



The crustacean model *Parhyale hawaiiensis*

Mathilde Paris^{a,b}, Carsten Wolff^c, Nipam H. Patel^{c,d,*},
and Michalis Averof^{a,b,*}

^aInstitut de Génomique Fonctionnelle de Lyon, École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, Lyon, France

^bCentre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), France

^cMarine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA, United States

^dDepartment of Organismal Biology and Anatomy, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, United States

*Corresponding authors: e-mail address: npatel@mbi.edu; michalis.averof@ens-lyon.fr

Contents

1. Natural habitat and lifecycle	200
1.1 Where <i>Parhyale</i> live	200
1.2 Morphology	200
1.3 Lifecycle	201
2. From mangrove to lab	202
2.1 Historical info	202
2.2 Lab culture	203
2.3 Inbred line	204
3. Major interests and research questions	204
3.1 Embryonic development and germ layer formation	204
3.2 Body and limb patterning	206
3.3 Regeneration	207
3.4 Neurobiology, sensory systems and behavior	208
3.5 Circadian and tidal rhythms	210
3.6 Lignocellulose digestion	211
3.7 Ecotoxicology	211
4. Experimental tools, approaches and resources	211
4.1 Experimental embryology	211
4.2 Loss-of function approaches	212
4.3 Transgenesis	213
4.4 Genetic markers and drivers	214
4.5 Genetic tools based on transgenesis	217
4.6 Live imaging and cell lineage analysis	218
4.7 Genetic crosses and forward genetics	219
4.8 Genome sequence	220
4.9 Gene identification and annotation	221
4.10 Expression and chromatin profiling	222

5. Research community	223
Acknowledgments/Funding	224
References	224

Abstract

Arthropods are the most abundant and diverse animals on earth. Among them, pan-crustaceans are an ancient and morphologically diverse group, comprising a wide range of aquatic and semi-aquatic crustaceans as well as the insects, which emerged from crustacean ancestors to colonize most terrestrial habitats. Within insects, *Drosophila* stands out as one of the most powerful animal models, making major contributions to our understanding of development, physiology and behavior. Given these attributes, crustaceans provide a fertile ground for exploring biological diversity through comparative studies. However, beyond insects, few crustaceans are developed sufficiently as experimental models to enable such studies. The marine amphipod *Parhyale hawaiiensis* is currently the best established crustacean system, offering year-round accessibility to developmental stages, transgenic tools, genomic resources, and established genetics and imaging approaches. The *Parhyale* research community is small but diverse, investigating the evolution of development, regeneration, aspects of sensory biology, chronobiology, bioprocessing and ecotoxicology.



1. Natural habitat and lifecycle

1.1 Where *Parhyale* live

Parhyale hawaiiensis (Dana, 1853) (Peracarida, Amphipoda, Hyalidae) are marine amphipod crustaceans, belonging to the talitrid superfamily (commonly known as beach-hoppers, sand-hoppers or sand-fleas) (Fig. 1). First described from the Hawaiian islands (Dana, 1853), *Parhyale hawaiiensis* are cosmopolitan amphipods with a worldwide, circumtropical distribution (Barnard, 1965; Shoemaker, 1956) and might represent a species complex (Myers, 1985). They occur in intertidal habitats such as bays, estuaries and mangroves (Poovachiranon, Boto, & Duke, 1986; Shoemaker, 1956) and prefer rocky beaches and macroalgal fauna (Barnard, 1965). Occupying shallow intertidal waters, *Parhyale* can tolerate variations in salinity (5 to 40 ppt) and temperature (Poovachiranon et al., 1986). As effective detritus feeders with large population sizes (up to 7000 individuals per m²) they can play an important role in ecosystems such as mangrove forests (Poovachiranon et al., 1986).

1.2 Morphology

Parhyale exhibit a pattern of segmental organization that is common to malacostracan crustaceans, including head, thoracic (pereon) and abdominal



Fig. 1 *Parhyale hawaiiensis* couple. The male clasps the smaller female. (Photo credit: Vincent Mongorgé).

(pleon) units with conserved numbers of segments. The head bears sensory antennae and feeding appendages. The pereon is composed of eight segments: a first segment bearing modified feeding appendages (maxillipeds, T1), followed by two grasping appendages (gnathopods, T2–3) and five walking legs (T4–8). Maxillipeds are morphologically and functionally associated with the head segments. Walking legs T4–5 are oriented anteriorly, while T6–8 are oriented posteriorly—hence the name “amphipoda,” which derives from the Greek *αμφί*/both and *πούς*/leg. The pleon is composed of six segments, each with a pair of branched (biramous) appendages. The first three pairs are swimmerets, the following three are smaller and more stiff uropods for holding onto or jumping from the substrate. All these various appendages with different morphologies are considered to be serially homologous (Liubicich et al., 2009; Martin et al., 2016; Pavlopoulos et al., 2009; Pavlopoulos & Wolff, 2020). Divakaran (1976) provides a detailed description of the morphology, organ systems and biology of *Parhyale hawaiiensis*.

1.3 Lifecycle

Like most amphipod crustaceans, *Parhyale* shows sexual dimorphism. Mature males are usually larger than females of the same age and bear T3 gnathopods in which the two last leg segments (propodus, dactylus) are significantly enlarged. Males use this enlarged claw-like structure to clasp and hold on to a female in a mating position known as amplexus (Fig. 1). *Parhyale* adults pair a few days before females are ready to lay eggs. When the female

moult, the male transfers sperm into the female's brood pouch and releases her, as she starts to release her eggs in the brood pouch (Borowsky & Borowsky, 1987; Divakaran, 1976). As in most peracarid crustaceans, the females carry the fertilized eggs in a ventral brood pouch (marsupium), which is formed by specialized side branches (oostegites) of thoracic appendages T3–6 (Wolff & Gerberding, 2015). Depending on the size and the age of the female, the marsupium can contain up to ~30 eggs. The eggs of each brood are developmentally synchronized (Browne, Price, Gerberding, & Patel, 2005). The embryonic development is direct, with no larval stages. After about 10 days at 26 °C, juveniles hatch as miniature versions of the adult (Browne et al., 2005) and stay for a few more days inside the marsupium. *Parhyale* grow through successive molts, in which they shed their cuticle and replace it by a new one, during their entire lifetime. Their body length increases from ~1 mm in hatchlings to >10 mm in adults. Secondary sexual characters, such as oostegites and male claspers differentiate during reproductive maturation, which takes at least 6–7 weeks at 26 °C.



2. From mangrove to lab

2.1 Historical info

While *Parhyale* are found in tropical waters around the world, the lab cultures of *Parhyale* are derived from animals collected by William Browne from the seawater filtration system of the Shedd Aquarium (Chicago, IL, USA) almost 25 years ago, in 1997. Thus, the geographical origin of the cultured animals remains a mystery, as the *Parhyale* presumably entered the system as hitchhikers from other material purposely introduced into the seawater tanks.

The selection of an amphipod crustacean was not a complete accident, however, as the extensive work of Wolfgang Dohle (reviewed in Dohle & Scholtz, 1988) had documented a remarkable pattern of orderly cell divisions that generates the germband of amphipod crustaceans, and at that time there was great interest in understanding the process of segmentation in arthropods that, unlike *Drosophila*, add segments sequentially in a cellularized rather than a syncytial context. Thus, *Parhyale* was an ideal organism for comparative evolutionary developmental studies of early pattern formation (phylogenetic context presented in Fig. 2). Once introduced into the lab, *Parhyale* were readily established in shallow seawater tanks and easily maintained with relatively little effort (Gerberding, Browne, & Patel, 2002). There were some issues with rotifers in the female brood pouches that led to high mortality of embryos, but these rotifers were eventually removed from the cultures.




Fig. 2 *Parhyale* and other arthropod models, shown in the context of animal phylogeny, focusing on experimental and/or genomics models representing five major arthropod clades: insects, branchiopod and malacostracan crustaceans, centipedes and spiders. Crustaceans are paraphyletic with respect to the insects (Schwentner, Combosch, Pakes Nelson, & Giribet, 2017). The divergence times are tentative and in some cases controversial; unresolved nodes are shown as polytomies (see Kapli & Telford, 2020; Telford, Budd, & Philippe, 2015).

2.2 Lab culture

Parhyale are very hardy and do well in a variety of culture systems (Fig. 3). They are generally kept in shallow trays of artificial seawater with either an airstone or impeller pump to keep water circulating. They will readily accept a variety of food including fish flakes, kelp powder, carrots, and pellets formulated for feeding shrimp. A substrate composed of crushed coral or aragonite rock will help to buffer the pH and provide hiding spaces for juvenile animals. Water changes at two-week intervals help to maintain water quality, although animals will easily survive even under conditions of poor water quality provided that the water remains well oxygenated. Water salinity is kept at 24–32ppt. Tanks with an active biological filtration system and strong circulation can support many hundreds of adult animals per liter. Under ideal conditions of 26–28 °C with frequent feeding, *Parhyale* can go through an entire generation in about 2 months. Individual adults can survive and remain reproductive for up to 2–3 years. *Parhyale* cultures are so robust that the species is being considered for aquaculture (Vargas-Abúndez, López-Vázquez, Mascaró, Martínez-Moreno, & Simões, 2021).



Fig. 3 A dense laboratory culture of *Parhyale* feeding on shrimp meal wafers.

2.3 Inbred line

Shortly after the *Parhyale* cultures were established, an inbred isofemale line, Chicago-F, was created through two rounds of sibling inbreeding, and then maintained as an isolated population since. This line was used for the creation of a BAC library (Parchem, Poulin, Stuart, Amemiya, & Patel, 2010, at the time the line was called Iso2) and for genome sequencing (Kao et al., 2016). Further attempts at inbreeding resulted in unhealthy animals which failed to survive (M. Vargas-Vila and N. Patel, unpublished observations). The Chicago-F line carries fewer polymorphisms than other laboratory populations, but still carries a high level of polymorphism in some parts of the genome (Kao et al., 2016).



3. Major interests and research questions

3.1 Embryonic development and germ layer formation

Embryogenesis takes ~11 days at 26 °C. Embryos undergo direct development, so hatch as miniature versions of the adults. Eggs can be removed from the female brood pouch without harming the female, and the eggs are easily maintained in petri dishes with sterile seawater.

