# A SUPERFAMILY-WIDE ACTIVITY ATLAS OF SERINE HYDROLASES IN *DROSOPHILA MELANOGASTER*

Kundan Kumar[1], Amol Mhetre[1], Girish S. Ratnaparkhi[1,*], Siddhesh S. Kamat[1,*]

[1]Department of Biology, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER) Pune, Dr. Homi Bhabha Road, Pashan, Pune, Maharashtra, India 411008.

*To whom the correspondence should be made: siddhesh@iiserpune.ac.in or girish@iiserpune.ac.in

**ABSTRACT**

The serine hydrolase (SH) superfamily is perhaps, one of the largest functional enzyme classes in all forms of life, and consists of proteases, peptidases, lipases, and carboxylesterases as representative members. Consistent with the name of this superfamily, all members, without any exception to date, use a nucleophilic serine residue in the enzyme active site to perform hydrolytic-type reactions via a two-step ping-pong mechanism involving a covalent enzyme intermediate. Given the highly conserved catalytic mechanism, this superfamily has served as a classical prototype in the development of several platforms of the chemical proteomics technique, activity-based protein profiling (ABPP), to globally interrogate the functions of its different members in various native, yet complex, biological settings. While ABPP-based proteome-wide activity atlas' for SH activities are available in numerous organisms, including humans, to the best of our knowledge, such an analysis for this superfamily is lacking in any insect model. To address this, here, we first report a bioinformatics analysis towards the identification and categorization of non-redundant SHs in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Following up on this *in silico* analysis, leveraging discovery chemoproteomics, we identify and globally map the full complement of SH activities during various developmental stages and in different adult tissues of *Drosophila*. Finally, as proof of concept of the utility of this activity atlas, we highlight sexual dimorphism in SH activities across different tissues in adult *Drosophila melanogaster*, and together, we prospect new research directions, resources and tools that this study can provide to the fly community.

**INTRODUCTION**

The serine hydrolase (SH) superfamily consists of enzymes that catalyze physiologically important hydrolytic reactions at electron deficient carbon (or phosphorus) centers at amide, ester or thioester functionalities, and consists of proteases, peptidases, esterases, lipases, amidases, and transacylases as prototypical members[1-4]. This enzyme superfamily is known to be present in both prokaryotes and eukaryotes, and constitutes 1 – 3 % of the total cellular proteome, thus making them, one of the largest functional enzyme classes across all forms of life. All members of this superfamily, without any exceptions known to date, contain a catalytically competent, conserved nucleophilic serine residue in the active site to perform the aforementioned hydrolytic-type reactions via a consensus two-step ping pong mechanism involving a covalent enzyme intermediate (**Figure 1A**), thus, leading to the "serine hydrolase" moniker for this superfamily[1-4]. This invariant catalytic serine residue is part of the famous catalytic triad[3, 4] (which is the hallmark of this superfamily), and is activated by an active site base (generally a histidine residue) to initiate the enzyme catalytic cycle (**Figure 1A**). Typically, this catalytic serine residue is part of a canonical GxSxG motif (x = any amino acid), although, exceptions to this motif have been found in all organisms[1, 2]. From a biological standpoint, deregulation in the activities of different SH enzymes has been linked to detrimental pathophysiological consequences in several organisms, and is often associated with various metabolic and/or autoimmune diseases in humans[1].

Given the conservation in their catalytic ping-pong mechanism, particularly the formation of the covalent enzyme intermediate, the SH enzyme superfamily has served as a classical prototype for the development and advancement of the chemical proteomics technique termed "activity-based protein profiling" (ABPP), pioneered by Cravatt and co-workers[5-9]. Briefly, ABPP is a functional proteomics technique that utilizes a biorthogonal "activity" probe with a reactive chemical group (often referred to as a "reactive warhead") (**Figure 1B**), which reacts with enzymes (or even proteins) that are mechanistically (or sometimes even functionally) related, typically from the same enzyme superfamily, and allows for their

detection, enrichment and quantitative identification via a reporter tag at a proteome wide scale from complex biological samples like cells or tissues[5-9]. The fluorophosphonate (FP) moiety in particular, has served as an excellent reactive chemical group (reactive warhead) for the SHs, and has been an integral part of most ABPP probes used for profiling enzymes of this superfamily[5-9] (**Figure 1C**).



**Figure 1. The SHs and ABPP.** (**A**) The consensus catalytic mechanism of the enzymes from the SH superfamily. (**B**) Generic structure of an activity-based probe, having three components, i.e. the reactive group or warhead, a linker and a reporter tag. (**C**) Reaction of a SH enzyme with a fluorophosphonate (FP) activity probe, leading to the formation of an irreversible covalent adduct, thus showing the utility of FP-probes towards ABPP applications.

ABPP has two popular platforms for assessing superfamily wide enzyme activities: (i) an in-gel fluorescence readout using SDS-PAGE analysis, also known as the "gel-based ABPP" platform, which is a medium throughout qualitative (or semi-quantitative) method, used for studying previously known enzymes and their activities in more physiological settings[5-9]; and (ii) a liquid chromatography coupled to an advanced mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) readout, popularly known as "ABPP-MudPIT" (MudPIT = Multidimensional Protein Identification Technology), which is relatively low throughput, but an exhaustive discovery based and/or quantitative method used towards identification and quantification of previously unknown enzyme activities from complex biological settings[6, 7, 10]. Traditionally, the activity probes used for gel-based ABPP experiments have various fluorophores (like fluorescein, rhodamines, BODIPYs, and their variants) as reporter tags, while biotin (leveraging avidin-based enrichment) has almost exclusively been used as a reporter tag for the activity probes used in the corresponding LC-MS/MS ABPP experiments.

Given their physiological importance, the enzymes from the SH family have been extensively investigated across all forms of life, and leveraging complementary ABPP platforms, superfamily-wide activity maps for this superfamily are available for numerous biological systems (e.g. cell lines, disease tissues, cancers)[11-14] and/or model organisms (e.g. rodents, worms, pathogens)[15-18]. Surprisingly, to the best of our knowledge, such an organismal level superfamily-wide activity map for the SHs (or any enzyme family for that matter) has not been described in literature for *Drosophila melanogaster* (fruit fly), a popular model organism used extensively for mechanistic discovery using its powerful genetic toolkit[19-23]. Not surprisingly, our current understanding of SH functions in *Drosophila* is mostly based on genetic experiments that have uncovered critical roles of SHs, particularly the serine proteases[24], to be important in physiological processes related to immune responses[25] and embryonic development[26] and patterning[27, 28].

Therefore, in this paper, we report the first chemoproteomics aided superfamily-wide activity atlas for the SH family in the very well-studied fly model, *Drosophila melanogaster*. Towards achieving this, we first performed an exhaustive bioinformatics analysis to survey, identify, collate and categorize all known non-redundant SHs from the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome. Next, leveraging established complementary gel-based and LC-MS/MS-based ABPP platforms, we assessed the superfamily-wide activity status of SHs across the various stages during its developmental life cycle (embryo, larva, pupa, and adult) and also in different tissues of adult flies. Our studies provide interesting new insights into the differential activities of SHs in various developmental life forms in flies, and also suggest sexual dimorphism in their activities. Given the immense value of chemoproteomics, and its poor utilization in fly models, we believe that the data and tools reported here, will be an invaluable resource to the fly community, and will provide new research directions towards connecting enzyme activities (particularly the SHs), to genetic phenotypes in different physiological processes and settings.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**.

