if the eyes are removed, suggesting hagfish may have extraocular photoreceptors (Kobayashi, 1964). Light does appear to play a role in circadian rhythm for hagfish and it has been proposed the eye may take on the function of the pineal organ (a pineal has not yet been identified in hagfish) (Ooka-Souda and Kabasawa, 1995; Lamb et al., 2007; Lamb, 2013). This has led to the standing idea that hagfish are more reliant on other senses (i.e., olfaction) to find food due to their deep-sea environment and living primarily as scavengers. However, some studies suggest hagfish can be predatory (perhaps to a greater extent than previously realized) and hagfish eye morphology does vary with the available light environment (Braun, 1996; Martini, 1998; Zintzen et al., 2011). Fernholm and Holmberg (1975) noted that hagfish species living in shallower water had more complex eye features than their deeper water relatives. Species in the genus *Myxine* have very reduced eyes covered by muscle whereas *Eptatretus* and *Paramyxine* species have eyes only covered by a translucent layer of skin (some light can reach the eye) (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975). The photoreceptors of *Myxine* hagfish are more reduced compared to Eptatretus and Paramyxine as well. This would suggest some elements of eye function remain intact in light-dwelling species. Furthermore, it has been

reported that hagfish actively avoid (and therefore respond to) light in their environments (Fernholm, 1974). This would support the idea of regression with a transition to dim-light environments. Yet, if regression were the full explanation for why hagfish eyes were reduced it would be odd for hagfish species living in well-lit environments to still have such rudimentary eyes. In *Astyanax mexicanus* (a species with cave-dwelling and surface-dwelling fish) there are populations with both functional vision and varying degrees of eye degeneration (Sifuentes-Romero et al., 2020). However, in hagfish all species surveyed appear to have reduced eyesight. This could be due to the evolutionary timeline of hagfish eye loss (i.e., hagfish may have adapted to this lifestyle over hundreds of millions of years compared to the divergence between surface dwelling and troglobiont cavefish (*A. mexicanus*) which diverged several million years ago). Further work is needed to establish to what extent hagfish utilize visual cues in their environment.

1.5.3 Hagfish eye regression via paedomorphosis

An alternate mechanism for regression of the hagfish eye is paedomorphosis. Several groups have compared the hagfish eye to the eye of larval lampreys (Lamb et al., 2007; Collin et al., 2009). Lamprey larvae have a relatively simple eyespot, only one type of photoreceptor, and simpler retinal organization/lamination compared to adults (as described in **Section 1.3.2**) (Suzuki and Grillner, 2018). The larval eyes are also buried under skin and do not emerge until after metamorphosis. These conditions are comparable to the state of hagfish eyes. This has led to the speculation that hagfish eyes may be paedomorphic. In this scenario ancestrally vertebrate eyes would have undergone a transition to a more complex state during ontogeny/maturation but during hagfish evolution a heterochronic shift(s) in gene expression resulted in the retention of a larval eye state (Figure 1-4C). Extant hagfish have direct development whereas the shift in eye

morphology in lampreys occurs during metamorphosis. Regardless, the ancestor of hagfish and lampreys may have had a shift in eye morphology that extant hagfish have lost. The fact that the lamprey retina undergoes some continual development throughout the larval stage (i.e., late-stage larvae have further retinal differentiation than the early-stage larvae) reduces support for the paedomorphosis model (Cornide-Petronio et al., 2015). If retinal differentiation/maturation is not restricted to a particular developmental stage, some complexity would still be present in the hagfish retina even if a hypothetical metamorphic stage was lost. As developmental data on the retina for embryonic hagfish and lampreys is scarce, it is difficult to support this model using current evidence. Similarly, it is difficult to use fossil data for support (fossils of juvenile cyclostomes are quite rare although some have recently been found (Miyashita et al., 2021)). Future work comparing retinogenesis in hagfish and lampreys could greatly help to explore this idea. If hagfish continue to express genes lost early in lamprey retinal development (or do not express genes that are expressed during lamprey metamorphosis) this could support the theory of heterochrony and a paedomorphic hagfish eye. Experiments manipulating expression of the identified genes to see if eye morphology shifts would provide additional support.

<u>1.5.4 Hagfish are at a vital phylogenetic position to unravel mysteries behind vertebrate eye</u> <u>evolution</u>

A combination of the above scenarios may have contributed to the evolution of the hagfish eye. The majority of current evidence refutes scenario 1 (the hagfish eye as ancestral). Importantly, the hagfish has been placed into a monophyletic clade with the lampreys (a group with a sophisticated eye/retina plan; Figure 1-1) (Mallatt and Sullivan, 1998; Kuraku et al., 1999; Heimberg et al., 2010; Ota et al., 2011; Miyashita et al., 2019). Although it is possible the lamprey eye independently converged onto a complex eye condition with the gnathostomes, this scenario is not parsimonious. The hagfish eye also clearly has some features that align with the eyes of lampreys and gnathostomes: despite its overall lack of organization the retina still contains the major retinal cell classes, the retinal non pigmented epithelium still maintains certain functions despite having no pigment, and the retina contains a CMZ (Dong and Allison, 2021). These findings suggest that the hagfish eye has more affinity with other vertebrates than previously thought and support the idea that the current state of the hagfish eye may be reduced from a more complex state (scenarios 2 and 3). Complexity also arises, because various hagfish eye features may have regressed via separate mechanisms. For example, paedomorphy could possibly account for lack of well-defined retinal lamination in hagfish, but paedomorphy seems untenable for loss of RPE pigmentation because photoreceptors are associated with pigment across all phyla and developmental stages (Bharti et al., 2006; Vopalensky and Kozmik, 2009).

Several lines of evidence support the regression theory for evolution of the hagfish eye. Fossil data suggests some components of the eye may have arisen via regression (i.e., fossil hagfish appear to have ocular pigment whereas extant hagfish species do not) but not others (i.e., a lens was not identified in the fossil hagfish specimen) (Gabbott et al., 2016). The correlation between the condition of the hagfish eye and the environment (i.e., ambient light levels) in extant species could also support the rudimentary eye features being a result of evolutionary regression. The proposal of the hagfish eye as paedomorphic is interesting (especially in the context of the eye phenotype shift during lamprey ontogeny) but requires more work to determine if heterochrony is at play during hagfish development. Determining whether certain eye features are ancestral, or degenerate would be aided by comparison across hagfish species (particularly species that inhabit photic vs. aphotic environments). Future work comparing the retinogenesis pathways of hagfish to lampreys, gnathostomes, and non vertebrate chordates would be an enlightening

contribution. If complex eye features were indeed lost during evolution there may still be vestiges of associated gene regulatory networks and developmental processes in the hagfish eye (the putative CMZ in the hagfish retina is one possible remnant).

Although the hagfish lineage has been separated from jawed vertebrates for at least 500–600 million years, the hagfish eye has some features that could be considered synapomorphic with gnathostomes and lampreys (i.e., the last common ancestor of gnathostomes and cyclostomes likely had each of the major classes of retinal cell types as these are found in both descendant lineages). Other traits may have been retained from the common ancestor in one lineage and lost in the other or are novel traits that arose in one lineage alone. Work examining gene expression during hagfish eye development and retinal neurogenesis could elucidate which genes were utilized for eye formation in the ancestor of cyclostomes and gnathostomes, versus genes which evolved or were co-opted for different uses in each respective lineage. Overcoming the logistical challenges of studying hagfish retinal development is key. Several research laboratories have successfully bred hagfish embryos, which would be an ideal organism for studying hagfish retinal development (Ota and Kuratani, 2008). However, the discovery of a putative ciliary marginal zone is an additional path for exploring retinal growth in adult specimens. In addition to characterizing cyclostome retinal neurogenesis pathways, manipulative genetic experiments in hagfish and lampreys would be an exciting future avenue for exploring the evolution of retinogenesis in the early vertebrates. Altering cyclostome gene expression to change the timing of certain developmental events (i.e., testing the heterochrony model) or to recapitulate phenotypes (i.e., trying to recover a more "functional" eye in hagfish or knocking down genes in lampreys to recreate the hagfish eye condition) could provide experimental evidence to support the three evolutionary scenarios outlined above.

1.6 Objectives and purpose of study

As members of a lineage that diverged from other vertebrates ~600 mya, hagfish are an ideal species to investigate the origin of the vertebrate eye. The unique, rudimentary morphology of the hagfish eye has previously been interpreted as representing an ancestral or transitional state in vertebrate eye evolution (Lamb, 2013). However, the monophyletic grouping of hagfish with lampreys (which do possess a complex, camera-style eye) makes this scenario unlikely. In addition, the hagfish eye does share similarities with the eyes of other vertebrates despite its comparatively simplistic organization (Dong and Allison, 2021). Another more probable scenario is that the hagfish eye has been reduced over evolutionary time. Existence as deep-sea marine scavengers may have released hagfish from the pressure to maintain a functional eye, resulting in the loss of critical eye structures. Alternatively, expansion of other structures (i.e., the olfactory system) may have led to a reduced eye via pleiotropy. By exploring proliferation and gene expression in the hagfish eye, the goal of this study is to uncover if the mechanisms driving retinogenesis are shared between cyclostomes and gnathostomes (and are therefore ancestral for the whole vertebrate lineage) or if each group has evolved distinct pathways to produce a retina.

This study has two main aims. The first is to confirm and characterize retinal proliferation in the adult hagfish. Previous work suggests hagfish may have a proliferative zone at the margin of the retina (similar to the CMZ of gnathostomes) (Dong and Allison, 2021). If true, this tissue would provide an opportunity to examine retinal development in adult animals where embryos are unavailable. In addition, continued proliferation in the hagfish retina is surprising given the diminutive/degenerate state of the eye. Characterizing the proliferation (i.e., where it occurs in the hagfish retina and what retinal cells are being generated) in adult hagfish may allow us to

determine if the tissue can be considered homologous to the CMZ of other vertebrates. It would also be fascinating to uncover why growth continues in the rudimentary and diminutive hagfish eye. Ciliary marginal zones are well known in teleost fishes and amphibians and occur to a limited extent in birds (Fischer et al., 2014). However, there is no clear evidence of a ciliary marginal zone in lampreys or sharks (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008; Hernández-Núñez et al., 2021). If the neurogenesis at the hagfish retinal periphery occurs via similar mechanisms to the gnathostome CMZ, this would be another example of a commonality between hagfish and gnathostome eyes. The presence of a ciliary marginal zone in hagfish could also mean that this tissue originated early in the vertebrate lineage (and has regressed more than once during retinal evolution).

The second aim is to investigate if the hagfish retina develops via similar cellular and molecular mechanisms to the gnathostome retina. Comparisons of model vertebrate species (i.e., mouse, frog, chicken, zebrafish) has demonstrated that many aspects of eye and retinal development are heavily conserved across the vertebrates. For example, expression of critical transcription factors such as *Otx2*, *Crx*, *Six3*, *Rx*, and *NeuroD* help regulate overall formation of the eye and perform crucial roles during retinogenesis in multiple vertebrate groups (Table 1-1, Table 1-2). Much less work has been done to examine eye/retina formation in the cyclostomes. As a lineage separated from other vertebrates for hundreds of millions of years, a comparison of hagfish retinal development to representative gnathostomes may allow us to draw more conclusions about the state of the ancestral vertebrate eye. If hagfish and gnathostomes possess shared developmental mechanisms for retinogenesis, this would suggest that these pathways are ancestral for vertebrates and evolved before the divergence of the cyclostome and gnathostome lineages. If

different genes or pathways are involved in each group, this could suggest that certain aspects of retinal development independently evolved in the cyclostome and gnathostome lineages.

Overall, the early origin of the vertebrate eye and retina remains unclear. The large timespan involved, and understudied nature of a major vertebrate clade, the Cyclostomata (lampreys and especially hagfish), make studying the evolution of these structures difficult. There is still much to be learned about retinogenesis in agnathans. Unravelling the retinal development pathways of these organisms through genetic/molecular/developmental characterization has the potential to clarify the evolutionary origins of this sophisticated sensory organ. The recent availability of hagfish embryos and the discovery of a proliferative CMZ region in adult hagfish creates exciting new opportunities to investigate the emergence of the vertebrate retina and camera-style eye. This study will utilize the CMZ region in adult hagfish to explore the developmental mechanisms driving hagfish retinogenesis.

Acknowledgements

We appreciate discussions with Emily Dong that contributed to the ideas discussed here.

Figures and Tables



Figure 1-1: Evolutionary origins of the vertebrate eye and the appearance of other photoreceptive organs across Chordata. A) A phylogeny of Chordata. Chordata consists of three subphyla: Cephalochordata (amphioxus), Urochordata (tunicates) and Vertebrata (the Vertebrates). Two clades form Vertebrata: The Hagfish and Lamprey (Myxiniformes and Petromyzontiformes) form a distinct group known as Cyclostomata (extant members of the jawless vertebrates (Agnatha)) and the jawed vertebrates form Gnathostomata. Paired, complex eyes appear within Vertebrata but not in the other Chordate subphyla. B) Most all gnathostomes have the familiar vertebrate eye and retinal structures, conserved from fish through mammals. The eyes are paired and bilateral. Each eye contains a multi-layered retina for light detection and image formation, a pigmented retinal epithelial layer and a lens to focus incoming light. C) The amphioxus frontal eye is an unpaired photoreceptive organ located at the anterior end of the amphioxus. The frontal eye contains a single pigment cell, several photoreceptor cells, and several interneurons (Vopalensky et al., 2012). D) The tunicate ocellus is an unpaired photoreceptor cells (Horie et al., 2005). In some species the ocellus also contains lens cells, but these are not believed to be homologous with the lens structure of the vertebrate eye. Graphics created using BioRender.com.



Figure 1-2: Retinal organization across cyclostomes and gnathostomes provides a backdrop for alternative hypotheses of vertebrate eye evolution. A) Across most all gnathostomes, the retina is composed of four distinct cellular layers – the retinal pigmented epithelium, the outer nuclear layer (ONL) containing photoreceptors, the inner nuclear layer (INL) containing bipolar cells and other interneurons and the retinal ganglion cell layer (RGC) containing retinal ganglion cells. B) The adult lamprey retina has a similar organization to the gnathostome retinal plan. The photoreceptors have a distinct morphology and the retinal ganglion cell bodies occur in the inner nuclear layer and the inner plexiform layer rather than forming their own distinct cellular layer. C) The pre-metamorphic larval lamprey retina is distinct from the adult, as it has only a small differentiated central retina (containing one type of photoreceptor, bipolar cells, retinal ganglion cells and Müller glia) and a larger undifferentiated peripheral retina. Completion of retinal

differentiation and the formation of horizontal and amacrine cells occurs during metamorphosis. D) The hagfish retina is morphologically distinct from lamprey and gnathostome retinae, which is intriguing considering the position of hagfish in the vertebrate phylogeny (Figure 1-1A). The retinal epithelium is unpigmented, and the lamination between the presumptive inner nuclear layer and the retinal ganglion cell layer is poor. Despite the reduced organization, molecular studies support that the hagfish retina contains all four cellular layers seen in lampreys and gnathostomes (Dong and Allison, 2021). Graphics created using BioRender.com.



Figure 1-3: Structure of the ciliary marginal zone (CMZ) in gnathostomes and cyclostomes. A) The ciliary marginal zone is a proliferative region that occurs at the periphery of the neural retina in multiple vertebrate groups (though it is reduced/absent in mammals). B) The boxed section of panel 1-3A. Within the ciliary marginal zone cells closest to the retinal periphery are multipotent stem cells that divide to generate new retinal cells. Moving towards the center of the retina the cells of the CMZ begin to express markers of neurogenesis and ultimately become specified and differentiated as one of the main retinal cell types. C) Presence of PCNA (a marker of proliferative cells) in the ciliary marginal zone of zebrafish. D) In zebrafish *Pax6* is expressed at the very peripheral margin of the CMZ (*Pax6* marks the retinal stem cells and a subset of differentiated INL and GCL cells). E) In sea lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus*) PCNA (black) labelling indicates that cell proliferation also occurs throughout the more peripheral sections of the retina. Once the lamprey complete metamorphosis the proliferative region of the retina loses

PCNA expression (the CMZ-like tissue is not maintained into adulthood). F) The hagfish retina has expression of *Pax6* at the most peripheral retinal margin. This expression pattern is similar to the *Pax6* expression seen in the CMZ of other vertebrates and supports the interpretation that hagfish have a CMZ (or a CMZ-like tissue) at the margin of the retina. Panels C and D were adapted from Raymond et al., (2006) (Copyright © 2006, Raymond et al; licensee BioMed Central Ltd.). Panel E was adapted from Villar-Cheda et al., (2008) (Reprinted from Brain Research, Volume 1201, Begoña Villar-Cheda, Xesús Manoel Abalo, Verona Villar-Cerviño, Antón Barreiro-Iglesias, Ramón Anadón, María Celina Rodicio, Late proliferation and photoreceptor differentiation in the transforming lamprey retina, Page 61, 2008, with permission from Elsevier). Panel F was adapted from Dong and Allison, 2021 (Copyright © 2021, Dong and Allison, 2021; The Royal Society (U.K.)). Graphics in Panels A and B were created using BioRender.com.



Figure 1-4: Alternative models of vertebrate eye evolution. A) The hagfish eye as the ancestral condition of the vertebrate eye. In this scenario the extant hagfish eye is representative of the ancestral vertebrate eye state (this 'primitive' eye still has greater complexity than the photoreceptive structures of non-vertebrate chordates). The lamprey converged upon a more complex eye condition alongside the gnathostomes. B) The hagfish eye as a degenerate/regressed condition. In this scenario the last common ancestor of cyclostomes and gnathostomes had a relatively sophisticated eye. Lampreys and the lineage leading to gnathostomes maintained this eye condition whereas the hagfish eye degenerated resulting in extant hagfish possessing rudimentary visual structures. C) The hagfish eye as a paedomorphic/neotenic condition. In this hypothesis, the last common ancestor of gnathostomes and cyclostomes would have undergone a shift in eye morphology during ontogeny, with larvae having more rudimentary features and adults having complex eyes. Lampreys (and gnathostomes) maintained this transition to a more complex state. The hagfish lost the transition and the eye seen in adult hagfish represents 'juvenile' vertebrate eye features. It is also possible that a combination of these scenarios could have contributed to the state of the extant hagfish eye (see Section 1.5). Graphics created using BioRender.com.

| Gene | Hagfish | Lamprey | Zebrafish | Mouse | Function |
|---------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| Gene Pax 6 | Hagfish Present (Dong and Allison, 2021; Feiner et al., 2014) | Lamprey Present (Ravi et al., 2019) | Zebrafish Present (Feiner et al., 2014) | Mouse Present (Feiner et al., 2014) | FunctionActs as a masterregulator of eyedevelopment,specifies eyefield, regulatestiming ofretinogenesis,regulates retinalcell multipotencyand contributesto specificationof multipleretinal cell types(Chow et al.,1999; Marquardtet al., 2001;Kozmik, 2005;Philips et al.,2005; Oron-Karni et al.,2008; Remez etal., 2017) |
| Otx1 | Present * (<i>OtxC</i>) | Present (<i>OtxC</i>) (Yamamoto et al., 2020) | Present (Lane and Lister, 2012) | Present (Martinez- Morales et al., 2001) | <i>Otx1</i> contributes to the formation of distinct eye regions (i.e., neural retina vs. RPE) and the proper formation of the neural retina (Martinez- Morales et al., 2001; Lane and Lister, 2012) |
| Otx2 | Present * (<i>OtxA</i>) | Present (<i>OtxA</i>) (Yamamoto et al., 2020) | Present (Lane and Lister, 2012) | Present (Martinez- Morales et al., 2001; Nishida et al., 2003) | <i>Otx2</i> contributes to specification of the eye field in the neural plate, formation of distinct eye territories, and proper formation of photoreceptors and bipolar cells (Martinez- Morales et al., 2001; Nishida et al., 2003; Lane and Lister, 2012) |
| Otx5/Crx | Present *(OtxB) | Present (OtxB) | Present** (Shen and | Present (Crx) | Aids in terminal differentiation of photoreceptors |

 Table 1-1.
 Presence of retinal homeobox genes across representative vertebrates

| | | (Yamamoto et al., 2020) | Raymond, 2004) | (Furukawa et al., 1997) | (Chen et al., 1997; Furukawa et al., 1997; Viczian et al., 2003) |
|--------|--|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Six3 | Present *** (Oisi et al., 2013) | Present *** | Present (Kumar, 2009) | Present (Kumar, 2009) | Promotes eye field formation, promotes neural retina fate over RPE and together with <i>six6</i> promotes neural retinal progenitor fate (Carl et al., 2002; Kumar, 2009; Diacou et al., 2018) |
| Six6 | Present? *** | Present? *** | Present (Kumar, 2009) | Present (Kumar, 2009) | Promotes neural retinal progenitor fate alongside <i>six3</i> (Jean et al., 1999; Kumar, 2009; Diacou et al., 2018) |
| Rx/Rax | Present (Kon and Furukawa, 2020) | Present (Kon and Furukawa, 2020) | Present (Mathers et al., 1997) | Present (Furukawa et al., 2000) | Necessary for optic vesicle formation; promotes proliferation of retinal progenitor cells, maintains <i>Pax6</i> expression, helps specify Müller glia (Mathers et al., 1997; Furukawa et al., 2000; Nelson et al., 2009b) |

*Yamamoto et al., (2020) argue lamprey OtxA, OtxB, and OtxC are homologous to gnathostome Otx2, Otx5/Crx, and Otx1 respectively. Higuchi et al., (2019) provide support for the homology of lamprey OtxA, OtxB and OtxC to hagfish Otx paralogs. This suggests the hagfish Otx genes are also homologs to gnathostome Otx2, Otx5/Crx, and Otx1.

**Mammalian *Crx* is a highly divergent orthologue of *Otx5* whereas the zebrafish *Crx* gene is believed to be from an independent duplication event (zebrafish have both an *Otx5* gene and a *Crx* gene) (Plouhinec et al., 2003; Shen and Raymond, 2004)

***Hagfish (*Eptatretus burgeri*) and lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus*) appear to have *Six3/6* paralogs, but it is difficult to assign the homologs as closer to a *Six3* or *Six6* identity. Oisi et al., (2013) identified a *Six3/6* homolog in hagfish. A TBLASTN search against the hagfish and lamprey genomes in Ensembl identified three possible *Six3/6* homologs in hagfish and three possible homologs in lamprey (when reciprocally blasted each of these sequences were the closest match to mouse and zebrafish *Six3* or *Six6*).

| Gene | Hagfish | Lamprey | Zebrafish | Mouse | Function |
|---------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Atoh7 | None found * | Present (Lara- Ramirez, 2013 (unpublished)) | Present (Miesfeld et al., 2020 | Present (Miesfeld et al., 2020) | Retinal ganglion cell specification (Brown et al., 2001; Kay et al., 2001; Wang et al., 2001) |
| Ascl1 | Present** | Present (Häming et al., 2011) | Present (Jorstad et al., 2017) | Present (Jorstad et al., 2017) | Regulation of Notch signalling during retinogenesis, Müller glia reprogramming to multipotency, specification of bipolar cells (Hatakeyama et al., 2001; Nelson et al., 2009a; Gao et al., 2021) |
| NeuroD1 | Present (Higuchi et al., 2019) | Present (Higuchi et al., 2019) | Present (Ochocinska and Hitchcock, 2009) | Present (Cherry et al., 2011) | Photoreceptor and amacrine cell differentiation (Inoue et al., 2002; Ochocinska and Hitchcock, 2009) |
| NeuroD4 | None found | None found | Present (<i>Zath3</i>) (Wang et al., 2003) | Present (<i>Math3</i>) (Cherry et al., 2011) | Bipolar cell and amacrine cell specification (Hatakeyama et al., 2001; Inoue et al., 2002) |
| NeuroG | Present (Higuchi et al., 2019) | Present*** (Higuchi et al., 2019) | Present *** (Korzh et al., 1998; Jeong et al., 2006; Hufnagel et al., 2010) | Present (Hufnagel et al., 2010) | Helps to drive the initial wave of retinogenesis in the retina (in mammals) (Hufnagel et al., 2010) |

 Table 1-2. Presence of retinal bHLH genes across representative vertebrates

* An *Atoh1* homolog was the top result for a TBLASTN search of mouse and zebrafish *Atoh7* sequences against the hagfish (*Eptatretus burgeri*) genome in Ensembl. A reciprocal blast of hagfish *Atoh1* matched mouse and zebrafish *Atoh1* more closely than *Atoh7*.

** Three hagfish *ascl1* homologs were identified via a TBLASTN search using mouse and zebrafish *ascl1* homologs as query sequences against the hagfish (*E. burgeri*) genome. The reciprocal best hits for each of the three hagfish sequences was *ascl1* sequences from mouse and zebrafish.

*** *NeuroG* homologs are present in zebrafish but their function in eye/retina development is unclear compared to mammals. Similarly, *NeuroG* was identified in the lamprey genome but does not appear to be expressed in the eye (Lara-Ramirez et al., 2015).

Chapter 2:

The retina of an early-branching vertebrate reveals deep conservation of mechanisms for retinogenesis within the vertebrate lineage

2.1 Abstract

The retina is a complex photosensory structure that is crucial for light mediated behaviors. However, the evolutionary origins of the vertebrate retina are currently a mystery. Comparative morphology has revealed fascinating structural and organizational differences in the eyes of cyclostomes (jawless vertebrates) and gnathostomes (jawed vertebrates). Here we examine retinal development to complement that approach and have begun to characterize retinogenesis in a representative cyclostome, the Pacific hagfish (Eptatretus stoutii). Knowledge of hagfish neurodevelopment is very limited because hagfish embryos are difficult to acquire, but evidence suggests they may have continued retinal neurogenesis late into their ontogeny. We applied a brief pulse of EdU to label proliferating cells, if any, in the retina. We also utilized bioinformatics and in situ hybridization to reveal if homologs of gnathostome retinal genes also drive retinogenesis in a jawless vertebrate. We observed EdU+ cells within the retinal periphery of the hagfish, a region reminiscent of the ciliary marginal zone of gnathostomes, in addition to within the central retina. We found that hagfish possess homologs of several key genes required for retinal neurogenesis in other vertebrates, and that these genes are expressed within the hagfish eye. We also demonstrated through in situ hybridization that two of these genes, OtxA and Rx (retinal homeobox), are expressed in the hagfish retina, including within the proliferative retinal periphery. These findings support that there are deeply conserved mechanisms for retinogenesis within the vertebrate lineage.

2.2 Introduction

The vertebrate eye and retina are highly conserved sensory structures that are remarkable for their morphological complexity, capacity for image formation, and also the stark mystery surrounding their evolutionary origins. Paired eyes and a sophisticated retina arose early in vertebrate evolution and are present in all extant representatives of this group (Bradshaw and Allison, 2022). In comparison, the light sensitive organs of the non-vertebrate chordates are composed of simpler clusters of photoreceptor and pigment cells that are only capable of light detection and not image formation (Lamb, 2013). To understand how the visual sense organs of vertebrates gained such complexity, previous work has employed the study of fossils or comparative morphology to explain the evolution of the eye and retina (Collin et al., 2009; Collin 2010; Davies et al., 2012; Lamb, 2013; Gabbott et al., 2016). These studies have revealed that the eyes of the early-branching jawless vertebrates (Cyclostomata) contain striking differences in structure and organization to other vertebrates. However, it is difficult to determine if these differences are due to retention of ancestral traits or secondary loss (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975; Bradshaw and Allison, 2022).

Therefore, we propose taking an evolutionary and developmental (evo-devo) approach to illuminate the evolutionary history of the retina. We have begun to explore retinogenesis in an obscure but phylogenetically important vertebrate species, the Pacific hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*). These organisms are deep-sea marine scavengers, and little is known about the development of their visual system (or their development in general) (Locket and Jørgensen, 1998; Martini, 1998). As a representative cyclostome, characterizing the hagfish retina would be highly informative and create a basis of comparison for the data available from the well-studied jawed vertebrates (Gnathostomata) (Bradshaw and Allison, 2022). A comparison of the retinal

developmental pathways between cyclostomes and gnathostomes will help to infer what the state of retinal development would have been like in the last common ancestor of jawed and jawless vertebrates.

