Genomics-based annotations help unveil the molecular composition of edible plants

Shany Ofaim[1], Giulia Menichetti[1,2], Michael Sebek[1] and Albert László Barabási[1,2,3*]

[1]Network Science Institute and Department of Physics, Northeastern University, Boston, USA;

[2]Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston,

USA; [3]Department of Network and Data Science, Central European University, Budapest,

Hungary.

Corresponding author

Correspondence to: a.barabasi@northeastern.edu

Abstract

Given the important role food plays in health and well-being, the past decades have seen

considerable experimental efforts dedicated to mapping the chemical composition of food

ingredients. As the composition of raw food is genetically predetermined, here we ask, to what

degree can we rely on genome-associated metabolic annotations to predict the chemical

composition of natural ingredients? To that end, we developed an approach to unveil the

chemical composition of 75 edible plants' genomes, finding that genome-associated functional

annotations substantially increase the number of compounds linked to specific plants. To account

for the gap between the metabolic potential represented by functional annotations and the

compounds likely to be accumulated and detected experimentally, we employed a predictive

thermodynamic feasibility approach to systematically identify compounds that are likely to

accumulate in plants. To quantify the accuracy of our predictions, we performed untargeted

metabolomics on 13 plants, allowing us to experimentally confirm the detectability of the

predicted compounds. For example, we observed 59 potentially novel compounds predicted and experimentally detected in corn. Our study shows that the application of genome-associated functional annotations can lead to an integrated metabologenomics platform capable of unveiling the chemical composition of edible plants and the biochemical pathways responsible for the observed compounds.

Author Summary

Nutrition and well-being take a central role in today's high pace life, but how much do we really know about the food we eat? Here, we harness existing metabolic knowledge encrypted in staple food ingredients' genome to help us explore the composition of raw edible plants. We first show the benefit and value of looking into genome-associated functional annotations on a wide scale. Next, we rely on new experimental data to develop a framework that helps us reveal new, potentially bioactive compounds in staple food ingredients. This has significance in, first, extending current food composition knowledge and second in discovering newly detected bioactive compounds, shedding light on the potential impacts of common food ingredients beyond their nutritional value as described in food labels. Finally, we show that staple foods that are already included in our daily diets might have the potential to contribute to our well-being.

Background

"Make every bite count" is one of the main guidelines the U.S Departments of Agriculture (USDA) Dietary recommends for Americans (2020-2025)[1], reminding us of the multiple roles of the food we consume, and how it contributes to our well-being. Fruit and

vegetables, serve as a source of energy and nutrients, modulating our health, and affecting disease [2–4]. Plants are complex organisms characterized by large genomes. For example, the corn genome (2,280 Mb) encodes 57,181 proteins, annotated to Gene Ontology (GO) categories, helping unveil the biological processes these proteins participate in and their potential molecular functions [5]. The genome can also be a strong predictor of phenotypic traits [6], like color, taste and aroma, known indicators of the nutritional value of a plant [7]. Indeed, color and pigments including carotenoids, betalains, and anthocyanins are well known for their bioactive properties [8]. Furthermore, the genetically predetermined polyphenols, alkaloids, carotenoids, and phytosterols have well-documented antioxidant and anti-inflammatory activities effecting multiple diseases, from cancer to diabetes or hypertension [9].

The composition of edible plants has been extensively mined in the context of bioactivity, focusing on antioxidants [10], anti-microbial potential as an alternative food preservatives [11], and most recently as holistic sources of bioactive compounds in work describing the use of the edible and non-edible parts of plant foods. For example, the non-edible parts of Bell pepper, like the seeds and leaves, were shown to be a valuable source of bioactive phytochemicals [12]. All these reports either rely on a collection of pre-existing work done on single plants or focus on a specific plant. To the best of our knowledge, the work presented here is the first systematic, large-scale approach developed for the exploration of edible plant composition.

Our current knowledge on food composition is limited to 150 nutrients catalogued by USDA, despite the fact that the true number of chemical compounds in food ranges from tens [13] to hundreds of thousands across all known plant species [14]. The bulk of our knowledge on the chemical composition of food comes from mass spectrometry and other low-throughput analytical methods and is compiled in repositories such as FooDB [15] and The Dictionary of

Food Compounds [16] (DFC), cataloguing comprehensive information on the detected

compounds, including both evidence-based and predicted annotations.

Our work is driven by the hypothesis that the full list of known, and yet unknown

chemicals present in plants are encoded in the genome of the respective organism, encapsulating

its metabolic capacities. Recent advancements in genomics have resulted in the emergence of

extensive annotation efforts to decipher the genetic potential and the metabolic capacities of

plants. For example, KEGG [17] links genes to their functional annotations such as enzymes,

reactions, and chemical compounds and catalogues them in metabolic pathway maps, offering

functional annotations for 7,254 organisms across the tree of life, out of which 56 are edible

plants. Another contributor to plant genome-associated metabolic annotations is PlantCyc [18], a

BioCyc [19] based platform adapted to annotate the functional diversity of plant genomes.

Although the number of plant genomes sequenced, assembled and annotated has dramatically

increased in recent years, the number of available genomes is relatively small (approx. 1,045

genomes in NCBI) and represents less than 0.16% of the known plant population [20]. As recent

estimates indicate, approximately thirty domesticated plant species represent a significant portion

of dietary diversity and three major grains (rice, wheat, and corn) contribute to more than half of

the world's caloric intake [21]. Thus, the exploration of existing genome-associated metabolic

annotations of staple plant ingredients like corn, rice, soybean, potatoes, and other highly

consumed edible plants offer a potentially good resource for describing their composition and

hidden benefits.

Here, we explore to what degree existing genome-associated metabolic annotations can

offer a valuable resource to deepen the knowledge of food composition. To do so, and focus on

the edible parts of plants, we rely on metabologenomics [22–24], integrating genomics and

metabolomics, used in the past to discover novel natural products [22,25]. To be specific, we

develop a systematic metabologenomics approach, coupled with thermodynamic feasibility

analysis, aiming to predict the composition of edible plants. We validate our predictions by

comparing them to the existing chemical knowledge curated by food composition databases like

FooDB, DFC, and USDA. We also collect new experimental data to explore the chemical

composition of 13 plants. Our findings indicate that existing genome-associated metabolic

annotations offer a predictive platform capable of systematically capturing the chemical

composition of plant-based food, from fruits to vegetables, and allow us to predict and

experimentally test the presence of novel compounds in plants.

Results

The existing knowledge on food composition

We collected data for 75 edible plants with published and metabolically annotated

genomes from two well established databases: KEGG and PlantCyc. Our collection represents

plants from 28 families including monocots and dicots (Figure 1a), covering major plant food

groups: fruits (apple, banana and orange), grains (rice, corn and quinoa), vegetables (tomato,

potato and spinach) and proteins (soy, chickpeas and pigeon pea).

To estimate the currently available knowledge on the chemical composition of edible

plants, we collected compound annotations from FooDB, DFC, and USDA, cataloguing 5,834,

5,151, and 140 compounds respectively, across all plants (Figure S1A). FooDB carries 723±452

compounds on average per plant (median: 850), a number that can be as low as three compounds

for clementine (*Citrus clementina*) and as high as 2,181 compounds for tea (*Camellia sinensis*).

DFC carries 83±121 compounds on average per plant (median: 33) with as low as one compound

for vegetable marrow (*Cucurbita pepo subsp. pepo*) and red rice (*Oryza punctata*) and as high as

697 compounds for tea. Finally, USDA carries 88±46 compounds on average per plant (median:

110), with a single compound for false flax (*Camelina sativa*) and Chinese white pear (*Pyrus ×*

bretschneideri) and 128 compounds for apple (*Malus domestica*).

Genome-associated metabolic annotations' contribution to food composition

To estimate the contribution of available genome-associated metabolic annotations to the

existing knowledge on food composition, we collected plant-related compounds from KEGG and

PlantCyc, FooDB, USDA, and DFC. KEGG stores information about 7,245 organisms, out of

which 546 are eukaryotes and 92 are plants, including 56 edible plants. PlantCyc is a plant-

oriented database storing 126 genomes, out of which 58 represent edible plants. As all of

databases detailed above are well-established and are of the highest quality of data, they provide

annotations with sequence and literature evidence. Thus we consider the collection of plant-

associated annotations as a comprehensive representation of the existing metabolic knowledge in

the plant genome. These databases overlap and complement each other (39 plants overlap),

covering 75 metabolically annotated plant genomes when combined. Overall, KEGG and

PlantCyc contributed 1,201 and 3,737 new unique compounds respectively, adding a total of

5,224 new compounds (unique and common) to the composition of plants in our catalogue

(Figure S1B).

To illustrate the contribution of genome-associated metabolic annotations to edible plants

(Figure 1b), we focused on corn (*Zea mays*), a highly consumed staple crop [26] worldwide and

in the US. Additionally, corn is known to have nutritional and medicinal qualities used in natural

medicine to alleviate numerous symptoms, including pain and rheumatism [27]. Existing

knowledge for corn includes 1,221 compounds from FooDB, 311 compounds from DFC, and

127 compounds from USDA. Considering overlaps between all sources, this compiled to a total

of 1,038 unique compounds. Next, we set out to explore the value of adding genome-based

annotations to corn's existing knowledge.