**Materials**. Unless mentioned otherwise all reagents and chemicals were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. FP-rhodamine was a kind gift from Prof. Benjamin F. Cravatt (Scripps Research), and FP-biotin was synthesized in house as per reported protocol[5].

**Generation and Phylogenetic Characterization of a SH database for *Drosophila melanogaster***. Genes encoding proteins predicted to be SHs were filtered and collated from four publicly available databases namely: (i) FLYBASE[29-35], (ii) NCBI database (Release 6 plus ISO1 MT, GCF_000001215.4, last modified: 2020-04-24) (SH_motif search), (iii) MEROPS[36-39], and (iv) HMMER[40-42]. Within the HMMER database, the filtered fasta sequence of each SH was further analyzed for a Pfam motif using HmmerWeb version 2.41.1. The command for this analysis was 'hmmscan --cut_ga --hmmdb pfam' against the Pfam version 32.0 database. The Pfam protein domain, catalytic residue order and Pfam

family identity number were retrieved, and the SHs having the same protein motif and catalytic order were grouped together. The SH genes whose catalytic residue were not predicted by the aforementioned HMMER searches, were retrieved using multiple sequence alignments from sequences collated from the other three databases. Proteins with an active SH motif i.e. GxSxGG, GxSxG, GxSxxG (where x is any amino acid) were filtered using a Python code on a local computer. The final enzyme list from all the published databases was manually curated to ensure they fit with the SH superfamily, and split into two categories: serine proteases or metabolic SHs, based on sequence alignments to known enzyme activities within this superfamily. Towards generating a phylogenetic tree for the serine proteases and metabolic SHs, multiple sequence alignments for enzymes of each category were performed using the MUSCLE program[43, 44] (MEGA-X) with default software defined parameters. The phylogenetic tree was generated by the MEGA-X software using the "Neighbor-Joining" method[45, 46], and visualized using the FigTree (version 1.4.4) software.

**Fly Experimentation**. The *Drosophila melanogaster* line, $w^{1118}$, was grown on standard cornmeal agar medium at 25 °C. The embryos (0 – 20 hours) were collected on standard sucrose-agar plate (3% w/v sucrose, 2.5% w/v agar) supplemented with fresh yeast paste. All life stages i.e. the embryo (~ 500 μL per biological replicate), third-instar larva (50 per biological replicate) , pupa (50 per biological replicate), 5 – 10 days old adult flies (50 per biological replicate) were eventually lysed in cold 1 x Phosphate buffered-saline (PBS), pH 7.4. For head, gut, carcass and hemolymph, adult flies, both males and females were used separately. Flies were beheaded by shaking adults in liquid nitrogen, and heads were subsequently collected using a 600-μ sieve. Gut, carcass, ovary and testis were dissected in ice-cold 1X PBS, pH 7.4, in a batch of 50 flies and then flash-frozen in the liquid nitrogen. For hemolymph extraction, 40 flies were punctured in the thorax using an insulin needle, and collected in a 0.5 mL microcentrifuge tube with a hole at the bottom. Thereafter, the 0.5 mL tube containing the pricked flies was placed in a 1.5 mL microcentrifuge tube, and

centrifuged at 4 °C, 5000g for 5 minutes to cause the release of hemolymph into the 1.5 mL microcentrifuge tube. After harvesting the necessary biological samples, they were flash-frozen and stored at -80 °C until further use.

**Gel-based ABPP Sample Preparation and Analysis**. All the gel-based ABPP experiments were done using established protocols previously reported by us[47-49]. Briefly, each sample [fly life stages (embryo, larva, pupa or adult), or tissue (head, gut) that was fractionated] was suspended in 500 μL of cold, sterile 1x PBS (pH 7.4) and homogenized using a tissue homogenizer (Bullet Blender24, Next Advance) with one scoop of glass beads (0.5-mm diameter; Next Advance) at a speed setting of 10 for 5 min at 4 °C. Thereafter, an additional 500 μL of cold sterile 1x PBS was added, mixed by pipetting, and centrifuged at 1000g for 5 min at 4 °C to separate the tissue debris. The resulting supernatant (700 μL) was collected and centrifuged at 21,000g for 90 min at 4 °C. Following this high speed centrifugation step, the resulting supernatant (soluble proteome) and pellet (membrane proteome) were collected in different tubes. The pellet (membrane proteome) was washed 3x with cold sterile 1x PBS and re-suspended in 500 μL of cold sterile 1x PBS by pipetting. For tissues not needing fractionation (carcass, hemolymph, and reproductive organs) in soluble/membrane proteomes, all steps remained the same, except that the high speed centrifugation step was excluded, and the resulting lysate was used as whole tissue lysate. The protein concentration of each sample lysate was estimated using BCA protein assay kit (Pierce). For the gel-based ABPP assays, 50 μg of each lysate (50 μL of 1 mg/mL concentration) was treated with FP-rhodamine (2 μM, 60 min, 37 °C, with shaking). The reaction was quenched with 12.5 μL of 5X loading buffer and was followed by boiling the samples (95 °C, 10 min). The fluorescently labeled proteomes were resolved on 12% SDS–PAGE gel, and visualized using a Syngene G-Box Chemi-XRQ gel documentation system.

**LC-MS/MS based ABPP Sample Preparation and Analysis**. For the proteomic preparations for the LC-MS/MS-based ABPP assays, 1 mg of each lysate (1 mg/mL in 1x PBS (pH = 7.4)) were labeled with FP-biotin (200 μM, 60 min, 37 °C, with shaking). After labeling, the proteomes were denatured, reductively alkylated using iodoacetamide, and subsequently digested with trypsin as described earlier using a protocol previously reported by us[48, 50]. The tryptic peptides were desalted and cleaned using the StageTip protocol[51]. All LC–MS/MS analysis was performed on a Sciex TripleTOF6600 mass spectrometer interfaced with an Eksigent nano-LC 425. Tryptic peptides (~ 1 μg) were loaded onto an Eksigent C18 trap column (5 μg capacity) and subsequently eluted on an Eksigent C18 analytical column (15 cm × 75-μm internal diameter) with a linear acetonitrile gradient. A typical LC run consisted of 360 min post-loading onto the trap at a constant flow rate of 300 nL/min with solvent A consisting of water + 0.1% formic acid and solvent B consisting of acetonitrile. The gradient schedule for the LC run was 5% (v/v) B for 1 min, a linear gradient of B from 0% to 30% (v/v) over 330 min, 90% (v/v) B for 20 min and equilibration with 5% (v/v) B for 10 min. For all proteomics samples, data were acquired in information-dependent acquisition (IDA) mode over a mass range of 200–2,000 m/z. Each full MS survey scan was followed by MS/MS of the 15 most intense peptides. Dynamic exclusion was enabled for all experiments (repeat count 2; exclusion duration 6 s). Peptide identification were carried out using the Protein Pilot (version 2.0.1, Sciex) using Pro Group™ and Paragon™ algorithms against the RefSeq protein database of the *Drosophila melanogastar* (Release 6). While searching the peptides, iodoacetamide alkylation of cysteine was defined as a static modification, while the oxidation of methionine and N-terminal acetylation were defined as variable modifications. During the peptide searches, the precursor ion and MS/MS mass tolerance were set at 20 and 50 ppm respectively. The Protein Pilot software[52] defined "Peptide Count" parameter was used for quantifying the extent of activity of a SH enzyme, and only those SHs that were identified in at least two biological replicates were considered

for further analysis with Peptide Counts $\geq$ 1. Precursor ions and MS/MS fragmentations were viewed using the PeakView software (Sciex).