When compared to other vertebrates, the hagfish eye is strikingly small and rudimentary. The eye is buried under a translucent layer of skin (or even buried beneath muscle in certain species) and lacks a lens (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975). The hagfish retina is unpigmented and based on morphology the retinal layers appear poorly laminated (Dong and Allison, 2021). These observations have led to the very reasonable interpretation that the hagfish eye is representative of the ancestral or proto-vertebrate eye condition (Collin et al., 2009; Lamb, 2013). However, recently our research group has helped to revise this understanding by providing compelling evidence that the hagfish retina is not a transitional form but is instead a rudiment that remains following regression of a once elaborate organ (Dong and Allison, 2021; Bradshaw and Allison 2022). Careful examination of the hagfish eye and use of molecular markers reveals the presence of photoreceptors, interneurons and retinal ganglion cells within the retina (Dong and Allison, 2021). The existence of the interneurons was previously obscured by the disorganized lamination of the inner nuclear layer. Compared to gnathostome eyes which have the interneurons and retinal ganglion cell bodies organized into two distinct layers, these two cell populations are intertwined in the hagfish retina (Dong and Allison, 2021). In addition, although the retinal epithelium layer is non-pigmented, this layer does appear to contain machinery required to complete the retinoid cycle, suggesting the hagfish retina may be more functional (and share a greater affinity with gnathostome eyes) than previously thought (Dong and Allison, 2021).

Phylogenetic studies based on molecular data support the monophyly of hagfishes with the other living cyclostome clade, the lampreys (see Figure 1-1A) (Mallatt and Sullivan, 1998; Kuraku et

al., 1999; Heimberg et al., 2010; Ota et al., 2011; Miyashita et al., 2019). This is very informative for interpreting the history that produced the rudimentary state of the hagfish eye, as the lamprey eye is similar morphologically to the gnathostome eye. The lamprey eye contains a lens, a pigmented RPE, and elaborate lamination of the interneuron and retinal ganglion cell layers (Suzuki and Grillner, 2018; Bradshaw and Allison, 2022). If the hagfish eye represents the state of the proto-vertebrate eye, lampreys would have converged onto an extremely similar retinal morphology to jawed vertebrates, a scenario that is highly unlikely. This provides further support that the rudimentary morphological features of the hagfish eye are due to evolutionary loss (regression) rather than retention of an ancestral state (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975; Dong and Allison, 2021; Bradshaw and Allison, 2022). However, given hagfish diverged from jawed vertebrates 600 million years ago (Blair and Hedges, 2005) the retina of this group is still highly important for inferring the state of the eye in the last vertebrate common ancestor. Exploring cyclostome eye development will reveal either deeply shared homology with gnathostomes or divergent mechanisms driving vertebrate retinal formation.

Although hagfish are in an excellent phylogenetic position to answer questions about vertebrate eye evolution, it is challenging to utilize an evo-devo approach for this organism because hagfish embryos are difficult to acquire (Gorbman, 1997; Holland, 2007; Kuratani and Ota, 2008a; Ota and Kuratani, 2006; Ota and Kuratani, 2008). Therefore, we turn our attention to the possibility of examining retinal development in the form of ongoing tissue morphogenesis in post-embryonic hagfish. In fish and amphibians, adult retinogenesis recapitulates many aspects of retinal embryonic development (Perron et al., 1998; Xu et al., 2020). Recent work suggests the hagfish eye continues to grow late into ontogeny (Dong and Allison, 2021). The hagfish eye increases in size with body size (and presumably age) of hagfish. In addition, the peripheral

region of the hagfish retina also expresses *Pax6*, a marker of retinal progenitor cells (Dong and Allison, 2021). The occurrence of *Pax6* at the hagfish retinal periphery is reminiscent of the *Pax6* expression in the gnathostome ciliary marginal zone (CMZ). The ciliary marginal zone (CMZ) is a retinal stem cell niche found at the retinal periphery in several vertebrate groups, including teleost fish and amphibians (Raymond et al., 2006). If the hagfish retinal margin is equivalent to a CMZ-like zone, then this region could be extremely useful for investigating mechanisms of retinal development/growth in adult animals.

Finding evidence of a proliferative region in the hagfish retina would be extremely surprising given the rudimentary nature of the eye. In addition, limited information from lampreys suggests that the only other living cyclostome group does not have adult retinal neurogenesis (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008). The possibility of a CMZ in hagfish suggests that post-embryonic retinogenesis could be an ancestral characteristic that has been secondarily lost in several vertebrate groups. Based on the available evidence, we hypothesize that the hagfish retinal periphery functions similarly to the gnathostome CMZ and drives continued retinal neurogenesis past embryonic development. The aims of this chapter are to determine where (if anywhere) proliferation occurs in the adult hagfish retina and to utilize this ongoing growth to study the genetic mechanisms producing new retinal tissue. We have identified several genes known to have highly conserved roles in retinogenesis of other vertebrates that we expect to be expressed in the hagfish retinal margin. These genes include the Otx genes (Plouhinec et al., 2003; Yamamoto et al., 2020), and the homeobox genes Rx (Mathers et al., 1997) and Six3 (Carl et al., 2002). If the retina of adult hagfish displays similar cell proliferation and gene expression patterns to the gnathostome CMZ, this would provide support that there are shared (conserved) developmental mechanisms driving retinal growth in cyclostomes and gnathostomes. The

presence of a CMZ in hagfish also suggests post-embryonic neurogenesis in the retina may have originated early in the evolution of the retina.

2.3 Materials and Methods

2.3.1 Animal collection and care

This study was conducted under the approval of the BioSciences Animal Care and Use Committee at the University of Alberta (Animal Use Protocol number: AUP00000077) which adheres to the Canadian Council for Animal Care guidelines. Animals were caught and held according to a Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada collection permit (XR 225 2021) and the animal use protocol approved by the Bamfield Marine Sciences Center (BMSC) (RS-21-06). Hagfish were acquired near BMSC in Barkley Sound on the west coast of Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada. BMSC staff caught the hagfish using a Korean cone trap baited with dead fish (BMSC Animal Care Standard Operating Procedure, Hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*), v.3 (Bartlett and Janusson, 2019)). The traps were deployed for 8-12 hours and then brought to the surface. Hagfish were held in large tanks with circulating seawater until tissue was collected (1-3 days). Hagfish were euthanized by administration of excess MS-222 (tricaine methanesulfonate). Eye and brain tissues were collected from euthanized specimens and were preserved in 4% paraformaldehyde /5% sucrose/0.1M phosphate buffer (referred to as 4% PFA from here on) or RNAlater (Invitrogen, Cat. No. AM7020).

2.3.2 EdU administration and tissue collection

Ten hagfish were anesthetized via MS-222 administration until they no longer responded to physical stimuli (i.e., touching, poking). The animals ranged in size from 26.99 g to 110.17g. An

intraperitoneal injection was completed by inserting a needle into the ventral side of the hagfish abdomen with the skin held off the wall of the abdomen. 20 ul of 10mM EdU (5-ethynyl-2'deoxyuridine) (EdU in vivo kit, baseclick GmbH, Cat. No. BCK488-IV-IM-S) diluted in PBS (phosphate buffered saline, pH 7.4) was injected per gram of body weight (Zhang et al., 2014). Fish were then allowed to recover in a bucket with circulating seawater. After 24 hours the fish were sacrificed, and eye and brain tissues were collected and preserved in 4% PFA as described previously.

2.3.3 Cryopreservation and cryosectioning of fixed tissue

After fixation with 4% PFA, hagfish eye samples were cryopreserved in a series of sucrose washes. The eyes were washed for 1 hour in 12.5% sucrose//0.1M phosphate buffer (room temperature), 1 hour in 20% sucrose//0.1M phosphate buffer (room temperature), and then overnight (at 4 °C) in 30% sucrose//phosphate buffer. The following day, the eyes were placed in a 1:1 solution of 30% sucrose//phosphate buffer and OCT (optimal cutting temperature) embedding compound (hereafter referred to as OCT) (VWR® Premium Frozen Section Compound, Cat. No. 95057-838) for 1 hour (4C). The samples were then flash frozen in a mold (made by taking the bottom half of a 1.5mL centrifuge tube and fixing it to a glass slide with nail polish) filled with OCT using dry ice. The frozen samples in the molds ('cryostat chucks') were stored at -80°C at least overnight prior to sectioning. The samples were sectioned at 10 μM thickness using a Leica CM 1900 UV cryostat (chamber temperature: -20°C). The sections were placed onto Superfrost Plus microscope slides (ThermoFisher Scientific, Cat. No. 12-550-15) and kept at -80°C at least overnight until use.

2.3.4 EdU detection assay

An EdU cell proliferation detection kit (EdU in vivo kit, baseclick GmbH, Cat. No. BCK488-IV-IM-S or BCK647-IV-IM-S) was used to detect EdU+ cells in retinal sections from six of the ten hagfish individuals treated with EdU. Sectioned eye tissue was thawed and fixed in 4% PFA for 15 min prior to the EdU detection assay. The samples were washed thrice for 5 min in 3% bovine serum albumin in PBS (pH 7.4) (hereafter 3% BSA). The samples were re-hydrated with PBS + 0.1% Tween (PBS-T) for 30 min. The sections were then permeabilized by adding a solution of PBS with 0.1% Triton X-100 onto the samples for 20 min (and then rinsed 3X 5 min in 3% BSA). The EdU detection cocktail was prepared according to the manufacturer's instructions (EdU in vivo kit, baseclick GmbH, Cat. No. BCK488-IV-IM-S or BCK647-IV-IM-S) and applied to the slides for 30 min. The samples were kept in the dark during this period and gently rocked/agitated every 5 min. Once the detection solution was removed, the samples were rinsed twice for 5 min in 3% BSA and 2 X 5 min in PBS-T. Nuclei were stained using lug/ml DAPI (4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole, dihydrochloride) (InvitrogenTM, Cat. No. D1306) diluted 1:1000 in PBS-T. The nuclear stain was applied for 10 min. The DAPI solution was then removed, and the samples washed 3 X 15 min in PBS. The completed slides were covered with 80% glycerol and sealed with nail polish. The slides were imaged using an LSM 710 confocal microscope (Zeiss) or an Olympus FV3000 confocal microscope. Of the samples from the six individuals imaged, the sections from three individuals (EdU 5, EdU 6, EdU 8) were intact enough to be used for quantification.

2.3.5 EdU cell quantification and statistical analysis

To determine if EdU + cells were occurring in specific regions of the hagfish retina, the length of the RnPE layer of each retinal section was measured in ImageJ (Schneider et al., 2012). This
length was then used to divide the retinal sections into six equal regions (regions 1-6). Region 1 was the most peripheral whereas region 6 was the most central. The number of EdU+ cells was then quantified in each region for each of the three individuals. This data was analyzed by a 2-way ANOVA followed by a Tukey's multiple comparisons test (GraphPad Prism version 9.5.1 for Windows, GraphPad Software, San Diego, California USA, <u>www.graphpad.com</u>). In a second analysis, the same retinal section images were divided into a peripheral 'CMZ-like' zone (based on the hagfish retinal morphology) and a 'central' zone (the remainder of the retina). The number of EdU+ cells were then counted in the two regions. This data was also analyzed by a 2-way ANOVA.

2.3.6 Sox2 immunohistochemistry

Sectioned zebrafish (n=1 eye) and hagfish (n=1 eye) tissues were thawed to room temperature and blocked in a mix of 10% donkey serum (Sigma-Aldrich, Cat. No. D9663-10ML)//PBS- T for 1 hour. Anti-sox2 (raised in goat, human Sox2 immunogen (Accession number: P48431) (R&D systems, Cat. No.AF2018)) was diluted 1:100 in PBS-T with 2% donkey serum and applied to the sections overnight at 4°C (negative controls were treated with only 2% donkey serum//PBS-T without the primary antibody). The samples were rinsed 2X and washed 2X (30 min each) in PBS-T before the secondary antibody solution was applied (1:1000 dilution of anti-goat 488 (Invitrogen, Cat. No. A-11055) or anti-goat 555 (Invitrogen, Cat. No. A-21432) in 2% donkey serum//PBS-T) overnight at 4°C. The samples were then rinsed 2 X and washed 3X (30 min each) in PBS-T before being labelled with 1:1000 DAPI//PBS-T for 30 min. The samples were washed 3 X 15 min in PBS-T and then covered with 80% glycerol and sealed with nail polish. The slides were imaged using an LSM 710 confocal microscope (Zeiss).

2.3.7 Synteny analysis

Two approaches were used to visualize the syntenic relationships between the three gnathostome *Otx* paralogs (*Otx1*, *Otx2*, and *Otx5/Crx*) and the four cyclostome paralogs (*OtxA*, *OtxB*, *OtxC*, *OtxD*). First, Genomicus (v.106) (Muffato et al., 2010; Nguyen et al., 2022) was used to visualize the relationships between the *Otx* genes across representative vertebrate species (mouse (*Mus musculus*), Western clawed frog (*Xenopus tropicalis*), spotted gar (*Lepisosteus oculatus*), coelacanth (*Latimeria chalumnae*), elephant shark (*Callorhinchus milii*), sea lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus*), and inshore hagfish (*Eptatretus burgeri*). The results generated were compared to genomic data in the NCBI (National Center for Biotechnology Information) Genome Data Viewer database (Sayers et al., 2022) (when this data was available - the NCBI database does not contain an annotated hagfish genome).

For synteny analysis using Simple Synteny (Veltri et al., 2016) a tBLASTn (translated nucleotide BLAST) search with a mouse query sequence (the proteins of a mouse Otx gene and the 10 genes directly to either side) was used to identify syntenic genomic regions in the area surrounding each Otx paralog (the 1 M base pairs directly adjacent on either side of each Otx gene) for the lamprey (*P. marinus*) and hagfish (*E. burgeri*). This was repeated using the proteins for each of the three mouse Otx paralogs (Otx1, Otx2, Crx) and their adjacent genes as query sequences. The e-value threshold used was 0.0001 and the minimum query coverage cut-off was left at one. The results generated were compared to the NCBI Genome Data Viewer database and hits that were not supported by both the database and the Simple Synteny analysis were excluded (for hagfish an annotated genome assembly is not available on NCBI, so only the syntenic analysis was completed). Query and genomic sequences were retrieved from NCBI for most

61

species examined. Genomic sequences for the hagfish (*E. burgeri*) were retrieved from the Ensembl database (Ensembl Genome Browser v. 108, Cunningham et al., 2022).

2.3.8 Phylogenetic analysis

A protein alignment of *Otx* paralogs (from representative chordates) was generated using Geneious Prime (Geneious Prime v. 2022.0.1, Biomatters Ltd.) with the Geneious alignment setting and inputted into the IQ-tree webserver (Nguyen et al., 2015; Trifinopoulos et al., 2016). A maximum-likelihood tree was generated using IQ-tree default settings (and ultrafast bootstrap-1000 iterations) (Hoang et al., 2018). Protein sequences were retrieved from NCBI (most organisms) or Ensembl (hagfish).

2.3.9 cDNA production

Hagfish RNA previously extracted by Emily Dong was used to generate cDNA for riboprobe production. cDNA was made as per manufacturer's instructions (Quantabio, Cat. No. 95048-100).

2.3.10 Riboprobe production

An antisense riboprobe to label the *E. stoutii* homolog of *Rx* was produced from a plasmid template using published methods (Barthel and Raymond, 1993; Barratt and Arkell, 2020; Dong and Allison, 2021). The template was generated by creating a gene block (IDT - Integrated DNA Technologies) based on the sequence from CL3100.Contig2_All (*Rx*) (Table 2-1). Restriction enzyme sites added to either end of the gene block to facilitate ligation into a PCS2+ plasmid. The plasmid was linearized with BamHI and used in a transcription reaction overnight with a T3 RNA polymerase (Roche, Cat. No.11031171001) and DIG (digoxigenin) conjugated dNTPs (Roche, Cat. No. 11277073910) to generate an antisense *Rx* probe. The RNA from the reaction was precipitated and the probe was suspended in 50uL of RNase free water to assess concentration and quality via Nanodrop 2000 (Thermo Scientific, Cat. No. ND-2000). The probe was diluted to its final concentration in Hauptmann's hybridization solution and kept at -80°C before use. The final *Rx* riboprobe was 1206 bp long and spanned three exons of the gene (Table 2-1).

A riboprobe to label the homolog of hagfish (*E. stoutii*) *OtxA* was generated from a template created via PCR reaction on hagfish eye cDNA (Phusion high-fidelity polymerase kit (ThermoFisher Scientific, Cat. No. F530S)) (Barthel and Raymond, 1993; Barratt and Arkell, 2020; Dong and Allison, 2021). Primers were designed to amplify *E. stoutii OtxA* with a T7 RNA polymerase site added to the 5' end of the reverse primer (Table 2-2). The amplicon underwent a transcription reaction similar to the plasmid derived probes (except using a T7 RNA polymerase (Roche, Cat. No. 10881767001)) and the RNA was then precipitated and quantified using the same methods as above. The *OtxA* riboprobe was 591 bp long and spanned three exons of the gene (Table 2-2).

2.3.11 In situ hybridization

In situ hybridization was completed as per Dong and Allison (2021). Slides were thawed to room temperature and fixed with 4% PFA for 10 min. After removing the PFA and rinsing the slides with RNase free 2X SSC (saline-sodium citrate buffer), sections were treated with proteinase K (Roche, Cat. No. 3115836001) for 2-10 min (probe dependent – see Table 2-3). They were then rinsed with RNase free 2X SSC and fixed again in PFA for an additional 10 min. After removing PFA and rinsing with 2X SSC, the slides were placed into a mixture of 0.3% acetic anhydride and 0.1M TEA (triethanolamine) for 10 min before being dehydrated through a series of ethanol washes (50%, 75%, 95%, 100% ethanol diluted in DEPC treated water). The slides were then

dried for an hour at room temperature. The slides were incubated with Hauptmann's hybridization solution for an hour at room temperature before the appropriate riboprobe (diluted in Hauptmann's solution) was applied (concentration used was probe dependent - see Table 2-3). For negative control slides, Hauptmann's hybridization solution without an added probe was used. The sections were then placed in a hybridization chamber overnight at 55°C.

The following day the probe solution was removed, and the slides underwent a series of post hybridization washes at 55 °C - 10 min in 2/3 2X SSC: 1/3 post-hybridization buffer, 5 min in 1/3 2X SSC: 2/3 post-hybridization buffer, 5 min in 2X SSC, 20 min in 0.2X SSC+0.1% Tween, and 2 X 20 min in 0.1X SSC+0.1% Tween. The slides were blocked in maleate buffer for an hour before being incubated with an alkaline phosphatase conjugated anti-DIG antibody (Roche, Cat. No. 11093274910) diluted 1:1000 in the maleate block overnight (4°C). The slides were then stained with a solution made using NBT (nitro blue tetrazolium)/BCIP (5-Bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl phosphate) Ready-to-Use Tablets (Roche, Cat. No.11697471001) following the manufacturer's instructions to visualize the bound riboprobe. For fluorescent *in situ* hybridization (FISH), after the post-hybridization washes the slides were incubated in an alkaline phosphatase conjugated anti-DIG POD (peroxidase) conjugated antibody (Roche, Cat. No. 11207733910) (antibody diluted 1:100 in the maleate block). The slides were incubated with the antibody solution in the dark overnight (4° C). The following day the slides were rinsed 3 X 15 min with PBS-T. The slides were then incubated in an Alexa fluor 488 tyramide detection solution (length of incubation was signal dependent) prepared according to the manufacturer's instructions (Alexa FluorTM 488 Tyramide SuperBoostTM Kit, InvitrogenTM, B40943). The reaction was stopped with application of a 1X stop reaction solution (Alexa Fluor[™] 488 Tyramide SuperBoost[™] Kit, Invitrogen[™], B40943) for 10 min. Slides were rinsed 3 X with PBS-T to remove any residual

detection and stop solutions. The slides were then stained with DAPI as previously described and sealed with 80% glycerol and nail polish. The slides were imaged on a LSM 710 Confocal (Zeiss) or a FV3000 Confocal (Olympus).

2.4 Results

2.4.1 The post-embryonic hagfish retina contains proliferating cells, including at the retinal margin (the putative CMZ)

To assess whether the adult hagfish retina contains proliferating cells, several adult hagfish were treated with a brief 24 h pulse of EdU (a thymidine analog incorporated into DNA of proliferating cells (Chehrehasa et al., 2009)) and sacrificed the next day. Sectioned eye tissue from those individuals underwent a ClickIt EdU detection reaction to label EdU positive (newly born) cells. The majority of retinal sections examined contained some cells positively labelled for EdU (Figure 2-1). EdU-positive cells (EdU+) were detected in the eyes of all animals treated with EdU (six individuals examined). The EdU+ cells often occurred in clusters at the peripheral edges of the retina. Some hagfish retina sections also contained several EdU positive cells in the more central portions of the retina. No such labeling was observed in hagfish that did not receive EdU (Figure 2-1C).

Qualitatively, the abundance of EdU+ cells was concentrated at the peripheral margins of the retina, nearest to the iris, consistent with the location of a CMZ in teleosts and other species (Raymond et al., 2006). To support this qualitative observation, we counted the EdU positive cells in various retinal regions: images of hagfish retina slices were divided into 6 equal sections distributed across the peripheral to central retina and EdU+ cells were enumerated (Figure 2-2).

The majority of EdU+ cells were peripherally located (based on 21 retinal sections from three EdU treated individuals – EdU 5, EdU 6, EdU 8) (Figure 2-2B). Over half (57%) of the EdU positive cells occurred in the most peripheral region (region 1) in the three individuals we examined (Figure 2-2C). On average, 3.7 EdU+ cells were found in region 1. Moving centrally, the number of EdU+ cells decreased (on average less than one cell per region for regions 2-6). A two-way ANOVA showed the retinal region had a significant effect on the number of EdU+ cells observed (p<0.0001) whereas the individual the retinal samples were taken from did not (p=0.06). There was a significant interaction between the effects of individual and region (F (10, 108) = 6.133, p<0.0001). The number of EdU+ cells in region 1 was significantly higher than the number of cells occurring in any of the other five regions (Tukey's multiple comparisons test, p<0.0001).

When the retina was separated into the peripheral region that morphologically resembles the gnathostome CMZ (the area between where the ONL and INL layers merge and the edge of the retina (Raymond et al., 2006)) and the central retina the result differed. In this analysis (two-way ANOVA for region ('CMZ' vs. 'central retina') and individual) there was no significant difference between the number of cells observed in the CMZ region and the rest of the retina (p=0.73) (Figure 2-2D). Although many proliferative cells occur in the hagfish retinal CMZ-like zone, there is a substantial number of EdU+ cells occurring in other parts of the retina as well. Attempts to label proliferating cells with antibodies such as PCNA or pH3 were not successful, but we attribute this to technical problems (non-optimal tissue fixative and/or challenges optimizing antigen retrieval). Attempts to label hagfish retinal tissue with a Sox2 antibody (a marker for neuronal progenitor cells) also failed. In zebrafish tissue, Sox2 clearly labelled cells in the INL whereas in hagfish no noticeable labelling was observed (Figure 2-3). The antibody

66

was designed against the human Sox2 protein, so we believe the lack of label could be due to low protein conservation between humans and hagfish rather than an absence of neuronal progenitor cells in the retina.

2.4.2 Bioinformatic and phylogenetic analysis supports homology of hagfish retinal transcripts with critical retinal development genes in lampreys and jawed vertebrates

The bioinformatics analyses reveal that hagfish have homologs for several genes known to be required for gnathostome retinal development. These homologs were initially identified via tBLASTn searches of the hagfish genome (*E. burgeri* genome assembly available on Ensembl v.108) and an available RNAseq dataset of *E. stoutii* (generated by Emily Dong; Dong and Allison, 2021) with query sequences from representative gnathostomes (mouse, spotted gar, elephant shark) (Table 2-4, Table 2-5, Table 2-6). tBLASTn searches of the hagfish genome were completed through the Ensembl BLAST search interface, whereas searches against the RNA sequencing dataset were performed with the BLAST function available in Geneious Prime (v. 2022.0, Biomatters). For reciprocal BLAST searches, RNA transcript sequences were queried against the NCBI Nucleotide collection (nr/nt) database.

The analyses identified one hagfish retinal homeobox (*rx*) homolog in the *E. burgeri* genome and the *E. stoutii* RNA sequencing dataset (Table 2-4). The *E. burgeri Rx* sequence was annotated in Ensembl (v. 108) and tBLASTn searches support its homology with gnathostome *Rx*, even if protein sequence conservation is low (Figure 2-4). The *E. burgeri Rx* genomic sequence and mouse and spotted gar *Rx sequences* matched closely with one of the *E. stoutii* transcript sequences in a tBLASTn search (CL3100.Contig2_All) (Table 2-7). The *E.stoutii Rx* transcript sequence had higher expression in eye tissue than the brain, suggesting that this gene may play

an important role in the eye. Therefore, this gene was selected as a target for *in situ* hybridization.

The analyses also identified three Six3/6 homologs in the E. burgeri genome (the sequences could not be assigned as the direct ortholog of either the Six3 or Six6 gnathostome paralogs) (Table 2-5). One of these sequences (ENSEBUG00000012950) was annotated as the hagfish Six3 homolog in Ensembl (v. 108). Comparing the percent identity of the hagfish (E. burgeri) Six 3/6 protein sequences to gar (L. oculatus) and mouse (M. musculus) Six proteins suggests the hagfish Six3/6 is closer to gnathostome Six6 (Figure 2-5). However, when mouse and gar Six gene sequences were used as query sequences in a tBLASTn search against the hagfish genome, the Six3 sequences were stronger matches with the hagfish Six3/6 paralog than the Six6 sequences (Table 2-5). The three E. burgeri Six3/6 genomic sequences matched closely with three E. stoutii transcript sequences from the RNA sequencing dataset. The query gnathostome Six3 and Six6 paralogs matched most closely to one of these E. stoutii Six3/6 transcripts (Unigene16248 All) (Table 2-5). This transcript also had much higher expression in eye tissue than in the brain, suggesting it may have a specific function in the eye (Table 2-7). Therefore, this paralog sequence was identified as a possible candidate for *in situ* hybridization (although this probe was not fully optimized – see Supplementary Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1). The tBLASTn searches also identified four potential *Otx* homologs in the *E. burgeri* genome. Two of these genes were previously annotated in Ensembl (v. 108) (OtxA and OtxD). The tBLASTn searches support a strong relationship between gnathostome and cyclostome Otx genes

direct orthology relationships between gnathostome and cyclostome *Otx* homologs based on this data, so synteny and phylogenetic analysis was employed to elucidate these relationships.

although protein sequence conservation is low (Figure 2-6, Table 2-6). It is difficult to assign

A phylogenetic analysis supports the overall homology of cyclostome Otx paralogs with gnathostome Otx genes, but the individual paralogs do not line up clearly with gnathostome Otx1, Otx2, or Otx5 (Figure 2-7). Lamprey and hagfish OtxB and OtxC were placed into a sister group with gnathostome Otx1 (lamprey OtxD was also placed in this group). Cyclostome OtxAformed a sister group to hagfish OtxD. The group containing the cyclostome OtxA and lamprey OtxD sequences did not form a sister group with one of the gnathostome Otx paralogs. Rather, the node containing both gnathostome Otx1 and cyclostome OtxB/OtxC was the sister group to these sequences, leaving the orthology relationships unclear. The Drosophila Otx homolog (oc) did not cluster with the vertebrate sequences, as expected.

