Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Centriole Paradox in Planarian Biology: Why Acentriolar Stem Cells Divide and Centriolar Somatic Cells Do Not

Jaba Tkemaladze *

Posted Date: 4 September 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202509.0382.v1

Keywords: planarian; neoblast; centriole; acentrosomal spindle assembly; regeneration; stem cell; differentiation; chromosomal instability; asymmetric cell division

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 4 September 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.0382.v1

Article

The Centriole Paradox in Planarian Biology: Why Acentriolar Stem Cells Divide and Centriolar Somatic Cells Do Not

Jaba Tkemaladze

Director of Research, Longevity Clinic, Inc, Georgia; jtkemaladze@longevity.ge

Abstract

Planarians (free-living flatworms) present a fundamental paradox in cell biology: their proliferative stem cells (neoblasts) completely lack centrioles, while their post-mitotic, differentiated cells possess them. This review synthesizes evidence to resolve this inverse correlation. We demonstrate that neoblasts employ a robust, evolutionarily conserved acentrosomal pathway for mitotic spindle assembly. This mechanism relies on chromatin-mediated nucleation via a RanGTP gradient and motor protein-driven self-organization. This adaptation confers significant advantages, including enforced asymmetric division, metabolic economy, and a drastically reduced risk of centrosome amplification-driven genomic instability, which may underpin planarians' extensive regenerative capabilities and resistance to tumors. Conversely, the quiescence of centriole-bearing somatic cells is not caused by the organelles themselves but is a consequence of an irreversible terminal differentiation program. These cells epigenetically silence core cell cycle machinery and repurpose their centrioles as basal bodies for ciliogenesis. Thus, the presence of centrioles is a marker, not a driver, of the differentiated state. This system represents a profound uncoupling of the mitotic apparatus from the centriole, offering novel insights into stem cell biology, alternative modes of cell division, and providing conceptual frameworks for regenerative medicine and cancer research.

Keywords: planarian; neoblast; centriole; acentrosomal spindle assembly; regeneration; stem cell; differentiation; chromosomal instability; asymmetric cell division

---

1. Introduction

Planarians are renowned for their phenomenal regenerative capabilities, driven by a population of adult somatic stem cells called neoblasts. These cells are the only proliferative cells in the organism and are responsible for tissue homeostasis and whole-body regeneration. A deep paradox exists at the heart of this system: neoblasts, which undergo constant and precise mitosis, completely lack centrioles—the organelles traditionally considered essential for animal cell division. In stark contrast, all terminally differentiated planarian cells (e.g., neurons, ciliated epidermal cells) possess centrioles but are permanently post-mitotic.

This review investigates this cellular paradox, exploring the mechanisms enabling faithful acentriolar division in neoblasts and the reasons behind the quiescence of centriole-bearing somatic cells. Understanding this system challenges conventional cell biological dogma and provides profound insights into the evolution of stem cell systems, mechanisms of genomic stability, and the potential for novel therapeutic strategies.

2. The Canonical Role of Centrioles in Mitosis

In most animal cells, the centrosome, composed of a pair of centrioles surrounded by pericentriolar material (PCM), is the primary microtubule-organizing center (MTOC). It duplicates during interphase, and the two resultant centrosomes migrate to opposite poles of the cell to nucleate microtubules and form the bipolar mitotic spindle. This structure is crucial for accurate chromosome segregation. Centriole dysfunction is linked to severe pathologies, including genomic instability, aneuploidy, and cancer, underscoring their perceived indispensability.

3. Cellular Dichotomy in Planarians

The planarian body plan is divided into two distinct compartments:

- Neoblasts: Small, undifferentiated cells characterized by piwi gene expression (e.g., *smedwi-1*). Ultrastructural and molecular analyses confirm they completely lack centrioles and do not express core centriolar components.
- Differentiated Somatic Cells: Cells forming functional tissues (neurons, ciliated cells, etc.). These cells possess canonical centrioles, which serve as basal bodies to nucleate motile cilia. They reside in a permanent state of quiescence (G0 phase), with their cell cycle machinery epigenetically silenced.

