# PNAS www.pnas.org

# **Supplementary Information for**

# **Transcriptional Network Orchestrating Regional Patterning of Cortical Progenitors**

Athéna R Ypsilanti<sup>1</sup>, Kartik Pattabiraman<sup>1</sup>, Rinaldo Catta-Preta<sup>6</sup>, Olga Golonzhka<sup>1</sup>, Susan Lindtner<sup>1</sup>, Ke Tang<sup>7</sup>, Ian R Jones<sup>3</sup>, Armen Abnousi<sup>2</sup>, Ivan Juric<sup>2</sup>, Ming Hu<sup>2</sup>, Yin Shen<sup>3</sup>, Diane E Dickel<sup>8</sup>, Axel Visel<sup>8,9,10</sup>, Len A Pennacchio<sup>8,9,11</sup>, Michael Hawrylycz<sup>4</sup>, Carol L Thompson<sup>4</sup>, Hongkui Zeng<sup>4</sup>, Iros Barozzi<sup>5</sup>, Alex S Nord<sup>6</sup>, John L Rubenstein<sup>1</sup>.

**<sup>1</sup>** Nina Ireland Laboratory of Developmental Neurobiology, Department of Psychiatry, UCSF Weill Institute for Neurosciences, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94158 USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Quantitative Health Sciences, Lerner Research Institute, Cleveland Clinic Foundation, Cleveland, OH 44195, USA

<sup>3</sup> Institute for Human Genetics and Department of Neurology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA.

<sup>4</sup> Allen Institute for Brain Science, Seattle, WA 98109, USA.

<sup>5</sup> Faculty of Medicine, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College, London, UK

<sup>6</sup> Department of Neurobiology, Physiology and Behavior, and Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA 95618, USA

<sup>7</sup> Precise Genome Engineering Center, School of Life Sciences, Guangzhou University, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510006, China

<sup>8</sup> Environmental Genomics and Systems Biology Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Department of Energy Joint Genome Institute, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>10</sup> School of Natural Sciences, University of California, Merced, CA 95343, USA

<sup>11</sup> Comparative Biochemistry Program, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

\* John L Rubenstein. **Email:** John.Rubenstein@ucsf.edu

# **This PDF file includes:**

Supplementary text Figures S1 to S7 Tables S1 Legends for Datasets S1 to S7 SI References

# **SUPPLEMENTARY TEXT**

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

# **Mice and genotyping**

All procedures and animal care were approved and performed in accordance with National Institutes of Health and the University of California San Francisco Laboratoy Animal Research Center (LARC) guidelines. Mice strains that were used have been previously reported: *Pax6Sey/Sey* (1), *Emx2-/-* (2), *NR2F1<sup>-/-</sup>* (3), *Emx1::Cre; NR2F1<sup>-/-</sup>; NR2F2<sup>fl/fl</sup>* (4, 5) and *Npas3<sup>-/-</sup>* (6). All mice were genotyped as previously reported.

# **Method Details**

# **Cortical expression analysis**

The Developing Mouse Brain database of the Allen Brain Institute has generated *in situ hybridization* catalogs for hundreds of proteins in the mouse embryonic and postnatal brain. Three separate investigators annotated expression patterns of the TFs in the cortex at E11.5 by annotating both the density and the intensity of the *ISH* staining in the ventricular zone and the subventricular zone/mantle zone of the lateral ventral pallium (LVP), rostral dorsal pallium (RDP), caudal dorsal pallium (CDP) and medium pallium (MP). These annotations were then computationally mined to identify novel gradient patterns and/or regional expression.

# **Histology**

Brains were fixed, cryopreserved and embedded as previously described (7). After cryostat-sectioning, brain sections were stained as described (8). In situ hybridization was performed as previously described (7). For details on how probes were generated, see ABA website.

# **Emx2 antibody production**

A guinea-pig Emx2 antibody was generated by Genscript. It was raised against a peptide of the Nterminus of mouse Emx2 (aa 1-155) which specifically excluded the homeodomain of Emx2.

