



Virginia Commonwealth University
VCU Scholars Compass

Chemical and Life Science Engineering
Publications

Dept. of Chemical and Life Science Engineering

2021

Applying model approaches in non-model systems: A review and case study on coral cell culture

Liza M. Roger

Virginia Commonwealth University, rogerlm@vcu.edu

Hannah Reich

University of Rhode Island, hannah_reich@uri.edu

Evan Lawrence

Virginia Commonwealth University, lawrencee4@vcu.edu

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/clse_pubs

 Part of the [Engineering Commons](#)

Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Downloaded from

https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/clse_pubs/29

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Dept. of Chemical and Life Science Engineering at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chemical and Life Science Engineering Publications by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact libcompass@vcu.edu.

Authors

Liza M. Roger, Hannah Reich, Evan Lawrence, Shuaifeng Li, Whitney Vizgaudis, Nathan Brenner, Lokender Kumar, Judith Klein-Seetharaman, Jinkyu Yang, Hollie M. Putnam, and Nastassja Lewinski

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Applying model approaches in non-model systems: A review and case study on coral cell culture


Liza M. Roger¹*, Hannah G. Reich², Evan Lawrence¹, Shuaifeng Li³‡, Whitney Vizgaudis⁴‡, Nathan Brenner⁴‡, Lokender Kumar⁴‡, Judith Klein-Seetharaman⁴‡, Jinkyu Yang³‡, Hollie M. Putnam²‡, Nastassja A. Lewinski¹‡

1 Life Science and Engineering, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia, United States of America, **2** Department of Biological Sciences, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island, United States of America, **3** Aeronautics and Astronautics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, United States of America, **4** Department of Chemistry, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colorado, United States of America

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

‡ These authors also contributed equally to this work

* rogerlm@vcu.edu, liza.roger.research@gmail.com



OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Roger LM, Reich HG, Lawrence E, Li S, Vizgaudis W, Brenner N, et al. (2021) Applying model approaches in non-model systems: A review and case study on coral cell culture. PLoS ONE 16(4): e0248953. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953>

Editor: Christian R. Voolstra, Universitat Konstanz, GERMANY

Received: November 4, 2020

Accepted: March 9, 2021

Published: April 8, 2021

Copyright: © 2021 Roger et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All protocols are available on https://github.com/thesyntheticcoral/SynCoral_Protocols/tree/master/Culturing and the detailed data corresponding to figures presented in the manuscript are directly available in the [Supporting information files](#).

Funding: This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under NSF Award Number 1939699.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Abstract

Model systems approaches search for commonality in patterns underlying biological diversity and complexity led by common evolutionary paths. The success of the approach does not rest on the species chosen but on the scalability of the model and methods used to develop the model and engage research. Fine-tuning approaches to improve coral cell cultures will provide a robust platform for studying symbiosis breakdown, the calcification mechanism and its disruption, protein interactions, micronutrient transport/exchange, and the toxicity of nanoparticles, among other key biological aspects, with the added advantage of minimizing the ethical conundrum of repeated testing on ecologically threatened organisms. The work presented here aimed to lay the foundation towards development of effective methods to sort and culture reef-building coral cells with the ultimate goal of obtaining immortal cell lines for the study of bleaching, disease and toxicity at the cellular and polyp levels. To achieve this objective, the team conducted a thorough review and tested the available methods (i.e. cell dissociation, isolation, sorting, attachment and proliferation). The most effective and reproducible techniques were combined to consolidate culture methods and generate uncontaminated coral cell cultures for ~7 days (10 days maximum). The tests were conducted on scleractinian corals *Pocillopora acuta* of the same genotype to harmonize results and reduce variation linked to genetic diversity. The development of cell separation and identification methods in conjunction with further investigations into coral cell-type specific metabolic requirements will allow us to tailor growth media for optimized monocultures as a tool for studying essential reef-building coral traits such as symbiosis, wound healing and calcification at multiple scales.

Introduction

Model organisms have delivered breakthroughs and new insights into key biological processes [1]. In mammalian and terrestrial systems humans, mice, *Caenorhabditis elegans* (roundworm), *Drosophila melanogaster* (common fruit fly), and *Arabidopsis* (rockcress) have provided us a wealth of insight into gene structure and function [2,3], disease and immunity [4–6], and genome to phenome mapping [7,8]. The abundance of resources available through model system approaches has the capacity to catalyze research advances at a time of critical need as organisms worldwide are impacted by global stressors of the Anthropocene [9].

The opportunities to use model system approaches become less frequent as one moves from mammalian vertebrate models to aquatic and marine invertebrates that are ecologically important. There is a growing number of models, however, for cnidarians given their basal location on the tree of life and ecological and economic importance in coral reef ecosystems. In the aquatic world, for example, *Hydra* and *Nematostella* (starlet sea anemone) have been used to generate cnidarian genomes, and *Aiptasia* (tropical sea anemone; *Exaiptasia* spp.) to study gene knockdown by RNAi, symbiosis and immunofluorescence [10] and references therein. *Exaiptasia diaphana* (*Exaiptasia pallida*) has generated the most traction in cnidarian model systems [11–16] with the capacity to harbor endosymbiotic dinoflagellates from four Symbiodiniaceae genera (*Symbiodinium*, *Breviolum*, *Cladocopium*, *Durusdinium*; [17] allowing comparative approaches to distinguish organismal functions according to symbiont identified. Several lines of evidence incorporating physiological [13], transcriptomic [18], proteomic [19], epigenetic [20], and metabolomic approaches [21,22] elucidate the tradeoffs associated with harboring different endosymbionts.

Coral reef ecosystems are specifically of interest in model development, as reef building corals are responding as a “canary in the coal mine” to climate change. While coral reefs worldwide support 25% of all marine life, rising concerns for their future persistence are intensifying [23,24]. Specifically, heat waves associated with rising ocean temperatures are disrupting the intricate and essential nutritional symbiosis between cnidarian hosts and their single celled dinoflagellate endosymbionts [25], in the family Symbiodiniaceae [26]. This symbiotic breakdown leads to a loss or expulsion of the photosynthetic algal cells [27], which results in the white skeleton appearing visible through the translucent coral tissues, in a detrimental phenomenon known as coral bleaching reviewed in van Oppen & Lough [28]. Mass coral bleaching events have increased in magnitude and frequency, with substantial loss of reef building corals in areas such as the Great Barrier Reef in Australia and other reefs worldwide [29,30]. This crisis highlights the need for model systems approaches to study the impacts of changing ocean environments on coral biology. Furthermore, it is clear that the handful of marine model systems already studied (e.g., urchin *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus* [31]; ascidian <http://tunicate-portal.org/>, [32]; oyster *Crassostera gigas*, <http://gigaton.sigene.org>, [33]; and Squid *Euprymna scolopes* [34] are ill-equipped for addressing this need, as other models are more evolutionarily derived, or do not combine a primary nutritional symbiosis and calcification. A shift towards model systems approaches will be particularly impactful for threatened reef building corals and marine research as a whole [10,35].

Existing resources used to study genomics and their developmental biology will serve as important tools to turn reef-building corals into model cnidarian taxa [e.g. 36,37]. Traits such as the potential to exist in multiple symbiotic states (symbiotically and aposymbiotically) living sympatrically (e.g. *Astrangia poculata*, aposymbiotic *Astrangia* do not harbor symbionts whereas their symbiotic counterparts harbor *Breviolum psygmophilum*, [38,39] will allow the study of facultative symbiosis ranging from cellular, to organismal, to ecological approaches [38,40,41]. Although scleractinian corals are considered non-model systems, they manifest

many qualities of model systems. Indeed, scleractinian corals, as clonal and colonial organisms, represent a readily available source of clonal population [10], a certain number of species manifest high phenotypic plasticity [42], and have been intensively studied both in field and laboratory settings [43–48]. Scleractinian corals are also known for harboring not only symbiotic dinoflagellate algae but also a diverse microbiome [49,50], including bacteria and viruses common to other life forms [51]. Further comparative physiology, transcriptomics, and the growing number of assembled genomes [52–55] contribute to the development of stony corals as model organisms. Study of these taxa with model systems approaches will not only improve our understanding of cnidarian biology, but also aid in the management and restoration practices for these valuable [56,57] ecosystem engineers.

To date, some scleractinian corals that have been suggested as potential model species include: *Acropora millepora* and *Stylophora pistillata* for the Indo-Pacific based on regional abundance, the ease with which they can be sampled (branching corals) and reared in aquaria, and existing genomic resources [55,58,59], *Acropora palmata* in the Caribbean because of its endangered status [10,60–62], *Montipora capitata* in Hawaii due to its endemic status, unique genome architecture, and its plasticity in performance when hosting primarily *Cladocopium* spp. or *Durisdinium glynnii* symbionts [63–65], and *Pocillopora damicornis* for its abundance and widespread geographical distribution [53,66,67]. Considering the aforementioned criteria in combination with calcification, symbiosis, and thermal tolerance, other species can be identified amongst the vast diversity of reef corals. The real lynchpin of successful model approaches are not the species chosen, but primarily the capacity that methods such as polyp scale models, immortal coral cell lines, closed life cycle, genomic resources, and an open and engaged community of researchers provide. Together this foundation will support the application of 'omic techniques [68–70], and functional genetic analysis such as CRISPR [71] to help us elucidate the still unknown aspects of these invaluable metaorganisms [68].

As studies embrace the importance of simulating environmentally-relevant conditions (e.g. pH and temperature fluctuations; [72,73], controlled laboratory testing is also necessary to deconvolute variables and directly mechanistically link the impact of a specific environmental change, such as presence of contaminants, to changes in coral health. Useful as they are, traditional model organisms alone are limited in their capacity to address questions pertaining to the response to climate change at the cellular level, to biomineralization, or to the microbial symbioses [10,51,74]. For this, methods for immortal cell lines, cell sorting [75], and single cell analyses [e.g. 76] need to be developed and/or advanced.

Free-living populations of isolated symbiotic cells (dinoflagellates from the family Symbiodiniaceae) have been successfully maintained and studied in culture collections since the late 1950s-early 1960s [77], but not all can be successfully cultivated [78]. From the host perspective, naturally, the two cell types that have received the most attention are the gastrodermal cells that can contain symbiotic dinoflagellate e.g. [27,77–82], and the cells responsible for biomineralization, the calicoblastic cells [79,80,83–85]. Recent work in the starlet anemone *Nematosella vectensis* and the soft coral *Xenia* sp. are the first to assess gene expression in cnidarians using a single cell RNASeq approach, and have provided detailed gene expression signatures for eight cnidarian cell classes and subtypes [86], and identified a putative endosymbiosis gene set [76], which will be essential for further functional testing. Our knowledge of the biomineralization cells and process are relatively more advanced than endosymbiotic cells, with a putative biomineralization toolkit [87,88] and multiple sequenced proteomes for the skeletal organic matrix [87,89]. To date however, neither coral gastrodermal cells nor calicoblastic epithelial cells have been successfully isolated and grown as immortal cell lines, hampering functional work that would improve our understanding of these essential processes.

Inverted microscopy, with live imaging directed at the growing edge of coral fragments or polyps on glass slides has, to date, been the most effective way of investigating coral calcification and carbonate chemistry of the extracellular calcifying fluid at high magnification [90–92] along with tissue balls and “proto-polyps” [84,93,94]. The Fluorescence Activated Cell Separation (FACS) method adapted by Traylor-Knowles and colleagues [75,95] to coral cells allows sorting and identification of different cell populations, and has potential for immunological studies. Nevertheless, there is a huge gap in our understanding of cellular and molecular processes in corals largely because coral cells are difficult to maintain and grow *in vitro* under controlled environmental conditions over extended periods of time [80,83,93,96,97]. Hence, there is a global need to establish rigorous cell-based culture methods for a variety of cell types to understand the molecular mechanism associated with coral cell biology and functions. However, establishing cell-based systems is challenging due to the limited information available on the complex interactions between cells, tissues, the microbiome and the holobiont equilibrium.

The work presented here reviews and assesses methods reported to date on dissociating and culturing coral cells as an initial step towards the overarching goal of obtaining immortal cell lines for the study of bleaching, disease and toxicity at the cellular and polyp levels. To better compare the available cell culture methods, we conducted tests of a set of methods across laboratories on a single coral genotype. The coral species choice (*Pocillopora acuta*) was mainly guided by the availability of many samples from the same coral genotype and the amount of existing data however, we did not limit our review and assessment of approaches to only those reported for that species. By examining methods applied to various cnidarian species, we aimed to identify cell culture techniques that can be applied to a variety of scleractinian corals, to place them amongst model systems approaches, and generate significant research advances in the field.

Materials and methods

Aquaculture

Pocillopora acuta. The species used here is *Pocillopora acuta* (Lamarck, 1618). Specimens from the same genotype were purchased from Ocean State Aquatics (Coventry, RI), sequence details in [S1 File](#). The *Pocillopora* genus has suffered from frequent species misidentification due to high levels of phenotypic plasticity [42,98]. More specifically, *Pocillopora damicornis* and *P. acuta* show signs of potential hybridization or incomplete lineage sorting which has led to confusion and mistakes in reporting [98]. The diversification of extant *Pocillopora* species originated from a common ancestor within the last ~3 million years [98]. *P. acuta* is a hermaphroditic species of scleractinian coral that manifests mixed reproduction methods [98,99], and represents, with *Pocillopora damicornis*, one of the most extensively studied species of reef building corals as a consequence of its wide geographic distribution [100]. *P. acuta* can be found in shallow tropical to subtropical waters of the Pacific Ocean, throughout Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. This species equally grows in sheltered or exposed reef habitats, upper reef slopes, and as deep as 40m [100]. Growth rate and branching morphology depend greatly on environmental conditions [42] but its common designations, cauliflower coral and lace coral, give indications about its general shape.

Aquaria. Coral fragments were maintained in a 37.8L glass aquarium containing artificial seawater (Specific Gravity 1.025 ±0.002, 30–36ppt salinity, Instant Ocean Reef Crystals) heated to 24–25°C and illuminated using a AI[®] Prime™ 16HD Smart Reef LED lighting system (8 LED colors, set to generate ~30% PAR at coral level) on a 10 h light: 14 h dark cycle. Water flow of 378.5 L/h was maintained using a filter system. Water chemistry was tested weekly

(API 5 in 1 test strips: pH, NO_2^- , NO_3^- , KH, GH) to verify maintenance of pH (8 ± 0.5), nitrogen sources (~ 0), and dissolved inorganic carbon (>80 ppm) levels. While certain laboratory setups differed slightly, the key parameters (light, seawater temperature, salinity, pH, flow) were kept consistent between each laboratory part of this study.

