Research article

How many sirtuin genes are out there? evolution of sirtuin genes in vertebrates with a description of a new family member*

Juan C. Opazo[1,2,3], Michael W. Vandewege[4], Federico G. Hoffmann[5,6], Kattina Zavala[2], Catalina Meléndez[7], Charlotte Luchsinger[8], Viviana A. Cavieres[7], Luis Vargas-Chacoff[1,9,10,11], Francisco J. Morera[1,12], Patricia V. Burgos[7,13,14], Cheril Tapia-Rojas[7,13], Gonzalo A. Mardones[1,8,15]

[1]Integrative Biology Group, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.
[2]Instituto de Ciencias Ambientales y Evolutivas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.
[3]Millennium Nucleus of Ion Channel-Associated Diseases (MiNICAD), Valdivia, Chile.
[4]College of Veterinary Medicine, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, 27607, USA
[5]Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, Entomology, and Plant Pathology, Mississippi State University, Starkville, Mississippi, USA.
[6]Institute for Genomics, Biocomputing and Biotechnology, Mississippi State University, Starkville, Mississippi, USA.
[7]Centro de Biología Celular y Biomedicina (CEBICEM), Facultad de Medicina y Ciencia, Universidad San Sebastián, Santiago, Chile.
[8]Department of Physiology, School of Medicine, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.
[9]Instituto de Ciencias Marinas y Limnológicas, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.
[10]Centro Fondap de Investigación de Altas Latitudes (IDEAL), Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.
[11]Millennium Institute Biodiversity of Antarctic and Subantarctic Ecosystems, BASE, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.
[12]Applied Biochemistry Laboratory, Facultad de Ciencias Veterinarias, Instituto de Farmacología y Morfofisiología, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.
[13]Centro Ciencia & Vida, Fundación Ciencia & Vida, Santiago, Chile.
[14]Centro de Envejecimiento y Regeneración (CARE-UC), Facultad de Ciencias Biológicas, Pontificia Universidad Católica, Santiago, Chile.
[15]Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of the Nervous System (CISNe), Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.

* This article is dedicated to the memory of Francisco Bozinovic and Andrés Rivera-Dictter

Corresponding authors:
Juan C. Opazo, jopazo@gmail.com
Gonzalo A. Mardones, gonzalo.mardones@uach.cl

Abstract

Studying the evolutionary history of gene families is a challenging and exciting task with a wide range of implications. In addition to exploring fundamental questions about the origin and evolution of genes, disentangling their evolution is also critical to those who do functional/structural studies to allow a deeper and more precise interpretation of their results in an evolutionary context. The sirtuin gene family is a group of genes that are involved in a variety of biological functions mostly related to aging. Their duplicative history is an open question, as well as the definition of the repertoire of sirtuin genes among vertebrates. Our results show a well-resolved phylogeny that represents an improvement in our understanding of the duplicative history of the sirtuin gene family. We identified a new sirtuin gene family member (*SIRT3.2*) that was apparently lost in the last common ancestor of amniotes but retained in all other groups of jawed vertebrates. According to our experimental analyses, elephant shark SIRT3.2 protein is located in mitochondria, the overexpression of which leads to an increase in cellular levels of ATP. Moreover, *in vitro* analysis demonstrated it has deacetylase activity being modulated in a similar way to mammalian SIRT3. Our results indicate that there are at least eight sirtuin paralogs among vertebrates and that all of them can be traced back to the last common ancestor of the group that existed between 676 and 615 millions of years ago.

Keywords: aging, deacetylase, gene family evolution, gene duplication, mitochondria, SIRT.

Introduction

The availability of whole-genome sequences in species of all main groups of vertebrates represents an opportunity to unravel the evolution of gene families. The number of genomes and their phylogenetic representativeness in the vertebrate tree of life allows performing robust inferences regarding how gene family members are related to each other and their modes of evolution (Nei and Rooney 2005). The available genomes also open an opportunity to discover new gene lineages that are not currently described maybe because they are not present in model species and/or to the absence of appropriate evolutionary analyses (Wichmann et al. 2016; Céspedes et al. 2017; Himmel et al. 2020). Gene copy number variation could be seen as a natural experiment (Albertson et al. 2009) that could help understand the evolutionary fate of duplicated genes, as individuals with different repertoires can, in principle, fulfill the biological functions with a different combination of paralogs (Gitelman 2007).

The sirtuin gene family, class III of histone deacetylase enzymes (HDACs), is a group of genes that in deuterostomes (the group that includes chordates, echinoderms, and hemichordates), is composed of seven paralogs (*SIRT1-7*) grouped into four classes (Fig. 1)(Frye 2000; Frye 2006). Sirtuin genes are involved in a variety of biological functions mostly related to aging, metabolic regulation, stress response, cell cycle among others (Fig. 1) (Michan and Sinclair 2007; Greiss and Gartner 2009; Haigis and Sinclair 2010; Zhao et al. 2019; Zhang et al. 2020). All sirtuin genes have a conserved catalytic domain and variable carboxy- and amino terminal domains. Sirtuins commonly possess NAD-dependent acyl-lysine deacylase activity (most commonly deacetylase activity), while some sirtuins may have, in addition to deacetylase activity, other enzymatic activities like ADP-ribosyltransferase, desuccinylase and demalonylase (Fig. 1). Further, they are located in different subcellular compartments and associated to different biological functions (Fig. 1).

The evolution of the sirtuin genes is an active area of investigation. There are multiple phylogenetic hypotheses describing evolutionary relationships among the orthologs and paralogs in the sirtuin gene family (Frye 2000; North and Verdin 2004; Frye 2006; Greiss and Gartner 2009; Pereira et al. 2011; Slade et al. 2011; Vassilopoulos et al. 2011; Costantini et al. 2013; Scholte et al. 2017; Simó-Mirabet et al. 2017; Yang et

al. 2017; Rajabi et al. 2018; Kabiljo et al. 2019; Zhao et al. 2019; Gold & Sinclair 2022).

Differences in the taxonomic sampling, number of orthologs and/or paralogs included,

and the inclusion of outgroups are likely contributors to this variation. Additionally, studies

that are focused on resolving evolutionary relationships are scarce, and in fact, most

phylogenetic analyses for sirtuin genes are part of studies where the sirtuin duplicative

history is a secondary goal. Additionally, and probably for similar reasons, there are no

systematic efforts to characterize the full complement of sirtuin genes among vertebrates.

Thus, unraveling the evolutionary history of sirtuin genes represents a challenging and

exciting task with a wide range of implications. Because of their role in the aging process,

these genes are of great interest. In addition to exploring fundamental questions about

the origin and evolution of sirtuin genes, disentangling their evolution is also critical to

understanding the diversification of functional and structural phenotypes present in the

sirtuin gene family.

This study aims to take advantage of the genomic data available in public

databases to advance our understanding of the diversity of vertebrate sirtuin genes and

to infer its duplicative history. We also aim to characterize the subcellular localization,

enzymatic activity, and mitochondrial activity of the *SIRT3.2* gene (a SIRT3-paralog gene)

in the elephant shark (*Callorhinchus milii*) as a representative species. Our phylogenetic

tree is in general well resolved, recovering vertebrate sirtuin genes into three clades: 1)

SIRT4, SIRT5, 2) SIRT6 and SIRT7, and 3) SIRT1, SIRT2, SIRT3, and SIRT3.2. The

sirtuin family member SIRT3.2 is found in jawed fish and amphibians, but is absent in

earlier branching deuterostomes (e.g. cephalochordates, urochordates, echinoderms and

hemichordates), is absent in cyclostomes (jawless fish), and is absent in amniotes (the

group that includes mammals, birds, and reptiles). Based on how sirtuin genes are related

to each other and the information which is already known for the other sirtuin family

members, particularly SIRT3, we can predict that SIRT3.2 belongs to the class I, has a

deacetylase activity, and is mainly located in mitochondria. Our experimental analyses

confirmed our evolutionary guided inferences.

Results and Discussion

Vertebrate sirtuin paralogs are recovered into three main clades

We recovered the monophyly of all sirtuin family members with strong support (Fig. 2). The diversity of sirtuin genes was arranged into three main clades (Fig. 2). The first clade contains the SIRT4 and SIRT5 paralogs, the second clade contains the SIRT6 and SIRT7 paralogs, and the third clade includes the SIRT1, SIRT2, SIRT3 and SIRT3.2 gene lineages (Fig. 2). A diversity of phylogenetic arrangements for sirtuin genes have been proposed in the past (Frye 2000; Frye 2006; Greiss and Gartner 2009; Slade et al. 2011; Vassilopoulos et al. 2011; Costantini et al. 2013; Scholte et al. 2017; Simó-Mirabet et al. 2017; Yang et al. 2017; Rajabi et al. 2018; Kabiljo et al. 2019; Zhao et al. 2019; Gold & Sinclair 2022), and our results largely support the relationships proposed by Frye (2006).

In the first clade we recovered the sister group relationships between SIRT4 and SIRT5 with strong support (Fig. 2). Evolutionary relationships between these two family members are still a matter of debate, as a variety of phylogenetic positions have been suggested for these paralogs (Slade et al. 2011; Vassilopoulos et al. 2011; Costantini et al. 2013; Yang et al. 2017; Rajabi et al. 2018; Gold & Sinclair 2022), and only in a fraction of the studies their sister group relationship is supported (Frye 2000; North and Verdin 2004; Frye 2006; Greiss and Gartner 2009; Hirschey 2011; Scholte et al. 2017; Simó-Mirabet et al. 2017; Kabiljo et al. 2019; Zhao et al. 2019). In the second clade, we recovered SIRT6 sister to the clade containing SIRT7 sequences with strong support (Fig. 2). The sister group relationship between SIRT6 and SIRT7 has been recovered in all examined studies (Frye 2000; North and Verdin 2004; Greiss and Gartner 2009; Hirschey 2011; Slade et al. 2011; Vassilopoulos et al. 2011; Costantini et al. 2013; Scholte et al. 2017; Simó-Mirabet et al. 2017; Yang et al. 2017; Rajabi et al. 2018; Kabiljo et al. 2019; Zhao et al. 2019; Gold & Sinclair 2022), suggesting there is robust support for the sister relationship between these sirtuin family members. In the third clade, there is a broad consensus in the literature that SIRT2 shares a common ancestor more recently in time with SIRT3 than with any other sirtuin paralog, and that the clade containing SIRT1 sequences is sister to the SIRT2/SIRT3 clade (Frye 2000; North and Verdin 2004; Frye 2006; Greiss and Gartner 2009; Hirschey 2011; Slade et al. 2011;

Vassilopoulos et al. 2011; Costantini et al. 2013; Scholte et al. 2017; Simó-Mirabet et al.

2017; Yang et al. 2017; Rajabi et al. 2018; Zhao et al. 2019). We recovered the same

evolutionary relationships with strong support (Fig. 2). The sister-group relationship

between the SIRT6/SIRT7 and SIRT2/SIRT3/SIRT3.2/SIRT1 received moderate support

(Fig. 2). The sister-group relationships among the three main sirtuin clades is something

that has been difficult to resolve (Simó-Mirabet et al. 2017; Zhao et al. 2019), as it

appears divergences were close in time, as evidence by the short length of the

corresponding branch (Fig. 2).

