

Bridging spatial and temporal scales of developmental gene regulation

Andrés H. Cardona^{1§}, Márcia Mesquita Peixoto^{1§}, Tohn Borjigin², Thomas Gregor^{1,2,3*}

¹Department of Stem Cell and Developmental Biology, CNRS UMR3738 Paris Cité, Institut Pasteur, 25 Rue du Docteur Roux, 75015 Paris, France

²Lewis-Sigler Institute for Integrative Genomics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

³Joseph Henry Laboratories of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

[§]These authors contributed equally.

*Correspondence: thomas.gregor@pasteur.fr

The development of multicellular organisms relies on the precise coordination of molecular events across multiple spatial and temporal scales. Understanding how information flows from molecular interactions to cellular processes and tissue organization during development is crucial for explaining the remarkable reproducibility of complex organisms. This review explores how chromatin-encoded information is transduced from localized transcriptional events to global gene expression patterns, highlighting the challenge of bridging these scales. We discuss recent experimental findings and theoretical frameworks, emphasizing polymer physics as a tool for describing the relationship between chromatin structure and dynamics across scales. By integrating these perspectives, we aim to clarify how gene regulation is coordinated across levels of biological organization and suggest strategies for future experimental approaches.

Keywords: Development, Spatiotemporal Scales, Transcription, Chromatin Dynamics, Polymer Physics

Introduction

The development of complex organisms, from a single cell to multicellular tissues, unfolds over extended periods—days, weeks, or even months. Though this process progresses gradually, it is driven by countless molecular events occurring on much faster and smaller spatiotemporal scales. How information from these rapid, localized events propagates to guide organismal development remains poorly understood. Bridging this gap requires dissecting the intermediate steps and understanding the connections between them.

Transcriptional regulation offers a central framework for exploring how molecular dynamics influence cellular behaviors and tissue-level processes. Chromatin interactions with regulatory effectors, occurring at the nanometer scale within seconds to minutes (Figure 1A), influence and are influenced by larger-scale chromatin reorganization, which spans micrometer distances across minutes to hours (Figure 1B). These layers of regulation collectively guide developmental processes that unfold over longer timeframes, at the tissue and organism scale (Figure 1C). Clarifying how rapid molecular dynamics drive broader developmental changes is essential for resolving the “black boxes” in gene regulation.

At the molecular level, transcription often relies on spatial interactions between gene promoters and cis-regulatory elements (CREs), such as enhancers, located thousands (kb) to millions (Mb) of base pairs apart (Figure 1A). However, the precise spatiotemporal nature of enhancer-promoter (E-P) interactions remains unclear, highlighting the complexity of the three-dimensional (3D) chromatin architecture involved in gene regulation [1]. Advances in high-throughput chromosome conformation

capture (3C) technologies have revealed multiple levels of chromatin organization, including loops, topologically associating domains (TADs), compartments (A/B), and chromosome territories (Figure 1A, B) [2]. These chromatin structures are increasingly recognized as key regulators of gene expression during development. For example, in vertebrates, TADs, CCCTC-binding factor (CTCF) insulators, and cohesin-mediated loop extrusion orchestrate the temporal activation of Hox genes, which are critical for body axis formation [3]. Understanding how chromatin structure regulates transcription across scales is crucial for linking localized molecular mechanisms to broader developmental outcomes (Figure 1C).

This review explores how gene regulation operates at three biological scales: (1) the locus scale, connecting transcription effectors, E-P interactions, and transcriptional dynamics; (2) the chromatin scale, emphasizing the random search process involved in long-distance regulation, chromatin structure, and polymeric behavior; and (3) the organism scale, where transcriptional programs and genome organization are coordinated among cell populations and tissues. Bridging these scales remains a significant challenge, requiring complex model systems, high-resolution techniques, and methods capable of capturing “4D” genome-scale data [4]. Current experimental approaches often face trade-offs between spatial or temporal resolution or focus on specific genomic loci, which can obscure the full picture of gene regulation. While this review does not delve into the limitations of these methods, recent publications have discussed their technical biases [1,2,5].

Polymer models offer a promising approach for linking chromatin structure with dynamic regulatory processes. However, discrepancies between experimental observations and theoretical models

underscore the need for a more unified framework that integrates transcriptional dynamics and chromatin behavior across scales. In addition, species-specific characteristics must be carefully considered when extrapolating chromatin behavior between model organisms. In this review, we also discuss how polymer models can help bridge spatial and temporal dimensions of gene regulation and the challenges of modelling chromatin, emphasizing the importance of incorporating species-specific factors for a comprehensive understanding of how molecular information is integrated during development.

Integrating Molecular Dynamics at the Gene Locus

At the gene locus scale, transcriptional regulation integrates molecular events, such as the assembly of transcriptional machinery and RNA polymerase II (Pol II) binding, with physical processes like chromatin folding and steric hindrances, across a broad range of spatiotemporal dimensions. Yet, the precise mechanisms bridging these scales remain elusive. To initiate transcription, transcription factors (TFs) and other transcription effectors must navigate large distances in the crowded nuclear environment to encounter CREs. Spatial organizational strategies, including condensates and transcriptional hubs, have emerged as conserved mechanisms to concentrate transcription effectors, facilitating the assembly of active gene loci and bridging spatial scales [1,6–10].

Once transcription effectors reach their targets, the challenge extends beyond transcriptional initiation to coordinating molecular dynamics with the timescales of transcriptional bursts. TF binding events typically last only seconds, whereas transcriptional bursts can persist for several minutes [1,11,12]. Insights into this disparity have emerged from studies in promoters with multiple TF binding sites, where cooperative binding through continuous TF exchange maintains high promoter occupancy, effectively bridging the shorter timescales of TF binding with the longer duration of transcriptional bursts [13,14] (Figure 2A).

Beyond local molecular interactions, E-P communication plays a central role in gene regulation [1,2] (Figure 1A). Although various models, including both direct contact and action-at-a-distance mechanisms, have been proposed to explain E-P communication [1], the dynamic and transient nature of chromatin configurations complicates this understanding [15]. Recent studies tracking chromatin dynamics have begun to clarify this picture. Fully extruded loops, which group gene regulatory units, are relatively rare and short-lived [16,17]. For example, tracking the boundaries of a silent TAD in mouse embryonic stem cells (mESCs), a fully extruded loop was observed only about 3% of the time, persisting for 10 to 30 min, whereas a partially extruded configurations were more common, occurring 92% of the time [16,17]. The

constraints imposed by cohesin and CTCF on extruded regions may help stabilize interactions and facilitate productive E-P communication [17]. However, whether productive E-P communication extends throughout the entire transcription process or occurs more rapidly remains an open question [18]. Notably, the relationships between E-P contact probabilities and transcription follows a non-linear, sigmoidal pattern, suggesting the involvement of intermediate regulatory steps bridging short-lived E-P contacts and transcriptional bursts [18] (Figure 2B). These regulatory steps, while abstract may represent a combination of stochastic regulatory processes, including TF recruitment, Mediator assembly, pre-initiation complex formation, and Pol II pausing and release, all contributing to transcriptional activity [18].

Live-cell imaging further indicates that sustained proximity, rather than direct physical contact, between E-P pairs is crucial for transcriptional activity. E-P pairs are typically 150–300 nm apart [19–24], and transcriptional output drops significantly when this proximity is disrupted [19,20]. However, the molecular signals transmitted during E-P interactions remain elusive, particularly given the small size of transcription complexes (10–20 nm) [1,25].

Emerging evidence suggests that transcriptional hubs, condensates, and clusters facilitate E-P communication by concentrating transcription effectors at gene loci, which can influence transcriptional bursting dynamics [1,6,8,22,26,27] (Figure 2C). These bursts can be regulated at the level of the OFF periods (burst frequency) and/or ON periods (burst size), thus modulating transcriptional activity [28]. For instance, embedding promoters within enhancer-associated clusters of Pol II general transcription factors (GTFs) has been shown to increase bursting frequency. The overlap between E-P interactions and GTFs activities suggest a mechanism for how nanoscale clusters extend productive E-P communication beyond molecular-scale interactions [22]. Additionally, condensates have been implicated in super-enhancer-driven gene bursting, where their assembly may help facilitate E-P communication [26]. E-P communication has been proposed to follow dynamic contact models, which describe productive E-P interactions as occurring in two phases: a brief E-P encounter phase followed by dissociation (e.g., "hit-and-run", "kiss-and-kick"), modulating transcriptional activity [1,10,26,29]. In mESCs, transcriptional burst size and frequency increase when Pol II condensate is spatially proximal (<1 μm) to the enhancer and gene locus ("three-way kissing"), with transcriptional activity decreasing as the condensate moves away. Further, depletion of cohesin does not affect basal transcription but limits burst size amplification when condensates are proximal [26], highlighting a complex regulatory network involving transcriptional hubs, condensates, and chromatin regulators. Interestingly, these mechanisms may follow general principles, as proposed by real-time measurements of endogenous transcriptional bursting in

Drosophila: changes in gene activity levels are mainly linked to modulation of burst frequency at low-transcribing regime and burst size at mid-to-high transcribing regime [28].