Embryogenesis has been divided into a series of stages based on morphological criteria (Browne et al. 2005). Initial cell divisions are holoblastic, and at 8 h of development the embryo is composed of 8 cells: 4 macromeres and 4 micromeres. Initial lineage studies show that these cells subsequently give

rise to defined germ layers of the embryo (Gerberding et al., 2002; Price, Modrell, Hannibal, & Patel, 2010). The four macromeres are called Ep, El, Er, and Mav, and the four micromeres are g, mr, ml, and en. Ep, Er, and El give rise to the ectoderm (posterior, right, and left, respectively). Mav gives rise to the visceral mesoderm and anterior somatic mesoderm. The somatic mesoderm on the left and right sides of the body are derived from ml and mr respectively, g gives rise to the germline. en was initially characterised as producing the endoderm, although subsequent studies suggest that it gives rise to extra-embryonic cells and the endoderm is derived from Mav (C. Chaw and N. Patel, unpublished). This lineage pattern is also observed in another amphipod, *Orchestia cavimana* (Wolff & Scholtz, 2002).

Ablation experiments of Ep, Er, El, ml, mr, and Mav reveal that compensation is possible when an individual macromere or micromere is ablated, but that compensation is restricted to within a given germ layer (Price et al., 2010). Thus, ablation of an ectodermal blastomere will be compensated, but only by another blastomere that would normally also give rise to ectoderm, and the same is true for the mesoderm. This compensation occurs if the ablation is done to a blastomere or its progeny prior to gastrulation. Once gastrulation has occurred, compensation either does not occur, or is very incomplete (Hannibal, Price, & Patel, 2012; Price et al., 2010). Studies of the g blastomere suggest that this cell contains germ plasm (Gupta & Extavour, 2013; Ozhan-Kizil, Havemann, & Gerberding, 2009) and other lineages cannot compensate for g cell ablation during embryogenesis (Extavour, 2005).

The ectoderm of the thorax and abdomen form by condensation of the ectodermal cells into an orderly array of rows and columns, which then follow a remarkably well-organized pattern of subsequent divisions, so that each subsequent parasegment of the embryo is derived from a single row of precursor cells, called a parasegment precursor row (PSPR) (Browne et al., 2005; Gerberding et al., 2002; Sun & Patel, 2019). This pattern of parasegment formation is also seen in other crustaceans (reviewed in Dohle & Scholtz, 1988), although amphipods are unique among malacostracan crustaceans in not possessing ectoteloblast stem cells that produce the PSPRs.

The somatic mesoderm of the thorax and abdomen of *Parhyale* are produced by eight mesoteloblast stem cells (four per side) derived from ml and mr. These mesoteloblasts undergo a series of highly organized asymmetric divisions, which form rows of mesoblasts, with each row of mesoblasts then giving rise to a segmental unit of muscles (Gerberding et al., 2002; Hannibal, Price, Parchem, & Patel, 2012; Hannibal, Price, & Patel, 2012).

3.2 Body and limb patterning

Like most other crustaceans, *Parhyale* possess a pair of appendages on each segment of the body. Orthologs of the homeotic (*Hox*) genes have been identified in *Parhyale* and found to be expressed along the anterior-posterior axis of the embryo as in most other animals (Liubicich et al., 2009, Serano et al., 2016). They are present as a single complex spanning about 3.6 Mb (D. Sun and N. Patel, unpublished observations). The function in *Parhyale* of one of these genes, *Ultrabithorax* (*Ubx*), has been probed by ubiquitous misexpression using a transgenic approach (Pavlopoulos et al., 2009) and knockdown via RNAi (Liubicich et al., 2009). Both experiments confirmed that *Ubx* plays a role in establishing segmental identity, most obviously seen by transformations of appendage identity. Furthermore, these studies supported the previous hypothesis, based on comparison of *Ubx* protein expression across several crustacean lineages, that *Ubx* plays a role in distinguishing maxillipeds from more typical locomotory appendages in crustaceans (Averof & Patel, 1997).

More recently a systematic analysis of *Hox* gene function was carried out using CRISPR knockouts (Martin et al., 2016), which led to a detailed picture of how the identity of segments of the thorax and abdomen is specified. While the overall results are largely consistent with the role of *Hox* genes in specifying segmental identities, as seen in insects, many of the details suggest that there are important evolutionary differences both in the expression patterns and in the interaction between *Hox* genes in *Parhyale* and *Drosophila* (Martin et al., 2016; Serano et al., 2016). Most notably, the general pattern of posterior prevalence is not obeyed for *Ubx*, *abd-A*, and *Abd-B* (further supported through an analysis of double mutant combinations; E. Jarvis and N. Patel, unpublished data). These results provide a basis for analysing the potential role of *Hox* genes in evolutionary changes in body patterning across crustacean lineages.

Arthropods also display a clear regionalization along the proximal-distal axis of their limbs, which appears to be mediated by an evolutionarily conserved set of genes in all arthropods. CRISPR-based knockout of *Parhyale* orthologs of these leg patterning genes suggests a specific evolutionary relationship of individual leg segments between *Parhyale* and insects, which supports the hypothesis that proximal leg segments present in the last common ancestor of insects and crustaceans became incorporated into the body wall during insect evolution. This change may explain the evolutionary origin of insect wings from a proximal exite (Bruce & Patel, 2020). Studies on the

orthologues of *Drosophila* wing patterning genes in *Parhyale* and in other crustaceans provide additional insights on the complex evolutionary origins of insect wings (Averof & Cohen, 1997; Clark-Hachtel & Tomoyasu, 2020; Shiga et al., 2017).

Cell lineage analyses of outgrowing thoracic limbs show that the early limb primordium becomes subdivided into anterior-posterior and dorsal-ventral compartments whose boundaries intersect at the distal tip of the growing limb. Limb formation is associated with a spatial modulation of cell proliferation, and limb elongation is driven by preferential orientation of cell divisions along the proximal-distal growth axis (Wolff et al., 2018).

3.3 Regeneration

Parhyale have the ability to regenerate their limbs, following limb injuries sustained by attacks from predators, cannibalism, or disease. They are able to regenerate any appendage (antennae, mouthparts, thoracic limbs, pleopods and uropods) and retain that ability throughout their lifetime.

Since their body is enclosed within a chitinous exoskeleton, arthropods depend on molting to fully restore the structure and function of their regenerating limbs. Live imaging using fluorescent nuclear markers has shown that the following events take place once a *Parhyale* leg has been amputated: (1) within minutes from the cut, haemocytes adhere to the wound surface and form a plug that stops the bleeding, (2) the wound surface becomes melanized within the next hours, a typical wounding reaction of arthropods that is mediated by the haemocytes at the wound, (3) within 1–2 days the wound epithelium stretches and closes over the wound surface, under the melanized scab, (4) extensive cell proliferation takes place in the region of the wound, (5) the epithelium at the wound site detaches from the cuticle and limb morphogenesis takes place below the scab, (6) the animal molts, the newly regenerated limb is released and becomes functional (Alwes, Enjolras, & Averof, 2016). Studies in other crustaceans suggest there is a complex interplay between the timing of regeneration and molting (Skinner, 1985), but this crosstalk has not yet been systematically investigated in *Parhyale*.

Many malacostracan crustaceans, including crabs and lobsters, can self-amputate limbs that are severely injured, a process known as autotomy. The injured limbs are broken off at specific sites near the base of the limb, under the control of a nervous reflex (Fredericq, 1882). We have not observed autotomy in *Parhyale*. Limbs can be amputated at any site along their proximo-distal axis, where they will heal and regenerate the missing parts.

Research in *Parhyale* has so far focused on the cellular basis of leg regeneration. Studies in mosaic animals, where individual blastomere lineages were marked by transposons carrying a fluorescent marker, established that *Parhyale* limb regeneration relies on distinct pools of progenitor cells for ectoderm and mesoderm, and that these progenitors reside locally, near the site of the regenerating limb (Konstantinides & Averof, 2014). There are no totipotent progenitors.

Cell transplantation and live imaging experiments have revealed the cellular sources for regeneration of muscle and epidermis: mesodermal cells resembling the satellite cells of vertebrates appear to act as progenitors for muscle (Konstantinides & Averof, 2014), while any epidermal cell near the site of amputation appears capable of regenerating the epidermis (Alves et al., 2016).

A unique asset for studying leg regeneration in *Parhyale*, so far unparalleled in other experimental models, is the ability to image regeneration continuously, at single-cell resolution (Alves et al., 2016; Sugawara, Çevrim, & Averof, 2022). This approach allows cell lineages to be tracked over the entire course of regeneration, from the time of amputation to the subsequent molt (~1 week), and provides a basis for studying the cell behaviors that underpin morphogenesis in regenerating legs. Detailed transcriptional profiling of leg regeneration has been performed in *Parhyale* (Sinigaglia et al., 2021), but to our knowledge no studies of gene function during regeneration have been undertaken so far. The impermeable cuticle that surrounds the limbs presents a significant challenge for in situ hybridization and immunochemical stainings.

3.4 Neurobiology, sensory systems and behavior

The central nervous system of *Parhyale* is composed of a brain and ventral nerve cord. The adult brain contains about 13,300 nuclei in total (Wittfoth, Harzsch, Wolff, & Sombke, 2019), a small number which renders this brain tractable for neuroanatomical studies. The ventral nerve cord comprises a fused subesophageal ganglion, seven segmental ganglia innervating the pereon, three segmental ganglia innervating pleon segments 1–3, and one fused ganglion innervating pleon segments 4–6 (Divakaran, 1982).

The brain of *Parhyale* is tripartite and formed during development through condensation of three segmental cephalic neuromeres. They represent three morphological regions with segmental identity: the protocerebrum, associated with the compound eyes, the deutocerebrum, associated with the first

antenna, and the tritocerebrum, associated with the second antenna (Divakaran, 1982). The general architecture of all major neuropils is in agreement with the suggested ground-pattern of malacostracan crustaceans (see Kenning, Müller, Wirkner, & Harzsch, 2013), however, some of these neuropils are difficult to demarcate due to their close association and uniform appearance. For example, in the visual system there are uncertainties about the presence/absence of the lobula and the inner chiasma connecting the medulla (Ramos et al., 2019; Wittfoth et al., 2019). Studies of photoreceptor projections to the optic lobe neuropils have revealed some unexpected differences from a conserved pattern of photoreceptor projections found in other crustaceans and insects, but these differences remain poorly understood (Ramos et al., 2019).