In summary, we present a phylogenetic analysis based on a taxonomic sampling that

included representative species from all main groups of vertebrates for all sirtuin family

members. Our phylogenetic tree is in general well resolved (Fig. 2), representing an

advance in our understanding of the duplicative history of the sirtuin gene family. In

comparison to the phylogenetic trees currently available in the literature only one study

shows the same topology as our study (Frye 2006).

Identification of a new sirtuin gene family member, *SIRT3.2*

In our analyses, we identified a new sirtuin family member (Fig. 2 and 3), *SIRT3.2*, which

is present in a fraction of the vertebrate tree of life (Fig. 4) that was recovered sister to

the *SIRT3* clade with strong support (Fig. 2 and 3). Synteny conservation provides further

support to the monophyly of the *SIRT3.2* gene lineage in gnathostomes (Fig. 5a), as

genes found at the 5` side (*POLR3B*, *RFX4* and *RIC8B*) and 3` side (*TMEM263*,

MTERF2, and *CRY1*) of the *SIRT3.2* gene are well conserved (Fig. 5a). Synteny is also

conserved in species in which the *SIRT3.2* gene was lost (Fig. 5a). Among vertebrates,

we found orthologs of the *SIRT3.2* gene in representative species of cartilaginous fish,

bony fish, coelacanth, lungfish and amphibians (Fig. 4). A comparison of the genomic

region of the tropical clawed frog (*Xenopus tropicalis*), which possesses the *SIRT3.2*

gene, with the corresponding region in the human (*Homo sapiens*), opossum

(*Monodelphis domestica*), chicken (*Gallus gallus*), gharial (*Gavialis gangeticus*), red-

eared slider (*Trachemys scripta*) and green anole (*Anolis carolinensis*) strongly suggests

that the *SIRT3.2* gene is not present in the vertebrate lineages that these species

represent (Fig. 5b). Interestingly, traces of the SIRT3.2 gene are present in the red-eared

slider (*Trachemys scripta*) genome (Fig. 5b). The absence of the *SIRT3.2* gene in mammals, birds and reptiles indicates that it was probably lost in the common ancestor of the group, between 352 and 312 millions of years ago (Kumar et al. 2017). In the case of cyclostomes, we found in the sea lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus*) a chromosomal region (Chr3) that possess *TMEM263* and *POLR3B* separated by 44 base pairs, suggesting that all the genes that should be in between (*RFX4*, *RIC8B*, *SIRT3.2*) were lost in cyclostomes. Alternatively, it is possible that *SIRT3.2*, and all the other genes are present in cyclostome genomes, but not in the current genome assembly. In the past, Pereira et al. (2011), with a limited taxonomic sampling, identified a clade sister to a group containing *SIRT3* sequences. This gene lineage included sequences from three species with an evolutionary history of whole-genome duplications, two teleost fish (zebrafish, *Danio rerio*, and green spotted puffer, *Tetraodon nigroviridis*), and one amphibian (African clawed frog, *Xenopus laevis*), complicating the definition of their duplicative history. Thus, our results, including a balanced taxonomic sampling of all main vertebrate groups and appropriate phylogenetic searches, define the existence of the *SIRT3.2* gene lineage and its phyletic distribution. In agreement with Gold and Sinclair (2022), more extensive sampling in deuterostomes, now including in addition to vertebrates, urochordates, cephalochordates, echinoderms, and hemichordates, confirms that the duplication event that gave rise to SIRT3 and SIRT3.2 occurred in the last common ancestor of vertebrates (Supplementary figures 1 and 2).

The lack of the *SIRT3.2* gene can be interpreted in different ways. We can think that the loss of *SIRT3.2* could have no physiological impact if the functional role of the lost gene is assumed by other family members, consistent with the idea that gene families possess functional redundancy (Ohno 1985; Félix and Barkoulas 2015; Albalat and Cañestro 2016). Alternatively, we can also think of gene loss as a source of adaptive evolution (Olson 1999; Nery et al. 2014; Albalat and Cañestro 2016; Helsen et al. 2020). The description of new gene lineages is not uncommon in the literature (Wichmann et al. 2016; Himmel et al. 2020; Opazo et al. 2021; Gold & Sinclair 2022), and it could be mainly attributed to the presence in non-model species and/or the absence of proper evolutionary analyses. The existence of species with different gene repertoires is an

opportunity to better understand the evolutionary fate of duplicated genes (Lynch and
Conery 2000) and the biological functions associated with a group of genes.

An amino acid alignment of the SIRT3.2 and SIRT3 sequences shows that the
catalytic domain of SIRT3.2 is well conserved, where six amino acid positions were
identified as diagnostic characters (Fig. 6). The amino acid divergence of the SIRT3.2
catalytic domain varies from 32.2% (spotted gar vs coelacanth) to 33.6% (spotted gar vs
elephant shark). The same comparisons for the SIRT3 catalytic domain show slightly
lower amino acid divergence values, between 24.8% (spotted gar vs coelacanth) and
31.0% (coelacanth vs elephant shark). As expected, the interparalog distance (SIRT3 vs
SIRT3.2) of the catalytic domains shows higher divergence values, ranging from 40.7%
(spotted gar SIRT3 vs spotted gar SIRT3.2) and 43.6% (elephant shark SIRT3 vs
elephant shark SIRT3.2). Although nothing is known about the protein encoded by the
SIRT3.2 gene, based on how sirtuin genes are evolutionarily related and the information
already known for the other family members (Fig. 1), we can speculate that SIRT3.2
belongs to the class I, is mainly located on the mitochondria/nucleus, and has deacetylase
activity. From a functional perspective it should perform functions similar to what has been
described for SIRT3 (Fig. 1) (Brown et al. 2013; McDonnell et al. 2015; Zhang et al. 2020).
It is important to highlight that the inferences regarding a newly discovered gene are better
performed if they are phylogenetically guided.

Expression pattern of sirtuin gene family members

Our next step in characterizing the *SIRT3.2* gene was to investigate whether it is
transcribed and if it was, to characterize the transcription pattern. To do this, we mapped
RNASeq reads to reference gene sequences of representative species of vertebrates and
examined transcript abundance. In agreement with the transcription pattern reported for
sirtuin genes (Stelzer et al. 2016; Kabiljo et al. 2019), our results show that although they
exhibited wide variance in tissue expression, sirtuin genes are expressed in almost all
tissues, including the novel *SIRT3.2* gene lineage (Fig. 7). In the case of the tropical
clawed frog, the *SIRT3.2* gene is transcribed at a similar level in all tissues, other than
the ovary where high transcription levels were estimated (Fig. 7). Coincident with the
pattern observed in the tropical clawed frog, the elephant shark *SIRT3.2* gene is mostly
transcribed in the ovary (Fig. 7). These results should be taken with caution given the lack

of biological replicates, at least within species. In the case of the zebrafish, although our
transcription level estimations did not follow the trend previously mentioned, an extensive
study examining the expression of all sirtuin genes in zebrafish showed that the *SIRT3.2*
gene in this species is mainly expressed in the ovary (Pereira et al. 2011). Thus, in
addition to showing that the *SIRT3.2* gene is transcribed, our analyses allow us to suggest
that this gene could be involved in biological processes associated with reproduction. This
observation agrees with the literature as for SIRT3 there are many studies in which its
functions related to reproduction have been reported (Zhao et al. 2016; Tatone et al. 2018;
Vazquez et al. 2020; Di Emidio et al. 2021).

Elephant shark SIRT3.2 protein localizes to mitochondria

To further explore the structural relationship between SIRT3 and SIRT3.2 proteins, we
performed an unbiased protein structure modeling of SIRT3.2 proteins from elephant
shark (*Callorhinchus milii*), spotted gar (*Lepisosteus oculatus*), salmon (*Salmo salar*) and
coelacanth (*Latimeria chalumnae*). Models of SIRT3.2 proteins were generated by the
SWISS-MODEL workspace that used as template crystal structure models of human
SIRT3: 4bvh.1.A for elephant shark, 5z94.1.A for spotted gar, 5d7n.3.A for salmon and
5bwo.1.B for coelacanth (data not shown). All models generated comprise only the central
portion of the SIRT3.2 proteins where the catalytic and its regulatory regions are expected
to be: amino acids G95 to Q365 for elephant shark, L115 to V388 for spotted gar, P114
to G387 for salmon, and K113 to P386 for coelacanth. The overall root mean square
deviation for 272 superimposable Cα coordinates for the models of human SIRT3 (pdb:
4bvh.1.A; amino acids G121 to G392) and elephant shark SIRT3.2 (amino acids G95 to
Q365) is 0.101 Å (Fig. 8a), suggesting extensive structural match. Some SIRT proteins,
such as SIRT1, SIRT2 and SIRT3, possess evolutionarily conserved, distinct cellular
localizations and functions, as evidenced by their analysis in several model species that
include Drosophila melanogaster, Mus musculus and Homo sapiens (McBurney et al.
2003; Blander and Guarente 2004; North and Verdin 2004; Michishita et al. 2005; Haigis
et al. 2006) (Fig. 1). Some sirtuins localize in more than one compartment, like SIRT1

and SIRT2 that localize to the nucleus and cytosol, and SIRT3 that localizes mainly to the

mitochondrial matrix, but with a small fraction localizing to the nucleus (Scher et al. 2007).

In contrast, SIRT4 and SIRT5 localize only to mitochondria, and SIRT6 and SIRT7

localize only to the nucleus. The sequence and structural comparison between SIRT3.2

and SIRT3 proteins, as well as subcellular localization prediction by LocTree3 (Goldberg

et al. 2014), suggest that the localization of SIRT3.2 proteins is also in the mitochondria.

To determine the subcellular localization of SIRT3.2 proteins, we chose to analyze

SIRT3.2 from elephant shark. To this end, we expressed in human cultured cells full-

length elephant shark SIRT3.2 tagged with three copies of the c-Myc epitope at the C-

terminus (SIRT3.2-3myc). To obtain biochemical evidence of the expression of this

protein, we performed immunoblot analysis with monoclonal antibody 9E10 against the

c-Myc epitope, which showed the detection of an expected 48.3 kDa protein in all cell

lines analyzed (Fig. 8b). Fluorescence microscopy analysis of human H4 neuroglioma

cells expressing SIRT3.2-3myc showed decoration by the anti-c-Myc antibody of

structures highly reminiscent of mitochondria, in addition to a faint fluorescent signal in

the rest of the cytoplasm (Fig. 8c, d). Mitochondria localization of SIRT3.2-3myc was

confirmed by co-localization with the fluorescent signal of MitoTracker Orange (Pearson's

correlation coefficient [r] = 0.94 ± 0.02; n = 20; Fig. 8c and Supplementary Fig. 3a).

Importantly, SIRT3.2-3myc showed no localization in any other major compartment, as

shown by lack of localization in the nucleus (detected with the nuclear stain DAPI; r = 0.21

± 0.03; n = 20; Fig. 8c, d and Supplementary Fig. 3b), the Golgi apparatus (detected with

antibody against Trans-Golgi network integral membrane protein 2 (TGN46)

(Ponnambalam et al. 1996) (r = 0.34 ± 0.09; n = 20; Fig. 8c, d and Supplementary Fig.

