Molecular and functional characterization of the *Drosophila melanogaster*

conserved smORFome

Authors:

Justin A. Bosch[1,6], Nathan Keith[2,3,6], Felipe Escobedo[1], William F. Fisher[2], James Thai

LaGraff[1], Jorden Rabasco[1], Kenneth H. Wan[2], Richard Weiszmann[2], Yanhui Hu[1], Shu

Kondo[4], James B. Brown[2,3,7], Norbert Perrimon[1,5,7], Susan E. Celniker[2,7,8]

[1]Department of Genetics, Blavatnik Institute, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

02115, USA

[2]Division of Biological Systems and Engineering, Lawrence Berkeley National

Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

[3]Division of Environmental Genomics and Systems Biology, Lawrence Berkeley

National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

[4]Laboratory of Invertebrate Genetics, National Institute of Genetics, Mishima, Shizuoka

411-8540, Japan

[5]Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA

[6]These authors contributed equally

[7]These authors jointly supervised this work

[8]Lead Contact

Correspondence: jabosch@hms.harvard.edu (J.B.), rnkeith@lbl.gov (N.K.),

jbbrown@lbl.gov (J.B.B.), perrimon@genetics.med.harvard.edu (N.P.)

secelniker@lbl.gov (S.C.)

Summary:

Short polypeptides encoded by small open reading frames (smORFs) are ubiquitously

found in eukaryotic genomes and are important regulators of physiology, development,

and mitochondrial processes. Here, we focus on a subset of 194 smORFs that are

evolutionarily conserved between *Drosophila melanogaster* and humans. Many of these

smORFs are conserved broadly in the bilaterian lineage, with ~60 conserved in plants.

Within these conserved smORFs, we observed remarkably heterogenous spatial and

temporal expression patterns – indicating wide-spread tissue-specific and stage-specific

mitochondrial architectures. In addition, an analysis of annotated functional domains

revealed a predicted enrichment of smORF polypeptides localizing to mitochondria. We

conducted an embryonic ribosome profiling experiment and applied a machine learning

approach, finding support for translation of 82 of these smORFs during embryogenesis.

We further embarked on functional characterization using CRISPR knockout/activation,

RNAi knockdown, and cDNA overexpression, revealing diverse phenotypes. This study

underscores the importance of identifying smORF function in disease and phenotypic

diversity.

Introduction:

Genome annotations have often overlooked proteins with less than 100 amino acids,

although many have been shown to play important roles in development and physiology

and are pervasive across the Tree of Life (Plaza et al., 2017; Couso and Patraquim,

2017). While some small proteins are cleavage products of longer proteins, many others

are encoded in the genome by small open reading frames (smORF genes; ≤ 100 amino

acids). Strikingly, among the currently 681 annotated human smORF genes, 30%

include disease-associated variants mapped within exons, compared to 15% of human

genes in general, according to the NHGRI GWAS catalog (Welter et al., 2014). Although

this two-fold enrichment is partially due to the fact that only the most highly conserved

smORF genes have been annotated due to the strict length cutoffs used during first-

generation genome annotations (Basrai et al., 1997; Olexiouk et al., 2018), these

estimates underscore the functional roles of smORFs and relevance to human

diseases.

Advances in proteomics and next-generation sequencing (NGS) technologies have led

to a significantly improved annotation of smORF genes. There is evidence for >2,500

smORF genes in humans (Martinez et al., 2020), and there are over 1,000 annotated

smORF genes in the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome (Adams et al., 2000). smORF

genes are important regulators of physiology, development and metabolism and encode

hormones (Pearson et al., 1993), neurotransmitters (Snyder and Innis, 1979), ligands

and cofactors (Yang et al., 2015), RNA and DNA binding factors, and components of

ribonucleoproteins (Henras et al., 1998). Interestingly, a number of them are involved in

numerous mitochondrial functions and processes (Bosch et al., 2020; Rathore et al.,

2018; Stein et al., 2018).