Synteny analysis of cyclostome Otx genes support hagfish (and lamprey) OtxC are homologous to gnathostome Otx1 (Figure 2-8A, Figure 2-9). In gnathostomes Otx1 is almost always directly adjacent to *Ehbp1*, *Wdpcp*, *Mdh1* and *Peli1*. Homologs of these genes occur near cyclostome OtxC. Similarly, syntenic relationships support hagfish OtxA and OtxD as being homologous to gnathostome Otx2. Otx2 is generally found near *Tmem260*, *Peli2*, *Slc35f4* and *Naa30* (Figure 2-8B, Figure 2-10). Hagfish and lamprey OtxA are located in between *Slc35f4* and *Tmem260* homologs. For both lamprey and hagfish, OtxD is found near an *Naa30* and a *Peli2* homolog. Homologous relationships between cyclostome OtxB genes and gnathostome Otx homologs were harder to determine with synteny. The genomic regions surrounding hagfish and lamprey OtxBdid not share many genes in common with those surrounding gnathostome Otx genes (Figure 2-8C, Figure 2-11). It should be noted that UGP2 (a gene commonly located near Otx1 in the gnathostome genomes examined) did occur near both hagfish and lamprey OtxB, but no other potentially syntenic genes could be identified in this analysis. Based on the synteny data it was decided that hagfish OtxA and OtxD (as likely homologs of gnathostome Otx2) would be chosen as targets for *in situ* hybridization. The *E. stoutii OtxA* (Unigene14754_All) and *OtxD* (CL6481.Contig1_All) transcript sequences were identified via tBLASTn searches (Table 2-6) and used to generate riboprobes. Only the *OtxA* probe was used for *in situ* hybridization (the *OtxD* probe was created, but not fully optimized (see Supplementary Table 2)). RNA sequencing data showed that both genes have higher expression in the eye than in the brain, supporting they may have specific roles in the eye and/or retina (Table 2-7).

2.4.3 The hagfish retina expresses markers for retinal progenitor cells and neurogenesis

In *situ hybridization* on hagfish retinal sections reveals expression of *OtxA* throughout multiple areas of the retina (Figure 2-12). Several cell populations appear to label for the *OtxA* probe including cells in the RnPE (retinal non-pigmented epithelium), the retinal periphery (CMZ), the inner nuclear layer, and possibly the photoreceptor layer (Figure 2-12A, B, D, E). Expression in the RnPE is particularly strong. In *situ hybridization* performed for the *Rx* probe reveals labelling within cells of the inner nuclear layer and perhaps the retinal periphery (Figure 2-13).

2.5 Discussion

2.5.1 The adult hagfish retina continues to proliferate despite its rudimentary features

Although the hagfish retina is small and has reduced organization compared to other vertebrates, EdU cell labeling reveals that the adult hagfish retina contains actively proliferating cells (Figure 2-1). Retinal sections examined from EdU treated animals consistently contained EdU+ cells with over 50% of these cells being located at the retinal margin (Figure 2-2). This finding mirrors a retinal stem cell niche found in other vertebrates, the ciliary marginal zone (CMZ) (Raymond et al., 2006). Other data also supports the hagfish retina grows throughout ontogeny. Eye size increases with hagfish body size, suggesting continuous retinal growth through the animal's lifespan (Dong and Allison, 2021). In addition, Dong and Allison (2021) demonstrated that the periphery of the hagfish retina expresses *Pax6*, a marker for retinal progenitor cells and the CMZ. Together with this study's findings that the hagfish retinal periphery expresses *OtxA* and *Rx* (markers of developing retinal neurons and neuronal progenitors respectively – see **Section 2.5.3**) these results support the EdU+ cells at the hagfish retinal periphery may be part of a CMZ-like structure (Dong and Allison, 2021).

The vertebrate CMZ is a stem cell niche that is best known from studies on teleost fish and amphibians (Raymond et al., 2006). The niche is less prominent in adult birds and is essentially absent in elasmobranchs (sharks and rays) and mammals (Fischer et al. 2014; Hernández-Núñez et al., 2021). Interestingly, sharks do exhibit continual retinal growth past sexual maturity (Harahush et al., 2009; Hernández-Núñez et al., 2021). Hernández-Núñez et al., (2021) suggest the continued growth could be driven by changes to retinal cell size and morphology rather than continued proliferation from the CMZ. One paper suggests the niche may also be absent in the lamprey retina (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008). Finding active growth of the retina in adult hagfish is surprising given the hagfish eye is so rudimentary in form. Why maintain and actively grow a tissue which cannot be used for vision? This raises the possibility that there are other functions for this tissue (i.e., regulation of circadian rhythm) or continued proliferation could be a paedomorphic trait where developmental retinal growth continues into adulthood. As mentioned, no CMZ-like tissue has been identified so far in other early branching vertebrate groups such as lampreys and sharks (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008; Hernández-Núñez et al., 2021). These organisms appear to lose neurogenesis in the eye once adulthood is reached. This suggests several possible evolutionary scenarios. One possibility is constitutive retinal neurogenesis was the ancestral

vertebrate condition and lampreys, sharks and mammals have lost this ability. Another scenario is that ancestrally vertebrates lost retinal proliferation after the embryonic stage but hagfish, teleost fish, and amphibians exhibit paedomorphosis for this particular trait. Alternatively, certain gnathostome groups may have gained the CMZ via a different mechanism altogether. When quantified by position from the edge of the retina, roughly 40% of the EdU labelled cells were found in the more central regions (Figure 2-2C). In addition, when cells were assigned a 'CMZ' or 'central retina' identity based on morphology of the retinal sections, similar numbers of proliferative cells were observed in the main body of the retina as in the presumptive CMZ region (Figure 2-2D). These central EdU+ cells do not occur in the correct location to be considered part of a (peripheral) CMZ-like stem cell niche. The identity of these cells is currently unknown, but their presence is consistent with proliferating cells in the mature retina of teleost fish. It is possible these cells could be a Müller glia like cell (a retinal glial cell that can dedifferentiate to produce new retinal neurons). Similar to the distribution of the centrally located EdU+ cells in the hagfish retina, Müller glia are normally located throughout the inner nuclear layer in jawed vertebrates. Müller glia proliferation can be activated in response to retinal injury (Raymond et al., 2006). In certain vertebrates (i.e., teleosts) the glia also proliferate under normal physiological conditions to produce certain retinal cell types (i.e., rod photoreceptors) (Lenkowski and Raymond, 2014). For this study, in order to collect hagfish from their natural environment the animals were captured from a depth of 80 m and were abruptly brought to the surface. This event likely exposed the fish to far brighter light than they were acclimated to and could have induced retinal injury. Therefore, if hagfish do have a Müller glia-based regeneration mechanism, the collection event could drive more glia to dedifferentiate and proliferate than under natural conditions. There is one report of Müller glia in a species of lamprey (based on

immunohistochemistry markers) (Fernández-López et al., 2016), but no studies have examined the hagfish retina for the presence of Müller glia as of yet. Alternatively, the unidentified EdU+ cells could be a different cell type such as microglia (Silverman and Wong, 2018) or even blood cells. Further work is needed to confirm the identity of the centrally located EdU+ cells.

The findings also raise additional questions about adult neurogenesis in hagfish. If continued retinal growth is a form of paedomorphosis would there be greater (relative) retinal proliferation in young hagfish than in older hagfish? As the animals age do they lose the ability to produce new retinal cells? Another factor to consider would be the rate of retinal proliferation. Future studies should expose hagfish to different durations of EdU administration (both shorter and longer periods than the 24 h pulse used in this study) to characterize how quickly new cells are produced and incorporated into the hagfish retina. Furthermore, the EdU labelled cells from hagfish treated with long durations of EdU exposure (several days to weeks) could be labelled with additional markers (i.e., for neuronal progenitors, for mature retinal cells). This would make it possible to confirm if the proliferating cells of the hagfish retina differentiate and join the mature retina as in the gnathostome CMZ. An attempt was made in this study to label neuronal progenitors in the hagfish retina with an antibody for Sox2 (Taranova et al., 2006; Gorsuch et al., 2017). This antibody did not label the retina in hagfish (although it clearly labelled cells in zebrafish) (Figure 2-3). However, this result is likely due to poor protein conservation between the target protein of the antibody (human Sox2) and the hagfish Sox2 homolog rather than an absence of neuronal progenitor cells in hagfish retina. There are other markers for which hagfish and gnathostomes have higher protein sequence conservation. An *in-situ* hybridization using probes designed against genes such as Notch1 or Olig2 (highly conserved neuronal progenitor

markers) could be very informative for determining the nature of the retinal periphery in hagfish (Perron and Harris, 2000; Nakamura et al., 2006; Dvoriantchikova et al., 2015).

2.5.2 Hagfish homologs of genes critical for gnathostome retinal development are expressed in the eye

Examination of hagfish genomic and RNAseq datasets revealed the hagfish eye expresses transcripts of several genes critical for vertebrate eye and retinal development. Some genes of particular interest (as markers of retinogenesis) include the retinal homeobox (Rx) gene, the Six3/6 genes (hagfish have 3 paralogs), and the Otx genes (hagfish have 4 paralogs – OtxA, OtxB, OtxC, OtxD) (Figures 2-4 to 2-6, Tables 2-4 to 2-6). In gnathostomes these genes are required for proliferation and maintenance of retinal progenitor cells (Rx and Six3 (Nelson et al., 2009b; Diacou et al., 2018) and differentiation of several neuronal cell types (Otx genes - photoreceptor and bipolar cell specification (Nishida et al., 2003; Viczian et al., 2003)).

The homology of hagfish (both *E. burgeri* and *E. stoutii*) Rx to gnathostome Rx homologs was strongly supported by data from tBLASTn searches, although the protein sequence conservation was low (Figure 2-4, Table 2-4). The homology of hagfish and gnathostome Rx is also supported by a synteny analysis from Kon and Furukawa (2020). This in combination with the available RNA sequencing data which shows a high expression of Rx in the *E. stoutii* eye (relative to brain tissue) (Table 2-7) support our prediction that Rx will also be important for eye/retina formation in hagfish. To further characterize Rx expression an *in-situ* hybridization was completed on hagfish retinal sections (see **Section 2.5.3**). Similar analyses support the homology of the three hagfish *Six3/6* paralogs with both gnathostome *Six3* and *Six6* (Figure 2-5, Table 2-5). It was not possible to assign any of the three hagfish paralogs to a 1:1 orthologous relationship with either gnathostome *Six3* or *Six6*. It is possible the hagfish *Six3/6* paralogs may be a result of a separate duplication event from the gnathostome *Six* genes. Regardless even if a 1:1 orthologous relationship between the hagfish and gnathostome sequences cannot be assigned, *Six3* and *Six6* are both genes known to be required in the maintenance of retinal progenitor cells (Diacou et al., 2018). The hagfish *Six3/6* homologs are likely involved in the cyclostome retinal development and their expression in the hagfish eye and retina should be explored further. Two hagfish *Six3/6* transcript sequences are of particular interest. One (Unigene16248_All) matched mostly closely to the gnathostome *Six3* and *Six6* sequences in the BLAST searches and had high expression in the retina (relative to brain tissue) (Table 2-5, Table 2-7). The other (Unigene5558_All) had high expression in both retina and brain tissue (Table 2-7).

Finally, the bioinformatics and phylogenetic analyses suggested hagfish have four Otx gene homologs (this is consistent with other studies (Higuchi et al., 2019)) (Figure 2-6, Figure 2-7, Table 2-6). However, assigning 1:1 orthology relationships of the cyclostome Otx paralogs to gnathostome Otx genes is difficult. The phylogenetic analysis did not show the hagfish Otxsequences clustering with specific gnathostome Otx paralogs, although it did suggest the cyclostome Otx genes are most closely related to gnathostome Otx1 and Otx2 (Figure 2-7). The synteny analysis supports homology between gnathostome Otx1 and Otx2 (Figure 2-7). The synteny analysis supports homology between gnathostome Otx1 and cyclostome Otx2 to both cyclostome OtxA and OtxD (Figure 2-8B, Figure 2-10). However, no syntenic relationship could be identified between gnathostome Crx/Otx5 with any of the hagfish Otx genes (Figure 2-8C, Figure 2-11). A previous publication (Yamamoto et al., 2020) suggested lamprey OtxB was homologous with gnathostome Crx (Otx5). Hagfish (*E. burgeri*) OtxB is a 1:1 ortholog to lamprey (*P. marinus*) OtxB, so this finding would suggest a link between hagfish OtxB and gnathostome Crx. However, the genes used to support the syntenic relationship by Yamamoto et al., (2020) are located farther from the cyclostome OtxB gene than the genes used in this synteny analysis. This is partially due to the limited genomic data available for hagfish (the *E. burgeri* contig containing OtxB only holds 8 genes). Interestingly, both the hagfish (*E. burgeri*) and lamprey (*P. marinus*) contigs containing OtxB also contain UGP2. UGP2 is a gene located near Otx1 in gnathostome genomes. Based on this data it is unclear if cyclostome OtxB shares a closer orthologous relationship to gnathostome Otx1 or Crx/Otx5. There is also the possibility that OtxBis a cyclostome specific paralog.

All three gnathostome Otx genes have important roles in eye and retina development. Otx1 and Otx2 help establish the identity of the early neural retina. In the context of post-embryonic retinogenesis, Otx2 is also required for the specification of photoreceptor cells and bipolar cells (Nishida et al., 2003; Viczian et al., 2003). Otx5/Crx is required for terminal photoreceptor differentiation (Furukawa et al., 1997). Based on the synteny and bioinformatics analyses, hagfish OtxC appears to be homologous to Otx1 and OtxA and OtxD are homologs of gnathostome Otx2. The RNA sequencing data supports that some of these paralogs could have functions in the adult eye. The E. stoutii transcripts that are the best match for OtxA and OtxD have high expression in the hagfish eye (compared to the brain) (Table 2-7). In contrast, the E. stoutii OtxC sequence has some expression in the eye, but not as high as the other three Otx paralogs. If OtxC coordinates early eye formation in cyclostomes, like Otx1 in gnathostomes, perhaps this paralog is expressed during embryonic eye development rather than in the adult eye. Therefore, we decided to focus on *OtxA* and *OtxD* for *in situ* hybridization on adult hagfish retinal sections (the *OtxD* probe was created but not fully optimized – see Supplementary Table 2). We expected OtxA to have a similar expression profile to gnathostome Otx2 (expressed in RPE (retinal pigmented epithelium) cells, photoreceptor cells and bipolar cells (Viczian et al.,

2003; Béby et al., 2010; Béby and Lamonerie, 2013)) as it consistently matched closely with Otx2 in tBLASTn searches (data not shown) (see Section 2.5.3). It is unclear which (if any) hagfish Otx paralog would take on the function of Crx/Otx5 to complete differentiation of hagfish photoreceptors. One possibility is the OtxB gene, as suggested by Yamamoto et al., (2020). This gene is expressed in the adult hagfish eye and could not be detected in the brain, suggesting it could have an eye specific function (Table 2-7). Another potential candidate would be the OtxD sequence, which also has high relative expression in the hagfish eye. The expression of both genes in the hagfish eye and/or retina should be characterized further (i.e., with *in situ* hybridization) in future studies.

2.5.3 Expression of OtxA and Rx in the hapfish retina parallels the expression of gnathostome Otx2 and Rx

In situ hybridization confirmed that several putative retinogenesis genes identified via genomic and RNA database searches are expressed in the hagfish (*E. stoutii*) retina. The expression of *OtxA* was particularly prominent (Figure 2-12). *OtxA* labels several cell populations within the hagfish retina. Interestingly, many of these cell types express *Otx2* in the gnathostome retina. The RnPE (retinal non-pigmented epithelium) cellular layer of the hagfish retina was heavily labelled by the *OtxA* probe (Figure 2-12A'). This expression pattern matches closely with the *Otx2* expression in mammalian retinae at the RPE (retinal pigmented epithelium) where it is vital for RPE cell specification and maintenance (Martínez-Morales et al., 2003; Rath et al., 2007; Béby and Lamonerie, 2013). *OtxA* was also expressed in other areas of the hagfish retina including directly adjacent to the RnPE (potentially the photoreceptor layer), the inner nuclear layer and the retinal periphery (Figure 2-12A'', A''', B, D, E). Expression in the photoreceptor layer corresponds to the gnathostome *Otx2* expression in photoreceptors. *Otx2* is critical for photoreceptor specification and in some vertebrates Otx2 expression is maintained in the photoreceptors and is required for these cells to remain healthy (Nishida et al., 2003). Otx2 is also utilized by gnathostomes to specify bipolar cells (Yamamoto et al., 2020). If the inner nuclear layer cells labelled by OtxA correspond to hagfish bipolar cells, this again would match the gnathostome profile. Performing a double labelling *in situ* hybridization experiment with the OtxA probe and a marker for hagfish bipolar cells (such as PKC-a) would be an important next step to confirm the identity of the labeled INL cells (Dong and Allison, 2021). Although the similar expression profiles of OtxA and Otx2 suggest that these genes may serve similar functions in hagfish and gnathostomes respectively, we cannot conclusively state that hagfish OtxA is promoting retinal development/retinogenesis based on the gene expression data alone. As mentioned, in other vertebrates Otx2 also functions in the maintenance of mature retinal neurons in addition to the specification of developing neurons. However, the labeling of OtxA at the retinal periphery (the putative CMZ zone) suggests that at least some of the OtxA expression is occurring in newly forming retinal neurons.

There is one other study that demonstrated OtxA expression in the retina of a cyclostome. Yamamoto et al., (2020) showed that OtxA is present in the retina of the Japanese lamprey (*Lethenteron camtschaticum*). However, in the adult lamprey OtxA was only observed in the photoreceptor layer (ONL). Based on this expression pattern, the authors suggest that Otx2 may have taken on its bipolar specification role only in the gnathostomes, and in cyclostomes it contributes solely to photoreceptor formation. However, the hagfish OtxA in situ hybridization data suggests otherwise. In adult hagfish OtxA expression occurred in multiple retinal layers including ONL and INL cells. Therefore, the absence of OtxA in lamprey bipolar cells compared to jawed vertebrates is likely not generalizable to cyclostomes overall. Another remaining curiosity is that in jawed vertebrates Otx5/Crx helps drive terminal photoreceptor differentiation (Furukawa et al., 1997), but it is unclear if cyclostomes have a direct ortholog of this gene. It has already been shown that *Maf* (a homolog of the gnathostome rod-specifying gene Nrl) is expressed in the hagfish retina (Dong, 2018 (unpublished)). In gnathostomes, Nrl interacts with Crx to drive proper photoreceptor differentiation (Mitton et al., 2000; Montana et al., 2011). It would be interesting to determine if there is an Otx homolog in hagfish that is expressed strictly in the photoreceptors and/or if any Otx genes interact with *Maf/Nrl*. As synteny analyses with the available genomic data could not identify a clear hagfish ortholog of Otx5, it is possible that Otx5 is a gnathostome specific paralog and one of the four hagfish Otx paralogs performs a similar role. OtxD is a potential candidate gene as it has high relative expression in eye tissue compared to brain tissue and appears to be homologous to gnathostome Otx2. Alternatively, if hagfish OtxB is homologous to Otx5/Crx (as suggested by data from Yamamoto et al., (2020)) and this relationship was missed by the synteny analysis because of incomplete hagfish genomic data, then perhaps this gene could regulate photoreceptor differentiation. RNA sequencing data shows *OtxB* is expressed in the adult hagfish eye at levels comparable to OtxD (Table 2-7), further supporting this gene could have a function in the eye and/or retina.

As Rx is a marker of retinal progenitor cells, expression of this gene was expected at the hagfish retinal periphery, but a stronger Rx signal was detected in the inner nuclear layer (INL) (Figure 2-13). Rx is a gene required for the maintenance of retinal progenitors in gnathostomes (Nelson et al., 2009b). As a result, during early development this gene has a broad expression pattern that gets restricted to specific areas (e.g., CMZ) once the retinal layers are established (Chuang et al., 1999). In adult zebrafish Rx1 and Rx2 are expressed in the CMZ (and cone photoreceptors) and

Rx3 is expressed in cells in the inner nuclear layer (Chuang et al., 1999). The hagfish *in situ* hybridization showed greatest Rx expression across the INL layer (Figure 2-13B) which is comparable to the expression pattern of zebrafish Rx3. The expression was not consistent across the whole layer but rather occurred in scattered cells. There was some Rx expression near the CMZ zone on one side of the retina (Figure 2-13C). However, the expression was unclear on the opposite side. There are reports of Rx being expressed in the INL cells and the photoreceptor cells of both zebrafish and rats (Chuang et al., 1999; Rohde et al., 2011). This expression pattern matches with what was observed in the hagfish retinal sections. As Rx is normally associated with retinal progenitor cells it does raise the possibility that the EdU+ cells located in the central retina and the Rx+ cells could be associated with each other. An important future experiment would be to perform Rx *in situ* hybridization on EdU treated samples. If the EdU and Rx labels co-localized in the same cells, that would support that the Rx riboprobe was labelling progenitor cells in the INL of the hagfish retina.

2.6 Conclusion

The hagfish is a poorly understood early-branching vertebrate with a bizarre, yet fascinating eye morphology. Investigating the eyes of this organism may reveal previously hidden clues to the evolutionary origins of the vertebrate eye and retina. One of the greatest limitations to studying hagfish is the logistical difficulty in acquiring embryos. However, careful examination of the hagfish retina in this study (and a previous study (Dong and Allison, 2021)) has revealed the presence of a CMZ-like zone in the hagfish retina. This creates a potential avenue to explore retinal neurogenesis in adult hagfish. The presence of a CMZ also suggests post-embryonic neurogenesis may have a more ancient origin in the vertebrate lineage than previously believed.

Further work exploring neurogenesis in other cyclostomes and early-branching gnathostomes will be crucial for elucidating the evolutionary history of this trait.

This study also presents data supporting there are shared developmental mechanisms driving retinogenesis in the hagfish and gnathostomes. Homologs of critical gnathostome retinal development genes (e.g., Rx, Otx2, Six3) are present in the hagfish genome and expressed in the eye. In addition, in situ hybridization reveals the expression patterns of two of these genes (OtxA/Otx2 and Rx) are similar in the hapfish and the gnathostome retina. This suggests potentially conserved functions of these genes in vertebrate retinogenesis. However, it is still unknown if the cyclostome genes fulfill the same functional roles as the gnathostome homologs. In order to determine if shared mechanisms drive retinal formation in hagfish and jawed vertebrates, more work needs to be done to characterize the expression of putative neurogenesis genes in the hagfish retina. Ideally work should also be done to assess the function of these genes. Although hagfish are not an organism that is amenable to laboratory studies, there is the potential to insert hagfish homologs of retinal genes into transgenic lines of other vertebrate species (i.e., zebrafish) to infer gene function. Moving forward, it will also be vital to compare data from the continuously proliferative adult hagfish retina to the retina of embryos (once those embryos become more widely available). Getting access to data from embryonic hagfish will be very informative for understanding conserved mechanisms driving eye and retinal development in vertebrates.

Although several studies have investigated the morphology of cyclostome eyes, data on eye and retinal development are extremely limited. Neurodevelopmental data could provide new insights on eye evolution where morphological data from extant organisms or fossil data are lacking. Functional work to determine if these genes operate during retinogenesis similarly to other

81

vertebrates will be incredibly valuable for dissecting shared developmental mechanisms between gnathostomes and cyclostomes. By taking advantage of a putative proliferative zone at the hagfish retinal margin, this study has laid the groundwork for further investigations of retinal development and evolution in the early-branching cyclostomes.

Acknowledgements

We thank the staff at the Bamfield Marine Sciences Center (BMSC) who collected and housed the live hagfish for this study. A special thanks to Dr. Juhno Eom (University of British Columbia) who assisted with the administration of the intraperitoneal EdU injections. We also thank Dr. Zachary Hall who provided advice for the EdU labelling protocol. We are grateful for Dr. Guobin Sun and Dr. Kacie Nortion who assisted with the microscopy. Finally, we thank Emily Dong who generated the RNA sequencing dataset and the hagfish RNA used in this project. This work was funded by an NSERC Discovery grant and an NSERC studentship.

Figures and Tables



Figure 2-1: EdU (5-ethynyl-2'-deoxyuridine) incorporation reveals proliferating cells in the post-embryonic hagfish retina. An abundance of EdU-positive (EdU+) cells at the retinal

margins indicate that ongoing proliferation likely contributes to adult retinal growth in this otherwise very rudimentary tissue. A) an overview of a hagfish retinal section from an adult hagfish treated with EdU 24 hours prior to sacrifice. The white arrows indicate cells that are EdU+. Nuclei are stained with DAPI. A') the same image with only EdU labelling shown. B) a closer view of the periphery of the retinal section in A (boxed region). White arrows indicate there are multiple EdU+ cells in this region. B') the same image as panel B with only EdU labelling shown. C) A retinal section from an animal not treated with EdU (negative control). No EdU+ cells are observed. C') The same image as panel C with only EdU labelling shown. Vitreous = vitreous side of retina. CMZ= putative ciliary marginal zone.



Figure 2-2: Quantification of EdU-positive (EdU+) cells in the hagfish retina suggests proliferating cells are concentrated at the peripheral retina. A.) Division of the retina for EdU+ cell quantification. Region 1 is the most peripheral and region 6 the most central. B.) Number of EdU+ cells per region across 21 retinal sections (from three EdU treated individuals – EdU 5, EdU 6, EdU 8). The maximum, minimum and average number of EdU+ cells per individual and per each region were plotted. The number of EdU+ cells in region 1 was significantly higher than the number found in the other 5 regions (P<0.001). C.) Proportion of the total number of EdU+ cells found in each retinal region. D.) The average number of EdU+ cells found in the 'CMZ' (defined by morphology) zone compared to the rest of the retina for each individual. The overall number of EdU+ cells (across all three individuals) located in the CMZ zone does not differ significantly from the number of cells located in the rest of the retina (ns = not significant). Error

bars represent standard error. Panels B-D were created in GraphPad Prism version 9.5.1 for Windows.