3c), or the endoplasmic reticulum (detected with antibody against Cytoskeleton-

associated protein 4 (P63) (Schweizer et al. 1993) (r = 0.47 ± 0.15; n = 20; Fig. 8d and

Supplementary Fig. 3d). The same pattern of expression of SIRT3.2-3myc was obtained

using other human cell lines, such as HeLa or MDA-MB-231 cells (data not shown).

Altogether, these results indicate that SIRT3.2 proteins are targeted to the mitochondria.

Elephant shark SIRT3.2 protein has deacetylase activity

Reversible lysine acetylation is one of the most common post-translational modifications
on proteins that regulate a variety of physiological processes including gene expression,
enzymatic activity, protein-protein interactions, and subcellular localization (Glozak et al.
2005). Sirtuin proteins share a catalytic core domain (North and Verdin 2004) that have
NAD$^+$-dependent deacetylase activity (Shahgaldi and Kahmini 2021). After translocation
into the mitochondrial matrix, human SIRT3 is inactive, but after proteolytic processing of
its N-terminus signal peptide it becomes active as deacetylase (Onyango et al. 2002;
Schwer et al. 2002). Similar to human SIRT3, secondary structure prediction of
representative SIRT3.2 proteins indicates that the first ~100 N-terminal amino acids are
in a disordered domain (data not shown). Therefore, to determine if SIRT3.2 proteins also
exhibit deacetylase activity, we produced in bacteria N-terminal truncated elephant shark
SIRT3.2 protein (amino acids 95-372; ΔNT-SIRT3.2). To analyze the enzymatic activity
of purified ΔNT-SIRT3.2, we used a commercial fluorometric deacetylation activity assay
that contains an acetylated substrate peptide for recombinant human SIRT3 (Abcam). An
initial analysis of activity at 37ºC showed that ΔNT-SIRT3.2 possesses a deacetylase
activity that is similar to that of human SIRT3, being also NAD$^+$-dependent (Fig. 9a, e, f).
Because the enzymatic activity of elephant shark SIRT3.2 could be influenced by the
environmental conditions, we next evaluated the optimal temperature of ΔNT-SIRT3.2
compared to that of human SIRT3. As expected, the optimal temperature of the human
SIRT3 was ~37ºC (Fig. 9b). In contrast, ΔNT-SIRT3.2 exhibited an optimal temperature
at ~24ºC (Fig. 9b). The optimal temperature value for the SIRT3.2 deacetylase activity of
the elephant shark could represent an evolutionary adjustment to the temperature regime
of the habitat in which this species lives, as it has been demonstrated for other enzymes
in other species (McCormick 1993; Somero 2004; Bilyk et al. 2021; Saravia et al. 2021).
Thus, all subsequent enzymatic activity analyses for ΔNT-SIRT3.2 were performed at
24ºC. The apparent specific activity of ΔNT-SIRT3.2 was 260.7 ± 9.9 fluorescence units
(FU) min^{-1} mg^{-1}, which was significantly lower than that of SIRT3 that was 1143.3 ± 46.3
FU min^{-1} mg^{-1}. Apparent K_m of ΔNT-SIRT3.2 and SIRT3 were 5.7 and 5.5, respectively,
which resulted not significantly different (Fig. 9c, d). In contrast, apparent V_{max} of ΔNT-
SIRT3.2 was 0.322 FU sec^{-1}, which was significantly different to that of SIRT3 that was
3.908 FU sec^{-1} (Fig. 9c, d). We next compared the effect of the sirtuin inhibitors

nicotinamide (NAM) (Sauve and Schramm 2003) and quercetin (QUE) (You et al. 2019)

on the activities of SIRT3 and ΔNT-SIRT3.2. As expected, SIRT3 activity was significantly

inhibited by NAM and QUE (Fig. 9e). We also found a significant inhibitory effect of both

NAM and QUE on the activity of ΔNT-SIRT3.2 (Fig. 9f). We also compared the effect of

the polyphenolic antioxidant resveratrol (REV), which is an activator of sirtuins (Wood et

al. 2004). As expected, we found a significant concentration-dependent activation of

SIRT3 deacetylase activity up to a 1.6 ± 0.1-fold increase in the presence of 100 μM REV

(Fig. 9e). Strikingly, we found a much more potent concentration dependent activation

effect of REV on ΔNT-SIRT3.2, showing up to a 11.1 ± 0.6 fold increase in the presence

of 100 μM REV (Fig. 9f). However, because the specific activity of ΔNT-SIRT3.2 was

~23% that of SIRT3 in the assay conditions, the activation of ΔNT-SIRT3.2 by REV in fact

represents a value only ~1.6 fold higher compared to the activation of SIRT3 by REV.

Because different sirtuins have activity on different proteins, as well as remove with

different specificity a variety of acyl groups other than the acetyl (Fig. 1) (Anderson et al.

2014), the modulation of ΔNT-SIRT3.2 activity by REV suggests that it has distinct

functional substrates. Together, these results demonstrate that elephant shark ΔNT-

SIRT3.2 has deacetylase activity and indicate that the activity of SIRT3.2 proteins is

modulated in a similar manner to that of mammalian sirtuins.

Elephant shark SIRT3.2 protein increases ATP cellular content

Considering that SIRT3 plays an important role in maintaining basal ATP levels by

deacetylation of mitochondrial proteins involved in electron transport chain (ETC), the

tricarboxylic acid cycle, and fatty-acid oxidation (Hirschey et al. 2010), we investigated

the impact of transient SIRT3.2-3myc expression on ATP cellular content in H4 and HeLa

cells (Fig. 10a). Similar to the well-known effect of mammalian SIRT3, SIRT3.2-3myc

expression increased ATP cellular content, suggesting that it shares with SIRT3 the ability

to enhance the activity of the mitochondrial ETC. Because an enhancement in the activity

of ETC can cause an increase in reactive oxygen species (ROS), we also evaluated the

levels of ROS in cells expressing SIRT3.2-3myc (Fig. 10b). We found similar ROS levels

in cells expressing SIRT3.2-3myc and untransfected cells (Fig. 10b). This finding

suggests that SIRT3.2 proteins share the mammalian SIRT3 characteristic of protection

against oxidative damage (Bause and Haigis 2013), likely by deacetylation of enzymes
involved in ROS clearance to protect mitochondrial membranes from oxidative stress
(Tseng et al. 2013). A candidate that could be activated by the deacetylation activity of
SIRT3.2 proteins is SOD2 that in human cells reduces cellular ROS content promoting
oxidative stress resistance (Qiu et al. 2010; Tao et al. 2010). Alternatively, SIRT3.2
proteins could activate the last complex of the ETC by deacetylation, enhancing ATP-
synthase activity without affecting ROS production, similar to the effect that SIRT3 has in
response to exercise-induced stress (Vassilopoulos et al. 2014). Together, our results
show that the SIRT3.2 protein is a new sirtuin family member with deacetylase activity
that could have important roles in the homeostasis of oxidative species and mitochondrial
metabolism.

Conclusions

We performed an evolutionary analysis of the sirtuin gene family in vertebrates. In
addition to describing the duplicative history of sirtuins, our phylogenetic analyses
revealed the presence of a new gene family member, *SIRT3.2*. This new vertebrate gene
lineage is present in all vertebrates other than mammals, birds, and reptiles. Furthermore,
our transcriptomic analyses show that *SIRT3.2* is transcribed in almost all examined
tissues, showing a tendency to be more expressed in the ovary, suggesting biological
functions related to reproduction. According to our analyses, SIRT3.2 localized in the
mitochondria, had deacetylase activity and increased the ATP cellular content. The
finding of a new sirtuin gene lineage highlights the need for more detailed assessments
of orthology with a broader taxonomic sampling to better define the membership
composition of gene families (Glover et al. 2019). In the literature, there are examples in
which more comprehensive analyses provide a better description of gene families,
including previously unknown family members (Castro et al. 2012; Wichmann et al. 2016;
Céspedes et al. 2017; Ramos-Vicente et al. 2018; Opazo, Kuraku, et al. 2019; Opazo,
Hoffmann, et al. 2019). The availability of species with different gene repertoires could be
seen as a natural experiment (Albertson et al. 2009) that helps us understand the
evolutionary fate of duplicated genes, as they can fulfill the biological functions associated
with the gene family but with a different combination of paralogs.

Methods

Protein sequences and phylogenetic analyses

We retrieved sirtuin amino acid sequences in representative species of all main groups of vertebrates. Our sampling included mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, lungfish, coelacanth, bony fish, cartilaginous fish, and cyclostomes (Supplementary Table S1). Sequences were obtained from the Orthologous MAtrix project (OMA), December 2021 release (Altenhoff et al. 2021)last accessed on April 8th, 2022). In addition, we complemented our sampling by retrieving sequences from vertebrate groups that were not present or poorly represented in the Orthologous MAtrix project (e.g., crocodiles) from the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) (Sharma et al. 2019) using the program blast (tblastn) with default parameters (Altschul et al. 1990) Supplementary Table S1). Protein sequences were aligned using the software MAFFT v.7 (Katoh and Standley 2013), allowing the program to choose the alignment strategy (FFT-NS-i, alignment length 2490 amino acids). To select the best-fitting model of molecular evolution we used the proposed model tool in the program IQ-Tree v1.6.12 (Kalyaanamoorthy et al. 2017), which selected JTT+F+I+G4. We used a maximum-likelihood approach to obtain the best tree using the program IQ-Tree v1.6.12 (Trifinopoulos et al. 2016). We carried out 20 independent runs to explore the tree space changing the value of the strength of the perturbation (-pers) parameter. We conducted the following analyses:

1. Five runs modifying the strength of the perturbation parameter from 0.5 (default value) to 0.3.
2. Five runs using the default value (0.5) for the strength of the perturbation parameter.
3. Five runs modifying the strength of the perturbation parameter from 0.5 (default value) to 0.7.
4. Five runs modifying the strength of the perturbation parameter from 0.5 (default value) to 0.9.

In all cases, the number of unsuccessful iterations to stop parameter (-nstop) value was changed from 100 (default value) to 500. The tree with the highest likelihood score was

chosen (log-likelihood: -127052.963, -pers 0.5 and -nstop 500). Support for the nodes

was evaluated using two approaches: the aBayes test (Anisimova et al. 2011) and the

ultrafast bootstrap procedure using 1000 replicates (Hoang et al. 2018). Nicotinamide

Nucleotide Transhydrogenase (NNT) protein sequences, a member of the DHS-like

NAD/FAD-binding domain superfamily, from the human (*Homo sapiens*), mouse (*Mus*

musculus), zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) and spotted gar (*Lepisosteus oculatus*) were used as

outgroups.

Assessment of conserved synteny

We examined genes found upstream and downstream of the sirtuin genes. For

comparative purposes, we used the estimates of orthology and paralogy derived from the

Ensembl Compara database (Herrero et al. 2016); these estimates are obtained from a

pipeline that considers both synteny and phylogeny to generate orthology mappings.