Although smORF genes are prevalent in metazoan genomes, a surprisingly small

fraction of smORF genes are evolutionarily conserved in animals suggesting a high birth

and death rate for these genes (Mackowiak et al., 2015; Martinez et al., 2020). For

instance, there are over 2,500 smORF sequences with ribosome profiling evidence of

translation across human cell lines, but only 273 of these human smORFs in the mouse

genome based on computational analysis (Martinez et al., 2020). SmORF genes with

deep evolutionary conservation are therefore of particular interest because of their

assumed importance to the health and fitness across Metazoa and their implications for

human health and disease.

Here, we provide an initial functional characterization of a collection of 194 conserved

smORFs. For a subset of these smORFs, we describe their spatial expression patterns

and phenotypes associated with gene loss of function or overexpression. Many of the

pronounced phenotypes are associated with expression in neural tissue, and genes

encoding mitochondrial proteins. In addition, several phenotypes were detectable only

in flies subjected to stressful diets. This study serves as a resource for the functional

annotation of this diverse and under-studied class of genes.

Results:

Deep conservation of smORFs

We identified 194 smORF genes that are evolutionarily conserved between humans and

Drosophila melanogaster, which we refer to as conserved smORFs (Materials and

Methods; Supplemental File 1). We further analyzed conservation of these 194

smORFs with the well-annotated transcriptomes of zebrafish (*Danio rerio*), nematodes

(*Caenorhabditis elegans)* and thale cress (*Arabidopsis thaliana)* (Figure 1A). There are

174 conserved in zebrafish, and 122 conserved in *C. elegans*. Notably, 68 conserved

smORFs were also conserved in *Arabidopsis*, providing evidence for the functional

importance of this dataset in non-Bilateria eukaryotes. Finally, amino acid alignment of

many of the human-fly conserved smORFs, such as *bc10*, *CG42497*, and *Tim10,* reveal

that they are also conserved among other invertebrate and vertebrate species (Figure

1B).

21 *Drosophila* conserved smORFs are polycistronic (Supplemental File 1, see example

in Figure 1B). Remarkably, while the individual smORFs that reside in *Drosophila*

polycistronic transcripts are evolutionarily conserved, their polycistronic structure is

generally not - indicating a complex evolutionary history. Interestingly, there are four

conserved smORFs encoded by polycistronic transcripts in both fly and *C. elegans*,

CG42372, CG42375, CG44195, and *Mocs2A*. Between flies and zebrafish, there are

two smORFs encoded by polycistronic transcripts in both species, *CG42497* and

Mocs2A. However, between flies and humans, or flies and *Arabidopsis,* there are none.

The human and *Arabidopsis* genomes are outliers in this analysis, wherein each

polycistronic *Drosophila* smORF is encoded within a single ORF transcript – consistent

with a model wherein transcriptional regulation is more complex in mammals and plants

(Lynch and Conery, 2003; Wray et al., 2003).

Gene Ontology analysis of conserved smORFs

The functions of conserved smORFs are diverse, as with any broad category of genes.

Gene Ontology (GO) Cellular Component enrichment analysis of conserved smORFs

determined that the majority of significantly enriched GO terms (Supplemental File 2)

are associated with mitochondrial function and localization (Figure 2, Supplemental File

3). Indeed, 58 conserved smORFs are predicted to be involved in mitochondrial function

(Supplemental File 3). "Mitochondrion" (P = 1.55 x 10^{-18}) which contains 36 conserved

smORFs is among the most significantly enriched GO Cellular Component terms in this

dataset, while "Mitochondrial Envelope" is the most significantly enriched GO Cellular

Component term (P = 1.07 x 10^{-21}). Additional significantly enriched terms include

mitochondrial inner membrane (P = 1.13 x 10^{-19}) and cytochrome complex (P = 2.80 x

10^{-11}) (Figure 2).