Figure 2-3: Sox2 immunohistochemistry (IHC) labels the zebrafish retina but not the hagfish retina. A.) Negative control (no primary antibody) for Sox2 in zebrafish retina. B.) Sox2 IHC in the zebrafish retina. Sox2 positive cells are present in the inner nuclear layer and the retinal ganglion cell layer. C.) Negative control for Sox2 in hagfish retina. D.) Sox2 IHC in hagfish retina. No Sox2+ cells were observed. RPE = retinal pigmented epithelium. RnPE = retinal non-pigmented epithelium).

| Α | | 1 | 50 | 100 | 150 | 200 | 250 | 300 | 365 |
|---|----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|-----|-----|---------------|------------------|-----|
| | Consensus | | | | | | | | |
| | Identity | La and Black | ALLAND LAND | Man Milling and | | | المراقع العسر | All Handrah land | |
| | 1. Mouse Rax | | | | | | | | |
| | 2. Frog Rax | | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Spotted gar Rx | | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Coelacanth Rx | | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Elephant shark Rx | | | | | | | | |
| | 6. Hagfish Rx | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| В | | Mouse Rax | Frog Rax | Spotted gar Rx | Coelacanth Rx | Elephant shark Rx | Hagfish Rx |
|---|-------------------|-----------|---|---|---|----------------------|------------|
| | Mouse Rax | $>\!\!<$ | 57.391% | 55.233% | 54.599% | 50.437% | 34.641% |
| | Frog Rax | 57.391% | $>\!$ | 59.021% | 65.409% | 54.321% | 32.353% |
| | Spotted gar Rx | 55.233% | 59.021% | $>\!$ | 67.857% | 60.062% | 34.653% |
| | Coelacanth Rx | 54.599% | 65.409% | 67.857% | $>\!$ | 62.581% | 33.007% |
| | Elephant shark Rx | 50.437% | 54.321% | 60.062% | 62.581% | $>\!\!\!<$ | 31.353% |
| | Hagfish Rx | 34.641% | 32.353% | 34.653% | 33.007% | 31.353% | $>\!\!<$ |

Figure 2-4: Hagfish retinal homeobox (Rx) protein shares low sequence identity with gnathostome Rx. A.) Protein alignment of hagfish (*Eptatretus burgeri*) Rx with representative gnathostome Rx homologs. B.) Protein % identity matrix for hagfish Rx compared to representative gnathostome Rx homologs. Image was created in Geneious Prime (v. 2022.0, Biomatters) and was edited in BioRender (Biorender.com).

| Consensus | | | | 1 | | 50 | 1 | 00 | 15 | | 200 | | 250 | | 300 ID-HIII | | 36 |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| identity | | | | - | - | | WALCON. | | | | | | | | - | أفاعصا فماته | 0_ |
| 1. Mouse Siz | х3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 2. Mouse Siz | x6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Froa Six3 | | | | | | | | | 11 11 | 11111 | | | 1 | | | н | |
| 4 Frog Six6 | | | | | | | mm | -0-0- | 111 11 | 11111 | | 111 | | | | | |
| 5 Spotted a | ar Siv3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | = |
| C. Creatted g | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | | = |
| 6. Spotted g | ar Sixo | | | | | | 1011 | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 7. Coelacant | th Six3 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 01 1 | |
| 8. Coelacant | th Six6 | | | | | | 1111 | | 11 11 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 9. Elephant | shark S | ix3 | | | [| | | | 111 11 | 11111 | | | 1 | | | 0.0 | |
| 10 Elenhant | shark | Six6 | | | | | m | 1-0 | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Lephan | 0: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | = |
| 11. Lamprey | 51X3-11 | Ke" | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ |
| 12. Lamprey | Six3-li | ke | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 13. Lamprey | Six6-li | ke° | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| | 0 | l. d | | | | | | | | | | 111 | | | | 1111 | |
| 14. Lamprey | / Six6-li | ke" | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Lamprey | SIX6-II Siy3-lik | Ke" O ^e | | | | | | | | | | | | | тит | 11 1 | |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish | Six6-II Six3-lik | Ke ^e | | | | | | | | 11111 | | | | | | | |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik | ice ^e | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik | ke" :e ^e :e ^f :e ^g | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | Dł. | | | |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik | ke ^s æ ^e æ ^f | | | [| | | 1 0-0 1 0-0 1 0-0 | 100 0 0 0 100 0 0 0 100 0 0 0 | | | | | н | | | |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik | ke Ge ^e Ge ^g | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | H | | | |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik | Ke ^s Ge ^e Ge ^f Ge ^g | Frog | Frog | Spotted | Spotted | Coelacanth | Coelacanth | Elephant | Elephant | Lamprey | Lamprey | Lamprey | Lamprey | Hagfish | Hagfish | Hagfish |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish | SIXO-II SiX3-lik SiX3-lik SiX3-lik Mouse SiX3 | Ke ^e Ge ^f Ce ^g Mouse Six6 | Frog Six3 | Frog Six6 | Spotted gar Six3 | Spotted gar Six6 | Coelacanth Six3 | Coelacanth Six6 | Elephant shark Six3 | Elephant shark Six6 | Lamprey Six3-like* | Lamprey Six3-like ^b | Lamprey Six6-like ^o | Lamprey Six6-like ^d | Hagfish Six3-like* | Hagfish Six3-like | Hagfish Six3-like |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish ^{Mouse Six3} | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik ^{Mouse} Six3 | Ke ^e e ^e e ^f ce ^g Mouse Six6 | Frog Six3 85.763% | Frog Six6 78.039% | Spotted gar Six3 | Spotted gar Six6 79.216% | Coelacanth Six3 86.254% | Coelacanth Six6 | Elephant shark Six3 | Elephant shark Six6 | Lamprey Six3-like ^a 75573% | Lamprey Six3-like ^b 72.656% | Lamprey Six6-like ⁶ 61.837% | Lamprey Six6-like ^d 65.267% | Hagfish Six3-like ^e 69310% | Hagfish Six3-like ⁴ 56.997% | Hagfish Six3-like |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish ^{Mouse Six3} ^{Mouse Six5} | Mouse | Ke ^e (e ^e (e ^g (e ^g Mouse Six6 77.255% | Frog Six3 85.763% 77.647% | Frog Six6 92.276% 78.431% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.186% | Spotted gar Six6 79.216% 90.650% 79.650% | Coelacanth Six3 86.254% 77.255% 86.301% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.715% | Elephant shark Six3 85.616% 76.863% | Elephant shark Six6 79.216% 89.243% | Lamprey Six3-like* 75.573% 73.282% 75.954% | Lamprey Six3-like ^b 72.656% 70.196% 70.196% | Lamprey Six6-like ^o 61.837% 63.158% | Lamprey Six6-like ^d 65.267% 67.557% | Hagfish Six3-like ^e 69310% 72.797% | Hagfish Six3-like ⁴ 56.997% 63.386% | Hagfish Six3-like ⁶ 74.262% 75.105% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish ^{Mouse Six3} ^{Mouse Six5} ^{Frog Six3} | Mouse Six3-lik | Ke ^e (e ^e (e ^g Mouse Six6 77.255% 77.547% 92.275% | Frog Six3 85.763% 77.647% | Frog Six6 78.039% 92.276% 78.431% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.186% 78.824% | Spotted gar Six6 79.216% 90.650% 79.608% 91.837% | Coelacanth Six3 86.254% 77.255% 86.301% 78.824% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.715% 80.392% 94.285% | Elephant shark Six3 85.616% 76.863% 85.666% 78.039% | Elephant shark Six6 79.216% 89.243% 79.608% 88.800% | Lamprey Six3-like* 75.573% 73.282% 75.954% 72.901% | Lamprey Six3-like ^b 72.656% 70.196% 71.484% | Lamprey Six6-like ^o 61.837% 63.158% 60.424% 63.514% | Lamprey Six6-like ^d 65.267% 66.031% 66.031% | Hagfish Six3-like ^e 69.310% 68.966% 72.031% | Hagfish Six3-like ⁷ 56.997% 63.386% 56.655% | Hagfish Six3-like 74 262% 75.105% 73.840% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish ^{Mouse Six3} ^{Mouse Six6} ^{Frog Six3} ^{Frog Six6} Spotted ar Six3 | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Mouse Six3 77.255% 85.763% 78.039% 85.034% | Ke ^e (e ^e (e ^g Mouse Six6 77.255% 77.547% 92.276% 77.255% | Frog Six3 85.763% 77.647% 78.431% 91.186% | Frog Six6 78.039% 92.276% 78.431% 78.824% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.186% 78.824% | Spotted gar Six6 79.216% 90.650% 79.68% 79.837% 78.824% | Coelacanth Six3 86.254% 77.255% 86.301% 78.824% 86.598% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.715% 80.000% | Elephant shark Six3 85.616% 76.863% 85.666% 78.039% 85.274% | Elephant shark Six60 79.216% 89.243% 79.608% 88.800% 88.800% | Lamprey Six3-like* 75.573% 73.282% 75.954% 72.901% 74.427% | Lamprey Six3-like ^b 72.656% 70.196% 71.484% 70.588% 72.266% | Lamprey Six6-like ^o 61.837% 60.424% 61.534% 61.131% | Lamprey Six6-like ^d 65.267% 66.031% 66.031% 64.504% | Hagfish Six3-like ^e 69.310% 72.797% 68.966% 72.031% | Hagfish Six3-like ⁷ 56.997% 63.386% 56.655% 63.386% 58.703% | Hagfish Six3-like 74.262% 73.840% 73.840% 74.262% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish ^{Mouse Six6} ^{Frog Six3} ^{Spotted gar Six6} | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Mouse Six3 77.255% 85.763% 78.039% 85.034% 79.216% | Ke ^e ge ^e ge ^f gg Six6 77.255% 92.276% 77.647% 92.276% | Frog Six3 85:763% 77:547% 91:185% 91:185% | Frog Six6 78.039% 92.276% 78.431% 78.824% 91.837% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.186% 78.824% | Spotted gar Six6 90.650% 79.608% 91.837% 78.824% | Coelacanth Six3 86.254% 77.255% 86.301% 78.824% 86.598% 79.216% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.715% 80.392% 94.286% 80.000% 93.902% | Elephant shark Six3 85.616% 76.863% 85.666% 78.039% 85.274% 78.431% | Elephant shark Six6 79.216% 89.243% 79.608% 88.80% 89.263% | Lamprey Six3-like* 75.573% 73.282% 75.954% 72.901% 74.427% 73.664% | Lamprey Six3-like ^b 72.556% 70.196% 71.484% 70.588% 72.266% 70.196% | Lamprey Six6-like ^o 61.837% 63.158% 60.424% 61.31% 64.286% | Lamprey Six6-like ^d 65.267% 67.557% 66.031% 66.031% 64.504% 66.794% | Hagfish Six3-like ⁶ 69.310% 72.797% 68.966% 72.031% 67.931% 72.414% | Hagfish Six3-like' 56.97% 63.386% 56.655% 63.386% 58.703% 64.173% | Hagfish Six3-like 74.262% 73.840% 73.840% 74.262% 75.105% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish Frog Sixô Frog Sixô Spotted gar Sixô Coelacanth Six3 | / Six6-II Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik 72255 857634 72255 857634 72255 857634 72255 857634 72255 857634 72255 | Ke [*] (e ^e (e ^f (e ^g) (e ^g) 77255% 77255% 77255% 77255% 77255% | Frog Six3 85.763% 77.647% 78.431% 91.186% 79.608% 86.301% | Frog Six6 78.039% 92.276% 78.431% 91.837% 78.824% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.186% 78.824% 86.598% | Spotted gar Six6 79.205% 90.55% 79.608% 91.837% 78.824% | Coelacanth Six3 86.254% 77.255% 86.301% 78.824% 86.598% 79.216% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.715% 80.392% 94.286% 80.000% 93.902% 80.784% | Elephant shark Six3 85.616% 76.863% 85.26% 78.039% 85.27% | Elephant shark Sids 99.243% 79.608% 88.800% 79.608% 89.243% 79.608% | Lamprey Six3-like* 75.573% 73.282% 72.901% 74.427% 73.5954% | Lamprey Six3-like ^b 72.656% 70.196% 71.484% 70.588% 72.266% 70.196% | Lamprey Six6-like ^c 61.837% 60.424% 60.424% 60.424% 61.131% 64.286% 61.484% | Lamprey Six6-like ⁴ 67.557% 66.031% 66.031% 66.794% 66.794% | Hagfish Six3-like ^e 69310% 72.797% 68.966% 72.031% 67.931% 72.414% 68.276% | Hagfish Six3-like' 56.955% 63.386% 56.655% 63.386% 58.703% 64.173% 56.701% | Hagfish Six3-liket 74.262% 73.840% 73.840% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish Mouse Sixé Frog Sixé Spotted gar Sixá Spotted gar Sixá Coelacanth Sixá | V SIX6-II Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik V V V Six3-lik V V V Six3-lik | Ke* ee ef ge gg 71,255% 71,255% 71,255% 90,250% 71,255% 90,715% | Frog Six3 85.763% 77.647% 78.431% 91.186% 79.608% 86.301% 80.302% | Frog Six6 78.039% 92.276% 78.824% 78.824% 94.837% 78.824% 94.286% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.186% 78.824% 80.000% | Spotted gar Six6 79.216% 90.550% 73.824% 91.837% 78.824% 93.902% | Coelacanth Six3 86.254% 77.255% 86.30% 78.824% 86.598% 79.216% 80.784% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.236% 80.392% 80.000% 93.302% 80.784% | Elephant shark Six3 85.616% 76.83% 85.666% 78.03% 85.274% 78.03% 85.274% 78.31% 78.31% | Elephant shark Six6 79.216% 89.243% 79.608% 88.800% 79.608% 89.243% 79.608% 92.400% | Lamprey Six3-like* 75.573% 75.954% 75.954% 72.901% 74.427% 75.191% 75.191% | Lamprey Six3-like ^b 72.656% 70.196% 72.266% 70.588% 72.266% 70.588% | Lamprey Skó-like 61.837% 63.158% 60.424% 61.131% 64.286% 61.484% 61.484% | Lamprey Six6-like ⁴ 65.267% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.7176% | Hagfish Six3-like [*] 69310% 72,797% 68,966% 72,031% 72,031% 72,414% 67,931% 73,946% | Hagfish Six3-like' 56.997% 63.386% 56.63386% 58.703% 64.173% 56.701% 63.386% | Hagfish Six3-like' 74.262% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 74.262% 74.262% 74.664% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish Mouse Sixé Frog Sixá Spotted gar Sixé Coelacanth Sixá Elephant shark Sixá | 7 Six6-II Six3-Iik Six3-Iik Six3-Iik Six3-Iik 72.55% 85.763% 78.03% 85.763% 78.03% 85.034% 79.216% 85.034% 85.035% 85.035% | Ke [*] (e ^e (e ^g (e ^g))) (e ^g (e ^g (e ^g))) (e ^g (e ^g)) (e ^g (e ^g))) (e ^g (e ^g))) (e ^g (e ^g))) (e ^g) (e ^g)) (e ^g)) (| Frog Six3 85.763% 70.647% 70.647% 70.647% 70.647% 70.60% | Frog Six6 78.039% 92.276% 78.824% 91.837% 78.824% 91.837% 78.824% 91.837% 78.826% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.186% 77.8244% 86.590% 80.000% 85.274% | Spotted gar Six6 79.216% 90.550% 79.808% 91.837% 78.824% 79.216% 93.902% 78.431% | Coelacanth Six3 86.254% 77.255% 86.301% 78.824% 86.598% 79.216% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.715% 80.392% 94.715% 80.392% 94.725% 80.784% 79.216% | Elephant shark Six3 85.616% 76.863% 85.666% 78.039% 85.274% 78.039% 85.274% 78.039% | Elephant shark Six6 79.216% 89.243% 79.608% 88.800% 88.80% 79.608% 89.243% 79.608% | Lamprey Six3-like" 75.573% 73.282% 75.954% 73.954% 75.954% 73.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954%75.954%75.954% 75.954%75.954%75.954%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556%75.9556% 75.956%756%756 | Lamprey Slx3-like ^b 72.656% 70.196% 71.484% 72.266% 70.588% 71.875% 71.875% 71.884% | Lamprey Slx6-like ⁶ 61.8378 60.424% 63.534% 60.424% 63.534% 61.1313% 64.286% 61.484% 63.910% | Lamprey Sixó-like ⁶ 65.267% 66.031% 64.504% 64.504% 64.885% 64.885% 64.304% | Hagfish Six3-like* 69310% 72,797% 68,966% 72,031% 67,931% 72,414% 68,276% 73,946% 68,621% | Hagfish Six3-like ⁷ 56.697% 63.386% 56.655% 63.386% 58.703% 64.173% 56.701% 63.386% 56.507% | Hagfish Six3-like' 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish Frog Sixô Frog Sixô Spotted gar Sixô Coelacanth Sixô Elephant shark Sixô | Six3-lik Six | Ke ⁺ e ^e e ^f (e ^g 77.255% 77.647% 92.276% 77.255% 94.715% 94.715% 92.23% | Frog Six3 85.763% 77.647% 78.431% 91.186% 86.301% 86.301% 86.302% 85.666% 73.608% | Frog Six6 78.039% 92.276% 78.824% 91.837% 78.824% 91.837% 94.82% 94.83% 88.80% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.186% 78.824% 86.595% 80.000% 85.2744% 79.608% | Spotted gar Six6 79.216% 91.837% 79.60% 91.837% 79.216% 93.902% 79.216% 93.902% 79.216% | Coelacanth Six3 86.2544 77.255% 86.307% 78.824% 86.598% 79.216% 80.784% 87.923% 80.784% | Coelacanth Sixó 80.000% 94.715% 80.392% 94.286% 80.00% 80.20% 80.284% 80.22% 93.902% 80.784% | Elephant shark Six3 85.615% 78.63% 78.63% 78.63% 79.216% 79.68% | Elephant shark Six6 79.216% 89.243% 79.608% 88.800% 79.608% 89.243% 79.608% 92.400% 79.608% | Lamprey Six3-like ^a 75.573% 73.282% 75.954% 72.901% 74.427% 74.645% | Lamprey Six3-like ^b 72.556% 70.196% 71.484% 70.588% 71.875% 70.588% 71.875% 70.588% | Lamprey Six6-like ^c 61.837% 63.158% 60.424% 63.354% 61.484% 61.484% 63.910% 60.977% 62.782% | Lamprey Six6-like ⁴ 65.267% 66.031% 66.031% 64.504% 64.504% 64.885% 67.176% 64.504% 64.5031% | Hagfish Six3-like* 69310% 72,297% 68,966% 72,031% 68,966% 72,041% 68,276% 73,946% | Hagfish Six3-like' 56.997% 53.386% 56.655% 63.386% 56.701% 63.386% 56.701% 63.386% | Hagfish Six3-like' 74.262% 75.105% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish Frog Six6 Spotted gar Six3 Spotted gar Six6 Coelacanth Six7 Elephant shark Six7 Elephant shark Six7 Elephant shark Six7 | Xix3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Xix | Ke ⁺ (e ^e (e ^g (e ^g) 77.255% 77.255% 92.276% 77.255% 94.715% 77.255% 94.715% 77.255% | Frog Six3 95.76.3% 77.647% 78.431% 91.186% 79.008% 86.301% 80.392% 85.866% 79.608% 75.954% | Frog Sixo 78.039% 92.276% 78.431% 78.824% 91.837% 78.824% 94.286% 94.286% 94.286% 78.039% 88.800% 72.001% | Spotted gar Six3 85.024% 77.255% 91.186% 78.824% 80.000% 85.274% 79.009% 74.427% | Spotted gar Six6 79.216% 90.650% 79.60% 91.837% 78.824% 79.216% 93.902% 78.831% 89.243% 73.664% | Coelacanth Six3 66.254% 77.255% 86.501% 78.824% 86.598% 79.216% 80.784% 80.794 | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.215% 80.302% 80.000% 94.280% 80.000% 93.024% 80.724 | Elephant shark Six3 85.616% 76.863% 85.666% 78.431% 85.974% 78.431% 79.216% | Elephant shark Six6 79.216% 89.243% 79.608% 88.800% 79.608% 99.243% 79.608% 92.400% 79.608% | Lamprey Six3-like* 75.573% 73.82% 73.954% 73.82% 73.954% 74.427% 74.427% 74.809% 74.427% 74.809% 74.426% | Lamprey 51x3-like ^b 72.556% 70.196% 71.845% 70.588% 72.266% 70.588% 71.875% 70.588% 71.875% 70.588% 71.844% 69.084% | Lamprey Six6-like ^c 61.837% 63.538% 60.424% 63.534% 61.331% 64.286% 63.531% 64.777% 63.910% 60.777% 63.758% | Lamprey Six6-like ^d 65.267% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% | Hagfish Six3-like* 69310% 72,797% 68,966% 72,031% 72,031% 72,031% 72,031% 72,031% 72,031% 72,031% 68,21% 73,946% 68,621% 73,946% 87,405% | Hagfish Six3-like' 56.997% 63.386% 56.655% 63.386% 58.703% 64.173% 56.507% 63.386% 64.173% | Hagfish Six3-liket 74.262% 73.840% 73.840% 74.262% 74.262% 74.264% 74.262% 74.262% 74.263% 74.263% 74.263% 74.263% 74.263% 74.263% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish Mouse Sixé Frog Sixá Spotted gar Sixé Coelacanth Sixé Elephant shark Sixá Elephant shark Sixá Lamprey Six3-like* | XiXb-II Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik X3 X3 X3 X3 X3 X3 X3 X3 X3 X3 X3 X3 X3 | Ke [*] (e ^e (e ^g (e ^g 77.255% 77.255% 90.550% 77.255% 77.256% 75.266% 75 | Frog Six3 85.763% 77.647% 91.166% 93.605% 86.301% 80.301% 80.305% 85.666% 73.608% 73.608% 73.508% 73.544% | Frog Slx6 78.039% 92.276% 78.824% 91.837% 78.824% 91.837% 78.824% 94.286% 78.039% 88.800% 70.588% | Spotted gar 51x3 85 034% 77.255% 91.186% 78.824% 86.500% 85.274% 77.60% 77.422% | Spotted gar Six6 79.216% 90.650% 79.60% 78.824% 78.824% 79.216% 93.902% 78.831% 89.243% 73.664% 73.664% 73.664% | Coelacanth Six3 86.254% 77.255% 86.50% 78.824% 86.50% 79.216% 80.784% 80.784% 80.784% 80.784% 80.785% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.715% 94.286% 80.392% 94.286% 93.902% 80.784% 79.216% 92.400% 79.216% 79.216% 79.216% 74.80% 74.80% 74.80% | Elephant shark Six3 55.616% 76.863% 85.666% 78.039% 78.039% 78.039% 78.039% 78.039% 78.039% 78.039% 78.039% 79.216% | Elephant shark 50243% 79.216% 69.243% 79.608% 89.243% 79.608% 99.243% 79.608% 79.608% | Lamprey SiX3-like 75.573% 73.584% 72.901% 74.427% 74.427% 74.809% 74.427% 74.046% | Lamprey SiX3-like ^b 72.556% 70.196% 71.484% 70.588% 71.858% 71.858% 71.858% 71.858% 71.858% 71.858% | Lamprey ShKó-like ⁶ 61.837% 63.158% 63.158% 63.4286% 61.837% 64.286% 61.848% 63.910% 62.782% 63.758% 63.7582% 63.7582% 63.769% | Lamprey Six6-like 65-267% 67557% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 64.504% 64.504% 64.855% 64.856% 64.7176% 64.854% 66.031% 68.702% 68.702% | Hagfish Six3-like' 69.310% 72.797% 68.966% 72.031% 72.414% 68.261% 73.946% 87.405% 68.966% | Hagfish Six3-like' 56.97% 63.386% 56.65% 58.703% 64.173% 56.507% 63.386% 56.507% 63.386% 56.507% 64.173% | Hagfish Six3-like 74.262% 75.105% 73.840% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish Frog Sixô Frog Sixô Spotted gar Sixô Coelacanth Sixô Elephant shark Sixô Lamprey Sixô-like* Lamprey Sixô-like* | Xix3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik 77,255% 5,054% 79,216% 79,216% 79,216% 79,216% 79,216% | Ke* (e ^e (e ^f (e ^g 77.255% 77.255% 77.255% 77.255% 90.255% 90.255% 92.276% 92.275% 92.275% 92.275% 92.275% 92.25% 92.25% 92.25% 92.25% 93.25% 9 | Frog Six3 55,763% 77,647% 78,431% 91,186% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,608% 79,642% | Frog 78.039% 92.276% 78.431% 78.824% 91.827% 78.824% 91.827% 78.826% 72.901% 72.901% 70.588% 63.534% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.1824% 78.824% 86.592% 80.000% 85.2724 85.2724 85.2724% 79.608% 74.427% 79.608% 61.133% | Spotted gar Six6 75.216% 90.505% 79.505% 79.337% 78.824% 79.216% 93.902% 78.837% 78.824% 79.216% 93.902% 78.831% 79.216% 93.902% 78.831% 64.265% | Coelacanth Six3 86.5544, 77.2554, 86.501% 78.8549, 70.2164, 80.7848, 80.784 | Coelacanth Isixó 80.000% 94.7152% 80.000% 93.922% 80.784% 93.9226% 93.922% 70.588% 63.910% | Elephant shark Six3 55.616% 76.853% 55.666% 78.039% 65.274% 78.039% 65.274% 79.216% 79.608% 74.427% 60.777% | Elephant shark Six6 79.216% 89.243% 79.508% 88.800% 79.508% 89.243% 79.508% 92.405% 79.508% 92.405% 69.804% 62.782% | Lamprey Six3-like* 75.573% 72.901% 74.427% 75.191% 74.427% 74.046% | Lamprey Six3-like ^b 72.85% 70.196% 71.875% 70.588% 72.266% 70.588% 71.875% 70.588% 71.875% 70.588% 71.875% 70.588% 71.845% 63.045% 63.045% 63.045% | Lamprey Six6-like ^c 61.837% 63.558% 60.4286% 61.337% 63.534% 61.337% 63.534% 63.534% 63.535% 63.558% 63.558% 63.558% | Lamprey Six6-like ⁴ 65.267% 66.031% 66.031% 64.504% 66.794% 64.885% 67.176% 64.885% 67.176% 64.904% 66.031% 68.382% 63.100% | Hagfish Six3-like* 69310% 72.797% 68.966% 72.031% 68.926% 73.946% 68.276% 73.946% 68.621% 73.946% 68.621% | Hagfish Six3-like' 56.997% 63.386% 56.507% 63.386% 58.703% 63.386% 64.173% 63.386% 64.173% 63.386% 64.173% | Hagfish Six3-like 74262w 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 73.840% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 76.37% 76.37% 76.262% 76.37% 76.262% 76.37% 76.262% 76.37% 76.37% 76.262% 76.37% 76.37% 76.262% 76.37%76% 76.37% 76.37% 76.37%76% 76.37% 76.37%76% 76.37% 76.37%76% 76.3 |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish Frog Sixô Frog Sixô Spotted gar Sixô Spotted gar Sixô Coelacanth Sixô Elephant shark Sixô Elephant shark Sixô Elephant shark Sixô Elephant shark Sixô Elephant shark Sixô Elephant shark Sixô | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik 77.255% 5.763% 78.25% 5.763% 79.216% 5.254% 5.255% 5.255% 5.255% 5.257% 5.257% 5.257% | Ke ^e (e ^e (e ^g) (g ^g) 77,255% 77,255% 90,650% 77,255% 90,650% 77,255% 90,650% 77,255% 90,650% 77,255% 90,650% 77,255% 90,650% 77,255% 90,650% 77,255% 90,650% 77,255% | Frog Six3 85.763% 77.647% 78.431% 91.186% 79.608% 85.301% 85.3 | Frog Six6 78.039% 92.276% 78.431% 78.824% 91.837% 78.824% 91.837% 78.824% 94.286% 94.286% 94.286% 72.901% 70.588% 65.534% 65.534% | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 91.185% 91.19 | Spotted gar Six6 90,550,5 91,837% 73,9216% 93,902% 78,824% 73,9216% 93,902% 73,824% 73,9216% 93,902% 73,844% 73,916% 66,794% 53,544% | Coelacanth Six3 86,254% 77,255% 86,301% 78,824% 86,595% 79,216% 80,784% 87,927% 79,208% 80,784% 87,927% 79,216% 80,784% 87,927% 79,216% 80,784% 81,792% 61,484% 61,485% 64,825% 64,825% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.715% 80.392% 94.255% 93.902% 80.784% 93.902% 80.784% 93.902% 80.784% 93.905% 74.809% 74.809% 70.585% 53.910% | Elephant shark Six3 55.616% 78.83% 55.666% 78.03% 55.224% 78.63% 78.03% 57.97% 78.68% 74.427% 71.484% 60.777% 71.484% | Elephant shark Six6 79.216% 89.243% 79.608% 89.243% 79.608% 89.243% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 74.046% 69.804% 69.804% 69.804% 69.804% 69.804% | Lamprey Six3-like 75.5738 72.5054% 72.901% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.809% 74.427% 74.809% 74.805% 76.9084% 60.084% 60.084% 60.084% 60.084% 60.084% 60.084% 60.084% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 60.025% 75.025% 75.025% 75.025% 75.05% 75% | Lamprey Six3-like ³ 72.556% 70.196% 71.884% 70.588% 71.884% 69.084% 69.084% 63.469% 68.382% 69.084% | Lamprey Six6-like 61.837% 63.554% 63.424% 63.426% 61.481% 63.910% 63.710% 63.7158% 63.469% 63.100% 63.100% 63.100% | Lamprey Six6-like 65.267% 66.031% 66.031% 64.504% 64.504% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% 66.031% | Hagfish Six3-like 69310% 72,297% 68,966% 72,031% 68,966% 72,031% 68,966% 57,31% 73,946% 87,405% 68,966% 59,717% 70,229% | Hagfish Six3-like' 56.997% 53.386% 56.655% 56.655% 56.70% 53.386% 56.507% 56.70% 53.386% 56.507% 56.507% 53.386% 54.173% 64.173% 54.173% 54.173% | Hagfish Six3-liket 74.262% 75.105% 73.840% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.263% 74.263% 73.418% 75.105% 73.418% 75.105% 73.418% 75.105% 73.418% 75.105% 73.418% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 74.262% 75.205% 74.262% 74% |
| 14. Lamprey 15. Hagfish 16. Hagfish 17. Hagfish 17. Hagfish Nouse Sixé Frog Sixá Spotted gar Sixé Coelacanth Sixé Elephant shark Sixá Elephant shark Sixá Elephant shark Sixá Lamprey Sixá-like* Lamprey Sixá-like* | Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik Six3-lik 7725% 5535% 7825% 85515% 78235% 85515% 79216% 79216% 79276% 7926% | Ke ⁺ (e ^e (e ^g (e ^g (f) (e ^g (f) (f) (f) (f) (f) (f) (f) (f) | Frog Six3 85.763% 77.647% 78.631% 91.166% 79.608% 85.3656% 79.508% 73.554% 73.566% 55.655% | Frog Sik6 78.039% 92.276% 91.837% 91.8 | Spotted gar Six3 85.034% 77.255% 97.8224% 86.593% 80.000% 85.274% 77.808% 74.422% 64.504% 64.504% 64.504% 64.504% 64.504% 64.504% | Spotted gar SiX6 79.216% 90.655% 91.837% 79.206% 93.902% 778.243% 78.243% 70.216% 93.902% 78.431% 89.243% 73.664 70.196% 64.285% 66.794% 72.414% | Coelacanth Six3 86.5254% 77.255% 86.507% 78.824% 86.507% 79.216% 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.772 80.784% 80.775% 80.775% | Coelacanth Six6 80.000% 94.715% 80.392% 94.286% 80.200% 79.216% 93.902% 80.784% 79.216% 79.216% 79.216% 79.216% 79.216% 73.946% 63.910% 73.946% | Elephant shark Six3 55.616% 76.863% 65.566% 78.039% 85.274% 78.431% 67.973% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 74.427% 71.484% 60.777% 79.608% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 74.427% 75.650% | Elephant shark Slx6 79.216% 89.243% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% 79.608% | Lamprey Six3-like* 75.573% 73.5282% 75.5282% 75.5282% 75.5282% 75.5282% 74.422% 74.422% 74.422% 74.646% 69.084% 63.152% 69.084% 63.152% 64.152% | Lamprey Sh3-like ¹⁰ 72.556% 70.196% 71.484% 70.588% 71.484% 70.596% 71.487% 71.484% 63.804% 63.469% 63.469% 63.852% 68.982% 68.986% 64.120 | Lamprey ShKo-like ⁶ 61.837% 63.158% 60.424% 61.837% 60.428% 61.131% 64.286% 61.831% 64.286% 64.285% 63.910% 60.777% 62.782% 63.100% 63.100% 63.100% 63.100% | Lamprey Six6-IIke ^d 65.267% 66.031% 66.031% 64.504% 66.794% 64.504% 66.794% 64.504% 66.301% 68.702% 68.382% 63.300% | Hagfish Six3-like* 69310% 72.797% 68.966% 72.031% 67.931% 72.414% 68.276% 72.414% 68.621% 73.946% 67.435% 68.621% 73.946% 68.966% 59.717% 70.229% | Hagfish Six3-like' 56.997% 63.386% 56.655% 64.173% 56.701% 63.386% 56.507% 64.173% 64.173% 64.173% 64.173% 64.173% | Hagfish Six3-like' 74.262% 73.840% 73.840% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.105% 74.262% 75.265% 74.262% 75.265% 74.262% 74.262% 75.265% 74.262% 75.265% 74.262% 75.265% 74.262% 75.265% 74.262% 75.265% 74.262% 75.265% 74.262% 75.265% 75%75.265% 75.265%75% 75.265% 75.265% 75.265%75% 75.265% 75.265%75% 75.265% 75.265%75% |