Although there is significant anatomical conservation across amphipod brains, there is also a degree of variability in the construction and size of different neuropils (Hanström, 1932), which seems to correlate with ecology and life history (Ramm & Scholtz, 2017). The brain of *Parhyale* does not display any major modifications or bias towards one sensory modality, therefore it likely represents a common type of amphipod brain.

The visual system of *Parhyale* consists of a pair of eyes, with up to ~50 ommatidia per adult eye, and the underlying visual circuits (Ramos et al., 2019). Hatchlings start off with a small number of ommatidia, which then grow in size and in number, likely increasing visual sensitivity and resolution several fold as the animals grow to adulthood (Keskinen, Takaku, Meyer-Rochow, & Hariyama, 2002; Ramos et al., 2019).

Each ommatidium contains five photoreceptor cells, four with large rhabdomeres (R1–4) and one with a small rhabdomere (R5). These two types of photoreceptors express distinct opsins and project their axons to distinct regions of the first optic neuropil (Ramos et al., 2019). Photoreceptors R1–R4 have long, straight rhabdomeres that should make them intrinsically sensitive to the direction of light polarization. The rhabdomeres of R1 + R3 and R2 + R4 are arranged in perpendicular orientations, which would make them most sensitive to different directions of polarized light. Overall, this design gives *Parhyale* very low visual resolution (20° interommatidial angle and 50 resolved pixels per adult eye, compared with 5° and 700 pixels in *Drosophila*; Land, 1997), but the potential to detect color and polarized light (Ramos et al., 2019).

These results suggest that *Parhyale* do not use vision to perform tasks that require good spatial resolution, such as finding food or interacting with mates (e.g., see Holmes, 1903), but are likely to use vision to orient

themselves within their habitat, e.g., by responding to gradients of light intensity and polarization. Behavioral experiments in other talitrid amphipods support this notion (Ciofini, Yamahama, Mercatelli, Hariyama, & Ugolini, 2020; Cohen, Cronin, Lessios, & Forward, 2010; Cohen & Putts, 2013; Ercolini & Scapini, 1976; Forward, Bourla, Lessios, & Cohen, 2009; Ugolini, 2014; Ugolini, Galanti, & Mercatelli, 2012). Simple behavioral experiments in *Parhyale* suggest that they have a phototactic response (Ramos et al., 2019).

Photoreceptors lacking overt pigmentation and a light-focusing apparatus have been found in the brain of other talitrid amphipods (Frelon-Raimond, Meyer-Rochow, Ugolini, & Martin, 2002). These photoreceptors could perform non-visual functions, such as entraining circadian rhythms. We speculate that in *Parhyale* these cells could be marked by the expression of the *3xP3* marker (see below).

Parhyale are likely to use chemosensory cues rather than vision to locate their food and mating partners. In laboratory conditions it is noticeable that males are more active in searching for females and probing whether they are receptive to mating (C. Wolff, personal observation). This observation is in agreement with studies on intertidal amphipod populations (Alegretti, Umbuzeiro, & Flynn, 2016) and suggests that waterborne attractants or contact pheromones might play an important role in reproductive behavior. There are studies on sexual dimorphisms of the peripheral sensory system, suggesting that the first antennae of male amphipods can be equipped with male-specific sensilla (Hallberg, Johansson, & Wallén, 1997; Lowry, 1986).

3.5 Circadian and tidal rhythms

Parhyale have recently attracted attention as an experimental model for studying biological clocks. Initial studies focused on probing circadian rhythms in locomotor activity, establishing a head transcriptome at 3-h intervals across the 24-h day/night cycle, and identifying core components of the circadian clock, including *Bmal1/Cycle*, *Cry2* and *Per* (Hunt, 2016; Hunt, Mallon, & Rosato, 2019). The genome of *Parhyale* appears to lack orthologues of *Cry1* and *Timeless* (Hunt et al., 2019). Preliminary observations on *Parhyale*'s locomotor behavior revealed 24-h and 12-h rhythms of activity, with highest activity in the dark hours of the circadian cycle (Hunt, 2016). As an organism living in intertidal habitats, *Parhyale* can also serve as a model for studying circatidal rhythms (E. Kwiatkowski, J. Rosenthal and P. Emery, unpublished observations).

3.6 Lignocellulose digestion

Insects such as termites and beetles have evolved complex digestive systems with the ability to digest wood and to use it as their main source of energy. To achieve this, they rely on populations of symbiotic microbes, resident in their digestive tract, which provide enzymes to digest lignocellulose (Watanabe & Tokuda, 2010). Within malacostracan crustaceans, some isopods and amphipods, including *Parhyale*, have evolved the capability to digest lignocellulose without relying on such microbes (Cragg et al., 2015; Zimmer et al., 2002). The *Parhyale* genome encodes GH7 family glycosyl hydrolase enzymes that are necessary for hydrolytically digesting lignocellulose (Kao et al., 2016). This offers an opportunity to understand the activity of glycosyl hydrolases in a digestive system, independently of gut microbes.

Lignocellulose (plant) biomass is the most abundant raw material on earth and exploiting this energy source on a larger scale would offer an exceptional chance to produce biofuels (Himmel et al., 2007). The genetic tools available in *Parhyale* could make significant contributions to this research.

3.7 Ecotoxicology

Amphipods are used as indicator or test species for environmental toxicology in aquatic habitats (e.g., Kunz, Kienle, & Gerhardt, 2010; Poynton et al., 2018). *Parhyale* are emerging as an attractive ecotoxicity test organism for coastal marine ecosystems, due to their worldwide distribution and abundance in tropical coastal and estuarine habitats, and their robust year-round reproduction in their natural habitats and in the laboratory (Alegretti et al., 2016; Artal, Dos Santos, Henry, & Umbuzeiro, 2018). Recent studies have tested the effects of ammonia, metals, the pesticide diflubenzuron and silver nanoparticles in this system (Artal et al., 2018, 2020; Diehl et al., 2021).



4. Experimental tools, approaches and resources

4.1 Experimental embryology

Cell ablation experiments can be carried out following a variety of methods in *Parhyale*. Injection of FITC-dextran into blastomeres is not harmful as long as embryos remain in subdued light, but exposure to intense blue light will kill cells containing the FITC-dextran. This method has been used to kill individual cells at the 4- and 8-cell stage, or entire lineages at gastrulation

or even at germband stages (Hannibal, Price, & Patel, 2012; Price et al., 2010). Cell ablation can also be accomplished by injection of RNase and DNase (Chaw & Patel, 2012). Manual ablations are also possible by poking a hole into the target cell and removing the cell content (Alves, Hinchén, & Extavour, 2011). Finally, individual cells, or small groups of cells, can also be efficiently killed by laser ablation; this technique has been used to examine the role of the *Parhyale* midline in establishing dorsal-ventral patterning of the germband (Vargas-Vila, Hannibal, Parchem, Liu, & Patel, 2010) and to probe the role of nerves in limb regeneration (C. Sinigaglia and M. Averof, unpublished).

Individual blastomeres can be separated and maintained in short term culture to probe their developmental potential in isolation from their neighbors (Extavour, 2005).

Robust protocols have been established for antibody staining (Rehm, Hannibal, Chaw, Vargas-Vila, & Patel, 2009a) and in situ hybridization (Rehm, Hannibal, Chaw, Vargas-Vila, & Patel, 2009b) of *Parhyale* embryos. A number of antibodies are available, including some made against *Parhyale* protein sequences, as well as cross-reacting antibodies raised against conserved epitopes. Recently, in situ HCR has been used to probe multiple transcripts per embryo (Bruce & Patel, 2020). Using HCR it is possible to simultaneously image five different transcripts at once, as well as to achieve robust results at hatchling stages when the cuticle has formed (Bruce et al., 2021).

4.2 Loss-of function approaches

Three approaches have been described for knockdown/knockout of gene expression in *Parhyale*: RNAi, morpholino, and CRISPR-Cas9. For RNAi, injection of Stealth siRNAs into 1–2 cell embryos was used to knock-down expression of *Distal-less* and *Ultrabithorax* (Liubicich et al., 2009) and *single-minded* (Vargas-Vila et al., 2010). Stealth siRNAs were found to be more efficient than dsRNA, possibly due to their increased stability, allowing them to persist to later stages of development. As is typical with RNAi experiments, this approach produced a phenotypic series, which could help to understand gene function. It also appears that RNAi acts cell-autonomously, as injection into a single blastomere at the 2-cell stage could create half-mutant embryos (D. Liubicich and N. Patel, unpublished observations). Integration of a *Minos*-based heat-inducible transgene generating a hairpin RNA of *abd-A* was also successfully used for knockdown and provides an approach for temporal control of RNAi in *Parhyale* (Martin et al., 2016).

The injection of morpholinos has been used successfully to inhibit the translation of *vasa*, which resulted in the death of germ cells (Ozhan-Kizil et al., 2009).

More recently, CRISPR-based approaches have been used to knock out a number of genes (Bruce & Patel, 2020; Clark-Hachtel & Tomoyasu, 2020; Kao et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2016). As in other systems, injections of Cas9 protein along with guide RNA is more effective than injections of Cas9 mRNA with guide RNA (Martin et al., 2016), and chemically modified sgRNAs (Synthego) have proven particularly efficient (Bruce & Patel, 2020; E. Jarvis and N. Patel, unpublished observations). CRISPR knock-outs allow for rapid phenotypic analysis as the gene edits occur early and (when using the most effective gRNAs) with such efficiency that fully mutant G0 animals can be readily generated. The technique can also be applied to analyze lineage specific gene function through injection at the 8-cell stage (E. Jarvis and N. Patel, unpublished).

4.3 Transgenesis

Transgenesis is routinely carried out in *Parhyale* using the *Minos* vector (Kontarakis & Pavlopoulos, 2014; Pavlopoulos & Averof, 2005), a versatile transposon that has been used with success in a wide variety of organisms (including insects, chordates and fungi; see Pavlopoulos, Oehler, Kapetanaki, & Savakis, 2007, Evangelinos et al., 2015). The vector typically carries a marker and a cargo that can be many kb in length. *Minos* plasmid constructs are co-injected with transposase mRNA in early embryos; the transposon jumps randomly in the *Parhyale* genome, giving rise to mosaic individuals (G0), carrying *Minos* insertions in different parts of the body. Once the transposase activity dies out, the insertions are fixed and thereafter inherited as stable genetic elements (Pavlopoulos & Averof, 2005).

