Diversification of multipotential postmitotic mouse retinal ganglion cell precursors into discrete types

Karthik Shekhar^{1,2,3,4*}, Irene E. Whitney^{4,5}, Salwan Butrus¹, Yi-Rong Peng^{4,6}, and Joshua R. Sanes^{4*}

Author Affiliations:

1. Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering; Helen Wills Neuroscience Institute; Center for Computational Biology; California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences, QB3, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA 94720

2. Biological Systems and Engineering Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA USA 94720

3. Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT, Cambridge, MA 02142, USA

4. Center for Brain Science and Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge MA, 02138

5. Present address: Honeycomb Biotechnologies 940 Winter Street Waltham MA 02451

6. Department of Ophthalmology, Stein Eye Institute, UCLA David Geffen School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

* Correspondence

Karthik Shekhar (kshekhar@berkeley.edu)

Joshua R Sanes (sanesj@mcb.harvard.edu)

Abstract (149 words)

The genesis of broad neuronal classes from multipotential neural progenitor cells has been extensively studied, but less is known about the diversification of a single neuronal class into multiple types. We used single-cell RNA-seq to study how newly-born (postmitotic) mouse retinal ganglion cell (RGC) precursors diversify into ~45 discrete types. Computational analysis provides evidence that RGC transcriptomic type identity is not specified at mitotic exit, but acquired by gradual, asynchronous restriction of postmitotic multipotential precursors. Some types are not identifiable until a week after they are generated. Immature RGCs may be specified to project ipsilaterally or contralaterally to the rest of the brain before their type identity emerges. Optimal transport inference identifies groups of RGC precursors with largely non-overlapping fates, distinguished by selectively expressed transcription factors that could act as fate determinants. Our study provides a framework for investigating the molecular diversification of discrete types within a neuronal class.

Keywords: development, diversification, retina, retinal ganglion cell, single-cell RNA-seq, optimal transport

Introduction

A central question in developmental neurobiology is how the brain's diverse neuronal types arise from multipotential progenitors (Lodato & Arlotta, 2015; McConnell, 1991; Wamsley & Fishell, 2017). The vertebrate retina has been a valuable model for addressing this question: it is about as complicated as any other region of the brain, but has several features that facilitate mechanistic analysis (Dowling, 2012). The retina contains five classes of neurons – photoreceptors that sense light, three interneuronal classes (horizontal, bipolar and amacrine cells) that process visual information, and retinal ganglion cells (RGCs) that pass the information to the rest of the brain through the optic nerve (**Fig. 1a**) (Masland, 2012). These classes can be divided into numerous types, ~130 in mouse and chick, each of which has characteristic morphological, physiological and molecular properties, and plays distinct roles in information processing (Baden et al., 2016; Franke et al., 2017; Goetz et al., 2021; Macosko et al., 2015; Rheaume et al., 2018; Shekhar et al., 2016; Shekhar & Sanes, 2021; Tran et al., 2019; Yamagata, Yan, & Sanes, 2021; Yan et al., 2020). Remarkably, nearly all types are distributed across the entire retina (Kay, Chu, & Sanes, 2012; Keeley, Eglen, & Reese, 2020; Rockhill, Euler, & Masland, 2000), so morphogen gradients, which play a critical role in other parts of the central nervous system (e.g. (Sagner & Briscoe, 2019)), cannot provide an explanation for retinal neuronal diversification (Marquardt & Gruss, 2002).

Seminal studies have provided deep insights into how retinal classes arise (Bassett & Wallace, 2012; Cepko, 2014). First, lineage tracing in rodents and frogs showed that single retinal progenitor cells (RPCs) can give rise to neurons of all classes as well as glia, and are therefore multipotential (Holt, Bertsch, Ellis, & Harris, 1988; Turner & Cepko, 1987; Turner, Snyder, & Cepko, 1990; Wetts & Fraser, 1988). Second, the competence of multipotential RPCs to generate cells of particular classes changes over time, accounting for their sequential (but overlapping) birth windows (Cepko, 2014; Livesey & Cepko, 2001). Such segregation of birth windows is a hallmark of many neuronal systems (Holguera & Desplan, 2018), and is believed to arise from the

differential temporal regulation of gene expression in RPCs (Blackshaw et al., 2004; Brown, Patel, Brzezinski, & Glaser, 2001; S. Chen et al., 1997; Clark et al., 2019; Trimarchi, Stadler, & Cepko, 2008). Third, competence is probabilistic rather than deterministic, with stochastic factors accounting for variations in the distribution of cell classes generated by individual RPCs (Boije, MacDonald, & Harris, 2014; Gomes et al., 2011; Johnston & Desplan, 2010).

In contrast to these well-established tenets of neuronal class generation, we know far less about how immature postmitotic neurons (which we call neuronal precursors here) committed to a specific class identity diversify into distinct types. We address this issue here, focusing on RGCs. All RGCs are similar in many respects: for example, they all elaborate dendrites that receive input from amacrine and bipolar interneurons, send axons through the optic nerve, and use glutamate as a neurotransmitter (Sanes & Masland, 2015). However, they differ in molecular, morphological and physiological details, which have led to their division into ~45 distinct types in mice (Baden et al., 2016; Bae et al., 2018; Goetz et al., 2021; Rheume et al., 2018; Tran et al., 2019). Most of these types appear to be feature detectors that collectively transmit a diverse set of highly processed images of the visual world to the rest of the brain (Baden, Euler, & Berens, 2020; Sanes & Masland, 2015). Several genes have been implicated in maturation of a few mouse RGC types (Clark et al., 2019; Kiyama et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2018; Lo Giudice, Leleu, La Manno, & Fabre, 2019; Lyu & Mu, 2021; Peng et al., 2017; Sajgo et al., 2017), but a comprehensive investigation of RGC diversification has been lacking.

To gain insight into how and when adult RGC types emerge, we used high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq (scRNA-seq) to profile RGC precursors during embryonic and postnatal life in mice. We find that the number and distinctiveness of molecularly defined groups of precursors increases with developmental age, implying that types arise by a gradual process rather than from ~45 committed precursor types. Using statistical inference approaches, we identify fate associations among immature RGCs as transcriptomically distinct types emerge. These analyses suggest a model in which

types arise from multipotential precursors by a process of restriction that we term fate decoupling. The decoupling is gradual and asynchronous, resulting in different types emerging at different times. We also use markers of RGCs that project to contralateral or ipsilateral retinorecipient areas to subdivide each type by its projection pattern, leading to the conclusion that laterality may be specified prior to type identity is fixed. Together, our results provide both a model of RGC diversification and a computational framework that can be applied generally to analyze the diversification of closely related neuronal types within a class.

Results

Transcriptomic atlas of developing mouse RGCs

Mouse RGCs are born between approximately embryonic days (E) 11 and 17 with newborn RGCs exiting the mitotic cycle near the apical margin, then migrating basally to form the ganglion cell layer (Drager, 1985; Marcucci, Soares, & Mason, 2019; Voinescu, Kay, & Sanes, 2009) (**Fig. 1b**). Reported birthdates differ among publications, and are complicated by naturally occurring cell death and the central-peripheral developmental gradient, but a detailed analysis concludes that >95% of RGCs in adult mouse retina are born after E12.8 and >85% before E16 (Farah & Easter, 2005). Shortly after they are born, RGCs extend axons through the optic nerve, with some reaching retinorecipient areas by E15 (Godement, Salaun, & Imbert, 1984; Osterhout et al., 2011) and forming diverse projection patterns (Martersteck et al., 2017). During early postnatal life, they extend dendrites apically into the inner plexiform layer of the retina, receiving synapses from amacrine cells by postnatal day (P)4 and bipolar cells a few days later (Kim, Zhang, Meister, & Sanes, 2010; Lefebvre, Sanes, & Kay, 2015). Light responses are detected in RGCs by P10 but image-forming vision does not begin until eye-opening, around P14 (Hooks & Chen, 2020).

To determine when and how RGCs diversify, we used droplet-based scRNA-seq (Macosko et al., 2015; Zheng et al., 2017) to profile them at 5 stages: E13 and E14 (during the period of peak RGC genesis), E16 (by which time RGCs axons are reaching

target retinorecipient areas), P0 (as dendrite elaboration begins), and P5 (shortly after RGCs begin to receive synapses). As RGCs comprise $\leq 1\%$ of retinal cells (Jeon, Strettoi, & Masland, 1998), we enriched them with antibodies to two RGC-selective cell-surface markers, Thy1/CD90 (Barres, Silverstein, Corey, & Chun, 1988) and L1cam (Demyanenko & Maness, 2003) (**Figure 1-figure supplement 1a**).

We obtained a total of 98,452 single-cell transcriptomes with acceptable quality metrics (**Methods**). Of these, we identified 75,115 (76%) as RGCs based on their expression of canonical RGC markers including *Rbpms* (an RNA-binding protein) and *Slc17a6* (the vesicular glutamate transporter VGLUT2) (**Figs. 1c-e, Figure 1-figure supplement 1b-c**). Non-RGCs included amacrine cells (*Tfap2a+Tfap2b+*), cone photoreceptors (*Otx2+Crx+*), microglia (*P2ry12+C1qa+*), anterior segment cells (*Mgp+Bgn+*), and retinal progenitor cells (RPCs). Anterior segment cells were found only in E13 and E14 samples because whole eyes were dissociated at these stages. RPCs formed a continuum, containing both “primary” RPCs expressing cell-cycle related genes (e.g. *Mki67*, *Ccnd5*, *Birc5*) and previously described RPC regulators (e.g. *Sfrp2*, *Vsx2* and *Fgf15*), and “neurogenic” RPCs expressing proneural transcription factors (e.g. *Hes6*, *Ascl1*, *Neurog2*) (Clark et al., 2019). Importantly, these markers were not expressed in cells annotated as RGCs (**Figure 1-figure supplement 1d**). These stringent criteria ensured that our dataset comprised postmitotic committed RGCs, allowing us to focus on their diversification and maturation.

Overall, we recovered ~5,900 to 18,500 RGCs at each of the five time points. Of the two surface markers used for enriching RGCs, Thy1 was effective at later stages as shown previously (Kay et al., 2011; Rheaume et al., 2018; Tran et al., 2019), whereas L1cam expression was more selective at E13 and E14 (**Figure 1-figure supplement 1b,c**). However, identical clusters were observed with both methods at E13, E14 and E16, albeit with different frequencies. This concordance supports the idea that neither marker fails to capture particular RGC types. To further evaluate the effectiveness of our enrichment strategy at early stages, we compared our data with two recent studies in which developing retinal cells were profiled using scRNA-seq without any enrichment

(Clark et al., 2019; Lo Giudice et al., 2019). A joint analysis of these datasets at embryonic time points showed consistency in the transcriptional signatures of major cell groups without discernible biases (**Figure 1-figure supplement 1e-g**). However, our enrichment protocols increased the fractional yield of RGCs by >3X at E14 and E16 and by >100X at P0 (**Figure 1-figure supplement 1h**), which enabled us to resolve heterogeneity within this class at immature stages. We also compared our P5 data with those from an earlier study in which P5 RGCs were profiled (Rheaume et al., 2018) and found a good correspondence (**Figure 1-figure supplement 1i**). For the analysis that follows, we combined precursor RGCs (E13-P5) to a previously described dataset of 35,699 mature RGCs at P56 (Tran et al., 2019).

Figure 1

Figure 1, Transcriptomic profiling of single postmitotic RGCs during embryonic and postnatal development in mice.

a. Sketch of a section of the mouse retina showing major cell classes - photoreceptors (PRs; rods and cones), horizontal cells (HCs), bipolar cells (BCs), amacrine cells (ACs), Müller glia (MGs) and retinal ganglion cells (RGCs). PRs reside in the outer nuclear layer (ONL), while BCs, HCs and most ACs reside in the inner nuclear layer (INL). RGCs and some ACs reside in the ganglion cell layer (GCL). Axons of RGCs project to higher visual areas via the optic nerve.

b. Retinal section of the indicated ages labeled for the cell-cycle marker *MKI67* (red) and the RGC marker *RBPMS* (green); nuclei are counterstained by the Hoeschst dye (blue). Micrographs are orientated as the schematic in panel a.

c. Visualization of transcriptional diversity of 98,452 cells using Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP), a nonlinear dimensionality reduction algorithm that assigns proximal x-y coordinates to cells (dots) with similar transcriptional profiles (Becht et al., 2019).

d. Same as c, with cells colored by cell class, assigned based on transcriptional signatures displayed in panel e. RPC, retinal progenitor cells; Ant. Seg., anterior segment cells.

e. Tracksplot showing expression patterns of cell-class specific marker genes (rows) across single cells (columns). Cells are grouped by class as in d. For each class, we randomly sampled 20% of total cells covering all immature time points (E13, E14, E16, P0, P5). For each gene, the scale on the y-axis (right) corresponds to normalized, log-transformed transcript counts detected in each cell.

Immature RGCs diversify postmitotically

One can envision two extreme models of RGC diversification. In one, RGC type would be specified at or before mitotic exit, with each type arising from a distinct set of committed precursors. At the other extreme, all precursor RGCs would be identical when they exit mitosis, and gradually acquire distinct identities as they mature (**Fig. 2a**). Intermediate models could involve multiple groups of precursor RGCs, each biased towards a distinct set of terminal types.

To distinguish among these alternatives, we analyzed the transcriptomic diversity of RGCs at each developmental stage using the same dimensionality reduction and graph clustering approaches devised for analysis of adult RGCs (Tran et al., 2019) (see **Methods**). This analysis led to three main results.

First, RGCs were already heterogeneous soon after mitotic exit. There were 10 transcriptionally defined precursor clusters at E13 (**Fig. 2b**), before or at the peak time of RGC birth. The number of discrete clusters increased only slightly by E14 (from 10 to 12; **Fig. 2c**), arguing against a model in which the number of precursor types extrapolated back to one. No single cluster dominated the frequency distribution at either time, as would be expected if a totipotent precursor RGC were to exist shortly after terminal mitosis.

250 *Second*, the number of transcriptionally defined clusters increased gradually, between
251 E13 and adulthood, reaching 45 only after P5 (**Figs. 2b-g**). Several arguments indicate
252 that this increase is biologically significant rather than being an artifact of the data or
253 computational analysis. (1) We used the same clustering procedure at all ages. (2) The
254 qualitative trends were robust against variations in clustering parameters. (3) All
255 embryonic clusters contained cells isolated with both cell markers, L1cam and *Thy1*
256 (**Figure 2-figure supplement 1a-c**), indicating that lower cluster numbers at early
257 stages did not result from biased collection methods. (4) The increase in the number of
258 effective molecular types was robust as demonstrated by three diversity indices - Rao,
259 Simpson and Shannon – all of which buffer against artificial inflation of diversity due to
260 small clusters (**Fig. 2h, Figure 2-figure supplement 1d; see Methods**). (5) There was
261 no systematic dependence of the number of clusters on the number of cells. For
262 example, we identified 12 clusters from 17,100 cells at E14 and 38 clusters from 17,386
263 cells at P5.

264
265 *Third*, the transcriptomic variation became increasingly discrete with age. We quantified
266 this increase in inter-cluster separation by calculating (1) the average cross-validation
267 error of a multi-class classifier, and (2) the ratio of mean cluster diameter to mean inter-
268 cluster distance in the low dimensional embedding (**Methods**). Both metrics decrease in
269 numerical value as the clusters are more-well defined. From these trends, we conclude
270 that the boundaries between RGC clusters become sharper as development proceeds
271 (**Figs. 2i,j**).

272
273 Taken together, our results show that transcriptomic clusters of RGCs increase in
274 number and distinctiveness over time, making it unlikely that RGC type identity is fully
275 specified at the progenitor stage.

Figure 2

Figure 2. The number and discreteness of transcriptomic clusters of RGCs increases with age.

a. Extreme models of RGC diversification. In one scenario (*left*) immature RGCs commit to one of the terminal types by the time of birth (i.e. mitotic exit) or shortly after. Alternatively (*right*), initially identical postmitotic RGC precursors acquire distinct molecular identities in a gradual process of restriction.

b-g. Visualization of transcriptomic diversity of immature RGCs at E13 (b), E14 (c), E16 (d), P0 (e), P5 (f) and P56 (g) using UMAP. Cells are colored by their cluster identity, determined independently using dimensionality reduction and graph clustering (**Methods**). Clusters are numbered based on decreasing size at each age. Data for adults (P56) are replotted from (Tran et al., 2019). In that study 45 transcriptomic types were identified via unsupervised approaches, one of which was mapped to 2 known functional types by supervised approaches. We do not distinguish them in this study.

h. Transcriptional diversity of RGCs as measured by the Rao diversity index (y-axis) increases with age (x-axis). The trend is insensitive to the number of genes used to compute inter-cluster distance (colors). See **Methods** for details underlying the calculation.

i. Transcriptomic distinctions between RGC clusters become sharper with age as shown by decreasing average per-cluster error of a multiclass-classifier with age. Gradient boosted decision trees (T. Chen & Guestrin, 2016) were trained on a subset of the data, and applied on held out samples to determine the test error.

j. RGC clusters also become better separated in the UMAP embedding, as shown by decreasing values of the average relative cluster diameter with age.

Temporal relationships among immature RGC clusters

We next investigated the temporal relationships among precursor RGC clusters identified at different ages. We again consider two extreme models. In a “specified” model, each terminal type arises from a single cluster at every preceding developmental stage (**Fig. 3a, left**). In this model, distinct transcriptomic states among precursor RGCs correspond to distinct groups of fates. At the other extreme, distinct clusters would share similar sets of fates (**Fig. 3a, right**). In an intermediate model, fates of precursor clusters would exhibit partial overlap.

As a first step in discriminating among these scenarios, we used transcriptome-wide correspondence among clusters as a proxy for fate association. We identified mappings between clusters across each pair of consecutive developmental stages (E13-E14, E14-E16, E16-P0, P0-P5, and P5-P56) using gradient boosted trees (T. Chen & Guestrin, 2016), a supervised classification approach (**Methods**). In each case, a classifier trained on transcriptional clusters at the older stage was used to assign older cluster labels to cells at the younger stage (e.g. E16 labels assigned to E14 RGCs). Patterns expected for the extreme models are schematized as “confusion matrices” (Stehman, 1997) in the lower panels of **Fig. 3a**.