Cell dissociation

Different methods for separating the coral tissue from the skeleton were tested, from scraping with a surgical scalpel or hook, to using a simple brush (paint brush or toothbrush) or calcium-, magnesium-free seawater incubation. Yield and survival being critical, methods inducing minimum cell damage should be preferred. The yield of brushing methods can vary depending on the applied pressure and rigidity of the bristle material. The use of calcium-, magnesium-free seawater [83] has been reported to result in spontaneous detachment of coral tissue from the underlying skeleton. This method relies on the fact that calcium and magnesium are known to promote cell adhesion and, by withholding these elements, tissue and cell detach from the skeleton. This method has been reported to produce both isolated cells and cell aggregates [83]. The full method description can be found in [S2 File](#).

Enzymatic digestion is a commonly used process of non-mechanical tissue and cell dissociation, i.e. separating cells from each other. The enzymes involved target cell-cell and cell-extracellular matrix bonds [97,101] and each method requires adjusting treatment parameters to cell type. This may involve increasing the tissue surface to provide a large contact surface area for enzyme activity, and enzymatic digestion of extracellular matrix components and cleaving cell-cell contacts. Cell damage should be kept to a minimum to avoid cellular DNA contamination. The enzymes tested here are trypsin (Fisher scientific #25300054) and a combination of trypsin, liberase with collagenase (Millipore Sigma #5401119001). The full method description can be found in Supplementary material: [S1 Table](#). Briefly, 2 mL of trypsin (concentrations tested: 0.125% and 0.025% concentration) were added to the coral cell pellets and incubated for 5 min minimum at 25°C; 2 mL of trypsin (concentrations tested: 0.125% and 0.025% concentration) mixed with 2 mL of liberase with collagenase solution were added to coral cell pellets and incubated for 3 days at 25°C. In both cases, culture media was added to neutralize enzyme digestion and subsequently centrifuged.

Cell sorting

The methods explored to efficiently separate different cell populations for monocultures are density gradient centrifugation [102], fluorescence assisted cell sorting [FACS, 73,74,93]. The density gradient centrifugation relies on cell type specific densities while the FACS method uses, in addition to endogenous fluorescence, fluorescent probes to separate the cell populations using a FACS machine. The tests performed using FACS relied on the methods (protocol, staining and gating) developed by Rosental et al. [75]. The full description of the FACS method can be found in [S2 File](#); briefly, coral cell suspension aliquots mixed with DAPI working solution (DAPI + phosphate-buffered saline) are run through the FACS machine (BD FACSAria™ II High-Speed Cell sorter with BD FACSDiva Software). The full description of the density gradient centrifugation (Percoll) method can be found in [S2 File](#); briefly, 1 mL of Percoll solution (concentrations at 100, 90, 80, 70, 60, 50, 40, 30, 20, 10, and 5% concentration) were added to 2 mL of coral suspension and centrifuged for 10 min at 1460 rpm.

Factors of growth

A combination of culture media reagents, antibiotics (Penicillin-Streptomycin, Antibiotic-Antimycotic, Gentamicin) and artificial seawater was tested using Dulbecco's Modified Eagle

Medium (DMEM) and Roswell Park Memorial Institute medium (RPMI, mammalian cell culture medium). DMEM and RPMI are common basal culture media for mammalian cell cultures and have been used for coral cell cultures in previous works [e.g. 79,81,94,100]. The full protocol can be found in Supplementary material [S2 File](#); briefly, 74 mL of artificial seawater (details [S2 File](#)) were mixed with 15 mL of DMEM (Fisher Scientific #30243010), 10 mL of Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS, Thermofisher Scientific #26140087), 1 mL of Antibiotics-Antimycotics solution (Anti-Anti, composed of Penicillin, Streptomycin and Amphotericin B, Thermofisher Scientific #1524006) and 0.5 mL of Gentamicin (Thermofisher Scientific #15710064).

Cell attachment

To promote cell adhesion, a number of surfaces were tested: plain glass, tissue culture treated (TCT) plastic, collagen coated glass and collagen coated TCT plastic.

Consideration of cell seeding density is important as the number of cells influences the response to ligands and xenobiotic materials in static batch experiments. Because different cells have different growth rates, seeding density also affects time to confluency, or complete cell coverage of the substrate. Coral cell diameters range between 10–25 microns [27,103] which is comparable to the cell diameters of human cells. Drawing parallels between human and coral cell culture, seeding densities of 15,000–30,000 cells/cm² are optimal for imaging and seeding densities of 300,000–500,000 cells/cm² are optimal for confluency at the onset of the experiment.

Cytotoxicity

Trypan blue was used to test cell viability (live cells vs dead cells); 10 µL of 0.4% trypan blue stain (Millepore Sigma T1854) are added to 100 µL of coral cell suspension (1–2 x10⁶ cells/mL), blue cells represent the dead cells in a viable population. 10 µL of stained cell suspension was added to a hemocytometer for counting under a Nikon Eclipse TS100 Inverted Routine Microscope. The full counting protocol can be found in [S2 File](#).

Results

Coral cell lines

Coral cell culture involves a series of steps for which different approaches can be used with varying results: cell dissociation (with or without isolation through enzyme digestion), cell sorting, cell attachment, and finally cell proliferation. Overall, the different methods tested to dissociated coral host cells and algae cells from coral nubbins yielded significantly different counts (algae cell yield ANOVA df = 9, F = 10.33, p = 4.17E-10; coral cell yield ANOVA df = 9, F = 180.73, p = 3.37E-47, [Fig 1](#)) and viabilities (ANOVA df = 8, F = 13.78, p = 8.85E-07, [Fig 2](#)). Amongst the four methods tested (washing, mechanical scraping, brushing and Ca²⁺-Mg²⁺ free seawater incubation), incubation in Ca²⁺-Mg²⁺ free seawater ([Fig 3a–3e](#)) for 1 hour yielded the maximum number of cells overall (1.39E+06 ± 1.03E+06 algae cells/cm², 1.07E+07 ± 1.03E+06 coral cells/cm², [Fig 1](#) and [S1](#) and [S2](#) Tables) without enzyme digestion, and the highest average viability (70.4%, [Fig 2](#), [S3 Table](#)). Both liberase and trypsin digestion in combination with scraping resulted in higher average algae yields (4.51E+06 ± 4.58E+05 and 2.20E+06 ± 8.29E+05 algae cells/cm² respectively, [Fig 1](#) and [S1](#) and [S2](#) Tables) compared to scraping alone (1.08E+06 ± 1.39E+05 algae cells/cm²), but with high variability (±3.34E+06, n = 21, and ±3.96E+06, n = 9, respective 95% confidence interval of the mean, compared to ±1.78E+05, n = 9 hard brushing alone, [Fig 1](#) and [S1 Table](#)). Focusing on coral cells only (i.e. host cells), Ca²⁺-Mg²⁺ free seawater incubation was most effective, especially 1 hour and 24 hours




Fig 1. Cell yields according to dissociation method. Average algae cell (left) and coral cell (right) yields as a factor of dissociation method (washing, soft/hard brushing, mechanical scraping, or calcium-magnesium-free seawater incubation for 1 to 24 hours) and enzyme digestion (Trypsin or Liberase), [S1 Table](#). [ANOVA single factor: Algae $df = 9$, $F = 10.33$, $p = 4.17E-10$; Coral $df = 9$, $F = 180.78$, $p = 3.37E-46$].

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.g001>

incubations (1H: $1.07E+07 \pm 1.03E+06$ cells/cm²; 24H: $1.65E+06 \pm 9.53E+05$ cells/cm²). Enzyme digestion did not increase coral cell yield ([Fig 1](#) and [S1](#) and [S2](#) Tables).

To assess the amount of cells remaining after mechanical scraping, enzyme digestion was done on nubbins post-scraping ([Fig 4](#)). Cell yields revealed mechanical scraping dissociates only ~50% of cells with the remainder being dissociated using trypsin digestion post-scraping (scraped average: $2.75E+06$ algae cells/cm² and $2.93E+05$ coral cells/cm²; scraped + trypsin: $2.59E+06$ algae cells/cm² and $2.57E+05$ coral cells/cm², [Fig 4](#)). Despite this, yields were not significantly different between simple scraping and scraping combined to trypsin digestion (algae cell yield ANOVA $df = 1$, $F = 0.057$, $p = 0.81$; coral cell yield ANOVA $df = 1$, $F = 0.48$, $p = 0.49$).

Two methods were tested to separate cell populations (qualitative approach): Percoll density gradient centrifugation ([S2 File](#)) and Fluorescence Activated Cell Separation (FACS, [S2 File](#)). The gradients created using Percoll were weak and layers were observed to leak into each other considerably. This method did not successfully separate different cell populations ([S1 Table](#)). FACS was successful at separating cell populations, such as aposymbiotic, symbiotic coral cells and additional sub-populations when using dyes, but the subsequent identification of these sub-population cell types needs to be improved before any quantitative data can be analyzed.

To exceed or at least match the longest coral culture duration (1 month, 94) adherent cells must attach to the culture substrate. To promote adhesion, two substrates with different treatments were tested with unsorted cell suspensions ([S2 File](#)): untreated glass, tissue culture




Fig 2. Overall cell viability (%) according to dissociation method. Percent viability (\pm SE) of cells dissociated from coral skeleton (immediately after dissociation) using different methods (soft/hard brushing, mechanical scraping, calcium-magnesium free seawater incubation for 1 to 24 hours, and enzyme digestion). [S3 Table](#) [ANOVA single factor: df = 8, F = 13.78, p = 8.85E-07].

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.g002>

treated plastic (TCT), collagen coated (Collagen coating solution, Sigma Aldrich Cat. No. 125–50) glass and collagen coated TCT plastic. The highest cell attachment was observed with untreated glass (60.64%) and tissue culture treated plastic (39.57%), [Fig 5](#) and [S5 Table](#), (glass ANOVA df = 1, F = 1.90, p = 0.23; TCT ANOVA df = 1, F = 9.56, p = 0.036). Lowest attachment was measured using collagen coated TCT plastic (6.83% attachment).

To encourage cell proliferation and growth different cell culture media combinations were tested using Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS: 0%, 5% and 10%), Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM), Roswell Park Memorial Institute medium (RPMI), or Ham's F12 medium, and different antibiotic combinations (Gentamicin, Antibiotic-Antimycotic, Penicillin-Streptomycin,




Fig 3. Ca^{2+} - Mg^{2+} free seawater incubation. Time series photographs of Ca^{2+} - Mg^{2+} free seawater coral nubbin incubation, T0 (a), 1H (b), 2H (c), 3H (d) and 24H (e). Photographs taken under a dissecting microscope.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.g003>




Fig 4. Cell dissociation method combination efficacy. Average algae cell and coral host cell yields as a factor of the origin of cell counted: Initial cell dissociation performed by scraping, remaining cells (on the skeleton) were dissociated using trypsin incubation for 1 hour. Significant difference between algae cell yield and coral cell yield by scraping and by scraping associated to trypsin digestion (scraped yield ANOVA $df = 1$, $F = 29.84$, $p = 4.3E-06$; scraped + trypsin yield ANOVA $df = 1$, $F = 77.45$, $p = 1.57E-07$) but no statistically different yields of algae cells and coral cells between methods (algae cell yield ANOVA $df = 1$, $F = 0.057$, $p = 0.81$; coral cell yield ANOVA $df = 1$, $F = 0.48$, $p = 0.49$) [S3 Table](#).

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.g004>

Gentamicin + Antibiotic-Antimycotic, [S2 File](#), [S6](#) and [S7 Tables](#)). Systematic observation revealed the average maximum uncontaminated number of days (7 days) was reached using 10% FBS with DMEM and Penicillin Streptomycin, with media replenishment every day ([Fig 6](#)). The media combinations presenting contamination from day 1 did not contain any FBS ([Fig 6](#), FBS: significant effect, ANCOVA $df = 1$, $F = 48.41$, $p = 7.04E-10$, [S6 Table](#)) and the longest lasting, contamination-free combinations were made of 5%FBS + Antibiotic-Antimycotic (with and without Gentamicin) regardless of the base medium used (DMEM, RPMI or F12). While contamination is problematic, antibiotic type did not significantly affect contamination rates (ANCOVA $df = 3$, $F = 2.48$, $p = 0.06$, [S6 Table](#)). Cell viability was measured on 7-day cultures (15% DMEM + 5%FBS + 1% Antibiotic-Antimycotic + 79% filtered artificial sterile seawater, media replenished on days 2 and 5) of cell dissociated using Ca-Mg free seawater incubation (1 hour) [Fig 7](#), [S8 Table](#). The data show a ~7, ~33 and ~37 point-decrease in percent cell viability after two, five and seven days of culture ([Fig 7](#), [S8 Table](#)).

Cultures without FBS show the fastest rate of contamination and the FBS concentration significantly impacts contamination overall ($df = 1$, $F = 48.41$, $p = 7.04E-10$). Cultures with Anti-Anti and Anti-Anti+Gentamicin show the most consistent average number of days without contamination across the three different media types (6 and 5 days respectively). ANCOVA results presented in [S7 Table](#).

Coral cells: Type and morphology

Data quality, reproducibility and scientific rigor are fundamental to ongoing applications and future work. The minimum information guidelines require that benchmark measurements be made regularly to attest of the robustness of the protocols followed. Typical measurements of




Fig 5. Cell attachment. Average cell attachment (% miscellaneous *Pocillopora acuta* cells) on glass and tissue culture-treated (TCT) plastic, with and without collagen coating after 24H incubation at 25°C and 12 h light / 12 h dark cycle, S1 Table. (Initial cell dissociation: Ca²⁺ Mg²⁺ free seawater incubation for 1 hour; Culture medium combination use: 15% DMEM, 5% FBS, 1% Penicillin-Streptomycin, 79% sterile filtered artificial seawater, see S5 Table). Significant difference between coated and uncoated substrate (df = 1, F = 6.34, p = 0.036) but no significant difference between TCT plastic and glass (df = 1, F = 2.64, p = 0.143) S5 Table.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.g005>

health in cell cultures are made to detect the onset of cell death or cell stress. These critical parameters include growth rate (doubling time), morphology (size, shape, *in vitro* and *in hospite*), concentration, and viability or apoptosis. However, benchmarks indicating the success of coral cell cultures have yet to be established due to the difficulties linked to keeping coral cell cultures over extended periods of time. Nevertheless, certain parameters have been identified in published works and summarized in Table 1. These parameters mainly refer to cell




Fig 6. Cell culture contamination variations. Average contamination free cell culture duration (days ± SE) as a factor of media type (F12, RPMI, DMEM), serum (0%, 5%, 10%) and antibiotic (Gentamicin, Anti-Anti: Antibiotic-Antimycotic, Anti-Anti + Gentamicin, Pen-Strep: Penicillin-Streptomycin). Thirty-six combinations [media + serum + antibiotic] tested with three replicates per combination. [ANCOVA: df = 6, F = 0.48, p = 0.82].