These predictions were visualized using the program Genomicus v100.01 (Nguyen et al.

2018). Our assessments were performed in humans (*Homo sapiens*), chicken (*Gallus*

gallus), gharial (*Gavialis gangeticus*), red-eared slider (*Trachemys scripta*), green anole

(*Anolis carolinensis*), tropical clawed frog (*Xenopus tropicalis*), coelacanth (*Latimeria*

chalumnae), spotted gar (*Lepisosteus oculatus*), and elephant shark (*Callorhinchus milii*).

Dot-plots

We retrieved the chromosomal region containing the *SIRT3.2* gene of the tropical clawed

frog (*Xenopus tropicalis*, Ch3) including 6.7 kb up- and downstream, and the

corresponding syntenic region in the human (*Homo sapiens*, Chr12), opossum

(*Monodelphis domestica*, Chr8), chicken (*Gallus gallus*, Chr1), gharial (*Gavialis*

gangeticus, NW_017729022.1), red-eared slider (*Trachemys scripta*, Chr1), and green

anole (*Anolis carolinensis*, Chr5) based on the location of the flanking genes (*RIC8B* and

TMEM263). We aligned SIRT3.2 syntenic regions using Advanced PipMaker (Schwartz

et al. 2000).

Transcript abundance analyses

Sirtuin transcript abundance was measured from a representative sample of vertebrates

including the elephant shark (*Callorhinchus milii*), zebrafish (*Danio rerio*), tropical clawed

frog (*Xenopus tropicalis*), anole lizard (*Anolis carolinensis*), and human (*Homo sapiens*).

RNASeq libraries from brain, heart, kidney, liver, muscle, ovary, and testis from each

species were gathered from the NCBI Short Read Archive (SRA; (Leinonen et al. 2011).

Accession numbers for species and tissue specific libraries can be found in Supplemental

Table S2. Reference transcript sequences were collected from Ensembl v.100 (Yates et

al. 2020) and we removed sequences that were shorter than 100 bp. For each library

adapters were removed using Trimmomatic 0.38 (Bolger et al. 2014) and reads were

filtered for quality using the parameters HEADCROP:5, SLIDINGWINDOW:5:30, and

MINLEN:50. We mapped quality filtered paired-end RNAseq reads back to reference

sequences using Bowtie 1.2.2 (Langmead et al. 2009) and default parameters of RSEM

(Li and Dewey 2011). Transcripts with < 10 mapped reads across all seven tissues per

species were removed prior to normalization. Normalization of raw read counts for each

species was performed using the median of ratios (Anders and Huber 2010) method

implemented by the estimateSizeFactors function in DESeq2 v1.26 (Love et al. 2014).

Briefly, for all samples within a species, the geometric mean is calculated for the read

counts of each gene. Read counts are then divided by the geometric mean and the

median ratio is determined for each sample. Normalized read counts are calculated by

dividing raw read counts by the sample-specific median ratio. If multiple SIRT transcripts

were present, we presented the expression data from the transcript with the most mapped

reads.

488 Protein structure homology modeling

489 Protein structure homology modeling was performed using the SWISS-MODEL server

490 (https://swissmodel.expasy.org/) (Waterhouse et al. 2018). Structural figures were

491 prepared with PyMOL Molecular Graphics System, Version 2.0.6 Schrödinger, LLC.

493 Recombinant cDNA Constructs

For expression in mammalian cells, a codon-optimized mammalian expression construct

encoding full-length (amino acids 1-372) elephant shark (*Callorhinchus milii*) SIRT3.2

(Supplementary table S1), cloned in-frame into the *Eco*RI and *Sal*I sites of the pCMV-
3Tag-4a vector followed by vector encoding sequence of three successive Myc epitope
tags before a stop codon, was acquired from GenScript (Piscataway, NJ). For the
generation of a codon-optimized bacterial expression construct, a cDNA encoding N-
terminal truncated (amino acids 95-372) elephant shark SIRT3.2, cloned in-frame into the
*Eco*RI and *Sal*I sites of the pGEX-4T-1 vector, was also acquired from GenScript. This
cDNA was subsequently cloned in-frame into the *Eco*RI and *Sal*I sites of the pGST-
Parallel-1 vector (Sheffield et al. 1999). The nucleotide sequence of all recombinant
constructs was confirmed by dideoxy sequencing using the AUSTRAL-omics core facility
at Universidad Austral de Chile (https://australomics.cl/).

Cell culture, cell transfection and preparation of protein extracts

H4 human neuroglioma cells, HeLa human cervix adenocarcinoma cells and MDA-MB-
231 human mammary gland adenocarcinoma cells were obtained from the American
Type Culture Collection (Manassas, VA). H4 and HeLa cells were maintained in
Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM), and MDA-MB-231 in DMEM-F12
(ThermoFisher, Waltham, MA). For all cell lines, media were supplemented with 10%
heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum, 100 U/ml penicillin, 100 µg/ml streptomycin
(ThermoFisher), and 5 µg/ml plasmocin (InvivoGen, San Diego, CA), and cells were
cultured in a humidified incubator with 5% CO_2 at 37 °C. For transient transfections, cells
were either seeded on top of glass coverslips on 24-well plates or on 6-well plates. When
cells were ~60% confluent, transfections were performed with Lipofectamine 2000
(ThermoFisher), according to the manufacturer's instructions. Preparation of protein
extracts from cultured, transfected or non-transfected cells was performed using methods
described elsewhere (Tenorio et al. 2016).

Antibodies and cell reagents

We used the following antibodies: mouse clone 9E10 against the c-Myc epitope
(Covance, Princeton, NJ), mouse clone BA3R against β-ACTIN (ThermoFisher), rabbit
polyclonal against Cytoskeleton-associated protein 4 (P63; Merck, Germany; cat #
HPA001225), and sheep polyclonal against Trans-Golgi network integral membrane

protein 2 (TGN46; Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA; cat # AHP500G). The following fluorochrome-conjugated antibodies were from ThermoFisher: Alexa Fluor-488– conjugated donkey anti mouse IgG, Alexa Fluor-594–conjugated donkey anti rabbit IgG and Alexa Fluor-647-conjugated donkey anti sheep IgG. HRP-conjugated secondary antibodies were from Jackson ImmunoResearch (West Grove, PA). Depending on their reactivity, primary antibodies were used at a dilution 1/200 to 1/2000. HRP-conjugated secondary antibodies were used at dilutions 1/5000 to 1/20000 also depending on their reactivity. All Alexa Fluor-conjugated secondary antibodies were used at a dilution 1/1000. The fluorescent nuclear stain 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI) was also from ThermoFisher.

Protein Electrophoresis, Immunoblotting and Immunofluorescence Microscopy

SDS-PAGE and immunoblotting were performed as described (Bustamante et al. 2020). For fluorescence microscopy, cells grown on glass coverslips were transfected, and after 16-h cells were left untreated or treated for 30 min with MitoTracker™ Orange CMTMRos (ThermoFisher) according to the manufacturer's instructions. After washing with phosphate buffered saline (PBS) supplemented with 0.1 mM $CaCl_2$ and 1 mM $MgCl_2$ (PBS-CM), cells were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde for 30 min at room temperature, permeabilized with 0.2% Triton X-100 in PBS-CM for 15 min at room temperature, and incubated with blocking solution (0.2% gelatin in PBS-CM) for 10 min at room temperature. Cells were incubated simultaneously either with antibodies to the c-Myc epitope (1/200) and to TGN46 (1/1000) or to the c-Myc epitope, to TGN46 and to P63 (1/600) for 30 min at 37 ºC in a humidified chamber. After washing coverslips with PBS, cells were incubated as before, but with fluorochrome-conjugated antibodies, followed by PBS-washing, and coverslips were mounted onto glass slides with Fluoromount-G mounting medium (ThermoFisher). Fluorescence microscopy images were acquired with an AxioObserver.D1 microscope equipped with a PlanApo 63x oil immersion objective (NA 1.4), and an AxioCam MRm digital camera (Carl Zeiss). To quantitatively evaluate colocalization of fluorescence signals, we obtained the Pearson's correlation coefficient and cytofluorograms of pairwise comparisons from images acquired under identical

settings, avoiding signal saturation and corrected for background, crosstalk and noise

signals on each set of images, using the plugin JACoP (Bolte and Cordelières 2006)

implemented in the software ImageJ (version 1.47h)(Schneider et al. 2012), and the

plugin Colocalization Finder implemented in the software ImageJ2 (version 2.3.0/1.53)

(Rueden et al. 2017). To prepare figures, 12-bit images were processed with ImageJ

software and Adobe Photoshop CS3 software (Adobe Systems, Mountain View, CA).

Expression and Purification of Recombinant N-terminal truncated elephant shark SIRT3.2 protein

Recombinant, N-terminal truncated elephant shark SIRT3.2 (ΔNT-SIRT3.2; amino acids

95-372) tagged with an N-terminal glutathione S-transferase (GST) followed by a tobacco

etch virus (TEV) protease cleavage site was expressed and purified using a method

described previously (Ross et al. 2014), with some modifications. Briefly, expression in

E. coli B834(DE3) (Novagen, Madison, WI) was induced with 0.25 mM IPTG at 25 °C for

16 h. Pellets of bacteria were resuspended in homogenization buffer (50 mM Tris HCl,

0.5 M NaCl, 5 mM EDTA, 5 mM β-mercaptoethanol, and 2 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl

fluoride, pH 8.0) and lysed by sonication. The clarified supernatant was purified on

glutathione-Sepharose 4B (GE Healthcare). After removal of the GST moiety by TEV

cleavage, and sequential further passage through glutathione-Sepharose 4B and Ni-NTA

(QIAGEN) resins, ΔNT-SIRT3.2 was further purified on a Superdex 200 pg column (GE

Healthcare) equilibrated in storage buffer (50 mM Tris HCl, 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT).

Aliquots of purified protein were kept at -80 ºC until use.

Deacetylation activity

To characterize deacetylation activity of recombinant, N-terminal truncated elephant

shark SIRT3.2 (ΔNT-SIRT3.2), we used a fluorometric SIRT3 activity assay kit (Abcam,

cat # ab156067; Cambridge, UK), according to the manufacturer's instructions. This

assay allows detection of a fluorescent signal upon deacetylation of an acetylated

substrate peptide for recombinant human SIRT3. The intensity of fluorescence was

measured on a fluorometric microplate reader (Varioskan Flash, ThermoFisher) with

excitation set at 350 nm and emission detection set at 450 nm. To analyze the

deacetylation activity of N-terminal truncated elephant shark SIRT3.2 protein, first we

determined its optimum temperature that resulted to be ~24 ºC. Subsequent analyses

were performed by comparing the activity of N-terminal truncated elephant shark SIRT3.2

protein at 24 ºC to that of human SIRT3, which is provided by the assay kit, at 37 ºC. K_m

and V_{max} were obtained by varying the concentration of the fluorogenic acetylated

substrate peptide provided by the assay kit. This assay was also used to determine the

effect of nicotinamide (NAM), quercetin (QUE) and resveratrol (REV; Sigma-Aldrich) on

the deacetylation activity of ΔNT-SIRT3.2.