Correspondence fell between the two extremes (**Figs. 3d-h and Figure 3-figure supplement 1a-d**). We quantified the extent of correspondence using two metrics:

Normalized Conditional Entropy (NCE) and the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) (**Methods**). Both NCE and ARI are restricted to the range (0,1), with lower values of NCE and higher values of ARI consistent with a specified mode of diversification. Both metrics exhibited an increased degree of specificity with age (**Figs. 3b,c**). Since NCE and ARI provide a single measure of specificity for the entire datasets being compared, we also computed a “local metric”, the Occupancy Fraction, which quantifies mapping specificity for each cluster (**Methods**). Results based on this metric were consistent with increased specificity of correspondence with age (**Figure 3-figure supplement 1e**). Overall, this analysis of transcriptomic correspondence suggests that poorly specified relationships among transcriptomic clusters at early stages are gradually refined to yield increasingly specific associations at later stages.

Figure 3

Figure 3. Incompletely specified temporal relationships among RGC clusters.

a. *Top*: Specified (*left*) and non-specified (*right*) modes of diversification. Nodes denote transcriptomic clusters of immature RGCs, and arrows denote fate relationships. *Bottom*:

Confusion matrices depicting transcriptomic correspondence between late and early clusters expected for the two modes. Circles and colors indicate the percentage of a given late cluster (row) assigned to a corresponding early cluster (column) by transcriptome-based classifier trained on early clusters. The number of late and early clusters have been set to eight and four for illustration purposes.

b. Barplot showing values of the normalized conditional entropy (NCE) for each age calculated using the transcriptional cluster IDs and the Xgboost-assigned cluster IDs corresponding to the next age or to P56 (E.g. for E13, the NCE was calculated across E13 RGCs by comparing their transcriptional cluster ID with assigned E14 cluster IDs based on a classifier trained on the E14 data). Lower values indicate specific mappings.

c. Same as b, but plotting values of the adjusted Rand Index (ARI), where larger values correspond to higher specificity.

d-h. Confusion matrices (representation as in a), showing transcriptomic correspondence between consecutive ages: E14-E13 (d), E16-E14 (e), P0-E16 (f), P5-P0 (g), P56-P5 (h). In each case, the classifier was trained on the late time point and applied to the early time point. Rows sum to 100%.

Immature RGCs are multipotential

The classification analysis presented so far relied on comparing clusters between ages and was therefore unable to link individual precursors to specific terminal fates. At one extreme, individual precursor clusters might contain several groups of cells, each committed to a distinct, small number of fates. Alternatively, individual cells might be as multipotential as the clusters in which they reside (**Fig. 4a**).

Unfortunately, this approach does not afford a straightforward way to explore variations in patterns of fate associations within clusters. We therefore turned to Waddington-Optimal Transport (WOT), a computational method rooted in optimal transport theory (Kantorovich, 1942; Monge, 1781) that utilizes scRNA-seq measurements at multiple stages to infer developmental relationships (Schiebinger et al., 2019). Briefly, WOT computes a “transport matrix” Π between each pair of consecutive ages with elements Π_{ij} encoding fate associations between a single RGC i at the younger age and RGC j at the older age (see **Methods**). WOT directly computes fate associations at the level of individual cells without requiring clustering as a prior step. We conducted extensive computational tests to assess the numerical stability of associations reported by WOT (**Figure 4-figure supplement 1**). We also determined that when collapsed to the level of clusters, the WOT inferred transport maps strikingly mirrored the confusion matrices obtained from multi-class classification (**Figure 4-figure supplement 2**).

Based on the success of these tests, we applied WOT to compute the “terminal fate” for each precursor RGC. We leveraged the fact that in WOT, fate associations between RGCs at non-consecutive ages (e.g. E16 and P56) can be estimated in a principled way by multiplying the intermediate transport matrices. This yielded a fate vector $\vec{f}$ for each of the 75,115 immature RGCs, whose k th element f_k represents the predicted probability of commitment to adult type $k \in (1, 2, \dots, 45)$ (**Methods**). A fully committed precursor would have all but one element of $\vec{f}$ equal to zero, whereas a partially committed precursor would have multiple non-zero elements in $\vec{f}$. Since the elements of $\vec{f}$ are interpreted as probabilities, they are normalized such that $\sum_k f_k = 1$.

We quantified the commitment of each precursor by computing its “potential” $P = \frac{1}{\sum_k f_k^2}$, which is defined analogously to the “inverse participation ratio” in physics (Fyodorov & Mirlin, 1992). In our case, the value of P for a given RGC ranges continuously between 1 and 45, with lower values implying a commitment to specific fates, and higher values reflecting indeterminacy. Importantly, this measure of commitment does not rely on arbitrary thresholding of the f_k values to assign precursors to types.

Five results emerged from this analysis.

- Nearly all prenatal RGCs (i.e. on or before P0) were multipotential rather than committed to a single terminal fate, with individual potentials distributed across a range of values (**Fig. 4b**).
- Multipotentiality was a general feature of immature RGCs, being present in cells of all clusters at E13, E14 and E16 (**Figs. 4c-f**).
- At early stages the average value of P varied among transcriptomic clusters, reflecting asynchronous specification (**Fig. 4c**). The tempo of commitment is further explored in the next section.
- Although they were multipotential, no precursor RGC was totipotent (i.e. completely unspecified, corresponding to $P=45$). At E13 the average value of P was 11.6 ± 4.9 which was 4-fold lower than the maximum possible value of 45, and no precursor had $P > 30$.

- Finally, inferred multipotentiality decreased gradually during development, and some persisted postnatally, (average $P = 3.4 \pm 2.1$ at P0, and 1.6 ± 0.9 at P5; **Figs. 4g,h**).

From these results, we conclude that early postmitotic RGCs are multipotential but not totipotent, and that type identity is specified gradually via progressive restriction.

Figure 4

Figure 4. Multipotential fate associations between immature RGCs and terminal types inferred via Optimal Transport

a. Extreme models of diversification at single-cell resolution. Multipotential fate associations in a transcriptionally defined cluster (ellipse) could arise from a mixture of unipotential RGCs (*left*) or from multipotential RGCs (*right*).

b. Distributions of potential P across immature RGCs by age showing that restriction increases with age.

c. Inter- and intra-cluster variation of potential by age. At each age, variation in the potential values are shown for each transcriptomically defined cluster at that age. Dots denote the average potential and dotted lines depict the standard deviation for cells within each cluster.

d-h. UMAP projections of E13 (d), E14 (e), E16 (f), P0 (g) and P5 (h) RGCs as in **Fig. 2**, but with individual cells colored by their inferred potential. Potential of all RGCs at P56 =1. The colorbar on the lower right is common to all panels, and values are thresholded at $P = 20$.

Asynchronous specification of mouse RGC types via fate decoupling

As a first step in understanding the progressive restriction of RGC fate, we analyzed the extent to which pairs of mature types were likely to have arisen from the same set of immature precursors. To this end we computed a “fate coupling” value $C(l, m; age)$ for each pair of terminal RGC types (l and m), defined as the Pearson correlation coefficient between the values of f_l and f_m across all precursors at a given age (**Methods**). f_l and f_m are fate probabilities corresponding to types l and m as defined in the previous section. Values of $C(l, m; age)$ in our data ranged from -0.11 to 0.95. Higher values of $C(l, m; age)$ indicate strong fate coupling between types l and m , implying the existence of common postmitotic precursors, whereas low $C(l, m; age)$ values suggest that types l and m arose from largely nonoverlapping sets of precursors. We visualized the pattern of fate couplings as network graphs, where the nodes represent types and the edge weights represent values of $C(l, m; age)$. The arrangement of nodes was determined at E13 using a force directed layout algorithm (Fruchterman & Reingold, 1991), with pairwise distances being inversely proportional to values of $C(l, m; E13)$, the fate coupling values at E13 (**Fig. 5a**). To visualize the temporal evolution of these fate couplings, we retained the same layout of nodes while updating edge weights according to $C(l, m; age)$ (**Figs. 5b-e**).

Types that were coupled in fate at the earliest time point gradually decoupled as development proceed. For example, at E13, 118/990 pairs (12%) were strongly coupled (threshold of $C(l, m; age) > 0.2$ as determined by randomization tests; see **Methods**), while at P5, only 8/990 (<1%) passed this criterion (**Figs. 5a,e**). Lowering this threshold for coupling to 0.05 increased the number of strongly coupled pairs at P5 to only 2% (20/990).

Different pairs of types decoupled at different rates (**Fig. 5f**). As they decoupled, RGC precursors became increasingly restricted to a single type (i.e. $f_k \gg f_{l \neq k}$ for a precursor favoring type k). This corresponded to a “localization” of precursors in transcriptomic space, and is a proxy for specification (see **Methods**). We modeled the extent of localization vs. age via a logistic function (**Fig. 5g** and **Figure 5-figure supplement 1d**), and used this to calculate a specification time for each type (τ_{sp}) (see **Methods** for details). Based on this analysis, 7/45 types are specified postnatally. The average τ_{sp} for RGCs was E17.8, but individual RGC types exhibited a wide range from E13.9 to P5.2 (**Fig. 5h**). The inferred specification time was not correlated to adult frequency (**Fig. 5i**).

We illustrate this range by considering three pairs of RGC types in **Figure 5-figure supplement 1**. C12 and C22 (numbered as in Tran et al., 2019; see **Fig. 2g**) exhibit low fate coupling at all ages profiled (**Figure 5-figure supplement 1a**), indicative of separate precursor populations. In contrast, C19 and C20 decouple only at P0, implying the existence of a common precursor throughout embryogenesis (**Figure 5-figure supplement 1b**). C21 and C34 display an intermediate pattern, decoupling around E16 (**Figure 5-figure supplement 1c**). Taken together, these results suggest that RGC types emerge by asynchronous fate decoupling of multipotential precursors.

Figure 5

479

Figure 5. Fate decoupling of RGC types

a. Force-directed layout visualization of fate couplings at E13, with nodes representing RGC types (numbered as in Tran, 2019) and the thickness of edges representing values of $C(l, m; E13)$. Edges with $C(l, m; E13) < 0.2$ are not shown. Number of edges with $C(l, m; E13) > 0.2$ are indicated on top.

b-e. Visualization of fate couplings at E14 (B), E16 (C), P0 (D) and P5 (E). The positions of the nodes are maintained as in panel a, but the edges are redrawn based on values of $C(l, m; age)$ at each age. As in panel a, we only show edges $C(l, m; age) > 0.2$.

f. The decay of pairwise fate couplings (y-axis) with age (x-axis). Each line corresponds shows the temporal decay of $C(l, m)$ for RGC pair l and m estimated via a logistic model (Methods). For each pair, couplings at each age were fit to a model $C(l, m; age) = 1/(1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 * age})$ with β_0, β_1 representing fitted parameters. The fitting was performed using data for ages E13, E14, E16, P0 and P5. The shaded portions correspond to the periods E8-E13 and P5- represent

extrapolations of the model. Black lines highlight the decay of all non-zero pairwise couplings for RGC type C8 as an example.

g. Schematic showing logistic modeling to estimate specification time τ_{sp} for a particular type. The y-axis is a measure of the extent to which precursors biased towards the type are present in a single transcriptomically defined cluster (i.e. localization, see **Methods** for details). Localization is defined as a numerical value in the range (0, 1) with higher values consistent with increasing specification. Individual triangles represent the localization values computed using WOT inferred fate couplings at each age, while the curve represents the fit using the logistic model. Dotted line shows the minimum threshold a type to be specified at each age. Its curved shape arises due to the increase in the number of clusters with age.

h. Localization curves (as in panel g) for the 38 RGC types showing the range of inferred specification times. 7 low frequency types have been excluded from display (see **Figure 5-figure supplement 1d**).

i. Scatter plot showing poor correlation between adult frequency of a type (from (Tran et al., 2019)) and its predicated specification time (calculated from h).

Fate decoupled groups of RGC types defined by transcription factors

Because fate coupling is a metric of inferred overlap of developmental history, it is likely that tightly coupled types share common precursors. This relationship implies that tightly coupled types might also be specified by common transcriptional programs. As a step towards identifying candidate fate determinants, we identified 8 transcription factors (TFs) that are expressed by distinct groups of mature RGC types (**Fig.6a, Figure 6-figure supplement 1a**). Three of these are well-characterized RGC-selective TFs: *Foxp2*, expressed by 5 F-RGC types (Rousso et al., 2016); *Tbr1*, expressed by 5 T-RGC types (Liu et al., 2018); and *Eomes* (also known as *Tbr2*), expressed by 7 types (C.-A. Mao et al., 2020; Tran et al., 2019). The 7 *Eomes/Tbr2* types include the melanopsin expressing intrinsically photosensitive (ip) RGC types (Berson, Dunn, & Takao, 2002). The remaining five were *Neurod2*, *Irx3*, *Mafb*, *Tfap2d*, and *Bnc2* that label 8, 5, 4, 6, and 3 types respectively. *Eomes* types also co-expressed *Tbx20* and *Dmrbt1* while *Neurod2* types also co-express *Satb2*. Together, 40/45 mature types expressed at least one of these TFs in a manner that was, with few exceptions, mutually exclusive. In many cases, the fate proximity of types that shared TF expression was obvious (**Fig. 6a**).

We refer to these TF-based groups as fate-restricted RGC subclasses – an intermediate taxonomic level between class and type based on inferred fate relationships. Consistent with their definition, the pairwise fate coupling among types

from different subclasses was significantly lower than among types from the same subclass (**Fig. 6b**). Thus, precursor RGC states associated with any two subclasses are more distinct than those associated with any two types. This is evident by the significant separation at E13 and negligible overlap at P5 for precursors favoring the *Eomes*, *Mafb* and *Neurod2* subclasses respectively, as shown in **Fig. 6c-e**.

We also asked whether the TF-based subclasses differed in inferred transcriptomic specification time τ_{sp} , as defined in **Fig. 5g**. As shown in **Figs. 6f-h**, and **Figure 6-figure supplement 1b-e**, four subclasses were specified within a narrow interval (E16.8-E17.2), but three others differed substantially. The average specification time for the *Eomes* group was E14.6 ($p < 0.0001$, Student's t-test, compared to the mean for all types), while that for the *Mafb* and *Neurod2* groups were E16.9 ($p < 0.001$) and E18.5 ($p < 0.0001$), respectively. The early specification of the *Eomes* group is consistent with birthdating studies showing the average earlier birthdate of ipRGCs compared to all RGCs (McNeill et al., 2011).

In summary, our results suggest the existence of fate-restricted RGC subclasses that arise from distinct sets of precursors and diversify into individual types. This method of defining RGC groups, which relies on inferred proximity of precursors in transcriptomic space, is distinct from previous definitions of RGC subclass based on shared patterns of adult morphology, physiology or gene expression (see **Discussion**). Accordingly, the fate couplings at E13 were only weakly correlated with transcriptomic proximity in the adult retina (**Figure 6-figure supplement 1f**). Further, while TF-based groups align with some previously defined subclasses (e.g. ipRGCs or *Tbr1*+ RGCs), they do not map to others subclasses such as alpha-RGCs (4 types) or T5-RGCs (9 types) (**Figure 6-figure supplement 1g**).

Figure 6

Figure 6. Temporal dynamics of RGC subsets expressing specific TFs

a. E13 network graph of fate couplings from Fig. 5a, with RGC types colored based on their selective expression of TFs at P56. Asterisks denote 3/45 types that express more than 1 TF (also see Figure 6-figure supplement 1a).

b. Box-and-whisker plots showing that pairwise fate couplings are higher between types within the same TF subclass than between types in different TF subclasses at all immature ages. Black horizontal line, median; bars, interquartile range; vertical lines, 1st and 99th percentile;

dots, outliers. Stars indicate significant p-values based on a two-sided t-test (****, $p < 10^{-7}$; ***, $p < 10^{-5}$; **, $p < 10^{-2}$).

c. *Eomes+* types. *Top*: UMAP representation of E13 RGCs with cells colored based on their cumulative fate association towards the 7 *Eomes+* types. *Bottom*: UMAP representation of P5 RGCs with cells colored based on their cumulative fate association towards the 7 *Eomes+* types. The value corresponding to the color of each cell (colorbar, right) can be interpreted as the probability of commitment towards the corresponding subclass.

d. Same as c for *Mafb+* types

e. Same as c for *Neurod2+* types

f-h. Localization curves (as in **Fig. 5g**) for *Eomes+* types (f), *Mafb+* types (g) and *Neurod2+* types (h). The mean inferred specification time τ_{sp} for each group is indicated on top of each panel.

Transcriptomic profiles of ipsilateral and contralateral RGCs

Finally, we considered the origin of two RGC groups defined by their projections: those with axons that remain ipsilateral at the optic chiasm (I-RGCs) and those that cross the midline to innervate contralateral brain structures (C-RGCs). The proportion of I-RGCs varies among vertebrates, in rough correspondence to the extent of binocular vision, ranging from none in most lower vertebrates to ~50% in primates. In mice, 3-5% of RGC axons remain ipsilateral, with most I-RGCs residing in the ventrotemporal (VT) retinal crescent (Mason & Slavi, 2020). While some I-RGCs have been observed to project from the dorsocentral retina during embryonic stages, these are rapidly eliminated so-called “transient” I-RGCs (Soares & Mason, 2015). Thus, in adulthood, C-RGCs are present throughout the retina while “permanent” I-RGCs are confined to the VT crescent.

The zinc-finger transcription factor *Zic2* is expressed in a subset of postmitotic RGCs in VT retina, and is both necessary and sufficient for establishing their ipsilateral identity (Herrera et al., 2003); transient dorsolateral I-RGCs do not express *Zic2* (Pak, Hindges, Lim, Pfaff, & O'Leary, 2004). *Isl2* marks a subset of C-RGCs throughout the retina and appears to specify a contralateral identity in part by repressing *Zic2* (Pak et al., 2004). These two transcription factors were expressed in a mutually exclusive fashion in RGC precursors between E13 and E16 (**Fig. 7a**); *Zic2* was down-regulated at later ages (**Figure 7-figure supplement 1a**). Furthermore, *Zic2* expression at E13 correlated with *Igf1* and *Fgf12*, and anti-correlated with *Igf1* and *Fgf12*, consistent with recent reports

(Wang, Marcucci, Cerullo, & Mason, 2016) (**Fig. 7b** and **Figure 7-figure supplement 1b,c**). We scored each cell at E13 based on its expression of ipsilateral genes (**Methods**), confirming that expression of ipsilateral and contralateral gene signatures were anticorrelated (**Fig. 7c**). Together, these observations support the idea that at E13 *Zic2*⁺ cells represent I-RGCs, and *Isl2*⁺ cells represent some but not all C-RGCs.