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.g006>




Fig 7. Cell viability (%) of 7-day cultures. Average overall cell viability (% \pm SE) of 7-day cultures. The cells were initially dissociated using Ca-Mg free seawater incubation for 1 hour and the culture medium used was composed of 15% DMEM, 10% FBS, 1% Penicillin-Streptomycin and 74% filtered artificial sterile seawater (replenished on days 2 and 5), $n = 3$. [ANOVA single factor, $df = 3$, $F = 13.61$, $p = 1.65E-03$].

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.g007>

morphology in the case of nematocysts, mucocytes and desmocytes nevertheless calciblastic cells and symbiotic cells, because their particular functions have attracted more scientific attention, can also be characterized in relation to other parameters such as the type of calcium carbonate (CaCO_3) precipitated, or fluorescence and density for symbiotic cells.

Not all cell types are presented here because of the limited data available. Tresguerres et al. [124] present nine cells types: epitheliomuscular cells, nematocysts, ciliated support cells, calciblastic cells, symbiotic cells, desmocytes, neurons, mucocytes and pigment cells, whereas Rosental et al. [75] identify 12 cell populations in scleractinian coral *Pocillopora acuta* through the use of FACS, and Hu et al. [76] indicate 16 cell populations in soft coral *Xenia* through a combination of FACS and single cell RNASeq. Table 1 presents several key cell types and their *in hospite* and *in vitro* characteristics alongside our measurements to serve as a reference for ongoing coral cell culture research.

Cell dissociation allowed us to observe different types of cells: symbiotic cells (singletons or doublets within a coral cell or free-living), nematocysts, undetermined host cells and amoebocytes (Fig 8). Host coral cells measured $\sim 10 \mu\text{m} \times 13 \mu\text{m}$ and symbiotic cells measured $\sim 40\text{--}50 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter (Fig 8b–8d). Four different types of nematocyst were observed: mastigophore nematocyst $\sim 130 \mu\text{m} \times 40 \mu\text{m}$ with 1.5mm rod (Fig 8d), trichous haploneme nematocyst $\sim 250 \mu\text{m} \times 30 \mu\text{m}$ with 260 μm rod (Fig 8d), trichous haploneme nematocyst capsule $\sim 120\text{--}150 \mu\text{m}$ in length (Fig 8d) and spirocyst $\sim 120 \mu\text{m}$ in length (Fig 8f). Amoebocyte-like cells were also visible $\sim 20\text{--}30 \mu\text{m} \times 10 \mu\text{m}$ (Fig 8f).

Growing evidence suggests marine invertebrate performance cannot be characterized using a single parameter (i.e. growth rate or morphology or concentration or viability), but rather an ensemble of interdependent factors [122,125,126]. While Symbiodiniaceae density and activity, and calcium carbonate precipitation by calciblastic cells can be measured, coral cellular activity of neurons, nematocysts and amoebocytes have not yet been investigated. Moreover,

Table 1. Benchmark measurements according to cell type, *in hospite* and *in vitro* for coral cell line cultures.

Cell Type	Indicator	<i>In Hospite</i> Expected Range	<i>In Vitro</i> Expected Range	Reference
Ectodermal cells (oral tissue)				
Nematocyst	Cell shape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Acropora hyacinthus</i>: rounded rectangular shape; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 1: thin and elongated; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 2: thicker than type 1; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 3: rounded oval shape; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pocillopora damicornis</i>: spindle shape; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 1: thick spindle-shaped capsule with sparsely (single coil) barbed shaft; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 2: thin spindle-shaped capsule with densely barbed (helix) shaft; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 3: oval-shaped with one sharper end; • <i>Pocillopora actua</i>: mastigophore and trichous haploneme: oblong; spirocyst: oblong with visible coil inside; 	[97,104–109] This study
	Cell size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Acropora hyacinthus</i>: ~5µm x 20µm; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 1: ~100µm x 800µm; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 2: ~100µm x 800µm; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 3: ~100µm x 200µm; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pocillopora damicornis</i>: 7.5µm by 30µm; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 1: capsule 10µm by 30µm, shaft 15µm; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 2: capsule 3µm by 30µm, shaft 20µm; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>, spirocyst type 3: capsule 6.5 by 13µm; • <i>Pocillopora actua</i> mastigophore ~130µm x 40 µm with 1.5mm rod; trichous haploneme ~250µm x 30µm with 260µm rod; spirocyst: 120µm; 	[97,105–109] This study
Mucocyte	Cell shape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Acropora hyacinthus</i>: thin and elongated, rectangular; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>: thick and elongated, densely packed along the ectoderm of “sweeper tentacles” but rare along the “catch tentacles”; • <i>Coelastrea aspera</i>: oval shaped; • <i>Montastraea annularis</i>: rounded rectangular shape; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>: elongated drop-shaped; • <i>Goniastrea aspera</i>: elongated drop-shaped; 	Unreported	[97,105–109]
	Cell size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>: ~150µm x 500µm; • <i>Galaxea fascicularis</i>: ~7µm x 35µm; • <i>Coelastrea aspera</i>: ~9µm x 11µm; • <i>Acropora hyacinthus</i>: ~10µm x 20µm; • <i>Montastraea annularis</i>: ~15µm x 30µm; • <i>Goniastrea aspera</i>: ~12.5µm x 40µm; 	Unreported	[97,105–109]
Calicoblastic Cells				
	Cell shape / description	“Long-thin-tall” to “thick and cup-like” Note: flat calicoblastic cells tend to manifest low calcifying activity whereas cup-like cells manifest the opposite	Rounded	[110,111]
	Cell size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: < 6µm; • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: 4–30µm; • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: 5–10µm; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: 5–6µm 	[94,110,112]

(Continued)

Table 1. (Continued)

Cell Type	Indicator	In Hospite Expected Range	In Vitro Expected Range	Reference
	CaCO ₃ crystal precipitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: 6.5–12.5µm rod-shaped or spherical-looking; • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: 2µm width, rod-shaped, growing in length; • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: 1–10µm fiber bundles (0.5–1µm fibers); • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: 4–10µm spherulite-like nanogranules, later becoming 10–35µm dumbbells; • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: 2.5–5µm spherulite-like nanogranules; • <i>Pocillopora acuta</i>: 1–5µm rod-shaped, aggregated into dumbbells 15–30µm in length; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stylophora pistillata</i>: 10µm 	[90,93,94,113,114]
Symbiotic Cells				
	Symbiont cell size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>D. glynnii</i>: length 9.52 ±0.31(SD), width 8.43 ±0.39 (SD); • <i>C. goreaui</i>: length 10.80 ±0.88 (SD), width 10.40 ±0.83 (SD) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>D. glynnii</i> and <i>Cladocopium</i> sp. are not culturable, <i>in vitro</i> values are derived from culturable strains from the same genus • <i>Durusdinium</i> cell volume: 246–1124 µm³. • <i>Cladocopium</i> cell volume: 220–1586 µm³ 	[26,65,115–117]
	Symbiont cell density	• 3.5 x 10 ⁵ –3 x 10 ⁶ cells/cm ²	Varies with growth phases	[118–120]
	Symbiont PSII photochemical efficiency (F _v /F _m)	~0.5–0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Durusdinium</i> spp. 0.37–0.52 • <i>Cladocopium</i> spp. 0.41–0.53 	[67,116,117,121,122]
Other				
Desmocyte	Cell shape	• <i>Mycetophyllia reesi</i> : rounded	Unreported	[123]
	Cell size	• <i>Mycetophyllia reesi</i> : 15µm x 20µm	Unreported	[123]
Amoebocyte	Cell shape Cell size	Unreported	<i>Pocillopora acuta</i> : roughly rounded with granular surface; <i>Pocillopora acuta</i> : 20–30µm	This study This study

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.t001>




Fig 8. Coral cell variety (microscope photographs). Different cell types observed after dissociation from *P. acuta* nubbbins, coral host cells of different sizes (a, red arrow heads), single Symbiodinaceae cell (b), two symbiotic cells encapsulated inside a coral host cell (c). (d) unsorted cells composed of miscellaneous coral host cells (red arrow heads), symbiotic Symbiodinaceae (black arrow heads), deployed trichous haploneme nematocyst (yellow arrow head) and deployed mastigophore nematocyst (yellow arrow head with red outline), closed capsule of trichous haploneme nematocyst (e), spirocyst nematocyst (f) and amoebocyte-like cell (g). Photographs (a)–(c) were taken using a Cytation3 imaging plate reader with GFP and Texas Red filters. Photographs (d)–(g) were taken under a compound microscope (no staining).

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.g008>

the complexity of coral microbiomes and the associated interdependencies [78] have not been sufficiently characterized to make any overarching assumptions of how the microbiome influences coral cell health in culture compared to *in hospite* interactions.

Evaluation of methods

Testing various cell culture methods enables their critical comparison and advantages and disadvantages for each method tested are summarized in Table 2. Exact protocols applied will be dependent on the optimal experimental designs for the hypotheses being tested. Nevertheless, quantifying variability and identifying the sources of this variability is fundamental for comparative assessment [e.g. 127], see variability in Table 1.

Discussion

Advances in coral aquaculture in recent decades, have provided fine-scale control over many key environmental factors to investigate the impact of change on multiple coral species raised *ex situ* in aquaria, but survival of isolated coral cells and obligate symbiont cells is still very limited [78,128]. Furthermore, despite the growing number of studies on coral bleaching (e.g., [129], and reference therein, diseases [e.g. 130–132, and references therein] and toxicity [e.g. 133–135], a concrete list of coral “health” indicators has yet to be established [68,136,137]. Several main indicators of coral performance that are commonly applied at the colony or fragment level include: polyp activity [i.e. extension, feeding, 117,138], tissue thickness, [118,138,139], biomass [140], symbiosis using symbiont density and green fluorescent protein intensity [141–143], microbiome distribution and composition [144–149] and skeletal growth [150,151]). With the advent of microsensors and nano scale assessment, more subtle metrics have also been identified over the past decade, such as ciliary beating [152] and the physiochemical equilibrium of the skeleton calcification mechanism [153,154]. These indicators mostly relate to polyp- and colony-level changes since most studies utilize primarily coral fragments for research, furthermore, some of these indicators have non-negligible limitations. Coral growth, for example, has long been considered as an important performance metric so, traditionally, the rate of linear extension was considered a measure of coral fitness because coral reproduction is based on size [155]. However, growth has also been demonstrated as highly variable according to parameters such as seawater temperature [156] and pH [155], and recent studies have identified limitations of tracking growth as a primary indicator of performance [125,157], with multiple metrics likely a necessity.

Through model systems approaches we can work towards identifying and standardizing the different metrics necessary to better define coral health and to make scientific findings more consistently comparable across scales and species. Coral cell lines, or at least long-lived cultures, represent a key method for applying the model systems toolkit and can catalyze research advances in coral biology. Testing the protocols developed by different research groups allowed us to highlight simple and effective cell dissociation methods (Ca^{2+} - Mg^{2+} free seawater incubation for 1 hour) plus potential challenges with common approaches (e.g. trypan blue) to simplify and widen the range of applications of coral cell cultures. This work has also allowed us to describe three different types of nematocysts and amoebocyte-like cells in *P. acuta*. Together our findings represent an advance towards a better understanding of coral cell biology. As we continue the optimization of coral cell culture, certain improvements remain to be made, namely tuning the culture media mixture to maximize cell survival and promote proliferation, as well as identifying the functions of the different cell populations.

Table 2. Summarized advantages and disadvantages of each method tested for coral cell culture.

Method used	Advantages	Disadvantages
Cell dissociation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By simple washing • By mechanical scraping with razor blade or scalpel 	Easy; Adapted to species with large polyps and/or large tentacles;	Not very effective; Time consuming; yielding ~50%; not adapted to species with small polyps and/or small tentacles;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By paint brush/toothbrush 	Relatively easy to perform regardless of the polyp size;	Can be rough for cell membranes and lead to contamination from the mucus layer; time-consuming;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Ca²⁺-, Mg²⁺-free seawater 	Simple incubation method;	Effect on desmocyttes unknown; mix of single cells and incompletely dissociated tissue fragments detach from the skeleton;
Cell digestion		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enzyme digestion: trypsin 	Simple incubation method; high yield; converts proteins to peptides; can promote cell aggregation;	Effect on desmocyttes unknown; no standard concentrations or incubation time available; cell clusters; can damage cell surface proteins and their subsequent adhesion capacity; chelating agent necessary to ensure effectiveness (e.g. EDTA);
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enzyme digestion: liberase 	Simple incubation method; high yield especially for algae cells;	Effect on desmocyttes unknown; no standard concentrations or incubation time available; can affect cell adhesion/aggregation capacity, often presented as a blend of various enzymes;
Cell sorting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percoll density gradient 	Only small doses of Percoll needed each time;	Not cost-effective; density gradients are not always marked enough; protocol must be optimized accordingly to the density characteristics of targeted cells and multiple successive Percoll step gradients needed for full separation;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FACS 	Staining process is simple; a lot of data is generated (cell counts per population and relative cell sizes);	Multiple dyes can be costly; partially based on ROS concentration; multiple passes needed for full separation; still new method applied to coral cells;
Growth medium		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DMEM • RPMI • F12 • FBS 	Methods established with other living organisms; many products available to purchase;	Does not correspond exactly to coral cell needs; must be combined with additives for optimization;
Antibiotic treatment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pen-Strep (Penicillin and Streptomycin) 	Method established with other living organisms; many products available to purchase;	Little effect on the bacterial and viral population observed;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anti-Anti (Penicillin, Streptomycin, Amphotericin B); 	Method established with other living organisms; many products available to purchase; More effective than Pen-Strep alone;	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gentamicin 	Method established with other living organisms; many products available to purchase;	Most efficient when combined with other antibiotics that target DNA synthesis;
Cell attachment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Untreated glass or plastic 	Simple;	~40% of cells lost;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collagen coating (glass or plastic) 	Can be tested with macromolecules other than collagen;	Might need to be tailored to different cell types;
Cell visualization for counting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trypan Blue 	No incubation necessary;	Lethal stain; reacts with salts and creates clusters;

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248953.t002>

Consolidating methods

Dissociation. The preparation of cell suspensions is a crucial factor for any successful cell culture-based experiment. The ideal method should isolate the desired cells from tissue samples while avoiding cell aggregation, preserving cell viability and cell surface markers for sorting and other experiments, e.g. immunophenotyping [158].