Transcriptional hubs and condensates do not remain static [12]. In *Drosophila*, hubs mature progressively through compositional changes into Pol II-enriched clusters that drive transcriptional activation. Each compositional transition is both selective and tightly regulated, determining the number of active hubs [30,31]. Notably, these hubs are transient and dispersive, with transcription itself acting as a negative feedback mechanism that limits burst duration by dispersing hub components [30]. For instance, in zebrafish, transcriptional elongation can release E-P contacts, further emphasizing the dynamic nature of these structures [29]. It has also been proposed that hubs can retain a compositional footprint, which may serve as a 'molecular memory' to facilitate rapid reactivation [31].

Transcriptional activity also influences larger chromatin structures at the gene locus (Figure 2D). Locus decompaction is commonly associated with transcriptional activity, though its relationship with transcription varies across species. In yeast, highly transcribed genes tend to be less compact [32]. In contrast, mammalian systems show positive correlations between gene activity and locus compaction [33]. Fixed-imaging studies in *Drosophila* embryos suggest that inactive loci are more compact, while active loci show spatial decompaction with enhancers physically closest to the promoter [21]. These findings align with the observation that transcription-associated topologies, such as promoter-promoter and E-P contacts, are more prominent within highly active loci [21,33]. Chromatin decompaction likely facilitates genome accessibility, allowing regulatory elements to reorganize into proximity. This process could stabilize a more confined locus configuration, potentially reinforced by transcription (Figure 2D). Accordingly, loci with paired E-P often exhibit smaller E-P separations when transcriptionally active compared to their silent state, where dissociation occurs more rapidly [20]. Some models propose that transcriptional hubs and condensates can promote gene bursting even when E-P distances increase, potentially reflecting phase separation events or active spacing mechanisms during transcription [7,10,24].

Connecting the spatiotemporal parameters of molecular events, transcription, and E-P dynamics is crucial for uncovering general principles of transcriptional regulation. Key questions include: How frequently do E-P pairs form productive interactions? How long do these interactions last? How do they relate to transcription bursts and locus conformation? Clarifying these mechanisms will be essential for understanding how genetic information is transmitted, integrated, and regulated at the gene locus level.

Chromatin Dynamics Across Scales: Polymer Models as Bridging Tools

At the gene locus scale, transcriptional regulation relies on the coordinated integration of molecular signals and E-P interactions. However, a complete understanding requires examining larger organizational scales, particularly how genes and regulatory elements are positioned within the genome. This section focuses on chromatin dynamics and how spatial organization impacts the search process for regulatory interactions, ultimately shaping transcriptional control.

Certain enhancers, such as the ZRS enhancer located approximately 850 kb from the *Shh* promoter, can regulate gene expression over vast genomic distances. However, enhancer relocation studies have demonstrated significant distance-dependent effects on transcriptional activation. For instance, as the genomic separation between enhancer and promoter increases, interactions may occur less frequently or with limited functionality [18,19,34–37]. The probability of E-P contact is proposed to follow a non-linear, sigmoidal relationship with transcriptional output [5,18], where genomic distance influences the frequency of interactions (interburst duration) but has minimal impact on burst size or duration [18]. This non-linearity helps reconcile the statistical nature of TADs with the moderate transcriptional control exerted by contact probabilities, as recently reviewed [38].

Interestingly, enhancer activity over long distances may be modulated by specific regulatory sequences distinct from those governing cell-type specificity. When such long-range elements are incorporated, short-range enhancers can extend their functional range [35]. Several studies suggest that enhancers possess an intrinsic "action radius" or "sphere of influence," governed by their regulatory strength, which can be expanded by specific regulatory DNA sequences [35] or by forming cooperative networks with other enhancers in multi-enhancer clusters [34]. These mechanisms may allow enhancers to bypass some spatial constraints and gain flexibility to control gene activity over varying distances.

Beyond sequence-based regulation, dynamic processes shaping chromatin architecture also influence long-range regulatory interactions. Mechanisms such as cohesin- and CTCF-mediated loop extrusion help organize chromatin into spatially favorable configurations, bringing distant regulatory elements into proximity [36,39]. Understanding chromatin's physical organization and dynamics is therefore crucial for elucidating how distal regulatory elements regulate gene expression.

A central challenge in chromatin biology is understanding how a polymer as long as the genome (centimeters to meters) folds into a nucleus only 5–20 micrometers in diameter. Chromatin achieves this through a complex interplay of physical forces and biochemical interactions, forming distinct functional domains while

remaining dynamic. To address this complexity, polymer physics models and simulations have proven valuable by providing simplified but predictive frameworks to describe chromatin behavior ([40,41], Table 1).

Polymer models typically reduce molecular detail while preserving essential physical properties (coarse-grained). They can be divided into two main classes: data-driven models, which reconstruct 3D chromatin conformations based on experimental data with minimal assumptions, and mechanistic models, which incorporate physical principles and specific hypotheses about chromatin organization, such as loop extrusion and phase separation. Key polymer physics metrics derived from imaging and sequencing studies help characterize chromatin behavior quantitatively: (1) physical distance, $R(s)$: the average separation between two loci at genomic distance s ; (2) contact probability, $P(s)$: the likelihood of physical interaction between loci separated by s ; (3) mean squared displacement ($MSD(t)$): the average movement of chromatin segments over time (t), reflecting chromatin diffusion and mobility. Comparing these metrics with polymer models such as the ideal chain, self-avoiding walk, equilibrium globule, and fractal globule can reveal how chromatin is organized and moves within the nucleus (reviewed in [42–45]; Figure 3A).

In a human cell line, contact probability measurements showed an exponent of $\alpha \approx 1$, which is not found in equilibrium polymer states, but fits a fractal globule polymer—a knot-free, crumpled polymer state where chromosomes segregate into compact territories and limit interchromosomal contacts (Figure 1B) [46–48]. Subsequent studies have shown α to be system-dependent, varying between different chromosomes and species [49].

Simultaneously, chromatin exhibits dynamic properties consistent with the Rouse polymer model, describing chromatin as a flexible, entropic chain driven by thermal fluctuations and entropy [15–17,19,50,51]. This apparent paradox—where chromatin exhibits both fractal compaction and Rouse-like dynamics—was highlighted in recent studies in *Drosophila* embryos. Live imaging of ectopic E-P pairs across genomic distances (50 kb to 3 Mb) revealed that physical distances and interaction probabilities scaled with genomic distance according to the fractal globule model, while MSD measurements followed the predictions of an ideal Rouse chain [19]. This anomalous combination of compaction and dynamics has profound implications for transcriptional regulation. For E-P pairs separated by ~ 3 Mb, the DNA polymer's relaxation time (the time for the polymer to reconfigure) was measured to be 100 times shorter than predicted by either model alone, suggesting active mechanisms might assist long-range E-P interactions in driving gene regulation.

Multiple live imaging studies have consistently shown that chromatin behaves according to the Rouse model ([15–17,19,50,51], Figure 3B). These studies are

beginning to shed light on both the slow and fast structural changes of chromatin, depending on the spatial scale under investigation (Figure 3B). For example, a 4 Mb subtelomeric region in human cells exhibited subdiffusive motion ($\alpha \sim 0.5$), being only moderately constrained by nuclear factors such as chromatin interfaces and nuclear landmarks when displaced magnetically [50]. Meanwhile, smaller regions (~ 8 kb) randomly inserted into mESCs showed similar subdiffusive behavior but with higher effective diffusion coefficient (D), suggesting faster local chromatin movement [17,50]. In *Drosophila* embryos, 5 kb regions separated by ~ 550 kb exhibited similar dynamics (Figure 3B) [19]. However, tracking the boundaries of a 550 kb TAD in mESCs revealed more restricted motion potentially due to loop extrusion, with D values 20-fold lower [16]. Such variations indicate that mobility is strongly influenced by the genomic context in question [52], such as differences in the processes underlying CTCF boundary interactions and E-P search, but might also reflect effects of transcription on chromatin mobility or species-specific differences.