**Proteomics Data**. The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium[53] via the PRIDE[54] partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD024321.

**Data Analysis**. All heat map plots presented in this study (Figure 3 & 5) represent mean of three biological replicates, and were made using the Prism 9 (version 9.0.2) for macOS (GraphPad) software.

## RESULTS

**Bioinformatics analysis towards identification of SHs in *Drosophila melanogaster*.**

Prior to embarking on the development of a chemoproteomics guided superfamily-wide activity atlas, we first decided to perform a bioinformatics analysis to identify and collate all the protein sequences of SH enzymes in *Drosophila melanogaster* from publicly available databases, as such an exhaustive analysis for this superfamily, has to the best of our knowledge, not been performed to date. Towards collating this list, we chose 4 publicly available databases: (i) FLYBASE (database for *Drosophila* genes and genomes)[29-32], (ii) NCBI database (Release 6 plus ISO1 MT, GCF_000001215.4, last modified: 2020-04-24) (with a SH_motif search), (iii) MEROPS (peptidase/protease database)[36-38], and (iv) HMMER (biosequence search and analysis tool)[40-42] (**Supplementary Table 1**). We found that the FLYBASE and HMMER databases yielded the most non-redundant SH protein sequences, with 346 and 342 respectively, with a significant overlap (339 common sequences between both databases), while the NCBI and MEROPS databases together provided additional non-redundant SH protein sequences that were not found (or missed while searching) in the FLYBASE or HMMER databases (**Figure 2A**, **Supplementary Table 1**). Together, we identified and collated 354 non-redundant SHs in *Drosophila melanogaster*, and manually

curated them to ensure that they possessed the conserved catalytic serine residue and/or the catalytic triad (**Supplementary Table 1**). Our bioinformatics analysis thus shows that the SH enzyme family in *Drosophila melanogaster* comprises of ~ 2.5 % of the total proteome (354 gene coded serine hydrolase enzymes from a total of 13968 gene coded proteins in *Drosophila melanogaster*).



**Figure 2. Bioinformatics analysis in building a SH database for *Drosophila melanogaster***. (**A**) Venn diagram representing the number of unique SHs identified and the extent of their redundancies from 4 publicly available databases. (**B**) Categorization of the SHs into '*Serine Proteases*' and '*Metabolic Serine Hydrolases*' along with an analysis of known functions within these categories. (**C**) List of known functions and/or clans with the '*Serine Proteases*' and '*Metabolic Serine Hydrolases*' categories.

Consistent with previous classifications[1, 4], we decided to broadly categorize members of this superfamily as: (i) serine proteases, and (ii) metabolic SHs. Using the inbuilt multiple protein alignment algorithms in HMMER database, and correlating them to known enzyme activities reported in the FLYBASE and Uniprot databases, we found that 210 protein sequences could be categorized as serine proteases, while 144 protein sequences were classified as metabolic SHs (**Figure 2B, Supplementary Table 1**). Upon manually searching these protein sequences for known functions in Uniprot, we found that only small number of the serine proteases (30 members), and metabolic SHs (26 members) had been experimentally validated, with functions and/or associations to established biological activities (**Figure 2B, Supplementary Table 1**). Our analysis further showed that approximately 84% members of the SH superfamily (86% of serine proteases, and 82% of metabolic SHs) remain uncharacterized in flies (**Figure 2B**).

Finally, in an attempt to broadly understand the extent of putative enzymatic activities within the two categories of this superfamily in *Drosophila melanogaster*, we surveyed these 354 protein sequences across the FLYBASE and MEROPS databases in search of possible clans or sub-families. Based on predicted molecular functions for the protein sequences from all the databases, we further sub-classified the 210 serine proteases as putative clip proteases (33 members), trypsin/chymotrypsin like proteases (159 members), rhomboid proteases (5 members), and subtilisin-like proteases (6 members) (**Figure 2C, Supplementary Table 1**). We found that 7 serine proteases could not classified as any of the above, and hence were classified as other proteases within this category (**Figure 2C, Supplementary Table 1**). A similar analysis for the metabolic SH category revealed a greater diversity in putative activities and a more even spread across its members (**Figure 2C, Table S1**). Here, we sub-classified the 144 metabolic SH enzymes as carboxylesterase-like (31 members), neutral or sterol lipase (32 members)[55], phospholipases (34 members)[55], acyltransferases (10 members) and peptidases (18 members) (**Figure 2C, Supplementary Table 1**). Like the serine proteases, we found that 19 members of the metabolic SH

category did not have enough sequence homology to the sub-category members listed above, and were therefore grouped together as "Others/Unknown" members (**Figure 2C, Supplementary Table 1**).

**Identification of SH activities during different developmental stages in *Drosophila melanogaster*.**

Having finalized an updated database of SHs in *Drosophila melanogaster*, we next assessed the superfamily wide activity status of its different members, and chose to profile these in the four major stages of the *Drosophila* life cycle, i.e. embryo, larva, pupa and adult. For the adult life form, we decided to separately profile male and female flies, to determine whether SHs displayed any sexual dimorphism in their enzymatic activities (described in a later section). Using established protocols[47, 48], we fractionated the different fly life forms into soluble and membrane proteomes, and performed a gel-based ABPP analysis on them to confirm activity-based labeling of SHs using the FP-rhodamine probe (2 $\mu$M, 50 $\mu$g proteome in 50 $\mu$l, 45 mins, 37 $^{\circ}$C, with constant shaking). For this gel-based ABPP experiment, we heat denatured the respective proteomes, to inactivate SH activities, and used them as controls for this assay. Consistent with similar studies using FP probes from other systems, we found that both the soluble and membrane proteomes from the different stages (embryo, larva, pupa and adult) displayed activity-dependent labeling of SHs, as evident in the active lysates, but not in the denatured lysates (**Figure 3A**). We confirmed the equal loading of respective lysates by Coomassie Blue staining of the gel (**Supplementary Figure 1**). Not surprisingly, we found distinct activity patterns for the soluble and membrane proteomes, suggesting that different SHs are active during different stages of development in *Drosophila* (**Figure 3A**).

Having shown activity dependent labeling by the gel-based ABPP, next, we wanted to enrich and identify the various SHs that were active during the various stages of fly development.

