# Questions for discussants

## Paper-1 group-1:

**Q1:**

What are the key objectives, methods, and findings of this paper, and how do they contribute to the field?

**Q2**:

The authors performed lineage tracing in an *ex-utero* culture set up. How was the *ex-utero* culture of the mouse embryo performed? Do you think lineage tracing could have been performed *in-utero*?

**Q3**:

Figure 3 presents a detailed categorization of cells, which is defined based on the localization of the injected clone. Do you think the approach used is satisfactory to identify specific fates?

**Q4:**

Do you think that the authors have sufficient ground to claim that “secondary organizers are composed of mixed fate progenitors” or do they need more evidence?

## Paper-2 group-2:

**Q1:**

What are the key objectives, methods, and findings of this paper, and how do they contribute to the field?

**Q2:**

In figure 1A the authors show the scheme for the genetic engineering of the mouse lines used in the study. Can you briefly explain how it works? Can you think about an alternative design for a mouse line to perform the same experiments?

**Q3**:

The time-lapse data in figure 7 is meant to track cell division and movement. The claim is that the experiment does not support a model

of active migration away from the RPC. If you were a reviewer would you accept the data in support of the claim?

**Q4:**

The results of this paper show big discrepancies with another study cited as number 14 in the references. This is an example of a case where different experimental strategies, aimed at answering the same question, lead to two different conclusions. Which of the two strategies do you think is more convincing?