Within TADs, physical constraints imposed by loop extrusion and chromatin compaction can influence regulatory dynamics by stabilizing regulatory interactions like E-P pairing. For example, tracking 8 kb regions within a neutral TAD in mESCs revealed constrained subdiffusive motion ($\alpha \sim 0.2$) (Figure 3B) [17]. However, theoretical models suggest that as genomic regions approach sub-kilobase scales, their mobility may either increase or decrease depending on local chromatin architecture and biochemical interactions [15,17] (Figure 3C). While chromatin can display both slow and fast dynamic changes, the behavior of chromatin at intermediate scales, such as TADs, remains poorly understood (Figure 3D). These dynamics are critical to transcriptional regulation, as they likely influence how enhancers and promoters encounter each other and initiate transcription.

Integrating classical polymer physics models with live-cell imaging and genome-wide assays has proven invaluable for describing chromatin behavior (Table 1). However, capturing both local and global chromatin organization, while integrating E-P dynamics and transcriptional activity, remains a significant challenge. Moving forward, combining high-resolution imaging, advanced polymer simulations, and quantitative models will be crucial for dissecting the multiscale regulation of chromatin during gene expression (Figure 3D).

Coordinating Genome Organization with Developmental Timing

Development is an intricately choreographed multicellular process requiring cells to integrate diverse signals and coordinate genomic activities with remarkable precision to guide tissue patterning and morphogenesis. While previous sections have focused on gene regulation at the individual cell level, development requires scaling

up to the tissue level, where genomic processes must be synchronized and regulated across groups of cells. Tracking chromatin dynamics across different cell types is crucial for understanding how chromatin organization influences cell fate decisions and how cells diversify during development.

Single-cell atlases of *Drosophila* early embryogenesis, integrating chromatin accessibility (ATAC-Seq) and gene expression (RNA-Seq), have revealed that chromatin accessibility often precedes gene expression. This suggests a "priming" mechanism where regulatory regions become accessible before transcription initiates [53]. Consistent with this, loops and CRE hubs were observed to form early in cells with distinct fates, preceding both TAD formation and transcriptional activation [54,55].

In mouse embryos, most post-gastrulation cells exhibit mild heterogeneity in chromatin conformation at the TAD and A/B compartment levels. However, terminally differentiated cells, such as primitive erythrocytes, display compact, highly organized chromatin folding and strongly demarcated compartments [56]. This suggests that large-scale chromatin architecture remains relatively stable during early development, maintaining cellular plasticity, while finer-scale chromatin features, such as E-P contacts, may play a more decisive role in cell fate decisions and lineage specification [56–60].

Chromatin in pluripotent cells appears primed for flexibility. Many enhancer regions in these cells are pre-accessible, suggesting the genome is strategically organized to support a range of potential developmental pathways [59]. This flexible regulatory landscape allows for rapid responses to differentiation cues while preserving developmental plasticity.

As differentiation progresses, chromatin structure becomes more specialized. Higher-order chromatin in undifferentiated mESCs is less compact, more dynamic, and more homogenous than in differentiated neuronal cells, which exhibit greater structural and dynamic heterogeneity [61]. A recent *in vivo* study quantified this plasticity by measuring the viscoelastic properties of chromatin, revealing that undifferentiated chromatin behaves as a Maxwell fluid, while differentiated chromatin displays both fluid-like and solid-like phases [61]. These findings align with earlier observations of a biphasic chromatin organization, where euchromatin and heterochromatin contribute to transcriptional activity and compaction, respectively [62].

Furthermore, euchromatin activity in differentiated states has been shown to enhance this biphasic continuum by promoting chromatin segregation and heterochromatin compaction, potentially stabilizing nuclear architecture [63]. While these associations between chromatin architecture and differentiation states are increasingly clear, the extent to which chromatin

structure drives or responds to differentiation remains an open question.

Two pivotal processes exemplify how development bridges molecular and organismal scales: zygotic gene activation (ZGA) and gene patterning. Both require the coordination of chromatin structure with gene regulatory networks across spatial and temporal scales.

ZGA marks a critical transition in early development when external maternal signals trigger genome-wide transcription and chromatin reorganization across the embryo. This process synchronizes chromatin dynamics and gene expression across all embryonic cells. The earliest chromatin compartmentalization signals during ZGA typically emerge at the TAD level, a pattern conserved across species. However, the timing of features such as A/B compartment formation and loop extrusion can vary significantly across species [64]. For example, A/B compartments appear later in humans than in mice and *Drosophila*, while loop formation timing also diverges between species.

Despite such conservation of regulatory principles, cross-species comparisons reveal substantial variation, likely due to differences in genome size, developmental timing, and experimental resolution. These differences highlight how chromatin structure and transcriptional activation remain tightly linked but context-dependent during ZGA.

Gene patterning further illustrates how development bridges scales. In *Drosophila*, the Bicoid morphogen gradient initiates a cascade of transcriptional responses across the embryo, starting from nuclear-level transcriptional activation. The localized transcriptional readouts of Bicoid are progressively integrated, producing a step-like transcriptional gradient of hunchback, a downstream transcription factor that regulates subsequent developmental processes [65,66].

This gradual integration of transcriptional activity ensures coordinated patterns of gene expression, directing body segmentation and tissue formation across developmental timeframes. As development progresses, these patterns are further refined by cross-regulation between target genes and feedback mechanisms, reinforcing the stability of transcriptional programs.

Post-transcriptional regulation is a critical layer of gene expression control across scales. Notably, RNA metabolism—including transcript diffusion, localization, and fate—can contribute significantly to patterning and morphogenesis. In many organisms, transcription is halted prior to fertilization, making early developmental decisions rely on the post-transcriptional control of maternal mRNAs preloaded into the cytoplasm, before the onset of zygotic transcription. Additionally, RNA diffusion and localization within the cytoplasm can modulate transcript distribution and local translation, facilitating cross-regulation and feedback loops. For example, localized mRNA translation is involved in processes such

as synapse formation and asymmetric cell fate decisions [67,68]. These mechanisms help spatially restricted gene products influence tissue-wide patterning, further linking molecular events to organism-scale outcomes.

Taken together, these examples illustrate how development achieves precise coordination of gene regulatory networks across multiple spatial and temporal scales. From the priming of chromatin accessibility in pluripotent cells to the genome-wide transcriptional reprogramming during ZGA and the orchestration of gene expression patterns during tissue patterning, chromatin architecture emerges as a dynamic regulatory scaffold.

These integrated mechanisms, which span from nuclear dynamics to tissue-level coordination, underscore how complex multicellular organisms emerge from the synchronized action of individual cells. Moving forward, investigating how chromatin structure and transcriptional activity reinforce each other across scales will be essential for a deeper understanding of developmental biology.

Discussion and future perspectives

Challenges for modeling scale-dependent chromatin dynamics

Chromatin displays a broad spectrum of dynamic behaviors, from rapid local reorganizations occurring within seconds to minutes [13–15,19,20] to slower, large-scale structural changes unfolding over hours to days [3,54,56]. Unraveling the mechanisms bridging these fast and slow timescales remains essential for linking chromatin structure with transcriptional regulation and gene expression control.

The interplay between gene loci dynamics and chromatin reorganization highlights the complexity of transcriptional regulation across spatial and temporal scales. Transcriptional activity can influence chromatin folding within TADs [15,20,21,33,69] and near TAD boundaries [70–75]. In turn, chromatin organization impacts transcription through mechanisms such as tethering elements and insulators [76,77]. Disruptions in these elements can alter transcriptional regulation, though effects often appear limited to local chromatin structures [77]. This emphasizes the challenge of reconciling higher-order chromatin structure with dynamic transcriptional activity, especially given observations of large-scale chromatin structure appearing decoupled from gene expression output [33,54,78–81].

Despite progress in polymer models of chromatin organization, no single theoretical framework accurately describes all aspects of chromatin behavior across scales, and polymer models that incorporate transcription are only starting to emerge [51]. Existing models often struggle to incorporate both the dynamic aspects of transcription and large-scale structural changes. Leveraging polymer physics to develop models that integrate global chromatin

dynamics, local CRE activity, and transcriptional bursts remains a key area for exploration.

A significant barrier to generalizing chromatin behavior lies in variations across chromatin regions and experimental contexts. Dynamic behaviors can differ depending on region size, simulation scale, and local chromatin properties such as loop density, chromatin accessibility, and macromolecular crowding [15,17,82,83]. For example, recent loop extrusion polymer models showed how simulating different looping mechanisms, topological (where cohesin embraces DNA) and non-topological (cohesin acts as a cross-linker), impacts the observed contact probabilities and polymer behaviors [83,84]. In the non-topological model, loops form a comb-like polymer structure with a rigid central backbone and short, unentangled loops [83]. Conversely, the topological model preserves a linear polymer structure with more flexible chromatin loops [84].