One contribution of genome-associated metabolic annotations is the metabolic context of

these compounds, carried by a network of pathways. Some known pathways are only partially

annotated even after considering multiple databases. For example, in Monoterpenoid

biosynthesis in corn (Fig 2B) six out of nine compounds are annotated in both databases. Of the

three remaining compounds, (R)-Ipsdienol is known to be present in food but was not annotated

to any plant in our collection. The two remaining compounds, Ipsdienon, a product of the

reaction catalyzed by EC 1.1.1.386 directly from (R)-Ipsdienol, and (6E)-8-Oxolinalool, a

product of the reaction catalyzed by EC 1.14.14.84, are currently documented in food but not in

corn (white circles, Figure 2b). To strengthen the stringency of our work, the compounds, whose

presence is documented in food but not known to be associated with corn, are not included in the

plant's catalogue.

Consider another example, the tocopherol biosynthesis pathway. Tocopherols are an

important class of compounds for health and nutrition [28] (α-tocopherol better known as

vitamin E). Figure 2c shows the tocopherol biosynthesis pathway in corn and the delineated

contribution of each database to its compounds. We find that databases such as FooDB and DFC

annotate the lower half of the pathway, capturing products such as vitamin E and its derivatives.

In contrast, genomics-based annotations offer a full pathway annotation, adding 4 new

intermediates: 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)pyruvate, homogenistate, phytyl diphosphate, and 2-methyl-

6-phytyl-1,4-benzoquinol and 2 new cofactors: S-adenosyl-L-homocysteine and S-adenosyl-L-

methionine, shedding light on the metabolic processes leading to the production of vitamin E in

corn.

Taken together, existing genome-associated metabolic annotations added 3,021

compounds to the list of chemical compounds potentially present in corn, increasing its

compound library by 64% (Figure 2a). Across our collection, genome-associated metabolic

annotations increased the number of compounds by 2,363±728 chemicals on average per plant,

an increase of 75%±15%. After this increase, our database documents 3,239±1,054 compounds

per plant. We find that some plants are well annotated in FooDB, DFC, and USDA, while others

are poorly annotated (Figure 3). Tea (*Camellia sinensis*) contains the highest number of FooDB,

DFC, and USDA annotations (2,547 compounds out of a total of 4,379) showing an increase of

42% in new compounds. Some varieties of rice (*Oryza glaberrima*, *Oryza longistaminata*, *Oryza*

barthii), white yam (*Dioscorea rotundata*), wild tomato (*Solanum pennellii*) and woodland

strawberry (*Fragaria vesca*) are not catalogued by FooDB, DFC, or USDA, hence for these

plants genome-associated metabolic annotations contributed 100% of the compounds. Other

plants like clementine (*Citrus clementina*), lotus (*Nelumbo nucifera*) and African oil palm

(*Elaeis guineensis*) are poorly annotated (<250 compounds) in FooDB, DFC, and USDA, hence

the addition of genome-associated metabolic annotations increased our knowledge about their

chemical composition by more than 85%.

Pathway enrichment analysis

Genome-associated metabolic annotations do not only increase our knowledge about the

chemical composition of plants but also help us unveil the network of pathways responsible for

the production of the newly predicted chemical compounds. Indeed, metabolic pathway mapping

allows for a better understanding of the metabolic mechanisms responsible for the synthesis and

modulation of natural products and offer a knowledge base towards the prediction of currently

undetected compounds.

Metabolic pathways are divided into two main classes: primary and secondary

metabolism. Primary metabolism is the collection of pathways involved in growth, energy, and

reproduction of a plant, while secondary metabolism captures all other functions [29], like

flavonoid biosynthesis, xenobiotics metabolism or plant-hormone metabolism, to name only a

few. For corn, we collected 789 pathways, of which 35% belong to primary, and 65% belong to

secondary metabolism. We asked if certain pathways are represented more than others in our

catalogue. To test for pathway bias, we performed a hypergeometric enrichment test capturing

the chance for a set of compounds mapped to a pathway in a certain plant to exceed the expected

overlap with the general reference pathway (p-value <0.05) (Figure S2). Although the use of the

hypergeometric test is a common and well-established tool, it is not without limitations,

including recurring tests on the same pathway and the use of pathways as singular units with no

inter-pathway biological dependence. To account for recurring tests on the same pathway, we

applied the Bonferroni correction to the p-values in this analysis. The choice of database was

shown to strongly affect pathway enrichment tests [30]. To maximize the biological relevance of

our analysis and compensate for the effects that might rise from database selection, including

biological dependence between pathways, we integrated pathway information from two

inherently different pathway schemes; KEGG, with larger, more generalized pathway maps, and

PlantCyc, a BioCyc-based mapping scheme with smaller, more specific pathway maps. In corn,

we found 479 enriched pathways spanning both primary (45%) and secondary metabolism

(55%), indicating that our corn dataset is metabolically diverse.

We next asked about specialized metabolism occurring only in corn, scanning our plant

collection for enriched pathways specific to it (Figure 4a). Corn-specific pathways include

specialized metabolism like kauralexin and zealexin biosynthesis [31,32], maysin biosynthesis

[33], bergamotene biosynthesis [34] and all-trans-farnesol biosynthesis [35]. Each of these

natural products of the diterpenoid, volatile sesquiterpenes, and flavone families are produced by

the plant to acquire resistance against biotic and abiotic stress, such as herbivore attack.

Generalizing, the analysis performed for corn, we next classified pathways to

primary/secondary in our entire collection. We identified 789 pathways across the full plant

catalogue, 35% of which are related to primary and 65% to secondary metabolism, a fraction

similar to the one observed for corn, offering evidence of diversity in our catalogue (Figure 4b,

e). We find most pathways to be enriched (p-value <0.05), with the exception of pathways

belonging to glycan biosynthesis and secondary biosynthesis metabolism. Other pathways

belonging to secondary metabolism showed a large variation in p-values as multiple outliers

were observed above the enrichment line (Figure 4b).

We found 762 enriched pathways across all plants (p-value<0.05), out of which 34% are

related to primary and 66% are related to secondary metabolism. The distribution of the number

of enriched pathways per plant shows two peaks (Figure 4c), corresponding to the two databases,

KEGG and PlantCyc. The peaks capture the fact that KEGG has fewer, more complex, and

generic pathway map representations, while PlantCyc has a larger number of smaller pathways.

For example, KEGG represents the metabolism of alanine, aspartate, and glutamate in one map,

while PlantCyc breaks down this process into 10 smaller pathways.

Different plants are known for their production of specialized compounds and natural

products. Examples include the production of curcumin by turmeric, thymol by thyme, and

vanillin by vanilla plants [36], prompting us to identify pathways enriched in single plants,

pointing towards potential unique functionalities. Indeed, we observed a bimodal distribution of

the number of plants per enriched pathway, one of the peaks being closer to 60 plants and

another around 5 plants, indicating the presence of specialized plant metabolism in our catalogue

(Figure 4c). Overall, we find that 30 out of 75 plants have at least one plant-specific enriched

pathway (Figure S3), out of which we explored seven (Figure 4a). An example of a unique

pathway is anthocyanin biosynthesis (delphinidin 3-O-glucoside) in grapes (*Vitis vinifera*),

present in seeds and grape skins and used to differentiate between types of wine [37,38]. Other

examples include: (1) hordatine biosynthesis in Barley (*Hordeum vulgare subsp. vulgare*).

Hordatine, an antifungal compound, highly abundant in young barley shoots, reported to be a

potential inhibitor of two main COVID-19 proteins, a protease (PDB ID: 7BQY) and a RNA

polymerase (PDB ID: 7bV2) [39] and found in measurable quantities in different types of beer

[40]. (2) Ricinoleate biosynthesis, found in castor bean (*Ricinus communis*) and the main

constituent of castor oil, was shown to have antibacterial activities, and its elastic properties

make it a candidate for packaging polymers with potential applications in biomedical and food

technology [41]. (3) Capsaicin, a specialized component in pepper (*Capsicum annuum*) [42],

was recently shown to have positive dietetic effects and beneficial antioxidant activity through

association with the gut microbiome [43]. (4) Sorgoleone, an allelochemical exuded from

sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*) roots, is known to affect both microbial communities and

neighboring plant growth [44]. Finally, we find a variety of acyl-sugar biosynthesis pathways in

tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*). Acyl-sugars are created in tomato trichomes and have

commercial and medicinal uses [45]. Another unique pathway in tomato is phenylpropanoid

volatiles glycoconjugation, a pathway describing specialized volatiles found in tomato fruits

contributing to its signature smell [46].

In summary, publicly-available genome-associated metabolic annotations bring diverse

metabolic information from both primary and secondary metabolism, offering evidence of new

specialized compounds with bioactivity potential.

Experimental confirmation of genome-associated metabolic annotations' contribution to

food knowledge

To experimentally test the capacity of existing plant genomics metabolic annotations to

predict the presence of compounds in plants, we performed untargeted metabolomics

experiments on 13 out of the 75 plants in our collection, resulting in a catalogue of 939 detected

compounds (see Methods). All experiments were done on the edible parts of these plants. On

average, 371 ± 130 compounds were detected per plant, ranging from 264 in pear to 652 in apple,

and 370 compounds for corn (39.4% of our experimental catalogue). These experimental results

allow us to evaluate the accuracy of genome-associated metabolic annotations in the context of

the edible parts of the plants analyzed. For this, we measured the overlap of the chemical

structures between experimentally detected compounds and our known genomics-based

compound collection, finding that genome-associated metabolic annotations significantly overlap

with experiments (p-value= 0.018, SI section 1).

To be specific, we identify 59 compounds that are found only in corn genome-associated

functional annotations and experimentally detected (Figure 5a). We clustered these new

compounds based on their chemical structure and classified them into primary and secondary

metabolism (Figure 5b, Figure S6), finding that the majority of compounds were attributed to

primary metabolism (30) and might represent pooled intermediates and their possible fragments.