As with RNAi and CRISPR, the slow holoblastic cleavage and stereotypic early cell lineage of *Parhyale* offer some unique advantages, such as the ability to test transgene constructs in G0s and the opportunity to generate mosaics where only half of the embryo or a specific germ layer is genetically marked/modified (see Konstantinides & Averof, 2014; Pavlopoulos et al., 2009).

Typically, about a third of embryos injected at the 1-cell stage give rise to mosaic G0s. Only a fraction of *Minos* insertions are present in the germline and will be carried through to subsequent generations (G1, G2, etc.). Transgenic individuals are identified through the marker carried in the transposon. For a long time transgenesis was based on *3xP3*-driven fluorescent

markers (Pavlopoulos & Averof, 2005), previously shown to be active in the eyes of several insects (Berghammer, Klingler, & Wimmer, 1999; Horn & Wimmer, 2000; Uhlirova, Asahina, Riddiford, & Jindra, 2002). In *Parhyale*, *3xP3* markers are not expressed in the eyes, but in a pair of spots at the posterior of the head (Pavlopoulos & Averof, 2005). In recent years, a *Parhyale* opsin promoter (*PhOpsin1*) has been adopted for marker expression, which drives robust expression in the eyes and is much easier to score (Ramos et al., 2019).

Transgenic *Parhyale* lines often carry tens of genomic insertions of *Minos* (Pavlopoulos & Averof, 2005) and are maintained as “mixed stocks,” in which individuals carry different sets of insertions. This speeds up the process of establishing transgenic lines, but results in heterogeneous stocks in which the frequency of individual insertions can drift over time.

Alternative transgenic approaches are available in *Parhyale*, in which the transgenes are targeted to specific loci rather than randomly integrated in the genome: (1) using the *phiC31* integrase to target transgenes to specific landing sites inserted in the genome (Kontarakis et al., 2011), and (2) using CRISPR knock-ins (Kao et al., 2016; Serano et al., 2016). Both could be useful for establishing transgenic lines carrying single, mapped insertions, but neither is yet routinely established. The *phiC31* approach requires establishing *Parhyale* lines with well characterized landing sites (ongoing work in the Pavlopoulos lab).

4.4 Genetic markers and drivers

Transgenesis in *Parhyale* has so far been used to fluorescently mark cells for live imaging and to build genetic tools for manipulating gene function. Both applications require the identification of functional *cis*-regulatory elements (CREs) to drive the expression of marker and effector proteins. Two types of CREs have been tested in *Parhyale* using reporter constructs: artificial elements consisting of multimerized binding sites of specific transcription factors, known to work in other species, and candidate CREs from *Parhyale* genes.

Among artificial elements, the Pax6-responsive *3xP3* element combined with the *Drosophila hsp70* core promoter (Berghammer et al., 1999; Horn & Wimmer, 2000) drives weak expression in a few cells at the posterior of the brain (Pavlopoulos & Averof, 2005). This weak expression as well as lack of expression in the eyes may be due to the use of the heterologous *Drosophila hsp70* core promoter. A second element, *DC5*, consisting of Pax and Sox2

binding sites (Kamachi, Uchikawa, Tanouchi, Sekido, & Kondoh, 2001; Blanco, Girard, Kamachi, Kondoh, & Gehring, 2005; combined with the *PhHS* promoter region), drives strong expression in the central nervous system. In the strongest lines, *DC5* also marks the motor neurons of the limbs (Alwes et al., 2016; Konstantinides & Averof, 2014). Reporters with multimerised Pax3/7 binding sites (Relaix et al., 2003) have also been tested but found to be nonfunctional in *Parhyale* (M. Grillo and M. Averof, unpublished).

So far, four robust endogenous CREs have been identified in *Parhyale*, two from *hsp70* family genes and two from opsins. The first to be identified, *PhMS* (*MS* for muscle-specific), is a fragment cloned from a *Parhyale hsp70c* (*hsp70*-related) gene, which drives robust expression in muscles (Pavlopoulos & Averof, 2005, sequence accession FR749990) (Fig. 4). It includes upstream regions that contain an array of putative bHLH binding sites, the promoter and a 5' UTR with an intron (see Fig. S1 in Kontarakis et al., 2011). *PhMS* has been used to visualize muscle fibres and satellite-like muscle precursors in the context of leg regeneration (Konstantinides & Averof, 2014). The second, *PhHS* (*HS* for heat shock), is a heat inducible CRE cloned from a *Parhyale hsp70* gene (Pavlopoulos et al., 2009, sequence accession FM991730). The fragment includes upstream sequences with putative HSF binding sites, the promoter and a 5' UTR with an intron (Fig. S1 in Kontarakis et al., 2011). *PhHS* is routinely used to drive



Fig. 4 Transgenic *Parhyale* juvenile expressing EGFP in muscles under the *PhMS* promoter. Confocal image of EGFP fluorescence (green) and cuticle autofluorescence (white).

ubiquitous and inducible gene expression (e.g., [Alwes et al., 2016](#); [Wolff et al., 2018](#)). Finally, the *PhOpsin1* and *PhOpsin2* CREs, derived from the *Parhyale opsin 1* and *opsin 2* genes, drive expression in each of the two types of photoreceptor cells in the eyes of *Parhyale* ([Ramos et al., 2019](#)). *PhOpsin1* is now used to drive robust expression of transgenic markers, replacing the less reliable *3xP3* markers.

In addition to these robust CREs, numerous other gene fragments have been tested for CRE activity (Averof, Pavlopoulos and Patel labs, unpublished). These include gene fragments upstream of ubiquitously expressed housekeeping genes, developmental genes and viral promoters, in some cases selected after chromatin profiling via ATAC-seq ([Sun & Patel, 2021](#)). The failure to identify robust CREs in many cases could be due to poor genome annotation (e.g., mis-identification of promoter regions), the wide dispersal of CREs in *Parhyale*'s large genome, the size of the tested fragments (usually no larger than 5 kb), or a bad choice of core promoters.

Several core promoters have been tested in *Parhyale* (including the *Drosophila hsp70*, *Parhyale PhHS* and the artificial *SCP* core promoters), but none appear to work reliably with heterologous CREs (A. Pavlopoulos, A. Kiupakis, M. Grillo and M. Averof, unpublished).

An alternative approach for generating markers is generating enhancer or exon traps, in which the expression of a transgene is driven by endogenous *cis*-regulatory/transcriptional activity at the site of insertion. *Minos* constructs bearing a core promoter sequence upstream of a fluorescent marker have given putative enhancer traps (F. Alwes, M. Grillo, C. Cevrim and M. Averof, unpublished) and elements carrying a splice donor have been shown to mediate exon trapping in *Parhyale* ([Kontarakis et al., 2011](#)). Enhancer or exon traps can be repurposed into diverse genetic tools using the *phiC31* integrase (if they contain an *attP* site; [Kontarakis et al., 2011](#)) or by using CRISPR-mediated transgene replacement ([Gilles, Schinko, & Averof, 2015](#)).

The large average size of introns in *Parhyale* ([Kao et al., 2016](#)) may particularly facilitate exon trapping in this species. Exon trap screens have produced up to 2 trap lines per 100 injected embryos in *Parhyale* ([Kontarakis et al., 2011](#), and F. Alwes unpublished). However it has been challenging to establish and maintain large numbers of exon trap lines.

A further alternative is to use CRISPR-mediated gene editing to knock-in marker or effector proteins in loci with the required pattern of gene expression (see [Kao et al., 2016](#); [Serano et al., 2016](#)). The efficiency

of CRISPR-mediated knock-ins can be very low (depending on target locus and gRNA) and careful consideration should be given to the knock-in strategy, to facilitate the selection of insertions and to avoid deleterious effects at the target locus.

4.5 Genetic tools based on transgenesis

Transgenesis provides opportunities to establish a wide range of genetic tools and approaches in *Parhyale*. First and foremost, the ability to express genes for gain-of-function studies. Since most genetic interventions are likely to have deleterious effects on survival, establishing conditional systems for gene expression has been a top priority. The *PhHS* regulatory element (described above) currently provides a robust tool for inducible gene expression in *Parhyale*, typically induced by a heat-shock of 30–60 min at 37°C (Pavlopoulos et al., 2009). So far, besides the expression of fluorescent markers, *PhHS* has been used to mis-express different isoforms of the Hox protein Ubx, leading to homeotic transformations (Pavlopoulos et al., 2009). One flaw is that the *PhHS* element gives some variable/leaky expression in the absence of a heat shock, particularly in muscles.

Developing a binary system for mis-expressing genes, such as the *GAL4/UAS* system that has revolutionized studies in *Drosophila* (Brand & Perrimon, 1993), has been the focus of several unsuccessful efforts in *Parhyale* (A. Pavlopoulos, A. Kiupakis, V. Douris and M. Averof, unpublished; J. Serano and N. Patel, unpublished). Possible reasons for the lack of success so far may include the lack of an effective core promoter, or the variable/insufficient activity of *GAL4* observed in some species (e.g., Asakawa et al., 2008; Schinko et al., 2010).

Some attempts have also been made to develop recombinase-mediated clonal approaches in *Parhyale* (N. Konstantinides, M. Grillo and M. Averof, unpublished). So far, only the *phiC31* integrase has been shown to work efficiently in *Parhyale* (Kontarakis et al., 2011) and a version of the *Raeppli* clonal marker which is based on this integrase (Kanca, Caussinus, Denes, Percival-Smith, & Affolter, 2013) has given promising early results (M. Grillo, P. Ramos and M. Averof, unpublished).

Various genetic approaches for inducible cell killing have been developed in different model organisms. One of the most versatile approaches combines transgene-mediated expression of the nitroreductase/NTR protein (providing spatial or cell-type specificity) with the application of the prodrug metronidazole to induce the ablation of NTR-expressing cells

(Curado, Stainier, & Anderson, 2008). Preliminary tests, using the *PhMS* and *DC5* regulatory elements to drive nitroreductase expression, suggest that this system provides an effective conditional approach for ablating specific cell types in *Parhyale* (I. Koltsaki and M. Averof, unpublished; C. Winchell and N. Patel, unpublished).