Figure 2-5: Hagfish have three six3/6 paralogs which share some protein sequence identity with gnathostome Six3 and Six6 sequences. A.) Protein alignment of hagfish (*Eptatretus burgeri*) Six3/6 paralogs with representative gnathostome and lamprey Six3 and Six6 homologs. B.) Protein % identity matrix for hagfish Six3/6 paralogs compared to representative gnathostome and lamprey Six3 and Six6 homologs. Superscript letters (a-g) refer to different cyclostome Six3/6 sequences (see Supplementary Table 4). Image was created in Geneious Prime (v. 2022.0, Biomatters) and was edited in BioRender (Biorender.com).

| Α | Consensus | | | 1 | 50 | 100 |) 150 | | | 250 | 300 11110-0000 | 350 350 | | 450 | 518 |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| | Identity 1. Mouse Ott 2. Spotted g 3. Mouse Ott 4. Spotted g 5. Mouse Cr 6. Spotted g 7. Hagfish O 8. Lamprey (9. Hagfish O 10. Lamprey 11. Hagfish (12. Lamprey 13. Hagfish (14. Lamprey | x1 ar Otx1 x2 ar Otx2 x ar Otx5 itxA DtxA DtxA OtxB OtxB OtxC OtxC OtxD OtxD | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| в | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Mouse Otv1 | Spotted gar | Mouse | Spotted gar | Mouse | Spotted gar | Hagfish | Lamprey | Hagfish | Lamprey | Hagfish | | Hagfish | Lamprey |
| | Mouse Otx1 | Otx1 | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% | Mouse Crx 37.634% | Spotted gar Otx5 48,189% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 | Otx1 | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 | 68.156% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 | 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% 54.902% 55.556% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 43.636% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 67.550% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% 47.801% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.008% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 54.603% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% 33.156% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 Mouse Crx | 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% 37.634% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% 54.902% 55.556% 38.440% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% 45.342% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% 43.636% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 43.636% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 67.550% 47.771% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% 37.752% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% 44.099% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% 35.535% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% 47.801% 36.522% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% 37.037% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.008% 28.385% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 54.603% 39.623% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% 33.156% 28.191% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 Mouse Crx Spotted gar Otx5 | Mouse Otx1 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% 37.634% 48.189% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% 54.902% 55.556% 38.440% 54.046% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% 45.342% 66.343% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% 43.636% 67.550% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 43.636% 47.771% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 67.550% 47.771% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% 37.752% 56.230% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% 44.099% 56.731% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% 35.535% 40.127% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% 47.801% 36.522% 47.463% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% 37.037% 44.860% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.008% 28.385% 35.884% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 54.603% 39.623% 52.733% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% 33.156% 28.191% 33.067% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 Mouse Crx Spotted gar Otx5 Hadfish OtxA | Mouse Otx1 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% 37.634% 48.189% 45.879% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% 54.902% 55.556% 38.440% 54.046% 49.570% | Mouse 0tx2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% 45.342% 66.343% 59.748% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% 43.636% 67.550% 58.896% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 43.636% 47.771% 37.752% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 67.550% 47.771% 56.230% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% 37.752% 56.230% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% 44.099% 56.731% 70.740% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% 35.535% 40.127% 39.557% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% 47.801% 36.522% 47.463% 42.775% | Hagfish 0txC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% 37.037% 44.860% 44.343% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.008% 28.385% 35.884% 35.696% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 54.603% 39.623% 52.733% 54.574% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% 33.156% 28.191% 33.067% 32.632% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 Mouse Crx Spotted gar Otx5 Hagfish OtxA Lamprey OtxA | Mouse 0tx1 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% 37.634% 48.189% 45.879% 46.575% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% 54.902% 55.556% 38.440% 54.046% 49.570% 50.000% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% 45.342% 66.343% 59.748% 58.044% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% 43.636% 67.550% 58.896% 59.807% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 43.636% 47.771% 37.752% 44.099% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 67.550% 47.771% 56.230% 56.230% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% 37.752% 56.230% 70.740% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% 44.099% 56.731% 70.740% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% 35.535% 40.127% 39.557% 41.083% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% 47.801% 36.522% 47.463% 42.775% 43.732% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% 37.037% 44.860% 44.343% 42.638% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.008% 28.385% 35.884% 35.696% 36.148% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 54.603% 39.623% 52.733% 54.574% 51.735% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% 33.156% 28.191% 33.067% 32.632% 33.867% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 Mouse Crx Spotted gar Otx5 Hagfish OtxA Hagfish OtxB | 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% 37.634% 48.189% 45.879% 46.575% 35.772% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% 54.902% 55.556% 38.440% 54.046% 49.570% 50.000% 36.415% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% 45.342% 66.343% 59.748% 58.044% 41.121% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% 43.636% 67.550% 58.896% 59.807% 42.222% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 43.636% 47.771% 37.752% 44.099% 35.535% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 67.550% 47.771% 56.230% 56.731% 40.127% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% 37.752% 56.230% 70.740% 39.557% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% 44.099% 56.731% 70.740% 41.083% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% 35.535% 40.127% 39.557% 41.083% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% 47.801% 36.522% 47.463% 47.463% 42.775% 43.732% 40.351% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% 37.037% 44.860% 44.343% 42.638% 37.736% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.008% 28.385% 35.884% 35.696% 36.148% 30.366% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 54.603% 39.623% 52.733% 54.574% 51.735% 40.317% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% 33.156% 28.191% 33.067% 32.632% 33.867% 27.321% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 Mouse Crx Spotted gar Otx5 Hagfish OtxA Lamprey OtxA Lamprey OtxB | 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% 37.634% 48.189% 45.879% 46.575% 35.772% 39.889% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% 54.902% 55.556% 38.440% 54.046% 49.570% 50.000% 36.415% 43.840% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% 45.342% 66.343% 59.748% 58.044% 41.121% 45.821% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% 43.636% 67.550% 58.896% 59.807% 42.222% 47.801% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 43.636% 43.636% 47.771% 37.752% 44.099% 35.535% 36.522% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 66.343% 67.550% 47.771% 56.230% 56.230% 56.731% 40.127% 40.127% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% 37.752% 56.230% 70.740% 39.557% 42.775% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% 44.099% 56.731% 70.740% 41.083% 43.732% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% 35.535% 40.127% 39.557% 41.083% 40.351% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% 47.801% 36.522% 47.463% 42.775% 43.732% 40.351% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% 37.037% 44.860% 44.343% 42.638% 37.736% 39.650% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.306% 35.884% 35.884% 35.696% 36.148% 30.366% 35.958% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 54.603% 39.623% 52.733% 54.574% 51.735% 40.317% 40.469% | Lamprey Otx0 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% 33.156% 28.191% 33.067% 32.632% 33.867% 27.321% 33.594% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 Mouse Crx Spotted gar Otx5 Hagfish OtxA Lamprey OtxA Hagfish OtxB Lamprey OtxB Hagfish OtxC | Mouse Otx1 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% 37.634% 48.189% 45.879% 46.575% 35.772% 39.889% 40.822% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% 54.902% 55.556% 38.440% 54.046% 49.570% 50.000% 36.415% 43.840% 39.831% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% 45.342% 66.343% 59.748% 59.748% 58.044% 41.121% 45.821% 45.231% | Spotted gar Otx2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% 43.636% 67.550% 58.896% 59.807% 42.222% 47.801% 46.395% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 43.636% 47.771% 37.752% 44.099% 35.535% 36.522% 37.037% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 66.343% 67.550% 47.771% 56.230% 56.731% 40.127% 40.127% 47.463% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% 37.752% 56.230% 70.740% 39.557% 42.775% 44.343% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% 44.099% 56.731% 70.740% 41.083% 43.732% 42.638% | Hagfish Otx8 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% 35.535% 40.127% 39.557% 41.083% 40.351% 37.736% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% 47.801% 36.522% 47.463% 42.775% 43.732% 40.351% 39.650% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% 37.037% 44.860% 44.343% 42.638% 37.736% 39.650% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.008% 28.385% 35.884% 35.696% 36.148% 30.366% 35.958% 40.157% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 54.603% 39.623% 52.733% 54.574% 51.735% 40.317% 40.469% 45.342% | Lamprey Otx0 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% 33.156% 28.191% 33.067% 32.632% 33.867% 27.321% 33.594% 29.708% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 Mouse Crx Spotted gar Otx5 Hagfish OtxA Lamprey OtxA Hagfish OtxB Lamprey OtxB Hagfish OtxC Lamprey OtxC | Mouse Otx1 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% 50.685% 37.634% 48.189% 45.879% 46.575% 35.772% 39.889% 40.822% 38.501% | Spotted gar Otx1 54.902% 55.556% 38.440% 54.046% 49.570% 50.000% 36.415% 43.840% 39.831% 39.370% | Mouse Otx2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% 45.342% 66.343% 59.748% 58.044% 41.121% 45.821% 45.821% 37.306% | Spotted gar Otz2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% 43.636% 67.550% 58.896% 59.807% 42.222% 47.801% 46.395% 37.008% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 45.342% 43.636% 47.771% 37.752% 44.099% 35.535% 36.522% 37.07% 28.385% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 67.550% 47.771% 56.230% 56.731% 40.127% 47.463% 44.860% 35.884% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% 37.752% 56.230% 70.740% 39.557% 42.775% 42.775% 43.35.696% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% 44.099% 56.731% 70.740% 41.083% 43.732% 43.732% 43.638% 36.148% | Hagfish OtxB 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% 35.535% 40.127% 39.557% 41.083% 40.351% 37.736% 30.366% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 43.840% 47.801% 36.522% 47.463% 42.775% 43.732% 40.351% 39.650% 35.958% | Hagfish OtxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% 37.037% 44.860% 44.343% 42.638% 37.736% 39.650% 40.157% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.008% 28.385% 35.884% 35.696% 36.148% 30.366% 35.958% 40.157% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 54.603% 39.623% 52.733% 54.574% 51.735% 40.317% 40.317% 40.345% 36.148% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% 35.844% 32.808% 33.156% 28.191% 33.067% 32.632% 33.867% 27.321% 33.594% 29.708% 34.772% |
| | Mouse Otx1 Spotted gar Otx1 Mouse Otx2 Spotted gar Otx2 Mouse Crx Spotted gar Otx2 Hagfish OtxA Lamprey OtxB Hagfish OtxB Hagfish OtxC Lamprey OtxC Hagfish OtxC | Mouse Otx1 68.156% 49.326% 50.685% 37.634% 48.189% 45.879% 46.575% 35.772% 39.889% 40.822% 38.501% 46.260% | Spotted gar Otx1 68.156% 54.902% 55.556% 38.440% 54.046% 49.570% 50.000% 36.415% 43.840% 39.831% 39.370% 47.278% | Mouse Ott2 49.326% 54.902% 91.000% 45.342% 66.343% 66.343% 59.748% 58.044% 41.121% 45.821% 45.821% 45.821% 53.7306% 52.960% | Spotted gar Otc.2 50.685% 55.556% 91.000% 43.636% 67.550% 58.896% 59.807% 42.222% 47.801% 46.395% 37.008% 54.603% | Mouse Crx 37.634% 38.440% 45.342% 43.636% 47.771% 37.752% 44.099% 35.535% 36.522% 37.037% 28.385% 39.623% | Spotted gar Otx5 48.189% 54.046% 66.343% 67.550% 47.771% 56.230% 56.731% 40.127% 47.463% 44.860% 35.884% 52.733% | Hagfish OtxA 45.879% 49.570% 59.748% 58.896% 37.752% 56.230% 70.740% 39.557% 42.775% 44.343% 35.696% 54.574% | Lamprey OtxA 46.575% 50.000% 58.044% 59.807% 44.099% 56.731% 70.740% 41.083% 43.732% 43.732% 42.638% 36.148% 51.735% | Hagfish Otx8 35.772% 36.415% 41.121% 42.222% 35.535% 40.127% 40.257% 40.355% 40.351% 37.736% 37.736% 40.317% | Lamprey OtxB 39.889% 43.840% 45.821% 47.801% 36.522% 47.463% 42.775% 43.732% 40.351% 39.650% 35.958% 40.469% | Hagfish otxC 40.822% 39.831% 45.231% 46.395% 37.037% 44.860% 44.343% 44.343% 42.638% 37.736% 39.650% 40.157% 45.342% | Lamprey OtxC 38.501% 39.370% 37.306% 37.008% 28.385% 35.884% 35.696% 36.148% 30.366% 35.958% 40.157% 36.148% | Hagfish OtxD 46.260% 47.278% 52.960% 52.960% 52.733% 54.603% 52.733% 54.574% 51.735% 40.317% 40.469% 45.342% 36.148% | Lamprey OtxD 34.430% 35.844% 32.80% 28.191% 33.067% 33.867% 27.321% 33.867% 33.8594% 29.70% 34.492% |

Figure 2-6: Hagfish have four Otx paralogs which share low overall protein sequence identity with other vertebrate Otx homologs. A.) Protein alignment of hagfish (*Eptatretus burgeri*) Otx paralogs with representative gnathostome and lamprey Otx homologs. B.) Protein % identity matrix for hagfish Otx paralogs compared to representative gnathostome and lamprey Otx homologs. Image was created in Geneious Prime (v. 2022.0, Biomatters) and was edited in BioRender (Biorender.com).



Figure 2-7: Maximum likelihood tree of cyclostome and gnathostome Otx protein sequences shows vertebrate sequences cluster together. Hagfish (*Eptatretus burgeri*) Otx paralogs (OtxA, OtxB, OtxC, and OtxD) fall between gnathostome Otx1 and Otx2 sequences on the tree. The hagfish sequences group closely with the lamprey (*P. marinus*) Otx paralogs (hagfish OtxA, OtxC and OtxD form sister groups with the equivalent lamprey Otx homologs). The numbers at each node represent the bootstrap support. Chordate (*Ciona intestinalis* and *Ciona savigyni*) and *Drosophila melanogaster* Otx sequences were used as outgroups for comparison.



В

Α



С



Figure 2-8: Homology of *Otx1* to *OtxC* and *Otx2* to *OtxA/OtxD* is supported by a comparison of the genomic arrangement of mouse *Otx* paralogs and surrounding genes to cyclostome and gnathostome genomes. A) The 20 genes directly adjacent to mouse *Otx1* were compared to the

92

genes surrounding Otx1 (or OtxC for hagfish and lamprey) for other vertebrates. This data shows there is synteny between gnathostome Otx1 and cyclostome OtxC. B) The 20 genes directly adjacent to mouse Otx2 were compared to the genes surrounding Otx2 (or OtxA and OtxD for hagfish and lamprey) for other vertebrates. These data support a syntenic relationship between gnathostome Otx2 and cyclostome OtxA/OtxD. C.) The 20 genes directly adjacent to mouse Crxwere compared to the genes surrounding Otx5/Crx (or OtxB for hagfish and lamprey) for other vertebrates. This data did not support a syntenic relationship between gnathostome Otx5/Crx and cyclostome OtxB. This figure was created in BioRender using data from Genomicus v. 106 (Nguyen et al., 2022).



Figure 2-9: Homology between gnathostome Otx1 and cyclostome OtxC is suggested by a synteny analysis of mouse Otx1 to cyclostome genomes. Mouse Otx1 and the 20 genes adjacent to it were used as query sequences against the genomic region (2M bases) surrounding the hagfish and lamprey Otx paralogs. Blast searches were used to map the query sequences to the genomic regions. For the Otx1 query, the majority of search hits were centered on the hagfish and lamprey contigs containing OtxC. One query gene (UGP2) also matched closely to genes on

the hagfish and lamprey *OtxB* containing contigs. This figure was made using the Simple Synteny web server (Veltri et al., 2016).


Figure 2-10: Synteny analysis of mouse Otx2 to cyclostome genomes supports homology of gnathostome Otx2 to cyclostome OtxA and OtxD. Mouse Otx2 and 20 adjacent genes were used as query sequences against the genomic region (2M bases) surrounding the hagfish and lamprey Otx paralogs. A blast search was used to map the query sequences to the genomic regions. For the Otx2 query sequences, the majority of matches were centered on the hagfish and lamprey contigs containing OtxA and OtxD. This figure was made using the Simple Synteny web server (Veltri et al., 2016).



Figure 2-11: Synteny analysis of mouse Crx (Otx5) to cyclostome genomes does not support homology between gnathostome Otx5 and cyclostome Otx homologs. Mouse Crx and 20 adjacent genes were used as query sequences against the genomic region (2M bases) surrounding the hagfish and lamprey Otx paralogs. A blast search was used to map the query sequences to the genomic regions. For the Crx query, the best search hit was on the lamprey OtxD contig and the hagfish OtxA contig. In both cases the cyclostome gene identified by the search hit did not match perfectly back to the original mouse query gene (i.e., mouse EDH2 matched most closely to

lamprey *EDH1* and mouse *DHX34* matched to hagfish *DHX57*) and the support for these matches was relatively weak compared to the *Otx1* and *Otx2* synteny analyses. This figure was made using the Simple Synteny web server (Veltri et al., 2016).



Figure 2-12: *OtxA is* expressed throughout multiple cell types in the Pacific hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*) retina. In situ hybridization probes were visualized with colorimetric detection (panels A-C) or fluorescent detection (panels D-G). A) Overview of a retinal section labeled with *OtxA*. A') Magnified image of the black box in panel A showing *OtxA* labelled cells in the RnPE layer. A'') Magnified image of the blue box in panel A showing *OtxA* labelled cells in the inner nuclear layer. A''') Magnified image of the red box in panel A showing *OtxA* labelled cells in the CMZ region. B) *OtxA* labelled cells in the photoreceptor layer and inner nuclear layer of the *E. stoutii* retina (from a different retinal section than panel A). C) Negative control section with no probe

applied. D) Retinal section fluorescently labelled with OtxA and stained with DAPI. E) Same image as panel D, but only showing the OtxA label. F,G) Negative control section with no riboprobe applied, with (panel F) and without (panel G) DAPI respectively. RnPE = retinal nonpigmented epithelium, vitreous = vitreous side of the hagfish retina, CMZ=ciliary marginal zone. Red arrows = CMZ. Blue arrows = inner nuclear layer. Purple arrows = photoreceptor layer. Black arrows = RnPE layer. White arrows = fluorescently labeled OtxA+ cells.



Figure 2-13: *Rx* is expressed in the inner nuclear layer and (perhaps) the periphery of the hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*) retina. An *Rx in situ* hybridization probe was visualized with NBT/BCIP detection of alkaline phosphatase. A) Overview of a retinal section labeled with *Rx*. B) Magnified image of the blue box in panel A showing *Rx* labelled cells in the inner nuclear layer (blue arrows). C) Magnified image of the red box in panel A showing *Rx* labelled cells in the CMZ (red arrow). RnPE = retinal non-pigmented epithelium layer, vitreous = vitreous side of the hagfish retina, CMZ=ciliary marginal zone. Blue arrow = inner nuclear layer. Red arrow = CMZ.

| Table 2-1: | Gene block | sequence | for the | Rx (p | olasmid | based) |) riboj | probe |
|------------|------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|-------|
| | | | 101 000 | - ••• \P | | | | |

| Riboprobe | Length (bp) | Gene Block Sequence 5' to 3' (red text = EcoRI cut site, blue text = XbaI cut site) |
|-----------|-------------|---|
| Rx | 1206 | GAT CGA ATT CAT GGA GCG TGA AGA TTC TTG TGG TAC TTC GCA TGC ACA CAG CAT CGA CTC GAT TCT GGG ATT CCA GAG GGA TGA TTC CTT CTT CGA TTC CTC CTT GAT CCA GGA ACA TTT GCC AGT GGA AGA AAG GGA AGC TTC CCA AGA ACA CTC TGA GTG CGA CGG CAG CGC CTT TGC GTC TCT GAA AGA GCT CCC TTC ACC CGA GCA GGA GGT GGA TGT GCG AGT CCC ATG TGG GAA ACC GCG GCG AAA TCG AAC CAC GTT CAC CAC GTT CCA GCT GCA TGA ACT TGA GCG TGC CTT TGA GCG ATC ACA CTA TCC AGA CGT GTA CAG CCG AGA GGA GCT GGC ACT CAA GGT CAA CCT TCC CGA AGT CCG CGT GCA GGT GTG GTT TCA GAA CCT TCC CGA AGT CCG CGT GCA GGT GTG GTT TCA GAA TCG TCG TGC TAA ATG GCG ACG TCA AGA AAG GCT TGA ACC AGT AAC ATC TTG CCT TCC TGG CCA AAT TGG CCA GCC ACC TTG CCA ACG TCC CAC TCC ACC ACT ACC TCT TGA GCC ATG GTT GCC CCC TGC CAT CTG TGG AGG TGC AGG AAC AGG CTC TGG TGG CAG TCC AGG AGT GCC AGT TAC TCC TCC AGT GTC TCA CAC CAG TAC ATC TTG CCA ACG TCC CAC TCC ACC ACT ACC TCT TGA GCC ATG GTT GCC CCC TGC CAT CTG TGG AGG TGC AGG AAC AGG CTC TGG TGG CAG TCC AGG AGT GCC AGT TAC TCC TCC AGT GTC TTC ACC CAG TCT GTC GTG CCT GTT GGG CTG CAC CGG CGG ACT GCA TGG ACC CCA TAG CCT GGC AGG TCT TAT ACC TCA GGG AGG GCA AGC TCT AAC TTA TGT TCC ATC TAC TCC TAC AAT AGG ACA CAC AAC GCA TCA CAC GTT GGG CAC TGC TCA GGG TCA AAT GAC TGT GAC AGC TTA CCA ACC AGC ATT ATC TGG ACT GCA GTT ATC TGG GCC GCC ATA TGA AGA GAC TTA CGG GCT AGG TGA GGT GCG GCG ATT ATC TGG ACG GCA GTT ATC TGG GCC GCC ATA TGA AGC CAA GGA CTT CAG GCT AGG TGA GGT GCG GCG ATC TGG TG GCA TCA AAT GAC TGT GGC TAC CCT ACG TGT CAA AGC CAA GGA GCA TCT TCA AGT GTA AGG TGC GCG GGT ACC TCG ATC AGG ATT GGC TAC CCT ACG TGT CAA AGC CAA GGA GCA TCT TCA AGT GTT AGG CAC CGG TTG GCA TCA AAT CTA GAG ATC |

Table 2-2: Primer sequences used to generate the OtxA (PCR based) riboprobe

| Probe | Forward Primer (5' to 3') | Reverse Primer with T7 Polymerase Site (underlined) (5' to 3') | Amplicon Size (bp) |
|-------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| OtxA | GTG TGG ATC CAT CAC TCC GG | TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GGG GGC TCC AGA TAG AAA CGG G | 591 |

Table 2-3: In situ hybridization conditions per each riboprobe

| Riboprobe | Proteinase K Digestion Time (min) | Probe concentration (µg/ml) | Hybridization temperature (°C) |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Rx | 6 | 2 | 55 |
| OtxA | 4 | 1 | 55 |

Table 2-4: Best tBlastn results for various vertebrate Rx homologs to the Eptatretus stoutii

transcriptome dataset

| Query Rax/Rx | Best transcript | % identity | e-value | Does the |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Sequence | match | | | transcript |
| (protein) | | | | sequence |
| | | | | reciprocally |
| | | | | blast (blastn) to |
| | | | | the query |
| | | | | sequence? |
| Mouse Rax | CL3100.Contig_ | 45.5% | 9.43e-33 | Yes (best hit) |
| | All | | | |
| Spotted gar Rx | CL3100.Contig2 | 54.8% | 3.78e-39 | No (it is the best |
| | _All | | | hit for the other |
| | | | | spotted gar |
| | | | | paralog – Rx1) |
| Inshore hagfish | CL3100.Contig2 | 99.0% | 2.82e-155 | Yes (best hit) |
| Rx | _All | | | |

 Table 2-5: Best tBlastn results for various vertebrate Six3 and Six6 homologs to the Eptatretus

 stoutii
 transcriptome dataset

| Query Six3 or Six6 Sequence (protein) | Best transcript match | % identity | e-value | Does the transcript sequence reciprocally blast (blastn) to the query sequence? |
|---|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---|
| Six3 (mouse) | Unigene16248_ All | 91.1% | 3.88e-122 | Yes (best hit) |
| Six3 (spotted gar) | Unigene16248_ All | 92.7% | 6.03e-122 | Yes (best hit) |
| Six6 (mouse) | Unigene16248_ All | 92.3% | 2.43e-120 | Yes (2 nd best hit) |
| Six6 (spotted gar) | Unigene16248_ All | 77.1% | 4.25e-123 | Yes (2 nd best hit) |
| Six-3 like ^a * (sea lamprey) | Unigene16248_ All | 88.2% | 9.98e-145 | Yes (best hit) |
| Six-3 like ^b * (sea lamprey) | Unigene5558_A 11 | 93.2% | 8.74e-129 | Yes (best hit) |
| Six6-like ^c * (sea lamprey) | Unigene22484_ All | 71.7% | 1.95e-125 | Yes (best hit) |
| Six6-like ^d * (sea lamprey) | Unigene16248_ All | 89.2% | 2.60e-117 | Yes (2 nd best hit) |
| Six3-like ^e * (inshore hagfish) | Unigene16248_ All | 99.7% | 0 | Yes (best hit) |
| Six3-like ^f * (inshore hagfish) | Unigene22484_ All | 98.0% | 3.49e-141 | Yes (best hit) |
| Six3-like ^g * (inshore hagfish) | Unigene5558_A 11 | 100.0% | 7.42e-137 | Yes (best hit) |

*Superscript letters (a-g) refer to different cyclostome Six3/6 sequences (see Supplementary

Table 4).