Metabolite detection may also vary depending on the compound and spectra libraries used in

identification. As primary compounds are better studied and annotated, secondary metabolites

and their fragmentation products are less abundant in spectra libraries [47]. Overall, we observed

well-characterized fractions of lipids, cofactors, sugar, and amino acid derivatives.

We identified seven compounds present in corn that might potentially affect human well-

being (Figure 5c). For example, Citrulline, a non-essential amino acid known to affect

cardiovascular health and dilate blood vessels, and primarily found in watermelon and in smaller

amounts in other fruits including a variety of corn species [48], is marketed as a dietary

supplement for bodybuilders and athletes to improve exercise endurance. N-Acetyl-D-

Glucosamine, previously detected in the shell that protects the first leaf of a corn shoot [49], is

known to help support the joints and may help promote healthy skin [50]. Another compound

detected is nicotinamide ribonucleotide (NMN), reported to be detected together with NAD+, a

well-known cofactor, always present in the cell [51]. Well-being benefits related to this

compounds stem from its effects on NAD+ content. This compound has been well studied and as

a member of the vitamin B3 family [52] and is being used for the treatment of several

cardiovascular, neurodegenerative, and metabolic disorders [53]. Other compounds detected in

corn and unveiled by genomics-based annotations have potential cancer-related effects. For

example, 5-methylthioadenosine (MTA), a sulfur-containing nucleoside, was recently reported as

a tumor suppresser [54]. Another cancer-associated compound, hypotaurine, a sulfinic acid with

antioxidant properties, derived from cysteine and an intermediate in taurine production, is one of

the top-ranked metabolites for differentiating low and high-grade tumors [55] but was also

shown to evoke a malignant phenotype in glioma, the most common primary brain malignancies

in adults [56]. It is also marketed as a dietary supplement, together with taurine and L-carnitine,

and associated with semen quality improvement [57]. Some other compounds observed in this

subset were suggested to have both well-being and economic/industrial importance. For

example, Pipecolic acid, a product of lysine metabolism, is an important regulator of immunity

in plants and humans. In plants, it accumulates upon pathogen infection and is associated with

systemic acquired resistance (SAR) [58]. Pipecolic acid is also an important intermediate of

pharmaceutically and biologically derived compounds such as immunosuppressive agents and

antibiotics [59,60]. The compound discussed above are known to have potential bioactivity for

several applications. The potential effects related to medicinal, industrial and other applications,

require further validation. Furthermore, rigorous quantitative analysis is needed to determine

their contribution in the scope of quantitative consumption of raw or cooked corn or the

concentrated form of a compound as a nutritional supplements.

Our experimental investigation also unveiled 22 compounds found only in FooDB, DFC,

and USDA. These include: (1) 6-Methoxy-2(3H)-benzoxazolone (MBOA), a degradation

product of the known bioactive compound 2,4-dihydroxy-7-methoxy-2H-1,4-benzoxazin-3(4H)-

one (DIMBOA). DIMBOA is the main benzoxazinone synthesized in young corn tissues and

accumulates in the cells. It is exuded by the roots and acts as a biocide against pests and as an

attractant for soil bacteria. MBOA, the more stable form, is often detected in corn soils [61].

Interestingly, while DIMBOA is annotated to the corn genome, MBOA, its derivative is not. (2)

Vanillic acid, a phenolic detected in corn grits [62]. (3) Trigonelline, an active alkaloid known to

be found in corn and associated with antioxidant, anti-carcinogenic, anti-diabetic, and anti-

hypercholesterolemia properties [63]. (4) Syringic acid, a phenolic compound found in fruits and

vegetables including corn, is reported to have anti-oxidant, antimicrobial, anti-inflammatory, and

antiendotoxic properties [64]. (5) Feruloylputrescine, a polyamine monoconjugate, previously

detected in corn kernels [65].

Finally, to complete our survey of experimentally-detected compounds also found in our

genomics-based annotations, we considered the remaining 12 out of 75 plants for which we have

both experimental data and plant-genomics metabolic annotations. We find that the number of

compounds added by genome-associated metabolic annotations is typically higher than those

already catalogued by FooDB and DFC (49 ± 15 and 26 ± 14 compounds respectively, Figure S7).

In other words, our analysis shows that genome-associated metabolic annotations significantly

enhance existing knowledge of edible plants' chemical composition, helping us uncover

potentially novel bioactive compounds.

333 Available genome-associated metabolic annotations annotations contribute to the feasibility

334 of compound accumulation

The number of currently identified compounds detected by metabolomics is limited by

instrumentation, standard libraries, and analysis pipelines. Recent work presented predictive

approaches, applying existing knowledge as a basis for compiling lists of potential compounds

that might be detectable by metabolomics experiments. One notable example of such an

approach is MINEs [66], a tool that employs pathway and enzyme-based candidate rules to

increase the amount and accuracy of compound annotations from raw mass-spectromtery data.

Other approaches employ the existing knowledge together with thermodynamic principles to test

the feasibility of metabolic pathways like glycolysis, explaining its activity under different

conditions and constrains [67]. As thermodynamics rules and constrains are often used to provide

insights on the pathway level, here, we hypothesize that the application of standard

thermodynamic annotations, and specifically reaction Gibbs free energy values on the compound

level can shed light on the likelihood of compounds to accumulate in different plants. Thus, we

would be able to identify not only active metabolic routs but the compounds that might play a

metabolic role or serve as important metabolic junctions in the plant cell. To that end, we set out

to explore genome-associated metabolic annotations' contribution to our ability to predict

compounds that accumulate in a plant's edible-parts. Indeed, chemicals that accumulate are more

likely to be present in sufficient quantity to be experimentally detected or to enter the

bloodstream, potentially modulating health. Indeed, transient compounds may be harder to

detect.

To study the likelihood of a compound to accumulate, we used Gibbs free energy (ΔG)

reaction values combined with genome-scale metabolic network topology. To establish

thermodynamic feasibility, we determine the probability that a compound accumulates given all

the reactions it takes part in a plant's network context (Figure 6a). In other words,

thermodynamic feasibility offers a method for discriminating compounds as likely to accumulate

based on cumulative ΔG values of the reactions it is either a reactant or a product in. We

collected ΔG values from modelSEED [68] and PlantCyc and calculated the cumulative ΔG

value (score) for each compound. ModelSEED values are calculated as described in eQuilibrator

[69], a well-established source for Gibbs free energy values. PlantCyc values are calculated

according to the BioCyc schema of computing Gibbs free energy as described in [18]. If the

compound acted as a reactant in a reaction, we assume that it is consumed, hence it is a transient

compound, assigned a negative ΔG value. In contrast, if the compound is a product of the

reaction, it is assigned a positive value. Compounds with positive scores are produced more than

consumed, thus they are likely to accumulate. The set of available reactions was considered for

each compound, out of this set, the reaction representing the largest absolute ΔG value may shift

the balance towards either the consumption or production of that compound. This, in turn may

determine the metabolic pathway activity and the creation of intermediates or byproducts that

may or may not accumulate if they are not consumed by other thermodynamically feasible

reactions. In corn, we scored 2,985 compounds (63% of total compounds), out of which 1,460

have positive ΔG values, i.e., are potentially expected to accumulate given the context of

reactions they are involved in.

To illustrate our findings, we explored the compounds on the vitamin E biosynthesis

pathway in corn (Figure 6b). We observed a potentially likely accumulation of pathway products

α and β tocopherol and of the intermediates γ and δ tocopherol. Intermediates with the potential

to accumulate are likely involved in more than one reaction outside the pathway. These reactions

may have larger absolute ΔG values that can either lead to the rerouting of the compound to

another metabolic pathway, creating a temporary hold on the production of certain compounds.

For example, phytyl diphosphate is involved in 7 reactions and 5 pathways. The largest ΔG value

measured for this set of reactions representing the largest ΔG value was annotated to the phytyl

salvage pathway, describing the conversion of degraded chlorophyll to phytyl phosphate,

contributing to its potentially high likelihood to accumulate. A compound could potentially

accumulate if it is an intermediate appearing in two reactions with a large ΔG value difference in

which the reaction with the larger ΔG value favors the production of the compound in question.

For example, 2,3-dimethyl-6-phytyl-1,4-benzoquinol is involved in two reactions, both annotated

to the vitamin E biosynthesis pathway, where the ΔG value for the reaction producing it (20.64

kcal/mol) is larger than the ΔG value for the reaction consuming it (-12.05 kcal/mol). The use of

thermodynamic feasibility to predict potentially accumulating compounds that might be

experimentally detected is not without its limitations. One example is pathway shifts due to ΔG

value differentiation. These shifts are governed not only by thermodynamic feasibility but by

various other cellular considerations such as genetic and metabolic regulation, and environmental

conditions including nutrient availability, temperature, osmolarity, and pressure. To further

estimate the power of our approach we condensed the compounds to compound families

represented by the first block of their InchIKey. This allows for better comparison to

metabolomics experimental results (see methods). Overall, 1,754±588 compound families were

scored per plant, covering an average of 79±17% of its compounds. The fraction of scored

compounds was as high as 96.5% of the total compounds in *Oryza longstaminata*, a species of

rice, and as low as 50% in adzuki bean (*Vigna angularis*).

To estimate the predictive power of our approach, we first asked if kinetics-based

annotations have increased the predictive power of our approach compared to total genome-

associated metabolic annotations. We find that thermodynamics-based annotations show a more

significant overlap with the experiments compared to genome-associated metabolic annotations

(p-value=0.0018, SI section 1, Figure S4), and they are characterized by a high degree of

structural similarity, significantly different from a random sample of the same size taken from

genome-associated metabolic annotations (p-value<0.001, SI section 1).