The first step, cell dissociation, can be performed using four different popular methods: mechanical scraping (using a scalpel), brushing (with soft paint brush vs. toothbrush), Ca^{2+} -, Mg^{2+} -free seawater incubation or enzymatic digestion. The first two methods are prone to person-to-person variability, instrument characteristics and possible species variations (e.g. large vs small polyps, [S1 Table](#), variability). Although all methods are effective, questions remain concerning cellular integrity after disruption of cell-to-matrix and cell-to-cell interactions. The vital stain used to count cells in the present study (trypan blue, recommended in the literature) reacted to seawater, creating blue clusters impairing visualization of staining efficacy. Enzymatic digestion using collagenase, has, for example, the potential to stimulate reprogramming and transdifferentiation of cell types [e.g. *Podocoryne carnea*, jellyfish, [128,159,160](#)] therefore, functional characteristics specific to different cell types and phenotypic stability need to be followed closely when enzyme digestion is involved [[128,159](#)]. Applied to coral cells, trypsin-EDTA treatment was reported most effective [high yield, [99,128](#)] compared to collagenase and pronase treatment, although trypsin can damage cell surfaces thereby impacting future adhesive capacities similarly to liberase blends made of pronase and collagenase [[97,101](#)]. Conflicting reports regarding cell surface damage using trypsin and liberase [[86,97,101,128](#)] can be attributed to the blend used and how rarely the extract enzymatic reagent blend is specified by the manufacturer. Our findings suggest combining mechanical dissociation and enzyme digestion (trypsin) can yield double the number of cells ([Fig 4](#)) with only a slight decrease in viability (-2.9%). While cell reaggregation capacity is not cardinal, cell adhesion is, especially for long term cell cultures. Mechanical scraping and Ca^{2+} -, Mg^{2+} -free seawater incubation also disrupt the cells responsible for the attachment of the soft tissue to the coral skeleton, desmocytes. This attachment disruption phenomenon and its cascading effects have yet to be fully investigated [[128](#)]. Studies focusing on desmocytes should carefully assess cell dissociation methods with the goal of minimal disruption in mind. Coral cell dissociation is a more delicate process than expected and considering the drawbacks of each approach is important to designing protocols adapted to the nature of each study.

Domart-Coulon et al. [[83](#)] report a yield of $0.5\text{--}1 \times 10^6$ cells from a 0.3–0.5 mm long coral nubbin after 3 h incubation in Ca^{2+} -, Mg^{2+} -free seawater. Replicating this method, we were able to dissociate $5.9\text{--}7.6 \times 10^6$ cells ([S1 Table](#)) from a 0.5–0.9 mm long coral nubbins, which aligns with the previously reported findings. Ca^{2+} -, Mg^{2+} -free seawater incubation is an effective, easy and cost-efficient method with high cell yields. Results show that optimum incubation time is 1 hour. While extended incubation periods could help dissociate different types of cells, the cell yield found after 1 hour incubation is sufficient for cell cultures. Further work should attempt to separate and identify the different populations dissociated at different time points during Ca^{2+} -, Mg^{2+} -free seawater incubation. This could also be done when comparing simple mechanical dissociation with mechanical dissociation and enzyme digestion).

Cell separation. The next step consists in separating the cell mixture into its individual constituent cell types to achieve monocultures of different coral cell populations. Density gradient centrifugation is reported to easily separate coral cells from contaminating bacterial cells with high-purity and high-yield [[102](#)]. Nevertheless, when tested, this method did not present the clear density gradient expected and the reagent cost significantly outweighed the effectiveness. While FACS method is more effective at separating coral host cells from symbiont cells, further separation partially relies on the differential concentration of reactive oxygen species (ROS) among different cell types [[75,95](#)]. Although innovative and effective, this method relies on a very active biological phenomenon, ROS production linked to oxidative stress, that is influenced by the biology of the cells and by every processing step prior to analysis with the FACS machine. To date, the production of ROS is still not well characterized in coral cells and variability in ROS concentration and type might lead to mixed populations. Label-free cell

separation using inertial microfluidics devices is a promising method recently reviewed by Gou et al. [161]. The recent advances in the field of microfluidics and the characterization of force and flow now allow us to circulate, sort and enrich different cells, e.g. tumor cells, exosomes, DNA and other biological materials, [161] and references therein. Simple devices can be engineered to sort the cells but, like the density gradient centrifugation and FACS methods, the system needs to be tailored to the different types of cells targeted, and full separation might involve multiple passes through the inertial microfluidics device [161]. Methods of cell separation such as the combination of affinity ligands to microfluidic devices, magnetic activated cell sorting, cell affinity chromatography or expanded bed chromatography (reviewed in [162]) should also be investigated in relation to coral cells to overcome issues related to *in vitro* cell morphology, i.e. different coral cell types tend to be very similar. Cell separation technology has progressed steadily despite lingering challenges, including meeting basic characteristics of rapidity, efficacy and affordability while maintaining high yield, purity and cellular functionality [162]. Bacon et al. [162] single out membrane-based separation combined to specific biorecognition moieties as a method that ensures high yield, purity and cellular functionality while allowing high throughput, reduced processing time and maintaining high viability.

Cell population separation is an important step that needs to be complemented by the identification of these populations. Rosental et al. [75] and Snyder et al. [95] were successful at separating symbiotic populations from asymbiotic populations but further identification or cell typing is needed. Identification could be undertaken by monitoring different parameters, e.g. granularity, size and shape, and it was observed in this study that cells become more rounded with increasing time in culture. FACS could further help the identification through forward and side scatter but no population specific ranges have yet been determined.

Proliferation. Once the coral tissue is successfully detached from the skeleton and the cells sorted according to their functionality, finding the optimal growth medium mixture is key to cell survival [163]. Culture media selection rests on the assumption that the closer media composition is to the metabolic requirements of the organism, the more successful the cell culture will be. Growth media should be comprised of amino acids, nucleic acids, vitamins, carbohydrates (glucose, galactose, maltose, fructose), inorganic salts (Ca^{2+} , Mg^{2+} , Sr^{2+}), buffering agents for pH and osmolarity, and (animal) serum, which contains lipids, proteins (albumin, transferrin, aprotinin, fetuin, fibronectin, collagen), growth factors, attachment factors, hormones. The media cocktails tested here on mixed coral cell populations, showed that FBS is a key ingredient since cultures with 0% FBS were nearly all contaminated after 1 day. Contamination occurred in every culture regardless of the base medium used (DMEM, RPMI or F12, see S9 Table for composition) but the added antibiotic-antimycotic and Penicillin Streptomycin treatments seemed to inhibit contamination the longest (Fig 6, average maximum number of days without contamination: 7 days; maximum number of days without contamination: 10 days), combined to a 10–15 min aerated iodine dip of the nubbins before cell dissociation (Reef Dip™ Coral disinfectant, Seachem). A better control of the microbial population needs to be achieved to design a better adapted culture medium for long term cultures. Furthermore, a “one-size-fits-all” approach to culture medium composition (S9 Table) may not yield consistent success rates among cell types because some coral cells harbor endosymbiotic dinoflagellates (Symbiodiniaceae). The different nutrient needs associated with each organism (i.e., Symbiodiniaceae and coral, [164–168]) need to be reflected in the different media blends to generate optimal yields (e.g. growth, isolation success rates, adhesion) and the exchanges between coral host and symbiont need to be carefully considered (e.g. amino acid synthesis, carbon and nitrogen source/sink [169]). The Currently available artificial growth media are poorly adapted to the diversity of coral cells as survival has not been achieved beyond one month [96].

Coral colonies have diverse microbiomes [e.g. 144,170–173] and microbial contamination of coral cell culture is problematic. Thorough initial sample rinsing can reduce the initial concentration of microorganisms, which often reside in the coral mucus, and the addition of antibiotics can inhibit the growth of bacterial and viral communities associated with coral cells. Anti-bacterial, -viral cocktails for coral cell cultures are poorly described and rarely justified through isolation and identification of problematic bacteria or viruses. Researchers have used 1% antibiotic cocktail (streptomycin–gentamycin, 1:1 ratio) to extract cells from soft coral *Simularia flexibilis* [101]. Lecointe et al. [97] used seawater supplemented with (v:v) 3% antibiotics-antimycotics solution (AB-AM, Gibco/Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA, USA) with final concentration of Amphotericin B <0.3%, Penicillin 1.5–4.5%, Streptomycin 1.5–4.5% for coral cell isolation from *P. damicornis* nubbins [97]. The antibiotic cocktails tested here showed that gentamicin alone was not sufficient to control the bacterial/viral population. The antibiotic-antimycotic treatment was the most consistent at controlling contamination compared to penicillin-streptomycin which varied with FBS concentration. Without a more in depth understanding of the bacterial and viral populations contaminating the coral cell cultures, it remains unclear which antibiotic combination is the best suited to prevent contamination over the longer term.

Cell attachment. Cell attachment is important to long-term culture and proliferation. Multiple substrates can be tailored to promote cell adhesion: tissue culture treated plastic, Primaria, and glass, with or without the use of surface coatings (e.g. collagen, poly-L-lysine, RGD-[e]tide). Amongst these techniques, the latter is the most open to innovations with the testing of different surface coating in accordance with biomimicking properties of the extracellular matrix (ECM) and the mesoglea, similarly to growth media engineering. As the ECM is the fundamental attachment medium for cnidarian cells, testing a number of its components could lead to very efficient surface coating to promote cell adhesion. Collagen forms a unique gel-like fibrillary layer in corals and is mainly composed of repeating glycine and hydroxyproline. Collagen is thought to be the main macromolecule responsible for cell bonds and, *a fortiori*, cell attachment. Contrary to expectations, collagen coated glass and plastic were less successful at promoting cell attachment compared to their uncoated counterparts. Other molecules, such as fibronectin, laminin, chitosan and the polysaccharide HSPG (heparin sulfate proteoglycan) could potentially promote adhesion [128,174] better than the collagen tested. Furthermore, testing different sources and types of collagen might help narrow down the essential ingredients for cell adhesion. Investigation of the composition of the mesoglea and the skeletal organic matrix (SOM) could lead to more testable molecules, but the SOM is notoriously difficult to isolate without losing the soluble fraction, or without residual tissue contamination [e.g. 85 and associated letters], thus SOM investigations require caution.

Benchmark measurements

Complete and accurate reporting of relevant information is essential to allow methods and protocol reproduction, and enable community adoption, meta-data analyses, modelling, systematic comparison and standard refinement [175]. Minimum information standards have been presented in an attempt to reduce animal testing, reduce financial waste and improve bioscience research reporting [e.g. 180,181]. Such guidelines can be applied here but the reporting of results and observations needs to be adapted to the complexity of reef-building corals. Considering the limited information available on coral cells even basic information, such as shape and size, need to be included as benchmark measurements along with Symbiodiniaceae activity and cell survival throughout culture and experimental period.

Cytotoxicity. Cell viability must be established for successful cell line generation regardless of cell origin. To this effect cytotoxicity assays need to be reliable, straightforward and relatively rapid to react. Methods for assessing cell membrane integrity include dye exclusion assays [e.g. trypan blue, 73,95], Evan's blue [176,177], propidium iodide [75], SYTOX green [85] and enzyme release assays (e.g. lactate dehydrogenase, LDH, [178]). Intracellular enzymatic activity has also been used as indicators of cell viability, such as measurement of esterase activity using fluorescein diacetate [27] and mineralization activity in calcifying cells using the alkaline phosphatase assay [83]. Assays measuring metabolic activity either directly (e.g. ATP bioluminescence) or indirectly via dye conversion (e.g. MTT (3-[4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl]-2,5-diphenyl tetrazolium bromide assay, 100) have also been used. Additionally, metabolic activity can be characterized through measurements of mitochondrial properties such as membrane potential (JC9 dye) and density (MAO dye, 100). The method used during our testing was Trypan blue staining. It is a simple and well-established method that stains dead cell membranes and tissues blue. Unfortunately, trypan blue reacts with seawater and proteins (from culture media) creating clusters that make observations difficult. Furthermore, trypan blue is a lethal stain which cannot be used to assess cell viability during culture. An approach using non-lethal vital stains should be preferred. Neutral red could be an alternative depending on the time needed for the cells to take up the stain (incubation). Neutral red staining protocols recommend a 2 hour incubation at culture temperature [179], 25°C in the case of corals, but this considerably extends the handling time, which could affect results. Further testing will determine whether neutral red is a suitable vital stain for coral cell viability measurements. DAPI (4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole) is also commonly used to stain dead cells. Unfortunately, DAPI stains dead cells with compromised membrane integrity (necrosis) leaving intact dead cells (apoptosis) unstained. Investigations into fluorescent stains more adapted to coral cells should be undertaken, especially considering the strong autofluorescence of both host coral cells and symbiotic algae cells.

When cell death is measured, additional studies to elucidate potential mechanisms of toxicity are conducted, which can include oxidative stress experiments to determine any imbalance in reactive oxygen or nitrogen species generation and genotoxicity experiments to assess the extent of DNA damage. A majority of coral cell studies have only focused on establishing cell cultures which remain viable beyond a few days. Therefore, additional research is needed to assess sublethal cellular level changes due to culture conditions and/or physico-chemical exposures.

It should be noted that in relation to culture, cell survival can be overshadowed by potential bacterial activity even with small, non-critical, levels of contamination (i.e. culture contamination is not necessarily synonymous with cell death). Considering the fragile balance corals have with their microbiome, low contamination levels may not be problematic to the coral cell culture itself but could interfere with cytotoxicity assessments.

Cell morphology and functionality. The cell dissociation allowed us to differentiate Symbiodiniaceae from other coral cells, along with multiple different types of nematocysts and amoebocyte-like cells. While nematocysts have been well studied in anemones, little data is available on coral nematocysts. Across Cnidaria, ~30 different types of nematocysts exist with high diversity amongst Medusozoa [180]. The diversity and complexity of nematocysts increased through evolution, from Anthozoa to Medusozoa and species are reported to each have between 2–6 different types [180]. Nematocysts are classified according to their shape. Reef building corals present three types of nematocysts: trichous haplonemes, spirocysts and mastigophores [180]. The nematocysts observed in *P. acuta* follow this rule (Fig 8e) showing a closed trichous haploneme capsule, a deployed mastigophore and a deployed trichous haploneme (Fig 8d), and a spirocyst (Fig 8f). The function of nematocysts is to capture prey and

defend against predation. Kass-Simon & Scappaticci [181] voice the fascination surrounding the potential for nematocysts to act independently, without neuronal intervention. Certain nematocysts in Hydra are reported to contribute to polyp locomotion [181] but this has not been investigated in coral polyps to date. It is also unknown how nematocysts respond to physiological stress (e.g. suppressed activity in bleached corals and potentially heightened coral starvation, potential involvement in polyp bailout).