In contrast to the GO Cellular Component enrichment analysis, the most significantly

enriched Biological Function and Molecular Process GO terms (Supplemental File 2)

are related to serine-endopeptidase inhibitor activity (Figure 2; Supplemental File 3). For

instance, the most significantly enriched Molecular Function GO term is serine-type

endopeptidase inhibitor activity (P = 2.91 x 10^{-22}) (Figure 2). Notably, 30 of the 80

predicted serine-endopeptidase inhibitors in the *D. melanogaster* genome are in the

conserved smORF dataset. Of these 30 smORFs, 21 contain a predicted pancreatic

trypsin inhibitor Kunitz domain (Interpro: IPR002223), and nine smORFs contain a

predicted a Kazal domain (Interpro: IPR002350) - providing evidence that these 30

conserved smORFs are serine-endopeptidase inhibitors (Rawlings et al., 2004).

Additionally, all 30 of these predicted serine-endopeptidase inhibitors contain an N-

terminal secretion signal (SignalP6.0; 0.982 or higher score).

The oxidative phosphorylation pathway is the only significantly enriched pathway in the

smORF dataset (P = 3.58 x 10^{-14}; Kanehisa et al., 2021 (KEGG); Supplemental File 2,

Figure 2A, Figure S1). Interestingly, five of the 19 conserved smORFs that are assigned

to the oxidative phosphorylation pathway are not currently annotated as such (i.e., "CG"

IDs). Further analysis of these five conserved "CG" smORFs identified *CG9065* as the

fly *Cytochrome C oxidase subunit 17* (*COX17*). The remaining four, *CG31644*,

CG40472, CG44296, and *CG43206,* are duplicates of annotated fly genes: *cyclope*

(*cype*) encoding the *cytochrome c oxidase subunit 6C*, *NADH dehydrogenase*

(ubiquinone) AGGG subunit (*ND-AGGG*)*, Ubiquinol-cytochrome c reductase 6.4 kDa*

subunit (*UQCR-6.4*) and *Cytochrome c oxidase subunit 7C* (*COX7C*). Interestingly,

CG31644, CG43206 and *CG44296* are primarily expressed in the adult testis, whereas

their paralogs (*cype*, *COX7C,* and *UQCR-6.4*, respectively*)* are ubiquitously expressed.

In situ imaging of smORF mRNA expression in embryos

To better understand the functional roles of smORFs in *Drosophila*, we performed in situ

mRNA hybridization to visualize smORF expression during embryogenesis

(Supplemental File 4; https://insitu.fruitfly.org/). Of these, organ-specific expression (i.e.,

"patterned" expression) could be assigned for 89 conserved smORFs during embryonic

development (Supplemental File 4).

In addition to patterned expression, conserved smORFs can also be classified as being

"maternally deposited", and therefore ubiquitously expressed in the embryo in the

earliest developmental stage(s), and/or classified as being "ubiquitously expressed",

where expression is observed throughout the full embryo after the earliest

developmental stage (Supplemental File 5). We found that 32 conserved smORFs were

classified as only being maternally deposited and/or being ubiquitously expressed (i.e.,

expressed throughout the entire embryo without assigned organ patterns) in at least

one embryonic stage. Of these 32 smORFs, *UQCR-6.4L* is the only smORF with no

observed expression after maternal deposition (i.e., after initial embryonic stages 1-3).

The remaining 72 smORFs revealed no observed expression in the embryo. In each

case this was concordant with RNA-seq (Brown, et al. 2018): these smORFs are

expressed later in development, and in specific tissues, or under stress conditions

(Brown, et al. 2018).

In situ imaging of mitochondria-associated smORF mRNA expression

Notably, mitochondria-associated conserved smORFs exhibited heterogenous spatial

expression patterns, indicating tissue- and stage-specific mitochondrial architectures,

and, by extension, tissue- and stage-specific mitochondrial functions (Figures 3A, B). Of

these, expression could be assigned as patterned for 34 smORFs. (Figures 3A, B). We

clustered these mitochondria-associated conserved smORFs with patterned expression

into five groups - showing extensive inter- and intra-group heterogeneity in organ

system expression patterns (Figures 3A, B).