# **TF Chromatin Immunoprecipitation (ChIP)**

Dissected cortices from embryos from multiple litters were dissociated and crosslinked at room temperature for 10 min in 1% formaldehyde (EMX2, LHX2) or 20 minutes in 1.5% formaldehyde (NR2F1, PAX6, PBX1) before being quenched for 5 mins in glycine (2.5mM) and washed gently with 1xPBS. Nuclei were extracted by Ivsing the fixed cells in a hypotonic buffer (50 mM Tris pH 7.5 / 0.5% NP40 / 0.25% Sodium Deoxycholate / 0.1% SDS / 150 mM NaCl). The crosslinked chromatin was sheared in dilution buffer (0.01% SDS, 1.1% Triton X- 100, 1.2mM EDTA, 16.7mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.1, 167mM NaCl) using a bioruptor (Diagenode) for either 18 rounds (for samples fixed in 1% PFA) or 40 rounds (1.5% PFA) (1 round = 30 s on/45 min off at high intensity) and incubated at 4°C overnight with 5 mg of antibody or either 20× blocking peptide or a control IgG which were used as negative controls as appropriate. Protein/antibody complexes were collected using Dynabeads (20 μL protein A + 20 μL protein G) before being washed in three wash buffers: low salt wash buffer (0.1% SDS, 1% Triton X-100, 2mM EDTA, 20mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.1, 150mM NaCl), high salt wash buffer (0.1% SDS, 1% Triton X-100, 2mM EDTA, 20mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.1, 500mM NaCl); and LiCl wash buffer (0.25M LiCl, 1% IGEPAL CA630, 1% deoxycholic acid (sodium salt), 1mM EDTA, 10mM Tris, pH 8.1and TE). Chromatin was eluted in Elution buffer (1%SDS, 10mM Codium bicarbonate buffer) at 65<sup>o</sup>C for 10 min. Eluted chromatin was reverse crosslinked overnight at  $65^{\circ}$ C with NaCl (500mM), then subsequently treated with RNase (10 µg/ 200 µl reaction, 15 min at 37˙C) and Proteinase K (10 µg/ 200 µl reaction, 60 min at 55˙C). DNA was then cleaned using a ChIP DNA Clean & Concentrator kit (Zymo Research). ChIP experiments were then validated by ChIP-qPCR using a 7900HT Fast Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems) with SYBR Green qPCR SuperMix (Invitrogen, Cat. No. 11760-100).

ChIP-seq libraries were prepared using the Ovation Ultralow DR Multiplex System (NuGEN). Generated libraries were size selected using Blue Pippin (centered around 300 bp), QC tested on a Bioanalyzer

(Agilent) and sequenced as single-end 50 nucleotide reads on a HiSeq 4000 (Illumina) at the Center for Advanced Technology at UCSF (http://cat.ucsf.edu/).

#### **ChIP-seq Computational Analysis**

Clustering, base calling, and quality metrics were performed using standard Illumina software. Sequencing libraries were analyzed for overall quality and were filtered, and reads were mapped to the mouse genome (mm9) using Burrows-Wheeler Alignment (BWA) (9).

#### **Pairwise Pearson Correlation**

Pearson correlation between aligned read counts of pairs of TFs was determined using DeepTools (10) to show association between TFs and between different TF replicates.

#### **Motif analysis**

*De novo* motif discovery and enrichment was performed using HOMER version 4.9 (11) in the called peaks for each individual TF, using standard parameters, 300 bp up- and downstream of TF peaks. We compared the significant motifs discovered with the JASPAR (25) database. Motif enrichment was determined for all motifs present in the HOMER known motif database with p-value < 10-100. We established the average motif coverage enrichment plot around 300 bp of peaks for each TF using custom R scripts.

#### **Gene Ontology analysis**

Gene Ontology analyses were conducted using the GREAT algorithm.

# **VISTA enhancer annotations**

Relevant VISTA enhancers were annotated by at least two experts in the field. Their region of activity was ascertained on whole-mount embryos and where necessary, using sections. Gradients of activity were only defined when they were clear and when consensus was obtained between at least two observers.

#### **Gradient modelling**

We established the model associating TF binding, enhancer spatial activity gradients, and enhancer regional activity by determining the pairwise correlation of among the different factors. The TF binding combinations and other factors were intersected using custom R scripts, and the correlation matrix and plot with R ggcorrplot package. Only correlations with  $p < 0.01$  was shown. Non-relevant associations were manually removed.