ATP and ROS content

ATP levels were quantified in cell lysates using a luciferin/luciferase bioluminescence

assay (ATP determination kit, Molecular Probes cat # A22066, Thermo Fisher Scientific)

as previously described (Jara et al. 2018). Briefly, cells were lysed in HEPES buffer (125

mM NaCl, 25 mM NaF, 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM EGTA, 1% NP-40, 25 mM HEPES, pH 7.4)

supplemented with a protease inhibitor mixture (cat # 78429, Thermo Fisher Scientific)

and centrifuged at 12000 rpm using a refrigerated centrifuge (Eppendorf model 5424R)

for 15 min at 4 ºC. Proteins in the supernatant were quantified, and 10 µl of lysate were

used to determine ATP levels according to the kit manufacturer's instructions. The ATP

level in each sample was calculated using standard curves and normalized to the protein

concentration in each sample. ROS content was determined in cell lysates using 25 µM

CM-H2DCFDA (DCF; a fluorogenic indicator of ROS), as previously described (Jara et

al. 2018; Olesen et al. 2020). The intensity of fluorescence was measured on a

fluorescence plate reader (Biotek Synergy HT, Agilent, Santa Clara, CA) with excitation

set at 485 nm and emission detection set at 530 nm. Briefly, in a dark 96-well plate, 25

µg of cell lysate proteins were incubated with CM-H2DCFDA (DCF) dye with shaking for

5 min at room temperature, followed by determination of the fluorescence of each sample

that was subtracted by the fluorescence of the respective blank.

Statistical Analysis

In the case of the deacetylation, ATP content and ROS content assays, quantification

was performed from at least three independent experiments/measurements. Statistical

analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel for Mac 2011 (Microsoft Corporation).

When appropriate, results are represented in graphs depicting the mean ± standard

deviation. Statistical significance was determined by two-tailed, paired t-test. P-values >

0.05 or ≤ 0.05 were regarded as not statistically significant or statistically significant,

respectively. In the figures, P-values between 0.01 and 0.05 are indicated with one

asterisk, P-values between 0.001 and 0.01 are indicated with two asterisks, and P-values

less than 0.001 are indicated with three asterisks.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Gene phylogeny, synteny, protein size, molecular weight, enzymatic activity, subcellular localization, functions and diseases associated with sirtuin genes. Information regarding the sister group relationships among sirtuin genes was obtained from this study, synteny from ENSEMBL v.106 (Howe et al. 2021), protein size from Fujita and Yamashita (2018)(Fujita and Yamashita 2018), molecular weight from Vassilopoulos et al. (2011)(Vassilopoulos et al. 2011) while enzymatic activity, subcellular localization, functions and diseases from Zhang et al. (2020)(Zhang et al. 2020). In the case of the SIRT3.2 of the elephant shark, synteny information was obtained from the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) (Sharma et al. 2019), protein size, molecular weight, enzymatic activity and subcellular localization from this study.

Figure 2. Maximum likelihood tree showing sister group relationships among sirtuin genes of vertebrates. Numbers on the nodes correspond to support from the aBayes and ultrafast bootstrap values. Nicotinamide Nucleotide Transhydrogenase (NNT) sequences from the human (*Homo sapiens*) mouse (*Mus musculus*), spotted gar (*Lepisosteus oculatus*) and zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) were used as outgroups (not shown). The scale denotes substitutions per site and colors represent vertebrate sirtuin lineages.

Figure 3. Maximum likelihood tree showing sister group relationships among SIRT3 and SIRT3.2 genes in vertebrates. Numbers on the nodes correspond to support from the aBayes and ultrafast bootstrap values. The scale denotes substitutions per site and colors represent gene lineages. This tree does not represent a novel phylogenetic analysis, it is the SIRT3/SIRT3.2 clade that was recovered from figure 2.

Figure 4. Phyletic distribution of sirtuin genes in vertebrates. The sister group relationships among sirtuin genes was obtained from this study, whereas, organismal phylogeny was obtained from the most updated phylogenetic hypotheses available in the literature (Iwabe et al. 2005; Delsuc et al. 2006; Delsuc et al. 2008; Hara et al. 2018). The colors of the circles are those used in figure 2 to define sirtuin gene lineages, whereas the classes to which the different sirtuins belong are shown with shading.

Figure 5. a Patterns of conserved synteny in the chromosomal region that harbor SIRT3.2 genes in gnathostomes. Asterisks denote that the orientation of the genomic piece is from 3´ to 5´, gray lines represent intervening genes that do not contribute to conserved synteny. b Pairwise dot-plot comparison of the genomic region of the tropical clawed frog (*Xenopus tropicalis*) with the corresponding region in the human (Homo sapiens), opossum (*Monodelphis domestica*), chicken (*Gallus gallus*), gharial (*Gavialis gangeticus*), red-eared slider (*Trachemys scripta*) and green anole (*Anolis carolinensis*). Light green vertical lines denote exons and regions in between are introns. Dot plots were based on the complete coding region in addition to 6.7 kb of upstream and downstream flanking sequence. The red circle highlights the vestiges of the fourth exon in the red-eared slider (*Trachemys scripta*).The genome assembly version of the species depicted in this figure is the following: Human: GRCh38.p13; Opossum: ASM229v1; Chicken: GRCg6a; Gharial: GavGan_comp1; red-eared slider: CAS_Tse_1.0; Green anole: AnoCar2.0v2; Tropical clawed frog: UCB_Xtro_10.0; Coelacanth: LatCha1; Spotted gar: LepOcu1 and Elephant shark: Callorhinchus_milii-6.1.3.

Figure 6. Alignment of the catalytic domain of SIRT3 in humans (*Homo sapiens*), and SIRT3 and SIRT3.2 of spotted gar (*Lepisosteus oculatus*), coelacanth (*Latimeria chalumnae*) and elephant shark (*Callorhinchus milii*). The shaded region denotes the catalytic domain. Diagnostic characters -i.e. amino acids positions that distinguish between SIRT3 and SIRT3.2 gene lineages - are indicated with a rectangle and green colors.

Figure 7. Heatmap representation of within-species relative transcriptional levels of sirtuin paralogs between 7 chosen tissues. Transcription values were calculated independently for each species and normalized over all tissues.

Figure 8. Structural model of elephant shark SIRT3.2 and expression of SIRT3.2-like-3myc in mammalian cells. a Superposition of the ribbon representations of elephant shark SIRT3.2 (green model; amino acids G95 to Q365) and human SIRT3 (magenta model;

pdb: 4bvh.1.A; amino acids G121 to G392). Depicted in ellipses are the indicated
functional/structural domains of SIRT3 and in dotted lines the binding sites for peptide
substrates and NAD+. b The indicated cells were left untreated (Control, lanes 1, 3 and
5) or transfected to express SIRT3.2-3myc (lanes 2, 4 and 6), followed by immunoblot
analysis with antibody against the c-Myc epitope or antibody against β-ACTIN used as
loading control. The position of molecular mass markers is indicated on the left. SIRT3.2-
3myc exhibits an electrophoretic mobility corresponding to a protein of 48.3 kDa, which
is expected considering the extra amino acids of the three copies of the c-Myc epitope at
the C-terminus. c and d H4 cells grown in glass coverslips were transfected to express
SIRT3.2-3myc (green channel) and incubated with the mitochondrial probe MitoTracker
Orange (red channel in c) or mock incubated (d). Cells were fixed, permeabilized, and
double- (c) or triple-labeled (d) with mouse monoclonal antibody against the c-Myc
epitope (c and d), rabbit polyclonal antibody against the endoplasmic reticulum protein
Cytoskeleton-associated protein 4 (P63; d) and sheep polyclonal antibody against the
Golgi apparatus protein Trans-Golgi network integral membrane protein 2 (TGN46; c and
d). Secondary antibodies were Alexa-Fluor-488-conjugated donkey anti-mouse IgG
(green channel), Alexa-Fluor-594-conjugated donkey anti-rabbit IgG (red channel), and
Alexa-Fluor-647-conjugated donkey anti-sheep IgG (blue channel), and nuclei were
stained with the DNA probe DAPI (white channel). Stained cells were examined by
fluorescence microscopy. Insets: X3 magnification with yellow arrows indicating
colocalization (c) and green and red arrows indicating lack of colocalization (d). Bar, 10
μm.

Figure 9. Comparison of deacetylase activity between human SIRT3 and elephant shark
ΔNT-SIRT3.2. a-f) Results obtained with a fluorometric deacetylation assay of an
acetylated substrate peptide. a) Time course of deacetylase activity at the indicated
concentration of SIRT3 and concentrations of ΔNT-SIRT3.2. b) Temperature dependence
of deacetylase activity. c-d) Michaelis-Menten plot and Lineweaver-Burk plot of SIRT3 (c)
and ΔNT-SIRT3.2 (d) deacetylase activity. e-f) NAD+ dependence and concentration
dependent effects of the SIRT3 inhibitors nicotinamide (NAM) and quercetin (QUE) and
of the SIRT3 activator resveratrol (REV) on the deacetylase activity of SIRT3 (e) and

ΔNT-SIRT3.2 (f). In a-d, graphs depict the mean ± standard deviation (n = 3). In e-f, bars

represent the mean ± standard deviation. Statistical analysis was performed using two-

tailed unpaired Student's t-test (n = 3; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; ns, not

statistically significant).

Figure 10. SIRT3.2-3myc expression causes an increment on ATP cellular content with

no difference in ROS levels. (a) ATP levels were measured by a luciferin/luciferase

bioluminescence assay in H4 and HeLa cells either left untreated (Control) or transiently

expressing SIRT3.2-3myc. (b) ROS content was measured by the intensity fluorescence

of the dye CM-H2DCFDA in H4 and HeLa cells either left untreated (Control) or transiently

expressing SIRT3.2-3myc. Bars represent the mean ± standard deviation. Statistical

analysis was performed using two-tailed unpaired Student's t-test (n = 4; ** $p < 0.01$; ns,

not statistically significant).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico

from Chile (FONDECYT 1210471) and The Millennium Nucleus of Ion Channel-

Associated Diseases is a Millennium Nucleus of the Millennium Scientific Initiative,

National Agency of Research and Development (ANID, NCN19_168), Ministry of Science,

Technology, Knowledge and Innovation, Chile to JCO, Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo

Científico y Tecnológico from Chile (FONDECYT 1211481) to GAM, National Science

Foundation (EPS-0903787, DBI-1262901 and DEB-1354147) to F.G.H., Financiamiento

Basal No. ANID/BASAL/ACE210009 to PVB and No. ANID/BASAL/FB210008 to PVB

and CTR, Fondap-Ideal Grant N° 15150003 and ANID-Millennium Science Initiative

Program-Center ICM-ANID ICN2021_002 to LV-C, Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo

Científico y Tecnológico from Chile (FONDECYT 1180957) to FJM, Vicerrectoría de

Investigación, Desarrollo y Creación Artística, Universidad Austral de Chile to JCO, FJM,

LVC, GAM. We thank Stefanie Teuber, John Quiroga and Rafael Burgos, Instituto de

Farmacología y Morfofisiología, Facultad de Ciencias Veterinarias, Universidad Austral

de Chile, for providing assistance in the use of the Varioskan Flash microplate reader;

Contributions

760 JCO and GAM designed the study. JCO, MWV, FGH, KZ, CM, CL, VC, FJM, PVB, CTR,
761 GAM, collected and/or analyzed data. JCO, PVB and GAM wrote the manuscript. JCO,
762 MWV, FGH, KZ, CM, CL, VC, LV-C, FJM, PVB, CTR and GAM, reviewed and edited the
763 manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.
764

Ethics declarations

Conflict of interest disclosure

767 The authors declare they have no conflict of interest relating to the content of this
768 article.

Data availability

771 Data and supplementary material are available online at zenodo.org

References

Albalat R, Cañestro C. 2016. Evolution by gene loss. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 17:379–391.