The observed discrepancies between chromatin's structural and dynamic properties underscore the limitations of purely scale-free polymer models [85]. Incorporating the viscoelasticity of the nucleoplasm [85,86] and refining heteropolymer models to account for variation along the chromatin fiber, transcription activity, and regulatory interactions could enhance model accuracy. Mechanistic polymer models that integrate these properties could generate testable predictions, guiding experimental strategies to better capture chromatin's multi-scale behavior.

Insights into phenotypic and species complexity

The complexity of chromatin architecture highlights that phenotypic diversity and species complexity arise not solely from genomic expansion but from the diversification and refinement of gene regulatory strategies. Though gene expression principles appear highly conserved, species-specific differences in genome organization can significantly influence chromatin structure and transcriptional dynamics. For instance, substantial variation in chromosome size and number between species might influence chromatin compaction mechanisms. Differences in cell cycle duration, particularly during early developmental stages, can further affect or be the consequence of the temporal dynamics of chromatin organization and transcriptional regulation.

Metazoan genomes rely on a combination of loop extrusion and focal DNA-DNA contacts. Vertebrates tend to rely more on loop extrusion [3,76,77], potentially resulting in a more linear chromosomal organization with slower relaxation dynamics due to persistent long-range correlations [83,84]. In contrast, invertebrates like flies exhibit more focal contacts [76,77], which may lead to a comb-like chromatin organization at smaller scales, allowing for faster domain dynamics as predicted by loop extrusion simulations [83,84].

Throughout development, cells must synchronize rapid changes in genome architecture with transcriptional programs. Elements such as CTCF binding and cohesin-mediated extrusion likely act as temporal regulators, facilitating genome compartmentalization while preserving nuclear organization. Species-specific differences in these regulatory mechanisms could influence the timing of chromatin reorganization and developmental progression, adding a layer of complexity to cross-species comparisons of gene regulation.

Concluding Remarks and Open Questions

Despite substantial progress, several critical questions remain regarding the interplay between chromatin dynamics and gene regulation:

- **Plasticity and Precision:** How do chromatin dynamics maintain both regulatory flexibility and precise developmental coordination across scales?
- **Temporal Control:** What additional mechanisms contribute to the temporal regulation of chromatin and transcriptional programs?
- **Species-Specific Variation:** How do species-specific differences in genome organization impact regulatory complexity and developmental timing?

- **Feedback Mechanisms:** To what extent do transcriptional bursts actively reshape chromatin architecture?

Addressing these questions will require continued exploration of both experimental and theoretical approaches that capture the temporal and spatial dimensions of chromatin regulation during development. Advancing multi-scale models, while integrating insights from polymer physics, will be critical for uncovering generalizable principles of gene regulation across species.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

We thank D. Brückner and B. Zoller for careful reading and comments on the manuscript.

This work was supported in part by the European Research Council grant DynaTrans (101118866); by U.S. NSF, through the Center for the Physics of Biological Function (PHY-1734030); by U.S. NIH Grants R01GM097275, U01DA047730, and U01DK12742

References and recommended reading

Papers have been highlighted as:

- of special interest
- of outstanding interest

1. Yang JH, Hansen AS: **Enhancer selectivity in space and time: from enhancer–promoter interactions to promoter activation.** *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2024, **25**:574–591. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-024-00710-6>.
2. Hafner A, Boettiger A: **The spatial organization of transcriptional control.** *Nat Rev Genet* 2023, **24**:53–68. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-022-00526-0>.
3. Rekaik H, Lopez-Delisle L, Hintermann A, Mascrez B, Bochaton C, Mayran A, Duboule D: **Sequential and directional insulation by conserved CTCF sites underlies the Hox timer in stembryos.** *Nat Genet* 2023, **55**:1164–1175. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-023-01426-7>.
 - This study uses mESCs-derived gastruloids to investigate the 'Hox timer' mechanism which controls sequential Hox gene activation. It reveals that the timer starts with Wnt-dependent transcription of the CTCF-free cluster, followed by stepwise activation of CTCF-rich genes. CTCF sites are crucial for maintaining the timer's sequence and pace.
4. Dekker J, Alber F, Aufmkolk S, Beliveau BJ, Bruneau BG, Belmont AS, Bintu L, Boettiger A, Calandrelli R, Disteche CM, et al.: **Spatial and temporal organization of the genome: Current state and future aims of the 4D nucleome project.** *Molecular Cell* 2023, **83**:2624–2640. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2023.06.018>.
5. Xiao JY, Hafner A, Boettiger AN: **How subtle changes in 3D structure can create large changes in transcription.** *eLife* 2021, **10**:e64320. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.64320>.
 - In this theoretical paper, the authors present a "futile cycle" model of enhancer-mediated gene regulation, showing how weak TAD boundaries can strongly impact gene expression. They propose two versions: one based on TF condensates at promoters and another on post-translational modifications, both exhibiting hypersensitivity to E-P contact frequency. The model also shows hysteresis, explaining why global cohesin depletion has less immediate impact than long-term disruption of individual TAD boundaries.
6. Richter WF, Nayak S, Iwasa J, Taatjes DJ: **The Mediator complex as a master regulator of transcription by RNA polymerase II.** *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2022, **23**:732–749. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-022-00498-3>.
7. Kawasaki K, Fukaya T: **Regulatory landscape of enhancer-mediated transcriptional activation.** *Trends in Cell Biology* 2024, **34**:826–837. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcb.2024.01.008>.
8. Hnisz D, Shrinivas K, Young RA, Chakraborty AK, Sharp PA: **A Phase Separation Model for Transcriptional Control.** *Cell* 2017, **169**:13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2017.02.007>.
9. Mann R, Notani D: **Transcription factor condensates and signaling driven transcription.** *Nucleus* 2023, **14**:2205758. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19491034.2023.2205758>.
10. Ryu K, Park G, Cho W-K: **Emerging insights into transcriptional condensates.** *Exp Mol Med* 2024, **56**:820–826. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s12276-024-01228-9>.
11. Lammers NC, Kim YJ, Zhao J, Garcia HG: **A matter of time: Using dynamics and theory to uncover mechanisms of transcriptional bursting.** *Current Opinion in Cell Biology* 2020, **67**:147–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceb.2020.08.001>.
12. Mir M, Stadler MR, Ortiz SA, Hannon CE, Harrison MM, Darzacq X, Eisen MB: **Dynamic multifactor hubs interact transiently with sites of active transcription in Drosophila embryos.** *eLife* 2018, **7**:e40497. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.40497>.
13. Pomp W, Meeussen JVW, Lenstra TL: **Transcription factor exchange enables prolonged transcriptional bursts.** *Molecular Cell* 2024, **84**:1036-1048.e9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2024.01.020>.
 - This study imaged TF Gal4 binding and GAL10 promoter activity in live yeast cells, supporting a TF exchange model. The results show that TF exchange extends high occupancy periods at the promoter, lengthening burst duration. This allows for prolonged transcriptional bursts, even though individual TF binding times are short.