#### **Histone mark ChIP**

We used Cell Trace Yellow Cell Proliferation Kit (ThermoFisher, #C34567) or Cell Trace CFSE Cell Proliferation Kit (ThermoFisher, #C34554) to label the ventricular zone of Pax6 and Emx2 mutants and their control littermates at E12.5. FlashTag labeling was conducted by injecting 0.3 µl of 10 mM of a carboxyfluorescein succinimidyl ester (CellTrace Yellow or Cell Trace CFSE, ThermoFisher) bilaterally into the fourth ventricle of E12.5 embryos (12). Gentle manual pressure was then applied to the exterior of the embryonic head to promote even mixing of the dyes. After 20 minutes, the cortices were then dissected and papain-treated (Papain dissociation system, Worthington Biochemical Corporation) for 15- 30 minutes at 37°C with rotation. After inhibiting the papain, dissociated cortical cells were resuspended in 4% FBS/1x-PBS and the singlet FTag-positive population was sorted using the BD FACS Aria III Cell Sorter at Helen Diller Cancer Building (UCSF). Approximately 200,000 cells were used for native ChIP as described in (13). Wild-type cells and mutant littermates were always injected, sorted and processed side by side using the same number of nuclei. Basically, nuclei were extracted from the sorted cells and digested for 8 mins with micrococcal nuclease (MNase, Sigma). Mono and di-nucleosomes were combined and used for ChIP of two epigenomic marks: H3 acetylated lysine 27 (H3K27ac, Abcam, ab472) and H3 trimethyl lysine-27 (H3K27me3, Active motif, 39157). After immunoprecipatation, DNA and libraries were prepared as for TF ChIP as described above.

# **ATAC-seq**

ATAC-seq was performed on around 80,000 sorted nuclei. Basically, we fluorescently labeled the VZ of wild-type and mutant littermates using the FlashTag procedure as indicated above. After making nuclei,

the pellet was resuspended in 25uL of Tagment DNA buffer and 2uL of enzyme (Tagment DNA Enzyme, Nextera DNA Library Prep Kit, 15028211, Illumina). Tagmentation was performed at 37°C for 30 mins without shaking. Samples were then purified using MinElute columns (Qiagen), PCR-amplified for 8-10 cycles using the NEB Next High Fidelity 2x PCR Master Mix (NEB, 72 °C 5 min, 98 °C 30 s, (98 °C 10 s, 63 °C 30 s, 72 °C 60 s) per cycle, held at 72 °C). The generated amplified libraries were purified on Ampure XP Bead (Beckmann Coulter) and bioanalyzed. Sequencing was carried out on a HiSeq4000 (50 bp PE, Illumina).

# **PLAC-seq**

PLAC-seq libraries for E12.5 cortex were prepared similar to the previously published protocol (14). 3 to 7 million cells were used for each library. If the cells appeared aggregated, they were dissociated with gentle MACS dissociator or dounce homogenizer. Each PLAC-seq library was prepared using DpnII as the restriction enzyme and Dynabeads M-280 sheep anti-rabbit IgG (Invitrogen #11203D) mixed with 5ug of H3K4me3 (04-745, Millipore) for the chromatin immunoprecipitation step. Finally, libraries were prepared with the Illumina Tru-seq adaptors and the final libraries were sent for paired-end sequencing on the HiSeq X Ten (150 bp reads).