Albertson RC, Craig Albertson R, Cresko W, William Detrich H, Postlethwait JH. 2009.
Evolutionary mutant models for human disease. *Trends in Genetics* [Internet]
25:74–81. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2008.11.006

Altenhoff AM, Train C-M, Gilbert KJ, Mediratta I, Mendes de Farias T, Moi D, Nevers Y,
Radoykova H-S, Rossier V, Warwick Vesztrocy A, et al. 2021. OMA orthology in
2021: website overhaul, conserved isoforms, ancestral gene order and more.
Nucleic Acids Res. 49:D373–D379.

Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment
search tool. *J. Mol. Biol.* 215:403–410.

Anderson KA, Green MF, Huynh FK, Wagner GR, Hirschey MD. 2014. SnapShot:
Mammalian Sirtuins. *Cell* 159:956–956.e1.

Anders S, Huber W. 2010. Differential expression analysis for sequence count data.
Genome Biol. 11:R106.

Anisimova M, Gil M, Dufayard J-F, Dessimoz C, Gascuel O. 2011. Survey of branch
support methods demonstrates accuracy, power, and robustness of fast likelihood-
based approximation schemes. *Syst. Biol.* 60:685–699.

Bause AS, Haigis MC. 2013. SIRT3 regulation of mitochondrial oxidative stress. *Exp.*
Gerontol. 48:634–639.

Bilyk KT, Zhuang X, Vargas-Chacoff L, Cheng C-HC. 2021. Evolution of chaperome
gene expression and regulatory elements in the antarctic notothenioid fishes.
Heredity 126:424–441.

Blander G, Guarente L. 2004. The Sir2 family of protein deacetylases. *Annu. Rev.*
Biochem. 73:417–435.

Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
sequence data. *Bioinformatics* 30:2114–2120.

Bolte S, Cordelières FP. 2006. A guided tour into subcellular colocalization analysis in
light microscopy. *J. Microsc.* 224:213–232.

Brown K, Xie S, Qiu X, Mohrin M, Shin J, Liu Y, Zhang D, Scadden DT, Chen D. 2013.
SIRT3 reverses aging-associated degeneration. *Cell Rep.* 3:319–327.

Bustamante HA, Cereceda K, González AE, Valenzuela GE, Cheuquemilla Y,
Hernández S, Arias-Muñoz E, Cerda-Troncoso C, Bandau S, Soza A, et al. 2020.
The Proteasomal Deubiquitinating Enzyme PSMD14 Regulates Macroautophagy

by Controlling Golgi-to-ER Retrograde Transport. *Cells* [Internet] 9. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/cells9030777

Castro LFC, Lopes-Marques M, Gonçalves O, Wilson JM. 2012. The evolution of
pepsinogen C genes in vertebrates: duplication, loss and functional diversification.
PLoS One 7:e32852.

Céspedes HA, Zavala K, Vandewege MW, Opazo JC. 2017. Evolution of the α-
adrenoreceptors in vertebrates: ADRA2D is absent in mammals and crocodiles.
Gen. Comp. Endocrinol. 250:85–94.

Costantini S, Sharma A, Raucci R, Costantini M, Autiero I, Colonna G. 2013. Genealogy
of an ancient protein family: the Sirtuins, a family of disordered members. *BMC*
Evol. Biol. 13:60.

Delsuc F, Brinkmann H, Chourrout D, Philippe H. 2006. Tunicates and not
cephalochordates are the closest living relatives of vertebrates. *Nature* 439:965–
968.

Delsuc F, Tsagkogeorga G, Lartillot N, Philippe H. 2008. Additional molecular support
for the new chordate phylogeny. *Genesis* 46:592–604.

Di Emidio G, Falone S, Artini PG, Amicarelli F, D'Alessandro AM, Tatone C. 2021.
Mitochondrial Sirtuins in Reproduction. *Antioxidants (Basel)* [Internet] 10. Available
from: http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/antiox10071047

Félix M-A, Barkoulas M. 2015. Pervasive robustness in biological systems. *Nat. Rev.*
Genet. 16:483–496.

Frye RA. 2000. Phylogenetic classification of prokaryotic and eukaryotic Sir2-like
proteins. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 273:793–798.

Frye RA. 2006. Evolution of Sirtuins From Archaea to Vertebrates. *Histone*
Deacetylases [Internet]:183–202. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1385/1-59745-
024-3:183

Fujita Y, Yamashita T. 2018. Sirtuins in Neuroendocrine Regulation and Neurological
Diseases. *Front. Neurosci.* 12:778.

Gitelman I. 2007. Evolution of the vertebrate twist family and synfunctionalization: a
mechanism for differential gene loss through merging of expression domains. *Mol.*
Biol. Evol. 24:1912–1925.

Glover N, Dessimoz C, Ebersberger I, Forslund SK, Gabaldón T, Huerta-Cepas J,
Martin M-J, Muffato M, Patricio M, Pereira C, et al. 2019. Advances and
Applications in the Quest for Orthologs. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 36:2157–2164.

Glozak MA, Sengupta N, Zhang X, Seto E. 2005. Acetylation and deacetylation of non-

histone proteins. *Gene* 363:15–23.

Gold DA, Sinclair DA. 2022. Sirtuin Evolution the dawn of animal life. *Mol. Biol. Evol*.
39:192.

Goldberg T, Hecht M, Hamp T, Karl T, Yachdav G, Ahmed N, Altermann U, Angerer P,
Ansorge S, Balasz K, et al. 2014. LocTree3 prediction of localization. *Nucleic Acids*
Res. 42:W350–W355.

Greiss S, Gartner A. 2009. Sirtuin/Sir2 phylogeny, evolutionary considerations and
structural conservation. *Mol. Cells* 28:407–415.

Haigis MC, Mostoslavsky R, Haigis KM, Fahie K, Christodoulou DC, Murphy AJ,
Valenzuela DM, Yancopoulos GD, Karow M, Blander G, et al. 2006. SIRT4 inhibits
glutamate dehydrogenase and opposes the effects of calorie restriction in
pancreatic beta cells. *Cell* 126:941–954.

Haigis MC, Sinclair DA. 2010. Mammalian sirtuins: biological insights and disease
relevance. *Annu. Rev. Pathol.* 5:253–295.

Hara Y, Yamaguchi K, Onimaru K, Kadota M, Koyanagi M, Keeley SD, Tatsumi K,
Tanaka K, Motone F, Kageyama Y, et al. 2018. Shark genomes provide insights
into elasmobranch evolution and the origin of vertebrates. *Nat Ecol Evol* 2:1761–
1771.

Helsen J, Voordeckers K, Vanderwaeren L, Santermans T, Tsontaki M, Verstrepen KJ,
Jelier R. 2020. Gene Loss Predictably Drives Evolutionary Adaptation. *Mol. Biol.*
Evol. 37:2989–3002.

Herrero J, Muffato M, Beal K, Fitzgerald S, Gordon L, Pignatelli M, Vilella AJ, Searle
SMJ, Amode R, Brent S, et al. 2016. Ensembl comparative genomics resources.
Database [Internet] 2016. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/database/bav096

Himmel NJ, Gray TR, Cox DN. 2020. Phylogenetics Identifies Two Eumetazoan TRPM
Clades and an Eighth TRP Family, TRP Soromelastatin (TRPS). *Mol. Biol. Evol.*
37:2034–2044.

Hirschey MD. 2011. Old enzymes, new tricks: sirtuins are NAD(+)-dependent de-
acylases. *Cell Metab.* 14:718–719.

Hirschey MD, Shimazu T, Goetzman E, Jing E, Schwer B, Lombard DB, Grueter CA,
Harris C, Biddinger S, Ilkayeva OR, et al. 2010. SIRT3 regulates mitochondrial
fatty-acid oxidation by reversible enzyme deacetylation. *Nature* 464:121–125.

Hoang DT, Chernomor O, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ, Vinh LS. 2018. UFBoot2:
Improving the Ultrafast Bootstrap Approximation. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 35:518–522.

Howe KL, Achuthan P, Allen J, Allen J, Alvarez-Jarreta J, Amode MR, Armean IM, Azov
AG, Bennett R, Bhai J, et al. 2021. Ensembl 2021. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 49:D884–
D891.

Iwabe N, Hara Y, Kumazawa Y, Shibamoto K, Saito Y, Miyata T, Katoh K. 2005. Sister
group relationship of turtles to the bird-crocodilian clade revealed by nuclear DNA-
coded proteins. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 22:810–813.

Jara C, Aránguiz A, Cerpa W, Tapia-Rojas C, Quintanilla RA. 2018. Genetic ablation of
tau improves mitochondrial function and cognitive abilities in the hippocampus.
Redox Biol 18:279–294.

Kabiljo J, Murko C, Pusch O, Zupkovitz G. 2019. Spatio-temporal expression profile of
sirtuins during aging of the annual fish Nothobranchius furzeri. *Gene Expression*
Patterns [Internet] 33:11–19. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gep.2019.05.001

Kalyaanamoorthy S, Minh BQ, Wong TKF, von Haeseler A, Jermiin LS. 2017.
ModelFinder: fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. *Nat.*
Methods 14:587–589.

Katoh K, Standley DM. 2013. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
improvements in performance and usability. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 30:772–780.

Kumar S, Stecher G, Suleski M, Hedges SB. 2017. TimeTree: A Resource for
Timelines, Timetrees, and Divergence Times. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 34:1812–1819.

Kuraku S. 2013. Impact of asymmetric gene repertoire between cyclostomes and
gnathostomes. *Semin. Cell Dev. Biol.* 24:119–127.

Langmead B, Trapnell C, Pop M, Salzberg SL. 2009. Ultrafast and memory-efficient
alignment of short DNA sequences to the human genome. *Genome Biol.* 10:R25.

Leinonen R, Sugawara H, Shumway M, International Nucleotide Sequence Database
Collaboration. 2011. The sequence read archive. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 39:D19–D21.

Li B, Dewey CN. 2011. RSEM: accurate transcript quantification from RNA-Seq data
with or without a reference genome. *BMC Bioinformatics* [Internet] 12. Available
from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-12-323

Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. 2014. Moderated estimation of fold change and
dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol.* 15:550.