14. Meeussen JVW, Lenstra TL: **Time will tell: comparing timescales to gain insight into transcriptional bursting.** *Trends in Genetics* 2024, **40**:160–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2023.11.003>.
15. Forte G, Buckle A, Boyle S, Marenduzzo D, Gilbert N, Brackley CA: **Transcription modulates chromatin dynamics and locus configuration sampling.** *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2023, **30**:1275–1285. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41594-023-01059-8>.
 - The authors used the HiP-HoP model to simulate chromatin mobility at the Pax6 locus in mESCs. They found that gene locus configurations rapidly change, continuously sampling many states within ~30 min. Larger chromatin regions (~40 Kb) showed consistent dynamics, while smaller regions (1 Kb) displayed varied mobilities, influenced by local macromolecular density.
16. Gabriele M, Brandão HB, Grosse-Holz S, Jha A, Dailey GM, Cattoglio C, Hsieh T-HS, Mirny L, Zechner C, Hansen AS: **Dynamics of CTCF- and cohesin-mediated chromatin looping revealed by live-cell imaging.** *Science* 2022, **376**:496–501. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn6583>.
 - This study, alongside Mach et al. (2022), used live-cell imaging to track CTCF looping dynamics in mESCs. They found that fully extruded loops at a silent TAD (~550 Kb) are rare (3-6.5% of the time) and short-lived (10-30 min), with the TAD mostly in partially extruded states. These findings challenge static 3D genome models, suggesting CTCF boundaries primarily block cohesin extrusion rather than form stable loops, highlighting a more dynamic role in gene regulation.
17. Mach P, Kos PI, Zhan Y, Cramard J, Gaudin S, Tünnermann J, Marchi E, Eglinger J, Zuin J, Kryzhanovska M, et al.: **Cohesin and CTCF control the dynamics of chromosome folding.** *Nat Genet* 2022, **54**:1907–1918. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01232-7>.
 - This study, alongside Gabriele et al. (2022), measured cohesin-mediated CTCF looping dynamics in living cells by analyzing random genomic insertions of CTCF-anchored motifs (~150 Kb). They found that loops are rare and transient, lasting 5-15 minutes. Cohesin decreases chromosome mobility, while its combination with CTCF constrains TAD dynamics. These findings suggest that long-range gene regulation relies on brief interactions between regulatory elements, providing insights into how cohesin and CTCF control chromosome folding dynamics.
18. Zuin J, Roth G, Zhan Y, Cramard J, Redolfi J, Piskadlo E, Mach P, Kryzhanovska M, Tihanyi G, Kohler H, et al.: **Nonlinear control of transcription through enhancer–promoter interactions.** *Nature* 2022, **604**:571–577. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04570-y>.
 - The authors used an enhancer mobilization assay to randomly relocate the Sox2 enhancer within a featureless TAD (~560 kb). Analyzing hundreds of cell lines, they found a sigmoidal relationship between enhancer-promoter contact and transcription, suggesting intermediate processes modulate how physical interactions drive gene expression. Regulatory steps are an abstract representation of any stochastic regulatory processes occurring at the E-P interface. These steps are reversible and transmit information to the promoter.
19. Brückner DB, Chen H, Barinov L, Zoller B, Gregor T: **Stochastic motion and transcriptional dynamics of pairs of distal DNA loci on a compacted chromosome.** *Science* 2023, **380**:1357–1362. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adf5568>.
 - The authors used a 3-color labeling strategy to measure ectopic enhancer-promoter pairs (spanning 50 Kb to 3 Mb) and transcription, simultaneously tracking chromosome dynamics and activity. They found that chromosomes have compact, globular organization and fast subdiffusive dynamics, leading to encounter times less dependent on genomic distance than expected, challenging current polymer models. In this study, to facilitate transcription, stable loop formation is promoted through homie-homie pairing between the endogenous *homie* in the *eve* locus and a *homie* inserted in the reporter cassette. Transcriptional encounters still occurred when replacing *homie* in the reporter cassette, albeit with a shorter median lifetime and reduced probability of observing a transcriptional state, demonstrating that both genomic sequence and genomic separation control the rate of transcriptional encounters.
20. Chen H, Levo M, Barinov L, Fujioka M, Jaynes JB, Gregor T: **Dynamic interplay between enhancer–promoter topology and gene activity.** *Nat Genet* 2018, **50**:1296–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-018-0175-z>.
21. Barinov L, Ryabichko S, Bialek W, Gregor T: **Transcription-dependent spatial organization of a gene locus.** 2020, <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2012.15819>.
22. Cheng L, De C, Li J, Pertsinidis A: **Mechanisms of transcription control by distal enhancers from high-resolution single-gene imaging.** 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.19.533190>.

23. Li J, Hsu A, Hua Y, Wang G, Cheng L, Ochiai H, Yamamoto T, Pertsinidis A: **Single-gene imaging links genome topology, promoter–enhancer communication and transcription control.** *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2020, **27**:1032–1040. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41594-020-0493-6>.
24. Benabdallah NS, Williamson I, Illingworth RS, Kane L, Boyle S, Sengupta D, Grimes GR, Therizols P, Bickmore WA: **Decreased Enhancer-Promoter Proximity Accompanying Enhancer Activation.** *Molecular Cell* 2019, **76**:473-484.e7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2019.07.038>.
25. Nollmann M, Bennabi I, Götz M, Gregor T: **The Impact of Space and Time on the Functional Output of the Genome.** *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a040378>.
26. Du M, Stitzinger SH, Spille J-H, Cho W-K, Lee C, Hijaz M, Quintana A, Cissé II: **Direct observation of a condensate effect on super-enhancer controlled gene bursting.** *Cell* 2024, **187**:331-344.e17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2023.12.005>.
27. Munshi R, Ling J, Ryabichko S, Wieschaus EF, Gregor T: **Transcription factor clusters as information transfer agents.** 2024, <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2403.02943>.
28. Chen P-T, Levo M, Zoller B, Gregor T: **Gene activity fully predicts transcriptional bursting dynamics.** 2023, <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2304.08770>.
29. Pownall ME, Miao L, Vejnar CE, M'Saad O, Sherrard A, Frederick MA, Benitez MDJ, Boswell CW, Zaret KS, Bewersdorf J, et al.: **Chromatin expansion microscopy reveals nanoscale organization of transcription and chromatin.** *Science* 2023, **381**:92–100. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ade5308>.
30. Cho C-Y, O'Farrell PH: **Stepwise modifications of transcriptional hubs link pioneer factor activity to a burst of transcription.** *Nat Commun* 2023, **14**:4848. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-40485-6>.
31. DeHaro-Arbona FJ, Roussos C, Baloul S, Townson J, Gómez Lamarca MJ, Bray S: **Dynamic modes of Notch transcription hubs conferring memory and stochastic activation revealed by live imaging the co-activator Mastermind.** *eLife* 2024, **12**:RP92083. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.92083.3>.
32. Hsieh T-HS, Weiner A, Lajoie B, Dekker J, Friedman N, Rando OJ: **Mapping Nucleosome Resolution Chromosome Folding in Yeast by Micro-C.** *Cell* 2015, **162**:108–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.05.048>.
33. Hsieh T-HS, Cattoglio C, Slobodyanyuk E, Hansen AS, Rando OJ, Tjian R, Darzacq X: **Resolving the 3D Landscape of Transcription-Linked Mammalian Chromatin Folding.** *Molecular Cell* 2020, **78**:539-553.e8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2020.03.002>.
34. Thomas HF, Feng S, Haslhofer F, Huber M, García Gallardo M, Loubiere V, Vanina D, Pitasi M, Stark A, Buecker C: **Enhancer cooperativity can compensate for loss of activity over large genomic distances.** *Molecular Cell* 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2024.11.008>.
35. Bower G, Hollingsworth EW, Jacinto S, Clock B, Cao K, Liu M, Dziulko A, Alcaina-Caro A, Xu Q, Skowronska-Krawczyk D, et al.: **Conserved *Cis* -Acting Range Extender Element Mediates Extreme Long-Range Enhancer Activity in Mammals.** 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.26.595809>.
36. Rinzema NJ, Sofiadis K, Tjalsma SJD, Verstegen MJAM, Oz Y, Valdes-Quezada C, Felder A-K, Filipovska T, Van Der Elst S, De Andrade Dos Ramos Z, et al.: **Building regulatory landscapes reveals that an enhancer can recruit cohesin to create contact domains, engage CTCF sites and activate distant genes.** *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2022, **29**:563–574. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41594-022-00787-7>.
37. Balasubramanian D, Borges Pinto P, Grasso A, Vincent S, Tarayre H, Lajoignie D, Ghavi-Helm Y: **Enhancer–promoter interactions can form independently of genomic distance and be functional across TAD boundaries.** *Nucleic Acids Research* 2024, **52**:1702–1719. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkad1183>.
38. Chen L-F, Lee J, Boettiger A: **Recent progress and challenges in single-cell imaging of enhancer–promoter interaction.** *Current Opinion in Genetics & Development* 2023, **79**:102023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gde.2023.102023>.
39. Kane L, Williamson I, Flyamer IM, Kumar Y, Hill RE, Lettice LA, Bickmore WA: **Cohesin is required for long-range enhancer action at the *Shh* locus.** *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2022, **29**:891–897. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41594-022-00821-8>.