4.6 Live imaging and cell lineage analysis

The availability of fluorescent markers, the small size and the relative transparency *Parhyale* embryos, juveniles and adults, render *Parhyale* attractive for live imaging. The first live imaging and lineage analysis experiments in *Parhyale* were carried out by injection of fluorescently labelled high molecular weight dextrans or mRNA encoding fluorescent proteins between the 1- to 16-cell stage (Chaw & Patel, 2012; Gerberding et al., 2002; Hannibal, Price, Parchem, & Patel, 2012; Hannibal, Price, & Patel, 2012; Price et al., 2010; Price & Patel, 2007; Rehm, Hannibal, Chaw, Vargas-Vila, & Patel, 2009c). With these injection approaches, however, fluorescence signal fades with time due to a combination of dilution by cell division and degradation of the fluorescent reporter. With injections in individual blastomeres at the 8-cell stage, signal remains clearly visible until hatching for the g cell (germline) lineage, owing to the very few cell divisions in this lineage, while in the ectoderm or mesoderm reliable cell tracking is only possible until mid germband stages (approx. stage 19–21). Cell lineages up to the gastrulation stage have also been imaged and tracked in unlabelled embryos using Nomarski optics (Alwes et al., 2011).

More recently, live imaging experiments have used stable transgenic lines expressing histone-H2B-tagged fluorescent proteins to track cells during embryonic development and regeneration (Alwes et al., 2016; Sugawara et al., 2022; Wolff et al., 2018). The fusion with histone allows the nuclei of individual cells to be resolved and be tracked through mitoses. Imaging at 5–20 min time intervals is sufficient to detect mitoses and to track dividing cells during embryonic development and regeneration. Additionally, to visualize the cell cycle, a reporter of the S, G2 and M phases of the cell cycle has been developed by fusing EGFP with the N-terminus of *Parhyale* Geminin (Alwes et al., 2016).

Live imaging is still constrained by the limited number of markers available in *Parhyale*. In the absence of a characterized constitutive promoter, ubiquitous markers rely on the *PhHS* regulatory element, which requires repeated heat-shocks to sustain marker expression.

Continuous live imaging has been performed over long periods in *Parhyale* using fluorescence widefield microscopy (spanning embryonic development, Price & Patel, 2007, Hannibal, Price, & Patel, 2012), light-sheet microscopy (4–5 days on mid-late embryos, Wolff et al., 2018), and confocal microscopy (2–11 days on regenerating adult limbs, Alwes et al., 2016, Sugawara et al., 2022; C. Cevrim and M. Averof, unpublished). Over extended periods of imaging photodamage becomes a concern, especially when imaging on a confocal microscope. Steps to minimise light exposure include imaging strong fluorescent signals with low laser power, minimizing the number of imaged z planes and lengthening time lapse intervals, which constrain the spatial and temporal resolution of imaging. Under these conditions, *Parhyale* can be imaged over multiple days and give rise to fully developed embryos or regenerated limbs. Light-sheet microscopy reduces fluorophore bleaching and phototoxic effects to a large extent (Stelzer, 2014). *Parhyale* embryos can be easily mounted in agarose (Price & Patel, 2007; Wolff et al., 2018).

Cell tracking has been performed on time lapse recordings in early embryogenesis (Alwes et al., 2011; Chaw & Patel, 2012), segment formation (Hannibal, Price, & Patel, 2012; Price & Patel, 2007), limb development (Wolff et al., 2018) and adult limb regeneration (Alwes et al., 2016; Sugawara et al., 2022), in some cases yielding complete cell lineages that span several days of development and regeneration. Leading software for cell tracking—MaMuT/Mastodon (Wolff et al., 2018) and ELEPHANT (incorporating deep learning, Sugawara et al., 2022)—have been developed and tested on *Parhyale* light-sheet and confocal data.

Examples of live image recordings can be found at the following links, for ectoderm and mesoderm segmentation (<https://ars.els-cdn.com/content/image/1-s2.0-S0012160611012772-mm55.mov>; Hannibal, Price, & Patel, 2012), limb development (<https://elifesciences.org/articles/34410/figures#fig1video2>; Wolff et al., 2018) and limb regeneration (<https://zenodo.org/record/4557870>; Sugawara et al., 2022).

4.7 Genetic crosses and forward genetics

Single-pair genetic crosses are performed routinely in *Parhyale* to establish transgenic lines and to combine transgenes. The females do not store sperm from previous matings, so there is no need to collect virgins. The lack of sperm transfer has been confirmed using fluorescent transgenic markers (G. Tsoumpekios and M. Averof, unpublished).

While establishing transgenic lines in *Parhyale*, we have in some cases identified heritable defects in embryonic patterning, eye morphology and eye color, likely to be caused by spontaneous mutations arising in our laboratory populations (P. Ramos and M. Averof, unpublished). These mutations were recessive and/or deleterious for survival, so we were not able to maintain them over long periods of time. The lack of easy solutions for maintaining stocks (such as cryopreservation), the slow reproductive rate (small brood size) and the long generation time of *Parhyale* make systematic forward genetics in this species a distant dream.

4.8 Genome sequence

The size of *Parhyale*'s genome is 3.6 Gb, similar to the size of the human genome and ~ 20 times larger than the genome of *Drosophila*.

The building of *Parhyale* genomic resources started in the early 2000s, at a time when sequencing gigabase-size genomes required huge investments. A BAC library of *Parhyale* genomic DNA, with $\sim 5 \times$ coverage of the genome, was generated, screened and partly sequenced (Parchem et al., 2010), allowing to identify important developmental genes (Hannibal, Price, Parchem, & Patel, 2012; Serano et al., 2016) and later to validate the full genome assembly (Kao et al., 2016).

The sequences of the *Parhyale* genome were obtained from a single male of the Chicago-F inbred line, using high throughput short read technology (Kao et al., 2016). The initial published assembly, named Phaw3.0, was one of the largest sequenced genomes at the time. It revealed high levels of heterozygosity, consistent with the high frequency of polymorphism found in lab populations. A large fraction of the genome was found to consist of repetitive sequences (57% of the assembled scaffolds), which at least partly explains the large size of the genome. High polymorphism and repeat content present serious challenges for genome assembly and caused this initial assembly to be somewhat fragmented (scaffold N50 of ~ 70 kb, scaffold L50 of $\sim 14,000$, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/assembly/GCA_001587735.1/).

The genome assembly was subsequently updated by Dovetail Genomics using Chicago and Hi-C technologies (Burton et al., 2013; Putnam et al., 2016) and curated by D. Kao (sponsored by the Pavlopoulos, Patel, Averof, Extavour and Aboobaker teams). The current assembly, named Phaw_5.0, has much larger scaffolds (scaffold N50 of 20 Mb, scaffold L50 of 42), although contig length has only moderately increased (from N50 of 4 kb for Phaw3.0 to N50 of ~ 10 kb for Phaw_5.0). This genome assembly is publicly available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/assembly/GCA_001587735.2/.

Parhyale hawaiiensis have 23 pairs of chromosomes (Kao et al., 2016). Although the latest genome assembly of *Parhyale* is of good quality, full contiguous chromosomal sequences are not available. With the advent of high throughput sequencing using long reads (tens or hundreds of kb long), chromosome-scale assemblies are quickly becoming the new standard, even for crustacean genomes (e.g., Baldwin-Brown, Weeks, & Long, 2018). It is likely that long reads will be necessary to cross through islands of repetitive sequences and to resolve haplotypes in the *Parhyale* genome, resulting in much longer contigs.

The closest relatives of *Parhyale* with assembled genomes are the amphipods *Hyalella azteca*, *Trinorchestia longiramus*, *Platorchestia hallaensis*, and *Orchestia grillus* (BioProject accessions PRJNA342675, PRJNA543945, PRJNA645242, and PRJNA557538 (Patra, Chung, Yoo, Baek, et al., 2020; Patra, Chung, Yoo, Kim, et al., 2020; Poynton et al., 2018). Of these, the best genome assembly is that of *Hyalella azteca*, which is significantly smaller (estimated genome size ~1 Gb, genome assembly 550 Mb) and more fragmented (N50 of ~200 kb for v2.0, Poynton et al., 2018) than *Parhyale*'s. It is estimated that these species have diverged from *Parhyale* for 40–90 million years (Copilas-Ciocianu, Borko, & Fiser, 2020), which means that non-functional sequences in these species are likely to have diverged extensively from those of *Parhyale*.

4.9 Gene identification and annotation

Before the genome sequencing, several transcriptomic datasets were produced in *Parhyale*, including EST data generated by Sanger sequencing (<https://genome.jgi.doe.gov/portal/parha/parha.info.html>) and de novo transcriptome assemblies generated by using early NGS sequencing technologies (454 pyrosequencing and SOLiD) on mRNA and small RNAs from maternal and embryonic tissues (Blythe et al., 2012; Zeng et al., 2011). DNA microarrays (Nestorov, Battke, Levesque, & Gerberding, 2013) and proteomic data (Trapp et al., 2016) were also produced to serve specific projects. Later, additional de novo transcriptomes were generated by Illumina sequencing to investigate embryonic development, limb regeneration, ecotoxicology and circadian rhythms in *Parhyale* (Artal et al., 2018; Calvo, Birgaoanu, Pettini, Ronshaugen, & Griffiths-Jones, 2022; Hunt et al., 2019; Sinigaglia et al., 2021; Sun & Patel, 2021).

When the *Parhyale* genome was sequenced, genes were annotated based on ab initio gene prediction (ORFs, splicing signals, etc.) and transcriptome data from diverse embryonic stages and adult regenerating limbs (Kao et al., 2016). In the Phaw3.0 assembly, many genes were split in unconnected

contigs and the corresponding gene predictions were incomplete. In the Phaw_5.0 assembly, gene models were significantly improved and most manually curated genes in this dataset were found to be of good quality. However this assembly still contains errors, such as incorrect ordering or orientation of contigs within a scaffold (a known problem of Hi-C-scaffolded genomes) and tandem repetitions due to unresolved polymorphic repeats (M. Paris, unpublished observations). These problems have not been quantified genome-wide.

EST data and transcriptomes helped to reveal that a large fraction of mRNAs in *Parhyale* are subject to trans-splicing (Douris, Telford, & Averof, 2010), whereby a shared leader sequence is spliced to the 5' end of diverse mRNAs (including mRNAs encoding the transcription factors Ultrabithorax, Twist and Mef2). The leader sequence comes from snRNAs that resemble spliceosomal snRNAs. Overall, we estimate that 10–20% of *Parhyale* mRNAs are trans-spliced (Douris et al., 2010, and M. Averof, unpublished observations).