# **PLAC-seq data analysis using the MAPS pipeline**

We applied the MAPS pipeline (15) to detect statistically significant H3K4me3-centric long-range chromatin interactions from PLAC-seq data. We only analyzed intra-chromosomal interactions for autosomal chromosomes, and identified chromatin interactions at 10Kb bin resolution between 20Kb and 1Mb. We first mapped the raw paired-end reads (i.e. fastq file) to the mm10 reference genome using bwa mem. Next, we applied filtering steps to remove PCR duplicates, low quality reads (MAPQ <= 30) and chimeric reads (15). We then split the remaining mapped reads into short-range (distance between pair ends within 1Kb) and long-range reads (distance between pair ends between 1Kb and 1Mb). We used the short-range and long-range reads to measure protein immunoprecipitation (IP) efficiency and detect longrange chromatin interactions, respectively. In addition, we collected ChIP-seq peaks called by MACS2 from cortical cells. Among all 10Kb bin pairs, we only examined those 10Kb bin pairs in which at least one 10Kb bin overlapped with MACS2 ChIP-seq peaks, since these 10Kb bin pairs are enriched by H3K4me3 antibody during the PLAC-seq experiment (16). We fitted a positive Poisson regression model on all selected 10Kb bin pairs with more than one raw count, taking into consideration multiple bias factors including 1D genomic distance between two interacting bins, restriction enzyme cut site frequency, GC content, mappability score, and H3K4me3 antibody IP efficiency measured by the number of short-range reads in each bin. After modeling fitting, we obtained expected contact frequency, p-value and false discovery rate (FDR) for each 10Kb bin pairs. Finally, we defined a 10Kb bin pair as a statistically significant long-range chromatin interaction if the raw contact frequency >= 12, normalized contact frequency (defined as observed contact frequency/expected contact frequency) >= 2, and FDR < 0.01. We further merged adjacent significant chromatin interactions together, and defined those isolated significant chromatin interactions as singletons. We applied a more stringent FDR threshold (FDR < 0.0001) among those singletons to reduce potential false positives.

# **Enhancer-Gene maps (definitions and annotation strategy).**

Associations were previously defined by correlation between the H3K27ac profile of putative enhancers and the total-RNA profile of annotated genes across embryonic development. Two different maps were used, based on a dataset of 29 (17) or 66 (18) samples representing time-courses considering up to 12 tissues and 7 time points. Given a list of genomic regions, a custom C++ script was used to annotate each one of these regions to the overlapping putative enhancers in these two maps (if any) and to associate them to the computationally inferred target gene.

# **Validated enhancers from the VISTA Enhancer Browser (derivation and annotation strategy)**

Human and murine validated elements available on August 25, 2017 on the VISTA enhancer browser (http://enhancer.lbl.gov) (19). Human regions (hg19) were lifted to the mouse genome (mm10) using liftOver (20). This was run with default parameters except for *minmatch* that was set to 0.1 for mouse to human conversions and to 0.95 for mapping between mm9 and mm10. After that, the same script and strategy outlined in the previous paragraph were used to annotated a given list of genomic intervals to the regions in VISTA.

# **PLAC-seq data annotation**

Using the same script and strategy outlined in the previous paragraphs, each end of the interaction was annotated to any overlapping: (1) VISTA element; (2) the putative target gene, as inferred separately from the two maps described in the previous paragraph; (3) TF-binding events, as inferred by ChIP-seq; in case of multiple overlapping peaks, the region was assigned the peaks with the highest enrichment score; (4) the closest gene on the linear genome, using the TSS of RefSeq genes as landmark. Coordinates of RefSeq genes were downloaded from the UCSC genome browser (19) on May 30, 2015. Merging of the resulting annotations was performed using the statistical computing environment R v3 (http://www.rproject.org).

# **Defining the interactome for loci in the Cortical Regionalization TF Network**

We defined genomic loci based on the farthest PLAC-seq interaction between promoters and pREs for each loci. In cases in which this chromatin binding domain was restricted to only one side (upstream or downstream) of the gene body (i.e. *Bcl11a* or *Dmrt3*, Figure S5), we added a 100kb buffer on the other side of the TSS or 5'UTR.

# **Transgenic enhancer assays**

Transgenic assays were performed according to published methods (21, 22) and the VISTA enhancer browser can be consulted here: https://enhancer.lbl.gov. A summary of the methodology can be found in Lindtner et al, 2019 (23).

# **Contact for Reagent and Resource Sharing**

Further information and requests for resources should be directed to and will be addressed by the Lead Contacts, John L. R. Rubenstein (John.Rubenstein@ucsf.edu) and Alex S. Nord (asnord@ucdavis.edu).

# **Table S1: Key Resources Table**









# **Figure S1. Genetic circuitry controlling the patterning of the rostral latero-ventral pallium (LVP)** (A) Schematic of transcriptional control of rostral LVP development.