Table 2-6: Best tBlastn results for various vertebrate Otx homologs to the Eptatretus stoutii

transcriptome dataset

| Query Otx | Best transcript | % identity | e-value | Does the |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------|--|
| Sequence | match | _ | | transcript |
| (protein) | | | | sequence |
| <u> </u> | | | | reciprocally |
| | | | | blast (blastn) to |
| | | | | the query |
| | | | | sequence? |
| Otx1 (mouse) | CL6481.Contig1 All | 82.1% | 3.11e-56 | Yes (best hit) |
| Otx1 (spotted gar) | CL6481.Contig1 All | 83.2% | 7.87e-54 | Yes (3 rd best hit) |
| Otx2 (mouse) | Unigene14754_A | 65.2% | 1.09e-104 | Yes (2 nd best |
| Otry 2 (an atta d | | (2.50/ | 1 44- 02 | nit) Vag (2 nd hast |
| Oix2 (spotted | Unigene 14/54_A | 03.3% | 1.446-92 | $Y \in (2^{-1})$ best |
| gar) | | 42.50/ | 2 77 - 50 | $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$ |
| Crx (mouse) | _All | 42.5% | 3.//e-50 | Y es (3 rd best hit) |
| Crx (spotted | Unigene14754_A | 55.5% | 9.90e-91 | Yes (best hit) |
| gar) | 11 | | | |
| OtxA (sea | Unigene14754_A | 67.7% | 1.97e-108 | Yes (best hit) |
| lamprey) | 11 | | | |
| OtxB (sea | CL6481.Contig1 | 72.7% | 3.05e-48 | Yes (3 rd best hit) |
| lamprey) | All | | | |
| OtxC (sea | CL1927.Contig1 | 88.3% | 1.04e-51 | Yes (best hit) |
| lamprey) | All | | | |
| OtxD (sea | CL6481.Contig1 | 83.2% | 2.32e-46 | Yes (2 nd best |
| lamprey) | All | | | hit) |
| OtxA (inshore | Unigene14754 A | 99.7% | 0 | Yes (best hit) |
| hagfish) | | | | |
| OtxB (inshore | CL1927.Contig1 | 46.5% | 1.02e-60 | Yes (4 th best hit) |
| hagfish) | All * | | | |
| OtxC (inshore | CL1927.Contig1 | 98.3% | 3.60e-171 | Yes (best hit) |
| hagfish) | _All* | | | |
| OtxD (inshore | CL6481.Contig1 | 99.3% | 0 | Yes (best hit) |
| hagfish) | All | | | |

* CL1927.Contig1_All was assigned as the *E. stoutii OtxC* homolog based on the tBLASTn results. Unigene45908_All was designated as the *E. stoutii OtxB* homolog based on a reciprocal BLAST search of the *E. stoutii* transcripts to the *Eptatretus burgeri* genome (data not shown).

| Gene | Transcript ID | FPKM (brain) | FPKM (eye) | Ratio of eye/brain FPKM |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------|----------------------------|
| OtxA | Unigene14754_ All | 2.78 | 18.78 | 6.76 |
| OtxB | Unigene45908_ All | N/A | 11.54 | N/A |
| OtxC | CL1927.Contig1 _All | 2.99 | 1.75 | 0.59 |
| OtxD | CL6481.Contig2 _All | 0.3 | 13.12 | 44.47 |
| <i>Six3/6</i> ¹ * | Unigene16248_ All | 0.34 | 8.88 | 26.51 |
| <i>Six3/6</i> ² * | Unigene22484_ All | 12.2 | 3.63 | 0.30 |
| <i>Six3/6</i> ³ * | Unigene5558_A1 1 | 22.16 | 47.99 | 2.17 |
| Rx | CL3100.Contig2 _All | 0.47 | 25.29 | 53.81 |
| RPE65 | Unigene936 2_All | 0.78 | 525.43 | 673.63 |
| Pax6 | CL2037.Contig3 _All | 4.06 | 12.90 | 3.18 |

Table 2-7: Relative expression of select *Eptatretus stoutii* gene transcripts in eye vs. brain tissue.FPKM = Fragments Per Kilobase of transcript per Million mapped reads.

*Three *Six3/6* transcripts were identified in the hagfish (*E. stoutii*) RNA sequencing dataset and are denoted by 1 , 2 , and 3 .

Chapter 3

Discussion

3.1 The organization of the hagfish retina is not representative of the ancestral vertebrate condition, but other aspects of this structure (i.e., development) could still be informative for the study of eye and retinal evolution across vertebrates

Morphology hints that the hagfish eye has more shared features with the eyes of gnathostomes (and lampreys) than previously believed. However, there are still differences in morphology (and potentially development) that could be informative for understanding the origins of the vertebrate eye. One example is the types of cells occurring in the hagfish retina. Although hagfish appear to have the same retinal cell types as other vertebrates (RnPE, photoreceptors, interneurons, retinal ganglion cells) both the morphology and organization of these cells is distinct from jawed vertebrates (Bradshaw and Allison, 2022). The hagfish RnPE has similar machinery to the gnathostome RPE to drive the retinoid cycle (i.e., expression of RPE65), but it contains no pigment (Dong and Allison, 2021). Loss of pigment is a feature that is likely due to loss rather than retention of an ancestral character (both lampreys and the non-vertebrate chordates contain pigment in their photosensory organs). However, it would still be worthwhile to investigate if the same developmental processes regulate RnPE cell specification in hagfish and RPE formation in gnathostomes. The expression of *OtxA* in the hagfish RnPE suggests that at least some of the developmental machinery is shared, as Otx2 is also critical in the development and maintenance of the jawed vertebrate RPE (Martínez-Morales et al., 2003; Béby and Lamonerie, 2013). Hagfish photoreceptors also have dramatic morphological differences compared to jawed vertebrates (and lampreys). Structurally, hagfish photoreceptors look ciliary in nature, but lack

the features that would allow them to be easily classified as rod or cone cells (Lamb, 2013). In addition, hagfish only possess one type of photoreceptor cell, compared to lampreys and gnathostomes which have multiple types of photoreceptors (usually one rod and at least one cone subclass) (Fain et al., 2010; Lamb, 2013; Fain, 2020). Investigating the morphology of hagfish photoreceptors and the developmental pathways that produce them has the potential to reveal how this cell type may have originated and/or changed throughout vertebrate evolution. Finally, the hagfish inner nuclear cell layer could also reveal clues to the evolution of the interneuron and retinal ganglion cells layers in vertebrates. Though disorganized, the hagfish retina does contain cells with markers for several classical gnathostome interneuron subtypes (calbindin, pKC-a, SNCG) (Dong and Allison, 2021). However, more work needs to be done delineating the specific interneuron cell subtypes the hagfish retina contains and how those neurons interact with the photoreceptor and retinal ganglion cell layers. In addition, genomic data suggests that hagfish do not have a direct homolog for *Atoh7* (although this could be due to incomplete genome data). Atoh7 is a critical factor for specification of the retinal ganglion cells in the vast majority of vertebrates (Brown, et al., 2001; Kay et al., 2001; Wang et al., 2001). If this gene is truly absent in hagfish, it would be interesting to explore if hagfish employ an alternative method to form retinal ganglion cells, and if these alternative pathways are also employed by other vertebrate groups. Comparing the development of hagfish RnPE, photoreceptors, interneurons and retinal ganglion cells to that of lampreys and gnathostomes would be incredibly informative for understanding how conserved the mechanisms of retinogenesis are throughout the vertebrate lineage.

3.2 Proliferation in the hagfish retina

3.2.1 The ciliary marginal zone may be an ancestral vertebrate trait

Although the hagfish retina is rudimentary and small, the retina does continue to proliferate throughout the life of the animal. Hagfish eye size increases with age and the periphery of the retina expresses a marker of retinal progenitor cells *Pax6* (Dong and Allison, 2021). The hagfish retina also shows incorporation of EdU after a short 24 h pulse (see Sections 2.4.1, 2.5.1). This data suggests that the hagfish retina may have a region comparable to the gnathostome ciliary marginal zone. This retinal stem cell niche allows for continuous retinal growth in teleost fish and amphibians throughout ontogeny (Raymond et al., 2006). Compared to those groups, it is surprising that hagfish would have ongoing retinal growth, given their small eyes and deep-sea habitat. In addition, adult neurogenesis does not appear to occur in other early branching fish groups, the lampreys and elasmobranchs (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008; Hernández-Núñez et al., 2021). This raises the possibility that the ciliary marginal zone is an ancestral vertebrate characteristic that was subsequently lost in several groups (i.e., lampreys, elasmobranchs, mammals) (Figure 3-1). However, further work is needed to elucidate the nature of this structure in different vertebrate groups. It is also possible that a CMZ-like region evolved in more than one lineage (or embryonic retinal neurogenesis evolved to persist in the adult retina in more than one group - see Section 3.2.3) (Figure 3-1). More early-branching cyclostome and gnathostome species (e.g., lampreys, sharks) need to be examined to determine if the CMZ can be considered ancestral or derived for the vertebrate clade. Future studies also need to continue characterizing adult retinogenesis at the hagfish retinal peripheral margin to support this tissue's homology with the CMZ of gnathostomes.

3.2.2 Do hagfish have Müller glia?

Although many EdU labelled cells were observed at the periphery of the hagfish retina in this study (Sections 2.4.1 and 2.5.1), a sizeable proportion (~40%) of cells were located throughout the interior retina. The distribution of the EdU+ cells suggests that proliferation in the hagfish retina is not restricted to the peripheral zone. This finding raises the possibility of Müller glia being present in hagfish. Müller glia are glial cells (located in the INL) that can de-differentiate to take on a neural identity after retinal injury in other vertebrates (Raymond et al., 2006). In the hagfish retina, both EdU+ cells and cells expressing Rx (a marker for retinal neuronal progenitor cells) were found in the inner nuclear layer. If these markers were labelling retinal cells (as opposed to microglia or blood cells) this would support those cells potentially being Müller glia. To confirm the presence of Müller glia it would be necessary to conduct more studies examining molecular markers in the hagfish retina. This would be particularly informative if performed on hagfish tissue that was light vs. dark adapted. Light exposure is an established method to induce retinal damage (Thummel et al., 2008; Ranski et al., 2018). Exposing hagfish to light to cause retinal damage and then assaying for signs of increased retinal proliferation could provide strong support for the presence of Müller glia (or at least a Müller glia-like mechanism) in the cyclostome eye. There are certain genes which could act as markers. Ascl1 (a gene involved in the de-differentiation and subsequent re-programming of Müller glia during damage repair) expression would be expected if hagfish EdU + retinal cells are initiating a regenerative response after tissue damage (Gao et al., 2021). Hagfish also have a homolog of CRALBP, another conserved marker of Müller glia (Roesch et al., 2008; Dong and Allison, 2021). However, other common markers of Müller glia (i.e., GFAP, ApoE, vimentin) could not be identified in available hagfish genomic or RNA sequencing datasets. Whether these genes are not present in the hagfish genome or are just missing due to those genomes being incomplete is unknown. However, if hagfish lack these genes that would create questions about whether Müller glia (or Müller glialike) cells are specified differently in hagfish compared to gnathostomes.

3.2.3 Could paedomorphosis be linked to continued retinal growth?

Given that the hagfish eye appears to be barely functional, it is surprising that there is evidence of continual retinal growth. One possibility is that this could represent a form of paedomorphosis or retention of larval characteristics. Unlike lampreys which undergo metamorphosis between a larval and adult stage, hagfish have direct development (Ota and Kuratani, 2006). Once embryos hatch, the hagfish emerge as smaller versions of the adult and then continue to grow throughout life. Whereas lampreys appear to lose retinal neurogenesis after metamorphosis (but clearly exhibit it during larval stages) (Villar-Cheda et al., 2008) perhaps the hagfish retina continues to develop because it has lost the signals needed to cease retinogenesis (or the timing of those signals has been altered). This interpretation is supported by the similar morphology of larval lamprey eyes to hagfish eyes (Suzuki and Grillner, 2018). Under this scenario, continuous retinal proliferation could be a remnant from a time when the hagfish eye was more functional (i.e., post-embryonic neurogenesis was retained despite regression of other features of the eye). Alternatively, paedomorphosis could have been selected for if continued retinal growth was somehow useful for the hagfish in their environment. Although not capable of forming images, perhaps the eye is needed as a light detector (Fernholm, 1974). This explanation would account for why hagfish would invest the energy to produce new cells in such a rudimentary sensory structure. There is also the possibility that the genes that promote continued retinal growth also perform other important roles (i.e., perhaps ongoing proliferation of the robust olfactory system)

112

for the hagfish that are too valuable to lose (i.e., pleiotropy limits what can evolve or what can be lost).

3.3 Hagfish retinal development appears to be conserved (to a degree) with gnathostomes

3.3.1 The (limited) gene expression data available suggests hagfish retinal cell types may be specified through the same pathways as other vertebrates, but further characterization of hagfish retinal development is needed

Although hagfish embryos are not easily accessible, we have been able to explore some aspects of retinal development by examining a proliferative tissue in the adult hagfish. Previous work has already shown that this region expresses *Pax6*, a common marker of retinal progenitor cell pools (Dong and Allison, 2021). This study found that the hagfish retina also expresses *OtxA* (a homolog of gnathostome *Otx2*) and possibly *Rx* at the peripheral CMZ-like zone (Sections 2.4.3 and 2.5.3). *Otx2* is vital for the development and maintenance of several cell types within gnathostomes including RPE cells, photoreceptors and bipolar cells (Martínez-Morales et al., 2003; Viczian et al., 2003; Béby and Lamonerie, 2013). Finding the hagfish homolog of this gene expressed in the CMZ (and throughout the hagfish retina) suggests that the cyclostome homolog may have similar functions. *Rx* is a marker of retinal progenitor cells. The *in-situ* hybridization data demonstrated that hagfish *Rx* is expressed throughout the INL and may be expressed at the CMZ. This pattern matched the expression seen in adult gnathostome eyes, again suggesting a shared functional role for this gene in both jawed and jawless vertebrates.

However, this gene expression data is not sufficient to confirm the hagfish homologs are regulating the development of the retina (and if the function of Otx2/OtxA and Rx are truly conserved between gnathostomes and cyclostomes). It would be highly valuable in the future to perform double-labelling experiments with OtxA and EdU or OtxA and a marker of retinal progenitor cells (i.e., Pax6, Rx, Six3) to determine if OtxA expression occurs in developing retinal cells. This would provide more support for OtxA controlling cell specification (as opposed to a maintenance role for mature retinal neurons). It would also be fascinating to treat live hagfish with EdU pulses at different times, and then see if EdU labelled, OtxA positive cells are eventually incorporated into the mature retina. If OtxA has similar functions in hagfish and gnathostomes one would expect developing OtxA+ cells to mature into RnPE, photoreceptor or bipolar cells. Another approach would be to use a transgenic line of animals to label OtxA expressing cells and then see what markers those cells co-express at different areas of the retina (i.e., CMZ vs. mature retina). Although this technique is not currently feasible in hagfish due to these organisms being difficult to breed and maintain in captivity, other lab groups have successfully started working on transgenic lines of lamprey (Parker et al., 2014). Work in lamprey could help complement what we have demonstrated in hagfish. Finally, performing double-labelling in situ hybridization experiments would provide more information about the nature of the hagfish CMZ zone. If retinal stem cell markers and markers for more committed retinal cells (e.g., neuronal markers) were labelled in the same retina, it would reveal if there were a continuum of cells at different stages of differentiation (i.e., akin to that seen in the gnathostome CMZ).

The ideal experiment would be to directly manipulate genes suspected to play a role in hagfish retinal development. By knocking out genes like *OtxA* and *Rx* and then examining the effect on

the retina, one could test the functional role of these genes. Again, hagfish are not a laboratory organism amenable to these genetic techniques (although it may be possible in lampreys). Another possibility would be to take an organism where genetic manipulation is well-established (i.e., mice or zebrafish) and create transgenic organisms that express the cyclostome homologs of certain retinal genes. These studies could allow one to determine if (and to what extent) retinogenesis gene functions are conserved across vertebrates. If cyclostome genes can drive elements of retinal development in a gnathostome model system, that would support the function of those genes is shared and/or that those genes act within similar pathways in jawed and jawless vertebrates. This study has identified several genes which could be utilized for this purpose. Future experiments comparing (and potentially manipulating) retinal developmental pathways in gnathostomes and cyclostomes would be invaluable for uncovering the evolutionary history of the vertebrate retina.

3.3.2 Absence vs. secondary loss of retinal genes and pathways in the hagfish eye

The hagfish eye is unique from that of other vertebrates in many ways. The existing literature suggests most of these features likely evolved via regression. However, investigation of hagfish retinal development could reveal new characteristics unique to hagfish (i.e., the potential absence of *Atoh7*, *GFAP*, *ApoE*, and *vimentin* in the hagfish genome). If these genes are truly missing in hagfish, this would imply elements of the hagfish retinogenesis pathway must operate differently than in vertebrates that have homologs of these genes. If so, it will be difficult to determine whether the absence of these genes is ancestral for vertebrates or they were secondarily lost in hagfish. Investigating the machinery producing the retina in jawless vertebrates (hagfish and lampreys) and comparing it to the gnathostome condition will be vital for understanding the

evolution of retinogenesis in the vertebrate lineage. Genes and developmental pathways that are shared in hagfish, lampreys and gnathostomes could represent ancestral vertebrate features.

In addition, aspects of retinal development that occur only in hagfish and lampreys can help us understand evolutionary changes unique to the cyclostome lineages. Whereas hagfish may have undergone loss or degeneration of their eyes during adaptation to a deep-sea habitat, lampreys did not undergo this ecological shift. Comparison of eye/retinal development between hagfish and lampreys could help separate whether missing and/or rudimentary elements of the hagfish eye are a result of regression or just never evolved in the first place (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975; Davies et al., 2012). Another factor to consider is the examination of different species of hagfish and lamprey. Most studies are based on a few species that are easily accessible. However, different species of hagfish possess different retinal and photoreceptor morphologies (likely linked to habitat and light availability) (Fernholm and Holmberg, 1975). Different species of lamprey also have variability in retinal structure, such as the number and classes of photoreceptor subtypes (Davies et al., 2009). By completing a more comprehensive phylogenetic examination of the cyclostome eye and retina, stronger conclusions can be drawn about the state of the cyclostome eye compared to the body of knowledge available for gnathostomes.

3.4 Conclusion

The mysterious and obscure hagfish represent a lineage that could be considered a type of living fossil. These organisms possess certain features that are unchanged from hundreds of millions of years ago (i.e., lack jaws and paired fins) and very little is known about hagfish ecology, development, and behavior. In the context of evolutionary studies, these organisms could contain a wealth of information about features that may be ancestral to the vertebrate lineage (in addition

116

to derived characteristics that arose solely in cyclostomes). To better facilitate the understanding of evolution of the vertebrate eye and retina, a greater emphasis should be placed on investigating the eyes of these creatures. Although rearing and husbandry of hagfish in captivity is still difficult, these fish are highly valuable from a phylogenetic perspective. Further studies investigating hagfish biology, development and evolution would be extremely informative for unravelling the origins and evolutionary history of key vertebrate innovations, including the eye.





Figure 3-1. Two hypotheses for the evolution of the ciliary marginal zone (CMZ) within the vertebrate lineage. A) Represents a scenario where adult retinal neurogenesis (at the retinal periphery) is the ancestral vertebrate condition (represented by the blue triangle at the base of the tree). In this case, the last common ancestor of vertebrates would have possessed a stem cell niche at the retinal margin (the CMZ) that was active throughout ontogeny. Several extant clades retained this structure (i.e., hagfish, teleost fishes), whereas other groups secondarily lost it (i.e.,

mammals). B) Represents a scenario where the CMZ and adult retinal neurogenesis is a derived condition. In this case, the cessation of retinal neurogenesis after embryonic development would be the ancestral condition (represented by the purple triangle at the base of the tree). Several groups then acquired continued neurogenesis at the retinal margin (CMZ) independently. Red circles indicate clades that secondarily lost the CMZ niche. Green circles represent clades that independently gained a CMZ (relative to the ancestral condition).

Literature Cited

- Abalo, X. M., Villar-Cerviño, V., Villar-Cheda, B., Anadón, R., and Celina Rodicio, M. (2008). Neurochemical differentiation of horizontal and amacrine cells during transformation of the sea lamprey retina. *J. Chem. Neuroanat.* 35, 225–232. doi:10.1016/J.JCHEMNEU.2007.12.002.
- Ahmad, I., Zagouras, P., and Artavanis-Tsakonas, S. (1995). Involvement of Notch-1 in mammalian retinal neurogenesis: association of Notch-1 activity with both immature and terminally differentiated cells. *Mech. Dev.* 53, 73–85. doi:10.1016/0925-4773(95)00425-4.
- Albalat, R. (2012). Evolution of the Genetic Machinery of the Visual Cycle: A Novelty of the Vertebrate Eye? *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 29. doi:10.1093/molbev/msr313.
- Arendt, D. (2003). Evolution of eyes and photoreceptor cell types. *Int. J. Dev. Biol.* 47, 563–571. doi:10.1387/IJDB.14756332.
- Barratt, K. S., and Arkell, R. M. (2020). Production of Digoxigenin-Labeled Riboprobes for In Situ Hybridization Experiments. *Curr. Protoc. Mouse. Biol.* 10. doi: 10.1002/cpmo.74.
- Barthel, L. K., and Raymond, P. A. (1993). Subcellular localization of α-tubulin and opsin mRNA in the goldfish retina using digoxigenin-labeled cRNA probes detected by alkaline phosphatase and HRP histochemistry. *J. Neurosci. Methods.* 50, 145–152. doi: 10.1016/0165-0270(93)90002-9.

Bartlett, K., and Janusson, C. (2019). Animal Care Hagfish Standard Operating Procedure, v3, Bamfield Marine Sciences Center. https://bamfieldmsc.com/resource/animal-carestandard-operating-procedures

Béby, F., Housset, M., Fossat, N., Le Greneur, C., Flamant, F., Godement, P., et al. (2010). *Otx2* Gene Deletion in Adult Mouse Retina Induces Rapid RPE Dystrophy and Slow
Photoreceptor Degeneration. *PLoS One.* 5, e11673. doi:
10.1371/journal.pone.0011673.

- Béby, F., and Lamonerie, T. (2013). The homeobox gene *Otx2* in development and disease. *Exp. Eye Res.* 111, 9–16. doi: 10.1016/j.exer.2013.03.007.
- Bernardos, R. L., Barthel, L. K., Meyers, J. R., and Raymond, P. A. (2007). Late-Stage Neuronal Progenitors in the Retina Are Radial Müller Glia That Function as Retinal Stem Cells. J. Neurosci. 27, 7028-7040. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1624-07.2007.
- Bharti, K., Nguyen, M.-T. T., Skuntz, S., Bertuzzi, S., and Arnheiter, H. (2006). The other pigment cell: specification and development of the pigmented epithelium of the vertebrate eye. *Pigment Cell Res.* 19, 380–394. doi:10.1111/J.1600-0749.2006.00318.X.
- Blair, J. E., and Hedges, S. B. (2005). Molecular phylogeny and divergence times of deuterostome animals. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 22, 2275–2284.
 doi:10.1093/MOLBEV/MSI225.

- Bradshaw, S. N., and Allison, W. T. (2022). Hagfish to Illuminate the Developmental and Evolutionary Origins of the Vertebrate Retina. *Front. Cell. Dev. Biol.* 10. doi: 10.3389/fcell.2022.822358.
- Braun, C. B. (1996). The Sensory Biology of the Living Jawless Fishes: A Phylogenetic Assessment. *Brain. Behav. Evol.* 48. doi:10.1159/000113205.
- Brown, N. L., Patel, S., Brzezinski, J., and Glaser, T. (2001). *Math5* is required for retinal ganglion cell and optic nerve formation. *Development*. 128, 2497–2508. doi:10.1242/DEV.128.13.2497.
- Bryan, C. D., Casey, M. A., Pfeiffer, R. L., Jones, B. W., and Kwan, K. M. (2020). Optic cup morphogenesis requires neural crest-mediated basement membrane assembly. *Development*. 147, dev181420. doi:10.1242/DEV.181420.
- Cardozo, M. J., Almuedo-Castillo, M., and Bovolenta, P. (2019). Patterning the Vertebrate Retina with Morphogenetic Signaling Pathways. *Neuroscientist*. 26, 185–196. doi:10.1177/1073858419874016.
- Carl, M., Loosli, F., and Wittbrodt, J. (2002). Six3 inactivation reveals its essential role for the formation and patterning of the vertebrate eye. Development. 129, 4057–4063. doi:10.1242/DEV.129.17.4057.
- Centanin, L., and Wittbrodt, J. (2014). Retinal neurogenesis. *Development*. 141, 241–244. doi:10.1242/DEV.083642.

- Chehrehasa, F., Meedeniya, A. C. B., Dwyer, P., Abrahamsen, G., and Mackay-Sim, A.
 (2009). EdU, a new thymidine analogue for labelling proliferating cells in the nervous system. *J. Neurosci. Methods.* 177, 122–130. doi: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2008.10.006.
- Chen, S., Wang, Q. L., Nie, Z., Sun, H., Lennon, G., Copeland, N. G., et al. (1997). Crx, a novel Otx-like paired-homeodomain protein, binds to and transactivates photoreceptor cell-specific genes. *Neuron*. 19, 1017–1030.
- Cherry, T. J., Wang, S., Bormuth, I., Schwab, M., Olson, J., and Cepko, C. L. (2011). NeuroD Factors Regulate Cell Fate and Neurite Stratification in the Developing Retina. *J. Neurosci.* 31. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2555-10.2011.
- Chow, R. L., Altmann, C. R., Lang, R. A., and Hemmati-Brivanlou, A. (1999). Pax6 induces ectopic eyes in a vertebrate. *Development*. 126, 4213–4222. doi:10.1242/DEV.126.19.4213.
- Chuang, J. C., Mathers, P. H., and Raymond, P. A. (1999). Expression of three *Rx* homeobox genes in embryonic and adult zebrafish. *Mech. Dev.* 84, 195–198. doi: 10.1016/S0925-4773(99)00077-5.
- Clements, T., Dolocan, A., Martin, P., Purnell, M. A., Vinther, J., and Gabbott, S. E. (2016).
 The eyes of Tullimonstrum reveal a vertebrate affinity. *Nature*. 532, 500–503.
 doi:10.1038/NATURE17647.
- Collin, S. P. (2010). Evolution and ecology of retinal photoreception in early vertebrates. *Brain. Behav. Evol.* 75, 174–185. doi:10.1159/000314904.