40. Bianco S, Chiariello AM, Conte M, Esposito A, Fiorillo L, Musella F, Nicodemi M: **Computational approaches from polymer physics to investigate chromatin folding**. *Current Opinion in Cell Biology* 2020, **64**:10–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceb.2020.01.002>.
41. Brackey CA, Marenduzzo D, Gilbert N: **Mechanistic modeling of chromatin folding to understand function**. *Nat Methods* 2020, **17**:767–775. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-020-0852-6>.
42. Mirny LA: **The fractal globule as a model of chromatin architecture in the cell**. *Chromosome Res* 2011, **19**:37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10577-010-9177-0>.
43. Tark-Dame M, Van Driel R, Heermann DW: **Chromatin folding – from biology to polymer models and back**. *Journal of Cell Science* 2011, **124**:839–845. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.077628>.
44. Parmar JJ, Woringer M, Zimmer C: **How the Genome Folds: The Biophysics of Four-Dimensional Chromatin Organization**. *Annu Rev Biophys* 2019, **48**:231–253. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biophys-052118-115638>.
45. Grosse-Holz S, Coulon A, Mirny L: **Scale-free models of chromosome structure, dynamics, and mechanics**. 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.14.536939>.
46. Bintu B, Mateo LJ, Su J-H, Sinnott-Armstrong NA, Parker M, Kinrot S, Yamaya K, Boettiger AN, Zhuang X: **Super-resolution chromatin tracing reveals domains and cooperative interactions in single cells**. *Science* 2018, **362**:eaau1783. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau1783>.
47. Lieberman-Aiden E, Van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, Amit I, Lajoie BR, Sabo PJ, Dorschner MO, et al.: **Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome**. *Science* 2009, **326**:289–293. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1181369>.
48. Rao SSP, Huntley MH, Durand NC, Stamenova EK, Bochkov ID, Robinson JT, Sanborn AL, Machol I, Omer AD, Lander ES, et al.: **A 3D Map of the Human Genome at Kilobase Resolution Reveals Principles of Chromatin Looping**. *Cell* 2014, **159**:1665–1680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.11.021>.
49. Barbieri M, Scialdone A, Piccolo A, Chiariello AM, Di Lanno C, Prisco A, Pombo A, Nicodemi M: **Polymer models of chromatin organization**. *Front Genet* 2013, **4**. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2013.00113>.
50. Keizer VIP, Grosse-Holz S, Woringer M, Zambon L, Aizel K, Bongaerts M, Delille F, Kolar-Znika L, Scolari VF, Hoffmann S, et al.: **Live-cell micromanipulation of a genomic locus reveals interphase chromatin mechanics**. *Science* 2022, **377**:489–495. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abi9810>.
 - The authors developed a technique to measure chromatin's mechanical properties by applying controlled magnetic forces to a genomic locus in live human cells. They found that interphase chromatin exhibits fluid-like behavior, functioning as a free polymer and only moderately constrained by nuclear factors like physical barriers, chromatin interfaces, and collisions.
51. Goychuk A, Kannan D, Chakraborty AK, Kardar M: **Polymer folding through active processes recreates features of genome organization**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2023, **120**:e2221726120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2221726120>.
52. Platania A, Erb C, Barbieri M, Molcrette B, Grandgirard E, De Kort MA, Meaburn K, Taylor T, Shchuka VM, Kocanova S, et al.: **Competition between transcription and loop extrusion modulates promoter and enhancer dynamics**. 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.25.538222>.
53. Calderon D, Blecher-Gonen R, Huang X, Secchia S, Kentro J, Daza RM, Martin B, Dulja A, Schaub C, Trapnell C, et al.: **The continuum of *Drosophila* embryonic development at single-cell resolution**. *Science* 2022, **377**:eabn5800. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn5800>.
54. Ing-Simmons E, Vaid R, Bing XY, Levine M, Mannervik M, Vaquerizas JM: **Independence of chromatin conformation and gene regulation during *Drosophila* dorsoventral patterning**. *Nat Genet* 2021, **53**:487–499. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-021-00799-x>.
55. Espinola SM, Götz M, Bellec M, Messina O, Fiche J-B, Houbbron C, Dejean M, Reim I, Cardozo Gizzi AM, Lagha M, et al.: **Cis-regulatory chromatin loops arise before TADs and gene activation, and are independent of cell fate during early *Drosophila* development**. *Nat Genet* 2021, **53**:477–486. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-021-00816-z>.

56. Rappoport N, Chomsky E, Nagano T, Seibert C, Lubling Y, Baran Y, Lifshitz A, Leung W, Mukamel Z, Shamir R, et al.: **Single cell Hi-C identifies plastic chromosome conformations underlying the gastrulation enhancer landscape.** *Nat Commun* 2023, **14**:3844. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-39549-4>.
57. Chen Z, Snetkova V, Bower G, Jacinto S, Clock B, Dizgehchi A, Barozzi I, Mannion BJ, Alcaina-Caro A, Lopez-Rios J, et al.: **Increased enhancer–promoter interactions during developmental enhancer activation in mammals.** *Nat Genet* 2024, **56**:675–685. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-024-01681-2>.
58. Gorkin DU, Barozzi I, Zhao Y, Zhang Y, Huang H, Lee AY, Li B, Chiou J, Wildberg A, Ding B, et al.: **An atlas of dynamic chromatin landscapes in mouse fetal development.** *Nature* 2020, **583**:744–751. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2093-3>.
59. Xiang Y, Zhang Y, Xu Q, Zhou C, Liu B, Du Z, Zhang K, Zhang B, Wang X, Gayen S, et al.: **Epigenomic analysis of gastrulation identifies a unique chromatin state for primed pluripotency.** *Nat Genet* 2020, **52**:95–105. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0545-1>.
60. Murphy D, Salataj E, Di Giammartino DC, Rodriguez-Hernaez J, Kloetgen A, Garg V, Char E, Uyehara CM, Ee L, Lee U, et al.: **3D Enhancer–promoter networks provide predictive features for gene expression and coregulation in early embryonic lineages.** *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2024, **31**:125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41594-023-01130-4>.
61. Eshghi I, Eaton JA, Zidovska A: **Interphase Chromatin Undergoes a Local Sol-Gel Transition upon Cell Differentiation.** *Phys Rev Lett* 2021, **126**:228101. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.228101>.
62. Gaspar-Maia A, Alajem A, Meshorer E, Ramalho-Santos M: **Open chromatin in pluripotency and reprogramming.** *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2011, **12**:36–47. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm3036>.
63. Mahajan A, Yan W, Zidovska A, Saintillan D, Shelley MJ: **Euchromatin Activity Enhances Segregation and Compaction of Heterochromatin in the Cell Nucleus.** *Phys Rev X* 2022, **12**:041033. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.12.041033>.
64. Ing-Simmons E, Rigau M, Vaquerizas JM: **Emerging mechanisms and dynamics of three-dimensional genome organisation at zygotic genome activation.** *Current Opinion in Cell Biology* 2022, **74**:37–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceb.2021.12.004>.
65. Huang A, Saunders TE: **A matter of time: Formation and interpretation of the Bicoid morphogen gradient.** In *Current Topics in Developmental Biology*. Elsevier; 2020:79–117.
66. Lucas T, Tran H, Perez Romero CA, Guillou A, Fradin C, Coppey M, Walczak AM, Dostatni N: **3 minutes to precisely measure morphogen concentration.** *PLoS Genet* 2018, **14**:e1007676. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1007676>.
67. Das S, Vera M, Gandin V, Singer RH, Tutucci E: **Intracellular mRNA transport and localized translation.** *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2021, **22**:483–504. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-021-00356-8>.
68. Bonnet C, Dian AL, Espie-Caullet T, Fabbri L, Lagadec L, Pivron T, Dutertre M, Luco R, Navickas A, Vagner S, et al.: **Post-transcriptional gene regulation: From mechanisms to RNA chemistry and therapeutics.** *Bulletin du Cancer* 2024, **111**:782–790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bulcan.2024.04.005>.
69. Ringel AR, Szabo Q, Chiariello AM, Chudzik K, Schöpflin R, Rothe P, Mattei AL, Zehnder T, Harnett D, Laupert V, et al.: **Repression and 3D-restructuring resolves regulatory conflicts in evolutionarily rearranged genomes.** *Cell* 2022, **185**:3689–3704.e21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.09.006>.
70. Banigan EJ, Tang W, Van Den Berg AA, Stocsits RR, Wutz G, Brandão HB, Busslinger GA, Peters J-M, Mirny LA: **Transcription shapes 3D chromatin organization by interacting with loop extrusion.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2023, **120**:e2210480120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2210480120>.
71. Zhang S, Übelmesser N, Josipovic N, Forte G, Slotman JA, Chiang M, Gothe HJ, Gusmao EG, Becker C, Altmüller J, et al.: **RNA polymerase II is required for spatial chromatin reorganization following exit from mitosis.** *Sci Adv* 2021, **7**:eabg8205. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abg8205>.
72. Zhang Y, Li T, Preissl S, Amaral ML, Grinstein JD, Farah EN, Destici E, Qiu Y, Hu R, Lee AY, et al.: **Transcriptionally active HERV-H retrotransposons demarcate topologically associating domains in human pluripotent stem cells.** *Nat Genet* 2019, **51**:1380–1388. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0479-7>.