Additional improvements in these gene models have been made by mapping a large number of new reads, obtained since the original gene models were assembled, and by long-read sequencing of cDNAs using Oxford Nanopore technology (Sinigaglia et al., 2021; Sun & Patel, 2021). Direct long-read sequencing of RNA would also allow the detection of modified bases in the RNA (Garalde et al., 2018).

Functional annotation of the *Parhyale* gene models is still limited. Gene orthologues of major classes of signaling molecules, transcription factors, non-coding RNAs and effectors of innate immunity were identified in the initial genome assembly (Kao et al., 2016). SID-1, implicated in systemic RNAi (Winston, Molodowitch, & Hunter, 2002; Maruekawong, Tirasophon, Panyim, & Attasart, 2018), was not found, which is consistent with the cell autonomous effects of RNAi described above.

Putative orthologies between *Parhyale*, *Drosophila* and human genes have been inferred on a genome-wide scale by reciprocal BLAST analysis (Sinigaglia et al., 2021) and by tree-based orthology reconstruction between *Parhyale* and 66 other metazoans (J. Huerta-Cepas and colleagues, unpublished data).

4.10 Expression and chromatin profiling

Genome-wide expression profiling by RNAseq has been applied in a number of projects to identify transcriptional dynamics and responses to treatments in *Parhyale*, including the timecourses of embryonic development (D. Sun,

H. Bruce and N. Patel, unpublished) and limb development and regeneration (Sinigaglia et al., 2021), the study of circadian rhythms (Hunt et al., 2019), and responses to environmental toxicants (Artal et al., 2020). Single-cell or single-nucleus RNAseq has been applied to embryos (L. Blondel and C. Extavour, unpublished) and adult limbs (Almazàn, Çevrim, Musser, Averof, & Paris, 2021). The large average intron size in *Parhyale* (median of >7 kb in *Parhyale* versus 1 kb in *Drosophila* and 18 kb in humans) favors capturing both spliced and unspliced/intronic reads, which can help to probe transcriptional dynamics at the single-cell level (La Manno et al., 2018) and to work on dissociated nuclei instead of whole cells.

Besides single-cell sequencing, cell- or tissue-specific transcriptional profiling can be carried out with the thiouracil/TU tagging approach, whereby transcripts expressed in specific cells over a chosen period of time can be tagged, isolated and sequenced (Gay, Karfilis, Miller, Doe, & Stankunas, 2014; Miller, Robinson, Cleary, & Doe, 2009). The approach is based on transgene-mediated expression of uracil-phosphoribosyltransferase/UPRT (providing spatial or cell type specificity) and the application of the nucleobase analogue 4-thiouracil (providing temporal control), which is converted by UPRT into a ribonucleotide that can be incorporated in RNA. Tests of the TU-tagging approach in *Parhyale*, using mosaic embryos that express UPRT in the mesoderm or the ectoderm, yielded 40- to 80-fold enrichments of mesodermal or ectodermal transcripts, respectively (N. Konstantinides and M. Averof, unpublished).

The study of chromatin states and epigenetic modifications is only just beginning in *Parhyale*. Bisulfite sequencing has revealed widespread CpG dinucleotide methylation in the *Parhyale* genome (Kao et al., 2016). Bulk and single-cell ATAC-seq data have been generated, revealing genome-wide patterns of chromatin accessibility in embryonic and adult tissues, providing a platform for the identification of novel *cis*-regulatory elements and many additional assays in the future (Sun & Patel, 2021; E. Skafida and M. Paris, unpublished).



5. Research community

The *Parhyale* research community is small, consisting of no more than 20–30 researchers at any time. Informal meetings, gathering most of the community, have been organised in Tübingen (2005), Lisbon (2012) and Janelia Research Campus (2017). The community welcomes new researchers, sharing genomic resources, transgenic lines and technical expertise.

Acknowledgments/Funding

We thank the *Parhyale* research community for sharing information and resources, and for allowing us to refer to unpublished information cited in this article. We acknowledge Vincent Moncorgé for the image shown in Fig. 1. *Parhyale* research in the Averof lab is supported by the European Research Council of the E.U., grant ERC-2015-AdG #694918. *Parhyale* research in the Patel lab has been supported by HHMI and NSF grant IOS-1257379.

References

- Alegretti, L., Umbuzeiro, G. d. A., & Flynn, M. N. (2016). Population dynamics of *Parhyale hawaiiensis* (Dana, 1853) (Amphipoda: Hyalidae) associated with an intertidal algal belt in southeastern Brazil. *Journal of Crustacean Biology*, 36, 785–791.
- Almazán, A., Çevrim, Ç., Musser, J. M., Averof, M., & Paris, M. (2021). Regenerated crustacean limbs are precise replicas. *bioRxiv*, 2021.12.13.472338.
- Alwes, F., Enjolras, C., & Averof, M. (2016). Live imaging reveals the progenitors and cell dynamics of limb regeneration. *eLife*, 5, e19766.
- Alwes, F., Hinchey, B., & Extavour, C. G. (2011). Patterns of cell lineage, movement, and migration from germ layer specification to gastrulation in the amphipod crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Developmental Biology*, 359, 110–123.
- Artal, M. C., Dos Santos, A., Henry, T. B., & Umbuzeiro, G. A. (2018). Development of an acute toxicity test with the tropical marine amphipod *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Ecotoxicology*, 27, 103–108.
- Artal, M. C., Pereira, K. D., Luchessi, A. D., Okura, V. K., Henry, T. B., Marques-Souza, H., et al. (2020). Transcriptome analysis in *Parhyale hawaiiensis* reveal sex-specific responses to AgNP and AgCl exposure. *Environmental Pollution*, 260, 113963.
- Asakawa, K., Suster, M. L., Mizusawa, K., Nagayoshi, S., Kotani, T., Urasaki, A., et al. (2008). Genetic dissection of neural circuits by Tol2 transposon-mediated Gal4 gene and enhancer trapping in zebrafish. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 105, 1255–1260.
- Averof, M., & Cohen, S. M. (1997). Evolutionary origin of insect wings from ancestral gills. *Nature*, 385, 627–630.
- Averof, M., & Patel, N. H. (1997). Crustacean appendage evolution associated with changes in hox gene expression. *Nature*, 388, 682–686.
- Baldwin-Brown, J. G., Weeks, S. C., & Long, A. D. (2018). A new standard for crustacean genomes: The highly contiguous, annotated genome assembly of the clam shrimp *Eulimnadia texana* reveals HOX gene order and identifies the sex chromosome. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, 10, 143–156.
- Barnard, J. L. (1965). Marine Amphipoda of atolls in Micronesia. *Proceedings of the United States National Museum*, 117, 459–552.
- Berghammer, A. J., Klingler, M., & Wimmer, E. A. (1999). A universal marker for transgenic insects. *Nature*, 402, 370–371.
- Blanco, J., Girard, F., Kamachi, Y., Kondoh, H., & Gehring, W. J. (2005). Functional analysis of the chicken delta1-crystallin enhancer activity in *Drosophila* reveals remarkable evolutionary conservation between chicken and fly. *Development*, 132, 1895–1905.
- Blythe, M. J., Malla, S., Everall, R., Shih, Y.-H., Lemay, V., Moreton, J., et al. (2012). High throughput sequencing of the *Parhyale hawaiiensis* mRNAs and microRNAs to aid comparative developmental studies. *PLoS One*, 7, e33784.
- Borowsky, B., & Borowsky, R. (1987). The reproductive behaviors of the amphipod crustacean *Gammarus palustris* (Bousfield) and some insights into the nature of their stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 107, 131–144.

- Brand, A. H., & Perrimon, N. (1993). Targeted gene expression as a means of altering cell fates and generating dominant phenotypes. *Development*, 118, 401–415.
- Browne, W. E., Price, A. L., Gerberding, M., & Patel, N. H. (2005). Stages of embryonic development in the amphipod crustacean, *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Genesis*, 42, 124–149.
- Bruce, H. S., Jerz, G., Kelly, S. R., McCarthy, J., Pomeranz, A., Senevirathne, G., & Patel, N. H. (2021). Hybridization chain reaction (HCR) in situ protocol. *protocols.io*. <https://doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bunznvf6>.
- Bruce, H. S., & Patel, N. H. (2020). Knockout of crustacean leg patterning genes suggests that insect wings and body walls evolved from ancient leg segments. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 4, 1703–1712.
- Burton, J. N., Adey, A., Patwardhan, R. P., Qiu, R., Kitzman, J. O., & Shendure, J. (2013). Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. *Nature Biotechnology*, 31, 1119–1125.
- Calvo, L., Birgaoanu, M., Pettini, T., Ronshaugen, M., & Griffiths-Jones, S. (2022). The embryonic transcriptome of *Parhyale hawaiiensis* reveals different dynamics of microRNAs and mRNAs during the maternal-zygotic transition. *Scientific Reports*, 12, 174.
- Chaw, R. C., & Patel, N. H. (2012). Independent migration of cell populations in the early gastrulation of the amphipod crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Developmental Biology*, 371, 94–109.
- Ciofini, A., Yamahama, Y., Mercatelli, L., Hariyama, T., & Ugolini, A. (2020). Specializations in the compound eye of *Talitrus saltator* (Crustacea, Amphipoda). *Journal of Comparative Physiology. A*, 206, 711–723.
- Clark-Hachtel, C. M., & Tomoyasu, Y. (2020). Two sets of candidate crustacean wing homologues and their implication for the origin of insect wings. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 13, 1–9.
- Cohen, J. H., Cronin, T. W., Lessios, N., & Forward, R. B. (2010). Visual physiology underlying orientation and diel behavior in the sand beach amphipod *Talorchestia longicornis*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 213, 3843–3851.
- Cohen, J. H., & Putts, M. R. (2013). Polarotaxis and scototaxis in the supratidal amphipod *Platorchestia platensis*. *Journal of Comparative Physiology. A*, 199, 669–680.
- Copilas-Ciocianu, D., Borko, S., & Fiser, C. (2020). The late blooming amphipods: Global change promoted post-Jurassic ecological radiation despite Palaeozoic origin. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 143, 106664.
- Cragg, S. M., Beckham, G. T., Bruce, N. C., Bugg, T. D., Distel, D. L., Dupree, P., et al. (2015). Lignocellulose degradation mechanisms across the tree of life. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, 29, 108–119.
- Curado, S., Stainier, D. Y., & Anderson, R. M. (2008). Nitroreductase-mediated cell/tissue ablation in zebrafish: A spatially and temporally controlled ablation method with applications in developmental and regeneration studies. *Nature Protocols*, 3, 948–954.
- Dana, J. D. (1853). Crustacea. *Part II United States Exploring Expedition*, 14, 900–901.
- Diehl, O. J., Assano, P. K.d., Costa, T. R. G., Oliveira, R., Marques-Souza, H., & Umbuzeiro, G. A. (2021). Antenna regeneration as an ecotoxicological endpoint in a marine amphipod: A proof of concept using dimethyl sulfoxide and diflubenzuron. *Ecotoxicology*, 30, 751–755.
- Divakaran, O. (1976). *Studies on the biology of Parhyale hawaiiensis* (Crustacea: Amphipoda). PhD thesis (pp. 1–371). India: University of Kerala.
- Divakaran, O. (1982). Nervous system of *Parhyale hawaiiensis* Dana (Crustacea: Amphipoda). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences India Section B - Biological Sciences*, 2, 218–224.
- Dohle, W., & Scholtz, G. (1988). Clonal analysis of the crustacean segment: The discordance between genealogical and segmental borders. *Development*, 104(suppl), 147–160.