Nearly all (33/34) patterned mitochondria-associated conserved smORFs were

maternally deposited (Supplemental File 4, Supplemental File 5), and 32/34 were

annotated as being ubiquitously expressed in at least one later embryonic stage

(Supplementary File 4). Of the two conserved smORFs without ubiquitous expression

after maternal deposition, one (*Cox17*) shows robust embryonic expression under RNA-

seq (Brown, et al. 2014.), but *in situ* hybridization was unsuccessful; while the other is

only annotated as patterned post maternal deposition (*CG17734*) (Supplemental File 4).

However, nearly all patterned, mitochondrial smORFs (33/34) exhibit complex and

tissue specific expression patterns after early embryonic ubiquitous expression (usually

due to maternal deposition) (Supplemental File 4). Hence, the zygotic regulation of

structural and functional components of mitochondria is highly patterned and specific to

individual tissues and cell types.

Ribosome profiling and proteomics analysis to support the translation of

conserved smORFs

To verify the translation of conserved smORFs, we performed ribosome profiling for six,

2-hour embryonic stages and six, 0-24 hr. mixed stage embryo samples (Figure 4;

Supplemental File 6, Supplemental File 7). We find evidence of translation for 91

conserved smORFs from these embryonic samples. We find that 22 (11%) conserved

smORFs are detected in only a single embryonic stage (Supplemental File 6),

consistent with transcriptional evidence from extensive RNA-seq experiments in a

developmental time course (Brown et al., 2014; Graveley et al., 2011).

We further analyzed published *Drosophila* proteomics datasets (Aradska et al., 2015;

Brown et al., 2018; Bucio-Mendez et al., 2019; Cammarato et al., 2011; Casas-Vila et

al., 2017; Dorus et al., 2006; Wasbrough et al., 2010) resulting in translation and/or

polypeptide support for 137 total conserved smORFs (Supplemental File 6). Analysis of

comprehensive *Drosophila* modENCODE mRNA expression data (Brown et al., 2014)

revealed 33/57 (58%) of conserved smORFs without evidence for translation or

peptides are maximally expressed in testes or accessory gland (Figure S2). Notably,

30/33 (91%) of these conserved smORFs that are maximally expressed in testes and

accessory gland are classified (FlyBase) as having no or low mRNA expression

throughout embryogenesis, and their expression is testes- and/or accessory gland-

specific.

Functional analysis of smORF genes by F1 CRISPR screens

Next, we assessed if conserved smORFs have important biological functions in

Drosophila by modifying their gene function in vivo. First, to knock out (KO) smORF

gene function in a systematic manner, we used a CRISPR/Cas9-based transgenic

crossing strategy (Port et al., 2020; Zirin et al., 2020) where a Cas9-expressing line is

crossed with sgRNA lines that target 5' coding sequence (sgRNA-KO). The resulting

progeny will contain somatic indels in the target gene that disrupt gene function. We

generated a collection of 177 sgRNA-KO lines that target 165 smORF genes

(Supplemental File 8). Each smORF sgRNA-KO line was crossed with *Act5c-Cas9*

(ubiquitous Cas9) and F1 progeny were screened for defects in viability, morphology, or

gross motor behavior (Figure 5A). Of the 115 sgRNA-KO lines tested, 14 (representing

14 genes) gave no mutant adult progeny or very few progenies compared to controls

(Figure 5B; Supplemental File 8), suggesting that they are essential genes. No other

morphological or behavioral phenotypes were observed for the remaining sgRNA-KO

lines.