73. Heinz S, Texari L, Hayes MGB, Urbanowski M, Chang MW, Givarkes N, Rialdi A, White KM, Albrecht RA, Pache L, et al.: **Transcription Elongation Can Affect Genome 3D Structure**. *Cell* 2018, **174**:1522-1536.e22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2018.07.047>.
74. Olan I, Parry AJ, Schoenfelder S, Narita M, Ito Y, Chan ASL, Slater GSTC, Bihary D, Bando M, Shirahige K, et al.: **Transcription-dependent cohesin repositioning rewires chromatin loops in cellular senescence**. *Nat Commun* 2020, **11**:6049. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19878-4>.
75. Busslinger GA, Stocsits RR, Van Der Lelij P, Axelsson E, Tedeschi A, Galjart N, Peters J-M: **Cohesin is positioned in mammalian genomes by transcription, CTCF and Wapl**. *Nature* 2017, **544**:503–507. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22063>.
76. Levo M, Raimundo J, Bing XY, Sisco Z, Batut PJ, Ryabichko S, Gregor T, Levine MS: **Transcriptional coupling of distant regulatory genes in living embryos**. *Nature* 2022, **605**:754–760. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04680-7>.
77. Batut PJ, Bing XY, Sisco Z, Raimundo J, Levo M, Levine MS: **Genome organization controls transcriptional dynamics during development**. *Science* 2022, **375**:566–570. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abi7178>.
- This study shows that the *Drosophila* genome is organized by two distinct classes of regulatory sequences—tethering elements and insulators—which coordinate gene expression during development. Tethering elements facilitate long-range enhancer-promoter interactions for rapid activation, while insulators block inappropriate interactions between neighboring regions.
78. Szabo Q, Jost D, Chang J-M, Cattoni DI, Papadopoulos GL, Bonev B, Sexton T, Gurgu J, Jacquier C, Nollmann M, et al.: **TADs are 3D structural units of higher-order chromosome organization in *Drosophila***. *Sci Adv* 2018, **4**:eaar8082. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aar8082>.
79. Ghavi-Helm Y, Jankowski A, Meiers S, Viales RR, Korbel JO, Furlong EEM: **Highly rearranged chromosomes reveal uncoupling between genome topology and gene expression**. *Nat Genet* 2019, **51**:1272–1282. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0462-3>.
80. Schwarzer W, Abdennur N, Goloborodko A, Pekowska A, Fudenberg G, Loe-Mie Y, Fonseca NA, Huber W, Haering CH, Mirny L, et al.: **Two independent modes of chromatin organization revealed by cohesin removal**. *Nature* 2017, **551**:51–56. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24281>.
81. Hsieh T-HS, Cattoglio C, Slobodyanyuk E, Hansen AS, Darzacq X, Tjian R: **Enhancer–promoter interactions and transcription are largely maintained upon acute loss of CTCF, cohesin, WAPL or YY1**. *Nat Genet* 2022, **54**:1919–1932. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01223-8>.
82. Kadam S, Kumari K, Manivannan V, Dutta S, Mitra MK, Padinhateeri R: **Predicting scale-dependent chromatin polymer properties from systematic coarse-graining**. *Nat Commun* 2023, **14**:4108. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-39907-2>.
83. Polovnikov KE, Brandão HB, Belan S, Slavov B, Imakaev M, Mirny LA: **Crumpled Polymer with Loops Recapitulates Key Features of Chromosome Organization**. *Phys Rev X* 2023, **13**:041029. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.13.041029>.
- The authors present an analytical model of a polymer folded into loops. Simulations show that chromosomes with loops remain unconstrained up to ~1-2 Mb but become crumpled at larger scales.
84. Polovnikov K, Slavov B: **Topological and nontopological mechanisms of loop formation in chromosomes: Effects on the contact probability**. *Phys Rev E* 2023, **107**:054135. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.107.054135>.
- The authors compare topological (cohesin encircling DNA) and nontopological (chemical bond) loop models. In the nontopological model, loops extend from a central backbone, shortening chromosomes at large scales, while the topological model preserves a linear structure with negatively correlated fluctuations. The study highlights how loop base structure influences chromosome organization across scales.
85. Grosse-Holz S, Coulon A, Mirny L: **Scale-free models of chromosome structure, dynamics, and mechanics**. 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.14.536939>.

86. Polovnikov KE, Gherardi M, Cosentino-Lagomarsino M, Tamm MV: **Fractal Folding and Medium Viscoelasticity Contribute Jointly to Chromosome Dynamics.** *Phys Rev Lett* 2018, **120**:088101. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.088101>.
87. Goychuk A, Kannan D, Chakraborty AK, Kardar M: **Polymer folding through active processes recreates features of genome organization.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2023, **120**:e2221726120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2221726120>.
88. Shi G, Thirumalai D: **From Hi-C Contact Map to Three-Dimensional Organization of Interphase Human Chromosomes.** *Phys Rev X* 2021, **11**:011051. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.11.011051>.
89. Jost D, Carrivain P, Cavalli G, Vaillant C: **Modeling epigenome folding: formation and dynamics of topologically associated chromatin domains.** *Nucleic Acids Research* 2014, **42**:9553–9561. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gku698>.
90. Conte M, Irani E, Chiariello AM, Abraham A, Bianco S, Esposito A, Nicodemi M: **Loop-extrusion and polymer phase-separation can co-exist at the single-molecule level to shape chromatin folding.** *Nat Commun* 2022, **13**:4070. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-31856-6>.
91. Conte M, Abraham A, Esposito A, Yang L, Gibcus JH, Parsi KM, Vercellone F, Fontana A, Di Pierno F, Dekker J, et al.: **Polymer Physics Models Reveal Structural Folding Features of Single-Molecule Gene Chromatin Conformations.** *IJMS* 2024, **25**:10215. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms251810215>.
92. Conte M, Fiorillo L, Bianco S, Chiariello AM, Esposito A, Nicodemi M: **Polymer physics indicates chromatin folding variability across single-cells results from state degeneracy in phase separation.** *Nat Commun* 2020, **11**:3289. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17141-4>.
93. Fiorillo L, Musella F, Conte M, Kempfer R, Chiariello AM, Bianco S, Kukalev A, Irastorza-Azcarate I, Esposito A, Abraham A, et al.: **Comparison of the Hi-C, GAM and SPRITE methods using polymer models of chromatin.** *Nat Methods* 2021, **18**:482–490. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-021-01135-1>.
94. Esposito A, Bianco S, Chiariello AM, Abraham A, Fiorillo L, Conte M, Campanile R, Nicodemi M: **Polymer physics reveals a combinatorial code linking 3D chromatin architecture to 1D chromatin states.** *Cell Reports* 2022, **38**:110601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2022.110601>.
95. Bianco S, Lupiáñez DG, Chiariello AM, Annunziatella C, Kraft K, Schöpflin R, Wittler L, Andrey G, Vingron M, Pombo A, et al.: **Polymer physics predicts the effects of structural variants on chromatin architecture.** *Nat Genet* 2018, **50**:662–667. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-018-0098-8>.
96. Racko D, Benedetti F, Dorier J, Stasiak A: **Transcription-induced supercoiling as the driving force of chromatin loop extrusion during formation of TADs in interphase chromosomes.** *Nucleic Acids Research* 2018, **46**:1648–1660. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx1123>.
97. Brackley CA, Johnson J, Michieletto D, Morozov AN, Nicodemi M, Cook PR, Marenduzzo D: **Nonequilibrium Chromosome Looping via Molecular Slip Links.** *Phys Rev Lett* 2017, **119**:138101. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.138101>.
98. Yuan T, Yan H, Bailey MLP, Williams JF, Surovtsev I, King MC, Mochrie SGJ: **The effect of loops on the mean square displacement of Rouse-model chromatin.** 2023, <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2304.11266>.
99. Goloborodko A, Marko JF, Mirny LA: **Chromosome Compaction by Active Loop Extrusion.** *Biophysical Journal* 2016, **110**:2162–2168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpj.2016.02.041>.
100. Buckle A, Brackley CA, Boyle S, Marenduzzo D, Gilbert N: **Polymer Simulations of Heteromorphic Chromatin Predict the 3D Folding of Complex Genomic Loci.** *Molecular Cell* 2018, **72**:786-797.e11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2018.09.016>.




Figure 1. Spatiotemporal scales of gene regulation during development.