- Douris, V., Telford, M. J., & Averof, M. (2010). Evidence for multiple independent origins of trans-splicing in Metazoa. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 27, 684–693.
- Ercolini, A., & Scapini, F. (1976). Sensitivity and response to light in the laboratory of the littoral amphipod *Talitrus saltator* Montagu. *The Italian Journal of Zoology*, 10, 293–309.
- Evangelinos, M., Anagnostopoulos, G., Karvela-Kalogeraki, I., Stathopoulou, P. M., Scazzocchio, C., & Diallinas, G. (2015). *Minos* as a novel Tc1/mariner-type transposable element for functional genomic analysis in *aspergillus nidulans*. *Fungal Genetics and Biology*, 81, 1–11.
- Extavour, C. G. (2005). The fate of isolated blastomeres with respect to germ cell formation in the amphipod crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Developmental Biology*, 277, 387–402.
- Forward, R. B., Jr., Bourla, M. H., Lessios, N. N., & Cohen, J. H. (2009). Orientation to shorelines by the supratidal amphipod *Talorchestia longicornis*: Wavelength specific behavior during sun compass orientation. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 376, 102–109.
- Fredericq, L. (1882). Amputation des pattes par mouvement réflexe chez le crabe. *Archives de Biologie III*, 235–240.
- Frelon-Raimond, M., Meyer-Rochow, V. B., Ugolini, A., & Martin, G. (2002). Intracerebral ocelli in an amphipod: Extraretinal photoreceptors of the sandhopper *Talitrus saltator* (Crustacea, Amphipoda). *Invertebrate Biology*, 121, 73–78.
- Garalde, D. R., Snell, E. A., Jachimowicz, D., Sipos, B., Lloyd, J. H., Bruce, M., et al. (2018). Highly parallel direct RNA sequencing on an array of nanopores. *Nature Methods*, 10, 57.
- Gay, L., Karfilis, K. V., Miller, M. R., Doe, C. Q., & Stankunas, K. (2014). Applying thio-uracil tagging to mouse transcriptome analysis. *Nature Protocols*, 9, 410–420.
- Gerberding, M., Browne, W. E., & Patel, N. H. (2002). Cell lineage analysis of the amphipod crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis* reveals an early restriction of cell fates. *Development*, 129, 5789–5801.
- Gilles, A. F., Schinko, J. B., & Averof, M. (2015). Efficient CRISPR-mediated gene targeting and transgene replacement in the beetle *Tribolium castaneum*. *Development*, 142, 2832–2839.
- Gupta, T., & Extavour, C. G. (2013). Identification of a putative germ plasm in the amphipod *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *EvoDevo*, 4, 34.
- Hallberg, E., Johansson, K. U. I., & Wallén, R. (1997). Olfactory sensilla in crustaceans: Morphology, sexual dimorphism, and distribution patterns. *International Journal of Insect Morphology and Embryology*, 26, 173–180.
- Hannibal, R. L., Price, A. L., Parchem, R. J., & Patel, N. H. (2012). Analysis of *snail* genes in the crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*: Insight into *snail* gene family evolution. *Development Genes and Evolution*, 222, 139–151.
- Hannibal, R. L., Price, A. L., & Patel, N. H. (2012). The functional relationship between ectodermal and mesodermal segmentation in the crustacean, *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Developmental Biology*, 361, 427–438.
- Hanström, B. (1932). Neue Untersuchungen über Sinnesorgane und Nervensysteme der Crustaceen. II. *Zoologische Jahrbücher. Abteilung für Anatomie und Ontogenie der Tiere*, 56, 387–520.
- Himmel, M. E., Ding, S. Y., Johnson, D. K., Adney, W. S., Nimlos, M. R., Brady, J. W., et al. (2007). Biomass recalcitrance: Engineering plants and enzymes for biofuels production. *Science*, 315, 804–807.
- Holmes, S. J. (1903). Sex recognition among amphipods. *The Biological Bulletin*, 5, 288–292.
- Horn, C., & Wimmer, E. A. (2000). A versatile vector set for animal transgenesis. *Development Genes and Evolution*, 210, 630–637.
- Hunt, B. J. (2016). *Advancing molecular crustacean chronobiology through the characterisation of the circadian clock in two malacostracan species, Euphausia superba and Parhyale hawaiiensis*. PhD thesis (pp. 1–240). U.K: University of Leicester.

- Hunt, B. J., Mallon, E. B., & Rosato, E. (2019). In silico identification of a molecular circadian system with novel features in the crustacean model organism *Parhyale hawaiensis*. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 10, 791.
- Kamachi, Y., Uchikawa, M., Tanouchi, A., Sekido, R., & Kondoh, H. (2001). Pax6 and SOX2 form a co-DNA-binding partner complex that regulates initiation of lens development. *Genes and Development*, 15, 1272–1286.
- Kanca, O., Caussinus, E., Denes, A. S., Percival-Smith, A., & Affolter, M. (2013). Raeppli: A whole-tissue labeling tool for live imaging of *Drosophila* development. *Development*, 141, 472–480.
- Kao, D., Lai, A. G., Stamatakis, E., Rosic, S., Konstantinides, N., Jarvis, E., et al. (2016). The genome of the crustacean *Parhyale hawaiensis*, a model for animal development, regeneration, immunity and lignocellulose digestion. *eLife*, 5, e20062.
- Kapli, P., & Telford, M. J. (2020). Topology-dependent asymmetry in systematic errors affects phylogenetic placement of Ctenophora and Xenacoelomorpha. *Science Advances*, 6, eabc5162.
- Kenning, M., Müller, C., Wirkner, C. S., & Harzsch, S. (2013). The Malacostraca (Crustacea) from a neurophylogenetic perspective: New insights from brain architecture in *Nebalia herbstii* leach, 1814 (Leptostraca, Phyllocarida). *Zoologischer Anzeiger - A Journal of Comparative Zoology*, 252, 319–336.
- Keskinen, E., Takaku, Y., Meyer-Rochow, V. B., & Hariyama, T. (2002). Postembryonic eye growth in the seashore isopod *Ligia exotica* (Crustacea, Isopoda). *The Biological Bulletin*, 202, 223–231.
- Konstantinides, N., & Averof, M. (2014). A common cellular basis for muscle regeneration in arthropods and vertebrates. *Science*, 343, 788–791.
- Kontarakis, Z., & Pavlopoulos, A. (2014). Transgenesis in non-model organisms: The case of *Parhyale*. *Methods in Molecular Biology*, 1196, 145–181.
- Kontarakis, Z., Pavlopoulos, A., Kiupakis, A., Konstantinides, N., Douris, V., & Averof, M. (2011). A versatile strategy for gene trapping and trap conversion in emerging model organisms. *Development*, 138, 2625–2630.
- Kunz, P. Y., Kienle, C., & Gerhardt, A. (2010). *Gammarus* spp. in aquatic ecotoxicology and water quality assessment: Toward integrated multilevel tests. *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, 205, 1–76.
- La Manno, G., Soldatov, R., Zeisel, A., Braun, E., Hochgerner, H., Petukhov, V., et al. (2018). RNA velocity of single cells. *Nature*, 560, 494–498.
- Land, M. F. (1997). Visual acuity in insects. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 42, 147–177.
- Liubicich, D. M., Serano, J. M., Pavlopoulos, A., Kontarakis, Z., Protas, M. E., Kwan, E., et al. (2009). Knockdown of *Parhyale* ultrabithorax recapitulates evolutionary changes in crustacean appendage morphology. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106, 13892–13896.
- Lowry, J. K. (1986). The callynophore, a eucaridan/peracaridan sensory organ prevalent among the Amphipoda (Crustacea). *Zoologica Scripta*, 15, 333–349.
- Martin, A., Serano, J. M., Jarvis, E., Bruce, H. S., Wang, J., Ray, S., et al. (2016). CRISPR/Cas9 mutagenesis reveals versatile roles of hox genes in crustacean limb specification and evolution. *Current Biology*, 26, 14–26.
- Maruekawong, K., Tirasophon, W., Panyim, S., & Attasart, P. (2018). Involvement of LvSID-1 in dsRNA uptake in *Litopenaeus vannamei*. *Aquaculture*, 482, 65–72.
- Miller, M. R., Robinson, K. J., Cleary, M. D., & Doe, C. Q. (2009). TU-tagging: Cell type-specific RNA isolation from intact complex tissues. *Nature Methods*, 6, 439–441.
- Myers, A. (1985). Shallow-water, coral reef and mangrove Amphipoda (Gammaridea) of Fiji. *Records of the Australian Museum*, 5, 1–143.
- Nestorov, P., Battke, F., Levesque, M. P., & Gerberding, M. (2013). The maternal transcriptome of the crustacean *Parhyale hawaiensis* is inherited asymmetrically to invariant cell lineages of the ectoderm and mesoderm. *PLoS One*, 8, e56049.