To determine if the 14 putative essential smORFs play an important role in individual

tissues, we crossed the 14 sgRNA-KO hit lines to cell-type specific Cas9 lines (muscles,

gut enterocytes, dorsal thorax, wing disc, neurons) (Figure S3). Nearly all sgRNA-KOs

reduced viability when expressing Cas9 in neurons (12/14), whereas none reduced

viability with muscle Cas9 (0/14). Interestingly, a subset of sgRNA-KO lines had

reduced viability only when Cas9 was expressed in neurons (CG14057, CG40127,

CG14812, CG17776). In contrast, Rbp12 sgRNA-KO was lethal or showed low viability

with all Cas9 lines except muscle, and CG4650 sgRNA-KO did not cause any obvious

phenotypes with any of the six tissue-specific Cas9 lines. Finally, using a larval wing

disc Cas9 line, some sgRNA-KO lines caused adult wing defects, such as notching or

crumpled wings (Figure S3).

To over-express smORF genes in a systematic manner, we used CRISPR activation

(CRISPRa), where a sgRNA targets the promoter region and increases expression of

the endogenous gene (sgRNA-OE) via a catalytically dead Cas9 (dCas9) fused with a

transcriptional activator (e.g. VPR or SAM) (Ewen-Campen et al., 2017; Jia et al., 2018).

Similar to our sgRNA-KO collection, we generated a collection of 197 transgenic

sgRNA-OE lines that target 176 smORF genes. Each smORF sgRNA-OE line was

crossed with *tub-Gal4*, *UAS-dCas9-VPR* (abbreviated *tub>VPR*), and the F1 progeny

were screened for phenotypes as described for the sgRNA-KO collection (Figure 5C;

Supplemental File 8). Of the 123 sgRNA-OE lines tested, a small number had reduced

numbers of expected progeny, however none were statistically significant when

compared to control crosses (Figure 5D). Interestingly, CG13838 sgRNA-OE resulted in

viable adults that were flightless and had a "held-up" wing phenotype (Figure 5E). Both

phenotypes were 100% penetrant (n=100 flies). None of the remaining tested lines

produced aberrant morphological or behavioral phenotypes. To validate overexpression

by CRISPRa, we crossed 14 smORF-OE lines to *tub>VPR* and analyzed target gene

expression in adults using quantitative PCR (qPCR) (Figure S4). These results showed

that 6/14 sgRNA-OE lines had significantly elevated transcript expression when

normalized to *Rp49* or *Gapdh* and compared to negative control crosses (*attP40*).

To complement our results with CRISPRa, we overexpressed a subset of smORFs

using *UAS-cDNA* lines (Figure 5F; Supplemental File 8), which generally results in

higher levels of overexpression (Ewen-Campen et al., 2017). Of the 66 lines tested,

representing 61 genes, two lines were lethal, *UAS-CG18508* and *UAS-CG13838*. All

other lines had no obvious defects in viability, morphology, or behavior.

Functional analysis of 25 uncharacterized smORF genes by whole animal KO

F1 CRISPR screening tools are fast and scalable but have technical limitations, namely that CRISPR-KO can produce mosaic phenotypes (Zirin et al., 2020) or phenotypes outside the target tissue (Port and Bullock, 2016). Therefore, we wanted to apply a more robust genetic tool to modify smORF gene function – whole animal knockout. Since this requires greater time and resources, we targeted a subset of the conserved smORFs with the least experimental characterization.

Using a combination of gene function prediction and manual searching (see Materials and Methods), we identified 25 conserved smORF genes with minimal to no experimental characterization in any organism with a corresponding homolog (Supplemental File 8). Interestingly, 12 of these smORFs have a paralog (Figure S5A). Using CRISPR/Cas9, we generated whole animal KOs for each of the 25 smORF genes and multi-gene KOs for each paralog group (Supplemental File 8; Figure S5B-D). When possible, we generated at least two independently derived alleles for each smORF. The resulting homozygous animals were assessed for mutant phenotypes. Remarkably, nearly all smORF KO lines were viable, fertile, and had no obvious morphological or behavioral defects (Supplemental File 8). Interestingly, KO of the paralogs *CG32736* and *CG42308* was lethal, either as single or double KO (Supplemental File 8; Figure S5B-C). Characterization of *CG32736* and *CG42308* will be described elsewhere (Bosch et al. 2020).