Towards this, we performed LC-MS/MS based ABPP experiments on the soluble and membrane proteomes from the different developmental stages using the FP-biotin probe. Here, using an established protocol[48], active SHs from proteomes (soluble or membrane) were labeled using the FP-biotin probe (200 $\mu$M, 1 mg proteome in 1 mL, 60 mins, 37 °C, with constant shaking), enriched by avidin-bead based chromatography and digested on bead using trypsin to yield peptides, that were desalted and subjected to LC-MS/MS to identify active SHs. From this LC-MS/MS based ABPP experiment, we identified a total of 89 SH enzymes, of which 35 were serine proteases (**Figure 3B, Supplementary Table 2**), while 54 were metabolic SHs (**Figure 3C, Supplementary Table 2**). Consistent with previous reports from mammalian systems showing FP-probes being better suited at enriching metabolic SHs[1, 2], we found that, of the total SHs enriched and identified (25.1%, 89 out of 354) using the FP-biotin probe in *Drosophila melanogaster*, there were substantially more metabolic SHs (37.5%, 54 out of 144) (**Figure 3C**) than serine proteases (16.7%, 35 out of 210) (**Figure 3B**). Concomitant with the gel-based ABPP experiments, the LC-MS/MS based ABPP experiments also identified differential SH activity profiles, and showed that certain SHs were exclusively present in only one developmental stage, pointing to a critical and possibly indispensable role for that enzyme in that development stage in flies (**Figure 3B, 3C**).

**Figure 3. ABPP analysis on lysates from different stages of fly development**. (**A**) Gel-based ABPP analysis on soluble and membrane proteomes from different developmental stages of *Drosophila* labeled with the SH-directed FP-rhodamine probe, and analyzed by SDS-PAGE analysis and in-gel fluorescence scanning. This gel-based ABPP experiment clearly shows that active (A), but not denatured (D) proteomes, have distinct SH activity profiles during different stages of *Drosophila* development. This gel-based ABPP experiment was done thrice with reproducible results each time. (**B, C**) Heat map plots for (**B**) *Serine Proteases*, and (**C**) *Metabolic Serine Hydrolases*, showing SH activity signals identified from a LC-MS/MS based ABPP experiment using the SH-directed FP-biotin probe during various stages of *Drosophila* development. Data in the heat maps are represented as average peptide counts from three independent biological replicates, and peptide counts above 10 & 100 for the serine proteases and metabolic SHs respectively are colored red.

**Anatomical profiling of SH activities in adult *Drosophila melanogaster*.**

Having identified unique active SHs during the different developmental stages in *Drosophila melanogaster*, next, we wanted to increase their superfamily wide coverage. Toward this, we decided to isolate different tissues and/or anatomical components in an adult fly (male and female done separately), and perform tandem ABPP experiments to enrich and identify additional active SHs. Here, we isolated the head, gut, reproductive organs (testis for males, and ovaries for females), hemolymph, and the remaining carcass from adult male and female flies separately for this chemoproteomics analysis. Since some tissues (reproductive organs, hemolymph, and the carcass) were difficult to get in sufficient amounts from adult flies, we decided to profile them as whole tissue lysates, while, more abundantly available tissues (head and gut) were fractionated into soluble and membrane proteomes. First, leveraging established gel-based ABPP protocols[47, 48], using the FP-rhodamine probe (2 $\mu$M, 50 $\mu$g proteome in 50 $\mu$l, 45 mins, 37 °C, with constant shaking), we found that all the tissues showed activity-dependent labeling of SHs in the active lysates, but not in the corresponding denatured controls (**Figure 4**). We confirmed equal loading of respective corresponding active and denatured lysates by Coomassie Blue staining of the gel after in-gel fluorescence imaging for SH activity (**Supplementary Figure 2**). Analogous to results from the developmental stages, not surprisingly again, we found distinct activity profiles for SHs in the different tissues and/or anatomical components, suggesting that specific SHs have distinct spatiotemporal expression and are functionally active in different tissues of flies (**Figure 4**).

Having confirmed efficient activity-dependent labeling of SHs by a FP-probe in adult fly tissue lysates by gel-based ABPP experiments, next, we wanted to identify the SHs that were active in the aforementioned tissues using LC-MS/MS based ABPP. Here, using an established protocol[48], with the FP-biotin probe (200 $\mu$M, 1 mg proteome in 1 mL, 60 mins, 37 °C, with constant shaking), we enriched SHs, and identified them by LC-MS/MS. From this LC-MS/MS based ABPP experiment, we identified 118 unique SHs, of which 50 and 68

belonged to serine proteases and metabolic SHs categories respectively (**Figure 5, Supplementary Table 2**). Consistent with the gel-based ABPP experiments (**Figure 4**), we found several SHs were uniquely enriched in certain tissues in adult flies, and possibly suggests an important role for these SHs in regulating this tissue's physiology. Not surprisingly, we found that a large fraction of active SHs were present in the adult fly gut, consistent with the role of this organ in digestion of food, and its metabolism.



**Figure 4. Gel-based ABPP analysis on fly tissue lysates**. A panel of *Drosophila melanogaster* tissue and/or anatomical component proteomes labeled with the SH-directed FP-rhodamine probe and analyzed by SDS-PAGE and in-gel fluorescence scanning. This gel-based ABPP experiment clearly shows that active (A), but not denatured (D) lysates, have distinct SH activity profiles in different *Drosophila* tissues and/or anatomical components. This gel-based ABPP experiment was done thrice with reproducible results each time.

**Figure 5. Determining the full complement of active SHs in adult flies**. Heat map plots for the 'Serine Proteases', and 'Metabolic Serine Hydrolases', showing SH activity signals identified from a LC-MS/MS based ABPP experiment using the SH-directed FP-biotin probe from various tissues and/or anatomical components from adult male and female flies. Data in the heat maps are represented as average peptide counts from three independent biological replicates, and peptide counts above 40 & 100 for the serine proteases and metabolic SHs respectively are colored red. For the head and gut analysis, S = soluble proteomic fraction, M = membrane proteomic fraction.

Of note, this LC-MS/MS based ABPP experiment led to a significant increase in the overall number of non-redundant active SHs identified in adult flies. Specifically, we identified an additional 40 and 34 serine proteases and metabolic SHs respectively (**Figure 5**), from this anatomical profiling in adult flies, relative to previous whole adult fly profiling (**Figure 3**), which had identified only 10 and 35 serine proteases and metabolic SHs respectively. Next, upon collating all the data from LC-MS/MS based ABPP experiments in total, we have now identified 136 non-redundant active SHs in flies, thus reaching a coverage of 38.4% (136 out of 354) for the SH superfamily with a single FP-biotin probe (**Figure 6**). Further, we find that amongst the total non-redundant active SHs identified, 61 are serine proteases (29%, 61 out of 210 total serine proteases), while 75 are metabolic SHs (52%, 75 out of 144 total

metabolic SHs) (**Figure 6, Supplementary Table 2**). Interestingly, our chemoproteomics profiling data further shows that only a small portion of SHs (11 out of 61 serine proteases, and 6 out of 75 metabolic SHs) are actually exclusively present in early developmental stages (embryo or larva or pupa) in flies, relative to those found exclusively found in adults (30 out of 61 serine proteases, and 26 out of 75 metabolic SHs) (**Figure 6, Supplementary Table 2**). Not surprisingly, several of the identified SHs were present in at least 1 early developmental stage (embryo or larva or pupa) and also in adult flies (20 out of 61 serine proteases, and 43 out of 75 metabolic SHs) (**Figure 6, Supplementary Table 2**).