Using WOT, we then identified the descendants of presumptive I-RGCs at later ages. We found that I-RGCs comprised 4.3% of adult RGCs, consistent with the range of 3-5% noted above. We queried these cells to identify genes that distinguished putative I-RGCs and C-RGCs throughout the developmental time course. At a fold-change of ≥ 1.5 we found 59 DE genes at E13 and 89 at E14 (**Figs. 7e,f**). In addition to *Zic2*, *Igfbp5*, *Isl2* and *Igf1*, which had been used to define I-RGCs and C-RGCs at E13, they included *Igfbp1*, *Pou3f1* and *Cntn2* enriched in I-RGCs, and *Lmo2*, *Pcsk1n* and *Syt4* enriched in C-RGCs. The number of genes DE between I- and C-RGCs decreased after E14, with 20, 9 and 0 significant genes at E16, P0 and P5, respectively (**Figure 7-figure supplement 1d,e**), presumably reflecting the downregulation of axon guidance programs once retinorecipient targets have been reached (see **Discussion**).

We also asked which RGC types included I-RGCs. At E13, putative I-RGCs were highly enriched in 2 of 10 clusters, comprising 38-40% of clusters 2 and 9, 9-14% of clusters 3 and 5, and <2% of the other 6 clusters (**Fig. 7d**). In adults, RGCs expressing *Tbr1*, *Mafb*, *Foxp2* and *Neurod2* contained 3-4X more I-RGCs than RGCs expressing *Eomes*, *Irx3* or *Tfap2d*. These results are consistent with previous observations that I-RGCs are morphologically and physiologically heterogeneous but not uniformly distributed across types (Hong, Kim, & Sanes, 2011; Johnson et al., 2021). Lastly, the WOT-predicted relationship between E13 precursor RGC clusters and I-RGC-rich or -poor terminal types were consistent with these patterns. The top six I-RGC-rich types (C4, C15, C19, C20, C38, C45) derived 14% and 4% of their relative fate association from E13 clusters 2 and 9, while the top six I-RGC-poor types (C8, C14, C18, C22, C31 and C41) derived only 3.8 and 0.2 % of their relative fate association from E13 clusters 2 and 9. Thus,

E13 clusters 2 and 9 are preferred precursors of adult types that are relatively rich in I-RGCs.

Figure 7

Figure 7. Transcriptomic identification of ipsilaterally projecting RGCs

a. *Zic2*, an I-RGC marker and *Isl2*, a C-RGC marker, are expressed in a mutually exclusive pattern at E13 (left), E14 (middle) and E16 (right). *Zic2* is undetectable after E16 (**Figure 7-figure supplement 1a**). Cells are colored based on a bivariate color scale representing co-expression of two markers (colorbar, right).

b. *Zic2* and *Igfbp5*, two I-RGC markers, are co-expressed at E13 (left) and E14 (middle). Representation as in panel a.

c. Scatter-plot of gene signatures used to identify I-RGCs (y-axis) and C-RGCs (x-axis) at E13 are negatively correlated (Pearson $R = -0.61$). Each dot corresponds to a cell, the color represents the number of cells located at a particular (x,y) location (see colorbar, right).

d. Barplot showing % of putative I-RGCs (y-axis) within each of the 45 adult RGC types, estimated by computing the descendants of E13 I-RGCs using WOT. RGC types are arranged along the x-axis based on their membership of TF-groups shown in **Fig. 6a** (annotation matrix, bottom).

e. Volcano plot showing DE genes (MAST test, $p < 10^{-6}$) between predicted I-RGCs and C-RGCs at E13. The x- and the y-axes show the fold-change and the p-value in log2- and log10-units, respectively. Dots represent genes, with red and blue dots highlighting I- and C-RGC enriched genes respectively at fold-change > 1.5 and Bonferroni corrected p-value $< 5 \times 10^{-5}$. The two vertical bars correspond to a fold-change of 1.5 in either direction. Select I-RGC and C-RGC enriched genes are labeled.

f. Same as panel e, for E14.

Discussion

The staggering diversity of its neurons underlies the computational power of the nervous system. Accordingly, a major quest in developmental neurobiology is to understand the mechanisms that diversify progenitors. A generally accepted way to deal with this diversity is to divide neurons into classes, and then subdivide classes into subclasses and subclasses into types (Zeng & Sanes, 2017). While much has been learned about how neural progenitors give rise to distinct neuronal classes, little is known about how classes diversify into subclasses and types.

Here, we used mouse RGCs to address this issue. We recently generated a molecular atlas that divided RGCs into ~45 distinct types based on their patterns of gene expression (Tran et al., 2019). We used this atlas here as a foundation to ask how these types are specified during development. We conclude that the earliest precursor RGCs are multipotential and exhibit continuous variation in transcriptomic identity, then diversify into definitive types by a gradual process of fate restriction. Interestingly, these features resemble those that have been discovered to control the generation of retinal

cell classes from cycling progenitors (RPCs): multipotentiality, progressive restriction of fate, and stochastic rather than deterministic fate choice (see **Introduction**). We suggest that, at least in this case, similar strategies are used to generate cell classes from mitotically active progenitors and cell types from postmitotic precursors.

Classes, subclasses and types

Definitions of neuronal class, subclass and type have been contentious (Yuste et al., 2020). In general, classes share general features of structure, function, molecular architecture and location, whereas types comprise the smallest groups within classes that can be qualitatively distinguished from other groups based on these and other criteria. Subclasses lie in-between. For RGCs, class identity has been clear for a century, but inventories of subclasses and types have emerged only over the last few decades, as high-throughput methods have been implemented for quantifying structural (primarily dendritic morphology), functional (responses to an array of visual stimuli) and molecular properties (gene and transgene expression) of large numbers of RGCs. Fortunately, to the extent that they have been compared, there is excellent concordance among types defined by molecular, structural and physiological criteria (Bae et al., 2018; Goetz et al., 2021; Tran et al., 2019) (see www.rgctypes.org). Moreover, RGCs of a single type exhibit a regular spacing, called a mosaic arrangement, in that they tend to avoid other members of the same cell type whereas their association with members of other types is random (Kay et al., 2012; Keeley et al., 2020; Rockhill et al., 2000). The molecular basis of this property is poorly understood, but it provides an additional criterion for defining a type. Thus, while no two RGCs are identical, and variation may be continuous in some other structures (Cembrowski & Spruston, 2019), there is strong reason to believe that RGC types are discrete.

The adult RGC atlas

Developmental trajectories of cell types cannot be better than the adult types at which they are aimed. We have two reasons to believe that our adult RGC atlas (Tran et al., 2019) is accurate and complete.

First, the atlas is based on detailed analysis of 35,699 cells, and is therefore powered to detect types occurring at ~0.1% frequency (>40 cells per type; <https://satijalab.org/howmanycells/>). Results were stable over a variety of parameters (Tran et al., 2019). Moreover, in the course of studies on responses of RGCs to injury, we recently profiled an additional ~120,000 cells (A. Jacobi, N. Tran, W Yan and J.R.S, in preparation), without identifying additional types.

Second, RGCs have now been classified by functional and structural properties, based on physiological responses to visual stimuli (Baden et al., 2016; Goetz et al., 2021) and serial section electron microscopy (Bae et al., 2018). The numbers of types defined in these ways (47 in (Bae et al., 2018), 42 in (Goetz et al., 2021) and > 32 in (Baden et al., 2016)) match well to the 45-46 defined molecularly (Tran et al., 2019).

Multipotentiality of precursor RGCs

The multipotentiality of dividing progenitor cells can be demonstrated by indelibly labeling a progenitor and then examining its progeny at a later stage. For mammals, this was initially done by infecting single cells with a recombinant retrovirus encoding a reporter gene that could be detected following multiple cell divisions (Price, Turner, & Cepko, 1987; Sanes, Rubenstein, & Nicolas, 1986; Turner & Cepko, 1987). More recently, it has become possible to greatly increase throughput by tracking scars or barcodes introduced by CRISPR/Cas9 (Baron & van Oudenaarden, 2019; Espinosa-Medina, Garcia-Marques, Cepko, & Lee, 2019; McKenna et al., 2016). In sharp contrast, conclusively demonstrating that a single postmitotic cell is multipotential would require following a cell from an unspecified to a specified state, then turning back time, watching it again, and asking if it acquired the same mature identity. Since this is impossible, we used computational methods to draw tentative conclusions about the extent to which newly postmitotic RGCs are committed to mature into a particular type based on their transcriptomic profiles. Consequently, our results are based on inferred rather than experimentally determined lineages.

Our analysis proceeded in three steps. First, to ask whether RGCs were committed to a particular fate before or shortly after they were born, we assessed transcriptomic heterogeneity at a time when a large fraction was newly postmitotic (E13 and E14). We found that heterogeneity was present but limited: 10 transcriptomic clusters were distinguishable at E13 and 12 at E14. Thus, some heterogeneity is present in precursor RGCs, but far less than would be required to specify type identity before or immediately after their birth. A relevant issue is whether at these early stages the transcriptomic variation among cells could reflect variation in their stages of differentiation, perhaps as a consequence of different intervals between birthdate and sampling. Although we cannot exclude this possibility, inter-cluster variability of key RGC-specific genes (e.g., *Rbpms*) was no greater at early times than in adults (data not shown).

Second, we used a supervised classification approach to ask whether precursor RGC clusters mature into mutually exclusive sets of adult types. This model would imply an orderly, step-wise restriction of cell fates. However, our results indicate substantial overlap in the types derived from cells in different immature clusters. This result argues against a deterministic model of diversification, and suggests that precursor RGCs are incompletely committed to a specific type for a substantial period after they are generated.

Third, we used optimal transport inference (WOT) to ask whether the multipotentiality observed at the level of groups was also a property of individual cells. This approach circumvents the limitation of the supervised classification approach, which compares similarity only at the level of clusters. WOT utilizes time course scRNA-seq snapshots to infer fate associations between individual cells sampled at different time points, without reference to the clusters in which they reside (Schiebinger et al., 2019). While being consistent with supervised classification results at the cluster level, WOT indicated that the majority of individual RGCs were multipotential at E13 and E14. Of equal importance, immature RGCs were not totipotent: the average predicted potential (P) was 11.6 at E13, or ~25% of the maximum possible value of 45, and no RGCs had P

766 >30. We conclude that single multipotential immature RGCs are biased in favor of
767 particular groups of adult RGC types.

769 **Progressive restriction of RGC fate**

770 Further analysis provided insight into the structure of multipotentiality among RGCs.
771 The adult RGC types associated with a precursor RGC were not a randomly chosen
772 subset; rather some were more likely to arise from a common precursor state (“fate
773 coupled”) than others. This suggests a model in which RGC types arise via a
774 progressive decoupling of fates within multipotential precursors. Decoupling is
775 asynchronously, with different types emerging at different times. By modeling the
776 temporal kinetics of fate decoupling, we were able to estimate a tentative specification
777 time for each type – that is, the time at which precursors acquire a distinct
778 transcriptomic identity. Analysis of transcriptomic changes that occur during this
779 process, and the effects of visual experience on maturation, will be presented
780 elsewhere (K.S., I.E.W., S.B. and J.R.S., in preparation).

782 Our conclusions about fate restriction are based on analyzing cell states defined by
783 expression patterns of highly variable genes identified in the data (**Figure 2H**). An
784 alternative and common view is that if a small set of genes is sufficient to define cell
785 state, they should be the focus of analysis. We believe this is an incorrect argument,
786 based on confusion between genes that determine a cell type or state, and those that
787 define it. The only way a small number of genes, whatever their functional role, can
788 exclusively define cell state is if they are expressed at very high levels. If this were the
789 case, they would be detected in our data and drive the clustering.

791 **Fate-restricted RGC subclasses**

792 For RGCs, class identity has been clear for a century, and type identity has been
793 solidified during over the last few decades, but criteria for defining subclasses remain
794 unclear. Tentative classifications have used molecular, physiological and morphological
795 criteria (Sanes & Masland, 2015; Tran et al., 2019); In general, these criteria correlate
796 imperfectly with each other, the main exception being that ON and OFF RGCs

(responding preferentially to increases and decreases in illumination, respectively) have dendrites that arborize in the inner and outer portion of the inner plexiform layer (Famiglietti & Kolb, 1976).

The pattern of fate couplings between RGC types at E13-14 provides an alternative way to define RGC subclasses – groups of RGC types that arise from the restriction of a common transcriptionally defined precursor state. We identified transcription factors selectively expressed within these subclasses. Our rationale was that among them would be fate determinants, an idea that could be tested by conventional genetic manipulations. Support for this idea is that there is already strong evidence that one such factor is a fate determinant in mouse: *Eomes* is selectively expressed by ipRGCs (and a few other types), and *Eomes* mutants fail to form ipRGCs although their retinas are normal in many respects (C. A. Mao et al., 2014). This encourages the hope that some of the other transcription factors in this set are also fate determinants. It will also be interesting to determine whether members of fate-restricted subclasses share structural or functional properties.

Laterality

The transcription factors *Isl2* and *Zic2* are selective markers of embryonic RGCs that project contralaterally or ipsilaterally, respectively, and are critical determinants of this choice (Herrera et al., 2003; Pak et al., 2004). We found that their expression was largely nonoverlapping in RGCs at E13, that they were co-expressed with previously reported markers of contralaterally and ipsilaterally projecting RGCs, respectively. Because few RGC axons reach the optic chiasm before E14, our results are consistent with genetic evidence that this differential expression is a cause rather than a consequence of the divergent choices the axons make at the chiasm. Among many genes co-expressed with *Isl2* or *Zic2* may be others that play roles in this choice.

Zic2 is downregulated later in embryogenesis, so we selected some RGCs as putative I-RGCs using genes known to be expressed in them (Wang et al., 2016), then used WOT to infer the RGC types to which they gave rise. Our analysis suggests that I-RGCs

comprise many differentiated types, consistent with previous results (Hong et al., 2011; Johnson et al., 2021). Surprisingly, however, there were few if any genes differentially expressed between the putative mature I- and C-RGCs. Assuming that WOT results are valid – an assertion that can be tested directly in the future – this result suggests a model in which newborn RGCs are doubly specified – by laterality and by type – but that once axonal choice has been made the laterality program is shut down.

Beyond the retina

Generation of neuronal classes has been analyzed in many parts of the vertebrate nervous system but we are aware of few reports on how classes diversify into types. A recent study addressed this issue for primary sensory neurons and reached the conclusion that newborn neurons in dorsal root ganglia are transcriptionally unspecialized and become type-restricted as development proceeds (Sharma et al., 2020). Similarly, both excitatory neuronal subclasses appear to diversify postmitotically in the mouse cerebral cortex (Di Bella et al., 2021; Lodato & Arlotta, 2015), and there is suggestive evidence that the same is true for interneuronal subclasses (Wamsley & Fishell, 2017). In all of these cases, it is attractive to speculate that diversification may occur by a process of fate decoupling in subpopulations of distinct multipotential precursors, akin to that documented here for RGCs. Our study provides a computational framework for investigating this issue.

Methods and Materials

Key Resources Table				
Reagent type (species) or resource	Designation	Source or reference	Identifiers	Additional information
strain, strain background (<i>Mus Musculus</i>)	C57BL/6	Charles River or Jackson Labs	Cat#JAX000664; RRID: IMSR_JAX:000664	
Antibody	Anti-Thy1/anti-CD90 (rat monoclonal)	ThermoFisher Scientific	#17-0902-82	1:200
Antibody	Anti-L1cam (rat monoclonal)	Miltenyi Biotec	#130-102-243	1:10
Antibody	Anti-CD90 pre-conjugated (Rat monoclonal)	Miltenyi Biotec	#130-049-101	1:200

Antibody	Anti-RBPMS (guinea pig polyclonal)	PhosphoSolutions	#1832-RBPMS	1:1000
Antibody	Anti-Kl67 (rabbit monoclonal)	ThermoFisher Scientific	#MA5-14520	1:250
chemical compound, drug	Fluoro-Gel	Electron Microscopy Sciences	#17985	
Commercial Assay or Kit	MACS Large Cell Columns	Miltenyi Biotec	#130-042-202	
Sequence based reagent	Drop-seq beads	ChemGenes Corporation	#Macosko201110	
Commercial assay or kit	Papain dissociation system	Worthington	#LK003160	
Commercial assay or kit	Chromium Single Cell 30 Library and Gel Bead Kit v2, 10X Genomics 16rxns	10X Genomics	# 120237	
software, algorithm	Cell Ranger v2.6.0	10X Genomics	https://support.10xgenomics.com/single-cell-gene-expression/software/downloads/latest	
software, algorithm	ImageJ (Fiji) Version 2.1.0	Fiji	https://imagej.net/Fiji	

Software, algorithm	R 3.6.2	The R foundation	https://www.r-project.org/	
Software, algorithm	RStudio 1.3.1056	Rstudio	https://www.adobe.com	

Mice

All animal experiments were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUC) at Harvard University. Mice were maintained in pathogen-free facilities under standard housing conditions with continuous access to food and water. Animals used in this study include both males and females. A meta-analysis (not shown) did not show any systematic sex-related effects in either differentially expressed genes or cell-type proportions. For scRNA-seq and histology, we used C57Bl/6J (JAX #000664). Embryonic and early post-natal C57Bl/6J mice were acquired either from Jackson Laboratories (JAX) from time-mated female mice or time-mated in-house. For timed-matings, a male was placed with a female overnight and removed the following morning (with the corresponding time recorded as day E0.5).

Cell preparation

RGCs were enriched from dissociated retinal cells as previously described with minor modifications (Tran et al., 2019). All solutions were prepared using Ames' Medium with L-glutamine and sodium bicarbonate (equilibrated with 95% O₂ / 5% CO₂), and all spin steps were done at 450g for 8 minutes. Retinas were dissected out in their entirety immediately after enucleation and digested in ~80U of papain at 37 C, with the exception of some E13 and E14 eyes which were digested whole, followed by manual trituration in ovomucoid solution. Clumps were removed using a 40µm cell strainer and

the cell suspension was spun down and re-suspended in Ames + 4% BSA at a concentration of 10 million cells per 100 μ l. Cells from E13, E14, E16, and P0 were incubated for 15 minutes at room temperature with antibodies to Thy1 (also known as CD90) and L1CAM pre-conjugated to the fluorophores APC (ThermoFisher Scientific #17-0902-82) and PE (Miltenyi Biotec #130-102-243), respectively. Cells were washed with 6ml of Ames + 4% BSA, spun down and resuspended at a concentration of ~7 million cells/ml, and calcein blue was added to label metabolically active cells.