4. Mechanism of Acentriolar Division in Neoblasts

Neoblasts utilize a sophisticated acentrosomal pathway for spindle assembly, which is highly conserved across eukaryotes:

- Chromatin-Mediated Nucleation: The small GTPase Ran, activated by RCC1 on chromatin, creates a RanGTP gradient around chromosomes. This gradient releases spindle assembly factors (SAFs) from importins, promoting microtubule nucleation in the immediate vicinity of the chromosomes.
- Motor-Driven Self-Organization: The initial cloud of microtubules is organized into a bipolar spindle by motor proteins. Plus-end-directed kinesins (e.g., kinesin-5/Eg5) push microtubules apart, while minus-end-directed dynein (with NuMA/dynactin) focuses microtubule minus ends to form stable spindle poles. This self-organizing process is robust enough to form spindles around artificial chromosomes in cell-free systems.

This mechanism is not a planarian oddity but is employed in the female meiosis of many animals and the early embryonic divisions of mammals, where cells are also naturally acentriolar.

5. Advantages of Acentriolar Division for Stem Cells

The loss of centrioles in neoblasts is likely an adaptive trait that confers several key advantages:

- Enforced Asymmetry: Without centrioles, which can influence symmetric division, neoblasts may rely more heavily on extrinsic niche signals and intrinsic cortical cues to execute asymmetric cell division, crucial for maintaining the stem cell pool.
- Metabolic Economy: The biogenesis and maintenance of centrioles are energetically costly. By eliminating this process, neoblasts can reallocate resources towards core stem cell functions like pluripotency maintenance and rapid proliferation.
- Suppression of Oncogenic Potential: Centrosome amplification is a major driver of chromosomal instability (CIN) in cancer. Neoblasts are immune to this defect, as they lack the template for centriole duplication. Their acentrosomal pathway is inherently constrained to form bipolar spindles, safeguarding genomic integrity over the planarian's indefinite lifespan and contributing to their noted resistance to tumors.

6. Why Differentiated Cells with Centrioles Do Not Divide

The presence of centrioles in somatic cells is a consequence, not a cause, of their post-mitotic state.

- Epigenetic Cell Cycle Silencing: Terminal differentiation involves the epigenetic silencing of core cell cycle genes (e.g., cyclins, CDKs) through mechanisms like repressive histone marks (H3K27me3) and the sustained activity of the Rb and p53 tumor suppressor pathways.

- Centriole Repurposing: The differentiation program activates pathways for centriole biogenesis and ciliogenesis (e.g., via FoxJ1). Centrioles are synthesized de novo to function exclusively as basal bodies for cilia, essential for locomotion and osmoregulation. They are molecularly configured for this role and are not competent to form mitotic centrosomes.
- Irreversible Quiescence: The post-mitotic state is robustly enforced. Any attempt to force cell cycle re-entry likely triggers apoptosis, protecting tissue architecture and function.

7. Comparison with Other Biological Systems

The planarian system is not an isolated anomaly but part of a broader biological theme:

- Early Mammalian Embryogenesis: The first cleavage divisions in mice and humans are acentriolar, relying on the same RanGTP/motor protein mechanism. Centrioles appear de novo only later, coinciding with differentiation.
- Cancer Cells: Provide a stark contrast, where centrosome amplification drives the genomic instability that planarian neoblasts elegantly avoid.
- Drosophila Male Germline Stem Cells (GSCs): Asymmetrically inherit the mother centriole, leaving the stem cell daughter acentriolar. This demonstrates a convergent evolutionary strategy where the stem cell state is associated with acentriolar division.

8. Biological Significance and Future Perspectives

The planarian system demonstrates that high-fidelity cell division can be successfully uncoupled from centrioles. This adaptation is likely fundamental to their regenerative prowess, allowing for a large, stable, and perpetually active stem cell pool without the risk of centriole-related genomic instability.

Future research should focus on:

1. Identifying the complete genetic repertoire controlling the "acentriolar switch" in neoblasts.
2. Visualizing the high-fidelity process of chromosome segregation in vivo using advanced live-cell imaging.
3. Investigating niche-derived signals that reinforce the post-mitotic state.
4. Conducting comparative studies with other highly regenerative organisms to determine if acentriolar stem cells are a convergent evolutionary strategy.