**Figure 6. Mapping SH activities during fly development**. A Venn diagram analysis showing the complete distribution of the full complement of active SHs identified by us using a LC-MS/MS based ABPP approach, during various life stages of *Drosophila* development.

**Sexual dimorphism of SH activities in adult *Drosophila melanogaster*.**

Having mapped the full complement of active SHs in flies, as a proof of concept of the utility of such a superfamily-wide activity atlas, next, we wanted to assess whether there exists any sexual dimorphism in SH activities in the different tissues and/or anatomical components in adult flies. To collate a list of such SHs, we looked at tissues and/or anatomical components (head, gut, carcass and hemolymph) other than the reproductive organs, and filtered those SHs that were present only in adult males or females, and had average peptide counts $\geq 2$ from 3 biological replicates. Additionally, we also looked for SHs in these same tissues that

had average peptide counts $\geq 2$ from 3 biological replicates, and were enriched $\geq 5$-fold in one gender over the other. Based on this criteria for selection, we found 16 serine proteases, and 19 metabolic SHs, in adult flies that displayed sexual dimorphism in their activities (**Table 1**). Not surprisingly, a large fraction of the differentially active SHs identified, were found in the gut, given this organ's role in metabolism and digestion (**Table 1**). Interestingly, a significant majority of the identified serine proteases (11 out of 16), and metabolic SHs (16 out of 19) were present in adult male flies (**Table 1**). Amongst the metabolic SHs, the enrichment of Yp1, Yp2 and Yp3 in females was expected, as these SHs are needed for necessary for egg formation. However, the enrichment of all other metabolic SHs displaying sexual dimorphism in activities in males was surprising, and raises intriguing new possibilities of hormonal regulation of enzymatic activities in flies, as most of these metabolic SHs lack proper functional annotation experimentally, despite having predicted molecular functions (**Table 1**).

**Table 1**. List of SHs showing sexual dimorphism in activities in adult fly.

| Gene ID | Predicted Molecular Function | Gender | Tissue(s) |
|---------|------------------------------|--------|-----------|
| **Serine Proteases** | | | |
| CG10469 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Female | Gut |
| Send1 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Female | Gut |
| CG4053 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Female | Gut |
| Jon65Aiii | Serine-type endopeptidase | Female | Gut |
| HtrA2 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Female | Head |
| CG17477 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Gut |
| CG8952 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Gut |
| Jon99Ci | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Gut |
| etaTry | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Gut |
| CG18179 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Gut |
| Jon25Biii | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Gut |
| CG10477 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Gut |
| Jon25Bii | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Gut |
| Jon25Bi | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Gut |
| Ser7 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Head |
| CG11037 | Serine-type endopeptidase | Male | Hemolymph |
| **Metabolic SHs** | | | |
| Yp1 | Carboxylic ester hydrolase | Female | Hemolymph |
| Yp2 | Carboxylic ester hydrolase | Female | Hemolymph |
| Yp3 | Carboxylic ester hydrolase | Female | Hemolymph |
| CG31872 | Sterol esterase | Male | Hemolymph, Gut |
| CG17097 | Sterol esterase | Male | Hemolymph, Gut |
| CG18258 | Carboxylic ester hydrolase | Male | Hemolymph, Gut |
| Est-Q | Unknown hydrolase | Male | Hemolymph |
| FASN2 | Fatty acid synthesis | Male | Gut |
| CG3739 | Serine-type peptidase | Male | Gut |
| CG5707 | Unknown hydrolase | Male | Gut |
| Alpha-Est10 | Carboxylic ester hydrolase | Male | Gut |
| Gas | Unknown hydrolase | Male | Gut |
| CG11608 | Triglyceride lipase | Male | Gut |
| CG18301 | Triglyceride lipase | Male | Gut |
| CG6295 | Phospholipase | Male | Gut |
| Ppt1 | Palmitoyl-(protein) hydrolase | Male | Gut |
| CG18858 | O-acyltransferase | Male | Gut, Carcass |
| MESK2 | Unknown hydrolase | Male | Head |
| CG1309 | Phospholipase | Male | Head |

**DISCUSSION**

From its early beginnings as a model organism for genetics in the Columbia 'Fly room' in 1910, *Drosophila* continues to be a powerful experimental tool in the fields of genetics, cell biology, developmental biology, neurobiology, and evolutionary biology[19-23]. Many fundamental discoveries have been based on work done in *Drosophila*, and this has led to six Nobel prizes, in diverse fields of biology. It's continued popularity is a consequence of the sustained upgradation of its genetic toolkit, with quantum improvements seen every decade. Increasingly, the fly model is seen as a translational tool towards improving human health, with a focus on understanding human genetic diseases[19-23]. Chemoproteomics has proved to be an invaluable and powerful tool in assigning functions to proteins[56, 57], particularly enzymes, in the post-genomic era, and yet, to the best of our knowledge, there are no reports describing its utility in *Drosophila melanogaster*, despite fly being such a popular biological model. The functional proteomics strategy, also popularly called ABPP, developed initially by Cravatt and co-workers, has been extensively used to study the SH superfamily[5-9]. SHs are known to function as metabolic lynchpins, regulate several physiologically important processes, and their deregulation is often associated with detrimental effects in in all forms of life[1]. However, despite their biological importance, the SH superfamily remains poorly explored in flies (**Figure 7**).

To address this problem, using bioinformatics, we first collated a list all the known non-redundant SHs in *Drosophila melanogaster* from various publicly available databases, and found that flies genetically encodes 354 of them (**Figure 2, Supplementary Table 1**). Consistent with previous categorizations, we classified these 354 non-redundant SHs based on sequence homology to known molecular functions into serine proteases and metabolic SHs, and found that the two categories contained 210 and 144 members respectively, of which a fair majority lacked known physiological function **Figure 2, Supplementary Table 1**). Next, leveraging gel-based and LC-MS/MS based ABPP approaches, we profiled and identified active SHs in various developmental stages in flies (**Figure 3, Supplementary**

**Table 2**) and in different tissues and/or anatomical components in adult male and female flies (**Figure 4-5, Supplementary Table 1**) in an attempt to develop an activity atlas for SHs in *Drosophila melanogaster*. From this ABPP study, we found a total of 136 non-redundant active SHs with a superfamily wide coverage of 38.4%, of which 61 were serine proteases (29% coverage for this category), while 75 belonged to the metabolic SH category (52% coverage for this category) (**Figure 7**). Further, we found that, several of identified SHs were present exclusively in the adult life form, and perhaps suggest an important (and perhaps conserved) role for these enzymes adult metabolism (**Figure 6, Supplementary Table 2**). During the course of our ABPP studies of the adult life form, we purposefully decided to profile males and females separately. Interestingly, we found in adult flies that several SHs display sexual dimorphism in their activities, and most of them have unknown physiological and/or molecular functions (**Table 1**). Overall, our studies reported here, to the best of knowledge, describe the first ABPP enabled superfamily wide activity atlas for any enzyme family in *Drosophila melanogaster*.