Amoebocytes (Fig 8g) are part of the inflammatory response related to injury. They are the putative immunocytes of the anthozoans [182] and poorly understood in scleractinian corals. Cultures of amoebocytes could lead to considerable breakthrough in the field of wound healing and tissue regeneration. This is particularly relevant today, with thermal stress compromising immune responses [183] and the increased frequency of marine heat-waves. Indeed, yellow band disease combined with thermal stress exhausted immune defenses of coral *Montastraea faveolata*, thereby letting pathogens colonize healthy tissue and precipitating colony death [183]. The complexity of the holobiont added to the combined effects of disease and thermal stress makes for an intricate system to understand. Amoebocytes culture could potentially help deconvolute the interconnections and identify whether colony death was due to the suppression of certain immune factors or the increased pathogen virulence.

Other important considerations

Symbiodiniaceae. The physiological upkeep of Symbiodiniaceae is paramount to the maintenance of coral-dinoflagellate mutualisms and therefore an important metric to gauge the success of cell culturing efforts. Tracking Symbiodiniaceae cell density is important for determining whether symbiosis has been re-established and for ensuring the further growth of cultures and can be monitored via microscopy. The use of photosystem II photochemical efficiency (F_v/F_m) serves as a benchmark for efficiency of photochemistry and allows for the comparison of cell culture health to a wide range of coral physiology and bleaching studies. Additionally, these indicators are important when gauging the success of culturing aposymbiotic cell lines because they can serve as quick indicators of contamination.

Cryopreservation. Cryopreservation of cells is advantageous for basic research as it provides a means to conserve cells or tissue for later use, allowing for experimentation without the need to collect fresh samples each time. Cryoprotectants, such as dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), are often employed to prevent ice formation, which can damage and reduce survival of cells. Feuillassier et al. [184] compared the effectiveness of ethylene glycol, DMSO, methanol and glycerol on preserving *Pocillopora damicornis* tissue balls and, based on tissue ball regression DMSO, ethylene glycol, and glycerol were determined to have the least toxicity.

Imaging. Imaging is a versatile method to explore structures and fundamental properties of coral reefs in the scales of millimeters to meters. At high-resolution, microscopy-based studies of corals lead to the clear interpretation of physical and biological processes governing coral health and proliferation. Tissue or cellular level coral physiology have been explored using advanced high-resolution microscopy methods, e.g. bright field microscopy, phase-contrast microscopy, differential interference-contrast microscopy [102,185]. Typical experimental examples are the observations of calcareous skeleton, decalcified coral tissues [102,185,186] and the physiological and nutritional status of their symbiotic dinoflagellates [187–190]. These successful attempts provide a great deal of information at the microscopic level, i.e. cellular and subcellular structures. However, the interaction of calcifying cells with the calcareous skeleton cannot be observed once the tissue is separated from the skeleton, and traditional tissue sections rely on fixatives that can create artifacts. Three-dimensional interactions between coral cells, symbiotic cells and the skeleton have therefore been limited. Moreover, dynamic

processes *in vivo* as a function of time cannot be revealed at the tissue and cellular levels using these methods. In order to solve this problem, some studies put forward the cell or tissue cultures as the miniaturized model, which can be studied *in vitro* in real time. Although this method provides an alternative to study the physiological processes involved in symbiosis and calcification, the generated cell or tissue cultures extracted from coral tissue will lose the tissue structures and organizations [83,85]. Besides, cells or tissues in cultures are in a state of declining health, which may not reflect the whole physiological and metabolic processes of corals [78,85,93].

Fluorescence microscopy opens up an avenue to use the autofluorescence of coral tissue as an indicator of coral performance [118,191,192]. This non-invasive method can provide a way to obtain the interaction of coral tissues as well as the dynamic processes *in vivo* in real time. For example, live imaging Confocal Laser Scanning Microscopy (CLSM) or Confocal Raman Microscopy (CRM) have allowed us to examine calcification [90,92], intracellular pH [193–196], tissue thickness and innate Symbiodinaceae autofluorescence [118,120,197], although these investigations are limited to relatively short duration. CLSM has also been used to quantify disease-induced changes in coral fluorescence associated with tissue loss diseases in *Montipora capitata* [191].

Conclusions

The work presented here establishes a framework for the development of immortal coral cell cultures and the application of model systems approaches to reef-building corals as non-model systems. The thorough comparison of coral cell dissociation methods highlighted different cell yields but preserving cell integrity and function is essential, as are ways to successfully assess both parameters. The various culture media combination tested show the composition needs to be tailored to extend cultures beyond one week and suppress contamination for longer periods. Furthermore, if the model systems approach is to be further applied to coral cell cultures, moving away from mammalian-based media supplements (e.g. FBS and basal media) is the next step. To this end, the cell-specific requirements of each coral cell type need to be investigated and matched with the right supplements and concentrations. The cell attachment tests performed in this study reveal typical surface coating for mammalian cell cultures do not promote coral cell attachment and different coating should be tested. Finally, coral cell identification needs to be more advanced before the field can move towards establishing rigorous and streamlined cell-based culture methods for a variety of cell types mirroring model systems', e.g. *in silico* cell identification, advanced cell separation, immortal monoculture cell lines. Only then we will be able to fully understand the molecular mechanism associated with coral cell biology and functions.

Supporting information

S1 Table. Methods tested for different steps of coral cell culture. Parameters: Yield, cell viability, reproducibility of method, effectiveness, incubation time.

(DOCX)

S2 Table. Cell dissociation method comparison data. Algae cell and coral cell yields as a factor of dissociation method (washing, soft/hard brushing, mechanical scraping, or calcium-magnesium-free seawater incubation for 1 to 24 hours) and enzyme digestion (Trypsin or Liberase).

(DOCX)

S3 Table. Overall cell viability immediately after dissociation, as a factor of dissociation method: Data. Percent viability of coral cells dissociated using different methods (soft/hard brushing, mechanical scraping, or calcium-magnesium-free seawater incubation for 1 to 24 hours, and enzyme digestion). Each method was replicated at least three times.
(DOCX)

S4 Table. Cell dissociation method combination efficacy data. Algae cell and coral host cell yields as a factor of the origin of cell counted: Initial cell dissociation performed by scraping (n = 18), remaining cells (on the skeleton) were dissociated using trypsin incubation for 1 hour (n = 9).
(DOCX)

S5 Table. Cell attachment experiment data. Four substrates were tested for coral cell attachment: Tissue culture treated plastic (TCT), collagen coated TCT, glass and collagen coated glass. Cells were counted and the data is presented below (counts and percentages).
(DOCX)

S6 Table. Culture contamination rate data. Average contamination free cell culture duration (days \pm SE) as a factor of media type (F12, RPMI, DMEM), serum (0%, 5%, 10%) and antibiotic (Gentamicin, Anti-Anti: Antibiotic-Antimycotic, Anti-Anti + Gentamicin, Pen-Strep: Penicillin-Streptomycin). Thirty-six combinations [media + serum + antibiotic] tested with three replicates per combination.
(DOCX)

S7 Table. Cell culture contamination variation ANCOVA results. FBS: 0%, 5%, 10%. MEDIA: F12, RPMI, DMEM. ANTIBIOTIC: Gentamicin, Antibiotic-Antimycotic, Antibiotic-Antimycotic + Gentamicin, Penicillin-Streptomycin.
(DOCX)

S8 Table. Cell viability (%) after 7 days culture: Data. Percent viability of coral cells dissociated using calcium-magnesium-free seawater incubation for 1 hour and grown for 7 days in growth media (15% DMEM + 10% FBS + 1% Penicillin-Streptomycin + 74% filtered artificial sterile seawater, media replenished on days 2 and 5, n = 3).
(DOCX)

S9 Table. Composition of different growth media used in this study.
(DOCX)

S1 File. *Pocillopora acuta* sequence and sequencing protocol. DNA sequence extracted from corals used for this study and link to associated protocol repository.
(DOCX)

S2 File. Cell dissociation protocol and protocol repository. Protocols used for coral cell dissociation, attachment, culture, count and separation.
(DOCX)

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank all contributors to the Synthetic Coral HDR project.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Judith Klein-Seetharaman, Jinkyu Yang, Hollie M. Putnam, Nastassja A. Lewinski.

Data curation: Liza M. Roger, Hannah G. Reich, Evan Lawrence.

Formal analysis: Liza M. Roger, Hannah G. Reich, Evan Lawrence.

Funding acquisition: Judith Klein-Seetharaman, Jinkyu Yang, Hollie M. Putnam, Nastassja A. Lewinski.

Investigation: Liza M. Roger, Hannah G. Reich, Evan Lawrence.

Methodology: Liza M. Roger, Hannah G. Reich, Evan Lawrence, Shuaifeng Li, Whitney Vizgaudis, Nathan Brenner, Lokender Kumar, Judith Klein-Seetharaman, Jinkyu Yang, Hollie M. Putnam, Nastassja A. Lewinski.

Project administration: Liza M. Roger, Hollie M. Putnam, Nastassja A. Lewinski.

Resources: Hollie M. Putnam, Nastassja A. Lewinski.

Supervision: Judith Klein-Seetharaman, Jinkyu Yang, Hollie M. Putnam, Nastassja A. Lewinski.

Validation: Liza M. Roger, Hannah G. Reich, Evan Lawrence, Shuaifeng Li, Nathan Brenner, Lokender Kumar, Judith Klein-Seetharaman, Jinkyu Yang, Hollie M. Putnam, Nastassja A. Lewinski.

Visualization: Liza M. Roger, Hannah G. Reich.

Writing – original draft: Liza M. Roger, Hannah G. Reich, Evan Lawrence, Shuaifeng Li, Whitney Vizgaudis, Nathan Brenner, Lokender Kumar, Judith Klein-Seetharaman, Jinkyu Yang, Hollie M. Putnam, Nastassja A. Lewinski.

Writing – review & editing: Liza M. Roger.

References

1. Davis RH. The age of model organisms. *Nat Rev Genet* 2004; 5:69–76. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg1250> PMID: 14708017
2. Adams MD, Celniker SE, Holt RA, Evans CA, Gocayne JD, Amanatides PG, et al. The Genome Sequence of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Science* 2000; 287:2185. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.287.5461.2185> PMID: 10731132
3. Green DR, Reed JC. Mitochondria and Apoptosis. *Science* 1998; 281:1309–12. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.281.5381.1309> PMID: 9721092
4. Bier E, Reiter LT. Using *Drosophila melanogaster* to uncover human disease gene function and potential drug target proteins. *Expert Opin Ther Targets* 2002; 6:387–99. <https://doi.org/10.1517/14728222.6.3.387> PMID: 12223075
5. Dunbar TL, Yan Z, Balla KM, Smelkinson MG, Troemel ER. *C. elegans* Detects Pathogen-Induced Translational Inhibition to Activate Immune Signaling. *Cell Host Microbe* 2012; 11:375–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2012.02.008> PMID: 22520465
6. Marsh EK, May RC. *Caenorhabditis elegans*, a Model Organism for Investigating Immunity. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2012; 78:2075. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.07486-11> PMID: 22286994
7. Li S, Armstrong CM, Bertin N, Ge H, Milstein S, Boxem M, et al. A Map of the Interactome Network of the Metazoan *C. elegans*. *Science* 2004; 303:540. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091403> PMID: 14704431
8. Nevo E. Evolution of genome–phenome diversity under environmental stress. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2001; 98:6233. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.101109298> PMID: 11371642
9. Lewis SL, Maslin MA. Defining the Anthropocene. *Nature* 2015; 519:171–80. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14258> PMID: 25762280
10. Weis VM, Davy SK, Hoegh-Guldberg O, Rodriguez-Lanetty M, Pringle JR. Cell biology in model systems as the key to understanding corals. *Trends Ecol Evol* 2008; 23:369–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.03.004> PMID: 18501991

11. Cziesielski MJ, Liew YJ, Aranda M. Summarized datasheet for multi-omics response of three *Exaiptasia* strains to heat stress: a new way to process omics data. *BMC Res Notes* 2018; 11:905. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-018-4018-x> PMID: 30563556
12. Dungan AM, Hartman LM, Tortorelli G, Belderok R, Lamb AM, Pisan L, et al. *Exaiptasia diaphana* from the great barrier reef: a valuable resource for coral symbiosis research. *Symbiosis* 2020; 80:195–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13199-020-00665-0>.
13. Hoadley KD, Rollison D, Pettay DT, Warner ME. Differential carbon utilization and asexual reproduction under elevated pCO₂ conditions in the model anemone, *Exaiptasia pallida*, hosting different symbionts. *Limnol Oceanogr* 2015; 60:2108–20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.10160>.
14. Tivey TR, Parkinson JE, Weis VM. Host and Symbiont Cell Cycle Coordination Is Mediated by Symbiotic State, Nutrition, and Partner Identity in a Model Cnidarian-Dinoflagellate Symbiosis. *MBio* 2020; 11:e02626–19. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.02626-19> PMID: 32156819
15. Van Treuren W, Brower KK, Labanieh L, Hunt D, Lensch S, Cruz B, et al. Live imaging of *Aiptasia* larvae, a model system for coral and anemone bleaching, using a simple microfluidic device. *Sci Rep* 2019; 9:9275. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-45167-2> PMID: 31239506
16. Wolfowicz I, Baumgarten S, Voss PA, Hambleton EA, Voolstra CR, Hatta M, et al. *Aiptasia* sp. larvae as a model to reveal mechanisms of symbiont selection in cnidarians. *Sci Rep* 2016; 6:32366. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep32366> PMID: 27582179
17. Schoenberg DA, Trench RK, Smith DC. Genetic variation in *Symbiodinium* (= *Gymnodinium*) *microadriaticum* Freudenthal, and specificity in its symbiosis with marine invertebrates. I. Isoenzyme and soluble protein patterns of axenic cultures of *Symbiodinium microadriaticum*. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 1980; 207:405–27. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1980.0031>.
18. Matthews JL, Crowder CM, Oakley CA, Lutz A, Roessner U, Meyer E, et al. Optimal nutrient exchange and immune responses operate in partner specificity in the cnidarian-dinoflagellate symbiosis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2017; 114:13194. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1710733114> PMID: 29158383
19. Sproles AE, Oakley CA, Matthews JL, Peng L, Owen JG, Grossman AR, et al. Proteomics quantifies protein expression changes in a model cnidarian colonised by a thermally tolerant but suboptimal symbiont. *ISME J* 2019; 13:2334–45. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-019-0437-5> PMID: 31118473
20. Li Y, Liew YJ, Cui G, Cziesielski MJ, Zahran N, Michell CT, et al. DNA methylation regulates transcriptional homeostasis of algal endosymbiosis in the coral model *Aiptasia*. *Sci Adv* 2018; 4:eaat2142. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aat2142> PMID: 30116782
21. Hillyer KE, Dias DA, Lutz A, Roessner U, Davy SK. Mapping carbon fate during bleaching in a model cnidarian symbiosis: the application of ¹³C metabolomics. *New Phytol* 2017; 214:1551–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14515> PMID: 28272836
22. Matthews JL, Oakley CA, Lutz A, Hillyer KE, Roessner U, Grossman AR, et al. Partner switching and metabolic flux in a model cnidarian–dinoflagellate symbiosis. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 2018; 285:20182336. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2336>.
23. Hoegh-Guldberg O, Kennedy EV, Beyer HL, McClennen C, Possingham HP. Securing a Long-term Future for Coral Reefs. *Trends Ecol Evol* 2018; 33:936–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.09.006> PMID: 30385077
24. Knowlton N. The future of coral reefs. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2001; 98:5419. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.091092998> PMID: 11344288
25. Venn AA, Loram JE, Douglas AE. Photosynthetic symbioses in animals. *J Exp Bot* 2008; 59:1069–80. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erm328> PMID: 18267943
26. LaJeunesse TC, Parkinson JE, Gabrielson PW, Jeong HJ, Reimer JD, Voolstra CR, et al. Systematic Revision of Symbiodiniaceae Highlights the Antiquity and Diversity of Coral Endosymbionts. *Curr Biol* 2018; 28:2570–2580.e6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2018.07.008> PMID: 30100341
27. Gates RD, Muscatine L. Three methods for isolating viable anthozoan endoderm cells with their intracellular symbiotic dinoflagellates. *Coral Reefs* 1992; 11:143–5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00255468>.
28. van Oppen MJH, Lough JM. Synthesis: Coral Bleaching: Patterns, Processes, Causes and Consequences. In: van Oppen MJH, Lough JM, editors. *Coral Bleach. Patterns Process. Causes Consequences*, Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2018, p. 343–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75393-5_14.
29. Hughes TP, Kerry JT, Álvarez-Noriega M, Álvarez-Romero JG, Anderson KD, Baird AH, et al. Global warming and recurrent mass bleaching of corals. *Nature* 2017; 543:373–7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21707> PMID: 28300113
30. Hughes TP, Anderson KD, Connolly SR, Heron SF, Kerry JT, Lough JM, et al. Spatial and temporal patterns of mass bleaching of corals in the Anthropocene. *Science* 2018; 359:80. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan8048> PMID: 29302011