We reasoned that viable smORF KO mutants might reveal a mutant phenotype if raised

under stressful conditions. To test this, we transferred 24hr old homozygous smORF

KO embryos onto modified foods known to cause animal metabolic stress, starvation

(Zirin et al., 2015), high fat (Birse et al., 2010), and high salt (Stergiopoulos et al., 2009),

and measured developmental timing. On normal food, all tested KO mutants had similar

developmental timing compared to wild-type (Figure 6A). However, several KO mutants

exhibited significant developmental delays, low viability, or lethality on stressful foods

(Figure 6B-D). For example, two independent CG17931-KO alleles were lethal on

starvation food and were developmentally delayed or low viability on high salt food. In

addition, two independent alleles of CG42371-KO showed low viability on high salt food,

and one CG42371 allele had low viability on high fat food. Finally, bc10-KO was

developmentally delayed on high salt food.

Discussion

We identified 194 conserved smORFs between humans and fruit flies, the vast majority

of which are conserved broadly across bilaterians, with 68 conserved in *Arabidopsis*.

Ribosome profiling and prior proteomic experiments support the translation of 138 of

these smORFs. The remaining 59 without direct evidence of translation are largely

highly tissue specific (33 are specific to male reproductive tissues), and likely more

targeted samples are needed for detection. Of course, the thresholds we selected for

defining smORFs are somewhat arbitrary, and more lenient parameterizations (>100aa)

would yield more expansive lists. Certainly, this threshold produced an under-studied

collection of genes with diverse functions and phenotypes.

Of the 194 conserved smORFs, 21 are arranged in polycistronic transcripts. However,

this gene architecture is rarely conserved in distant species, with only four remaining

polycistronic in distant species – the remainder are partitioned into distinct

transcriptional units, often on different chromosomes. Polycistronic gene architectures

may have been selected against in eukaryotes – possibly as part of antiviral defense, as

mRNA viruses often make use of internal ribosome entry sites.

The largest class of conserved smORFs is related to mitochondrial structure and

function – including components of the oxidative phosphorylation pathway. Intriguingly,

mitochondrial smORFs exhibit highly tissue specific expression patterns after initial

ubiquitous maternal deposition. While mitochondrial functional diversity has been

explored in the nervous system (Fecher et al., 2019), this study indicates a far broader

diversity in mitochondrial architecture throughout the developing organism. The

profound conservation of these genes suggests that mitochondria are optimized in a

tissue-specific fashion throughout the bilaterian lineage. This observation points to an

evolutionary impetus for the translocation of mitochondrial genes to the host nuclear

genome – an intriguing direction for future study.

Results from our F1 CRISPR knockout screens revealed a number of essential smORF

genes. Interestingly, animal homologs of these gene hits (10/14) show lethality in other

organisms (Marrvel.org), and 5/14 are predicted mitochondrial (Supplemental File 3),

suggesting that fly lethality may be due to disrupted mitochondrial function.

Furthermore, these essential smORFs may be required in different tissues. For

example, Rbp12 knockout in either the gut, dorsal thorax, wing disc, or neurons caused

significant reduction in animal viability. In contrast, four essential smORFs were only

lethal when knocked out in neurons.

One interesting hit from our F1 knockout screen was *CG18508*. *CG18508* is the fly

homolog of *C18orf32*, which has been shown to associate with lipid droplets (Bersuker

et al., 2018). While ubiquitous *CG18508* knockout reduced viability, knockout in six

tissues did not. However, *CG18508* knockout in the wing disc caused adult wing

notching. Surprisingly, homozygous *CG18508* mutants are viable, fertile, and had

normal wing morphology, suggesting that *CG18508* sgRNA-KO has off-target effects.