**Figure 7. A chemoproteomic atlas of SH activities in *Drosophila melanogaster*.** A dendrogram analysis of all the predicted serine proteases and metabolic SHs in *Drosophila melanogaster*, in which, the red and black coloring represents enzymes that were enriched and not enriched respectively in the LC-MS/MS based ABPP experiments using the SH-directed FP-biotin probe. All protein sequences of the respective category (serine proteases and metabolic SHs) were aligned using the MUSCLE program of the MEGA-X software by the neighbor joining method, where the branch length denotes relatedness between protein sequences.

Moving ahead, we anticipate that this study will lead to chemoproteomics being more extensively used in fly models, and more ABPP enabled superfamily-wide activity atlas' for different well studied enzyme families in *Drosophila melanogaster* will emerge, towards understanding endogenous function of unannotated enzymes, and uncovering of new biological pathways. Here, we show that a large fraction of the SH superfamily, particularly metabolic SHs, lack defined and/or experimentally validated physiological functions, but are amenable to labeling/enrichment using FP-probes. Therefore, following up on this study, assigning the endogenous function to such SHs, and mapping the biological pathways they regulate in flies, should now be more tractable using the rich array of established pharmacological tools and chemical genetic screening methods used for members of this superfamily in other organisms[15, 58]. Next, we also report several candidate SHs that show sexual dimorphism in their activity in adult flies, and characterizing the basis of this differential activity, will certainly provide new biological insights and advanced our understanding of hormonal regulation of enzymatic activities. Further, we acknowledge that a large portion of the SHs (> 60%) are still not covered using the FP-probes and the ABPP approaches we describe here. We attribute this to two major factors: (i) we profiled adult male and female flies between 5 – 10 days of age, under normal conditions and environment, and we posit that several SHs display age and/or context (e.g. exposure to infection, inflammatory stimuli, stress etc.) dependent expression and in turn activity; and (ii) Previous reports from mammalian systems have shown that several SHs (particularly serine proteases) don't react with FP-probes[15, 58], and therefore tailored activity probes (e.g. HT01, WHP01)[59, 60] for such SHs may need to be developed to increase the chemoproteomic coverage of members of this family. Lastly, as more ABPP profiling studies in flies with FP-probes emerge, it will be interesting to also determine whether non-SH enzymes (e.g. threonine hydrolases like AIG1 and ADTRP)[61] are also active and FP reactive, and if such enzyme classes indeed exist in flies.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The rapid progress in genome sequencing technologies have made a large number of protein sequences available for numerous organisms, and assigning function to these proteins represents a major challenge for researchers in the post-genomic era[62]. Over the past decade, the chemoproteomics technique ABPP has emerged as a powerful and popular tool in bridging this knowledge gap, and has greatly facilitated the functional annotation of enzymes from diverse enzyme families[6, 7]. The SHs catalyze a large number of physiologically important hydrolysis reactions, and this superfamily remains the most investigated enzyme class using ABPP[5-9]. While ABPP aided superfamily-wide activity atlas' are available for SHs in various organisms, both ABPP and the SH superfamily remain largely unexplored in the fly model, *Drosophila melanogaster*. Here, using gel-based and LC-MS/MS based ABPP, we build an activity atlas map of SHs in flies, and report the activity profiles of enzymes from this superfamily during various developmental stages and in different adult tissues. Our studies also suggest sexual dimorphism in SH activities, and the resource we provide here, will greatly facilitate the use of ABPP, and aid functional annotation of hitherto unknown SHs in various fly models.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The Supporting Information is available free of charge at xxxxx.

Supplemental Figures 1 & 2 (PDF)

Supplementary Tables 1 & 2 (xlsx)

All the proteomics data are available via ProteomeXchange with identifier PXD024321.

## ACCESSION CODES

The NCBI accession IDs for all the SH enzymes in *Drosophila melanogaster* can be found in Supplementary Table 1.

## NOTES

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

**AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

K.K. performed all the experiments. A.M. synthesized all compounds. K.K., G.R., and S.S.K. analysed all the data. G.R. and S.S.K. conceived and supervised the project, and acquired funding. S.S.K. wrote the paper with inputs from all authors.

**REFERENCES**

[1] Long, J. Z., and Cravatt, B. F. (2011) The metabolic serine hydrolases and their functions in mammalian physiology and disease, *Chem Rev 111*, 6022-6063.

[2] Simon, G. M., and Cravatt, B. F. (2010) Activity-based proteomics of enzyme superfamilies: serine hydrolases as a case study, *J Biol Chem. 285*, 11051-11055.

[3] Dodson, G., and Wlodawer, A. (1998) Catalytic triads and their relatives, *Trends Biochem Sci 23*, 347-352.

[4] Carter, P., and Wells, J. A. (1988) Dissecting the catalytic triad of a serine protease, *Nature 332*, 564-568.

[5] Liu, Y., Patricelli, M. P., and Cravatt, B. F. (1999) Activity-based protein profiling: the serine hydrolases, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 96*, 14694-14699.

[6] Cravatt, B. F., Wright, A. T., and Kozarich, J. W. (2008) Activity-based protein profiling: from enzyme chemistry to proteomic chemistry, *Annu Rev Biochem 77*, 383-414.

[7] Niphakis, M. J., and Cravatt, B. F. (2014) Enzyme inhibitor discovery by activity-based protein profiling, *Annu Rev Biochem 83*, 341-377.

[8] Jessani, N., Young, J. A., Diaz, S. L., Patricelli, M. P., Varki, A., and Cravatt, B. F. (2005) Class assignment of sequence-unrelated members of enzyme superfamilies by activity-based protein profiling, *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl 44*, 2400-2403.

[9] Jessani, N., and Cravatt, B. F. (2004) The development and application of methods for activity-based protein profiling, *Curr Opin Chem Biol 8*, 54-59.

[10] Jessani, N., Niessen, S., Wei, B. Q., Nicolau, M., Humphrey, M., Ji, Y., Han, W., Noh, D. Y., Yates, J. R., 3rd, Jeffrey, S. S., and Cravatt, B. F. (2005) A streamlined platform for high-content functional proteomics of primary human specimens, *Nat Methods 2*, 691-697.

[11] Nomura, D. K., Dix, M. M., and Cravatt, B. F. (2010) Activity-based protein profiling for biochemical pathway discovery in cancer, *Nat Rev Cancer 10*, 630-638.

[12] Jessani, N., Humphrey, M., McDonald, W. H., Niessen, S., Masuda, K., Gangadharan, B., Yates, J. R., 3rd, Mueller, B. M., and Cravatt, B. F. (2004) Carcinoma and stromal

enzyme activity profiles associated with breast tumor growth in vivo, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 101*, 13756-13761.