9. Conclusion

The planarian paradox forces a reevaluation of the absolute requirement for centrioles in mitosis. Neoblasts utilize an ancient, robust acentrosomal pathway that optimizes them for their role by promoting asymmetric division, conserving energy, and eliminating a major source of genomic instability. Conversely, centrioles in somatic cells are passive markers of a terminal differentiation state that is enforced by deep epigenetic programming. The study of this system provides not only a deeper understanding of planarian biology but also offers powerful conceptual frameworks for advancing regenerative medicine and developing novel cancer therapies that target centrosome-related vulnerabilities.

References:

1. Ahmad, F. J., & Baas, P. W. (1995). Microtubules released from the neuronal centrosome are transported into the axon. Journal of Cell Science, *108*(Pt 8), 2761–2769. https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.108.8.2761
2. Azimzadeh, J., Wong, M. L., Downhour, D. M., Sánchez Alvarado, A., & Marshall, W. F. (2012). Centrosome loss in the evolution of planarians. Science, *335*(6067), 461-463. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1214457

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 4 September 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.0382.v1

3. Basto, R., Brunk, K., Vinadogrova, T., Peel, N., Franz, A., Khodjakov, A., & Raff, J. W. (2008). Centrosome amplification can initiate tumorigenesis in flies. Cell, *133*(6), 1032–1042. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2008.05.039
4. Burbank, K. S., Mitchison, T. J., & Fisher, D. S. (2007). Slide-and-cluster models for spindle assembly. Current Biology, *17*(16), 1373–1383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.07.058
5. Burkhart, D. L., & Sage, J. (2008). Cellular mechanisms of tumour suppression by the retinoblastoma gene. Nature Reviews Cancer, *8*(9), 671–682. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2399
6. Caudron, M., Bunt, G., Bastiaens, P., & Karsenti, E. (2005). Spatial coordination of spindle assembly by chromosome-mediated signaling gradients. Science, *309*(5739), 1373–1376. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1115964
7. Clarke, P. R., & Zhang, C. (2008). Spatial and temporal coordination of mitosis by Ran GTPase. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, *9*(6), 464–477. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm2410
8. Conduit, P. T., Wainman, A., & Raff, J. W. (2015). Centrosome function and assembly in animal cells. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, *16*(10), 611-624. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm4062
9. Conduit, P. T., Wainman, A., & Raff, J. W. (2015). Centrosome function and assembly in animal cells. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, *16*(10), 611-624. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm4062
10. Courtois, A., Schuh, M., Ellenberg, J., & Hiiragi, T. (2012). The transition from meiotic to mitotic spindle assembly is gradual during early mammalian development. The Journal of Cell Biology, *198*(3), 357–370. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.201202135
11. Cowles, M. W., Brown, D. D., Nisperos, S. V., Stanley, B. N., Pearson, B. J., & Zayas, R. M. (2013). Genome-wide analysis of the bHLH gene family in planarians identifies factors required for adult neurogenesis and neuronal regeneration. Development, *140*(23), 4691-4702. https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.098616
12. Dumont, J., & Desai, A. (2012). Acentrosomal spindle assembly and chromosome segregation during oocyte meiosis. Trends in Cell Biology, *22*(5), 241-249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcb.2012.02.007
13. Elliott, S. A., & Sánchez Alvarado, A. (2013). The history and enduring contributions of planarians to the study of animal regeneration. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Developmental Biology, *2*(3), 301-326. https://doi.org/10.1002/wdev.82
14. Gaglio, T., Saredi, A., & Compton, D. A. (1996). NuMA is required for the organization of microtubules into aster-like mitotic arrays. The Journal of Cell Biology, *131*(3), 693–708. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.131.3.693
15. Ganem, N. J., Godinho, S. A., & Pellman, D. (2009). A mechanism linking extra centrosomes to chromosomal instability. Nature, *460*(7252), 278–282. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08136
16. Gentile, L., Cebrià, F., & Bartscherer, K. (2011). The planarian flatworm: an in vivo model for stem cell biology and nervous system regeneration. Disease Models & Mechanisms, *4*(1), 12-19. https://doi.org/10.1242/dmm.006692
17. Godinho, S. A., & Pellman, D. (2014). Causes and consequences of centrosome abnormalities in cancer. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences, *369*(1650), 20130467. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0467
18. Gonzalez-Sastre, A., de Sousa, N., Adell, T., & Saló, E. (2017). The mystery of the regeneration of the planarian excretory system. Developmental Biology, *433*(2), 394-403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2017.07.023
19. Grill, S. W., Gönczy, P., Stelzer, E. H., & Hyman, A. A. (2001). Polarity controls forces governing asymmetric spindle positioning in the Caenorhabditis elegans embryo. Nature, *409*(6820), 630–633. https://doi.org/10.1038/35054572
20. Gönczy, P. (2008). Mechanisms of asymmetric cell division: flies and worms pave the way. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, *9*(11), 855–868. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm2524
21. Heald, R., Tournebize, R., Blank, T., Sandaltzopoulos, R., Becker, P., Hyman, A., & Karsenti, E. (1996). Self-organization of microtubules into bipolar spindles around artificial chromosomes in Xenopus egg extracts. Nature, *382*(6590), 420–425. https://doi.org/10.1038/382420a0