31. Davidson EH. The Sea Urchin Genome: Where Will It Lead Us? *Science* 2006; 314:939. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1136252> PMID: 17095689
32. Satoh N, Satou Y, Davidson B, Levine M. *Ciona intestinalis*: an emerging model for whole-genome analyses. *Trends Genet* 2003; 19:376–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9525\(03\)00144-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9525(03)00144-6) PMID: 12850442
33. Riviere G, Klopp C, Ibouniyamine N, Huvet A, Boudry P, Favrel P. GigaTON: an extensive publicly searchable database providing a new reference transcriptome in the pacific oyster *Crassostrea gigas*. *BMC Bioinformatics* 2015; 16:401. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-015-0833-4> PMID: 26627443
34. Lee PN, McFall-Ngai MJ, Callaerts P, de Couet HG. The Hawaiian Bobtail Squid (*Euprymna scolopes*): A Model to Study the Molecular Basis of Eukaryote-Prokaryote Mutualism and the Development and Evolution of Morphological Novelties in Cephalopods. *Cold Spring Harb Protoc* 2009; 2009: pdb.emo135. <https://doi.org/10.1101/pdb.emo135>.
35. Neff EP. The quest for an animal model of coral health and disease. *Lab Anim* 2020; 49:37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41684-019-0467-7> PMID: 31988412
36. Ohdera AH, Abrams MJ, Ames CL, Baker DM, Suescún-Bolívar LP, Collins AG, et al. Upside-Down but Headed in the Right Direction: Review of the Highly Versatile *Cassiopea xamachana* System. *Front Ecol Evol* 2018; 6:35. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2018.00035>.
37. Ohdera A, Ames CL, Dikow RB, Kayal E, Chiodin M, Busby B, et al. Box, stalked, and upside-down? Draft genomes from diverse jellyfish (Cnidaria, Acraspeda) lineages: *Alatina alata* (Cubozoa), *Calvadosia cruxmelitensis* (Staurozoa), and *Cassiopea xamachana* (Scyphozoa). *GigaScience* 2019; 8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giz069>.
38. Dimond J, Carrington E. Temporal variation in the symbiosis and growth of the temperate scleractinian coral *Astrangia poculata*. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 2007; 348:161–72.
39. Peters EC. Nomenclature and Biology of *Astrangia poculata*. 1988.
40. Aichelman HE, Zimmerman RC, Barshis DJ. Adaptive signatures in thermal performance of the temperate coral *Astrangia poculata*. *J Exp Biol* 2019; 222:jeb189225. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.189225> PMID: 30718370
41. Wuitchik D, Almanzar A, Benson B, Brennan S, Chavez J, Liesegang M, et al. Convergent stress response repertoire to thermal challenges in a temperate aposymbiotic coral. *BioRxiv* 2020:2020.01.25.919399. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.25.919399>.
42. Schmidt-Roach S, Miller KJ, Lundgren P, Andreakis N. With eyes wide open: a revision of species within and closely related to the *Pocillopora damicornis* species complex (Scleractinia; Pocilloporidae) using morphology and genetics. *Zool J Linn Soc* 2014; 170:1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zoj.12092>.
43. Fadlallah YH. Sexual reproduction, development and larval biology in scleractinian corals. *Coral Reefs* 1983; 2:129–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00336720>.
44. Harrison PL. Sexual Reproduction of Scleractinian Corals. In: Dubinsky Z, Stambler N, editors. *Coral Reefs Ecosyst. Transit.*, Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2011, p. 59–85. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0114-4_6.
45. Hughes DJ, Alderdice R, Cooney C, Kühl M, Pernice M, Voolstra CR, et al. Coral reef survival under accelerating ocean deoxygenation. *Nat Clim Change* 2020; 10:296–307. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0737-9>.
46. Jurriaans S, Hoogenboom MO. Thermal performance of scleractinian corals along a latitudinal gradient on the Great Barrier Reef. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci* 2019; 374:20180546. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0546> PMID: 31203761
47. Romano SL, Palumbi SR. Evolution of Scleractinian Corals Inferred from Molecular Systematics. *Science* 1996; 271:640. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.271.5249.640>.
48. Todd PA. Morphological plasticity in scleractinian corals. *Biol Rev* 2008; 83:315–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2008.00045.x> PMID: 18979594
49. Hernandez-Agreda A, Gates RD, Ainsworth TD. Defining the Core Microbiome in Corals' Microbial Soup. *Trends Microbiol* 2017; 25:125–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2016.11.003> PMID: 27919551
50. Hernandez-Agreda A, Leggat W, Bongaerts P, Herrera C, Ainsworth TD. Rethinking the Coral Microbiome: Simplicity Exists within a Diverse Microbial Biosphere. *MBio* 2018; 9:e00812–18. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00812-18> PMID: 30301849
51. Godoy-Vitorino F, Toledo-Hernandez C. Reef-Building Corals as a Tool for Climate Change Research in the Genomics Era. In: Kloc M, Kubiak JZ, editors. *Mar. Org. Model Syst. Biol. Med.*, Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2018, p. 529–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92486-1_23.
52. Bhattacharya D, Agrawal S, Aranda M, Baumgarten S, Belcaid M, Drake JL, et al. Comparative genomics explains the evolutionary success of reef-forming corals. *ELife* 2016; 5:e13288. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.13288> PMID: 27218454

53. Cuning R, Bay RA, Gillette P, Baker AC, Traylor-Knowles N. Comparative analysis of the *Pocillopora damicornis* genome highlights role of immune system in coral evolution. *Sci Rep* 2018; 8:16134. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-34459-8> PMID: 30382153
54. Robbins SJ, Singleton CM, Chan CX, Messer LF, Geers AU, Ying H, et al. A genomic view of the reef-building coral *Porites lutea* and its microbial symbionts. *Nat Microbiol* 2019; 4:2090–100. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-019-0532-4> PMID: 31548681
55. Fuller ZL, Mocellin VJL, Morris LA, Cantin N, Shepherd J, Sarre L, et al. Population genetics of the coral *Acropora millepora*: Toward genomic prediction of bleaching. *Science* 2020; 369:eaba4674. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba4674> PMID: 32675347
56. Bishop RC, Chapman DJ, Kanninen BJ (Barbara J, Krosnick JA, Leeworthy VR, Meade NF. Total economic value for protecting and restoring Hawaiian coral reef ecosystems final report 2011.
57. Costanza R, d'Arge R, de Groot R, Farber S, Grasso M, Hannon B, et al. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature* 1997; 387:253–60. <https://doi.org/10.1038/387253a0>.
58. Voolstra CR, Li Y, Liew YJ, Baumgarten S, Zoccola D, Flot J-F, et al. Comparative analysis of the genomes of *Stylophora pistillata* and *Acropora digitifera* provides evidence for extensive differences between species of corals. *Sci Rep* 2017; 7:17583. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-17484-x> PMID: 29242500
59. Ying H, Hayward DC, Cooke I, Wang W, Moya A, Siemerling KR, et al. The Whole-Genome Sequence of the Coral *Acropora millepora*. *Genome Biol Evol* 2019; 11:1374–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evz077> PMID: 31059562
60. Baums IB, Hughes C, Hellberg ME. Mendelian microsatellite loci for the Caribbean coral *Acropora palmata*. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 2005; 288:115–27.
61. Baums IB, Miller MW, Hellberg ME. Regionally isolated populations of an imperiled Caribbean coral, *Acropora palmata*. *Mol Ecol* 2005; 14:1377–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2005.02489.x> PMID: 15813778
62. Kitchen SA, Von Kuster G, Kuntz KLV, Reich HG, Miller W, Griffin S, et al. STAGdb: a 30K SNP genotyping array and Science Gateway for *Acropora* corals and their dinoflagellate symbionts. *Sci Rep* 2020; 10:12488. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-69101-z> PMID: 32719467
63. Cuning R, Ritson-Williams R, Gates RD. Patterns of bleaching and recovery of *Montipora capitata* in Kāne'ohe Bay, Hawai'i, USA. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 2016; 551:131–9.
64. Shumaker A, Putnam HM, Qiu H, Price DC, Zelzion E, Harel A, et al. Genome analysis of the rice coral *Montipora capitata*. *Sci Rep* 2019; 9:2571. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-39274-3> PMID: 30796282
65. Wham DC, Ning G, LaJeunesse TC. *Symbiodinium glynnii* sp. nov., a species of stress-tolerant symbiotic dinoflagellates from pocilloporid and montiporid corals in the Pacific Ocean. *Phycologia* 2017; 56:396–409. <https://doi.org/10.2216/16-86.1>.
66. Bramanti L, Iannelli M, Fan TY, Edmunds PJ. Using demographic models to project the effects of climate change on scleractinian corals: *Pocillopora damicornis* as a case study. *Coral Reefs* 2015; 34:505–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-015-1269-z>.
67. Putnam HM, Gates RD. Preconditioning in the reef-building coral *Pocillopora damicornis* and the potential for trans-generational acclimatization in coral larvae under future climate change conditions. *J Exp Biol* 2015; 218:2365. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.123018> PMID: 26246609
68. Cleves PA, Shumaker A, Lee J, Putnam HM, Bhattacharya D. Unknown to Known: Advancing Knowledge of Coral Gene Function. *Trends Genet* 2020; 36:93–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2019.11.001> PMID: 31882190
69. Cziesielski MJ, Schmidt-Roach S, Aranda M. The past, present, and future of coral heat stress studies. *Ecol Evol* 2019; 9:10055–66. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.5576> PMID: 31534713
70. Voolstra C, Miller D, Ragan M, Hoffmann A, Hoegh-Guldberg O, Bourne D, et al. The ReFuGe 2020 Consortium—using “omics” approaches to explore the adaptability and resilience of coral holobionts to environmental change. *Front Mar Sci* 2015; 2:68. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2015.00068>.
71. Cleves PA, Strader ME, Bay LK, Pringle JR, Matz MV. CRISPR/Cas9-mediated genome editing in a reef-building coral. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2018; 115:5235. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1722151115> PMID: 29695630
72. Putnam HM, Edmunds PJ. The physiological response of reef corals to diel fluctuations in seawater temperature. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 2011; 396:216–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2010.10.026>.
73. Rivest EB, Comeau S, Cornwall CE. The role of natural variability in shaping the response of coral reef organisms to climate change. *Curr Clim Change Rep* 2017; 3:271–81. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-017-0082-x>.