- Ozhan-Kizil, G., Havemann, J., & Gerberding, M. (2009). Germ cells in the crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis* depend on vasa protein for their maintenance but not for their formation. *Developmental Biology*, 327, 230–239.
- Parchem, R. J., Poulin, F., Stuart, A. B., Amemiya, C. T., & Patel, N. H. (2010). BAC library for the amphipod crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Genomics*, 95, 261–267.
- Patra, A. K., Chung, O., Yoo, J. Y., Baek, S. H., Jung, T. W., Kim, M. S., & Choi, J.-H. (2020). The draft genome sequence of a new land-hopper *Platorchestia hallaensis*. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 11, 621301.
- Patra, A. K., Chung, O., Yoo, J. Y., Kim, M. S., Yoon, M. G., Choi, J.-H., & Yang, Y. (2020). First draft genome for the sand-hopper *Trinorchestia longiramus*. *Scientific Data*, 7, 85.
- Pavlopoulos, A., & Averof, M. (2005). Establishing genetic transformation for comparative developmental studies in the crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102, 7888–7893.
- Pavlopoulos, A., Kontarakis, Z., Liubicich, D., Serano, J., Akam, M., Patel, N. H., et al. (2009). Probing the evolution of appendage specialization by hox gene mis-expression in an emerging model crustacean. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106, 13897–13902.
- Pavlopoulos, A., Oehler, S., Kapetanaki, M. G., & Savakis, C. (2007). The DNA transposon *Minos* as a tool for transgenesis and functional genomic analysis in vertebrates and invertebrates. *Genome Biology*, 8(Suppl 1), S2.
- Pavlopoulos, A., & Wolff, C. (2020). Chapter 2. Crustacean limb morphogenesis during normal development and regeneration. In M. Thiel, K. Anger, & S. Harzsch (Eds.), *The natural history of the Crustacea* (pp. 45–78). Volume VII: Developmental Biology and Larval Ecology. Oxford University Press.
- Poovachiranon, S., Boto, K., & Duke, N. (1986). Food preference studies and ingestion rate measurements of the mangrove amphipod *Parhyale hawaiiensis* (Dana). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 98, 129–140.
- Poynton, H. C., Hasenbein, S., Benoît, J. B., Sepulveda, M. S., Poelchau, M. F., Hughes, D. S. T., et al. (2018). The toxicogenome of *Hyalella azteca*: A model for sediment ecotoxicology and evolutionary toxicology. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 52, 6009–6022.
- Price, A. L., Modrell, M. S., Hannibal, R. L., & Patel, N. H. (2010). Mesoderm and ectoderm lineages in the crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis* display intra-germ layer compensation. *Developmental Biology*, 341, 256–266.
- Price, A. L., & Patel, N. H. (2007). Investigating divergent mechanisms of mesoderm development in arthropods: The expression of *Ph-twist* and *Ph-mef2* in *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *The Journal of Experimental Zoology*, 310B, 24–40.
- Putnam, N. H., O'Connell, B. L., Stites, J. C., Rice, B. J., Blanchette, M., Calef, R., et al. (2016). Chromosome-scale shotgun assembly using an in vitro method for long-range linkage. *Genome Research*, 26, 342–350.
- Ramm, T., & Scholtz, G. (2017). No sight, no smell? – brain anatomy of two amphipod crustaceans with different lifestyles. *Arthropod Structure & Development*, 46, 537–551.
- Ramos, A. P., Gustafsson, O., Labert, N., Salecker, I., Nilsson, D. E., & Averof, M. (2019). Analysis of the genetically tractable crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis* reveals the organisation of a sensory system for low-resolution vision. *BMC Biology*, 17, 67.
- Rehm, E. J., Hannibal, R. L., Chaw, R. C., Vargas-Vila, M. A., & Patel, N. H. (2009a). Antibody staining of *Parhyale hawaiiensis* embryos. *Cold Spring Harbor Protocols*, 2009(1). pdb.prot5129.
- Rehm, E. J., Hannibal, R. L., Chaw, R. C., Vargas-Vila, M. A., & Patel, N. H. (2009b). In situ hybridization of labeled RNA probes to fixed *Parhyale hawaiiensis* embryos. *Cold Spring Harbor Protocols*, 2009(1). pdb.prot5130.

- Rehm, E. J., Hannibal, R. L., Chaw, R. C., Vargas-Vila, M. A., & Patel, N. H. (2009c). Injection of *Parhyale hawaiiensis* blastomeres with fluorescently labeled tracers. *Cold Spring Harbor Protocols*, 2009(1). [pdb.prot5128](https://doi.org/10.1101/160010).
- Relaix, F., Polimeni, M., Rocancourt, D., Ponzetto, C., Schafer, B. W., & Buckingham, M. (2003). The transcriptional activator PAX3-FKHR rescues the defects of Pax3 mutant mice but induces a myogenic gain-of-function phenotype with ligand-independent activation of met signaling in vivo. *Genes and Development*, 17, 2950–2965.
- Schinko, J. B., Weber, M., Viktorinova, I., Kiupakis, A., Averof, M., Klingler, M., et al. (2010). Functionality of the GAL4/UAS system in *Tribolium* requires the use of endogenous core promoters. *BMC Developmental Biology*, 10, 53.
- Schwentner, M., Combosch, D. J., Pakes Nelson, J., & Giribet, G. (2017). A phylogenomic solution to the origin of insects by resolving crustacean-hexapod relationships. *Current Biology*, 27, 1818–1824.
- Serano, J. M., Martin, A., Liubicich, D. M., Jarvis, E., Bruce, H. S., La, K., et al. (2016). Comprehensive analysis of hox gene expression in the amphipod crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Developmental Biology*, 409, 297–309.
- Shiga, Y., Kato, Y., Aragane-Nomura, Y., Haraguchi, T., Saridaki, T., Watanabe, H., et al. (2017). Repeated co-option of a conserved gene regulatory module underpins the evolution of the crustacean carapace, insect wings and other flat outgrowths. *BioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/160010>.
- Shoemaker, C. R. (1956). Observations on the amphipod genus *Parhyale*. *Proceedings of the United States National Museum*, 106, 345–358.
- Sinigaglia, C., Almazan, A., Sémon, M., Gillet, B., Hughes, S., Edsinger, E., & Paris, M. (2021). Distinct gene expression dynamics in developing and regenerating limbs. *bioRxiv*, 2021.06.14.448408.
- Skinner, D. M. (1985). Molting and regeneration. In D. E. Bliss, & L. H. Mantel (Eds.), *The biology of Crustacea: Integument, pigments, and hormonal processes* (pp. 43–146). Academic Press.
- Stelzer, E. H. K. (2014). Light-sheet fluorescence microscopy for quantitative biology. *Nature Methods*, 12, 23–26.
- Sugawara, K., Çevrim, Ç., & Averof, M. (2022). Tracking cell lineages in 3D by incremental deep learning. *eLife*, 11, e69380.
- Sun, D. A., & Patel, N. H. (2019). The amphipod crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*: An emerging comparative model of arthropod development, evolution, and regeneration. *WIREs Developmental Biology*, 8, e355.
- Sun, D. A., & Patel, N. H. (2021). Identification and classification of *cis*-regulatory elements in the amphipod crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *bioRxiv*, 2021.09.16.460328.
- Telford, M. J., Budd, G. E., & Philippe, H. (2015). Phylogenomic insights into animal evolution. *Current Biology*, 25, R876–R887.
- Trapp, J., Almunia, C., Gaillard, J.-C., Pible, O., Chaumot, A., Geffard, O., et al. (2016). Proteogenomic insights into the core-proteome of female reproductive tissues from crustacean amphipods. *Journal of Proteomics*, 135, 51–61.
- Ugolini, A. (2014). Optic flow and sea-land orientation in the sandhopper *Talitrus saltator*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 217, 2041–2043.
- Ugolini, A., Galanti, G., & Mercatelli, L. (2012). The skylight gradient of luminance helps sandhoppers in sun and moon identification. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 215, 2814–2819.
- Uhlirova, M., Asahina, M., Riddiford, L., & Jindra, M. (2002). Heat-inducible transgenic expression in the silkworm *Bombyx mori*. *Development Genes and Evolution*, 212, 145–151.
- Vargas-Abúndez, J. A., López-Vázquez, H. I., Mascaró, M., Martínez-Moreno, G. L., & Simões, N. (2021). Marine amphipods as a new live prey for ornamental aquaculture: Exploring the potential of *Parhyale hawaiiensis* and *Elasmopus pectenicrus*. *PeerJ*, 9, e10840.

- Vargas-Vila, M. A., Hannibal, R. L., Parchem, R. J., Liu, P. Z., & Patel, N. H. (2010). A prominent requirement for single-minded and the ventral midline in patterning the dorsoventral axis of the crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *Development*, 137, 3469–3476.
- Watanabe, H., & Tokuda, G. (2010). Cellulolytic systems in insects. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 55, 609–632.
- Winston, W. M., Molodowitch, C., & Hunter, C. P. (2002). Systemic RNAi in *C. elegans* requires the putative transmembrane protein SID-1. *Science*, 295, 2456–2459.
- Wittfoth, C., Harzsch, S., Wolff, C., & Sombke, A. (2019). The “amphi”-brains of amphipods: New insights from the neuroanatomy of *Parhyale hawaiiensis* (Dana, 1853). *Frontiers in Zoology*, 16, 30.
- Wolff, C., & Gerberding, M. (2015). Crustacea: Comparative aspects of early development. In A. Wanninger (Ed.), *Vol. 4 Ecdysozoa II: Crustacea. Evolutionary developmental biology of invertebrates* (pp. 39–46). Springer Press.
- Wolff, C., & Scholtz, G. (2002). Cell lineage, axis formation, and the origin of germ layers in the amphipod crustacean *Orchestia cavimana*. *Developmental Biology*, 250, 44–58.
- Wolff, C., Tinevez, J.-Y., Pietzsch, T., Stamataki, E., Harich, B., Guignard, L., et al. (2018). Multi-view light-sheet imaging and tracking with the MaMuT software reveals the cell lineage of a direct developing arthropod limb. *eLife*, 7, e34410.
- Zeng, V., Villanueva, K. E., Ewen-Campen, B. S., Alwes, F., Browne, W. E., & Extavour, C. G. (2011). De novo assembly and characterization of a maternal and developmental transcriptome for the emerging model crustacean *Parhyale hawaiiensis*. *BMC Genomics*, 12, 581.
- Zimmer, M., Danko, J., Pennings, S., Danford, A., Carefoot, T., Ziegler, A., et al. (2002). Cellulose digestion and phenol oxidation in coastal isopods (Crustacea: Isopoda). *Marine Biology*, 140, 1207–1213.