[13] Jessani, N., Liu, Y., Humphrey, M., and Cravatt, B. F. (2002) Enzyme activity profiles of the secreted and membrane proteome that depict cancer cell invasiveness, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 99*, 10335-10340.

[14] Keller, L. J., Lentz, C. S., Chen, Y. E., Metivier, R. J., Weerapana, E., Fischbach, M. A., and Bogyo, M. (2020) Characterization of Serine Hydrolases Across Clinical Isolates of Commensal Skin Bacteria Staphylococcus epidermidis Using Activity-Based Protein Profiling, *ACS Infect Dis 6*, 930-938.

[15] Bachovchin, D. A., Ji, T., Li, W., Simon, G. M., Blankman, J. L., Adibekian, A., Hoover, H., Niessen, S., and Cravatt, B. F. (2010) Superfamily-wide portrait of serine hydrolase inhibition achieved by library-versus-library screening, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 107*, 20941-20946.

[16] Chen, A. L., Lum, K. M., Lara-Gonzalez, P., Ogasawara, D., Cognetta, A. B., 3rd, To, A., Parsons, W. H., Simon, G. M., Desai, A., Petrascheck, M., Bar-Peled, L., and Cravatt, B. F. (2019) Pharmacological convergence reveals a lipid pathway that regulates C. elegans lifespan, *Nat Chem Biol 15*, 453-462.

[17] Yoo, E., Schulze, C. J., Stokes, B. H., Onguka, O., Yeo, T., Mok, S., Gnadig, N. F., Zhou, Y., Kurita, K., Foe, I. T., Terrell, S. M., Boucher, M. J., Cieplak, P., Kumpornsin, K., Lee, M. C. S., Linington, R. G., Long, J. Z., Uhlemann, A. C., Weerapana, E., Fidock, D. A., and Bogyo, M. (2020) The Antimalarial Natural Product Salinipostin A Identifies Essential alpha/beta Serine Hydrolases Involved in Lipid Metabolism in P. falciparum Parasites, *Cell Chem Biol 27*, 143-157 e145.

[18] Lentz, C. S., Sheldon, J. R., Crawford, L. A., Cooper, R., Garland, M., Amieva, M. R., Weerapana, E., Skaar, E. P., and Bogyo, M. (2018) Identification of a S. aureus virulence factor by activity-based protein profiling (ABPP), *Nat Chem Biol 14*, 609-617.

[19] Hales, K. G., Korey, C. A., Larracuente, A. M., and Roberts, D. M. (2015) Genetics on the Fly: A Primer on the Drosophila Model System, *Genetics 201*, 815-842.

[20] Rajan, A., and Perrimon, N. (2013) Of flies and men: insights on organismal metabolism from fruit flies, *Bmc Biol 11*.

[21] Jennings, B. H. (2011) Drosophila - a versatile model in biology & medicine, *Mater Today 14*, 190-195.

[22] Bier, E. (2005) Drosophila, the golden bug, emerges as a tool for human genetics, *Nat Rev Genet 6*, 9-23.

[23] Bilder, D., and Irvine, K. D. (2017) Taking Stock of the Drosophila Research Ecosystem, *Genetics 206*, 1227-1236.

[24] Cao, X. L., and Jiang, H. B. (2018) Building a platform for predicting functions of serine protease-related proteins in Drosophila melanogaster and other insects, *Insect Biochem Molec 103*, 53-69.

[25] Levashina, E. A., Langley, E., Green, C., Gubb, D., Ashburner, M., Hoffmann, J. A., and Reichhart, J. M. (1999) Constitutive activation of toll-mediated antifungal defense in serpin-deficient Drosophila, *Science 285*, 1917-1919.

[26] Cho, Y. S., Stevens, L. M., Sieverman, K. J., Nguyen, J., and Stein, D. (2012) A Ventrally Localized Protease in the Drosophila Egg Controls Embryo Dorsoventral Polarity, *Current Biology 22*, 1013-1018.

[27] Misra, S., Hecht, P., Maeda, R., and Anderson, K. V. (1998) Positive and negative regulation of Easter, a member of the serine protease family that controls dorsal-ventral patterning in the Drosophila embryo, *Development 125*, 1261-1267.

[28] Morisato, D., and Anderson, K. V. (1995) Signaling pathways that establish the dorsal-ventral pattern of the Drosophila embryo, *Annu Rev Genet 29*, 371-399.

[29] Larkin, A., Marygold, S. J., Antonazzo, G., Attrill, H., Dos Santos, G., Garapati, P. V., Goodman, J. L., Gramates, L. S., Millburn, G., Strelets, V. B., Tabone, C. J., Thurmond, J., and FlyBase, C. (2021) FlyBase: updates to the Drosophila melanogaster knowledge base, *Nucleic Acids Res 49*, D899-D907.

[30] Thurmond, J., Goodman, J. L., Strelets, V. B., Attrill, H., Gramates, L. S., Marygold, S. J., Matthews, B. B., Millburn, G., Antonazzo, G., Trovisco, V., Kaufman, T. C., Calvi, B. R., and FlyBase, C. (2019) FlyBase 2.0: the next generation, *Nucleic Acids Res 47*, D759-D765.

[31] Rey, A. J., Attrill, H., Marygold, S. J., and FlyBase, C. (2018) Using FlyBase to Find Functionally Related Drosophila Genes, *Methods Mol Biol 1757*, 493-512.

[32] Marygold, S. J., Crosby, M. A., Goodman, J. L., and FlyBase, C. (2016) Using FlyBase, a Database of Drosophila Genes and Genomes, *Methods Mol Biol 1478*, 1-31.

[33] Marygold, S. J., Leyland, P. C., Seal, R. L., Goodman, J. L., Thurmond, J., Strelets, V. B., and Wilson, R. J. (2013) FlyBase: improvements to the bibliography, *Nucleic Acids Res 41*, D751-757.

[34] Gelbart, W. M., Crosby, M., Matthews, B., Rindone, W. P., Chillemi, J., Russo Twombly, S., Emmert, D., Ashburner, M., Drysdale, R. A., Whitfield, E., Millburn, G. H., de Grey, A., Kaufman, T., Matthews, K., Gilbert, D., Strelets, V., and Tolstoshev, C. (1997) FlyBase: a Drosophila database. The FlyBase consortium, *Nucleic Acids Res 25*, 63-66.

[35] Ashburner, M., and Drysdale, R. (1994) FlyBase--the Drosophila genetic database, *Development 120*, 2077-2079.

[36] Rawlings, N. D., and Bateman, A. (2021) How to use the MEROPS database and website to help understand peptidase specificity, *Protein Sci 30*, 83-92.

[37] Rawlings, N. D., Barrett, A. J., Thomas, P. D., Huang, X., Bateman, A., and Finn, R. D. (2018) The MEROPS database of proteolytic enzymes, their substrates and inhibitors in 2017 and a comparison with peptidases in the PANTHER database, *Nucleic Acids Res 46*, D624-D632.