Next, we used the experimentally detected compounds in the 13 plants for which we

performed untargeted metabolomics, to estimate the performance of our approach. Similar to

known machine learning methods, we look for compounds that are likely to accumulate, since

our experimental data used as validation does not contain concentration information, we use

compound score as means to establish the best performing threshold for solving for a binary

classification (a compound might likely accumulate or not). After establishing the score

threshold, all compounds with scores above it are considered as likely to accumulate. We then compare it to our experimentally detected compound catalogue as ground truth values (a binary classification denoting presence or absence). We calculated standard performance metrics, such as the true positive and false positive rates and the area under the receiver-operator curve (ROC), AUC_{ROC}. In addition, we calculated the precision, recall, and F1 scores. Since our data may be imbalanced, we initially set the threshold of prediction to be larger than zero (positive values). We then performed a moving threshold analysis (see Methods) to determine the optimal threshold for best performance in each plant found in both our annotation and experimental catalogue (Table S1). Most AUC_{ROC} values were above the discrimination line (0.5), several representing acceptable discrimination (AUC_{ROC} values between 0.69 to 0.76) (Figure 6c).

Finally, we selected the top ranked 110 corn compound families with the best performance of our thermodynamics-based approach (AUC_{ROC}=0.74). This list contained 15 experimentally detected compounds including AMP, S-adenosylhomocysteine (SAH), and 5-methylthioadenosine (MTA), which are cofactors maintained as constant pools in the cell. Other compounds such as succinate, Glycerol 3-phosphate, and 3-phospho-D-glycerate are key products of major energy producing pathways, such as carbon fixation by photosynthesis, glycolysis, and the TCA cycle. Interestingly, L-glutamate and D-Galacturonic acid were also detected. L-glutamate was previously reported as a key metabolite in corn, measured in large amounts in the endosperm [70,71]. D-Galacturonic acid is the main component of pectin, a polysaccharide naturally found in plant cell walls. Thus, both compounds are likely to accumulate and be detected in metabolomics measurements, supporting the predictive power of our approach. To further examine the possibility of detecting natural products in both our experiments and predictions, we compared our results to CoconutDB [72], an open collection of

natural products. Indeed, we found that most of our predicted and experimentally detected compounds overlap with this dataset (Figure S5, Table S2). Surprisingly, CoconutDB contains many annotations for primary metabolites, including TCA cycle intermediates and simple sugars. Interestingly, the fraction of experimentally detected compounds that does not overlap with CoconutDB is comprised mostly of fatty acid derivatives. Indeed, the detection and annotation of lipids by mass spectrometry is limited. One of the limitations is the existence of thousands of structurally diverse lipids in large gradient of concentrations, some being below the experimental detection level. Another limitation in the detection and annotation of these compounds is ingrained in the differences between mammalian and plant lipids, as most of the existing lipid measurement technologies were developed for mammalian lipid analysis. Finally, lipid annotations are limited to well-studied and well-captured lipids. For example, the KEGG database contains 4,132 lipid annotations, representing only a small fraction of the expected diversity of hundreds of thousands of plant lipid species [73]. In many cases lipids are represented as a general backbone that can carry different residues (R groups). One example is the KEGG annotation of Glycerophosphoglycoglycerolipid (KEGG compound C06041), a generic compound with an unknown R group that still takes part in two pathways; (1) Teichoic acid biosynthesis and (2) Glycerolipid metabolism. Considering these and other limitations, the presented approach still captures a significant signal describing the compounds that can potentially accumulate in edible plants.

Discussion

Here, we developed a systematic methodology to extract the contribution of publicly available genome-associated metabolic annotations to the molecular composition of foods. We

found that genome-associated metabolic annotations not only boosted, in some cases by more

than 85%, the number of compounds known to be present in a plant (in comparison to FooDB,

DFC, and USDA databases) but also offered valuable mechanistic knowledge in the form of

chemical structures and the metabolic pathways responsible for their production. Using multiple

types of annotations (compounds, reactions, and pathways), we surveyed the contribution of

genome-associated metabolic annotations in depth. These annotations, combined with

experimentally detected compounds, were used to gain new insights into the chemical

composition of edible plants, specifically corn.

The molecular composition of plants changes in time and in response to biotic and abiotic

stresses such as environmental conditions, herbivore and pathogen attacks and hormonal signals,

all governed by complex genetic and metabolic regulation. We therefore set out to explore the

feasibility of a compound to accumulate, affecting the likelihood of being experimentally

detectable. We find good discriminative power, supporting the large-scale use of thermodynamic

annotations. As experimental data and thermodynamics annotations' availability increase, they

may lead to significant enhancement in the predictive power of metabologenomics.

While the advent of genome-associated metabolic annotations offers new insights into the

composition of edible plants, it is not without limitations. Various biases that might arise from

such data were explored throughout this work, representing only a few of the multiple factors

that might affect our knowledge of food composition. One major limitation of a whole-genome

holistic 'metabolic-soup' approach, specifically in complex organisms such as plants, is the

spatial allocation of compounds. It is known that in plants, a compound can be formed in one

tissue and accumulate in another. For example, the spatiotemporal distribution of amino acids,

flavonoids, and more was shown to be differential across different tissues of citrus fruits with a

larger fraction of flavonoids in the peel and an increased content of amino acids in the juice sacs

[74] . Another challenge is whole-genome metabolic approaches is the integration of genetic and

metabolic regulation. The use of transcriptomics in plants has been recently rising. As

transcriptomics analysis advances, technologies such as single-cell transcriptomics and

transcriptomics integrated with metabolomics are more widely used in plant biology [75,76].

One notable example is the integration of transcriptomics and metabolomics to study

anthocyanin biosynthesis in cabernet sauvignon grape berries in response to growth condition

changes [76]. A natural extension of transcriptomics is plant proteomics, describing the proteins

that are encoded by activated or transcribed genes. Plant proteomics has also been shown to be

valuable in agricultural and food applications [77,78]. The integration of transcriptomics and

proteomics data into the approach developed here, may improve and augment the prediction of

compounds that are likely to accumulate and be detected by mass spectrometry analysis in the

future. Annotations of regulation of gene expression and metabolic feed-forward or back loops

are limited. With the advancement of the collection, analysis, and standardized curation, these

data will improve our predictions. Another major limitation is the availability of annotated plant

genomes. One limitation is the ability of existing annotation tools to comprehensively annotate

compounds that might be metabolized by enzymes encoded by orphan genes or genes with

unknown functions. Recent work suggested such genes to contribute to a wide variety of

biological functions and playing essential roles in plant phenotype [79]. As many annotation

tools rely on homolog information to infer metabolic annotations (notable examples are

plantiSMASH [80] and PlantCyc), these functions might be overlooked. Other metabolic

annotation repositories like KEGG curate their annotations based on experimental and published

work and therefore provide a more accurate collection. Still these data repositories rely heavily

on published work that in turn might overlook orphan gene contributions. As plant orphan gene identification and study of function is rapidly advancing [81], improved annotations may soon be available for a more accurate investigation into the metabolic annotation of edible plants.

While the cost of sequencing dropped significantly, we find that the number of non-model plant genomes annotated remains limited and grows slowly. Other factors such as annotation quality and database standardization can also limit omics-based analysis. As shown here, two major databases, KEGG and PlantCyc, has introduced some redundancy in pathway mappings, partially rooted in the different pathway definitions used. As data continues to accumulate, standardization and mappings between the different data sources is key to deriving new insights.

The use of metabolomics to detect compounds in edible plants highly depends on the instrumentation used, standard libraries, and identification methods. Sample variation in the form of produce origin, growth conditions, and post-harvest treatments can also increase the variability and introduce environmental compounds that might be experimentally detected. For example, it is known that mass-spectrometers have poor detection of stereoisomers [82–84]. In our results, we apply the most stringent gold standard metabolomics annotation method, comparing the resulting spectra to known standards. To determine this approach's comparability to the benchmark of massSpec annotation methodologies used for food metabolomics, we assessed the methodologies on the three most common experimental platforms (HILIC, RP, GC) and five food items (seaweed, Sichuan peppercorn, Miso, Pig's Ear mushroom, Macaroni and cheese) and three annotation approaches: gold standard, spectra matching, and computational annotation. We find that the gold standard method tends to annotates up to 597 compounds, spectra library matching annotates up to 2,855 compounds, and the computational method

annotates up to 5,225 compounds. We find that spectra library matching offers a 5-fold increase

to gold standard and computation annotation provides an 8-fold increase. In our pilot the existing

single-peak based tools annotated 2,426 peaks of the total 28,000 peaks combined over three

experimental methods. Studies have shown that about 50% of the peaks in any MassSpec

experiment are adducts [85–87], molecules formed by the addition of two or more molecules

during sample preparation. This means that about 14,000 peaks correspond to individual

compounds of which currently only 17.3% are annotated. Plants are known to produce around

200,000 compounds, including primary and secondary metabolites [88]. As new metabolomics

annotation tools are being developed, with a focus on computational analysis, we expect more

and more compounds to be annotated, increasing the discovery of a greater fraction of the vast

diversity produced by plants. Even though considerable efforts have been made to establish

spectral analysis pipelines, high-throughput metabolomics compound identification remains

limited. Future improvements in metabolomics analysis and annotation could significantly

enhance our knowledge of specialized metabolites and natural products in edible plants.

Additionally, wider scale surveys including samples of produce from different points in the

supply chain, starting from the field and ending in the grocery store will be useful to further

study the accumulation patterns of potential bioactive compounds and their availability to the

consumer.

Finally, the genome-associated metabolic annotations analyzed here greatly contribute to

our existing knowledge of the composition of edible plants. Furthermore, this approach can be

extended to be used for predicting microbial natural products and compound with bioactivity or

industrial potential. Microbial genomes are smaller and easier to sequence and assemble.