- Collin, S. P., Davies, W. L., Hart, N. S., and Hunt, D. M. (2009). The evolution of early vertebrate photoreceptors. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 364, 2925-2940. doi:10.1098/RSTB.2009.0099.
- Cornide-Petronio, M. E., Anadón, R., Barreiro-Iglesias, A., and Rodicio, M. C. (2015). Tryptophan hydroxylase and serotonin receptor 1A expression in the retina of the sea lamprey. *Exp. Eye Res.* 135, 81–87. doi:10.1016/J.EXER.2015.04.017.
- Crooks, G. E., Hon, G., Chandonia, J.-M., and Brenner, S. E. (2004). WebLogo: A sequence logo generator. *Genome Res.* 14, 1188–1190. doi:10.1101/gr.849004.
- Cunningham, F., Allen, J. E., Allen, J., Alvarez-Jarreta, J., Amode, M. R., Armean, I. M., et al. (2022). Ensembl 2022. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 50, D988–D995. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkab1049.
- D'Aniello, S., D'Aniello, E., Locascio, A., Memoli, A., Corrado, M., Russo, M. T., et al. (2006). The ascidian homolog of the vertebrate homeobox gene *Rx* is essential for ocellus development and function. *Differentiation*. 74. doi:10.1111/j.1432-0436.2006.00071.x.
- Das, A. V., James, J., Rahnenführer, J., Thoreson, W. B., Bhattacharya, S., Zhao, X., et al. (2005). Retinal properties and potential of the adult mammalian ciliary epithelium stem cells. *Vision Res.* 45. doi:10.1016/j.visres.2004.12.017.
- Davies, W. L., Collin, S. P., and Hunt, D. M. (2009). Adaptive Gene Loss Reflects Differences in the Visual Ecology of Basal Vertebrates. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 26. doi:10.1093/molbev/msp089.

- Davies, W. I. L., Collin, S. P., and Hunt, D. M. (2012). Molecular ecology and adaptation of visual photopigments in craniates. *Mol. Ecol.* 21. doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2012.05617.x.
- Diacou, R., Zhao, Y., Zheng, D., Cvekl, A., and Liu, W. (2018). Six3 and Six6 Are Jointly Required for the Maintenance of Multipotent Retinal Progenitors through Both Positive and Negative Regulation. Cell Rep. 25, 2510-2523. doi:10.1016/J.CELREP.2018.10.106.
- Dickson, D. H., and Collard, T. R. (1979). Retinal development in the lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus* L.): Premetamorphic ammocoete eye. *Am. J. Anat.* 154, 321–336. doi:10.1002/AJA.1001540303.
- Dickson, D. H., and Graves, D. A. (1979). Fine structure of the lamprey photoreceptors and retinal pigment epithelium (*Petromyzon marinus* L.). *Exp. Eye Res.* 29, 45–60. doi:10.1016/0014-4835(79)90165-9.
- Dong, E. M. (2018). Novel vertebrate features identified in the rudimentary eye of the Pacific hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*). [dissertation/MSc thesis]. University of Alberta.
- Dong, E. M., and Allison, W. T. (2021). Vertebrate features revealed in the rudimentary eye of the Pacific hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*). *Proceedings. Biol. Sci.* 288. doi:10.1098/RSPB.2020.2187.
- Dvoriantchikova, G., Perea-Martinez, I., Pappas, S., Barry, A. F., Danek, D., Dvoriantchikova, X., et al. (2015). Molecular characterization of Notch1 positive

progenitor cells in the developing retina. PLoS One. 10. doi:

10.1371/journal.pone.0131054.

- Eakin, R. M., and Kuda, A. (1971). Ultrastructure of sensory receptors in ascidian tadpoles. *Zeitschrift für Zellforsch. und Mikroskopische Anat.* 112. doi:10.1007/BF02584045.
- Ecker, J. L., Dumitrescu, O. N., Wong, K. Y., Alam, N. M., Chen, S.-K., LeGates, T., et al. (2010). Melanopsin-expressing retinal ganglion-cell photoreceptors: cellular diversity and role in pattern vision. *Neuron.* 67, 49. doi:10.1016/J.NEURON.2010.05.023.
- Emerling, C. A., and Springer, M. S. (2014). Eyes underground: Regression of visual protein networks in subterranean mammals. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 78. doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2014.05.016.
- Esposito, R., Racioppi, C., Pezzotti, M. R., Branno, M., Locascio, A., Ristoratore, F., et al. (2015). The ascidian pigmented sensory organs: structures and developmental programs. *Genesis.* 53, 15–33. doi:10.1002/DVG.22836.
- Fain, G. L. (2020). Lamprey vision: Photoreceptors and organization of the retina. Semin. Cell Dev. Biol. 106, 5–11. doi:10.1016/J.SEMCDB.2019.10.008.
- Fain, G. L., Hardie, R., and Laughlin, S. B. (2010). Phototransduction and the evolution of photoreceptors. *Curr. Biol.* 20. doi:10.1016/J.CUB.2009.12.006.
- Feiner, N., Meyer, A., and Kuraku, S. (2014). Evolution of the Vertebrate Pax4/6 Class of Genes with Focus on Its Novel Member, the *Pax10* Gene. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 6. doi:10.1093/gbe/evu135.

- Fernald, R. D. (2000). Evolution of eyes. Curr. Opin. Neurobiol. 10, 444–450. doi:10.1016/S0959-4388(00)00114-8.
- Fernald, R. D. (2004). Eyes: Variety, Development and Evolution. *Brain Behav Evol.* 64, 141–147. doi:10.1159/000079743.
- Fernández-López, B., Romaus-Sanjurjo, D., Senra-Martínez, P., Anadón, R., Barreiro-Iglesias, A., and Rodicio, M. C. (2016). Spatiotemporal Pattern of Doublecortin Expression in the Retina of the Sea Lamprey. *Front. Neuroanat.* 10. doi:10.3389/fnana.2016.00005.
- Fernholm, B. (1974). Diurnal variations in the behaviour of the hagfish *Eptatretus burgeri*. Mar. Biol. 27, 351–356. doi:10.1007/BF00394371.
- Fernholm, B., and Holmberg, K. (1975). The eyes in three genera of hagfish (*Eptatretus*, *Paramyxine* and *Myxine*) - a case of degenerative evolution. *Vision Research*. 15, 253-259. doi: 10.1016/0042-6989(75)90215-1.
- Fimbel, S. M., Montgomery, J. E., Burket, C. T., and Hyde, D. R. (2007). Regeneration of Inner Retinal Neurons after Intravitreal Injection of Ouabain in Zebrafish. *J. Neurosci.* 27. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5317-06.2007.
- Fischer, A. J., Bosse, J. L., and El-Hodiri, H. M. (2014). Reprint of: The ciliary marginal zone (CMZ) in development and regeneration of the vertebrate eye. *Exp. Eye Res.* 123. doi:10.1016/j.exer.2014.04.019.

- Fujitani, Y., Fujitani, S., Luo, H., Qiu, F., Burlison, J., Long, Q., et al. (2006). *Ptf1a* determines horizontal and amacrine cell fates during mouse retinal development. *Development*. 133, 4439–4450. doi:10.1242/DEV.02598.
- Furukawa, T., Morrow, E. M., and Cepko, C. L. (1997). *Crx*, a novel *otx*-like homeobox gene, shows photoreceptor-specific expression and regulates photoreceptor differentiation. *Cell*. 91, 531–541. doi: 10.1016/s0092-8674(00)80439-0.
- Furukawa, T., Mukherjee, S., Bao, Z.-Z., Morrow, E. M., and Cepko, C. L. (2000). rax, Hes1, and notch1 promote the formation of Müller glia by postnatal retinal progenitor cells. Neuron. 26, 383–394. doi:10.1016/S0896-6273(00)81171-X.
- Gabbott, S. E., Donoghue, P. C. J., Sansom, R. S., Vinther, J., Dolocan, A., and Purnell, M.
 A. (2016). Pigmented anatomy in Carboniferous cyclostomes and the evolution of the vertebrate eye. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 283. doi:10.1098/RSPB.2016.1151.
- Gao, H., A, L., Huang, X., Chen, X., and Xu, H. (2021). Müller Glia-Mediated Retinal Regeneration. *Mol. Neurobiol.* 58. doi:10.1007/s12035-020-02274-w.
- Gehring, W., and Seimiya, M. (2010). Eye evolution and the origin of Darwin's eye prototype. *Ital. J. Zool.* 77, 124–136. doi:10.1080/11250001003795350.
- Goldman, D. (2014). Müller glial cell reprogramming and retina regeneration. Nat. Rev. Neurosci. 15. doi:10.1038/nrn3723.
- Gorbman, A. (1997). Hagfish Development. Zool. Sci. 14, 375–390. doi:10.2108/ZSJ.14.375.

- Gorsuch, R. A., Lahne, M., Yarka, C. E., Petravick, M. E., Li, J., and Hyde, D. R. (2017). Sox2 regulates Müller glia reprogramming and proliferation in the regenerating zebrafish retina via Lin28 and Ascl1a. *Exp. Eye Res.* 161, 174–192. doi: 10.1016/j.exer.2017.05.012.
- Govardovskii, V., Rotov, A., Astakhova, L., Nikolaeva, D., and Firsov, M. (2020). Visual cells and visual pigments of the river lamprey revisited. *J. Comp. Physiol. A.* 206, 71–84. doi:10.1007/S00359-019-01395-5.
- Guérin, A., d'Aubenton-Carafa, Y., Marrakchi, E., Da Silva, C., Wincker, P., Mazan, S., et al. (2009). Neurodevelopment genes in lampreys reveal trends for forebrain evolution in craniates. *PLoS One.* 4, e5374. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0005374.
- Gustafsson, O. S. E., Collin, S. P., and Kröger, R. H. H. (2008). Early evolution of multifocal optics for well-focused colour vision in vertebrates. *J. Exp. Biol.* 211. doi:10.1242/jeb.016048.
- Häming, D., Simoes-Costa, M., Uy, B., Valencia, J., Sauka-Spengler, T., and Bronner-Fraser, M. (2011). Expression of Sympathetic Nervous System Genes in Lamprey
 Suggests Their Recruitment for Specification of a New Vertebrate Feature. *PLoS One*.
 6. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0026543.
- Harahush, B. K., Hart, N. S., Green, K., and Collin, S. P. (2009). Retinal neurogenesis and ontogenetic changes in the visual system of the brown banded bamboo shark, *Chiloscyllium punctatum* (hemiscyllidae, elasmobranchii). *J. Comp. Neurol.* 513, 83–97. doi: 10.1002/cne.21953.

- Hatakeyama, J., Tomita, K., Inoue, T., and Kageyama, R. (2001). Roles of homeobox and bHLH genes in specification of a retinal cell type. *Development*. 128, 1313–1322. doi:10.1242/DEV.128.8.1313.
- Heimberg, A. M., Cowper-Sal·lari, R., Sémon, M., Donoghue, P. C. J., and Peterson, K. J. (2010). microRNAs reveal the interrelationships of hagfish, lampreys, and gnathostomes and the nature of the ancestral vertebrate. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 107, 19379–19383. doi:10.1073/PNAS.1010350107.
- Hernández-Núñez, I., Robledo, D., Mayeur, H., Mazan, S., Sánchez, L., Adrio, F., et al.
 (2021). Loss of Active Neurogenesis in the Adult Shark Retina. *Front. Cell Dev. Biol.*9, 115. doi:10.3389/FCELL.2021.628721/BIBTEX.
- Higuchi, S., Sugahara, F., Pascual-Anaya, J., Takagi, W., Oisi, Y., and Kuratani, S. (2019). Inner ear development in cyclostomes and evolution of the vertebrate semicircular canals. *Nature*. 565. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0782-y.
- Hitchcock, P., Ochocinska, M., Sieh, A., and Otteson, D. (2004). Persistent and injuryinduced neurogenesis in the vertebrate retina. *Prog. Retin. Eye Res.* 23. doi:10.1016/j.preteyeres.2004.01.001.
- Hoang, D. T., Chernomor, O., von Haeseler, A., Minh, B. Q., and Vinh, L. S. (2018).
 UFBoot2: Improving the Ultrafast Bootstrap Approximation. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 35, 518–522. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msx281.
- Holland, N. D. (2007). Hagfish embryos again: the end of a long drought. *Bioessays*. 29, 833–836. doi:10.1002/BIES.20620.

- Holmberg, K. (1971). The hagfish retina: electron microscopic study comparing receptor and epithelial cells in the Pacific hagfish, *Polistotrema stouti*, with those in the Atlantic hagfish, *Myxine glutinosa. Z. Zellforsch. Mikrosk. Anat.* 121, 249–269. doi:10.1007/BF00340676.
- Holmberg, R. (1970). The hagfish retina: Fine structure of retinal cells in *Myxine glutinosa*,
 L., with special reference to receptor and epithelial cells. *Zeitschrift für Zellforsch. und Mikroskopische Anat.* 111, 519–538. doi:10.1007/BF00330929.
- Horie, T., Orii, H., and Nakagawa, M. (2005). Structure of ocellus photoreceptors in the ascidian *Ciona intestinalis* larva as revealed by an anti-arrestin antibody. *J. Neurobiol.* 65, 241–250. doi:10.1002/NEU.20197.
- 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. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2010.02.002.
- Inoue, T., Hojo, M., Bessho, Y., Tano, Y., Lee, J. E., and Kageyama, R. (2002). *Math3* and *NeuroD* regulate amacrine cell fate specification in the retina. *Development*. 129, 831– 842. doi:10.1242/DEV.129.4.831.
- Jadhav, A. P., Cho, S.-H., and Cepko, C. L. (2006). Notch activity permits retinal cells to progress through multiple progenitor states and acquire a stem cell property. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 103, 18998–19003. doi:10.1073/PNAS.0608155103.
- Jean, D., Bernier, G., and Gruss, P. (1999). Six6 (Optx2) is a novel murine Six3-related homeobox gene that demarcates the presumptive pituitary/hypothalamic axis and the ventral optic stalk. Mech. Dev. 84, 31–40. doi:10.1016/S0925-4773(99)00068-4.
- Jeffery, W. R. (2009). Regressive Evolution in Astyanax Cavefish. Annu. Rev. Genet. 43. doi:10.1146/annurev-genet-102108-134216.
- Jeong, J.-Y., Einhorn, Z., Mercurio, S., Lee, S., Lau, B., Mione, M., et al. (2006). *Neurogenin1* is a determinant of zebrafish basal forebrain dopaminergic neurons and is regulated by the conserved zinc finger protein Tof/Fezl. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 103. doi:10.1073/pnas.0600337103.
- Jian, Q., Xu, H., Xie, H., Tian, C., Zhao, T., and Yin, Z. (2009). Activation of retinal stem cells in the proliferating marginal region of RCS rats during development of retinitis pigmentosa. *Neurosci. Lett.* 465. doi: 10.1016/j.neulet.2009.07.083.
- Johns, P. R. (1977). Growth of the adult goldfish eye. III. Source of the new retinal cells. J. *Comp. Neurol.* 176. doi:10.1002/cne.901760304.
- Jorstad, N. L., Wilken, M. S., Grimes, W. N., Wohl, S. G., VandenBosch, L. S., Yoshimatsu, T., et al. (2017). Stimulation of functional neuronal regeneration from Müller glia in adult mice. *Nature*. 548. doi:10.1038/nature23283.
- Kay, J. N., Finger-Baier, K. C., Roeser, T., Staub, W., and Baier, H. (2001). Retinal ganglion cell genesis requires *lakritz*, a Zebrafish atonal Homolog. *Neuron*. 30, 725–736. doi:10.1016/S0896-6273(01)00312-9.

- Kobayashi, H. (1964). On the photo-perceptive function in the eye of the hagfish, *Myxine* garmani Jordan et Snyder. J. Shimonoseki Univ. Fish. 13, 67-83.
- Koenig, K. M., and Gross, J. M. (2020). Evolution and development of complex eyes: a celebration of diversity. *Development*. 147. doi:10.1242/DEV.182923.
- Kon, T., and Furukawa, T. (2020). Origin and evolution of the *Rax* homeobox gene by comprehensive evolutionary analysis. *FEBS Open Bio*. 10, 657-673. doi:10.1002/2211-5463.12832.
- Korzh, V., Sleptsova, I., Liao, J., He, J., and Gong, Z. (1998). Expression of zebrafish
 bHLH genes *ngn1* and *nrd* defines distinct stages of neural differentiation. *Dev. Dyn.*213, 92-104. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0177(199809)213:1<92::AID-AJA9>3.0.CO;2-T.
- Kozmik, Z. (2005). *Pax* genes in eye development and evolution. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* 15. doi:10.1016/j.gde.2005.05.001.
- Kumar, J. P. (2009). The sine oculis homeobox (SIX) family of transcription factors as regulators of development and disease. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.* 66. doi:10.1007/s00018-008-8335-4.
- Kuraku, S., Hoshiyama, D., Katoh, K., Suga, H., and Miyata, T. (1999). Monophyly of lampreys and hagfishes supported by nuclear DNA-coded genes. J. Mol. Evol. 49, 729–735. doi:10.1007/PL00006595.

- Kuratani, S., and Ota, K. G. (2008). Hagfish (Cyclostomata, Vertebrata): Searching for the ancestral developmental plan of vertebrates. *BioEssays*. 30, 167–172. doi: 10.1002/bies.20701.
- Kuratani, S., and Ota, K. G. (2008). Primitive versus derived traits in the developmental program of the vertebrate head: views from cyclostome developmental studies. *J. Exp. Zool. Part B Mol. Dev. Evol.* 310B, 294–314. doi:10.1002/JEZ.B.21190.
- Kusakabe, T., Kusakabe, R., Kawakami, I., Satou, Y., Satoh, N., and Tsuda, M. (2001). *Ciopsin1*, a vertebrate-type opsin gene, expressed in the larval ocellus of the ascidian *Ciona intestinalis*. *FEBS Lett.* 506. doi:10.1016/S0014-5793(01)02877-0.
- Kusakabe, T., and Tsuda, M. (2007). Photoreceptive Systems in Ascidians[†]. Photochem. Photobiol. 83. doi:10.1562/2006-07-11-IR-965.
- Lacalli, T. (2018). Amphioxus, motion detection, and the evolutionary origin of the vertebrate retinotectal map. *Evodevo*. 9. doi:10.1186/s13227-018-0093-2.
- Lamb, T. D. (2013). Evolution of phototransduction, vertebrate photoreceptors and retina. *Prog. Retin. Eye Res.* 36, 52–119. doi:10.1016/J.PRETEYERES.2013.06.001.
- Lamb, T. D., Collin, S. P., and Pugh, E. N. (2007). Evolution of the vertebrate eye: Opsins, photoreceptors, retina and eye cup. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 8, 960–976. doi:10.1038/NRN2283.
- Lamb, T. D., and Hunt, D. M. (2017). Evolution of the vertebrate phototransduction cascade activation steps. *Dev. Biol.* 431. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2017.03.018.

- Land, M. F., and Fernald, R. D. (1992). The Evolution of Eyes. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 15, 1– 29. doi:10.1146/annurev.ne.15.030192.000245.
- Lane, B. M., and Lister, J. A. (2012). Otx but Not Mitf Transcription Factors Are Required for Zebrafish Retinal Pigment Epithelium Development. *PLoS One*. 7(11), e49357. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0049357.
- Lara-Ramirez, R. (2013) Lamprey Neural Helix-Loop-Helix (HLH) Genes and the Evolution of the Vertebrate Nervous System. [dissertation/PhD thesis]. St Anne's College, University of Oxford.
- Lara-Ramírez, R., Patthey, C., and Shimeld, S. M. (2015). Characterization of two *neurogenin* genes from the brook lamprey *Lampetra planeri* and their expression in the lamprey nervous system. *Dev. Dyn.* 244. doi:10.1002/dvdy.24273.
- Lenkowski, J. R., and Raymond, P. A. (2014). Müller glia: Stem cells for generation and regeneration of retinal neurons in teleost fish. *Prog. Retin. Eye Res.* 40. doi:10.1016/j.preteyeres.2013.12.007.
- Link, B. A., and Darland, T. (2001). Genetic analysis of initial and ongoing retinogenesis in the zebrafish: comparing the central neuroepithelium and marginal zone. *Prog. Brain Res.* 131, 565-577. doi:10.1016/S0079-6123(01)31044-0.
- Locket, N. A., and Jørgensen, J. M. (1998). "The Eyes of Hagfishes," in The Biology of Hagfishes (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands), 541–556. doi: 10.1007/978-94-011-5834-3_34.

- Mallatt, J., and Sullivan, J. (1998). 28S and 18S rDNA sequences support the monophyly of lampreys and hagfishes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 15, 1706–1718. doi:10.1093/OXFORDJOURNALS.MOLBEV.A025897.
- Marquardt, T., Ashery-Padan, R., Andrejewski, N., Scardigli, R., Guillemot, F., and Gruss,
 P. (2001). Pax6 is required for the multipotent state of retinal progenitor cells. *Cell*.
 105, 43–55. doi:10.1016/S0092-8674(01)00295-1.
- Martinez-Morales, J. R., Del Bene, F., Nica, G., Hammerschmidt, M., Bovolenta, P., and Wittbrodt, J. (2005). Differentiation of the Vertebrate Retina Is Coordinated by an FGF Signaling Center. *Dev. Cell.* 8, 565–574. doi:10.1016/J.DEVCEL.2005.01.022.
- Martínez-Morales, J. R., Dolez, V., Rodrigo, I., Zaccarini, R., Leconte, L., Bovolenta, P., and Saule, S. (2003). OTX2 Activates the Molecular Network Underlying Retina
 Pigment Epithelium Differentiation. *J. Biol. Chem.* 278(24), 21721–21731.
 https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M301708200
- Martinez-Morales, J. R., Signore, M., Acampora, D., Simeone, A., and Bovolenta, P. (2001). *Otx* genes are required for tissue specification in the developing eye. *Development*. 128, 2019–2030. doi:10.1242/DEV.128.11.2019.
- Martini, F. H. (1998). The Ecology of Hagfishes. In: The Biology of Hagfishes. Springer, (Dordrecht), 57-77. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5834-3 5
- Mathers, P. H., Grinberg, A., Mahon, K. A., and Jamrich, M. (1997). The *Rx* homeobox gene is essential for vertebrate eye development. *Nature*. 387. doi:10.1038/42475.

- Mears, A. J., Kondo, M., Swain, P. K., Takada, Y., Bush, R. A., Saunders, T. L., et al. (2001). Nrl is required for rod photoreceptor development. Nat. Genet. 29, 447–452. doi:10.1038/NG774.
- Melo, J. de., Zibetti, C., Clark, B. S., Hwang, W., Miranda-Angulo, A. L., Qian, J., et al. (2016). Lhx2 Is an Essential Factor for Retinal Gliogenesis and Notch Signaling. J. Neurosci. 36, 2391. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3145-15.2016.
- Meyer-Rochow, V. B., and Stewart, D. (1996). Review of larval and postlarval eye ultrastructure in the lamprey (cyclostomata) with special emphasis on *Geotria australis* (gray). *Microsc. Res. Tech.* 35, 431-444. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0029(19961215)35:6<431::AID-JEMT3>3.0.CO;2-L
- Miesfeld, J. B., Ghiasvand, N. M., Marsh-Armstrong, B., Marsh-Armstrong, N., Miller, E.
 B., Zhang, P., et al. (2020). The *Atoh7* remote enhancer provides transcriptional robustness during retinal ganglion cell development. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 117. doi:10.1073/pnas.2006888117.
- Mitton, K. P., Swain, P. K., Chen, S., Xu, S., Zack, D. J., and Swaroop, A. (2000). The Leucine Zipper of *NRL* Interacts with the *CRX* Homeodomain. *J. Biol. Chem.* 275, 29794–29799. doi: 10.1074/jbc.M003658200.
- Miyashita, T., Coates, M. I., Farrar, R., Larson, P., Manning, P. L., Wogelius, R. A., et al. (2019). Hagfish from the Cretaceous Tethys Sea and a reconciliation of the morphological–molecular conflict in early vertebrate phylogeny. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 116, 2146–2151. doi:10.1073/PNAS.1814794116.

- Miyashita, T., Gess, R. W., Tietjen, K., and Coates, M. I. (2021). Non-ammocoete larvae of Palaeozoic stem lampreys. *Nature*. 591, 408–412. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03305-9.
- Montana, C. L., Lawrence, K. A., Williams, N. L., Tran, N. M., Peng, G.-H., Chen, S., et al. (2011). Transcriptional Regulation of Neural Retina Leucine Zipper (*Nrl*), a Photoreceptor Cell Fate Determinant. *J. Biol. Chem.* 286, 36921–36931. doi: 10.1074/jbc.M111.279026.
- Morshedian, A., and Fain, G. L. (2015). Single-photon sensitivity of lamprey rods with cone-like outer segments. *Curr. Biol.* 25, 484–487. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2014.12.031.
- Morshedian, A., and Fain, G. L. (2017). Light adaptation and the evolution of vertebrate photoreceptors. *J. Physiol.* 595, 4947. doi:10.1113/JP274211.
- Mu, X., Fu, X., Sun, H., Beremand, P. D., Thomas, T. L., and Klein, W. H. (2005). A gene network downstream of transcription factor Math5 regulates retinal progenitor cell competence and ganglion cell fate. *Dev. Biol.* 280, 467–481. doi:10.1016/J.YDBIO.2005.01.028.
- Muffato, M., Louis, A., Poisnel, C.-E., and Crollius, H. R. (2010). Genomicus: a database and a browser to study gene synteny in modern and ancestral genomes. *Bioinformatics*. 26, 1119–1121. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btq079.
- Nakamura, K., Harada, C., Namekata, K., and Harada, T. (2006.). Expression of *olig2* in retinal progenitor cells. *NeuroReport*. 17, 345-349.
 doi:10.1097/01.wnr.0000203352.44998.6b

- Nelson, B. R., Hartman, B. H., Ray, C. A., Hayashi, T., Bermingham-McDonogh, O., and Reh, T. A. (2009). *Acheate-scute like* 1 (*Ascl1*) is required for normal *Delta-like* (*Dll*) gene expression and Notch signaling during retinal development. *Dev. Dyn.* 238, 2163-2178. doi:10.1002/DVDY.21848.
- Nelson, S. M., Park, L., and Stenkamp, D. L. (2009). *Retinal homeobox 1* is required for retinal neurogenesis and photoreceptor differentiation in embryonic zebrafish. *Dev. Biol.* 328, 24–39. doi:10.1016/J.YDBIO.2008.12.040.
- Neumann, C. J., and Nuesslein-Volhard, C. (2000). Patterning of the Zebrafish Retina by a Wave of Sonic Hedgehog Activity. *Science*. 289, 2137–2139. doi:10.1126/SCIENCE.289.5487.2137.
- Nguyen, L.-T., Schmidt, H. A., von Haeseler, A., and Minh, B. Q. (2015). IQ-TREE: A Fast and Effective Stochastic Algorithm for Estimating Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 32, 268–274. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msu300.
- Nguyen, N. T. T., Vincens, P., Dufayard, J. F., Roest Crollius, H., and Louis, A. (2022). Genomicus in 2022: comparative tools for thousands of genomes and reconstructed ancestors. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 50, D1025–D1031. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkab1091.
- Nilsson, D.-E. (2009). The evolution of eyes and visually guided behaviour. *Philos. Trans.R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 364, 2833–2847. doi:10.1098/rstb.2009.0083.
- Nilsson, D.-E. (2013). Eye evolution and its functional basis. *Vis. Neurosci.* 30, 5-20. doi:10.1017/S0952523813000035.