Lynch M, Conery JS. 2000. The Evolutionary Fate and Consequences of Duplicate
Genes. *Science* [Internet] 290:1151–1155. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.290.5494.1151

McBurney MW, Yang X, Jardine K, Hixon M, Boekelheide K, Webb JR, Lansdorp PM,

Lemieux M. 2003. The mammalian SIR2alpha protein has a role in embryogenesis
and gametogenesis. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 23:38–54.

McCormick SD. 1993. Methods for nonlethal gill biopsy and measurement of Na+, K+-
ATPase activity. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 50:656–658.

McDonnell E, Peterson BS, Bomze HM, Hirschey MD. 2015. SIRT3 regulates
progression and development of diseases of aging. *Trends Endocrinol. Metab.*
26:486–492.

Michan S, Sinclair D. 2007. Sirtuins in mammals: insights into their biological function.
Biochem. J 404:1–13.

Michishita E, Park JY, Burneskis JM, Barrett JC, Horikawa I. 2005. Evolutionarily
conserved and nonconserved cellular localizations and functions of human SIRT
proteins. *Mol. Biol. Cell* 16:4623–4635.

Nei M, Rooney AP. 2005. Concerted and birth-and-death evolution of multigene
families. *Annu. Rev. Genet.* 39:121–152.

Nery MF, Arroyo JI, Opazo JC. 2014. Increased rate of keratin gene loss in the
cetacean lineage. *BMC Genomics.* 2014. 15:869.

Nguyen NTT, Vincens P, Roest Crollius H, Louis A. 2018. Genomicus 2018: karyotype
evolutionary trees and on-the-fly synteny computing. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 46:D816–
D822.

North BJ, Verdin E. 2004. Sirtuins: Sir2-related NAD-dependent protein deacetylases.
Genome Biol. 5:224.

Ohno S. 1985. Dispensable genes. *Trends Genet.* 1:160–164.

Olesen MA, Torres AK, Jara C, Murphy MP, Tapia-Rojas C. 2020. Premature synaptic
mitochondrial dysfunction in the hippocampus during aging contributes to memory
loss. *Redox Biol* 34:101558.

Olson MV. 1999. When less is more: gene loss as an engine of evolutionary change.
Am. J. Hum. Genet. 64:18–23.

Onyango P, Celic I, McCaffery JM, Boeke JD, Feinberg AP. 2002. SIRT3, a human
SIR2 homologue, is an NAD-dependent deacetylase localized to mitochondria.
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 99:13653–13658.

Opazo JC, Hoffmann FG, Zavala K, Edwards SV. 2019. Evolution of the DAN gene
family in vertebrates. *Evolutionary Biology*:185.

Opazo JC, Kuraku S, Zavala K, Toloza-Villalobos J, Hoffmann FG. 2019. Evolution of
nodal and nodal-related genes and the putative composition of the heterodimers

that trigger the nodal pathway in vertebrates. *Evolution & Development* [Internet]
21:205–217. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ede.12292

Opazo JC, Vandewege MW, Gutierrez J, Zavala K, Vargas-Chacoff L, Morera FJ,
Mardones GA. 2021. Independent duplications of the Golgi phosphoprotein 3
oncogene in birds. *Sci. Rep.* 11:12483.

Pereira TCB, Rico EP, Rosemberg DB, Schirmer H, Dias RD, Souto AA, Bonan CD,
Bogo MR. 2011. Zebrafish as a model organism to evaluate drugs potentially able
to modulate sirtuin expression. *Zebrafish* 8:9–16.

Ponnambalam S, Girotti M, Yaspo ML, Owen CE, Perry AC, Suganuma T, Nilsson T,
Fried M, Banting G, Warren G. 1996. Primate homologues of rat TGN38: primary
structure, expression and functional implications. *J. Cell Sci.* 109 (Pt 3):675–685.

Qiu H, Hildebrand F, Kuraku S, Meyer A. 2011. Unresolved orthology and peculiar
coding sequence properties of lamprey genes: the KCNA gene family as test case.
BMC Genomics 12:325.

Qiu X, Brown K, Hirschey MD, Verdin E, Chen D. 2010. Calorie restriction reduces
oxidative stress by SIRT3-mediated SOD2 activation. *Cell Metab.* 12:662–667.

Rajabi N, Galleano I, Madsen AS, Olsen CA. 2018. Targeting Sirtuins: Substrate
Specificity and Inhibitor Design. *Prog. Mol. Biol. Transl. Sci.* 154:25–69.

Ramos-Vicente D, Ji J, Gratacòs-Batlle E, Gou G, Reig-Viader R, Luís J, Burguera D,
Navas-Perez E, García-Fernández J, Fuentes-Prior P, et al. 2018. Metazoan
evolution of glutamate receptors reveals unreported phylogenetic groups and
divergent lineage-specific events. *Elife* [Internet] 7. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.7554/eLife.35774

Ross BH, Lin Y, Corales EA, Burgos PV, Mardones GA. 2014. Structural and functional
characterization of cargo-binding sites on the μ4-subunit of adaptor protein complex
4. *PLoS One* 9:e88147.

Rueden CT, Schindelin J, Hiner MC, DeZonia BE, Walter AE, Arena ET, Eliceiri KW.
2017. ImageJ2: ImageJ for the next generation of scientific image data. *BMC*
Bioinformatics 18:529.

Saravia J, Paschke K, Oyarzún-Salazar R, Cheng C-HC, Navarro JM, Vargas-Chacoff
L. 2021. Effects of warming rates on physiological and molecular components of
response to CTMax heat stress in the Antarctic fish Harpagifer antarcticus. *J.*
Therm. Biol. 99:103021.

Sauve AA, Schramm VL. 2003. Sir2 regulation by nicotinamide results from switching
between base exchange and deacetylation chemistry. *Biochemistry* 42:9249–9256.

Scher MB, Vaquero A, Reinberg D. 2007. SirT3 is a nuclear NAD+-dependent histone

deacetylase that translocates to the mitochondria upon cellular stress. *Genes Dev.*
21:920–928.

Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW. 2012. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of
image analysis. *Nat. Methods* 9:671–675.

Scholte LLS, Mourão MM, Pais FS-M, Melesina J, Robaa D, Volpini AC, Sippl W, Pierce
RJ, Oliveira G, Nahum LA. 2017. Evolutionary relationships among protein lysine
deacetylases of parasites causing neglected diseases. *Infect. Genet. Evol.* 53:175–
188.

Schwartz S, Zhang Z, Frazer KA, Smit A, Riemer C, Bouck J, Gibbs R, Hardison R,
Miller W. 2000. PipMaker--a web server for aligning two genomic DNA sequences.
Genome Res. 10:577–586.

Schweizer A, Ericsson M, Bächi T, Griffiths G, Hauri HP. 1993. Characterization of a
novel 63 kDa membrane protein. Implications for the organization of the ER-to-
Golgi pathway. *J. Cell Sci.* 104 (Pt 3):671–683.

Schwer B, North BJ, Frye RA, Ott M, Verdin E. 2002. The human silent information
regulator (Sir)2 homologue hSIRT3 is a mitochondrial nicotinamide adenine
dinucleotide-dependent deacetylase. *J. Cell Biol.* 158:647–657.

Shahgaldi S, Kahmini FR. 2021. A comprehensive review of Sirtuins: With a major focus
on redox homeostasis and metabolism. *Life Sci.* 282:119803.

Sharma S, Ciufo S, Starchenko E, Darji D, Chlumsky L, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Schoch CL.
2019. The NCBI BioCollections Database. *Database* [Internet] 2019. Available
from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/database/baz057

Sheffield P, Garrard S, Derewenda Z. 1999. Overcoming expression and purification
problems of RhoGDI using a family of "parallel" expression vectors. *Protein Expr.*
Purif. 15:34–39.

Simó-Mirabet P, Bermejo-Nogales A, Calduch-Giner JA, Pérez-Sánchez J. 2017.
Tissue-specific gene expression and fasting regulation of sirtuin family in gilthead
sea bream (Sparus aurata). *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* [Internet]
187:153–163. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00360-016-1014-0

Slade KM, Freggiaro S, Cottrell KA, Smith JJ, Wiley EA. 2011. Sirtuin-mediated nuclear
differentiation and programmed degradation in Tetrahymena. *BMC Cell Biol.* 12:40.

Smith JJ, Kuraku S, Holt C, Sauka-Spengler T, Jiang N, Campbell MS, Yandell MD,
Manousaki T, Meyer A, Bloom OE, et al. 2013. Sequencing of the sea lamprey
(Petromyzon marinus) genome provides insights into vertebrate evolution. *Nat.*
Genet. 45:415–421, 421e1–e2.

Somero GN. 2004. Adaptation of enzymes to temperature: searching for basic

"strategies." *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. B Biochem. Mol. Biol.* 139:321–333.

Stelzer G, Rosen N, Plaschkes I, Zimmerman S, Twik M, Fishilevich S, Stein TI, Nudel
R, Lieder I, Mazor Y, et al. 2016. The GeneCards Suite: From Gene Data Mining to
Disease Genome Sequence Analyses. *Curr. Protoc. Bioinformatics* 54:1.30.1–
1.30.33.

Tao R, Coleman MC, Pennington JD, Ozden O, Park S-H, Jiang H, Kim H-S, Flynn CR,
Hill S, Hayes McDonald W, et al. 2010. Sirt3-mediated deacetylation of
evolutionarily conserved lysine 122 regulates MnSOD activity in response to stress.
Mol. Cell 40:893–904.

Tatone C, Di Emidio G, Barbonetti A, Carta G, Luciano AM, Falone S, Amicarelli F.
2018. Sirtuins in gamete biology and reproductive physiology: emerging roles and
therapeutic potential in female and male infertility. *Hum. Reprod. Update* 24:267–
289.

Tenorio MJ, Ross BH, Luchsinger C, Rivera-Dictter A, Arriagada C, Acuña D, Aguilar M,
Cavieres V, Burgos PV, Ehrenfeld P, et al. 2016. Distinct Biochemical Pools of
Golgi Phosphoprotein 3 in the Human Breast Cancer Cell Lines MCF7 and MDA-
MB-231. *PLoS One* 11:e0154719.

Trifinopoulos J, Nguyen L-T, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. 2016. W-IQ-TREE: a fast online
phylogenetic tool for maximum likelihood analysis. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 44:W232–
W235.

Tseng AHH, Shieh S-S, Wang DL. 2013. SIRT3 deacetylates FOXO3 to protect
mitochondria against oxidative damage. *Free Radic. Biol. Med.* 63:222–234.

Vassilopoulos A, Fritz KS, Petersen DR, Gius D. 2011. The human sirtuin family:
evolutionary divergences and functions. *Hum. Genomics* 5:485–496.

Vassilopoulos A, Pennington JD, Andresson T, Rees DM, Bosley AD, Fearnley IM, Ham
A, Flynn CR, Hill S, Rose KL, et al. 2014. SIRT3 deacetylates ATP synthase F1
complex proteins in response to nutrient- and exercise-induced stress. *Antioxid.*
Redox Signal. 21:551–564.