Viable Thy1 or L1CAM positive cells were sorted using a MoFlo Astrios sorter into ~100 μ l of AMES + 4% BSA. Sorted cells were spun down a final time and resuspended in PBS + 0.1% BSA at a concentration of 500-2000 cells/ μ l. P5 RGCs were enriched using only CD90, with either magnetic-activated cell sorting (MACS) using large cell columns and CD90 pre-conjugated to microbeads (#130-042-202 and #130-049-101, Miltenyi Biotec), fluorescence activated cell sorting (FACS) with CD90 pre-conjugated to PE/Cy7 (ThermoFisher Scientific #25-0902-81), or both.

Droplet-based single-cell RNA-seq

Statement on replicates

We profiled immature RGCs using scRNA-seq at five developmental time points: E13, E14, E16, P0 and P5. At each age, data was collected from four replicate experiments. Experiments at E13, E14, E16 and P0 involved two biological replicates (distinct mice). Each of these biological replicates were further subdivided into two equal pools and the cells were subjected to two different enrichment methods (anti-Thy1 and anti-L1cam). Thus, each of these time points consisted of four replicate experiments. RGC enrichment at P5 exclusively utilized anti-Thy1, but four biological replicate experiments were performed. One of these was profiled using 10X and three of these were profiled using Drop-seq.

Drop-seq

A subset of P5 RGC dataset was collected using Drop-seq (Macosko et al., 2015), performed largely as described previously (Shekhar et al., 2016). Briefly, cells were diluted to an estimated final droplet occupancy of 0.05, and co-encapsulated in droplets with barcoded beads, which were diluted to an estimated final droplet occupancy of 0.06. The beads were purchased from ChemGenes Corporation, Wilmington MA (#Macosko201110). Individual droplet aliquots of 2 ml of aqueous volume (1 ml each of cells and beads) were broken by perfluorooctanol, following which beads were harvested, and hybridized RNA was reverse transcribed. Populations of 2,000 beads (~100 cells) were separately amplified for 14 cycles of PCR (primers, chemistry, and cycle conditions identical to those previously described) and pairs of PCR products were co-purified by the addition of 0.6x AMPure XP beads (Agencourt). Fifteen experimental replicates were sequenced in total from 5 biological replicates using an Illumina NextSeq 500. Read 1 was 20bp; read 2 (paired-end) was 60bp.

10X Genomics

Single cell libraries were prepared using the Single-cell gene expression 3' kit on the Chromium platform (10X Genomics, Pleasanton, CA) following the manufacturer's protocol. As our datasets were collected over a long period of time, we used a combination of v1 (a single channel of P5 RGCs), v2 (E13, E14, E16, P0). Briefly, single cells were partitioned into Gel beads in EMulsion (GEMs) in the 10X Chromium instrument followed by cell lysis and barcoded reverse transcription of RNA, amplification, enzymatic fragmentation, 5' adaptor attachment and sample indexing. On average, approximately 8,000-12,000 single cells were loaded on each channel and approximately 3,000-7,000 cells were recovered. Libraries were sequenced on the Illumina HiSeq 2500 platforms at the Broad institute (Paired end reads: Read 1, 26 bases, Read 2, 98 bases).

Power analysis

An important question in all single-cell experiments is that of the number of cells to profile. A widely used approach is the power analysis tool published by the Satija lab (<https://satijalab.org/howmanycells/>). Fortunately, in this study we were also guided by

our previous study of adult RGCs, where we had knowledge of the frequency distribution of adult RGC types, with the rarest type being approximately 0.2% (Tran et al., 2019). In that study, we also found that when classification is performed in a supervised fashion based on an existing atlas, approximately ~8000 RGCs were sufficient to recover the accurate relative frequency distribution of 45 RGC types. We therefore aimed to profile ~ 8000 cell at each time point as our analysis involved mapping immature RGCs to the adult atlas. With the exception of E13, all time points contain 1.5-2X more cells than this target value.

Histology

Tissue fixation

Adult (P56) mice were intracardially perfused with 2-5ml of PBS followed by 15ml of 4% PFA, followed by additional fixation of eyes for 15 minutes in 4% PFA. P0 and P5 mice were not perfused, rather eyes were fixed in 4% PFA for 30 minutes. At E13, 14, and 16 embryos were fixed whole for 30 minutes in 4% PFA, following which eyes were removed. Following fixation eyes from all time points were transferred to PBS and stored at 4C until subsequent use.

Sectioning

Cross sections for immunohistochemistry (IHC) were generated using a Leica CM1850 cryostat. For some early developmental time points eyes were kept whole for IHC, otherwise retinas were either (1) dissected out in their entirety from eyes, or (2) the cornea, iris and lens was removed leaving the sclera and retina intact. Tissues were sunk in 30% sucrose overnight at 4C, embedded in tissue freezing medium, and cryo-sectioned into 25mm slices. Slides with tissue sections were air dried for ~3 hours and stored at -80C until staining.

Immunohistochemistry (IHC)

All IHC solutions were made up in PBS + 0.3% Triton-X, and all incubation steps were carried out in a humidified chamber. Following a 1 hour protein block in 5% Normal Donkey Serum at room temperature, slides were incubated overnight at 4C with primary antibodies, washed twice for 5 minutes each in PBS, incubated for 2 hours at room temperature with secondary antibodies conjugated to various fluorophores (1:1000, Jackson Immunological Research) and Hoechst (1:10000, Life Technologies), and washed again twice for 5 minutes each in PBS before coverslipping with Fluoro-Gel (#17985, Electron Microscopy Sciences). Primary antibodies used include: guinea pig anti-RBPMS (1:1000, #1832-RBPMS, PhosphoSolutions), rabbit anti-KI67 (1:250, #MA5-14520, ThermoFisher Scientific), rat anti-L1CAM (1:10, #130-102-243, Miltenyi Biotec).

Imaging

All images were acquired using an Olympus Fluoview 1000 scanning laser confocal microscope, with a 20X oil immersion objective and 2x optical zoom. Optical slices were taken at 1µm steps. Fiji was used to pseudocolor each channel and generate a maximum projection from image stacks. Brightness and contrast was adjusted in Adobe Photoshop.

Alignment and quantification of gene expression in single cells

All single-cell libraries were aligned to the UCSC mm10 transcriptomic reference (*M. musculus*) and gene expression matrices were quantified using standard protocols described previously. For the single-cell libraries generated using the 10X platform (E13, E14, E16, P0 and P5), these steps were performed using cellranger v2.1.0 (10X Genomics). For the single-cell libraries generated using Drop-seq (P5), we used Drop-seq tools (v1.12; (Macosko et al., 2015)), following procedures described earlier (Shekhar et al., 2016). Alignment and quantification was done for each sample library separately to generate a genes X cells expression matrix of transcript counts. These matrices were column-concatenated for further analysis.

We retained cells that expressed at least 700 genes, resulting in 98,452 cells. We also removed genes expressed in fewer than 10 cells. The resulting M genes $\times$ N cells matrix of UMI counts C_{mn} was normalized along each column (cell) to sum to 8,340, the median of the column sums resulting in a normalized matrix X_{mn} . This was followed by the transformation $X_{mn} \leftarrow \log(X_{mn} + 1)$.

Overview of clustering analysis

The following procedure was adopted to perform batch correction, dimensionality reduction and clustering throughout the paper. The procedure was first applied on the entire dataset to separate RGCs from other cell classes, and then to RGCs at each age to identify transcriptomically distinct groups.

1. *Identification of highly variable genes (HVGs)*: We used the Gamma-Poisson framework described previously to identify HVGs (Pandey et al., 2018). Briefly, we compute for each gene the mean (μ_m) and the coefficient of variation (CV_m) for the UMI counts C_{mn} ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_m &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_n C_{mn} \\ \sigma_m^2 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_n (C_{mn} - \mu_m)^2 \\ CV_m &= \frac{\sigma_m}{\mu_m}\end{aligned}$$

For a given μ_m , the Gamma-Poisson model predicts a “null” coefficient of variation (CV_m^{null}) arising from a combination of Poisson “shot” noise and large variations in library size, assumed to be due to technical reasons,

$$CV_m^{null} = \frac{1}{\mu_m} + \frac{1}{\alpha}$$

1036

1037 Here, α is the shape parameter of a Gamma-distribution fit to the distribution of
1038 normalized library sizes T_n (using the R package `MASS`),

1039

$$T_n = \frac{\sum_m C_{mn}}{\sum_{m,n} C_{mn}}$$

1040

1041 In practice, CV_m^{null} serves as a tight lower-bound for empirically observed values of
1042 CV_m across the full range of μ_m . This enables us to compute for each gene m , a
1043 deviation score $d_m = \log \frac{CV_m}{CV_m^{null}}$, quantifying the extent to which its observed coefficient
1044 of variation exceeds the predicted null model. Highly-variable genes (HVGs) are
1045 selected if they satisfy $d_m > \text{Mean}(d_m) + 0.8 \text{Std}(d_m)$.

1046

1047 2. *Batch correction and Dimensionality Reduction*: We subsetting the rows of the
1048 expression matrix X_{mn} to the HVGs identified in Step 1. As our data comprised
1049 cells sampled at different developmental ages as well as multiple biological
1050 replicates within each age, we used Liger, a non-negative matrix factorization
1051 technique, to embed the data in a reduced dimensional latent space of shared
1052 factors (Welch et al., 2019). Liger computes a factorized representation for each
1053 matrix that separate “shared” and “dataset-specific” gene expression modules
1054 (factors). We use Liger’s normalized H factor loadings for cells to build a nearest
1055 neighbor graph and define clusters.

1056

1057 As in any matrix factorization technique, Liger requires the user to choose k , the
1058 dimensionality of the latent space. To find k , we use a Random Matrix Theory
1059 approach (outlined in (Peng et al., 2017)). Briefly, k is estimated as the number of
1060 eigenvalues of the sample gene-gene correlation matrix that exceed the 99th
1061 percentile of the distribution of the largest eigenvalue of a random Hermitian
1062 matrix of the same dimensions. This is given by the Tracy Widom distribution.
1063 For these calculations, we used the R package `RMTstat`.

3. *Clustering and 2D Visualization*: To cluster cells based on transcriptomic similarity, we first built a nearest-neighbor graph on the cells based on their normalized *H* factor coordinates computed using Liger. The number of nearest neighbors was chosen to be 30. The edges were weighted based on the Jaccard overlap metric and graph clustering was performed using the Louvain algorithm, as described previously (Shekhar et al., 2016). The normalized *H* factor coordinates were also used as input to project cells on to a nonlinear 2D space using the Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection algorithm (UMAP; (Becht et al., 2019)). Graph-construction, clustering and the UMAP projection were performed using the R packages `FNN`, `igraph` and `umap`, respectively.

We began by clustering the full dataset combining all ages using the procedure outlined above. We identified groups of clusters corresponding to cell classes, which included retinal ganglion cells (RGCs; *Rbpms*, *Slc17a6*, *Sncg*, *Nefl*), microglia (*P2ry12*, *C1qa-c*, *Tmem119*), photoreceptors (*Otx2*, *Gngt2*, *Gnb3*), amacrine cells (*Tfap2a*, *Tfap2b*, *Onecut2*), anterior segment cells (*Mgp*, *Col3a1*, *Igf1bp7*), cycling progenitors (*Ccnd1*, *Fgf15*, *Hes5*) and neurogenic progenitors (*Hes6*, *Ascl1*, *Neurog2*). Deeper annotation (e.g. of RGC type) was not done at this stage. No other cellular classes were identified. 3 clusters comprising fewer than 1.2% of the cells expressed markers of more than one class. These were flagged as doublets and removed from further analyses.

Defining RGC precursor heterogeneity at each age

RGC precursors at each age were separately analyzed following the clustering pipeline outlined previously. When implementing Liger, each biological replicate was regarded as a separate batch. The nominal clusters identified by the Louvain algorithm were refined as follows:

1. *Removing contaminants*: Clusters were flagged for further examination if they did not exclusively express RGC-specific markers (e.g. *Rbpms*, *Slc17a6*, *Sncg*,

Nefl). These clusters were small (typically < 1-2% of cells) and in all cases expressed non-RGC markers (e.g. *P2ry12* or *Tfap2b*). These cells, which likely reflect trace contaminants, were discarded from further analysis.

2. *Merging proximal clusters*: Transcriptomic relationships between nominated clusters were visualized on a dendrogram computed using hierarchical clustering, as noted above above. Neighboring clusters on the dendrogram, which were leaves in a terminal branch, were assessed for differential expression using the MAST differential expression (DE) test (Finak et al., 2015). A gene g was regarded as significantly DE between clusters $\mathcal{C}_a$ and $\mathcal{C}_b$ if it satisfied $|\log FC_g(\mathcal{C}_a, \mathcal{C}_b)| > 0.5$ and MAST p -value was less than 10^{-5} (FDR corrected), where:

$$\log FC_g(\mathcal{C}_a, \mathcal{C}_b) = \ln \left(\frac{|\mathcal{C}_b| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}_a} X_{gn}}{|\mathcal{C}_a| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}_b} X_{gn}} \right)$$

is defined to be the log-fold change in expression. Clusters that showed fewer than 10 significant DE genes were merged. In this manner, we identified 10 RGC clusters at E13, 12 at E14, 19 at E16, 27 at P0, and 38 at P5. Using MAST, we identified DE genes that distinguished each cluster against the rest at any given age.

Quantifying RGC diversity at different ages

We quantified the molecular diversity of RGCs based on clusters at each stage using 3 measures of population diversity - The Rao index (**Fig. 2**), the Shannon index, and the Simpson index (**Figure 2-figure supplement 1**). For N clusters with relative frequencies $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N$, these indices are defined as follows,

1. Let d_{ij} be a distance measure between clusters i and j ($0 \leq d_{ij} \leq 1$). The Rao index is defined as,

$$R = \sum_{i \neq j} d_{ij} p_i p_j$$

1123 We used varying number of genes ($\approx 1200-3000$) to calculate d_{ij} . The computed Rao
1124 index was insensitive to these variations.

1125

1126 2. The *Shannon index* is defined as,

1127

$$H = - \sum_i p_i \log p_i$$

1128 3. The *Simpson index* is defined as,

1129

$$S = \sum_i p_i^2$$

1130

1131 While the Rao and Shannon indices increase with diversity, the Simpson index
1132 decreases with diversity.

1133

1134 **Analysis of cluster distinctiveness**

1135 We quantified the mutual separation of clusters at each age using two approaches:

1136

1137 1. *Multi-class classification*: We trained a multi-class classifier (R package
1138 `xgboost`) at each age on 50% of the cells using their cluster IDs. The remaining
1139 50% of the cells were used to test the learned classifier and estimate a
1140 classification error per cluster, which were averaged at each age. As clusters
1141 become better separated, the average classification error decreases.

1142 2. *Relative positions in PC space*: At each age, the top 20 PCA coordinates were
1143 first standardized by z-scoring. For each cluster C at a given age, we computed
1144 two quantities:

1145 a. r_C , the median of euclidean distances of each cell from the cluster centroid
1146 in the standardized PCA coordinates.

b. d_C , the median of euclidean distances of each cell from the centroid of the nearest external cluster.

For a cluster C , a low of value r_C/d_C indicates a higher degree of separatedness. Averaging this metric across all the clusters at a given age quantifies the degree to which clusters are separated in the UMAP representation.

Relating clusters across ages using supervised classification

Analysis Overview

To distinguish between “specified” and “non-specified” modes of diversification (**Figure 3**), we first used a supervised classification approach to associate immature RGC clusters at young ages (tests) to cluster IDs determined at older ages (references). We used XGBoost, a decision-tree based ensemble learning algorithm (T. Chen & Guestrin, 2016), to train multi-class classifiers on reference clusters, and used these to assign labels to individual test RGCs.

Two kinds of references were used: (1) Classifiers trained on the adult (P56) clusters were used to assign immature RGCs at each of the five developmental ages (five separate analyses) to adult labels. (2) Classifiers trained on E14, E16, P0, and P5 clusters were used to assign E13, E14, E16, and P0 RGCs to labels corresponding to the previous age, respectively (four separate analyses). The correspondence between classifier assigned labels and cluster IDs of test RGCs were visualized using confusion matrices (e.g. **Figure 3d-h**) and quantified using two metrics - the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) and Normalized Conditional Entropy (NCE) metrics, described below.

Classification Overview

To describe our classification analysis, we introduce some notation to facilitate a description in general terms. Let $\mathcal{A}^R$ and $\mathcal{A}^T$ denote the reference and the test atlases for the purpose of supervised classification. The number of cells (i.e. RGCs) contained in the reference and test atlases are denoted $|\mathcal{A}^R|$ and $|\mathcal{A}^T|$, respectively. $\mathcal{A}^R$ and $\mathcal{A}^T$ could correspond to any pair of ages as described above. Without loss of generality, let

1178 us assume that $\mathcal{A}^R$ contains r transcriptomic clusters denoted $\{\mathcal{C}_1^R, \mathcal{C}_2^R, \dots, \mathcal{C}_r^R\}$.
 1179 Similarly, $\mathcal{A}^T$ is assumed to contain t transcriptomically defined clusters denoted $\{\mathcal{C}_1^T,$
 1180 $\mathcal{C}_2^T, \dots, \mathcal{C}_t^T\}$.