- Nishida, A., Furukawa, A., Koike, C., Tano, Y., Aizawa, S., Matsuo, I., et al. (2003). *Otx2* homeobox gene controls retinal photoreceptor cell fate and pineal gland development. *Nat. Neurosci.* 6, 1255–1263. doi:10.1038/nn1155.
- Ochocinska, M. J., and Hitchcock, P. F. (2009). *NeuroD* regulates proliferation of photoreceptor progenitors in the retina of the zebrafish. *Mech. Dev.* 126. doi:10.1016/j.mod.2008.11.009.
- Oel, A. P., Neil, G. J., Dong, E. M., Balay, S. D., Collett, K., and Allison, W. T. (2020). Nrl Is Dispensable for Specification of Rod Photoreceptors in Adult Zebrafish Despite Its Deeply Conserved Requirement Earlier in Ontogeny. *iScience*. 23, 101805. doi:10.1016/J.ISCI.2020.101805.
- Ohsawa, R., and Kageyama, R. (2008). Regulation of retinal cell fate specification by multiple transcription factors. *Brain Res.* 1192, 90–98. doi:10.1016/J.BRAINRES.2007.04.014.
- Oisi, Y., Ota, K. G., Kuraku, S., Fujimoto, S., and Kuratani, S. (2013). Craniofacial development of hagfishes and the evolution of vertebrates. *Nature*. 493. doi:10.1038/nature11794.
- Ooka-Souda, S., and Kabasawa, H. (1995). Circadian Rhythms in Locomotor Activity of the Hagfish, *Eptatretus burgeri* V. The Effect of Light Pulses on the Free-running Rhythm. *Zoolog. Sci.* 12. doi:10.2108/zsj.12.337.

- Oron-Karni, V., Farhy, C., Elgart, M., Marquardt, T., Remizova, L., Yaron, O., et al.
 (2008). Dual requirement for Pax6 in retinal progenitor cells. *Development*. 135, 4037-4047. doi:10.1242/DEV.028308.
- Osório, J., and Rétaux, S. (2008). The lamprey in evolutionary studies. *Dev. Genes Evol.* 218, 221–235. doi:10.1007/S00427-008-0208-1.
- Ota, K. G., Fujimoto, S., Oisi, Y., and Kuratani, S. (2011). Identification of vertebra-like elements and their possible differentiation from sclerotomes in the hagfish. *Nat. Commun.* 2, 373. doi:10.1038/NCOMMS1355.
- Ota, K. G., and Kuratani, S. (2006). The History of Scientific Endeavors Towards Understanding Hagfish Embryology. *Zoolog. Sci.* 23, 403–418. doi: 10.2108/zsj.23.403.
- Ota, K. G., and Kuratani, S. (2008). Developmental biology of hagfishes, with a report on newly obtained embryos of the Japanese inshore hagfish, *Eptatretus burgeri. Zoolog. Sci.* 25, 999–1011. doi:10.2108/ZSJ.25.999.
- Parker, H. J., Sauka-Spengler, T., Bronner, M., and Elgar, G. (2014). A Reporter Assay in Lamprey Embryos Reveals Both Functional Conservation and Elaboration of Vertebrate Enhancers. *PLoS One.* 9, e85492. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0085492.
- Patzner, R. A. (1978). Experimental studies on the light sense in the hagfish, *Eptatretus burgeri* and *Paramyxine atami* (Cyclostomata). *Helgoländer wissenschaftliche Meeresuntersuchungen*. 31, 180–190. doi:10.1007/BF02296996.

- Pergner, J., and Kozmik, Z. (2017). Amphioxus photoreceptors insights into the evolution of vertebrate opsins, vision and circadian rhythmicity. *Int. J. Dev. Biol.* 61. doi:10.1387/ijdb.170230zk.
- Perron, M., and Harris, W. A. (2000). Determination of vertebrate retinal progenitor cell fate by the Notch pathway and basic helix-loop-helix transcription factors. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.* 57, 215–223. doi:10.1007/PL00000685.
- Perron, M., Kanekar, S., Vetter, M. L., and Harris, W. A. (1998). The Genetic Sequence of Retinal Development in the Ciliary Margin of the *Xenopus* Eye. *Dev. Biol.* 199. doi:10.1006/dbio.1998.8939.
- Philips, G. T., Stair, C. N., Lee, H. Y., Wroblewski, E., Berberoglu, M. A., Brown, N. L., et al. (2005). Precocious retinal neurons: Pax6 controls timing of differentiation and determination of cell type. *Dev. Biol.* 279, 308-321. doi:10.1016/J.YDBIO.2004.12.018.
- Plouhinec, J.-L., Sauka-Spengler, T., Germot, A., Le Mentec, C., Cabana, T., Harrison, G., et al. (2003). The Mammalian *Crx* Genes Are Highly Divergent Representatives of the *Otx5* Gene Family, a Gnathostome Orthology Class of Orthodenticle-Related Homeogenes Involved in the Differentiation of Retinal Photoreceptors and Circadian Entrainment. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 20, 513–521. doi:10.1093/MOLBEV/MSG085.
- Ranski, A. H., Kramer, A. C., Morgan, G. W., Perez, J. L., and Thummel, R. (2018). Characterization of retinal regeneration in adult zebrafish following multiple rounds of phototoxic lesion. *PeerJ.* 6, e5646. doi:10.7717/peerj.5646

- Rath, M. F., Morin, F., Shi, Q., Klein, D. C., and Møller, M. (2007). Ontogenetic expression of the *Otx2* and *Crx* homeobox genes in the retina of the rat. *Exp. Eye Res.* 85, 65–73. doi: 10.1016/j.exer.2007.02.016.
- Ravi, V., Bhatia, S., Shingate, P., Tay, B.-H., Venkatesh, B., and Kleinjan, D. A. (2019).
 Lampreys, the jawless vertebrates, contain three *Pax6* genes with distinct expression in eye, brain and pancreas. *Sci. Rep.* 9. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-56085-8.
- Raymond, P. A., Barthel, L. K., Bernardos, R. L., and Perkowski, J. J. (2006). Molecular characterization of retinal stem cells and their niches in adult zebrafish. *BMC Dev. Biol.* 6. doi:10.1186/1471-213X-6-36.
- Raymond, P. A., Reifler, M. J., and Rivlin, P. K. (1988). Regeneration of goldfish retina:
 Rod precursors are a likely source of regenerated cells. *J. Neurobiol.* 19.
 doi:10.1002/neu.480190504.
- Remez, L. A., Onishi, A., Menuchin-Lasowski, Y., Biran, A., Blackshaw, S., Wahlin, K. J., et al. (2017). Pax6 is essential for the generation of late-born retinal neurons and for inhibition of photoreceptor-fate during late stages of retinogenesis. *Dev. Biol.* 432, 140–150. doi:10.1016/J.YDBIO.2017.09.030.
- Riesenberg, A. N., and Brown, N. L. (2016). Cell autonomous and nonautonomous requirements for Delltalike1 during early mouse retinal neurogenesis. *Dev. Dyn.* 245, 631. doi:10.1002/DVDY.24402.

- Roesch, K., Jadhav, AP., Trimarchi, JM., Stadler, MB., Roska, B., Sun, BB., and Cepko,
 CL. (2008). The transcriptome of retinal Müller glial cells. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 509(2),
 225–238. doi:10.1002/cne.21730
- Rohde, K., Klein, D. C., Møller, M., and Rath, M. F. (2011). *Rax*: developmental and daily expression patterns in the rat pineal gland and retina. *J. Neurochem.* 118, 999–1007. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-4159.2011.07385.x.
- Rubinson, K., and Cain, H. (1989). Neural differentiation in the retina of the larval sea lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus*). Vis. Neurosci. 3, 241–248. doi:10.1017/S0952523800009998.
- Sato, S., and Yamamoto, H. (2001). Development of Pigment Cells in the Brain of Ascidian Tadpole Larvae: Insights into the Origins of Vertebrate Pigment Cells. *Pigment Cell Res.* 14. doi:10.1034/j.1600-0749.2001.140602.x.
- Satow, T., Bae, S.-K., Inoue, T., Inoue, C., Miyoshi, G., Tomita, K., et al. (2001). The Basic Helix-Loop-Helix Gene *hesr2* Promotes Gliogenesis in Mouse Retina. *J. Neurosci.* 21, 1265. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.21-04-01265.2001.
- Sayers, E. W., Bolton, E. E., Brister, J. R., Canese, K., Chan, J., Comeau, D. C., et al. (2022). Database resources of the national center for biotechnology information. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 50, D20–D26. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkab1112.
- Schlosser, G. (2006). Induction and specification of cranial placodes. *Dev. Biol.* 294, 303–351. doi:10.1016/J.YDBIO.2006.03.009.

- Schlosser, G., Patthey, C., and Shimeld, S. M. (2014). The evolutionary history of vertebrate cranial placodes II. Evolution of ectodermal patterning. *Dev. Biol.* 389. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2014.01.019.
- Schmidt, T. M., Do, M. T., Dacey, D., Lucas, R., Hattar, S., and Matynia, A. (2011).
 Melanopsin-positive intrinsically photosensitive retinal ganglion cells: from form to function. *J. Neurosci.* 31, 16094–16101. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4132-11.2011.
- Schneider, C. A., Rasband, W. S., and Eliceiri, K. W. (2012). NIH image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis. *Nat. Methods*. 9, 671–675. doi:10.1038/nmeth.2089.
- Shen, Y., and Raymond, P. A. (2004). Zebrafish *cone-rod* (*crx*) homeobox gene promotes retinogenesis. *Dev. Biol.* 269. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2004.01.037.
- Shimeld, S. M., and Donoghue, P. C. J. (2012). Evolutionary crossroads in developmental biology: cyclostomes (lamprey and hagfish). *Development*. 139, 2091–2099. doi:10.1242/DEV.074716.
- Sifuentes-Romero, I., Ferrufino, E., Thakur, S., Laboissonniere, L. A., Solomon, M., Smith,
 C. L., et al. (2020). Repeated evolution of eye loss in Mexican cavefish: Evidence of similar developmental mechanisms in independently evolved populations. *J. Exp. Zool. Part B Mol. Dev. Evol.* 334, 423–437. doi:10.1002/JEZ.B.22977.
- Silverman, S. M., and Wong, W. T. (2018). Microglia in the Retina: Roles in Development, Maturity, and Disease. Annu. Rev. Vis. Sci. 4, 45–77. doi: 10.1146/annurev-vision-091517-034425.

- Steinfeld, J., Steinfeld, I., Coronato, N., Hampel, M.-L., Layer, P. G., Araki, M., et al. (2013). RPE specification in the chick is mediated by surface ectoderm-derived BMP and Wnt signalling. *Development*. 140, 4959–4969. doi:10.1242/DEV.096990.
- Stenkamp, D. L. (2015). Development of the Vertebrate Eye and Retina. Prog. Mol. Biol. Transl. Sci. 134, 397–414. doi:10.1016/BS.PMBTS.2015.06.006.
- Suzuki, D. G., and Grillner, S. (2018). The stepwise development of the lamprey visual system and its evolutionary implications. *Biol. Rev.* 93, 1461–1477. doi:10.1111/BRV.12403.
- Taranova, O. V., Magness, S. T., Fagan, B. M., Wu, Y., Surzenko, N., Hutton, S. R., et al. (2006). SOX2 is a dose-dependent regulator of retinal neural progenitor competence. *Genes. Dev.* 20, 1187–1202. doi: 10.1101/gad.1407906.
- Thummel, R., Kassen, S. C., Enright, J. M., Nelson, C. M., Montgomery, J. E., and Hyde,
 D. R. (2008). Characterization of Müller glia and neuronal progenitors during adult
 zebrafish retinal regeneration. *Exp. Eye Res.* 87(5), 433–444. doi:
 10.1016/j.exer.2008.07.009
- Trifinopoulos, J., Nguyen, L.-T., von Haeseler, A., and Minh, B. Q. (2016). W-IQ-TREE: a fast online phylogenetic tool for maximum likelihood analysis. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 44, W232–W235. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkw256.
- Valdivia, L. E., Lamb, D. B., Horner, W., Wierzbicki, C., Tafessu, A., Williams, A. M., et al. (2016). Antagonism between *Gdf6a* and retinoic acid pathways controls timing of

retinal neurogenesis and growth of the eye in zebrafish. *Development*. 143, 1087-1098. doi:10.1242/DEV.130922.

- Veltri, D., Wight, M. M., and Crouch, J. A. (2016). SimpleSynteny: a web-based tool for visualization of microsynteny across multiple species. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 44, W41-W45. doi: 10.1093/NAR/GKW330.
- Viczian, A. S., Vignali, R., Zuber, M. E., Barsacchi, G., and Harris, W. A. (2003). XOtx5b and XOtx2 regulate photoreceptor and bipolar fates in the Xenopus retina. Development. 130, 1281–1294. doi:10.1242/DEV.00343.
- Villar-Cerviño, V., Abalo, X. M., Villar-Cheda, B., Meléndez-Ferro, M., Pérez-Costas, E., Holstein, G. R., et al. (2006). Presence of glutamate, glycine, and gamma-aminobutyric acid in the retina of the larval sea lamprey: comparative immunohistochemical study of classical neurotransmitters in larval and postmetamorphic retinas. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 499, 810–827. doi:10.1002/CNE.21136.
- Villar-Cheda, B., Abalo, X. M., Villar-Cerviño, V., Barreiro-Iglesias, A., Anadón, R., and Rodicio, M. C. (2008). Late proliferation and photoreceptor differentiation in the transforming lamprey retina. *Brain Res.* 1201, 60–67. doi:10.1016/J.BRAINRES.2008.01.077.
- Vopalensky, P., and Kozmik, Z. (2009). Eye evolution: common use and independent recruitment of genetic components. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 364, 2819–2832. doi:10.1098/rstb.2009.0079.

- Vopalensky, P., Pergner, J., Liegertova, M., Benito-Gutierrez, E., Arendt, D., and Kozmik, Z. (2012). Molecular analysis of the amphioxus frontal eye unravels the evolutionary origin of the retina and pigment cells of the vertebrate eye. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 109, 15383–15388. doi:10.1073/PNAS.1207580109.
- Wang, S. W., Kim, B. S., Ding, K., Wang, H., Sun, D., Johnson, R. L., et al. (2001).
 Requirement for *math5* in the development of retinal ganglion cells. *Genes Dev.* 15, 24–29. doi:10.1101/GAD.855301.
- Wang, X., Emelyanov, A., Korzh, V., and Gong, Z. (2003). Zebrafish atonal homologue *zath3* is expressed during neurogenesis in embryonic development. *Dev. Dyn.* 227. doi:10.1002/dvdy.10331.
- Wang, Y., Dakubo, G. D., Thurig, S., Mazerolle, C. J., and Wallace, V. A. (2005). Retinal ganglion cell-derived sonic hedgehog locally controls proliferation and the timing of RGC development in the embryonic mouse retina. *Development*. 132, 5103–5113. doi:10.1242/DEV.02096.
- Wehman, A. M., Staub, W., Meyers, J. R., Raymond, P. A., and Baier, H. (2005). Genetic dissection of the zebrafish retinal stem-cell compartment. *Dev. Biol.* 281. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2005.02.010.
- Xu, B., Tang, X., Jin, M., Zhang, H., Du, L., Yu, S., et al. (2020). Unifying developmental programs for embryonic and postembryonic neurogenesis in the zebrafish retina. *Development*. 147. doi:10.1242/DEV.185660.

- Yajima, I., Endo, K., Sato, S., Toyoda, R., Wada, H., Shibahara, S., et al. (2003). Cloning and functional analysis of ascidian Mitf in vivo: insights into the origin of vertebrate pigment cells. *Mech. Dev.* 120. doi:10.1016/j.mod.2003.08.009.
- Yamamoto, H., Kon, T., Omori, Y., and Furukawa, T. (2020). Functional and Evolutionary Diversification of *Otx2* and *Crx* in Vertebrate Retinal Photoreceptor and Bipolar Cell
 Development. *Cell Rep.* 30, 658-671.e5. doi:10.1016/J.CELREP.2019.12.072.
- Yamamoto, Y., Byerly, M. S., Jackman, W. R., and Jeffery, W. R. (2009). Pleiotropic functions of embryonic sonic hedgehog expression link jaw and taste bud amplification with eye loss during cavefish evolution. *Dev. Biol.* 330. doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2009.03.003.
- 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. PMID: 9740021
- Yang, X. J. (2004). Roles of cell-extrinsic growth factors in vertebrate eye pattern formation and retinogenesis. *Semin. Cell Dev. Biol.* 15, 91–103. doi:10.1016/J.SEMCDB.2003.09.004.
- Yokoyama, S. (2000). Molecular evolution of vertebrate visual pigments. *Prog. Retin. Eye Res.* 19, 385–419. doi:10.1016/S1350-9462(00)00002-1.
- York, J. R., Yuan, T., and McCauley, D. W. (2020). Evolutionary and Developmental Associations of Neural Crest and Placodes in the Vertebrate Head: Insights From Jawless Vertebrates. *Front. Physiol.* 11. doi:10.3389/fphys.2020.00986.

- Yoshizawa, M., Yamamoto, Y., O'Quin, K. E., and Jeffery, W. R. (2012). Evolution of an adaptive behavior and its sensory receptors promotes eye regression in blind cavefish. *BMC Biol.* 10. doi:10.1186/1741-7007-10-108.
- Yu, C. Q., Schwab, I. R., and Dubielzig, R. R. (2009). Feeding the vertebrate retina from the Cambrian to the Tertiary. J. Zool. 278, 259-269. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2009.00580.x.
- Yu, J.-K. S. (2010). The evolutionary origin of the vertebrate neural crest and its developmental gene regulatory network – insights from amphioxus. *Zoology*. 113. doi:10.1016/j.zool.2009.06.001.
- Zhang, G., Pizarro, I. V., Swain, G. P., Kang, S. H., and Selzer, M. E. (2014). Neurogenesis in the lamprey central nervous system following spinal cord transection. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 522, 1316–1332. doi: 10.1002/cne.23485.
- Zintzen, V., Roberts, C. D., Anderson, M. J., Stewart, A. L., Struthers, C. D., and Harvey,
 E. S. (2011). Hagfish predatory behaviour and slime defence mechanism. *Sci. Reports*.
 1, 131(2011). doi:10.1038/srep00131.
- Zuber, M. E., Gestri, G., Viczian, A. S., Barsacchi, G., and Harris, W. A. (2003).
 Specification of the vertebrate eye by a network of eye field transcription factors.
 Development. 130, 5155–5167. doi:10.1242/DEV.00723.
- Zuker, C. S. (1994). On the Evolution of Eyes: Would You Like It Simple or Compound? *Science*. 265, 742-743. doi:10.1126/science.8047881.

Appendix A – Attempted In situ hybridization probes



Supplementary Figure 1. The *Six3 in situ* hybridization probe very weakly labels the inner nuclear layer of the hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*) retina. We interpret the very faint labelling as the *in situ* hybridization conditions for the probe not being optimal. This probe should be re-attempted with different hybridization conditions (e.g., more concentrated probe, different proteinase K digestion times) to determine if and where *Six3* is expressed in the hagfish retina.

Supplementary Table 1. Gene block sequence for the Six3 (plasmid based) riboprobe

| Riboprobe | Length (bp) | Gene Block Sequence 5' to 3' (red text = EcoRI cut site, blue text = XbaI cut site) | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Six3 | 1149 | GAT CGA ATT CCA TGC TCT CCA TCA TCT CCC CCA GCT CGG AGG GTG CTT CGC TTC TTT ATT ACT CTC TCC AAA GCA CAG TGC CAG CGT TCG GAG GCT CCA TGT TTC ACC TGC CCA TCC TAA GCT TCA CGC CGC AGC AGG TGG CCA GCG TCT GTG AGA CGT TGG AGG AGA GTG GCG ATG TGG AGC GAC TTG GTC GTT TCC TCT GGT CAT TGC CTG TGG CTC CTG GTG CTT GGG AGG CCC TCA ACA AAC ATG AGT CTG TGC TAC GTG CAC GTG CAG TTG TAG CCT TTC ATG CGG GTA ACT TCC GTG ACC TTT ACC ACA TCC TGG AGA ACC ATA AGT TCA CCA AAG AGT CTC ACG GGA AGT TAC AAG CCA TGT GGC TCG AAG CAC ATT ATC AAG AAG CTG AGA AAC TGC GTG GAC GCC CAC TCG GAC CTG TTG ACA AGT ACC GGG TCC GCA AGA AGT TCC CGT TGC CCA AGA CAA TTT GGG ATG GTG AGC AGA AGA CTC ACT GCT TTA AGG AGC GAA CGC GAA ACC TGC TTC GTG AGT GGT ACC TTC AGG ATC CAT ACC CAA ATC CAT GC TTA AGG AGC GCA CAT TG CAC AGG CCA CAG GCC TGA CCC CGA CTC AAG TTG CAC AGA AGA CTC ACT GCT TTA AGG AGC GGA ACC TGC CAC AGG CCA AGA CAA TTT GGG ATG GTG AGC AGA AGA CTC ACT GCA TAC AGG CGC AAC TTG CAT ACC CAA ATC CAT CGA AGA AGC GCG AAC TTG CAT ACC CAA ATC CAT CGA AGA AGC GCG AGC CGT CC AGG CCA CAG GCC TGA CCC CGA CTC AAG TTG GAA ACT GGT TCA AGA ACC GCA GGC AGC AGC AGC CGC TCG CGC TGT GCC CGT CGG AGC CGC CGC TCG AGG CCT GCA CGG CAA AAA ACA GGC TCC AGC AGC CGC TGG CAG CAG CAA AAA ACA GGC TCC AGC AGC CGC TGG CCG TGT GCC CGT CGG AGC CGC GCG TCC AGG CCT GCA CGG CGC GGC CTT ACG ACT CCA AGC ATC GGG CCT GA GCG AGT CTC CGA CTT CAA GCC TGA GCG ATC GGC CCG GGA TAA GCG CCT GCA CGG TCC AGG CCT GA GCG AGT CTC CGA CCT GCA CGG TGG CCA GTC CAG GTG CAG GAA GCC TTT CAA GCC TGA GCG ATC GGC CCG GGA TAA GCG CCT GCA CGG ACT TCT AGA GAT C | | | | | |

| Probe | Forward Primer (5' to 3') | Reverse Primer + T7 Polymerase Site (underlined) (5' to 3') | Amplicon Size (bp) |
|-------|-------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| OtxD* | GTC TTG TCC TGC GTT TTC CC | TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GGT TCA GCT TCC AAG AGG AGC C | 898 |

Supplementary Table 2. Primer sequences used to generate the OtxD (PCR based) riboprobe

*This probe was created, but optimization of the *in situ* hybridization was not completed due to

time constraints.

Appendix B - Gene Accession Numbers

| Supprementally Table 5. Recession Ramoers for tex nonotogs (protein sequences |
|---|
|---|

| Organism | Accession Number |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Mouse (Mus musculus) | NP_038463.2 |
| Frog (Xenopus tropicalis) | XP_002936715.1 |
| Spotted gar (Lepisosteus oculatus) | XP_006627202.2 |
| Coelacanth (Latimeria chalumnae) | XP_006005850.1 |
| Elephant shark (Callorhinchus milii) | XP_007901317.1 |
| Hagfish (Eptatretus burgeri) | ENSEBUP00000010652.1 |

| Organism | Six3 | Six6 |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Mouse (Mus musculus) | XP_017172856.1 | NP_035514.1 |
| Frog (Xenopus tropicalis) | XP_002944388.2 | NP_001093696.1 |
| Spotted gar (Lepisosteus | XP_006638703.1 | XP_015206118.1 |
| oculatus) | | |
| Coelacanth (Latimeria | XP_005998848.1 | XP_005986483.1 |
| chalumnae) | | |
| Elephant shark | XP_042189390.1 | XP_007902021.1 |
| (Callorhinchus milii) | | |
| Lamprey (Petromyzon | XP_032803937.1 (Six3-like ^a) | XP_032818834.1 (Six6-like ^c) |
| marinus)* | XP_032820798.1 (Six3-like ^b) | XP_032819592.1 (Six6-like ^d) |
| Hagfish (Eptatretus | ENSEBUP00000020951.1 | N/A |
| burgeri)* | (Six3-like ^e) | |
| | ENSEBUP0000002483.1 | |
| | (Six3-like ^f) | |
| | ENSEBUP00000017317.1 | |
| | (Six3-like ^g) | |

Supplementary Table 4. Accession Numbers for Six3/6 homologs (protein sequences)

* Both hagfish and lamprey had multiple Six3/6 paralogs, but these paralogs could not be assigned to a Six3 or Six6 identity (the paralogs have been classified here based on tBLASTn search results, but further work is needed to confirm sequence identity). The cyclostome Six3/6 sequences are labeled a-g as per Figure 2-5 and Table 2-5.

Supplementary Table 5. Accession Numbers for Otx homologs (transcript (red) and protein

(blue) sequences)

| Organism | OtxA | OtxB | OtxC | OtxD | Otx1 | Otx2 | Otx5/Crx |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Mouse (Mus musculus) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | ENSMUS T0000000 6071.14 | ENSMUS T0000011 9070.8 | ENSMUS T0000017 4318.8 |
| | | | | | ENSMUS P0000000 6071.8 | ENSMUS P0000011 2532.2 | ENSMUS P0000013 4400.3 |
| Western clawed frog (Xenopus tropicalis) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | ENSXET T0000009 9908.2 ENSXET | ENSXET T0000003 4219.5 ENSXET | ENSXET T0000004 0682.5 ENSXET |
| | | | | | P0000009 8844.2 | P0000003 4219.4 | P0000004 0682.4 |
| Spotted gar (Lepisosteus oculatus) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | ENSLOC T0000001 9837.1 | ENSLOC T0000001 3768.1 | ENSLOC T0000001 7490.1 |
| | | | | | ENSLOC P0000001 9804.1 | ENSLOC P0000001 3739.1 | ENSLOC P0000001 7459.1 |
| Coelacanth (<i>Latimeria</i> <i>chalumnae</i>) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | ENSLAC T0000001 9719.1 | ENSLAC T0000002 1735.1 | ENSLAC T0000001 4227.1 |
| | | | | | ENSLAC P0000001 9581.1 | ENSLAC P0000002 1594.1 | ENSLAC P0000001 4128.1 |
| Elephant shark (<i>Callorhinch</i> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | XM_0423 33478.1 | XM_0423 38324.1 | XM_0423 45401.1 |
| us milii), | | | | | XP_04218 9412.1 | XP_04219 4258.1 | XP_04220 1335.1 |
| Sea lamprey (<i>Petromyzon</i> <i>marinus</i>) | XM_0329 56047.1 | XM_0329 64131.1 | XM_0329 48424.1 | XM_0329 62818.1 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | XP_03281 1938.1 | XP_03282 0022.1 | XP_03280 4315.1 | XP_03281 8709.1 | | | |

| Inshore | ENSEBU | ENSEBU | ENSEBU | ENSEBU | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|-------------|----------|----------|---------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|
| hagfish | T0000000 | T0000001 | T0000000 | T000002 | | | |
| (Eptatretus | 4000.1 | 3972.1 | 3049.1 | 7855.1 | | | |
| burgeri) | | | | | | | |
| | ENSEBU | ENSEBU | ENSEBU | ENSEBU | | | |
| | P0000000 | P0000001 | P0000000 | P000002 | | | |
| | 3621.1 | 3396.1 | 2692.1 | 7279.1 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Appendix C - Protein Alignments for Figure 2-7 Otx phylogenetic tree

Supplementary Figure 2. Protein alignment for 36 *Otx* sequences (used to construct the phylogenetic tree in Figure 2-7). Protein alignment completed in Geneious Prime (Geneious Prime, v. 2022.0.1, Biomatters Ltd) using Geneious alignment. Figure created using WebLogo3 (Crooks et al., 2004) <u>https://weblogo.threeplusone.com</u>.