(B) Depiction of the rostral LVP at E16.5. Piriform cortex (*Lmo3+* and *Npas3+*) is pink. Endopiriform cortex and claustrum (*Nurr1+*) are blue. Subplate is green.

(C) Table of regulatory elements (pREs) around the *Nr2f1, Npas3* and *Lmo3* loci, that may participate in rostral LVP patterning Shown are NR2F1 and PAX6 ChIP-seq peaks, differential epigenomic peaks in the *Nr2f1-/- and Pax6-/-* and pRE/TSS interactions (see Figures 4, 6, 7).



 $< 10$   $< 33$   $< 66$   $< 100$ 

# **Figure S2. Characterization of EMX2, LHX2, NR2F1, PAX6, and PBX1 combinatorial binding**

(A) ISH cortical expression gradients of TFs used for ChIP at E11.5. *Lhx2* has a caudorostral (CR) gradient. *Emx2 has a CR and dorsoventral (DV) gradient. Nr2f1* has a CR and ventrodorsal (VD) gradient. *Pax6* and *Pbx1* have a rostrocaudal (RC) and VD gradient.

(B) ChIP-qPCR on *Emx2+/+* (blue bars) and *Emx2-/-* (red bars) cortices at E15.5 shows significantly decreased enrichment of binding at genomic targets (enhancers around *Nfib*, *Dmrt3* and *Sp8*) in *Emx2-/-* .

(C) Proximal (near promoter) vs. Distal binding for each TF ChIP-seq

(D) Heatmap showing pairwise Pearson Correlation for genome-wide coverage values for each TF ChIPseq replicate.

(E) Enrichment of functional annotation terms (GO) for genomic loci showing combinatorial binding of 5 TFs by ChIP-seq.

(F) Relative motif enrichment for primary binding DNA motifs of EMX2, LHX2, NR2F1, PAX6 and PBX1 ChIP-seq across all pREs.

(G) Motif enrichment of all *de novo* motifs in pREs of the TF ChIPs.

(H) Counts of distance from TSS for loci showing combinatorial binding of 5TFs by ChIP-seq.

(I) Non-TF genes important in cortical development showing co-binding of 5TFs by ChIP-seq. Light green are genes with known functions during cortical development; Dark green are chromatin modifiers; Orange are TFs with expression in other brain regions.

(J) Analysis showing percentage of peaks with motif enrichment of primary binding motifs (described in Figure 4C) for each unique or combinatorial binding of TFs by ChIP-seq. Abbreviations: Hbox: homeobox.



Ventral

#### **Figure S3. Using VISTA enhancers to model how combinatorial binding of EMX2, LHX2, NR2F1, PAX6, and PBX1 predicts cortical activity and graded expression in the developing pallial VZ.**

(A) Plot showing how likely VISTA enhancer loci bound by the TFs are forebrain-active as opposed to active in other brain regions and elsewhere (heart as a surrogate). Main plot shows the frequency of occurrence, while the upper one depicts the comparison of mean number of enhancers hit by sampling, showing significant difference among different enhancer classes (p < 0.01).

(B) Examples of cortical VISTA enhancers with graded patterns of activity. The wholemounts and sections for each example are placed along the central grid according to their annotated gradient of activity in the developing pallium. hs1035 has a DV and RC gradient; hs798 has a DV and CR gradient; hs636 has a RC and VD gradient; and finally, hs1172 has a CR and VD gradient.

(C) Correlalogram showing the expansion of the modeling presented in Figure 4D showing the different combinations of TF binding and their predictions of gradients of activity (p < 0.01)



# **Figure S4. Epigenomic profiling of CRTFN genes (Cortical Regionalization TF Network) in the cortical VZ.**

(A) Histology of Flash-Tag staining of the cortical VZ at E12.5; note that the Flash-Tag labeled VZ cells do not overlap with TBR2 immunostained SVZ progenitors.

(B) Example FACs plots showing data for Flash-Tag (CFSE) positive progenitor cells prepared from the E12.5 cortex. The histogram of FITC counts shows a bi-modal FITC negative population (VZ-) and a FITC positive population  $(VZ^+)$ . The dot plot depicting FSC vs. FITC shows the gating which was used to collect the FITC<sup>+</sup> (VZ<sup>+</sup>) population. Black bar above VZ<sup>+</sup> correspond to the cells collected for further analysis.