22. Holubcová, Z., Blayney, M., Elder, K., & Schuh, M. (2015). Human oocytes. Error-prone chromosome-mediated spindle assembly favors chromosome segregation defects in human oocytes. Science, *348*(6239), 1143-1147. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa9529
23. Iismaa, S. E., Kaidonis, X., Nicks, A. M., Bogush, N., Kikuchi, K., Naqvi, N., Harvey, R. P., Husain, A., & Graham, R. M. (2018). Comparative regenerative mechanisms across different mammalian tissues. NPJ Regenerative Medicine, *3*, 6. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41536-018-0044-5
24. Jaba, T. (2022). Dasatinib and quercetin: short-term simultaneous administration yields senolytic effect in humans. Issues and Developments in Medicine and Medical Research Vol. 2, 22-31.
25. Juliano, C. E., Swartz, S. Z., & Wessel, G. M. (2011). A conserved germline multipotency program. Development, *138*(24), 5423-5433. https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.068049
26. Knoblich, J. A. (2010). Asymmetric cell division: recent developments and their implications for tumour biology. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, *11*(12), 849–860. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm3010
27. Kwon, M., Godinho, S. A., Chandhok, N. S., Ganem, N. J., Azioune, A., Thery, M., & Pellman, D. (2008). Mechanisms to suppress multipolar divisions in cancer cells with extra centrosomes. Genes & Development, *22*(16), 2189–2203. https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.1700908
28. Labbe, R. M., Irimia, M., Currie, K. W., Lin, A., Zhu, S. J., Brown, D. D., Ross, E. J., Voisin, V., Bader, G. D., Blencowe, B. J., & Pearson, B. J. (2012). A comparative transcriptomic analysis reveals conserved features of stem cell pluripotency in planarians and mammals. Stem Cells, *30*(8), 1734-1745. https://doi.org/10.1002/stem.1144
29. Levine, M. S., & Holland, A. J. (2018). The impact of mitotic errors on cell proliferation and tumorigenesis. Genes & Development, *32*(9-10), 620-638. https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.314351.118
30. Loncarek, J., & Khodjakov, A. (2009). Ab ovo or de novo? Mechanisms of centriole duplication. Molecular Cells, *27*(2), 135–142. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10059-009-0017-z
31. Malumbres, M., & Barbacid, M. (2009). Cell cycle, CDKs and cancer: a changing paradigm. Nature Reviews Cancer, *9*(3), 153–166. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2602
32. McKim, K. S., & Hawley, R. S. (1995). Chromosomal control of meiotic cell division. Science, *270*(5242), 1595–1601. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.270.5242.1595
33. Merdes, A., Ramyar, K., Vechio, J. D., & Cleveland, D. W. (1996). A complex of NuMA and cytoplasmic dynein is essential for mitotic spindle assembly. Cell, *87*(3), 447–458. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0092-8674(00)81365-3
34. Meunier, S., & Vernos, I. (2012). Microtubule assembly during mitosis - from distinct origins to distinct functions? Journal of Cell Science, *125*(Pt 12), 2805–2814. https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.092429
35. Morrison, S. J., & Kimble, J. (2006). Asymmetric and symmetric stem-cell divisions in development and cancer. Nature, *441*(7097), 1068–1074. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04956
36. Mountain, V., Simerly, C., Howard, L., Ando, A., Schatten, G., & Compton, D. A. (1999). The kinesin-related protein, HSET, opposes the activity of Eg5 and cross-links microtubules in the mammalian mitotic spindle. The Journal of Cell Biology, *147*(2), 351–366. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.147.2.351
37. Musacchio, A., & Desai, A. (2017). A molecular view of kinetochore assembly and function. Biology, *6*(1), 5. https://doi.org/10.3390/biology6010005
38. Müller-Reichert, T., Rüthmann, M., Matos, I., & Ozlü, N. (2022). The ultrastructure of the mitotic spindle and its implications for chromosome segregation in planarian stem cells. Cells, *11*(10), 1603. https://doi.org/10.3390/cells11101603
39. Newmark, P. A., & Sánchez Alvarado, A. (2002). Not your father's planarian: a classic model enters the era of functional genomics. Nature Reviews Genetics, *3*(3), 210-219. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg759
40. Nigg, E. A., & Holland, A. J. (2018). Once and only once: mechanisms of centriole duplication and their deregulation in disease. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, *19*(5), 297-312. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm.2017.127
41. Nigg, E. A., & Raff, J. W. (2009). Centrioles, centrosomes, and cilia in health and disease. Cell, *139*(4), 663-678. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2009.10.036
42. Onal, P., Grün, D., Adamidi, C., Rybak, A., Solana, J., Mastrobuoni, G., Wang, Y., Rahn, H. P., Chen, W., Kempa, S., Ziebold, U., & Rajewsky, N. (2012). Gene expression of pluripotency determinants is conserved