Vazquez BN, Vaquero A, Schindler K. 2020. Sirtuins in female meiosis and in
reproductive longevity. *Mol. Reprod. Dev.* 87:1175–1187.

Waterhouse A, Bertoni M, Bienert S, Studer G, Tauriello G, Gumienny R, Heer FT, de
Beer TAP, Rempfer C, Bordoli L, et al. 2018. SWISS-MODEL: homology modelling
of protein structures and complexes. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 46:W296–W303.

Wichmann IA, Zavala K, Hoffmann FG, Vandewege MW, Corvalán AH, Amigo JD,
Owen GI, Opazo JC. 2016. Evolutionary history of the reprimo tumor suppressor
gene family in vertebrates with a description of a new reprimo gene lineage. *Gene*
591:245–254.

Wood JG, Rogina B, Lavu S, Howitz K, Helfand SL, Tatar M, Sinclair D. 2004. Sirtuin
activators mimic caloric restriction and delay ageing in metazoans. *Nature*
430:686–689.

Yang L, Ma X, He Y, Yuan C, Chen Q, Li G, Chen X. 2017. Sirtuin 5: a review of
structure, known inhibitors and clues for developing new inhibitors. *Sci. China Life*
Sci. 60:249–256.

Yates AD, Achuthan P, Akanni W, Allen J, Allen J, Alvarez-Jarreta J, Amode MR,
Armean IM, Azov AG, Bennett R, et al. 2020. Ensembl 2020. *Nucleic Acids Res.*
48:D682–D688.

You W, Zheng W, Weiss S, Chua KF, Steegborn C. 2019. Structural basis for the
activation and inhibition of Sirtuin 6 by quercetin and its derivatives. *Sci. Rep.*
9:19176.

Zhang J, Xiang H, Liu J, Chen Y, He R-R, Liu B. 2020. Mitochondrial Sirtuin 3: New
emerging biological function and therapeutic target. *Theranostics* 10:8315–8342.

Zhao E, Hou J, Ke X, Abbas MN, Kausar S, Zhang L, Cui H. 2019. The Roles of Sirtuin
Family Proteins in Cancer Progression. *Cancers* [Internet] 11. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/cancers11121949

Zhao H-C, Ding T, Ren Y, Li T-J, Li R, Fan Y, Yan J, Zhao Y, Li M, Yu Y, et al. 2016.
Role of Sirt3 in mitochondrial biogenesis and developmental competence of human
in vitro matured oocytes. *Hum. Reprod.* 31:607–622.

Gene phylogeny	Synteny	Protein Size (AA)	MW (KD)	Enzymatic activity	Subcellular localization	Function	Disease
SIRT1 (Class I)	Human Chr10 — DNAJC12, SIRT1, HERC4	747	81.7	Deacetylase	Nucleus & Cytosol	Metabolism regulation, Regulation of chromatin and transcription, DNA repair & Inflammation suppression	Aging, Neurodegenration, Metabolic disease, Cardiovascular disease & Cancer
SIRT2 (Class I)	Human Chr19 — RINL, SIRT2, NFKBIB	389	41.5	Deacetylase	Nucleus & Cytosol	Cell differentiation, Metabolism regulation, Cell cycle regulation, Microtubule dynamics & Inflammation regulation	Cancer & Neurodegeneration
SIRT3 (Class I)	Human Chr11 — RIC8A, SIRT3, PSMD13	399	43.6	Deacetylase	Nucleus & Mitochondria	Metabolism regulation, Inflammation suppression, Inhibition of oxidative stress, Apoptosis regulation & Autophagy regulation	Aging, Neurodegenration, Metabolic disease, Cardiovascular disease & Cancer
SIRT3.2 (Class I)	Elephant shark NW_024704746.1* — RIC8B, SIRT3.2, TMEM263	401	44.2	Deacetylase	Mitochondria	?	?
SIRT6 (Class IV)	Human Chr19 — CREB3L3, SIRT6, ANKRD24	355	39.1	Deacetylase & ADP-ribosyltransferase	Nucleus	Metabolism regulation & Chromatin and DNA repair	Aging, Metabolic disease, Cardiovascular disease & Cancer
SIRT7 (Class IV)	Human Chr17 — PCYT2, SIRT7, MAFG	400	44.9	Deacetylase	Nucleus	Transcription regulation, Chromatin remodeling & Metabolism regulation	Metabolic disease, Cardiovascular disease & Cancer
SIRT4 (Class II)	Human Chr12 — PXN, SIRT4, PLA2G1B	314	35.2	ADP-ribosyltransferase, Lipoamidase & Deacetylase	Mitochondria	Metabolism regulation	Neurodegenration, Metabolic disease & Cancer
SIRT5 (Class III)	Human Chr6 — GFOD1, SIRT5, NOL7	310	33.9	Deacetylase, Desuccinylase, Deglutarylase & Demalonylase	Mitochondria	Metabolism regulation & Immune response modulation	Metabolic disease, & Cancer

Figure 2

Figure 3

SIRT3

SIRT3.2

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Sequence position markers: 116, 126, 194

Human SIRT3	GSSDKGKLSLQDVAELIRARACQRVVVMVGAGISTPSGIPDFRSPGSGLYSNLQQYDLPYPEAIFELPFFFHNPKPFFT
Coelacanth SIRT3	GGSEQKQQLLEDIARKIRNRECNRIVVMAGAGISTPSGIPDFRSPGSGLYDNLRHFGIPYPEAVFEINYFLHDPKPFYS
Spotted gar SIRT3	RGGSQEQQTLQDVARFIRDQEYKRIVVMAGAGISTPSGIPDFRSPGSGLYDNLQQYDLPYAEAIFEINYRHNPKPFFA
Elephant shark SIRT3	KGSSQRASSLEDVASLVRNKECQRIVVMAGAGISTASGIPDFRSPGSGLYDNLQTYDIPYPEAIFEIDYFHCNPKPFFV
Coelacanth SIRT3.2	PSVGGKLKNLNDIAALILYKRCKNIIIIAGAGISTASGIPDFRTPGTGLYDNLQQYNIPCPEAIFDIDYFTYNPKPFFS
Spotted gar SIRT3.2	RRAPSQLRNLEDVARLIQQRPCRNIIVVAGAGISTASGIPDFRTPESGLYANLQKYNIPYPEAIFDIDYFTCDPQPFFS
Elephant Shark SIRT3.2	SNARGKLTKLQDVAALIRNRHCRNIVVMAGAGISTASGIPDFRTPGTGLYDNLEEYNVPYPEAIFDESYFVHNPLPFFS

Sequence position markers: 195, 273

Human SIRT3	LAKELYPGNYKPNVTHYFLRLLHDKGLLLRLYTQNIDGLERVSGIPASKLVEAHGTFASATCTVCQRPFPGEDIRADVM
Coelacanth SIRT3	LAKELYPGNYKPNWAHYFVRLLYKKGMLLRMYTQNIDGLERLAGIPPSMLVEAHGSFATASCTVCCESYPGENFRDEVM
Spotted gar SIRT3	LAKELYPGNYLPNLTHFFIRLLHDKGLLHRMYTQNIDGLERMAGIPSSKLVEAHGTFATATCTVCRTSYPGEALRAEIL
Elephant shark SIRT3	LAKELYPGSCWPNFTHYFVRLLHQKGILLRMYTQNIDGLERMAGIPPEKLVEAHGTFATATCTVCLKAYSWEELRDDVM
Coelacanth SIRT3.2	LVKELYPGNYQPNYIHYFVKMLHEKGLLLKMYTQNIDGLERKAGIPSEKLVEAHGTFSTASCHSCCKPFPAKIAQEAIM
Spotted gar SIRT3.2	LAKELYPGCYRPNYVHYFVRMLHEKGLLLRMYTQNIDGLERISGIPEEKLVEAHGTFSSASCHLCYTKFPVTEAKKLIL
Elephant shark SIRT3.2	LAKKLYTENYKPNYIHYFLRMLHEKGLLLRLYTQNIDGLERMAGIPSIKMVEAHGTFLTASCSSCRSPYPASKAKAEIL

Sequence position markers: 274, 351

Human SIRT3	ADRVPRCPVCTGVVKPDIVFFGEPLPQRFL-LHVVDFPMADLLLILGTSLEVEPFASLTEAVRSSVPRLLINRDLVGPL
Coelacanth SIRT3	EGKVPLCPICTGVIKPDIIFFGQELPKRFF-LYLTDFPLADLLIIMGTSLEVEPFASLAGAVRSSVTRLLINRDLVGPF
Spotted gar SIRT3	ESKIPKCPSCKGVLKPDIVFFGEELPQQFF-LYLTDFPMADLLIVMGTSLEVEPFASLAGAVRSSVPRVLINRDLVGPF
Elephant shark SIRT3	QSKVPQCATCSGVIKPDIVFFGEQLPQKFD-LHMLDLPLADLLVIMGTSLEVEPFASLSGMVRGSVPRVLINQDLVGSF
Coelacanth SIRT3.2	NDKIPRCKACSGIVKPDIVFFGEDLPKRFY-RFSKDFVNADLVFIMGTSLEIEPFASIVDSARSYVPRLLLNRDLVGPF
Spotted gar SIRT3.2	SNKVPRCKNCQGTVKPDVVFFGEDLPKKFF-LHTKDFPKADLLIIMGTSLQIEPFASIVNTVKATVPRLLLNRDPIGPF
Elephant shark SIRT3.2	SDKIPKCKRCTGIVKPDIVFFGEDLPKRFHSLYRKDFYKSDLLIVMGTSLEIEPFAGIVNSVQPNVPRLLLNRDPVGPF

Sequence position markers: 352, 382, 392

Human SIRT3	AWHP-RSRDVAQLGDVVHGVESLVELLGWTEEMRDLVQRETG
Coelacanth SIRT3	SWYS-RSNDVVELGEVIGGVRKFVDLLGWKEEMKDLIERETE
Spotted gar SIRT3	AYPSRPNDVVEQGDVITGVQKFVDTLGWGEELNELIAVETA
Elephant shark SIRT3	VRNPPRGGDVTELGDIVRGVERFAELLGWKQEVNDLLQREHK
Coelacanth SIRT3.2	KRKPMRNTDVAELGDLIENIKRLVGILGWEEKMDELIRAHTH
Spotted gar SIRT3.2	QKIPLKRTDFMELGDLVDGVKMFARHLGWHEEIEDLIRRHEC
Elephant shark SIRT3.2	QGKCLKKTDVRALGDLTKSIQLFVDMVGWKNDLDELIQERAL

Figure 7

a

SIRT3
SIRT3.2

Cofactor-
Binding
Loop

Zinc-Binding
Domain

NAD+

Peptide
Substrate

Rossmann-Fold
Domain

b

H4   HeLa   MDA-MB-231

Control Transfected Control Transfected Control Transfected

Molecular mass (kDa)

50 — SIRT3.2-3myc

50 — β-ACTIN

1   2   3   4   5   6

c

SIRT3.2-3myc   MitoTracker Orange

H4 cells

TGN46   DAPI / Merge

d

SIRT3.2-3myc   P63

H4 cells

TGN46   DAPI / Merge

a

Figure 10

b