1181

1182

1183 Each cell in our dataset is the member of a particular atlas, and is assigned to a single
 1184 cluster within the atlas based on its transcriptome. The transcriptome of each cell is a
 1185 vector (denoted using lowercase boldface symbols, e.g. $\mathbf{u}$ or $\mathbf{v}$) with number of
 1186 elements equal to the number of HVGs (the features used for classification). Let
 1187 $cluster(\mathbf{u})$ denote the transcriptionally assigned of cell $\mathbf{u}$. For example, the following
 1188 statement,

1189

$$\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^T, \quad cluster(\mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{C}_k^T$$

1190

1191 translates to “Cell $\mathbf{u}$ in atlas $\mathcal{A}^T$ is a member of cluster $\mathcal{C}_k^T$.” Our goal is to *assign* each
 1192 cell $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^T$ a second ID $cluster'(\mathbf{u})$ based on its transcriptomic correspondence to the
 1193 reference atlas $\mathcal{A}^R$. We perform this via an XGBoost classifier trained on $\mathcal{A}^R$ and
 1194 applied it to every cell in $\mathcal{A}^T$, allowing us to infer transcriptomic correspondences
 1195 between the two sets of clusters. The main steps are as follows,

1196

- 1197 • The expression matrices in $\mathcal{A}^R$ and $\mathcal{A}^T$ are z-scored along each feature. The
 1198 initial set of features are chosen as the common HVGs in the two atlases.
 1199 Parameters are adjusted to select the common top ~2000-3000 HVGs.
- 1200 • Classifiers $Class_0^R$ and $Class_0^T$ are trained on $\mathcal{A}^R$ and $\mathcal{A}^T$ independently. For
 1201 training, we randomly sample 60% of cells in each cluster up to a maximum of
 1202 300 cells. The remaining “held-out” cells are used for validation. We ran the
 1203 training routine for `xgboost` with the following parameter specification (see
 1204 <https://xgboost.readthedocs.io/en/latest/parameter.html>),

1205

```
1206 xgb_params <- list("objective" = "multi:softprob",
1207                   "eval_metric" = "mlogloss",
```

```

1208         "num_class" = nClusters,
1209         "eta" = 0.2, "max_depth"=6, subsample = 0.6)
1210

```

- 1211 • When applied to a cell vector $\mathbf{u}$, the classifier $Class_0^R$ (or $Class_0^T$) returns a vector
- 1212 of $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots)$ of length r (or t) with entries representing probability values of
- 1213 predicted cluster memberships in the corresponding atlas. We use these values
- 1214 to compute the “softmax” assignment of $\mathbf{u}$, so that $cluster'(\mathbf{u}) = \operatorname{argmax}_i p_i$.
- 1215 • Post training, $Class_0^R$ and $Class_0^T$ are evaluated on the respective validation sets.
- 1216 Using the predicted cluster assignments of the “held out” cells, we compute for
- 1217 each cluster in $\mathcal{A}^R$ and $\mathcal{A}^T$ the error-rate, defined as the fraction of held-out cells
- 1218 that were misclassified. If the error-rate for any cluster was higher than 10%, the
- 1219 classifier is retrained by artificially upsampling cells from the high error-rate
- 1220 clusters. In the final classifiers, the cluster-specific error rates were typically 1-
- 1221 4%, and in no case exceeded 10%.
- 1222 • The top 500 discriminatory features (genes) are identified based on average
- 1223 information gain (using the function `xgb.importance`) for each of $Class_0^R$ and
- 1224 $Class_0^T$. These gene sets are denoted as $\mathcal{G}^R$ and $\mathcal{G}^T$ respectively.
- 1225 • The common features $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^R \cap \mathcal{G}^T$ are used to train a third classifier $Class^R$ on
- 1226 the reference atlas $\mathcal{A}^R$. This ensures that inferred transcriptomic
- 1227 correspondences are based on “core” gene expression programs that are
- 1228 conserved at both time points rather than temporally regulated genes.
- 1229 • Finally, $Class^R$ is applied to each cell $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^T$ to generate predicted labels
- 1230 $cluster'(\mathbf{u})$. Global transcriptional correspondence were visualized using
- 1231 confusion matrices between cluster IDs $cluster(\mathbf{u}) \in \{\mathcal{C}_1^T, \mathcal{C}_2^T, \dots, \mathcal{C}_t^T\}$ and
- 1232 reference assignments $cluster'(\mathbf{u}) \in \{\mathcal{C}_1^R, \mathcal{C}_2^R, \dots, \mathcal{C}_r^R\}$, and their correspondence
- 1233 was quantified using metrics described below.

1234

1235

1236 **Quantifying cluster correspondence using global and local metrics**

1237 Let N_{ij} denote the number of cells in $\mathcal{A}^T$ that are part of transcriptomic cluster $\mathcal{C}_j^T$, and

1238 are assigned by $Class^R$ to reference cluster $\mathcal{C}_i^R$. Thus,

1239

$$N_{ij} = \#\{cluster'(\mathbf{u}) = C_i^R, cluster(\mathbf{u}) = C_j^T \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^T\}$$

1240

1241 N_{ij} defines a contingency table, whose marginal sums are defined as,

1242

$$a_i = \sum_{j=1}^t N_{ij}$$

$$b_j = \sum_{i=1}^r N_{ij}$$

1243

1244 Let $N = \sum_{i,j} N_{ij} = |\mathcal{A}^T|$, the number of cells in $\mathcal{A}^T$. Then the Adjusted Rand index (ARI)
1245 corresponding to the assignments can be evaluated using the following equation,

1246

$$ARI = \frac{\sum_{i,j} \binom{N_{ij}}{2} - [\sum_i \binom{a_i}{2} \sum_j \binom{b_j}{2}] / \binom{N}{2}}{\frac{1}{2} [\sum_i \binom{a_i}{2} + \sum_j \binom{b_j}{2}] - [\sum_i \binom{a_i}{2} \sum_j \binom{b_j}{2}] / \binom{N}{2}}$$

1247 The *ARI* ranges from 0 and 1, with extremes corresponding to random association and
1248 1:1 correspondences between $\mathcal{A}^R$ and $\mathcal{A}^T$, respectively. The ARI can technically also
1249 take on negative values for certain scenarios, but these are not observed in our data.

1250

1251 As an alternative, we also used the Normalized Conditional Entropy (NCE), an
1252 information-theoretic measure. The NCE quantifies the extent to which knowledge of the
1253 value of $cluster'(\mathbf{u})$ reduces the uncertainty (measured in information bits) about the
1254 value of $cluster(\mathbf{u})$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^T$.

1255

1256 We introduce probability weights q_{ij} and the corresponding marginals $q_{i,\cdot}$ and $q_{\cdot,j}$ as
1257 follows,

1258

$$q_{ij} = \frac{N_{ij}}{N}$$

$$q_{i.} = \frac{a_i}{N}$$

$$q_{.j} = \frac{b_j}{N}$$

1259

1260 The Conditional Entropy (CE) is then given by the expression (Cover and Thomas,
1261 1991),

1262

$$H(cluster(\mathbf{u})|cluster'(\mathbf{u})) = - \sum_{ij} q_{ij} \log \frac{q_{ij}}{q_{i.}}$$

1263

1264 Note that CE is asymmetric, i.e. $H(cluster(\mathbf{u})|cluster'(\mathbf{u})) \neq$
1265 $H(cluster'(\mathbf{u})|cluster(\mathbf{u}))$. One notes that $H=0$ if for each cluster $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $q_{ij} =$
1266 δ_{i,k_i} for a single cluster k_i where δ_{lm} is the Kronecker delta defined as,

1267

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{ij} &= 1, \text{ if } i = j \\ \delta_{ij} &= 0, \text{ if } i \neq j \end{aligned}$$

1268

1269 Finally, NCE is defined as,

1270

$$NCE = \frac{H(cluster(\mathbf{u})|cluster'(\mathbf{u}))}{H(cluster(\mathbf{u}))}$$

1271

1272 where $H(cluster(\mathbf{u})) = - \sum_j q_{.j} \log q_{.j}$ is the Shannon entropy. Due to this
1273 normalization, NCE values range from 0 to 1, with extremes corresponding to fully
1274 specific mapping or random association, respectively between $\mathcal{A}^R$ and $\mathcal{A}^T$. ARI and
1275 NCE are inversely related. Unlike ARI , however, NCE is able to detect specificity in
1276 both many:1 and 1:1 mappings. ARI returns a value lower than 1 for specific mappings
1277 if the number of clusters in $\mathcal{A}^R$ and $\mathcal{A}^T$ are not equal.

1278

ARI and *NCE* quantify global correspondences between $\mathcal{A}^R$ and $\mathcal{A}^T$. We also computed a local metric, the Occupancy Fraction (OF) that quantified whether individual reference labels $\mathcal{C}_i^R$ were distributed in a “localized” or “diffuse” manner between test clusters $\in \{\mathcal{C}_1^T, \mathcal{C}_2^T, \dots, \mathcal{C}_t^T\}$.

$$OF(\mathcal{C}_i^R) = \frac{1}{t} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_j \left(\frac{q_{ij}}{q_{i..}} \right)^2} \right]$$

Note that the term $\frac{q_{ij}}{q_{i..}}$ is simply the fraction of the total test cells belonging to test cluster $\mathcal{C}_j^T$ that are assigned to reference cluster $\mathcal{C}_i^R$ by the classifier. Defined this way, the term in the square brackets computes an occupation number that ranges from 1 to t and can be interpreted as the number of test clusters that are specifically associated with $\mathcal{C}_i^R$. Division by t the number of test clusters, therefore converts this number into a fraction.

Overview of Waddington Optimal Transport (Waddington-OT) analysis

To identify fate relationships among maturing RGCs used Waddington-OT (Schiebinger et al., 2019) a recently developed framework that is rooted in Optimal Transport theory (Villani, 2009). Waddington-OT does not rely on clustering, and therefore is able to identify ancestor-descendant relationships between any pair of temporally separated RGCs in our data.

At its heart, Waddington-OT models cellular transcriptomes $\mathbf{u}$ measured at a given age t as a probability distribution in gene expression space $\mathbb{P}_t(\mathbf{u})$ (note that $\mathbf{u}$ may represent the original gene expression space or a reduced dimensional embedding estimated via Principal Component Analysis or Diffusion Maps.). This probability distribution evolves with time, as cells differentiate and mature. Different temporal measurements collected at times $\dots, t_{i-1}, t_i, t_{i+1}, \dots$ represent temporal snapshots of the corresponding cell distributions $\dots, \mathbb{P}_{t_{i-1}}, \mathbb{P}_{t_i}, \mathbb{P}_{t_{i+1}}, \dots$. Unfortunately, as each cell can only be measured once, the measurement at different times are from different cells. Therefore, for a

particular cell $\mathbf{u}$ at time t_i , it is not clear which cell(s) at time t_{i-1} is likely to be its ancestor(s) and which cell(s) at time t_{i+1} are likely to be descendant(s). It is this problem at Waddington-OT addresses.

Briefly, for a given pair of consecutive transcriptomic snapshots $\mathbb{P}_{t_i}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathbb{P}_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{v})$, we wish to estimate the joint distribution $\Pi_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$, representing the probability that a cell having an expression vector $\mathbf{u}$ at time t_i transitions to a cell with an expression vector $\mathbf{v}$ at time t_{i+1} . $\Pi_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is also called the temporal coupling, which, owing to the destructive nature of scRNA-seq assays, is not directly observable. Under the assumption that cells move short distances in transcriptomic space when $\Delta t_i = t_{i+1} - t_i$ is “reasonably close”, Waddington-OT estimates $\Pi_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$, as the solution to the following convex optimization problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Pi}_{t_i, t_{i+1}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\Pi} & \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^{t_i}} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}^{t_{i+1}}} c(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \Pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - \epsilon \int \int \Pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \log \Pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} \\ & + \lambda_1 KL \left[\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^{t_i}} \Pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) || d\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{v}) \right] + \lambda_1 KL \left[\sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}^{t_{i+1}}} \Pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) || d\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{t_i}(\mathbf{u}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

In the above equation,

- $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{v})$ is an empirical distribution constructed from $\mathcal{A}^{t_{i+1}}$, which denotes the scRNA-seq atlas at t_{i+1} ,

$$\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}^{t_{i+1}}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{A}^{t_{i+1}}} \delta(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}_i)$$

where $\delta(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x})$ denotes the Dirac delta function, a probability distribution placing all its mass at the location $\mathbf{x}$.

- $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{t_i}(\mathbf{u})$ is the cell distribution at t_i rescaled by the relative growth rate to account for cell division/death,

$$\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{t_i}(\mathbf{u}) = \hat{\mathbb{P}}_{t_i}(\mathbf{u}) \frac{g(\mathbf{u})^{t_{i+1}-t_i}}{\int g(\mathbf{u})^{t_{i+1}-t_i} d\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{t_i}}$$

- Here $g(\mathbf{u})$ represents the relative growth rate of cell $\mathbf{u}$ in the time interval (t_i, t_{i+1}) and is estimated within the framework of unbalanced optimal transport (Chizat, Peyré, Schmitzer, & Vialard, 2018). For more details, we refer the reader to the supplementary information of (Schiebinger et al., 2019).
- $c(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is a cost function defined as the euclidean distance $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}|^2$. The first term of the objective function minimizes the cost function weighted by the temporal couplings, which may be interpreted as the transport distance between the distributions $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{t_i}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{t_{i+1}}$ (also known as the Wasserstein distance).
- The second term on the RHS represents entropic regularization, and ϵ is the corresponding strength. Classic OT identifies “deterministic” couplings in that one cell at t_i is transported to a single cell at t_{i+1} . Introduction of the entropic regularization term makes this problem non-deterministic, capturing the notion that there may exist immature cells whose fate is not completely determined. Our inferences of multipotentiality is directly a consequence of adding this entropic regularization term. Additionally, entropic regularization also makes the problem strongly convex, which is computationally beneficial.
- The third and the fourth terms are features of unbalanced optimal transport, where equality constraints on the marginals (a consequence of mass conservation) are relaxed. λ_1 and λ_2 are corresponding Lagrange multipliers.

We note that values of the hyperparameters ϵ, λ_1 and λ_2 are held fixed for all pairwise transport map calculations (E13, E14), (E14, E16), ... etc.

Application of WOT to RGC diversification and long-range couplings

We apply Waddington-OT to each pair of consecutive ages t_i and t_{i+1} to estimate the transport map $\hat{\Pi}_{t_i, t_{i+1}}$. Transport maps connecting non-consecutive time points t_i and t_{i+k} are estimated through a simple matrix multiplication of intermediate transport maps,

1357

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{t_i, t_{i+k}} = \hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{t_i, t_{i+1}} \hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{t_{i+1}, t_{i+2}} \dots \hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{t_{i+k-1}, t_{i+k}}$$

1358

1359 The transport matrices $\hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{t_i, t_j}$ encode fate relationships between cells at t_i and cells at a
 1360 later time $t_j > t_i$. These relationships can be analyzed at the level of clusters at t_j to
 1361 associate each cell $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^{t_i}$ with transcriptomically defined cluster. This is particularly
 1362 useful in estimating the terminal identity of immature RGCs.

1363

1364 Operationally we compute for each cell $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^{t_i}$ a “cell fate vector” $f_{t_j}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t_i)$, ($\beta =$
 1365 $1, 2, \dots$) encoding the probabilities that $\mathbf{u}$ is associated with cluster $\mathcal{C}_\beta^{t_j}$ at time t_j ,

1366

$$f_{t_j}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t_i) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}_\beta^{t_j}} \hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{t_i, t_j}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})}{\sum_{\beta} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}_\beta^{t_j}} \hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{t_i, t_j}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})}$$

1367

1368 It is easy to verify that,

1369

$$\sum_{\beta} f_{t_j}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t_i) = 1 \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^{t_i}$$

1370

1371 The cell fate vector $f_{t_j}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t_i)$ encodes probabilistic associations between the cell $\mathbf{u}$
 1372 and terminal clusters at $t_j > t_i$ indexed by β . The “cluster ancestry vector” at an earlier
 1373 time t_i of a cluster $\mathcal{C}_\beta^{t_j}$ at time $t_j > t_i$, denoted $\Gamma_{t_i}(\mathbf{u}; \mathcal{C}_\beta^{t_j})$, is defined as follows,

1374

$$\Gamma_{t_i}(\mathbf{u}; \mathcal{C}_\beta^{t_j}) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}_\beta^{t_j}} \hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{t_i, t_j}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})}{\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^{t_i}} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}_\beta^{t_j}} \hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{t_i, t_j}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})} \quad (t_j > t_i)$$

1375

1376 In a similar vein, the “cluster descendant vector” at a later time t_o of a cluster $C_\beta^{t_j}$ at a
 1377 time $t_j < t_o$, denoted $\Gamma_{t_o}(\mathbf{u}; C_\beta^{t_j})$, is defined as,
 1378

$$\Gamma_{t_o}(\mathbf{u}; C_\beta^{t_j}) = \frac{\sum_{v \in C_\beta^{t_j}} \hat{\Pi}_{t_j, t_o}(v, \mathbf{u})}{\sum_{u \in \mathcal{A}^{t_o}} \sum_{v \in C_\beta^{t_j}} \hat{\Pi}_{t_j, t_o}(v, \mathbf{u})} (t_o > t_j)$$

1379
 1380 These equations can be used to compute the putative ancestral or descendent cells
 1381 associated with a cluster $C_\beta^{t_j}$ at time t_j .
 1382

1383 **Implementation details of WOT**

1384
 1385 RGC vectors from all ages were combined, median normalized and log-transformed.
 1386 2854 HVGs were identified using the Gamma-Poisson model, and Waddington-OT was
 1387 run on this matrix as follows,
 1388

```
1389 wot    optimal_transport    --matrix    RGC_mat.mtx    --cell_days
1390 cell_day.txt --growth_iters 3 --epsilon 0.005 --out tmaps/RGC
```

1391
 1392 Cell days were specified in `cell_day.txt` as 0, 1, 3, 6, 11 and 20 for E13, E14, E16,
 1393 P0, P5 and P56 respectively. We computed trajectories and fates for each age using
 1394 the following command illustrated for P0,
 1395

```
1396 wot trajectory --tmap tmaps/RGC --cell_set cell_sets.gmt --day 6
1397 --out tmaps/traj_RGC_P0.txt
```

1398
 1399 Fates were computed as,
 1400
 1401 wot fates --tmap tmaps/RGC --cell_set cell_sets.gmt --day 6 --out
 1402 tmaps/fate_RGC_P0.txt
 1403

1404 The above process was repeated for each age.

1405

1406 Multipotentiality of precursors

1407

1408 For each cell at ages E13-P5, we computed the terminal fate association

1409 $f_{P56}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t)$, $t \in (E13, E14, \dots, P5)$, quantifying the probability that it is a precursor of type

1410 $\beta \in (1, 2, \dots, 45)$. Note that $f_{P56}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t)$ is denoted as f_β for brevity in the main text. We

1411 define,

1412

$$P(\mathbf{u}; t) = \frac{1}{\sum_{\beta} f_{P56}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t)^2}$$

1413

1414 as the potential of precursor $\mathbf{u}$ at age t . Values of P range between 1 and 45, with lower

1415 values indicating restriction of fate and higher values suggesting multipotentiality.