(C) Overview of epigenomic enrichment in pREs with differential combinatorial TF binding (0-5 TFs) for CRTFN TF gene loci. Number of pREs at each locus are in brackets (n=#pREs). Percentage of total pREs are indicated by a teal histogram bar. Percentage of pREs with the following epigenetic marks are indicated by the following colors: ATAC = yellow; H3K27ac = dark green; H3K27me3 = red. See Figure S4A which summarizes this data for each TF locus.





Ratio of H3K27ac/H3K27me3



★ Ventral-Dorsal<br>← Dorsal-Ventral<br>O Medial Pallium

# **Figure S5. Epigenomic profiling of the cortical VZ shows a diminished H3K27ac/H3K27me3 ratio over pREs for MP TFs**

(A) Table showing percentage enrichment of TF binding and epigenomic marks of pREs at each locus of the Cortical Regionalization TF Network. A H3K27ac/H3K27me3 ratio is calculated for each locus.

(B) Statistical analysis shows that the H3K27ac/H3K27me3 ratio is significantly lower for pREs in genomic loci of TFs with MP expression (red) compared to pREs for the non-MP TFs (purple) (p<0.05, unpaired two-tailed t-test).

(C) Plot of genomic features (TF binding, Epigenomic marks, H3K27ac, H3K27me3, ATAC) over VISTA enhancers that have pallial (dark green), subpallial (light green), non-telencephalic (yellow) and no activity (red) at E11.5.

Arx



















Dmrt5



Ruler<br>chr4<br>refGene п  $109400K$  $\frac{1}{109700K}$  $\frac{1}{109500K}$  $109300K$ 109200K 109600K \*\*\*Rnf11<br>\*\*\***\*\*\*\***4#4930522H14Rik Cdkn2c<sup>\*\*</sup><br>Cdkn2c<sup>\*\*</sup><br>Faf1<sup>\*\*</sup>  $Dmrta2$  $\frac{a}{a}$ \*\*\* 414930522H14Rik



 $10k$ 



 $rac{1}{5k}$ 

 $10k$ 



























f I









































hs1320





Pax<sub>6</sub>





Pbx1

























Rule





















# **Figure S6. CRTFN transcriptional network in** *Emx2-/- , Nr2f1-/-* **and** *Pax6-/-*

For each of the 38 TFs in the CRTFN, we show:

- ISH of TF gene in wild-type and mutant mice at E11.5.

- pallial VISTA enhancer wholemount (and sections if available) showing activity in the cortex at E11.5.

- Table with a comprehensive list of pREs that shows differential regulation in *Pax6-/-* , *Emx2-/-* and *Nr2f1-/* around the interactome of the relevant TF. Each pRE in this table is highlighted by a yellow column in the genome tracks below. The highlighted columns have orange numbers matched to the row number in this table.

- TF's genomic loci showing:

- 1. RefSeq genes around the TF gene (highlighted in purple).
- 2. Genomic position of VISTA enhancers with cortical activity (Green), activity in other regions (Blue) or no activity (Red) at E11.5.
- 3. Computationally derived enhancer-gene associations based on correlation between the putative enhancer activity (using Encode data: Comp\_Encode or data generate here: Comp MO) and the expression level of the genes residing in the same topologicallyassociating domain.
- 4. TF ChIP binding for EMX2, LHX2, NR2F1, PAX6 and PBX1; replicates are shown.
- 5. Epigenomic marks in VZ of Wild-Type (Shaded in white) and *Pax6-/-* , *Emx2-/-* and *Nr2f1-/* littermates (shaded in grey). For each experiment, H3K27ac tracks are in blue, H3K27me3 tracks are in purple, and ATAC-seq tracks are in red. Replicates are shown.
- 6. pRE-promoter interactions derived from PLAC-seq are shown by arcs (magenta) using two statistical stringencies (5k and 10k).

pREs with differential epigenomic marks in any one mutant are highlighted in yellow columns. These columns are labelled by orange numbers that correspond to the rows in the table above.



#pREs for CRTFN

# **Figure S7.**

Bar plot showing proportion of pREs for CRTFN genomic loci that are sensitive (light green) or insensitive (dark green) to the effects of *Pax6-/-* , *Emx2-/-* and *Nr2f1-/-* .