74. Russell JJ, Theriot JA, Sood P, Marshall WF, Landweber LF, Fritz-Laylin L, et al. Non-model model organisms. *BMC Biol* 2017; 15:55. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-017-0391-5> PMID: 28662661
75. Rosental B, Kozhekbaeva Z, Fernhoff N, Tsai JM, Traylor-Knowles N. Coral cell separation and isolation by fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS). *BMC Cell Biol* 2017; 18:30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12860-017-0146-8> PMID: 28851289
76. Hu M, Zheng X, Fan C-M, Zheng Y. Lineage dynamics of the endosymbiotic cell type in the soft coral *Xenia*. *Nature* 2020; 582:534–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2385-7> PMID: 32555454
77. LaJeunesse TC. Validation and description of *Symbiodinium microadriaticum*, the type species of *Symbiodinium* (Dinophyta). *J Phycol* 2017; 53:1109–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpy.12570> PMID: 28746748
78. Krueger T, Gates RD. Cultivating endosymbionts—Host environmental mimics support the survival of *Symbiodinium* C15 ex hospite. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 2012; 413:169–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2011.12.002>.
79. Downs CA, Kramarsky-Winter E, Fauth JE, Segal R, Bronstein O, Jeger R, et al. Toxicological effects of the sunscreen UV filter, benzophenone-2, on planulae and in vitro cells of the coral, *Stylophora pistillata*. *Ecotoxicology* 2014; 23:175–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-013-1161-y> PMID: 24352829
80. Downs CA, Kramarsky-Winter E, Segal R, Fauth J, Knutson S, Bronstein O, et al. Toxicopathological Effects of the Sunscreen UV Filter, Oxybenzone (Benzophenone-3), on Coral Planulae and Cultured Primary Cells and Its Environmental Contamination in Hawaii and the U.S. Virgin Islands. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* 2016; 70:265–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-015-0227-7> PMID: 26487337
81. Frank U, Rabinowitz C, Rinkevich B. In vitro establishment of continuous cell cultures and cell lines from ten colonial cnidarians. *Mar Biol* 1994; 120:491–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00680224>.
82. Gibbin EM, Putnam HM, Gates RD, Nitschke MR, Davy SK. Species-specific differences in thermal tolerance may define susceptibility to intracellular acidosis in reef corals. *Mar Biol* 2015; 162:717–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-015-2617-9>.
83. Domart-Coulon IJ, Elbert DC, Scully EP, Calimlim PS, Ostrander GK. Aragonite crystallization in primary cell cultures of multicellular isolates from a hard coral, *Pocillopora damicornis*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2001; 98:11885. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.211439698> PMID: 11593000
84. Drake JL, Schaller MF, Mass T, Godfrey L, Fu A, Sherrell RM, et al. Molecular and geochemical perspectives on the influence of CO₂ on calcification in coral cell cultures. *Limnol Oceanogr* 2018; 63:107–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.10617>.
85. Helman Y, Natale F, Sherrell RM, LaVigne M, Starovoytov V, Gorbunov MY, et al. Extracellular matrix production and calcium carbonate precipitation by coral cells in vitro. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2008; 105:54. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0710604105> PMID: 18162537
86. Seb e-Pedr os A, Saudemont B, Chomsky E, Plessier F, Mailh e M-P, Renno J, et al. Cnidarian Cell Type Diversity and Regulation Revealed by Whole-Organism Single-Cell RNA-Seq. *Cell* 2018; 173:1520–1534.e20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2018.05.019> PMID: 29856957
87. Drake JL, Mass T, Haramaty L, Zelzion E, Bhattacharya D, Falkowski PG. Proteomic analysis of skeletal organic matrix from the stony coral *Stylophora pistillata*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2013; 110:3788. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1301419110> PMID: 23431140
88. Mass T, Putnam HM, Drake JL, Zelzion E, Gates RD, Bhattacharya D, et al. Temporal and spatial expression patterns of biomineralization proteins during early development in the stony coral *Pocillopora damicornis*. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 2016; 283:20160322. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.0322> PMID: 27122561
89. Ramos-Silva P, Kaandorp J, Huisman L, Marie B, Zanella-Cl eon I, Guichard N, et al. The Skeletal Proteome of the Coral *Acropora millepora*: The Evolution of Calcification by Co-Option and Domain Shuffling. *Mol Biol Evol* 2013; 30:2099–112. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mst109> PMID: 23765379
90. Sevilgen DS, Venn AA, Hu MY, Tambutt e E, de Beer D, Planas-Bielsa V, et al. Full in vivo characterization of carbonate chemistry at the site of calcification in corals. *Sci Adv* 2019; 5:eau7447. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aau7447> PMID: 30746460
91. Tambutt e E, Tambutt e S, Segonds N, Zoccola D, Venn A, Erez J, et al. Calcein labelling and electrophysiology: insights on coral tissue permeability and calcification. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 2012; 279:19–27. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.0733> PMID: 21613296
92. Venn A, Tambutt e E, Holcomb M, Allemand D, Tambutt e S. Live Tissue Imaging Shows Reef Corals Elevate pH under Their Calcifying Tissue Relative to Seawater. *PLOS ONE* 2011; 6:e20013. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0020013> PMID: 21637757
93. Mass T, Drake JL, Haramaty L, Rosenthal Y, Schofield OME, Sherrell RM, et al. Aragonite Precipitation by “Proto-Polyps” in Coral Cell Cultures. *PLOS ONE* 2012; 7:e35049. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0035049> PMID: 22514707

94. Mass T, Drake JL, Heddleston JM, Falkowski PG. Nanoscale Visualization of Biomineral Formation in Coral Proto-Polyps. *Curr Biol* 2017; 27:3191–3196.e3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.09.012> PMID: 29033329
95. Snyder GA, Browne WE, Traylor-Knowles N. Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorting for the isolation of Scleractinian cell populations. *J Vis Exp* 2020; 159. <https://doi.org/10.3791/60446> PMID: 32538898
96. Kopecky EJ, Ostrander GK. Isolation and primary culture of viable multicellular endothelial isolates from hard corals. *In Vitro Cell Dev Biol* 1999; 35:616–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11626-999-0101-x> PMID: 10614872
97. Lecointe A, Cohen S, Gèze M, Djediat C, Meibom A, Domart-Coulon I. Scleractinian coral cell proliferation is reduced in primary culture of suspended multicellular aggregates compared to polyps. *Cytotechnology* 2013; 65:705–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10616-013-9562-6> PMID: 23756729
98. Johnston EC, Forsman ZH, Flot J-F, Schmidt-Roach S, Pinzón JH, Knapp ISS, et al. A genomic glance through the fog of plasticity and diversification in Pocillopora. *Sci Rep* 2017; 7:5991. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-06085-3> PMID: 28729652
99. Ward S. Evidence for broadcast spawning as well as brooding in the scleractinian coral *Pocillopora damicornis*. *Mar Biol* 1992; 112:641–6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00346182>.
100. Veron JEN, Stafford-Smith M. Corals of the world. *Sea Challengers*. 2000.
101. Khalesi MK. Cell cultures from the symbiotic soft coral *Sinularia flexibilis*. *Vitro Cell Dev Biol—Anim* 2008; 44:330–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11626-008-9128-7> PMID: 18661193
102. Downs CA, Fauth JE, Downs VD, Ostrander GK. In vitro cell-toxicity screening as an alternative animal model for coral toxicology: effects of heat stress, sulfide, rotenone, cyanide, and cuprous oxide on cell viability and mitochondrial function. *Ecotoxicology* 2010; 19:171–84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-009-0403-5> PMID: 19757033
103. Davy SK, Allemand D, Weis VM. Cell Biology of Cnidarian-Dinoflagellate Symbiosis. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 2012; 76:229. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MMBR.05014-11> PMID: 22688813
104. Bakshani CR, Morales-Garcia AL, Althaus M, Wilcox MD, Pearson JP, Bythell JC, et al. Evolutionary conservation of the antimicrobial function of mucus: a first defence against infection. *Npj Biofilms Microbiomes* 2018; 4:14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41522-018-0057-2> PMID: 30002868
105. Brown BE, Bythell JC. Perspectives on mucus secretion in reef corals. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 2005; 296:291–309.
106. Palmer CV, Traylor-Knowles NG, Willis BL, Bythell JC. Corals Use Similar Immune Cells and Wound-Healing Processes as Those of Higher Organisms. *PLOS ONE* 2011; 6:e23992. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0023992> PMID: 21887359
107. Piggot AM, Fouke BW, Sivaguru M, Sanford RA, Gaskins HR. Change in zooxanthellae and mucocyte tissue density as an adaptive response to environmental stress by the coral, *Montastraea annularis*. *Mar Biol* 2009; 156:2379–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-009-1267-1>.
108. Traylor-Knowles N, Rose NH, Palumbi SR. The cell specificity of gene expression in the response to heat stress in corals. *J Exp Biol* 2017; 220:1837. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.155275> PMID: 28254881
109. Yosef O, Popovits Y, Malik A, Ofek-Lalzer M, Mass T, Sher D. A tentacle for every occasion: comparing the hunting tentacles and sweeper tentacles, used for territorial competition, in the coral *Galaxea fascicularis*. *BMC Genomics* 2020; 21:548. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-020-06952-w> PMID: 32770938
110. Puverel S, Tambutté E, Zoccola D, Domart-coulon I, Bouchot A, Lotto S, et al. Antibodies against the organic matrix in scleractinians: a new tool to study coral biomineralization. *Coral Reefs* 2005; 24:149–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-004-0456-0>.
111. Tambutté S, Holcomb M, Ferrier-Pagès C, Reynaud S, Tambutté É, Zoccola D, et al. Coral biomineralization: From the gene to the environment. *Coral Reefs Future Dir* 2011; 408:58–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2011.07.026>.
112. Zoccola D, Tambutté E, Kulhanek E, Puverel S, Scimeca J-C, Allemand D, et al. Molecular cloning and localization of a PMCA P-type calcium ATPase from the coral *Stylophora pistillata*. *Biochim Biophys Acta BBA—Biomembr* 2004; 1663:117–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbamem.2004.02.010> PMID: 15157614
113. Barott KL, Venn AA, Thies AB, Tambutté S, Tresguerres M. Regulation of coral calcification by the acid-base sensing enzyme soluble adenylyl cyclase. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 2020; 525:576–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2020.02.115> PMID: 32115151
114. Neder M, Laissue PP, Akiva A, Akkaynak D, Albéric M, Spaeker O, et al. Mineral formation in the primary polyps of pocilloporoid corals. *Acta Biomater* 2019; 96:631–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2019.07.016> PMID: 31302296

115. Fujise L, Nitschke MR, Frommlet JC, Serôdio J, Woodcock S, Ralph PJ, et al. Cell Cycle Dynamics of Cultured Coral Endosymbiotic Microalgae (Symbiodinium) Across Different Types (Species) Under Alternate Light and Temperature Conditions. *J Eukaryot Microbiol* 2018; 65:505–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeu.12497> PMID: 29316019
116. Ros M, Camp EF, Hughes DJ, Crosswell JR, Warner ME, Leggat WP, et al. Unlocking the black-box of inorganic carbon-uptake and utilization strategies among coral endosymbionts (Symbiodiniaceae). *Limnol Oceanogr* 2020; 65:1747–63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.11416>.
117. Suggett DJ, Goyen S, Evenhuis C, Szabó M, Pettay DT, Warner ME, et al. Functional diversity of photobiological traits within the genus Symbiodinium appears to be governed by the interaction of cell size with cladal designation. *New Phytol* 2015; 208:370–81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13483> PMID: 26017701
118. Huffmyer AS, Matsuda SB, Eggers AR, Lemus JD, Gates RD. Evaluation of laser scanning confocal microscopy as a method for characterizing reef-building coral tissue thickness and Symbiodiniaceae fluorescence. *J Exp Biol* 2020; 223:jeb220335. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.220335> PMID: 32098888
119. LaJeunesse TC, Pettay DT, Sampayo EM, Phongsuwan N, Brown B, Obura DO, et al. Long-standing environmental conditions, geographic isolation and host–symbiont specificity influence the relative ecological dominance and genetic diversification of coral endosymbionts in the genus Symbiodinium. *J Biogeogr* 2010; 37:785–800. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2010.02273.x>.
120. Mullen AD, Treibitz T, Roberts PLD, Kelly ELA, Horwitz R, Smith JE, et al. Underwater microscopy for in situ studies of benthic ecosystems. *Nat Commun* 2016; 7:12093. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12093> PMID: 27403715
121. Hoadley KD, Pettay DT, Grottolli AG, Cai W-J, Melman TF, Schoepf V, et al. Physiological response to elevated temperature and pCO₂ varies across four Pacific coral species: Understanding the unique host+symbiont response. *Sci Rep* 2015; 5:18371. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep18371> PMID: 26670946
122. Putnam HM, Mayfield AB, Fan TY, Chen CS, Gates RD. The physiological and molecular responses of larvae from the reef-building coral *Pocillopora damicornis* exposed to near-future increases in temperature and pCO₂. *Mar Biol* 2013; 160:2157–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-012-2129-9>.
123. Goldberg WM. Desmococytes in the calicoblastic epithelium of the stony coral *Mycetophyllia reesi* and their attachment to the skeleton. *Tissue Cell* 2001; 33:388–94. <https://doi.org/10.1054/tice.2001.0192> PMID: 11521955
124. Tresguerres M, Barott KL, Barron ME, Deheyn DD, Kline DI, Linsmayer LB. Cell Biology of Reef-Building Corals: Ion Transport, Acid/Base Regulation, and Energy Metabolism. In: Weihrauch D, O'Donnell M, editors. *Acid-Base Balance Nitrogen Excretion Invertebr. Mech. Strateg. Var. Invertebr. Groups Consid. Chall. Caused Ocean Acidif.*, Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2017, p. 193–218. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39617-0_7.
125. Edmunds PJ, Putnam HM. Science-based approach to using growth rate to assess coral performance and restoration outcomes. *Biol Lett* 2020; 16:20200227. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2020.0227> PMID: 32673540
126. Pan T-CF, Applebaum SL, Manahan DT. Experimental ocean acidification alters the allocation of metabolic energy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2015; 112:4696. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1416967112> PMID: 25825763
127. Rösslein M, Elliott JT, Salit M, Petersen EJ, Hirsch C, Krug HF, et al. Use of Cause-and-Effect Analysis to Design a High-Quality Nanocytotoxicology Assay. *Chem Res Toxicol* 2015; 28:21–30. <https://doi.org/10.1021/tx500327y> PMID: 25473822
128. Domart-Coulon I, Ostrander GK. Coral Cell and Tissue Culture Methods. *Dis. Coral*, 2015, p. 489–505.
129. Suggett DJ, Smith DJ. Coral bleaching patterns are the outcome of complex biological and environmental networking. *Glob Change Biol* 2020; 26:68–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14871> PMID: 31618499
130. Bruno JF, Selig ER, Casey KS, Page CA, Willis BL, Harvell CD, et al. Thermal Stress and Coral Cover as Drivers of Coral Disease Outbreaks. *PLOS Biol* 2007; 5:e124. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0050124> PMID: 17488183
131. Willis BL, Page CA, Dinsdale EA. Coral Disease on the Great Barrier Reef. In: Rosenberg E, Loya Y, editors. *Coral Health Dis.*, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2004, p. 69–104. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-06414-6_3.
132. Woodley DM, Porter J. *Diseases of Coral*. John Wiley & Sons; 2015.
133. Kroon FJ, Berry KLE, Brinkman DL, Kookana R, Leusch FDL, Melvin SD, et al. Sources, presence and potential effects of contaminants of emerging concern in the marine environments of the Great Barrier Reef and Torres Strait, Australia. *Sci Total Environ* 2020; 719:135140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135140> PMID: 31859059