Moreover microbial species are better represented in the metabolic annotation databases and

potentially may lead to more accurate predictions. The integration of genomics and

metabolomics has been suggested as a promising combination towards the identification of

promising compounds [89]. Here, we employ metabolomics of the edible parts of staple plant

food ingredients and specifically corn to show the value this approach in the discovery of new

compounds in specific plant tissues. Thus, this work offers a stepping stone towards a better

understanding of food composition, offering insights based on fast-growing computational and

experimental datasets.

Methods

Data collection

Compound annotations were collected from open-source (FooDB and USDA) and

proprietary (DFC) databases. Genomics based compound, reaction and pathway annotations

were collected from KEGG and PlantCyc. ΔG values were gathered from PlantCyc and

modelSEED. All annotations were completed with SMILES, InChIKey, and molecular weight.

Plant diversity was analyzed and visualized using the ETE3 toolkit [90] tree functions (ete3,

version 3.1.2). All taxonomic data originated from NCBI. Overall, our catalogue includes

15,296, out of which 12,662 first block InChIKeys representing chemical families. To compare

our catalogue and experimentally detected compounds (detailed in the next section), we collected

first block InChikey compound annotations from CoconutDB (January 2022 release).

CoconutDB identifiers were converted to BioCyc and KEGG identifiers for further functional

analysis using CTS – The chemical translation service [91]. The database files are available on

https://github.com/Barabasi-Lab/Plant-genomics.

Mass spectrometry experiments

A selection of 13 produce items was purchased from two local grocery stores (Whole Foods Market and Stop & Shop): apple, banana, carrot, chickpea, corn, lettuce, olive, peach, pear, potato, spinach, soybean, and tomato. Produce available in grocery stores represent the product consumed by the populations. Indeed, this produce may be affected by post-harvest treatments and preservation methods that might introduce foreign non-plant produced compounds. To standardize and minimize these potentially foreign compounds, we treated the samples as they are eaten by the customer. For example, a common post-harvest treatment is applying a wax coating to fruit like apples, this protects the fruit from both mechanical and microbial damage. Removing the peel, removes these waxy compounds that otherwise would potentially be detected by mass spectrometry. Each produce item sample contained the combined material of six units (for example 6 apples) and was prepared in a humidity-controlled room with minimum light exposure. Sample preparation included peeling, chopping, freeze drying (-80ºC for 24 hrs, Catalog No. 10-269-56B from LabConco/Fisher) and pulverizing into a fine homogenized powder (Kitchen Aid, 170W, Model No. BCG111OBO). All samples were prepared by the Giese lab (Northeastern University, Boston MA USA). The final samples were stored at -80 °C in vials containing 200 mg of powder and argon gas. The samples were shipped to two metabolomics centers (West Coast Metabolomics Center, UC Davis, CA USA and Metabolon, Morrisville, NC USA) for analysis on multiple platforms including UHPLC-CSH C18-HRMS-Orbitrap, UHPLC-BEH Amide-HRMS-Orbitrap, UHPLC-PFP-HRMS-Orbitrap, and Shimadzu LC and SelexION QTRAP MS and annotation (see SI section 2).

Experimental results were annotated by spectral matching or identified by a reference

standard library. Results from both metabolomics centers were merged and standardized to

InChIKeys (PubChem). Since metabolomics methodologies does not account for

stereochemistry, only the first block of the InChIKey is used to compare two entries. Therefore,

the resulting list is one of unique compound structures found in each food item. All mass

spectromtery data is available in MetabolomicsWorkbench as ST002493 (for data acquired from

UC Davis) and ST002492 (for data acquired from Metabolon).

Statistics and enrichment tests

Enrichment analysis was performed with the hypergeometric distribution test (python 3.8,

scipy [92] 1.6.3). Pathway enrichment test was performed per organism. To that end, we first

collected all the compound annotations for the reference pathways from KEGG and PlantCyc,

including all known annotations attributed to that pathway. We calculated the number of

compounds found in each pathway in the organism and tested it for significance against the

reference. To account for multiple testing on the same pathway, Bonferroni correction was

applied to pathways' p-values.

Compound similarity across genomics, kinetics, and experiments

To investigate the degree of structural similarity and overlap between molecules retrieved by

different techniques, we performed similarity search and clustering on a variety of molecular

fingerprints (FP). We leveraged the python package rdkit [93] to standardize SMILES and

InChIKeys associated with each compound annotation, using Morgan fingerprints (FP). To

generate a Morgan FP, all substructures around the heavy atoms of a molecule within a defined

radius are generated and assigned to unique identifiers. These identifiers are then hashed to a

vector with a fixed length. The chemoinformatic community employs 1024- or 2048-bit vectors,

populating them with fragments up to radius 1 or 2. For our analysis we increased the resolution

up to 8192 bits and radius 3, to capture fragments of bigger size and reduce the potential bit

collision.

Since the first block of the InChIKey represents several stereoisomers, we assign a bit

vector to each first block as the union of all bit vectors representing the related isomers. We then

compare the degree of structural similarity between any pair of compounds by computing the

Jaccard similarity between binary vectors.

We assess structural similarity for a given set of N compounds, by calculating the *intrinsic*

dimension of their Jaccard similarity matrix $[S_{ij}]$, a function of the spectrum $[\lambda_i]$ of $[S_{ij}]$,

$$n = e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\lambda_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k} \log\left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k}\right)} = e^{H},$$

$$(1)$$

where the Shannon entropy H of the normalized spectrum is used to estimate the number of

independent components synthetizing the same amount of structural similarity observed in the

sample. A higher n indicates a more chemically diverse sample. We used n to assess how

different the kinetics annotations are compared to a random sample from the genomics set

(comparison with 1000 subsamples) (SI Section 1).

Thermodynamic feasibility analysis

We collected available thermodynamic annotations for all the plants in our collection.

Thermodynamic annotations in the form of ΔG values (Kcal/mol) were collected from

ModelSEED[68] and PlantCyc [18].

As our validation set is based on metabolomics identified compounds, we used the first

block of the InChIKey string as a compound identifier. First block identifiers collapse

stereoisomer information, a known limitation of mass spectrometry. To calculate the cumulative

score of ΔGs for a compound we collected all the reaction annotations in which it is involved. If

the compound was acting as reactant in a reaction its ΔG value would be assigned a negative

value and if it would be a product, a positive value. All the values were then summed to

represent a likelihood to accumulate score where a positive value indicated a likely to

accumulate compound and a negative value a likely to be consumed value. This approach was

applied for each plant in our plant collection with corresponding experimental results. A

schematic overview of the developed pipeline is described in Figure S7.

Performance evaluation

To evaluate the performance of the thermodynamics feasibility approach, we used the

first block of the InChIKey of our experimentally detected compound catalogue as a validation

set and ground truth. For each plant we created a binary matrix representing the predicted score

(calculated likely to accumulate value) and the experimental outcome (detected/not detected)

using a cutoff threshold of a positive score (>0). We then created an ROC and precision-recall

curve and calculated the area under the curves. To test for optimal performance, we first ranked

our data according to the highest scores, implying better likelihood to accumulate and/or be

detected experimentally. Next, we applied a moving threshold analysis to establish the cutoff

threshold leading to optimal performance. Briefly, we systematically increased the portion of

ranked data, calculating performance metrics for each step and identified the threshold leading to

optimal performance by finding the maximum geometric mean of sensitivity and specificity, and

updated performance metrics accordingly. All calculations were performed and plotted using the

sklearn (version 0.24.1) and seaborn (version 0.11.1) python packages and Python 3.8).

Acknowledgements

Experiments performed at the West Coast Metabolomics Center at University of California,

Davis were led by Dr. Oliver Fiehn and Dr. Arpana Vaniya. Experiments at Metabolon were led

by Nino Esile, Dr. Brian Ingram, and Nathan Testa. We thank Dr. John de la Parra, and Rebekah

Carlson for preparing the food samples analyzed by UC Davis. We thank Dr. Roger Giese and

Dr. Pushkar M. Kulkarni at the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Northeastern University

for preparing the food samples analyzed by Metabolon, Inc.

Author contributions

Shany Ofaim: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Software, Methodology, Validation,

Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation. **Giulia Menichetti:** Conceptualization,

Formal analysis, Methodology, Software, Writing – Review & Editing. **Michael Sebek**: Data

Curation, Investigation, Resources, Writing – Review & Editing. **Albert László Barabási:**

Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing.

Competing interests

A.L.B. is a scientific founder of Scipher Medicine, Inc., which applies network medicine

strategies to personalized drug selection and Naring, Inc., which applies data science to food and

health. All other authors declare no competing interests.

Data availability

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available on

https://github.com/Barabasi-Lab/Plant-genomics.

Code availability

Code and scripts are available on https://github.com/Barabasi-Lab/Plant-genomics.