1416

1417

1418

1419

1420

1421

1422 **Network analysis of fate couplings**

1423

1424 We define,

1425

$$\begin{aligned} C(\alpha, \beta; t) &= \frac{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}^t|} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^t} (f_{P56}(\alpha; \mathbf{u}, t) - \overline{f_{P56}(\alpha; t)}) (f_{P56}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t) - \overline{f_{P56}(\beta; t)})}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}^t|} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^t} (f_{P56}(\alpha; \mathbf{u}, t) - \overline{f_{P56}(\alpha; t)})^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}^t|} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}^t} (f_{P56}(\beta; \mathbf{v}, t) - \overline{f_{P56}(\beta; t)})^2}} \end{aligned}$$

1426

as the fate coupling between RGC types α and β at age t . Clearly, $C(\alpha, \beta; t)$ is simply the Pearson correlation coefficient between $f_{P56}(\alpha; \mathbf{u}, t)$ and $f_{P56}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t)$, the probabilities that a cell $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^t$ is a precursor of α and β precursor. Here,

$$f_{P56}(\alpha; t) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}^t|} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^t} f_{P56}(\alpha; \mathbf{u}, t)$$

is the mean probability that a cell at age t is a precursor of type α . We computed $C(\alpha, \beta; t)$ across all 990 pairs of RGC types at each immature age $t \in (E13, E14, \dots, P5)$. The values $C(\alpha, \beta; E13)$ were used as edge weights to visualize the fate coupling network of RGC types using the force-directed layout method (Fruchterman & Reingold, 1991) as implemented in the R package `igraph`. The node layout was computed using $C(\alpha, \beta; E13)$ values. For other ages, the node layout at E13 was retained but the edges were replotted based on $C(\alpha, \beta; t)$ values at the corresponding age.

We computed a null distribution of $C(\alpha, \beta; t)$ by randomizing the values of $f_{P56}(\alpha; \mathbf{u}, t)$ within each cell $\mathbf{u}$ across types. Null values of $C(\alpha, \beta; t)$ rarely exceeded 0.1 and never exceeded 0.2, so only edges with larger weights were visualized in **Figure 5**.

Decay of pairwise couplings

For each pair of RGC types α and β , we fitted a logistic equation to model the decay of pairwise couplings as,

$$C(\alpha, \beta; t) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 t)}$$

The values of t corresponding to E13, E14, E16, P0 and P5 were $t=0, 1, 3, 6, 11$, with $C(\alpha, \beta; t)$ computed as above. We also assumed that $C(\alpha, \beta; t) = 0$ at $t=36$, corresponding to P30. Thus, six data-points were used to estimate two parameters for

each of the 180 pairs of RGC types that had non-zero values of $C(\alpha, \beta; t)$. The `nls` function from the R package `stats` was used to estimate β_0 and β_1 . The results are plotted in **Figure 5f**.

Logistic modeling of specification and calculation of τ_{sp}

We hypothesized that the specification of a type β corresponds to the localization of its precursors in transcriptomic space. The extent of localization for a RGC type β at across the time course was calculated as follows. At each age t , we identified the set of precursor RGCs $Prec(\beta; t)$ showing the highest fate probability corresponding to type β ,

$$Prec(\beta; t) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^t \mid f_{P56}(\beta; \mathbf{u}, t) > f_{P56}(\alpha \neq \beta; \mathbf{u}, t)\}$$

Next, we calculated how the precursors of β were distributed across clusters at time t . We computed the occupancy fractions of precursor cells for type β across all cluster $\mathcal{C}_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, N(t)$ at a particular time t ($N(t)$ is the number of transcriptomically defined clusters at time t)

$$p_k(\beta; t) = \frac{\#\{cluster(\mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{C}_k \mid \mathbf{u} \in Prec(\beta; t)\}}{\#\{\mathbf{u} \in Prec(\beta; t)\}}$$

The localization score for each type β at a given time t was defined as,

$$Localization(\beta; t) = 1 - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N(t)} \frac{1}{p_k(\beta; t)^2}}{N(t)}$$

where the index k ranges over the number of clusters at time t . As defined $Localization(\beta; t)$ is restricted to be between 0 to 1, with higher values representing a greater specification. We used a logistic model to approximate the localization of each type as,

$$Localization(\beta; t) = \frac{\exp(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 t)}{1 + \exp(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 t)}$$

As in the previous section the `nls` function was used to estimate the logistic parameters γ_0 and γ_1 . We consider a type β as specified if its specification crosses the line $y(t) = 0.95 (1 - 1/N(t))$. Thus the specification time for a type β is defined as,

$$\tau_{sp}(\beta) = \operatorname{argmin}_t Localization(\beta; t) \geq y(t)$$

Note that as defined, τ_{sp} can be any time point in the interval (E13, P30) corresponding to $t \in (0,36)$.

Inference of laterality in RGC types

To identify putative ipsilateral and contralateral specified-RGC precursors at E13, we scored each precursor RGC based on their expression of bonafide ipsilateral genes (*Zic2*, *Zic1* and *Igf1*) and bonafide contralateral genes (*Isl2*, *Fgf12*, *Igf1*) as in (Wang et al., 2016). We refer to these as I-RGC and C-RGC scores. Putative I-RGCs were those cells that expressed the I-RGC score at 1.5 standard deviations higher than the mean across all cells, and those that express the C-RGC score at 1.5 standard deviations lower than the mean across all cells. C-RGCs were defined analogously. Many cells did not express either of these marker sets as shown in **Figure 7c**. These are likely to be RGCs that have not declared their laterality, or C-RGCs that are not defined by the expression of *Isl2*, *Fgf12*, and *Igf1*.

WOT was then used to compute the descendants of E13 I-RGCs at all subsequent ages through P56 using the `wot fates` command introduced above. These descendants were used for two purposes. First, we assessed the proportion of putative I-RGCs across types as in **Figure 7d**. We also performed a differential gene expression test between putative I-RGCs and the remaining RGCs at all ages, as shown in **Figures 7e,f** and **Figure 7-figure supplement 1d,e**.

Comparison with previous retina scRNA-seq datasets

We compared our data with two scRNA-seq studies that profiled the whole retina during development:

1. (Clark et al., 2019): Count matrices and cell/gene level annotations were downloaded from the author's public repository https://github.com/gofflab/developing_mouse_retina_scRNASeq. This dataset contains whole retinal cells sampled at 10 time points (E11, E12, E14, E16, E18, P0, P2, P5, P8, P14) with four of these (E14, E16, P0, P5) common with our study. We excluded P5 from our analysis as only N=11 RGCs were identified by the authors at this time point.
2. (Lo Giudice et al., 2019): Count matrix corresponding to E15.5 retinal cells was kindly provided by the authors.
3. (Rheaume et al., 2018): Count matrix corresponding to P5 RGCs was downloaded from the online submission.

For consistency with our filtering parameters, we extracted cells based on a cutoff of 700 genes/cell from each of the above datasets. For the Clark et al. dataset, this selected 17,827 cells at E14, 1,674 cells at E16 and 8,343 cells at P0 respectively (N=27,844 cells). In these samples, RGCs comprised 19%, 28% and 0.45%. For the Giudice et al. dataset, this selected 5218 cells, of which 23% were RGCs. \

The Rheaume et al. dataset was directly compared with P5 RGCs collected in this study using supervised classification (**Figure 1-figure supplement 1i**). Clark et al. and Lo Giudice et al. data were combined with the retinal cells profiled in this study at corresponding time points (25,685 cells at E14; 21,274 cells at E16; and 23,251 cells at P0). Together this resulted in a 14,350 genes X 103,272 cells expression matrix that was analyzed following steps outlined previously. In the alignment step, cells from each combination of age and study was considered as a separate "batch". We visualized the

transcriptional heterogeneity of the full dataset using UMAP, and used the expression of canonical markers to confirm the co-clustering of cell-classes in **Figure 1-figure supplement 1** (*Rbpms* for RGCs, *Tfap2b* for ACs, *Fgf15* for RPCs and *Gngt2* for RPCs).

Acknowledgments

Funding for this study was provided by National Institute of Health grants R37NS029169, R01EY022073 (JRS), NSF GRP DGE1752814 (SB), and R00EY028625 (KS), and startup funding from UC Berkeley (KS, SB). We are grateful to Prof. Seth Blackshaw for helpful suggestions on the preprint. The authors would like to thank Joshua Hahn for valuable feedback.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to K.S. or J.R.S.

Data availability

All scRNA-seq data collected in this study are submitted to the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) under GSE185671. The data can be visualized on the Broad Institute's Single Cell Portal under the identifier SCP1706.

Code availability

The scripts (written in R) generated for this study are shared at <https://github.com/shekharlab/mouseRGCdev>.

Figure Legends

Figure 1, Transcriptomic profiling of single postmitotic RGCs during embryonic and postnatal development in mice.

a. Sketch of a section of the mouse retina showing major cell classes - photoreceptors (PRs; rods and cones), horizontal cells (HCs), bipolar cells (BCs), amacrine cells (ACs),

Müller glia (MGs) and retinal ganglion cells (RGCs). PRs reside in the outer nuclear layer (ONL), while BCs, HCs and most ACs reside in the inner nuclear layer (INL). RGCs and some ACs reside in the ganglion cell layer (GCL). Axons of RGCs project to higher visual areas via the optic nerve.

b. Retinal section of the indicated ages labeled for the cell-cycle marker MKI67 (red) and the RGC marker RBPMS (green); nuclei are counterstained by the Hoeschst dye (blue). Micrographs are orientated as the schematic in panel a.

c. Visualization of transcriptional diversity of 98,452 cells using Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP), a nonlinear dimensionality reduction algorithm that assigns proximal x-y coordinates to cells (dots) with similar transcriptional profiles (Becht et al., 2019).

d. Same as c, with cells colored by cell class, assigned based on transcriptional signatures displayed in panel e. RPC, retinal progenitor cells; Ant. Seg., anterior segment cells.

e. Tracksplot showing expression patterns of cell-class specific marker genes (rows) across single cells (columns). Cells are grouped by class as in d. For each class, we randomly sampled 20% of total cells covering all immature time points (E13, E14, E16, P0, P5). For each gene, the scale on the y-axis (right) corresponds to normalized, log-transformed transcript counts detected in each cell.

Figure 2. The number and discreteness of transcriptomic clusters of RGCs increases with age.

a. Extreme models of RGC diversification. In one scenario (*left*) immature RGCs commit to one of the terminal types by the time of birth (i.e. mitotic exit) or shortly after. Alternatively (*right*), initially identical postmitotic RGC precursors acquire distinct molecular identities in a gradual process of restriction.

b-g. Visualization of transcriptomic diversity of immature RGCs at E13 (b), E14 (c), E16 (d), P0 (e), P5 (f) and P56 (g) using UMAP. Cells are colored by their cluster identity, determined independently using dimensionality reduction and graph clustering (**Methods**). Clusters are numbered based on decreasing size at each age. Data for adults (P56) are replotted from ref. 10. In that study 45 transcriptomic types were identified via unsupervised approaches, one of which was mapped to 2 known functional types by supervised approaches. We do not distinguish them in this study.

h. Transcriptional diversity of RGCs as measured by the Rao diversity index (y-axis) increases with age (x-axis). The trend is insensitive to the number of genes used to compute inter-cluster distance (colors). See **Methods** for details underlying the calculation.

i. Transcriptomic distinctions between RGC clusters become sharper with age as shown by decreasing average per-cluster error of a multiclass-classifier with age. Gradient boosted decision trees were trained on a subset of the data, and applied on held out samples to determine the test error.

j. RGC clusters also become better separated in the UMAP embedding, as shown by decreasing values of the average relative cluster diameter with age.

Figure 3. Incompletely specified temporal relationships among RGC clusters.

a. *Top*: Specified (*left*) and non-specified (*right*) modes of diversification. Nodes denote transcriptomic clusters of immature RGCs, and arrows denote fate relationships. *Bottom*: Confusion matrices depicting transcriptomic correspondence between late and early clusters expected for the two modes. Circles and colors indicate the percentage of a given late cluster (row) assigned to a corresponding early cluster (column) by transcriptome-based classifier trained on early clusters. The number of late and early clusters have been set to eight and four for illustration purposes.

b. Barplot showing values of the normalized conditional entropy (NCE) for each age calculated using the transcriptional cluster IDs and the Xgboost-assigned cluster IDs corresponding to the next age or to P56 (E.g. for E13, the NCE was calculated across E13 RGCs by comparing their transcriptional cluster ID with assigned E14 cluster IDs based on a classifier trained on the E14 data). Lower values indicate specific mappings.

c. Same as b, but plotting values of the adjusted Rand Index (ARI), where larger values correspond to higher specificity.

d-h. Confusion matrices (representation as in a), showing transcriptomic correspondence between consecutive ages: E14-E13 (d), E16-E14 (e), P0-E16 (f), P5-P0 (g), P56-P5 (h). In each case, the classifier was trained on the late time point and applied to the early time point. Rows sum to 100%.

Figure 4. Multipotential fate associations between immature RGCs and terminal types inferred via Optimal Transport

a. Extreme models of diversification at single-cell resolution. Multipotential fate associations in a transcriptionally defined cluster (ellipse) could arise from a mixture of unipotential RGCs (*left*) or from multipotential RGCs (*right*).

b. Distributions of potential P across immature RGCs by age showing that restriction increases with age.

c. Inter- and intra-cluster variation of potential by age. At each age, variation in the potential values are shown for each transcriptomically defined cluster at that age. Dots denote the average potential and dotted lines depict the standard deviation for cells within each cluster.

d-h. UMAP projections of E13 (d), E14 (e), E16 (f), P0 (g) and P5 (h) RGCs as in **Fig. 2**, but with individual cells colored by their inferred potential. Potential of all RGCs at P56 = 1. The colorbar on the lower right is common to all panels, and values are thresholded at $P = 20$.

Figure 5. Fate decoupling of RGC types

a. Force-directed layout visualization of fate couplings at E13, with nodes representing RGC types (numbered as in Tran, 2019) and the thickness of edges representing values of $C(l,m;E13)$. Edges with $C(l,m;E13) < 0.2$ are not shown. Number of edges with $C(l,m;E13) > 0.2$ are indicated on top.

b-e. Visualization of fate couplings at E14 (B), E16 (C), P0 (D) and P5 (E). The positions of the nodes are maintained as in panel a, but the edges are redrawn based on values of $C(l,m;age)$ at each age. As in panel a, we only show edges $C(l,m;age) > 0.2$.

f. The decay of pairwise fate couplings (y-axis) with age (x-axis). Each line corresponds shows the temporal decay of $C(l,m)$ for RGC pair l and m estimated via a logistic model (**Methods**). For each pair, couplings at each age were fit to a model $C(l,m;age) = 1/(1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 * age})$ with β_0, β_1 representing fitted parameters. The fitting was performed using data for ages E13, E14, E16, P0 and P5. The shaded portions correspond to the periods E8-E13 and P5- represent extrapolations of the model. Black lines highlight the decay of all non-zero pairwise couplings for RGC type C8 as an example.

g. Schematic showing logistic modeling to estimate specification time τ_{sp} for a particular type. The y-axis is a measure of the extent to which precursors biased towards the type are present in a single transcriptomically defined cluster (i.e. localization, see **Methods** for details). Localization is defined as a numerical value in the range (0, 1) with higher values consistent with increasing specification. Individual triangles represent the localization values computed using WOT inferred fate couplings at each age, while the curve represents the fit using the logistic model. Dotted line shows the minimum threshold a type to be specified at each age. Its curved shape arises due to the increase in the number of clusters with age.

h. Localization curves (as in panel g) for the 38 RGC types showing the range of inferred specification times. 7 low frequency types have been excluded from display (see **Figure 5-figure supplement 1d**).

i. Scatter plot showing poor correlation between adult frequency of a type (from ref. 9) and its predicated specification time (calculated from H).

Figure 6. Temporal dynamics of RGC subsets expressing specific TFs

a. E13 network graph of fate couplings from **Fig. 5a**, with RGC types colored based on their selective expression of TFs at P56. Asterisks denote 3/45 types that express more than 1 TF (also see **Figure 6-figure supplement 1a**).

b. Box-and-whisker plots showing that pairwise fate couplings are higher between types within the same TF subclass than between types in different TF subclasses at all immature ages. Black horizontal line, median; bars, interquartile range; vertical lines, 1st and 99th percentile; dots, outliers. Stars indicate significant p-values based on a two-sided t-test (****, $p < 10^{-7}$; ***, $p < 10^{-5}$; **, $p < 10^{-2}$).

c. *Eomes+* types. *Top*: UMAP representation of E13 RGCs with cells colored based on their cumulative fate association towards the 7 *Eomes+* types. *Bottom*: UMAP representation of P5 RGCs with cells colored based on their cumulative fate association towards the 7 *Eomes+* types. The value corresponding to the color of each cell (colorbar, right) can be interpreted as the probability of commitment towards the corresponding subclass.

d. Same as c for *Maib+* types

e. Same as c for *Neurod2+* types

f-h. Localization curves (as in **Fig. 5g**) for *Eomes+* types (f), *Maib+* types (g) and *Neurod2+* types (h). The mean inferred specification time τ_{sp} for each group is indicated on top of each panel.