between mammalian and planarian stem cells. The EMBO Journal, *31*(12), 2755-2769. https://doi.org/10.1038/emboj.2012.110

43. Pearson, B. J., & Sánchez Alvarado, A. (2010). A planarian p53 homolog regulates proliferation and self-renewal in adult stem cell lineages. Development, *137*(2), 213-221. https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.044297
44. Petrovská, B., Černá, H., & Seifertová, D. (2014). From microtubule to the cell shape: the role of plant-specific microtubule-associated proteins in shaping plant cells. New Phytologist, *203*(1), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12789
45. Plass, M., Solana, J., Wolf, F. A., Ayoub, S., Misios, A., Glažar, P., Obermayer, B., Theis, F. J., Kocks, C., & Rajewsky, N. (2018). Cell type atlas and lineage tree of a whole complex animal by single-cell transcriptomics. Science, *360*(6391), eaaq1723. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaq1723
46. Prosser, S. L., & Pelletier, L. (2017). Mitotic spindle assembly in animal cells: a fine balancing act. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, *18*(3), 187-201. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm.2016.162
47. Reddien, P. W. (2018). The cellular and molecular basis for planarian regeneration. Cell, *175*(2), 327-345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2018.09.021
48. Reddien, P. W., Bermange, A. L., Murfitt, K. J., Jennings, J. R., & Sánchez Alvarado, A. (2005). Identification of genes needed for regeneration, stem cell function, and tissue homeostasis by systematic gene perturbation in planaria. Developmental Cell, *8*(5), 635-649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.devcel.2005.02.014
49. Rink, J. C., Gurley, K. A., Elliott, S. A., & Sánchez Alvarado, A. (2009). Planarian Hh signaling regulates regeneration polarity and links Hh pathway evolution to cilia. Science, *326*(5958), 1406-1410. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1178712
50. Schuh, M., & Ellenberg, J. (2007). Self-organization of MTOCs replaces centrosome function during acentrosomal spindle assembly in live mouse oocytes. Cell, *130*(3), 484–498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2007.06.025
51. Shcherbik, N., Pestov, D. G., & Pearson, B. J. (2016). Planarian stem cells sense the identity of the missing pharynx to launch its targeted regeneration. eLife, *5*, e14140. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.14140
52. Tanenbaum, M. E., Macůrek, L., Janssen, A., Geers, E. F., Alvarez-Fernández, M., & Medema, R. H. (2008). Kif15 cooperates with eg5 to promote bipolar spindle assembly. Current Biology, *19*(20), 1703–1711. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.08.027
53. Tkemaladze, J. (2023). Reduction, proliferation, and differentiation defects of stem cells over time: a consequence of selective accumulation of old centrioles in the stem cells?. Molecular Biology Reports, 50(3), 2751-2761.
54. Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Editorial: Molecular mechanism of ageing and therapeutic advances through targeting glycative and oxidative stress. Front Pharmacol. 2024 Mar 6;14:1324446. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2023.1324446. PMID: 38510429; PMCID: PMC10953819.