[38] Rawlings, N. D., and Barrett, A. J. (2000) MEROPS: the peptidase database, *Nucleic Acids Res 28*, 323-325.

[39] Rawlings, N. D., and Barrett, A. J. (1999) MEROPS: the peptidase database, *Nucleic Acids Res 27*, 325-331.

[40] Potter, S. C., Luciani, A., Eddy, S. R., Park, Y., Lopez, R., and Finn, R. D. (2018) HMMER web server: 2018 update, *Nucleic Acids Res 46*, W200-W204.

[41] Prakash, A., Jeffryes, M., Bateman, A., and Finn, R. D. (2017) The HMMER Web Server for Protein Sequence Similarity Search, *Curr Protoc Bioinformatics 60*, 3 15 11-13 15 23.

[42] Finn, R. D., Clements, J., and Eddy, S. R. (2011) HMMER web server: interactive sequence similarity searching, *Nucleic Acids Res 39*, W29-37.

[43] Edgar, R. C. (2004) MUSCLE: a multiple sequence alignment method with reduced time and space complexity, *BMC Bioinformatics 5*, 113.

[44] Edgar, R. C. (2004) MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput, *Nucleic Acids Res 32*, 1792-1797.

[45] Saitou, N., and Nei, M. (1987) The Neighbor-Joining Method - a New Method for Reconstructing Phylogenetic Trees, *Mol Biol Evol 4*, 406-425.

[46] Tamura, K., Nei, M., and Kumar, S. (2004) Prospects for inferring very large phylogenies by using the neighbor-joining method, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 101*, 11030-11035.

[47] Rajendran, A., Vaidya, K., Mendoza, J., Bridwell-Rabb, J., and Kamat, S. S. (2020) Functional Annotation of ABHD14B, an Orphan Serine Hydrolase Enzyme, *Biochemistry 59*, 183-196.

[48] Kelkar, D. S., Ravikumar, G., Mehendale, N., Singh, S., Joshi, A., Sharma, A. K., Mhetre, A., Rajendran, A., Chakrapani, H., and Kamat, S. S. (2019) A chemical-genetic screen identifies ABHD12 as an oxidized-phosphatidylserine lipase, *Nat Chem Biol 15*, 169-178.

[49] Joshi, A., Shaikh, M., Singh, S., Rajendran, A., Mhetre, A., and Kamat, S. S. (2018) Biochemical characterization of the PHARC-associated serine hydrolase ABHD12 reveals its preference for very-long-chain lipids, *Journal of Biological Chemistry 293*, 16953-16963.

[50] Kulkarni, A., Soni, I., Kelkar, D. S., Dharmaraja, A. T., Sankar, R. K., Beniwal, G., Rajendran, A., Tamhankar, S., Chopra, S., Kamat, S. S., and Chakrapani, H. (2019) Chemoproteomics of an Indole-Based Quinone Epoxide Identifies Druggable Vulnerabilities in Vancomycin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus, *J Med Chem 62*, 6785-6795.

[51] Rappsilber, J., Mann, M., and Ishihama, Y. (2007) Protocol for micro-purification, enrichment, pre-fractionation and storage of peptides for proteomics using StageTips, *Nature protocols 2*, 1896-1906.

[52] Jagtap, P., Bandhakavi, S., Higgins, L., McGowan, T., Sa, R., Stone, M. D., Chilton, J., Arriaga, E. A., Seymour, S. L., and Griffin, T. J. (2012) Workflow for analysis of high mass accuracy salivary data set using MaxQuant and ProteinPilot search algorithm, *Proteomics 12*, 1726-1730.

[53] Deutsch, E. W., Bandeira, N., Sharma, V., Perez-Riverol, Y., Carver, J. J., Kundu, D. J., Garcia-Seisdedos, D., Jarnuczak, A. F., Hewapathirana, S., Pullman, B. S., Wertz, J., Sun, Z., Kawano, S., Okuda, S., Watanabe, Y., Hermjakob, H., MacLean, B., MacCoss, M. J., Zhu, Y. P., Ishihama, Y., and Vizcaino, J. A. (2020) The ProteomeXchange consortium in 2020: enabling 'big data' approaches in proteomics, *Nucleic Acids Research 48*, D1145-D1152.

[54] Perez-Riverol, Y., Csordas, A., Bai, J., Bernal-Llinares, M., Hewapathirana, S., Kundu, D. J., Inuganti, A., Griss, J., Mayer, G., Eisenacher, M., Perez, E., Uszkoreit, J., Pfeuffer, J., Sachsenberg, T., Yilmaz, S., Tiwary, S., Cox, J., Audain, E., Walzer, M., Jarnuczak, A. F., Ternent, T., Brazma, A., and Vizcaino, J. A. (2019) The PRIDE database and related tools and resources in 2019: improving support for quantification data, *Nucleic Acids Res 47*, D442-D450.

[55] Horne, I., Haritos, V. S., and Oakeshott, J. G. (2009) Comparative and functional genomics of lipases in holometabolous insects, *Insect Biochem Molec 39*, 547-567.

[56] Saghatelian, A., and Cravatt, B. F. (2005) Assignment of protein function in the postgenomic era, *Nat Chem Biol 1*, 130-142.

[57] Saghatelian, A., and Cravatt, B. F. (2005) Global strategies to integrate the proteome and metabolome, *Curr Opin Chem Biol 9*, 62-68.

[58] Bachovchin, D. A., and Cravatt, B. F. (2012) The pharmacological landscape and therapeutic potential of the serine hydrolases, *Nat Rev Drug Discov 11*, 52-68.

[59] Kamat, S. S., Camara, K., Parsons, W. H., Chen, D. H., Dix, M. M., Bird, T. D., Howell, A. R., and Cravatt, B. F. (2015) Immunomodulatory lysophosphatidylserines are regulated by ABHD16A and ABHD12 interplay, *Nat Chem Biol 11*, 164-171.

[60] Hsu, K. L., Tsuboi, K., Adibekian, A., Pugh, H., Masuda, K., and Cravatt, B. F. (2012) DAGLbeta inhibition perturbs a lipid network involved in macrophage inflammatory responses, *Nat Chem Biol. 8*, 999-1007.

[61] Parsons, W. H., Kolar, M. J., Kamat, S. S., Cognetta, A. B., 3rd, Hulce, J. J., Saez, E., Kahn, B. B., Saghatelian, A., and Cravatt, B. F. (2016) AIG1 and ADTRP are atypical integral membrane hydrolases that degrade bioactive FAHFAs, *Nat Chem Biol 12*, 367-372.

[62] Gerlt, J. A., Allen, K. N., Almo, S. C., Armstrong, R. N., Babbitt, P. C., Cronan, J. E., Dunaway-Mariano, D., Imker, H. J., Jacobson, M. P., Minor, W., Poulter, C. D., Raushel, F. M., Sali, A., Shoichet, B. K., and Sweedler, J. V. (2011) The Enzyme Function Initiative, *Biochemistry 50*, 9950-9962.

# TABLE OF CONTENT GRAPHICS