Figure 7. Transcriptomic identification of ipsilaterally projecting RGCs

- a. *Zic2*, an I-RGC marker and *Isl2*, a C-RGC marker, are expressed in a mutually exclusive pattern at E13 (left), E14 (middle) and E16 (right). *Zic2* is undetectable after E16 (**Figure 7-figure supplement 1a**). Cells are colored based on a bivariate color scale representing co-expression of two markers (colorbar, right).
- b. *Zic2* and *Igfbp5*, two I-RGC markers, are co-expressed at E13 (left) and E14 (middle). Representation as in panel a.
- c. Scatter-plot of gene signatures used to identify I-RGCs (y-axis) and C-RGCs (x-axis) at E13 are negatively correlated (Pearson R = -0.61). Each dot corresponds to a cell, the color represents the number of cells located at a particular (x,y) location (see colorbar, right).
- d. Barplot showing % of putative I-RGCs (y-axis) within each of the 45 adult RGC types, estimated by computing the descendants of E13 I-RGCs using WOT. RGC types are arranged along the x-axis based on their membership of TF-groups shown in **Fig. 6a** (annotation matrix, bottom).
- e. Volcano plot showing DE genes (MAST test, $p < 10^{-6}$) between predicted I-RGCs and C-RGCs at E13. The x- and the y-axes show the fold-change and the p-value in log2- and log10- units, respectively. Dots represent genes, with red and blue dots highlighting I- and C-RGC enriched genes respectively at fold-change > 1.5 and Bonferroni corrected p-value < 5×10^{-5} . The two vertical bars correspond to a fold-change of 1.5 in either direction. Select I-RGC and C-RGC enriched genes are labeled.
- f. Same as panel e, for E14.

Figure 1-figure supplement 1. Separation of major transcriptomic groups and assessment of immature RGCs at E13-P5.

- a. Retinal sections stained with L1CAM (red), which was used to enrich for RGCs at early stages, and the pan-RGC marker RBPMS, (green) at E13, E14, E16 and P0. Nuclei are counterstained by the Hoeschst dye (blue).
- b. Relative proportions (y-axis) of major cell classes shown in **Fig. 1c-e** at each combination of age and enrichment method. Both anti-Thy1 and anti-L1cam were used to enrich RGCs at E13, E14, E16 and P0, but only anti-Thy1 was used at P5, because L1cam becomes localized to axons postnatally. AC, Amacrine Cells; RPC, retinal progenitor cells.
- c. Box and whisker plots show gene expression levels of key markers by RGCs as a function of age and enrichment method. Markers shown are two pan-RGC markers, *Rbpms*, *Nefl*, and the two cell-surface proteins used for enrichment, *Thy1* and *L1cam*. Note that *Thy1* expression is poor at E13, consistent with low RGC yield in anti-Thy1 enriched cells (panel B). Black horizontal line, median; bars, interquartile range; vertical lines, range; dots, outliers.
- d. Dotplot showing genes (columns) that are selectively expressed in RGCs and RPCs. The size of each circle is proportional to the percentage of cells expressing the gene, and the color depicts the average log-normalized expression.

e. Co-embedding analysis of E14, E16 and P0 data collected in this study with whole retina single-cell transcriptomes in independent studies: E14, E16 and P0 data from (Clark et al., 2019) and E15.5 data from (Lo Giudice et al., 2019). Cells (points) are visualized in UMAP and colored by study of origin.

f. Same as e, with cells colored by the expression level of *Nefl*, an RGC marker. This shows the higher enrichment of RGCs in our study compared to (Clark et al., 2019) and (Lo Giudice et al., 2019).

g. Same as d, with cells colored by expression level of *Fgf15*, an RPC marker.

h. Relative proportions of major cell classes across different datasets analyzed in panel e separated by age. T, this study.

i. Confusion matrix showing *post hoc* transcriptomic correspondence between P5 RGC types identified in Rheume et al., 2018 (y-axis) and P5 RGC clusters reported in this study (x-axis). In each case, RGCs from Rheume et al. were assigned P5 cluster labels using an Xgboost classifier trained on P5 RGCs profiled in this study.

Figure 2-figure supplement 1. Transcriptomic diversity of immature RGCs by age.

a-c. UMAP embedding for RGCs at E14 (a, same as Fig. 2c), E16 (b, same as Fig. 2d) and P0 (c, same as Fig. 2e) with cells colored by enrichment method showing comparable transcriptomic diversity of immature RGCs enriched by L1cam or Thy1. All clusters are present in both collection types, although the relative frequencies vary. This concordance supports the idea that neither marker excludes particular types.

d. Simpson and Shannon diversity indices (see **Methods**) associated with clustering decrease and increase with age respectively, consistent with increasing transcriptomic diversity.

Figure 3-figure supplement 1. Temporal correspondences between transcriptomic clusters evaluated using supervised classification.

a-d. Confusion matrices, showing transcriptomic correspondence between adult RGC types at P56 (rows) and immature RGC clusters (columns) at ages E13 (a), E14 (b), E16 (c) and P0 (d). In each case, immature RGCs were assigned adult labels using an Xgboost classifier trained on adult RGCs. The P56 to P5 mapping is shown in Fig. 2h.

e. Line plots showing occupancy fraction (OF) of mapping of an early cluster to cluster IDs at later ages. OF values quantifies the specificity of mapping of an early cluster to late clusters, with lower values denoting higher specificity. The average occupancy fraction across clusters decreases steadily with age consistent with the decrease and increase in NCE and ARI respectively (Figs. 3b,c). Error bars indicate standard deviation computed across clusters. Also, as expected, the occupancy fraction values are lower for mapping to adjacent time points than to P56.

Figure 4-figure supplement 1. Variations in WOT inferred temporal couplings and tests across variations in hyperparameters.

a. Variations in WOT inferred temporal couplings (Π_{ij}) at the level of cells and clusters to changes in the set of highly variable genes (HVGs) used for computing transport maps. Four sets of features were tested corresponding to the top 800, 1100, 1400 and 1800 HVGs based on our previously described Poisson-Gamma model (Pandey et al.,

2018). Using these sets, we inferred four corresponding transport maps at each of the 5 age pairs E13-E14, E14-E16, E16-P0, P0-P5 and P5-P56. The entropic regularization hyperparameter ϵ (see panels b, c) was held constant at a value 2^{-7} in these tests. At each age pair, we computed the Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC) between estimated temporal couplings for every older cell (column of the transport map Π) across each pairwise combination of the four transport maps, towards a total of 6 combinations. These are indicated as red dots and lines (mean $\pm$ SD). We then grouped (summed) the rows of the transport map by transcriptomic cluster at the younger age, such that each element of the new matrix indicates cell (column)-cluster (row) couplings. The PCC of these couplings were computed for each older cell (column) within each pairwise combination of the four transport maps and are indicated as green dots and lines (mean $\pm$ SD). Finally, we grouped (summed) both the rows and columns of the transport map by transcriptomic cluster at either age to obtain a matrix of cluster-cluster couplings. The PCC values of these couplings were computed for each older cluster within each pairwise combination of the four transport maps and are indicated as blue dots and lines (mean $\pm$ SD). We find that the cell-cell couplings increase in robustness at later ages, but the cell-cluster and cluster-cluster couplings are quite robust (correlation > 0.6).

b. Variations in WOT inferred temporal couplings at the level of cells and clusters as in panel A, but to changes in the entropic regularization ϵ . Six values were used - (2^{-8} , 2^{-7} , 2^{-6} , 2^{-5} , 2^{-4} , 2^{-3}) with increasing values corresponding to more transport maps with decreasingly localized (or increasingly distributed) couplings. At each age pair, 6 transport maps are computed and PCC values for cell-cell, cell-cluster and cluster-cluster couplings are computed as in panel A for each of 15 transport map pairs. Here too, the cluster-cluster and cell-cluster couplings show higher stability, although at later stages higher values of ϵ exhibit loss of stability even at the cluster-cluster level (see panel c).

c. Heatmap showing cluster-cluster PCC values for P5-P56 transport maps inferred using different values of the entropic regularization parameter, epsilon (rows and columns). Loss of stability occurs at higher values of the entropic regularization, consistent with panel B. Based on this we used epsilon = 2^{-7} to calculate results shown in **Fig. 4**.

Figure 4-figure supplement 2. Temporal correspondences between transcriptomic clusters evaluated using Waddington Optimal Transport.

a-e. Average temporal couplings at the level of clusters. Panels correspond to the pairs E14-E13 (a), E16-E14 (b), P0-E16 (c), P5-P0 (d), P56-P5 (e), respectively. In each case, the WOT inferred transport map was grouped along rows and columns based on transcriptomic cluster, and the elements were summed within each group. The resulting matrix was normalized such that each row sums to 100%. These matrices strongly resemble those in **Figs. 3d-h**, as confirmed by the high values of the Pearson correlation coefficient (top, all $p \geq 0.92$).

Figure 5-figure supplement 1. Fate decoupling and temporal specification of RGC types.

a-c. Examples of fate decoupling. Panels from left to right correspond to ages E13-P5 with precursor RGCs shown on a reduced dimensional UMAP representation as in **Figs. 2c-g**. Each RGC is colored using a biaxial color scale (legend) based on its predicted fate values. C12 and C22 are transcriptomically distinct as early as E13 (a). C19 and C20 exhibit high fate coupling at all embryonic ages and are only decoupled at P5 (b). C21 and C34 decouple around E16 (c).

d. Same as **Fig. 6h** showing specification curves for RGC types, but in this case each curve is colored based on adult frequency (colorbar, right). The 7 curves marked by asterisks correspond to late-specified types. As can be seen from their colors, they are also among the types with the lowest frequency (<0.3%), which may result in the dropout of the corresponding precursors because of sampling fluctuations. Such dropouts at earlier time points give the appearance of late specification. Because of this issue, we exclude them from our analysis.

Figure 6-figure supplement 1. Transcription factor (TF) based subgroups.

a. Dotplot showing mutually exclusive patterns of expression of TFs that mark groups of RGC types. In addition to the 8 TFs shown in **Fig. 6a**, we highlight *Zic1*, which selectively labels C6. Selectively expressed TFs could not be identified for 4 types (C1, C2, C11, and C15).

b-e. Localization curves (as in **Fig. 5g**) for *Tbr1*+ types (b), *Tfap2d*+ types (c), *Foxp2*+ types (d) and *Bnc2*+ types (e). Note that the “low frequency” types labeled in **Figure 5-figure supplement 1d** are not shown. The mean specification time τ_{sp} for each group is shown above the graphs.

f. Correlation of fate coupling at E13 with transcriptomic correlation at P56.

g. Same as **Fig. 6a**, with nodes corresponding to subclasses defined in Tran et al., 2019, which includes ipRGCs, alpha-RGCs and T5-RGCs.

Figure 7-figure supplement 1. Transcriptomic analysis of RGC laterality.

a. RGCs at E13, E14, E16, P0, and P5 colored by their expression of *Zic2*, an I-RGC marker. *Zic2* is expressed in a localized fashion until E16 and becomes undetectable beyond this age.

b. *Zic2*, an I-RGC marker and *Igf1*, a C-RGC marker, are expressed in mutually exclusive patterns at E13-E16.

c. *Zic2* and *Zic1*, two I-RGC markers, are co-expressed in subsets of RGCs at E13-E16.

d. Volcano plot showing DE genes (MAST test, $p < 10^{-6}$) between predicted I-RGCs and C-RGCs at E16. The x- and the y-axes show the fold-change and the p-value in log2- and log10- units, respectively. Dots represent genes, with red and dots highlighting I- and C-RGC enriched genes respectively at fold-change > 1.5 and Bonferroni corrected p-value < 5e-5. The two vertical bars correspond to a fold-change of 1.5 in either direction.

e. Same as d, for P0

1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900

1901
1902

1903
1904
1905

1906
1907
1908

1909
1910
1911

1912
1913

1914
1915
1916

1917
1918

1919
1920
1921

1922
1923
1924

References

Baden, T., Berens, P., Franke, K., Roman Roson, M., Bethge, M., & Euler, T. (2016). The functional diversity of retinal ganglion cells in the mouse. *Nature*, 529(7586), 345-350. doi:10.1038/nature16468

Baden, T., Euler, T., & Berens, P. (2020). Understanding the retinal basis of vision across species. *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 21(1), 5-20. doi:10.1038/s41583-019-0242-1

Bae, J. A., Mu, S., Kim, J. S., Turner, N. L., Tartavull, I., Kemnitz, N., . . . Eyewirers. (2018). Digital Museum of Retinal Ganglion Cells with Dense Anatomy and Physiology. *Cell*, 173(5), 1293-1306 e1219. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2018.04.040

Baron, C. S., & van Oudenaarden, A. (2019). Unravelling cellular relationships during development and regeneration using genetic lineage tracing. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol*, 20(12), 753-765. doi:10.1038/s41580-019-0186-3

Barres, B. A., Silverstein, B. E., Corey, D. P., & Chun, L. L. (1988). Immunological, morphological, and electrophysiological variation among retinal ganglion cells purified by panning. *Neuron*, 1(9), 791-803. doi:10.1016/0896-6273(88)90127-4

Bassett, E. A., & Wallace, V. A. (2012). Cell fate determination in the vertebrate retina. *Trends Neurosci*, 35(9), 565-573. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2012.05.004

Becht, E., McInnes, L., Healy, J., Dutertre, C.-A., Kwok, I. W., Ng, L. G., . . . Newell, E. W. (2019). Dimensionality reduction for visualizing single-cell data using UMAP. *Nature biotechnology*, 37(1), 38-44.

Berson, D. M., Dunn, F. A., & Takao, M. (2002). Phototransduction by retinal ganglion cells that set the circadian clock. *Science*, 295(5557), 1070-1073. doi:10.1126/science.1067262

Blackshaw, S., Harpavat, S., Trimarchi, J., Cai, L., Huang, H., Kuo, W. P., . . . Cepko, C. L. (2004). Genomic analysis of mouse retinal development. *PLoS Biol*, 2(9), E247. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0020247

Boije, H., MacDonald, R. B., & Harris, W. A. (2014). Reconciling competence and transcriptional hierarchies with stochasticity in retinal lineages. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*, 27, 68-74. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2014.02.014

- 1925 Brown, N. L., Patel, S., Brzezinski, J., & Glaser, T. (2001). Math5 is required for retinal ganglion
1926 cell and optic nerve formation. *Development*, 128(13), 2497-2508. Retrieved from
1927 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11493566>
- 1928 Cembrowski, M. S., & Spruston, N. (2019). Heterogeneity within classical cell types is the rule:
1929 lessons from hippocampal pyramidal neurons. *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 20(4), 193-204.
1930 doi:10.1038/s41583-019-0125-5
- 1931 Cepko, C. (2014). Intrinsically different retinal progenitor cells produce specific types of progeny.
1932 *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 15(9), 615-627. doi:10.1038/nrn3767
- 1933 Chen, S., Wang, Q. L., Nie, Z., Sun, H., Lennon, G., Copeland, N. G., . . . Zack, D. J. (1997).
1934 Crx, a novel Otx-like paired-homeodomain protein, binds to and transactivates
1935 photoreceptor cell-specific genes. *Neuron*, 19(5), 1017-1030. doi:10.1016/s0896-
1936 6273(00)80394-3
- 1937 Chen, T., & Guestrin, C. (2016). *Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system*. Paper presented at
1938 the Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge
1939 discovery and data mining.
- 1940 Chizat, L., Peyré, G., Schmitzer, B., & Vialard, F.-X. (2018). Scaling algorithms for unbalanced
1941 optimal transport problems. *Mathematics of Computation*, 87(314), 2563-2609.
- 1942 Clark, B. S., Stein-O'Brien, G. L., Shiao, F., Cannon, G. H., Davis-Marcisak, E., Sherman, T., . .
1943 . Blackshaw, S. (2019). Single-Cell RNA-Seq Analysis of Retinal Development Identifies
1944 NFI Factors as Regulating Mitotic Exit and Late-Born Cell Specification. *Neuron*, 102(6),
1945 1111-1126 e1115. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2019.04.010
- 1946 Demyanenko, G. P., & Maness, P. F. (2003). The L1 cell adhesion molecule is essential for
1947 topographic mapping of retinal axons. *J Neurosci*, 23(2), 530-538. Retrieved from
1948 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12533613>
- 1949 Di Bella, D. J., Habibi, E., Stickels, R. R., Scalia, G., Brown, J., Yadollahpour, P., . . . Arlotta, P.
1950 (2021). Molecular logic of cellular diversification in the mouse cerebral cortex. *Nature*,
1951 595(7868), 554-559. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03670-5
- 1952 Dowling, J. E. (2012). *The Retina: An Approachable Part of the Brain* (2nd ed.): Harvard
1953 University Press.
- 1954 Drager, U. C. (1985). Birth dates of retinal ganglion cells giving rise to the crossed and
1955 uncrossed optic projections in the mouse. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, 224(1234), 57-
1956 77. doi:10.1098/rspb.1985.0021
- 1957 Espinosa-Medina, I., Garcia-Marques, J., Cepko, C., & Lee, T. (2019). High-throughput dense
1958 reconstruction of cell lineages. *Open Biol*, 9(12), 190229. doi:10.1098/rsob.190229

- 1959 Famigietti, E. V., Jr., & Kolb, H. (1976). Structural basis for ON-and OFF-center responses in
1960 retinal ganglion cells. *Science*, 194(4261), 193-195. doi:10.1126/science.959847
- 1961 Farah, M. H., & Easter, S. S., Jr. (2005). Cell birth and death in the mouse retinal ganglion cell
1962 layer. *J Comp Neurol*, 489(1), 120-134. doi:10.1002/cne.20615
- 1963 Finak, G., McDavid, A., Yajima, M., Deng, J., Gersuk, V., Shalek, A. K., . . . Gottardo, R. (2015).
1964 MAST: a flexible statistical framework for assessing transcriptional changes and
1965 characterizing heterogeneity in single-cell RNA sequencing data. *Genome Biol*, 16, 278.
1966 doi:10.1186/s13059-015-0844-5
- 1967 Franke, K., Berens, P., Schubert, T., Bethge, M., Euler, T., & Baden, T. (2017). Inhibition
1968 decorrelates visual feature representations in the inner retina. *Nature*, 542(7642), 439-
1969 444. doi:10.1038/nature21394
- 1970 Fruchterman, T. M., & Reingold, E. M. (1991). Graph drawing by force-directed placement.
1971 *Software: Practice and experience*, 21(11), 1129-1164.
- 1972 Fyodorov, Y. V., & Mirlin, A. D. (1992). Analytical derivation of the scaling law for the inverse
1973 participation ratio in quasi-one-dimensional disordered systems. *Physical review letters*,
1974 69(7), 1093.
- 1975 Godement, P., Salaun, J., & Imbert, M. (1984). Prenatal and postnatal development of
1976 retinogeniculate and retinocollicular projections in the mouse. *J Comp Neurol*, 230(4),
1977 552-575. doi:10.1002/cne.902300406
- 1978 Goetz, J., Jessen, Z. F., Jacobi, A., Mani, A., Cooler, S., Greer, D., . . . Sanes, J. (2021). Unified
1979 classification of mouse retinal ganglion cells using function, morphology, and gene
1980 expression. *bioRxiv*.
- 1981 Gomes, F. L., Zhang, G., Carbonell, F., Correa, J. A., Harris, W. A., Simons, B. D., & Cayouette,
1982 M. (2011). Reconstruction of rat retinal progenitor cell lineages in vitro reveals a
1983 surprising degree of stochasticity in cell fate decisions. *Development*, 138(2), 227-235.
1984 doi:10.1242/dev.059683
- 1985 Herrera, E., Brown, L., Aruga, J., Rachel, R. A., Dolen, G., Mikoshiba, K., . . . Mason, C. A.
1986 (2003). Zic2 patterns binocular vision by specifying the uncrossed retinal projection. *Cell*,
1987 114(5), 545-557. doi:10.1016/s0092-8674(03)00684-6
- 1988 Holguera, I., & Desplan, C. (2018). Neuronal specification in space and time. *Science*,
1989 362(6411), 176-180. doi:10.1126/science.aas9435
- 1990 Holt, C. E., Bertsch, T. W., Ellis, H. M., & Harris, W. A. (1988). Cellular determination in the
1991 *Xenopus* retina is independent of lineage and birth date. *Neuron*, 1(1), 15-26.
1992 doi:10.1016/0896-6273(88)90205-x