References

1. Dietary Guidelines for Americans | USDA-FNS. [cited 29 Jun 2021]. Available:
https://www.fns.usda.gov/cnpp/dietary-guidelines-americans

2. Luo Y, Shang P, Li D. Luteolin: A Flavonoid that has multiple cardio-protective effects and its
molecular mechanisms. Frontiers in Pharmacology. 2017. pp. 1–10. doi:10.3389/fphar.2017.00692

3. Barabási AL, Menichetti G, Loscalzo J. The unmapped chemical complexity of our diet. Nature
Food. 2020. pp. 33–37. doi:10.1038/s43016-019-0005-1

4. Hooton F, Menichetti G, Barabási A-L. Exploring food contents in scientific literature with
FoodMine. Sci Rep. 2020;10: 16191. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-73105-0

5. Wimalanathan K, Lawrence-Dill CJ. Gene Ontology Meta Annotator for Plants (GOMAP). Plant
Methods 2021 171. 2021;17: 1–14. doi:10.1186/S13007-021-00754-1

6. Choi IY, Kwon EC, Kim NS. The C- and G-value paradox with polyploidy, repeatomes, introns,
phenomes and cell economy. Genes and Genomics. 2020. pp. 699–714. doi:10.1007/s13258-020-
00941-9

7. Nyonje WA, Schafleitner R, Abukutsa-Onyango M, Yang RY, Makokha A, Owino W. Precision
phenotyping and association between morphological traits and nutritional content in Vegetable
Amaranth (Amaranthus spp.). J Agric Food Res. 2021;5: 100165.
doi:10.1016/J.JAFR.2021.100165

8. Sharma S, Katoch V, Kumar S, Chatterjee S. Functional relationship of vegetable colors and
bioactive compounds: Implications in human health. J Nutr Biochem. 2021;92.
doi:10.1016/J.JNUTBIO.2021.108615

9. Otunola GA, Martiryosan D. Choosing suitable food vehicles for functional food products. Funct
Foods Heal Dis. 2021;11: 44–55. doi:10.31989/FFHD.V11I2.764

10. Arias A, Feijoo G, Moreira MT. Exploring the potential of antioxidants from fruits and vegetables
and strategies for their recovery. Innov Food Sci Emerg Technol. 2022;77: 102974.
doi:10.1016/J.IFSET.2022.102974

11. Oulahal N, Degraeve P. Phenolic-Rich Plant Extracts With Antimicrobial Activity: An Alternative
to Food Preservatives and Biocides? Front Microbiol. 2022;12: 3906.
doi:10.3389/FMICB.2021.753518/XML/NLM

12. Anaya-Esparza LM, de la Mora ZV, Vázquez-Paulino O, Ascencio F, Villarruel-López A. Bell
peppers (Capsicum annum l.) losses and wastes: Source for food and pharmaceutical applications.
Molecules. MDPI; 2021. doi:10.3390/molecules26175341

13. Moghe GD, Leong BJ, Hurney SM, Jones AD, Last RL. Evolutionary routes to biochemical
innovation revealed by integrative analysis of a plant-defense related specialized metabolic
pathway. Elife. 2017;6: 1–33. doi:10.7554/eLife.28468

14. Vermeulen R, Schymanski EL, Barabási A-L, Miller GW. The exposome and health: Where
chemistry meets biology. Science (80-). 2020;367: 392–396. doi:10.1126/science.aay3164

15. FooDB, www.foodb.ca. [cited 11 Feb 2023]. Available: https://foodb.ca/

16. Yannai S. Dictionary of food compounds with CD-ROM. 2012.

17. Kanehisa M, Goto S. KEGG: kyoto encyclopedia of genes and genomes. Nucleic Acids Res.
2000;28: 27–30.

18. Schläpfer P, Zhang P, Wang C, Kim T, Banf M, Chae L, et al. Genome-wide prediction of
metabolic enzymes, pathways, and gene clusters in plants. Plant Physiol. 2017;173: 2041–2059.
doi:10.1104/pp.16.01942

19. Karp PD, Billington R, Caspi R, Fulcher CA, Latendresse M, Kothari A, et al. The BioCyc
collection of microbial genomes and metabolic pathways. Brief Bioinform. 2019;20: 1085–1093.
doi:10.1093/BIB/BBX085

20. Marks RA, Hotaling S, Frandsen PB, VanBuren R. Representation and participation across 20
years of plant genome sequencing. Nat Plants. 2021;7: 1571–1578. doi:10.1038/s41477-021-
01031-8

21. Ray A, Ray R, Sreevidya EA. How Many Wild Edible Plants Do We Eat—Their Diversity, Use,
and Implications for Sustainable Food System: An Exploratory Analysis in India. Front Sustain
Food Syst. 2020;4. doi:10.3389/fsufs.2020.00056

22. Soldatou S, Eldjárn GH, Ramsay A, van der Hooft JJJ, Hughes AH, Rogers S, et al. Comparative
Metabologenomics Analysis of Polar Actinomycetes. Mar Drugs. 2021;19: 1–21.
doi:10.3390/md19020103

23. Parkinson EI, Tryon JH, Goering AW, Ju K-S, McClure RA, Kemball JD, et al. Discovery of the
Tyrobetaine Natural Products and Their Biosynthetic Gene Cluster via Metabologenomics. ACS
Chem Biol. 2018;13: 1029–1037. doi:10.1021/ACSCHEMBIO.7B01089

24. Saad H, Aziz S, Gehringer M, Kramer M, Straetener J, Berscheid A, et al. Nocathioamides,
Uncovered by a Tunable Metabologenomic Approach, Define a Novel Class of Chimeric
Lanthipeptides. Angew Chemie Int Ed. 2021;60: 16472–16479. doi:10.1002/ANIE.202102571

25. Fox Ramos AE, Evanno L, Poupon E, Champy P, Beniddir MA. Natural products targeting
strategies involving molecular networking: Different manners, one goal. Nat Prod Rep. 2019;36:
960–980. doi:10.1039/c9np00006b

26. Ranum P, Peña-Rosas JP, Garcia-Casal MN. Global maize production, utilization, and
consumption. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2014;1312: 105–112. doi:10.1111/nyas.12396

27. Narayan A, Kumar D, Narayan Jhariya A. Mini Review Paper Nutritional, Medicinal and
Economical importance of Corn: A Mini Review. Res J Pharm Sci. 2013;2: 1–6.
doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.30058.62408

28.   Shahidi F, Pinaffi-Langley ACC, Fuentes J, Speisky H, de Camargo AC. Vitamin E as an essential
micronutrient for human health: Common, novel, and unexplored dietary sources. Free Radic Biol
Med. 2021;176: 312–321. doi:10.1016/J.FREERADBIOMED.2021.09.025

29.   Aharoni A, Galili G, Avni A, Blazquez M. Metabolic engineering of the plant primary-secondary
metabolism interface. Curr Opin Biotechnol. 2011;22: 239–244. doi:10.1016/j.copbio.2010.11.004

30.   Karp PD, Midford PE, Caspi R, Khodursky A. Pathway size matters: the influence of pathway
granularity on over-representation (enrichment analysis) statistics. BMC Genomics. 2021;22.
doi:10.1186/s12864-021-07502-8

31.   Schmelz EA, Huffaker A, Sims JW, Christensen SA, Lu X, Okada K, et al. Biosynthesis,
elicitation and roles of monocot terpenoid phytoalexins. Plant J. 2014;79: 659–678.
doi:10.1111/tpj.12436

32.   Murphy KM, Ma LT, Ding Y, Schmelz EA, Zerbe P. Functional characterization of two class ii
diterpene synthases indicates additional specialized diterpenoid pathways in maize (zea mays).
Front Plant Sci. 2018;871: 1–12. doi:10.3389/fpls.2018.01542

33.   Moore VM, Tracy WF. Combining ability of husk extension, maysin content, and corn earworm
resistance. J Am Soc Hortic Sci. 2021;146: 14–23. doi:10.21273/JASHS04974-20

34.   Köllner TG, Degenhardt J, Gershenzon J. The product specificities of maize terpene synthases
tps4 and tps10 are determined both by active site amino acids and residues adjacent to the active
site. Plants. 2020;9. doi:10.3390/plants9050552

35.   Schnee C, Köllner TG, Gershenzon J, Degenhardt J. The maize gene terpene synthase 1 encodes a
sesquiterpene synthase catalyzing the formation of (E)-β-farnesene, (E)-nerolidol, and (E,E)-
farnesol after herbivore damage. Plant Physiol. 2002;130: 2049–2060. doi:10.1104/pp.008326

36.   Chiorcea-Paquim AM, Enache TA, De Souza Gil E, Oliveira-Brett AM. Natural phenolic
antioxidants electrochemistry: Towards a new food science methodology. Compr Rev Food Sci
Food Saf. 2020;19: 1680–1726. doi:10.1111/1541-4337.12566

37.   Kyraleou M, Kallithraka S, Gkanidi E, Koundouras S, Mannion DT, Kilcawley KN.
Discrimination of five Greek red grape varieties according to the anthocyanin and
proanthocyanidin profiles of their skins and seeds. J Food Compos Anal. 2020;92: 103547.
doi:10.1016/j.jfca.2020.103547

38.   Tang K, Liu T, Han Y, Xu Y, Li JM. The Importance of Monomeric Anthocyanins in the
Definition of Wine Colour Properties. South African J Enol Vitic. 2017;38: 1–10.
doi:10.21548/38-1-661

39.   Dahab MA, Hegazy MM, Abbass HS. Hordatines as a Potential Inhibitor of COVID-19 Main
Protease and RNA Polymerase: An In-Silico Approach. Nat Products Bioprospect. 2020;10: 453–
462. doi:10.1007/s13659-020-00275-9

40.   Pihlava JM, Kurtelius T, Hurme T. Total hordatine content in different types of beers. J Inst Brew.
2016;122: 212–217. doi:10.1002/jib.311

41. Totaro G, Sisti L, Bozzi Cionci N, Martinez GA, Di Gioia D, Celli A. Elastomeric/antibacterial
properties in novel random Ricinus communis based-copolyesters. Polym Test. 2020;90: 106719.
doi:10.1016/j.polymertesting.2020.106719

42. Scossa F, Roda F, Tohge T, Georgiev MI, Fernie AR. The Hot and the Colorful: Understanding
the Metabolism, Genetics and Evolution of Consumer Preferred Metabolic Traits in Pepper and
Related Species. CRC Crit Rev Plant Sci. 2019;0: 1–43. doi:10.1080/07352689.2019.1682791