# **DATASETS**

**DATASET S1**: Annotation of TF expression in pallium at E11.5. Expression levels were assessed on a scale of 0-5 for density (D) and intensity (I) of ISH staining in subregions of the pallium: LVP, RDP, CDP, MP. When possible, VZ/SVZ and Mantle zone expression were assessed (blank means levels of staining in these regions could not be assessed).

**DATASET S2**: Genomic coordinates of CRTFN pRES annotated for TF ChIP-seq peaks (EMX2, LHX2, NR2F1, PAX6 and PBX1), histone ChIP-seq peaks (H3K27ac, H3K27me3) and ATAC-seq peaks. Each row is a pRE. Column A is the TF gene and column B-D is the interactome of a given TF gene. Column H is the size of the pRE. Numbers in column I are the number of TFs co-bound to a given pRE. Numbers in columns (J-Q) indicates how many replicates have a peak. Number of replicates for each ChIPseq/ATAC-seq is indicated in parenthesis in the title of column. Column R annotates the presence of a VISTA enhancer.

**DATASET S3**: Classification of CRTFN VISTA enhancers as Pallial, Subpallial, Non-telencephalic and Inactive at E11.5. Table shows VISTA enhancer name, genomic coordinates, region of activity and VISTA annotation of other regions of activity, TF and histone ChIP-seq peaks. Table includes: enhancer name, genomic coordinates, size of enhancer, relevant region of activity of enhancer (P for Pallial, SP for Subpallial, N for Non-telencephalic and I for Inactive), other regions of activity of enhancer, TF ChIP-seq, WT histone marks (H3K27ac and H3K27me3) and ATAC-seq peaks. In rows, x indicates presence of that particular feature.

**DATASET S4:** Classification of gradients of activity in CRTFN VISTA enhancers. Table shows VISTA enhancer name, genomic coordinates, flanking genes, cortical gradient of activity (RC = rostrocaudal, CR = caudorostral, DV = dorsoventral, VD = ventrodorsal) and a detailed analysis of their subregional cortical expression of activity when sections were available (columns J-R). Number 1 in column indicates presence of that particular feature.

**DATASET S5:** PLAC-seq and computational pREs-promoter interactions in the interactome of CRTFN genes. Tab 1 maps the interactions derived from PLAC-seq in CRTFN interactomes using a 5k stringency. Computationally derived enhancer-gene associations are also indicated. This computational analysis is based on correlation between the putative enhancer activity (using Encode data: Comp\_Encode or data generated here: Comp\_MO) and the expression level of the genes residing in the same topologically-associating domain. Tab 2 is the same as Tab 1 with a stringency for PLAC-seq of 10k. Footnotes and abbreviations for Tab 1-2 is in Tab 3.

**DATASET S6:** Coordinates and activity annotations of newly tested VISTA enhancers. Each row is a newly tested VISTA enhancer and includes information about its coordinates, its activity overall, its cortical activity (column F), annotations of other regions of activity, annotations for presence of TF ChIPseq, histone and ATAC ChIP-seq peaks, and pRE-promoter interactions. x and xx indicate presence of peaks in 1 or 2 replicates respectively.

**DATASET S7:** Coordinates and annotations (Gain, Loss, No Change) of pREs that show changes in histone marks and/or chromatin accessibility in *Pax6<sup>-/-</sup>*, *Emx2<sup>-/-</sup>* and *Nr2f1<sup>-/-</sup>. This table shows for each* interactome: coordinates of sensitive pREs (column B); primary DNA binding motifs (column C-G); TF ChIP-Seq (column H-L); Gain, Loss and No Change in Histone marks and ATAC Seq in Pax6, Emx2 and Nr2f1 mutants (Columns M-U); Plac-Seq and computation pRE-promoter binding (Column V-W); Genomic features of a given pRE.