- 1993 Hong, Y. K., Kim, I. J., & Sanes, J. R. (2011). Stereotyped axonal arbors of retinal ganglion cell
1994 subsets in the mouse superior colliculus. *J Comp Neurol*, 519(9), 1691-1711.
1995 doi:10.1002/cne.22595
- 1996 Hooks, B. M., & Chen, C. (2020). Circuitry Underlying Experience-Dependent Plasticity in the
1997 Mouse Visual System. *Neuron*, 107(5), 986-987. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2020.08.004
- 1998 Jeon, C. J., Strettoi, E., & Masland, R. H. (1998). The major cell populations of the mouse
1999 retina. *J Neurosci*, 18(21), 8936-8946. Retrieved from
2000 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9786999>
- 2001 Johnson, K. P., Fitzpatrick, M. J., Zhao, L., Wang, B., McCracken, S., Williams, P. R., &
2002 Kerschensteiner, D. (2021). Cell-type-specific binocular vision guides predation in mice.
2003 *Neuron*, 109(9), 1527-1539 e1524. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2021.03.010
- 2004 Johnston, R. J., Jr., & Desplan, C. (2010). Stochastic mechanisms of cell fate specification that
2005 yield random or robust outcomes. *Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol*, 26, 689-719.
2006 doi:10.1146/annurev-cellbio-100109-104113
- 2007 Kantorovich, L. V. (1942). *On the translocation of masses*. Paper presented at the Dokl. Akad.
2008 Nauk. USSR (NS).
- 2009 Kay, J. N., Chu, M. W., & Sanes, J. R. (2012). MEGF10 and MEGF11 mediate homotypic
2010 interactions required for mosaic spacing of retinal neurons. *Nature*, 483(7390), 465-469.
2011 doi:10.1038/nature10877
- 2012 Kay, J. N., De la Huerta, I., Kim, I. J., Zhang, Y., Yamagata, M., Chu, M. W., . . . Sanes, J. R.
2013 (2011). Retinal ganglion cells with distinct directional preferences differ in molecular
2014 identity, structure, and central projections. *J Neurosci*, 31(21), 7753-7762.
2015 doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0907-11.2011
- 2016 Keeley, P. W., Eglén, S. J., & Reese, B. E. (2020). From random to regular: Variation in the
2017 patterning of retinal mosaics. *J Comp Neurol*, 528(13), 2135-2160.
2018 doi:10.1002/cne.24880
- 2019 Kim, I. J., Zhang, Y., Meister, M., & Sanes, J. R. (2010). Laminar restriction of retinal ganglion
2020 cell dendrites and axons: subtype-specific developmental patterns revealed with
2021 transgenic markers. *J Neurosci*, 30(4), 1452-1462. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4779-
2022 09.2010
- 2023 Kiyama, T., Long, Y., Chen, C. K., Whitaker, C. M., Shay, A., Wu, H., . . . Mao, C. A. (2019).
2024 Essential Roles of Tbr1 in the Formation and Maintenance of the Orientation-Selective J-
2025 RGCs and a Group of OFF-Sustained RGCs in Mouse. *Cell Rep*, 27(3), 900-915 e905.
2026 doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2019.03.077

- 2027 Lefebvre, J. L., Sanes, J. R., & Kay, J. N. (2015). Development of dendritic form and function.
2028 *Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol*, 31, 741-777. doi:10.1146/annurev-cellbio-100913-013020
- 2029 Liu, J., Reggiani, J. D. S., Laboulaye, M. A., Pandey, S., Chen, B., Rubenstein, J. L. R., . . .
2030 Sanes, J. R. (2018). Tbr1 instructs laminar patterning of retinal ganglion cell dendrites.
2031 *Nat Neurosci*, 21(5), 659-670. doi:10.1038/s41593-018-0127-z
- 2032 Livesey, F. J., & Cepko, C. L. (2001). Vertebrate neural cell-fate determination: lessons from the
2033 retina. *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 2(2), 109-118. doi:10.1038/35053522
- 2034 Lo Giudice, Q., Leleu, M., La Manno, G., & Fabre, P. J. (2019). Single-cell transcriptional logic
2035 of cell-fate specification and axon guidance in early-born retinal neurons. *Development*,
2036 146(17). doi:10.1242/dev.178103
- 2037 Lodato, S., & Arlotta, P. (2015). Generating neuronal diversity in the mammalian cerebral
2038 cortex. *Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol*, 31, 699-720. doi:10.1146/annurev-cellbio-100814-
2039 125353
- 2040 Lyu, J., & Mu, X. (2021). Genetic control of retinal ganglion cell genesis. *Cell Mol Life Sci*, 78(9),
2041 4417-4433. doi:10.1007/s00018-021-03814-w
- 2042 Macosko, E. Z., Basu, A., Satija, R., Nemesh, J., Shekhar, K., Goldman, M., . . . McCarroll, S. A.
2043 (2015). Highly Parallel Genome-wide Expression Profiling of Individual Cells Using
2044 Nanoliter Droplets. *Cell*, 161(5), 1202-1214. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2015.05.002
- 2045 Mao, C.-A., Chen, C.-K., Kiyama, T., Weber, N., Whitaker, C. M., Pan, P., . . . Massey, S. C.
2046 (2020). Tbr2-expressing retinal ganglion cells are ipRGCs. *bioRxiv*.
- 2047 Mao, C. A., Li, H., Zhang, Z., Kiyama, T., Panda, S., Hattar, S., . . . Wang, S. W. (2014). T-box
2048 transcription regulator Tbr2 is essential for the formation and maintenance of
2049 Opn4/melanopsin-expressing intrinsically photosensitive retinal ganglion cells. *J*
2050 *Neurosci*, 34(39), 13083-13095. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1027-14.2014
- 2051 Marcucci, F., Soares, C. A., & Mason, C. (2019). Distinct timing of neurogenesis of ipsilateral
2052 and contralateral retinal ganglion cells. *J Comp Neurol*, 527(1), 212-224.
2053 doi:10.1002/cne.24467
- 2054 Marquardt, T., & Gruss, P. (2002). Generating neuronal diversity in the retina: one for nearly all.
2055 *Trends Neurosci*, 25(1), 32-38. doi:10.1016/s0166-2236(00)02028-2
- 2056 Martersteck, E. M., Hirokawa, K. E., Evarts, M., Bernard, A., Duan, X., Li, Y., . . . Harris, J. A.
2057 (2017). Diverse Central Projection Patterns of Retinal Ganglion Cells. *Cell Rep*, 18(8),
2058 2058-2072. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2017.01.075

2059 Masland, R. H. (2012). The neuronal organization of the retina. *Neuron*, 76(2), 266-280.
2060 doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2012.10.002

2061 Mason, C., & Slavi, N. (2020). Retinal Ganglion Cell Axon Wiring Establishing the Binocular
2062 Circuit. *Annu Rev Vis Sci*, 6, 215-236. doi:10.1146/annurev-vision-091517-034306

2063 McConnell, S. K. (1991). The generation of neuronal diversity in the central nervous system.
2064 *Annu Rev Neurosci*, 14, 269-300. doi:10.1146/annurev.ne.14.030191.001413

2065 McKenna, A., Findlay, G. M., Gagnon, J. A., Horwitz, M. S., Schier, A. F., & Shendure, J.
2066 (2016). Whole-organism lineage tracing by combinatorial and cumulative genome
2067 editing. *Science*, 353(6298), aaf7907. doi:10.1126/science.aaf7907

2068 McNeill, D. S., Sheely, C. J., Ecker, J. L., Badea, T. C., Morhardt, D., Guido, W., & Hattar, S.
2069 (2011). Development of melanopsin-based irradiance detecting circuitry. *Neural Dev*, 6,
2070 8. doi:10.1186/1749-8104-6-8

2071 Monge, G. (1781). Mémoire sur la théorie des déblais et des remblais. *Histoire de l'Académie*
2072 *Royale des Sciences de Paris*.

2073 Osterhout, J. A., Josten, N., Yamada, J., Pan, F., Wu, S. W., Nguyen, P. L., . . . Huberman, A.
2074 D. (2011). Cadherin-6 mediates axon-target matching in a non-image-forming visual
2075 circuit. *Neuron*, 71(4), 632-639. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2011.07.006

2076 Pak, W., Hindges, R., Lim, Y. S., Pfaff, S. L., & O'Leary, D. D. (2004). Magnitude of binocular
2077 vision controlled by islet-2 repression of a genetic program that specifies laterality of
2078 retinal axon pathfinding. *Cell*, 119(4), 567-578. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2004.10.026

2079 Peng, Y. R., Tran, N. M., Krishnaswamy, A., Kostadinov, D., Martersteck, E. M., & Sanes, J. R.
2080 (2017). Satb1 Regulates Contactin 5 to Pattern Dendrites of a Mammalian Retinal
2081 Ganglion Cell. *Neuron*, 95(4), 869-883 e866. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2017.07.019

2082 Price, J., Turner, D., & Cepko, C. (1987). Lineage analysis in the vertebrate nervous system by
2083 retrovirus-mediated gene transfer. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 84(1), 156-160.
2084 doi:10.1073/pnas.84.1.156

2085 Rheaume, B. A., Jereen, A., Bolisetty, M., Sajid, M. S., Yang, Y., Renna, K., . . . Trakhtenberg,
2086 E. F. (2018). Single cell transcriptome profiling of retinal ganglion cells identifies cellular
2087 subtypes. *Nat Commun*, 9(1), 2759. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-05134-3

2088 Rockhill, R. L., Euler, T., & Masland, R. H. (2000). Spatial order within but not between types of
2089 retinal neurons. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 97(5), 2303-2307.
2090 doi:10.1073/pnas.030413497

- 2091 Rousso, D. L., Qiao, M., Kagan, R. D., Yamagata, M., Palmiter, R. D., & Sanes, J. R. (2016).
 2092 Two Pairs of ON and OFF Retinal Ganglion Cells Are Defined by Intersectional Patterns
 2093 of Transcription Factor Expression. *Cell Rep*, 15(9), 1930-1944.
 2094 doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2016.04.069
- 2095 Sagner, A., & Briscoe, J. (2019). Establishing neuronal diversity in the spinal cord: a time and a
 2096 place. *Development*, 146(22). doi:10.1242/dev.182154
- 2097 Sajgo, S., Ghinia, M. G., Brooks, M., Kretschmer, F., Chuang, K., Hiriyanna, S., . . . Badea, T.
 2098 C. (2017). Molecular codes for cell type specification in Brn3 retinal ganglion cells. *Proc*
 2099 *Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 114(20), E3974-E3983. doi:10.1073/pnas.1618551114
- 2100 Sanes, J. R., & Masland, R. H. (2015). The types of retinal ganglion cells: current status and
 2101 implications for neuronal classification. *Annu Rev Neurosci*, 38, 221-246.
 2102 doi:10.1146/annurev-neuro-071714-034120
- 2103 Sanes, J. R., Rubenstein, J. L., & Nicolas, J. F. (1986). Use of a recombinant retrovirus to study
 2104 post-implantation cell lineage in mouse embryos. *EMBO J*, 5(12), 3133-3142. Retrieved
 2105 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3102226>
- 2106 Schiebinger, G., Shu, J., Tabaka, M., Cleary, B., Subramanian, V., Solomon, A., . . . Lander, E.
 2107 S. (2019). Optimal-Transport Analysis of Single-Cell Gene Expression Identifies
 2108 Developmental Trajectories in Reprogramming. *Cell*, 176(6), 1517.
 2109 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2019.02.026
- 2110 Sharma, N., Flaherty, K., Lezgiyeva, K., Wagner, D. E., Klein, A. M., & Ginty, D. D. (2020). The
 2111 emergence of transcriptional identity in somatosensory neurons. *Nature*, 577(7790),
 2112 392-398. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1900-1
- 2113 Shekhar, K., Lapan, S. W., Whitney, I. E., Tran, N. M., Macosko, E. Z., Kowalczyk, M., . . .
 2114 Sanes, J. R. (2016). Comprehensive Classification of Retinal Bipolar Neurons by Single-
 2115 Cell Transcriptomics. *Cell*, 166(5), 1308-1323 e1330. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.07.054
- 2116 Shekhar, K., & Sanes, J. R. (2021). Generating and Using Transcriptomically Based Retinal Cell
 2117 Atlases. *Annu Rev Vis Sci*. doi:10.1146/annurev-vision-032621-075200
- 2118 Soares, C. A., & Mason, C. A. (2015). Transient ipsilateral retinal ganglion cell projections to the
 2119 brain: Extent, targeting, and disappearance. *Dev Neurobiol*, 75(12), 1385-1401.
 2120 doi:10.1002/dneu.22291
- 2121 Stehman, S. V. (1997). Selecting and interpreting measures of thematic classification accuracy.
 2122 *Remote sensing of Environment*, 62(1), 77-89.
- 2123 Tran, N. M., Shekhar, K., Whitney, I. E., Jacobi, A., Benhar, I., Hong, G., . . . Sanes, J. R.
 2124 (2019). Single-Cell Profiles of Retinal Ganglion Cells Differing in Resilience to Injury

2125 Reveal Neuroprotective Genes. *Neuron*, 104(6), 1039-1055 e1012.
2126 doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2019.11.006

2127 Trimarchi, J. M., Stadler, M. B., & Cepko, C. L. (2008). Individual retinal progenitor cells display
2128 extensive heterogeneity of gene expression. *PLoS One*, 3(2), e1588.
2129 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001588

2130 Turner, D. L., & Cepko, C. L. (1987). A common progenitor for neurons and glia persists in rat
2131 retina late in development. *Nature*, 328(6126), 131-136. doi:10.1038/328131a0

2132 Turner, D. L., Snyder, E. Y., & Cepko, C. L. (1990). Lineage-independent determination of cell
2133 type in the embryonic mouse retina. *Neuron*, 4(6), 833-845. doi:10.1016/0896-
2134 6273(90)90136-4

2135 Villani, C. (2009). *Optimal transport: old and new* (Vol. 338): Springer.

2136 Voinescu, P. E., Kay, J. N., & Sanes, J. R. (2009). Birthdays of retinal amacrine cell subtypes
2137 are systematically related to their molecular identity and soma position. *J Comp Neurol*,
2138 517(5), 737-750. doi:10.1002/cne.22200

2139 Wamsley, B., & Fishell, G. (2017). Genetic and activity-dependent mechanisms underlying
2140 interneuron diversity. *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 18(5), 299-309. doi:10.1038/nrn.2017.30

2141 Wang, Q., Marcucci, F., Cerullo, I., & Mason, C. (2016). Ipsilateral and Contralateral Retinal
2142 Ganglion Cells Express Distinct Genes during Decussation at the Optic Chiasm. *eNeuro*,
2143 3(6). doi:10.1523/ENEURO.0169-16.2016

2144 Welch, J. D., Kozareva, V., Ferreira, A., Vanderburg, C., Martin, C., & Macosko, E. Z. (2019).
2145 Single-Cell Multi-omic Integration Compares and Contrasts Features of Brain Cell
2146 Identity. *Cell*, 177(7), 1873-1887 e1817. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2019.05.006

2147 Wetts, R., & Fraser, S. E. (1988). Multipotent precursors can give rise to all major cell types of
2148 the frog retina. *Science*, 239(4844), 1142-1145. doi:10.1126/science.2449732

2149 Yamagata, M., Yan, W., & Sanes, J. R. (2021). A cell atlas of the chick retina based on single-
2150 cell transcriptomics. *Elife*, 10. doi:10.7554/eLife.63907

2151 Yan, W., Laboulaye, M. A., Tran, N. M., Whitney, I. E., Benhar, I., & Sanes, J. R. (2020). Mouse
2152 Retinal Cell Atlas: Molecular Identification of over Sixty Amacrine Cell Types. *J Neurosci*,
2153 40(27), 5177-5195. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0471-20.2020

2154 Yuste, R., Hawrylycz, M., Aalling, N., Aguilar-Valles, A., Arendt, D., Armananzas, R., . . . Lein,
2155 E. (2020). A community-based transcriptomics classification and nomenclature of
2156 neocortical cell types. *Nat Neurosci*, 23(12), 1456-1468. doi:10.1038/s41593-020-0685-8

2157 Zeng, H., & Sanes, J. R. (2017). Neuronal cell-type classification: challenges, opportunities and
2158 the path forward. *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 18(9), 530-546. doi:10.1038/nrn.2017.85

2159 Zheng, G. X., Terry, J. M., Belgrader, P., Ryvkin, P., Bent, Z. W., Wilson, R., . . . Bielas, J. H.
2160 (2017). Massively parallel digital transcriptional profiling of single cells. *Nat Commun*, 8,
2161 14049. doi:10.1038/ncomms14049
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166

Supplementary Fig. 1

Supplementary Fig. 2

Supplementary Fig. 3

a **b** **c**

Correlation of transport couplings at the level of clusters

Supplementary Fig. 5

Supplementary Figure 6

Supplementary Figure 8