43. Sinisgalli C, Vezza T, Diez-Echave P, Ostuni A, Faraone I, Hidalgo-Garcia L, et al. The
Beneficial Effects of Red Sun-Dried Capsicum annuum L. Cv Senise Extract with Antioxidant
Properties in Experimental Obesity are Associated with Modulation of the Intestinal Microbiota.
Mol Nutr Food Res. 2021;65: 1–13. doi:10.1002/mnfr.202000812

44. de Oliveira IF, Simeone MLF, de Guimarães CC, Garcia NS, Schaffert RE, de Sousa SM.
Sorgoleone concentration influences mycorrhizal colonization in sorghum. Mycorrhiza. 2020;
259–264. doi:10.1007/s00572-020-01006-1

45. Schilmiller AL, Gilgallon K, Ghosh B, Jones AD, Last RL. Acylsugar acylhydrolases:
Carboxylesterase-catalyzed hydrolysis of acylsugars in tomato trichomes. Plant Physiol. 2016;170:
1331–1344. doi:10.1104/pp.15.01348

46. Tikunov YM, de Vos RCH, Paramás AMG, Hall RD, Bovy AG. A role for differential
glycoconjugation in the emission of phenylpropanoid volatiles from tomato fruit discovered using
a metabolic data fusion approach. Plant Physiol. 2010;152: 55–70. doi:10.1104/pp.109.146670

47. Covington BC, McLean JA, Bachmann BO. Comparative mass spectrometry-based metabolomics
strategies for the investigation of microbial secondary metabolites. Natural Product Reports. 2017.
pp. 6–24. doi:10.1039/c6np00048g

48. Corleto KA, Singh J, Jayaprakasha GK, Patil BS. A sensitive HPLC-FLD method combined with
multivariate analysis for the determination of amino acids in L-citrulline rich vegetables. J Food
Drug Anal. 2019;27: 717–728. doi:10.1016/j.jfda.2019.04.001

49. Martínez-Cruz M, Zenteno E, Córdoba F. Purification and characterization of a galactose-specific
lectin from corn (Zea mays) coleoptyle. Biochim Biophys Acta - Gen Subj. 2001;1568: 37–44.
doi:10.1016/S0304-4165(01)00196-9

50. Belcaro G, Cesarone MR, Feragalli B, Cotellese R, Hu S, Dugall M, et al. Management of
symptoms, pain and mobility with supplementary managements (including Movardol Forte) in
osteoarthrosis: A 6-month, morphology supplement study. Minerva Ortop e Traumatol. 2021;71:
160–167. doi:10.23736/S0394-3410.20.04008-4

51. Trammell SAJ, Brenner C. Targeted, LCMS-based metabolomics for quantitative measurement of
NAD+ metabolites. Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal. Research Network of
Computational and Structural Biotechnology; 2013. p. e201301012. doi:10.5936/csbj.201301012

52. Conze DB, Crespo-Barreto J, Kruger CL. Safety assessment of nicotinamide riboside, a form of
vitamin B 3. doi:10.1177/0960327115626254

53.   Mehmel M, Jovanoviˊc NJ, Spitz U. Nicotinamide Riboside-The Current State of Research and
Therapeutic Uses. [cited 8 May 2021]. doi:10.3390/nu12061616

54.   Li Y, Wang Y, Wu P. 5'-Methylthioadenosine and Cancer: old molecules, new understanding. J
Cancer. 2019;10: 927–936. doi:10.7150/jca.27160

55.   Shen D, Tian L, Yang F, Li J, Li X, Yao Y, et al. Cell Death Discovery ADO/hypotaurine: a novel
metabolic pathway contributing to glioblastoma development. Cell Death Discov. 2021;7: 21.
doi:10.1038/s41420-020-00398-5

56.   Gao P, Yang C, Nesvick CL, Feldman MJ, Sizdahkhani S, Liu H, et al. Hypotaurine evokes a
malignant phenotype in glioma through aberrant hypoxic signaling. Oncotarget. 2016;7: 15200–
15214. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.7710

57.   Partyka A, Rodak O, Bajzert J, Kochan J, Nihanski W. The Effect of L-Carnitine, Hypotaurine,
and Taurine Supplementation on the Quality of Cryopreserved Chicken Semen. 2017 [cited 8 May
2021]. doi:10.1155/2017/7279341

58.   Wang C, Liu R, Lim GH, De Lorenzo L, Yu K, Zhang K, et al. Pipecolic acid confers systemic
immunity by regulating free radicals. Sci Adv. 2018;4. doi:10.1126/sciadv.aar4509

59.   Cheng J, Chen · Peng, Song A, Wang D, Wang Q. Expanding lysine industry: industrial
biomanufacturing of lysine and its derivatives. J Ind Microbiol Biotechnol. 2030;45: 719–734.
doi:10.1007/s10295-018-2030-8

60.   Cheng J, Huang Y, Mi L, Chen W, Wang D, Wang Q. An economically and environmentally
acceptable synthesis of chiral drug intermediate l-pipecolic acid from biomass-derived lysine via
artificially engineered microbes. J Ind Microbiol Biotechnol. 2018;45: 405–415.
doi:10.1007/s10295-018-2044-2

61.   Schulz M, Hofmann D, Sicker D, Hennig L, Schütz V, Preusche M, et al. Pantoea ananatis
converts MBOA to 6-methoxy-4-nitrobenzoxazolin-2(3H)-one (NMBOA) for cooperative
degradation with its native root colonizing microbial consortium. Nat Prod Commun. 2018;13:
1275–1278. doi:10.1177/1934578x1801301010

62.   Fenz R, Galensa R, Ernst L. Phenolcarbonsäuren und ihre Glycerinester in Maisgrits. Z Lebensm
Unters Forsch. 1992;194: 252–258. doi:10.1007/BF01198417

63.   Mahajan N, Raina K, Gupta A, N. M, K. R, A. G, et al. High fructose induced adipogenesis and
inhibitory potential of trigonelline on murine mesenchymal stem cells: A morphological study. Int
J Pharm Sci Res. 2019;10: 528–536. Available: http://ijpsr.com/bft-article/high-fructose-induced-
adipogenesis-and-inhibitory-potential-of-trigonelline-on-murine-mesenchymal-stem-cells-a-
morphological-study/?view=fulltext

64.   Srinivasulu C, Ramgopal M, Ramanjaneyulu G, Anuradha CM, Suresh Kumar C. Syringic acid
(SA) – A Review of Its Occurrence, Biosynthesis, Pharmacological and Industrial Importance.
Biomed Pharmacother. 2018;108: 547–557. doi:10.1016/J.BIOPHA.2018.09.069

65. Moreau RA, Nuñez A, Singh V. Diferuloylputrescine and p-coumaroyl-feruloylputrescine,
abundant polyamine conjugates in lipid extracts of maize kernels. Lipids. 2001;36: 839–844.
doi:10.1007/S11745-001-0793-6

66. Jeffryes JG, Colastani RL, Elbadawi-Sidhu M, Kind T, Niehaus TD, Broadbelt LJ, et al. MINEs:
Open access databases of computationally predicted enzyme promiscuity products for untargeted
metabolomics. J Cheminform. 2015;7: 1–8. doi:10.1186/s13321-015-0087-1

67. Greinert T, Vogel K, Maskow T, Held C. New thermodynamic activity-based approach allows
predicting the feasibility of glycolysis. Sci Reports |. 123AD;11: 6125. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-
85594-8

68. Seaver SMD, Liu F, Zhang Q, Jeffryes J, Faria JP, Edirisinghe JN, et al. The ModelSEED
Biochemistry Database for the integration of metabolic annotations and the reconstruction,
comparison and analysis of metabolic models for plants, fungi and microbes. Nucleic Acids Res.
2021;49: D575–D588. doi:10.1093/nar/gkaa746

69. Beber ME, Gollub MG, Mozaffari D, Shebek KM, Flamholz AI, Milo R, et al. EQuilibrator 3.0: A
database solution for thermodynamic constant estimation. Nucleic Acids Res. 2022;50: D603–
D609. doi:10.1093/nar/gkab1106

70. Wang L, Xu C, Qu M, Zhang J. Kernel amino acid composition and protein content of
introgression lines from Zea mays ssp. mexicana into cultivated maize. [cited 22 May 2021].
doi:10.1016/j.jcs.2007.09.014

71. Li K, Wen W, Alseekh S, Yang X, Guo H, Li W, et al. Large-scale metabolite quantitative trait
locus analysis provides new insights for high-quality maize improvement. Plant J. 2019;99: 216–
230. doi:10.1111/tpj.14317

72. Sorokina M, Merseburger P, Rajan K, Yirik MA, Steinbeck C. COCONUT online: Collection of
Open Natural Products database. J Cheminform. 2021;13: 1–13. doi:10.1186/S13321-020-00478-
9/FIGURES/4

73. Kehelpannala C, Rupasinghe T, Hennessy T, Bradley D, Ebert B, Roessner U. The state of the art
in plant lipidomics. Molecular Omics. Royal Society of Chemistry; 2021. pp. 894–910.
doi:10.1039/d1mo00196e

74. Wang S, Tu H, Wan J, Chen W, Liu X, Luo J, et al. Spatio-temporal distribution and natural
variation of metabolites in citrus fruits. Food Chem. 2016;199: 8–17.
doi:10.1016/J.FOODCHEM.2015.11.113

75. Seyfferth C, Renema J, Wendrich JR, Eekhout T, Seurinck R, Vandamme N, et al. Advances and
Opportunities in Single-Cell Transcriptomics for Plant Research. https://doi.org/101146/annurev-
arplant-081720-010120. 2021;72: 847–866. doi:10.1146/ANNUREV-ARPLANT-081720-010120