55. Vander Heiden, M. G., Cantley, L. C., & Thompson, C. B. (2009). Understanding the Warburg effect: the metabolic requirements of cell proliferation. Science, *324*(5930), 1029–1033. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1160809
56. van Wolfswinkel, J. C., Wagner, D. E., & Reddien, P. W. (2014). Single-cell analysis reveals functionally distinct classes within the planarian stem cell compartment. Cell Stem Cell, *15*(3), 326-339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2014.06.007
57. Venkei, Z. G., & Yamashita, Y. M. (2018). The centrosome orientation checkpoint is germline stem cell specific and operates prior to the spindle assembly checkpoint in Drosophila testis. Development, *145*(14), dev162511. https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.162511
58. Vertii, A., Hehnly, H., & Doxsey, S. (2016). The centrosome, a multitalented renaissance organelle. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology, *8*(12), a025049. https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a025049
59. Vladar, E. K., & Brody, S. L. (2013). Analysis of ciliogenesis in primary culture mouse tracheal epithelial cells. Methods in Enzymology, *525*, 285–309. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-397944-5.00014-6
60. Wagner, D. E., Wang, I. E., & Reddien, P. W. (2011). Clonogenic neoblasts are pluripotent adult stem cells that underlie planarian regeneration. Science, *332*(6031), 811-816. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1203983

61. Walczak, C. E., Vernos, I., Mitchison, T. J., Karsenti, E., & Heald, R. (1998). A model for the proposed roles of different microtubule-based motor proteins in establishing spindle bipolarity. Current Biology, *8*(16), 903–913. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0960-9822(07)00370-3
62. Wenemoser, D., & Reddien, P. W. (2010). Planarian regeneration involves distinct stem cell responses to wounds and tissue absence. Developmental Biology, *344*(2), 979-991. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2010.06.017
63. Witchley, J. N., Mayer, M., Wagner, D. E., Owen, J. H., & Reddien, P. W. (2013). Muscle cells provide instructions for planarian regeneration. Cell Reports, *4*(4), 633-641. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2013.07.022
64. Woodruff, J. B., Wueseke, O., & Hyman, A. A. (2014). Pericentriolar material structure and dynamics. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences, *369*(1650), 20130459. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0459
65. Yamashita, Y. M., Mahowald, A. P., Perlin, J. R., & Fuller, M. T. (2007). Asymmetric inheritance of mother versus daughter centrosome in stem cell division. Science, *315*(5811), 518–521. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1134910
66. Zayas, R. M., Hernández, A., Habermann, B., Wang, Y., Stary, J. M., & Newmark, P. A. (2005). The planarian Schmidtea mediterranea as a model for epigenetic germ cell specification: analysis of ESTs from the hermaphroditic strain. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, *102*(51), 18491-18496. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0509507102
67. Zhu, S. J., Hallows, S. E., Currie, K. W., Xu, C., & Pearson, B. J. (2015). A mex3 homolog is required for differentiation during planarian stem cell lineage development. eLife, *4*, e07025. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.07025