134. Negri AP, Heyward AJ. Inhibition of coral fertilisation and larval metamorphosis by tributyltin and copper. *Mar Environ Res* 2001; 51:17–27. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0141-1136\(00\)00029-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0141-1136(00)00029-5) PMID: 11125701
135. Negri A, Vollhardt C, Humphrey C, Heyward A, Jones R, Eaglesham G, et al. Effects of the herbicide diuron on the early life history stages of coral. *Catchment Reef Water Qual Issues Gt Barrier Reef Reg* 2005; 51:370–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2004.10.053> PMID: 15757736
136. Louis YD, Bhagooli R, Kenkel CD, Baker AC, Dyal SD. Gene expression biomarkers of heat stress in scleractinian corals: Promises and limitations. *Comp Biochem Physiol Part C Toxicol Pharmacol* 2017; 191:63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpc.2016.08.007> PMID: 27585119
137. Williams A, Chiles EN, Conetta D, Pathmanathan JS, Cleves PA, Putnam HM, et al. Metabolome shift associated with thermal stress in coral holobionts. *BioRxiv* 2020:2020.06.04.134619. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.134619>.
138. Burmester EM, Breeff-Pilz A, Lawrence NF, Kaufman L, Finnerty JR, Rotjan RD. The impact of autotrophic versus heterotrophic nutritional pathways on colony health and wound recovery in corals. *Ecol Evol* 2018; 8:10805–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4531> PMID: 30519408
139. Loya Y, Sakai K, Yamazato K, Nakano Y, Sambali H, van Woessik R. Coral bleaching: the winners and the losers. *Ecol Lett* 2001; 4:122–31. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1461-0248.2001.00203.x>.
140. Thornhill DJ, Rotjan RD, Todd BD, Chilcoat GC, Iglesias-Prieto R, Kemp DW, et al. A Connection between Colony Biomass and Death in Caribbean Reef-Building Corals. *PLOS ONE* 2011; 6:e29535. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0029535> PMID: 22216307
141. Bollati E, D'Angelo C, Alderdice R, Pratchett M, Ziegler M, Wiedenmann J. Optical Feedback Loop Involving Dinoflagellate Symbiont and Scleractinian Host Drives Colorful Coral Bleaching. *Curr Biol* 2020; 30:2433–2445.e3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.04.055> PMID: 32442463
142. Roth MS, Deheyn DD. Effects of cold stress and heat stress on coral fluorescence in reef-building corals. *Sci Rep* 2013; 3:1421. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep01421> PMID: 23478289
143. Siebeck UE, Marshall NJ, Klüter A, Hoegh-guldberg O. Monitoring coral bleaching using a colour reference card. *Coral Reefs* 2006; 25:453–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-006-0123-8>.
144. Apprill A, Marlow HQ, Martindale MQ, Rappé MS. The onset of microbial associations in the coral *Pocillopora meandrina*. *ISME J* 2009; 3:685–99. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2009.3> PMID: 19242535
145. Bourne DG, Munn CB. Diversity of bacteria associated with the coral *Pocillopora damicornis* from the Great Barrier Reef. *Environ Microbiol* 2005; 7:1162–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2005.00793.x> PMID: 16011753
146. Epstein HE, Torda G, van Oppen MJH. Relative stability of the *Pocillopora acuta* microbiome throughout a thermal stress event. *Coral Reefs* 2019; 38:373–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-019-01783-y>.
147. Glasl B, Bourne DG, Frade PR, Thomas T, Schaffelke B, Webster NS. Microbial indicators of environmental perturbations in coral reef ecosystems. *Microbiome* 2019; 7:94. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-019-0705-7> PMID: 31227022
148. Luna GM, Biavasco F, Danovaro R. Bacteria associated with the rapid tissue necrosis of stony corals. *Environ Microbiol* 2007; 9:1851–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2007.01287.x> PMID: 17564618
149. Pootakham W, Mhuantong W, Yoocha T, Puchim L, Jomchai N, Sonthirod C, et al. Heat-induced shift in coral microbiome reveals several members of the Rhodobacteraceae family as indicator species for thermal stress in *Porites lutea*. *MicrobiologyOpen* 2019; 8:e935. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mbo3.935> PMID: 31544365
150. Baumann JH, Ries JB, Rippe JP, Courtney TA, Aichelman HE, Westfield I, et al. Nearshore coral growth declining on the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef System. *Glob Change Biol* 2019; 25:3932–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14784> PMID: 31456305
151. Cantin NE, Lough JM. Surviving Coral Bleaching Events: *Porites* Growth Anomalies on the Great Barrier Reef. *PLOS ONE* 2014; 9:e88720. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0088720> PMID: 24586377
152. Shapiro OH, Fernandez VI, Garren M, Guasto JS, Debaillon-Vesque FP, Kramarsky-Winter E, et al. Vortical ciliary flows actively enhance mass transport in reef corals. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2014; 111:13391. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1323094111> PMID: 25192936
153. Coronado I, Fine M, Bosellini FR, Stolarski J. Impact of ocean acidification on crystallographic vital effect of the coral skeleton. *Nat Commun* 2019; 10:2896. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10833-6> PMID: 31263108
154. DeCarlo TM, Comeau S, Cornwall CE, McCulloch MT. Coral resistance to ocean acidification linked to increased calcium at the site of calcification. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 2018; 285:20180564. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.0564> PMID: 29720418

155. Fantazzini P, Mengoli S, Pasquini L, Bortolotti V, Brizi L, Mariani M, et al. Gains and losses of coral skeletal porosity changes with ocean acidification acclimation. *Nat Commun* 2015; 6:7785. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8785> PMID: 26183259
156. Dandan SS, Falter JL, Lowe RJ, McCulloch MT. Resilience of coral calcification to extreme temperature variations in the Kimberley region, northwest Australia. *Coral Reefs* 2015; 34:1151–63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-015-1335-6>.
157. Edmunds PJ. Intraspecific variation in growth rate is a poor predictor of fitness for reef corals. *Ecology* 2017; 98:2191–200. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.1912> PMID: 28555884
158. Alberts B, Johnson A, Walter P, Raff M, Roberts K. *Molecular Biology of the Cell* 4th Edition. International Student Edition. Garland Science; 2002.
159. Schmid V. Transdifferentiation in Medusae. In: Jeon KW, Friedlander M, editors. *Int. Rev. Cytol.*, vol. 142, Academic Press; 1992, p. 213–61. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0074-7696\(08\)62077-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0074-7696(08)62077-X).
160. Schmid V, Reber-Müller S. Transdifferentiation of isolated striated muscle of jellyfish in vitro: the initiation process. *Semin Cell Biol* 1995; 6:109–16. <https://doi.org/10.1006/scel.1995.0016> PMID: 7548849
161. Gou Y, Jia Y, Wang P, Sun C. Progress of Inertial Microfluidics in Principle and Application. *Sensors* 2018; 18:1762. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s18061762> PMID: 29857563
162. Bacon K, Lavoie A, Rao BM, Daniele M, Menegatti S. Past, Present, and Future of Affinity-based Cell Separation Technologies. *Acta Biomater* 2020; 112:29–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2020.05.004> PMID: 32442784
163. Arora M. Cell culture media: a review. *Mater Methods*, vol. 3, 2013, p. 24.
164. Horwitz R, Borell EM, Fine M, Shaked Y. Trace element profiles of the sea anemone *Anemonia viridis* living nearby a natural CO₂ vent. *PeerJ* 2014; 2:e538. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.538> PMID: 25250210
165. Mitchelmore CL, Alan Verde E, Ringwood AH, Weis VM. Differential accumulation of heavy metals in the sea anemone *Anthopleura elegantissima* as a function of symbiotic state. *Aquat Toxicol* 2003; 64:317–29. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-445x\(03\)00055-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-445x(03)00055-9) PMID: 12842595
166. Ranjbar Jafarabadi A, Riyahi Bakhtiari A, Maisano M, Pereira P, Cappello T. First record of bioaccumulation and bioconcentration of metals in Scleractinian corals and their algal symbionts from Kharg and Lark coral reefs (Persian Gulf, Iran). *Sci Total Environ* 2018; 640–641:1500–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.06.029> PMID: 30021316
167. Reichelt-Brushett AJ, McOrist G. Trace metals in the living and nonliving components of scleractinian corals. *Mar Pollut Bull* 2003; 46:1573–82. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X\(03\)00323-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X(03)00323-0) PMID: 14643784
168. Reich HG, Rodriguez IB, LaJeunesse TC. Endosymbiotic dinoflagellates pump iron: differences in iron and other trace metal needs among the Symbiodiniaceae. *Coral Reefs* 2020; 6:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-020-01911-z>.
169. Ferrier-Pagès C, Martinez S, Grover R, Cybulski J, Shemesh E, Tchernov D. Tracing the Trophic Plasticity of the Coral–Dinoflagellate Symbiosis Using Amino Acid Compound-Specific Stable Isotope Analysis. *Microorganisms* 2021; 9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms9010182> PMID: 33466994
170. Goldberg WM. Coral Food, Feeding, Nutrition, and Secretion: A Review. In: Kloc M, Kubiak JZ, editors. *Mar. Org. Model Syst. Biol. Med.*, Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2018, p. 377–421. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92486-1_18.
171. Massé A, Domart-Coulon I, Golubic S, Duché D, Tribollet A. Early skeletal colonization of the coral holobiont by the microboring Ulvophyceae *Ostreobium* sp. *Sci Rep* 2018; 8:2293. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-20196-5> PMID: 29396559
172. Ricci F, Marcelino Vanessa Rossetto, Blackall LL, Kühl M, Medina M, Verbruggen H. Beneath the surface: community assembly and functions of the coral skeleton microbiome. *Microbiome* 2019; 7:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-019-0762-y>
173. Weber L, Gonzalez-Díaz P, Armenteros M, Apprill A. The coral ecosphere: A unique coral reef habitat that fosters coral–microbial interactions. *Limnol Oceanogr* 2019; 64:2373–88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.11190>.
174. Fowler SJ, Jose S, Zhang X, Deutzmann R, et al. Characterization of Hydra Type IV Collagen: TYPE IV COLLAGEN IS ESSENTIAL FOR HEAD REGENERATION AND ITS EXPRESSION IS UP-REGULATED UPON EXPOSURE TO GLUCOSE. *J Biol Chem* 2000; 275:39589–99. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M005871200> PMID: 10956657
175. Faria M, Björnmalin M, Thurecht KJ, Kent SJ, Parton RG, Kavallaris M, et al. Minimum information reporting in bio–nano experimental literature. *Nat Nanotechnol* 2018; 13:777–85. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41565-018-0246-4> PMID: 30190620

176. Barnay-Verdier S, Dall'osso D, Joli N, Olivré J, Priouzeau F, Zamoum T, et al. Establishment of primary cell culture from the temperate symbiotic cnidarian, *Anemonia viridis*. *Cytotechnology* 2013; 65:697–704. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10616-013-9566-2> PMID: 23595421
177. Ventura RD, Padalhin AR, Lee BT. In-vitro and in-vivo evaluation of hemostatic potential of decellularized ECM hydrogels. *Mater Lett* 2018; 232:130–3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matlet.2018.08.013>.
178. Bopp SK, Lettieri T. Comparison of four different colorimetric and fluorometric cytotoxicity assays in a zebrafish liver cell line. *BMC Pharmacol* 2008; 8:8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2210-8-8> PMID: 18513395
179. Zetsche E-M, Meysman FJR. Dead or alive? Viability assessment of micro- and mesoplankton. *J Plankton Res* 2012; 34:493–509. <https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbs018>.
180. David CN, Özbek S, Adamczyk P, Meier S, Pauly B, Chapman J, et al. Evolution of complex structures: minicollagens shape the cnidarian nematocyst. *Trends Genet* 2008; 24:431–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2008.07.001> PMID: 18676050
181. Kass-Simon G, Scappaticci AA Jr. The behavioral and developmental physiology of nematocysts. *Can J Zool* 2002; 80:1772–94. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z02-135>.
182. Meszaros A, Bigger C. Qualitative and Quantitative Study of Wound Healing Processes in the Coelenterate, *Plexaurella fusifera*: Spatial, Temporal, and Environmental (Light Attenuation) Influences. *J Invertebr Pathol* 1999; 73:321–31. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jipa.1999.4851> PMID: 10222188
183. Mydlarz LD, Couch CS, Weil E, Smith G, Harvell CD. Immune defenses of healthy, bleached and diseased *Montastraea faveolata* during a natural bleaching event. *Dis Aquat Organ* 2009; 87:67–78. <https://doi.org/10.3354/dao02088> PMID: 20095242
184. Feuillassier L, Masanet P, Romans P, Barthélémy D, Engelmann F. Towards a vitrification-based cryopreservation protocol for the coral *Pocillopora damicornis* L.: Tolerance of tissue balls to 4.5M cryoprotectant solutions. *Cryobiology* 2015; 71:224–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cryobiol.2015.07.004> PMID: 26188079
185. Pernice M, Meibom A, Van Den Heuvel A, Kopp C, Domart-Coulon I, Hoegh-Guldberg O, et al. A single-cell view of ammonium assimilation in coral–dinoflagellate symbiosis. *ISME J* 2012; 6:1314–24. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2011.196> PMID: 22222466
186. Tchernov D, Gorbunov MY, de Vargas C, Narayan Yadav S, Milligan AJ, Häggblom M, et al. Membrane lipids of symbiotic algae are diagnostic of sensitivity to thermal bleaching in corals. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004; 101:13531. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0402907101> PMID: 15340154
187. Blank RJ. Cell architecture of the dinoflagellate *Symbiodinium* sp. inhabiting the Hawaiian stony coral *Montipora verrucosa*. *Mar Biol* 1987; 94:143–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00392906>.
188. Decelle J, Veronesi G, Gallet B, Stryhanyuk H, Benettoni P, Schmidt M, et al. Subcellular Chemical Imaging: New Avenues in Cell Biology. *Trends Cell Biol* 2020; 30:173–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcb.2019.12.007> PMID: 31987730
189. Kopp C, Domart-Coulon I, Barthelemy D, Meibom A. Nutritional input from dinoflagellate symbionts in reef-building corals is minimal during planula larval life stage. *Sci Adv* 2016; 2:e1500681. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1500681> PMID: 27051861
190. Uwizeye C, Decelle J, Jouneau P-H, Gallet B, Keck J-B, Moriscot C, et al. In-cell quantitative structural imaging of phytoplankton using 3D electron microscopy. *BioRxiv* 2020:2020.05.19.104166. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.104166>.
191. Caldwell JM, Ushijima B, Couch CS, Gates RD. Intra-colony disease progression induces fragmentation of coral fluorescent pigments. *Sci Rep* 2017; 7:14596. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-15084-3> PMID: 29097717
192. Kenkel CD, Traylor MR, Wiedenmann J, Salih A, Matz MV. Fluorescence of coral larvae predicts their settlement response to crustose coralline algae and reflects stress. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 2011; 278:2691–7. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.2344> PMID: 21270034
193. Barott KL, Venn AA, Perez SO, Tambutté S, Tresguerres M. Coral host cells acidify symbiotic algal microenvironment to promote photosynthesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2015; 112:607. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1413483112> PMID: 25548188
194. DeCarlo TM, Comeau S, Cornwall CE, Gajdzik L, Guagliardo P, Sadekov A, et al. Investigating marine bio-calcification mechanisms in a changing ocean with in vivo and high-resolution ex vivo Raman spectroscopy. *Glob Change Biol* 2019; 25:1877–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14579>.
195. Gibbin EM, Putnam HM, Davy SK, Gates RD. Intracellular pH and its response to CO₂-driven seawater acidification in symbiotic versus non-symbiotic coral cells. *J Exp Biol* 2014; 217:1963. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.099549> PMID: 24625648

196. Venn AA, Tambutté E, Lotto S, Zoccola D, Allemand D, Tambutté S. Imaging intracellular pH in a reef coral and symbiotic anemone. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2009; 106:16574. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0902894106> PMID: 19720994
197. Shapiro OH, Kramarsky-Winter E, Gavish AR, Stocker R, Vardi A. A coral-on-a-chip microfluidic platform enabling live-imaging microscopy of reef-building corals. *Nat Commun* 2016; 7:10860. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms10860> PMID: 26940983