# **SI References:**

- 1. Hill RE, et al. (1991) Mouse small eye results from mutations in a paired-like homeobox-containing gene. *Nature* 354(6354):522–525.
- 2. Pellegrini M, Mansouri A, Simeone A, Boncinelli E, Gruss P (1996) Dentate gyrus formation requires Emx2. *Development* 122(12):3893–3898.
- 3. Zhou C, Tsai SY, Tsai MJ (2001) COUP-TFI: an intrinsic factor for early regionalization of the neocortex. *Genes & Development* 15(16):2054–2059.
- 4. Tang K, Rubenstein JLR, Tsai SY, Tsai M-J (2012) COUP-TFII controls amygdala patterning by regulating neuropilin expression. *Development* 139(9):1630–1639.
- 5. Gorski JA, et al. (2002) Cortical excitatory neurons and glia, but not GABAergic neurons, are produced in the Emx1-expressing lineage. *Journal of Neuroscience* 22(15):6309–6314.
- 6. Erbel-Sieler C, et al. (2004) Behavioral and regulatory abnormalities in mice deficient in the NPAS1 and NPAS3 transcription factors. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 101(37):13648–13653.
- 7. Pattabiraman K, et al. (2014) Transcriptional Regulation of Enhancers Activein Protodomains of the Developing Cerebral Cortex. *Neuron* 82(5):989–1003.
- 8. Zhao Y, et al. (2008) Distinct molecular pathways for development of telencephalic interneuron subtypes revealed through analysis of Lhx6 mutants. *J Comp Neurol* 510(1):79–99.
- 9. Li H, Durbin R (2009) Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. *Bioinformatics* 25(14):1754–60.
- 10. Ramírez F, et al. (2016) deepTools2: a next generation web server for deep-sequencing data analysis. *Nucleic Acids Research* 44(W1):W160–5.
- 11. Heinz S, et al. (2010) Simple combinations of lineage-determining transcription factors prime cisregulatory elements required for macrophage and B cell identities. *Molecular Cell* 38(4):576–589.
- 12. Telley L, et al. (2016) Sequential transcriptional waves direct the differentiation of newborn neurons in the mouse neocortex. *Science* 351(6280):1443–1446.
- 13. Sandberg M, et al. (2016) Transcriptional Networks Controlled by NKX2-1 in the Development of Forebrain GABAergic Neurons. *Neuron* 91(6):1260–1275.
- 14. Fang R, et al. (2016) Mapping of long-range chromatin interactions by proximity ligation-assisted ChIP-seq. *Nature Publishing Group* 26(12):1345–1348.
- 15. Juric I, et al. (2019) MAPS: Model-based analysis of long-range chromatin interactions from PLAC-seq and HiChIP experiments. *PLoS Comput Biol* 15(4):e1006982.
- 16. Zhang Y, et al. (2008) Model-based analysis of ChIP-Seq (MACS). *Genome Biol* 9(9):R137.
- 17. Osterwalder M, et al. (2018) Enhancer redundancy provides phenotypic robustness in mammalian development. *Nature* 554(7691):239–243.
- 18. Gorkin DU, et al. (2020) An atlas of dynamic chromatin landscapes in mouse fetal development. *Nature* 583(7818):744–751.
- 19. Visel A, Minovitsky S, Dubchak I, Pennacchio LA (2007) VISTA Enhancer Browser--a database of tissue-specific human enhancers. *Nucleic Acids Research* 35(Database issue):D88–D92.
- 20. Speir ML, et al. (2016) The UCSC Genome Browser database: 2016 update. *Nucleic Acids Research* 44(D1):D717–D725.
- 21. Kothary R, et al. (1989) Inducible expression of an hsp68-lacZ hybrid gene in transgenic mice. *Development* 105(4):707–714.
- 22. Pennacchio LA, et al. (2006) In vivo enhancer analysis of human conserved non-coding sequences. *Nature* 444(7118):499–502.
- 23. Lindtner S, et al. (2019) Genomic Resolution of DLX-Orchestrated Transcriptional Circuits Driving Development of Forebrain GABAergic Neurons. *CellReports* 28(8):2048–2063.e8.
- 24. Monahan K, et al. (2017) Cooperative interactions enable singular olfactory receptor expression in mouse olfactory neurons. *eLife* 6. doi:10.7554/eLife.28620.
- 25. Fornes O, et al. (2020) JASPAR 2020: update of the open-access database of transcription factor binding profiles. *Nucleic Acids Research* 48(D1):D87–D92.