(A) Enhancer-Promoter (E-P) interactions at the locus scale. Enhancers (blue) and their target promoters (red) interact dynamically through loops that bring them into close proximity (~200 nm) but not direct contact. These E-P loops facilitate transcription initiation, typically occurring in short, stochastic bursts lasting minutes. Transcription factor (TF) binding, which occurs on even shorter timescales (seconds), contributes to transcriptional activation. Together, these rapid interactions establish the first layer of gene regulation, localized at individual loci. **(B) Higher-order chromatin structures at the chromatin scale.** Chromatin is organized into topologically associating domains (TADs), which are megabase-sized regions of increased self-interaction. TADs are further segregated into A and B compartments, reflecting differences in genomic activity and accessibility. Chromosomes occupy distinct, non-interlaced nuclear territories. Chromatin reorganization at this scale occurs over minutes to hours, enabling dynamic adjustments in gene regulation. **(C) Gene expression patterns at the organism scale.** The coordinated activity of E-P interactions at the locus scale and the dynamic restructuring of chromatin at the chromatin scale together generate spatially and temporally regulated gene expression patterns across tissues and developmental stages. This coordination unfolds over extended timescales, from hours to days, synchronizing gene expression programs across multiple loci and cell types. Shown are examples of the *even-skipped (eve)* gene in the *Drosophila* embryo at nuclear cycle (n.c.) 14 and the *Brachyury (Bra)* gene in the mouse embryo at embryonic (E) days E8 and E9, where gene activity patterns guide tissue formation and body axis specification.




Figure 2. Mechanisms bridging temporal and spatial scales in transcriptional regulation.

(A) Cooperative transcription factor (TF) binding and transcriptional bursts. TFs bind and unbind promoters on short timescales (seconds). However, transcriptional bursts typically persist for longer periods (minutes). Continuous TF exchange, particularly at promoters with multiple binding sites, maintains high promoter occupancy, bridging short binding events with transcriptional bursts timescales. Adapted from Pomp et al. [13]. **(B) Enhancer-promoter (E-P) interactions and regulatory steps.** Zuin et al. [18] observed a sigmoidal (nonlinear) relationship between E-P contact probabilities and transcription levels, rather than a direct linear correlation. This finding suggests that physical E-P proximity alone does not directly translate to transcriptional output. Instead, a series of intermediate regulatory steps, such as TF recruitment, Mediator complex assembly, pre-initiation complex formation, and RNA polymerase pausing/release, collectively modulate transcription activity. These steps act intervene in the integration of rapid E-P interactions with slower transcriptional bursts. **(C) Condensates and transcriptional hubs.** Transcriptional condensates and microenvironments (~200 nm) concentrate TFs, coactivators, and RNA Pol II, potentially mediating E-P proximity and facilitating the assembly of active transcriptional machinery. Such hubs may influence transcriptional bursting dynamics. **(D) Transcription-dependent chromatin reorganization.** Hypothetical model illustrating transcription-dependent chromatin decompaction and reorganization. In the inactive state, the locus is highly compacted, limiting regulatory interactions. Chromatin decompaction enhances genome accessibility and allows regulatory elements to come into closer proximity. Transcription may subsequently stabilize a more confined and reorganized chromatin configuration.




Figure 3. Integrating chromatin dynamics across spatial scales.

(A) Scaling relationships predicted by polymer models. The end-to-end distance (R), contact probability (P), and mean square displacement (MSD) are shown as functions of genomic distance (s) and time (t) for two widely used polymer physics models: the Rouse model (green) and the fractal globule model (red). The scaling coefficients for each model are indicated, highlighting the differences in chromatin behavior predicted by these theoretical frameworks. D in the MSD equation represents the diffusion quotient, which reflects the average rate of loci movement and the distance moved over time. **(B) Experimental measurements of chromatin mobility.** Summary of studies measuring chromatin dynamics using different cell types and genomic contexts. Diffusion exponents (α) and coefficients (D) vary across systems. On the left, the genomic segment sizes tracked in each study are indicated. Studies that simultaneously tracked two regions (e.g., enhancer-promoter pairs or TAD boundaries) are represented with blue and violet dots. Variations in α and D reveal scale-dependent chromatin dynamics, but differences in experimental methodologies and genomic contexts caution against overgeneralization. **(C) Simulations of chromatin mobility across scales.** The top panel shows simulated MSD curves for different genomic distances (from 40 Kb to 1 Mb) in a polymer with loop extrusion, where smaller distances exhibit higher MSD values and greater constraints. Adapted from Mach et al. [17]. The bottom panel shows MSD values for the center of mass of chromatin segments measured with different probe sizes, indicating higher mobility in smaller regions, as shown by Forte et al. [15]. **(D) Dynamic polymer modeling and**

chromatin behavior. Experimental results suggest that larger chromatin regions exhibit slower dynamics, while smaller scales display more rapid movement. However, as scales approach sub-kilobase resolution, additional factors such as loop extrusion, enhancer-promoter interactions, transcription, and macromolecular crowding significantly influence chromatin mobility, making predictions more complex. This complexity, represented by the black box with a question mark, underscores the need for dynamic polymer models that incorporate multiple species, scales, and genomic contexts. A more comprehensive model would account for chromatin accessibility, loop density, folding mechanisms, molecular crowding, and transcriptional interference to capture chromatin behavior accurately.

References: Keizer et al., 2023 [50]; Mach et al., 2022 [17]; Brückner et al., 2023 [19]; Gabriele et al., 2022 [16]; Forte et al., 2023 [15]. n.s. – not shown.

Table 1. Coarse-grained polymer simulation models.

Summary of commonly used chromatin polymer models, emphasizing the diversity of approaches and the trade-offs between data-driven and mechanistic modeling strategies. All models described here can be implemented using a coarse-grained bead-and-spring polymer framework. Mechanistic models incorporate physical principles from polymer physics, such as the ideal chain or fractal globule models, while data-driven models focus on reconstructing chromatin conformations directly from experimental datasets. The choice of model influences both the spatial and temporal resolution, as well as the ability to capture dynamic chromatin behavior. Each approach offers different advantages, with mechanistic models providing insights into underlying physical principles, while data-driven models prioritize accuracy in reconstructing observed chromatin architectures.

	<i>Model</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Data fitting?</i>	<i>Input</i>	<i>Output</i>	<i>Refs.</i>
Mechanistic, agnostic, Inverse	Maximum Entropy (MaxEnt) inference	Statistical approach used to infer 3D chromatin structure from experimental data	Makes minimal assumptions beyond the experimental constraints	Lack of mechanistic insights Computationally intensive for large-scale modeling Often does not capture the dynamic nature of chromatin	Yes	Contact probability maps	Simulated contact probability maps	[87,88]
	Block-copolymer	The chromatin fiber is modeled as a chain of beads, where beads of the same type have attractive interactions, while different types have repulsive or neutral interactions. These interactions drive the spontaneous formation of domains and compartments	Accounts for heterogeneity in chromatin properties Can model large genomic regions or whole chromosomes	Oversimplification Often does not account for dynamic changes in chromatin Does not include protein-mediated interactions	No	Contact probability maps Epigenetic modifications	Simulated contact probability maps	[89]
Mechanistic, Forward	Springs and Binders Switch (SBS)	Type of block-copolymer The springs represent the chromatin fiber, modeled as a chain of beads, and the binders the protein complexes, that can bind to specific sites on the chromatin The binders can form bridges between different regions, creating loops The system can switch between different conformational states based on binder concentration and affinity Equilibrium model	Predicts sharp transitions in chromatin states (phase transitions) Directly incorporates the role of binding proteins Makes predictions at both local and global scales	Reduces complex protein-chromatin interactions to simple binding events Does not account for loop extrusion dynamics High sensibility to input-parameters	Yes or No	Contact probability maps	Simulated contact probability maps	[89–97]
	Loop extrusion (LE)	Extrusion factors are simulated as dynamic units that can bind chromatin and move along it Non-equilibrium model Variations have been developed to considering extrusion without an active, ATP-dependent motor, but driven by thermal diffusion of transcription-induced supercoiling	Explore features not captured by simple polymer models (e.g., CTCF orientation bias) Makes testable predictions about the dynamics of loop formation	Oversimplification Primarily explains loop and TAD formation, not all aspects of chromatin organization Computationally intensive for large genomic regions	No	CTCF/cohesin binding Epigenetic modifications DNA accessibility	Ensemble of 3D chromatin conformations Simulated contact probability maps	[16,17,83,84,90,98,99]
	Highly predictive heteromorphic polymer (HiP-HoP)	Represents chromatin with different levels of compaction (heteromorphic), combined with diffusing protein bridges and loop extrusion	Accounts for heterogeneity in chromatin properties Can account for loop extrusion dynamics Can incorporate multiple mechanisms of chromatin organization	Computationally intensive Requires integration of multiple types of experimental data	No	CTCF/cohesin binding Epigenetic modifications DNA accessibility	Simulated contact probabilities maps, FISH	[15,100]