76. Yang B, He S, Liu Y, Liu B, Ju Y, Kang D, et al. Transcriptomics integrated with metabolomics
reveals the effect of regulated deficit irrigation on anthocyanin biosynthesis in Cabernet
Sauvignon grape berries. Food Chem. 2020;314. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2020.126170

77. Agregán R, Echegaray N, López-Pedrouso M, Aadil RM, Hano C, Franco D, et al. Proteomic
advances in cereal and vegetable crops. Molecules. MDPI AG; 2021.
doi:10.3390/molecules26164924

78. Carrera M. Proteomics and food analysis: Principles, techniques, and applications. Foods. MDPI;
2021. doi:10.3390/foods10112538

79. Ma D, Lai Z, Ding Q, Zhang K, Chang K, Li S, et al. Identification, Characterization and Function
of Orphan Genes Among the Current Cucurbitaceae Genomes. Front Plant Sci. 2022;13.
doi:10.3389/fpls.2022.872137

80. Kautsar SA, Suarez Duran HG, Blin K, Osbourn A, Medema MH. PlantiSMASH: Automated
identification, annotation and expression analysis of plant biosynthetic gene clusters. Nucleic
Acids Res. 2017;45: W55–W63. doi:10.1093/nar/gkx305

81. Jiang M, Li X, Dong X, Zu Y, Zhan Z, Piao Z, et al. Research Advances and Prospects of Orphan
Genes in Plants. Frontiers in Plant Science. Frontiers Media S.A.; 2022.
doi:10.3389/fpls.2022.947129

82. Opialla T, Kempa S, Pietzke M. Towards a More Reliable Identification of Isomeric Metabolites
Using Pattern Guided Retention Validation. Metabolites. 2020;10: 1–16.
doi:10.3390/METABO10110457

83. Claes BSR, Takeo E, Fukusaki E, Shimma S, Heeren RMA. Imaging Isomers on a Biological
Surface: A Review. Mass Spectrom. 2019;8. doi:10.5702/MASSSPECTROMETRY.A0078

84. Kranenburg RF, Van Geenen FAMG, Berden G, Oomens J, Martens J, Van Asten AC. Mass-
Spectrometry-Based Identification of Synthetic Drug Isomers Using Infrared Ion Spectroscopy.
Anal Chem. 2020;92: 7282–7288. doi:10.1021/ACS.ANALCHEM.0C00915

85. Baker ES, Patti GJ. Perspectives on Data Analysis in Metabolomics: Points of Agreement and
Disagreement from the 2018 ASMS Fall Workshop. J Am Soc Mass Spectrom. 2019;30: 2031–
2036. doi:10.1007/S13361-019-02295-3/ASSET/IMAGES/MEDIUM/JS8B06238_0004.JPG

86. Determination of Abundant Metabolite Matrix Adducts Illuminates the Dark Metabolome of
MALDI-Mass Spectrometry Imaging Datasets. Anal Chem. 2021;93: 8399–8407.
doi:10.1021/acs.analchem.0c04720

87. Stricker T, Bonner R, Lisaek F, Hopfgartner G. Adduct annotation in liquid chromatography/high-
resolution mass spectrometry to enhance compound identification. doi:10.1007/s00216-020

88. Vinay CM, Udayamanoharan SK, Prabhu Basrur N, Paul B, Rai PS. Current analytical
technologies and bioinformatic resources for plant metabolomics data. Plant Biotechnology
Reports. Springer; 2021. pp. 561–572. doi:10.1007/s11816-021-00703-3

89. Van Der Hooft JJJ, Mohimani H, Bauermeister A, Dorrestein PC, Duncan KR, Medema MH.
Linking genomics and metabolomics to chart specialized metabolic diversity. Chem Soc Rev.
2020;49: 3297–3314. doi:10.1039/d0cs00162g

90.   Huerta-Cepas J, Serra F, Bork P. ETE 3: Reconstruction, Analysis, and Visualization of
Phylogenomic Data. Mol Biol Evol. 2016;33: 1635–1638. doi:10.1093/molbev/msw046

91.   Wohlgemuth G, Haldiya PK, Willighagen E, Kind T, Fiehn O. The Chemical Translation Service
—a web-based tool to improve standardization of metabolomic reports. Bioinformatics. 2010;26:
2647. doi:10.1093/BIOINFORMATICS/BTQ476

92.   Virtanen P, Gommers R, Oliphant TE, Haberland M, Reddy T, Cournapeau D, et al. SciPy 1.0:
fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat Methods. 2020;17: 261–272.
doi:10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2

93.   Landrum G. Rdkit: Open-source cheminformatics software. In: URL http://www. rdkit. org/,
https://github. com/rdkit/rdkit. 2016.

List of Legends for Supporting Information Files

1. Supporting Information (PDF) – Contains all supporting text and supporting figures S1-S8.

2. Table S2 (CSV) – Contains supporting metabolomics data used in this work.

Figure 1 – Plant phylogenetic diversity and schematic overview of genomics contribution to food composition knowledge. (a) Phylogenetic tree representing the 75 plants in our collection colored by plant order. **(b)** Collection and evaluation of genomics-based annotations to food composition knowledge. Functional annotations include compounds, reactions, and pathways. **(c)** Kinetics-based annotations help us to infer compounds likely to accumulate and hence experimentally detectable. **(d)** Validation of our kinetics-based approach against new metabolomics experiments, which detected compounds for 13 plants in our collection.

Figure 2 – Genomics-based annotations boost corn composition knowledge. **(a)** Database annotations for corn, indicating that some compounds are annotated in multiple databases. The total number (N=4,721) represents the number of unique compounds for corn after the addition of genomics-based annotations. Genomics databases are represented by KEGG and PlantCyc. Other food related databases used in this work are DFC (the Dictionary of Food Compounds), FooDB, and USDA. Finally, experiments denote the set of compounds collected by metabolomics experiments reported here for corn. **(b)** A partial adaptation of the Monoterpenoid biosynthesis pathway in corn (KEGG) showing annotation availability, overlap and gaps in the coverage of different databases and genomics-based annotations. The different colors denote annotation sources as single or multiple concentric circles. **(c)** Vitamin E biosynthesis (tocopherols) pathway in corn (PlantCyc). Circles denote compounds and edges denote reactions. The different colors denote annotation sources as single or multiple concentric circles.

Figure 3 – Contribution of the different sources of food composition across the entire edible plant catalogue. Genomics-based annotation are presented in two shades of green and include the KEGG (light green) and PlantCyc (dark green). Food composition databases include FooDB (yellow), DFC (red), and USDA (blue). Compounds detected in metabolomics experiments are shown in orange. The stacked bars represent here convey the proportions of annotations available from each of the databases/experiments. Annotations from each data source might overlap.

1006

Figure 4 – Pathway enrichment analysis. (a) Plant specific significantly enriched pathways (hypergeometric test, p<0.05, Bonferroni multiple testing correction). The coverage of each pathway is defined by the ratio of present compounds to the total number of compounds in the reference pathway. These include signature known pathways like Capsaicin biosynthesis in pepper (red bars), acyl sugars and alpha tomatine pathways in tomato (light red bars) and maysin and zealexin biosynthesis (yellow bars). **(b)** A boxplot of the p-values (hypergeometric test, p<0.05, Bonferroni multiple testing correction) of pathway categories in corn. Medians found below the dashed line (0.05 enrichment line) represent the enriched pathways. We find that most pathways are enriched, indicating the diversity in our pathway coverage. **(c)** A density plot describing the distribution of enriched pathways per plant. We observed two peaks compatible with the two genomics databases included, KEGG (lower number of maps, each containing a larger number of reactions) and PlantCyc (larger number of maps, each containing a smaller number of reactions) **(d)** A density plot describing the distribution of the number of plants per enriched pathway. While most pathways are found in many plants, we observe several plant specific pathways described in detail in (a) and Figure S3. **(e)** A boxplot of enriched pathways (hypergeometric test, p<0.05, Bonferroni multiple testing correction) classified as primary and secondary metabolism. Medians found below the dashed line (0.05 enrichment line) represent an enriched class.

1007

Figure 5 –Bioactive compounds in corn unveiled by genomics. (a) Venn diagram comparing all sources of data contributing to the corn compound collection. The black circle marks the fraction of compounds unique to genomics-based annotations and metabolomics experiments reported here. **(b)** A structural similarity based clustermap of the 59 compounds highlighted by the black circle in panel (a). Compounds are classified to primary (blue) and secondary (red) metabolism according to the pathways they are part of. Greyscale denotes structural similarity as Jaccard distance, 0 being not similar and 1 being composed of the same bits in their vector representation. **(c)** The potential of corn as a nutritional influencer on well-being as learned with the addition of genome-based annotations, associated with antioxidant and anti-inflammatory activity promoting, heart, skin, and metabolic health.

1018

1019

1020

1021

Figure 6 – Application of kinetics-based annotations to predict likely to accumulate compounds. **(a)** Schematic description of the kinetics-based annotations approach. Gibbs free energy values, ΔG, were collected for each reaction in each plant and used to calculate the cumulative score of a compound. If a compound is a reactant in a reaction, it gets a negative ΔG value and if it is a product, it gets a positive ΔG value. **(b)** Vitamin E biosynthesis (tocopherols) pathway of corn (PlantCyc), describing the possible outcomes of our approach. Circles are compounds and edges are reactions. **(c)** Performance of our approach including (i) optimal threshold analysis on the top-ranking compounds predicted to accumulate, establishing the window of best performance denoted by the area under the receiver operator curve, AUC_{ROC} and the area under the precision recall curve, AUC_{PR} for each plant, and (ii) the optimal receiver operating curves for plants included in this analysis.

45