Interestingly, overexpression of *CG18508* by UAS-cDNA was lethal. While it is not clear

if *CG18508* overexpression if physiologically relevant, it would be intriguing to examine

if animals die due to defects in lipid storage.

Results from the smORF overexpression screen revealed one additional smORF with

notable phenotypes. Overexpression of *CG13838* by CRISPRa resulted in flightless

adult flies with "held-up" wings, whereas overexpression by UAS-cDNA was lethal.

Since UAS-cDNA generally results in higher transcript expression compared to

CRISPRa (Ewen-Campen et al., 2017), *UAS-CG13838* cDNA lethality may be due to

higher expression. The *C. elegans* homolog of *CG13838*, *bubblin* (*bbln*), has recently

been characterized as essential for intermediate filament function (Remmelzwaal et al.,

2021). Interestingly, other fly mutations have been described that cause a wing

phenotype, such as *heldup*, which disrupts muscle thin filaments (Beall and Fyrberg,

1991). Like intermediate filaments, thin filaments are actin-based cytoskeletal structures

(Henderson et al., 2017). Therefore, *CG13838* overexpression may interfere with thin

filaments and/or intermediate filaments in muscle.

Many conserved smORFs have known or predicted functions. For example, smORF

CG14483 is uncharacterized in *Drosophila*, but its human homolog PET100 (65% aa

similarity, 37% aa identity) is a known regulator of mitochondrial complex IV biogenesis

and mutated in families with mitochondrial complex IV deficiency nuclear type 12

(MC4DN12) (Lim et al., 2014). In contrast, we identified 25 smORFs with little to no

characterization in any organism. For example, CG32736 is homologous to human

Small Integral Membrane Protein 4 (SMIM4) (66% aa similarity, 46% aa identity), but

had not been experimentally studied in any organism until recently (34969438, Bosch et

al. 2020). Studying poorly characterized smORF genes like *CG32736* could reveal new

biology and/or help understand human disease progression. Interestingly, we found

three previously uncharacterized smORFs (*CG17931/ SERFs*, *CG42371/ CEBPZOS*,

bc10/BLCAP) that were required for normal developmental progression on stressful

food diets.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Benjamin W Booth for processing the RNA-seq data and submitting RNA and

ribosome profiling data to the SRA. This work was funded by an award from the NIH

National Human Genome Research Institute (R01HG009352) to S.E.C. (Principal

Investigator). J.A.B. was supported by the Damon Runyon Foundation (DRG-2258-16)

and a "Training Grant in Genetics" T32 Ruth Kirschstein-National Research Service

Award institutional research training grant funded through the NIH/National Institute of

General Medical Sciences (T32GM007748). NP is an HHMI investigator. This article is

subject to HHMI's Open Access to Publications policy. HHMI lab heads have previously

granted a nonexclusive CC BY 4.0 license to the public and a sublicensable license to

HHMI in their research articles. Pursuant to those licenses, the author-accepted

manuscript of this article can be made freely available under a CC BY 4.0 license

immediately upon publication.

Materials and Methods:

Bioinformatic identification of 194 fly-human conserved smORFs

First, 266,066 human smORFs were selected, including all annotated human smORF

transcripts (18,494 annotated in GENCODE version 24 less than 100aa), and 215,901

smORFs identified by 3-frame translations of all human transcripts that lack long ORFs

(11-100aa). This set was filtered to identify high-confidence elements by leveraging a

stringent, high-confidence set of conserved *Drosophila* smORFs. In *Drosophila*, there

are 984 unique peptides with no more than 100 aa from protein-coding genes annotated

at FlyBase (release 6.09) with evidence of translation. This set was expanded by taking

smORFs (11-100aa) predicted from two independent studies (Aspden et al. 2014),

adding 2,819 additional smORFs with evidence of translation from either Ribosome

Profiling or conservation among Drosophilidae. In addition, "stand alone" smORFs were

exclusively selected, and smORFs corresponding to either uORFs or smORFs that are

splice variants of longer ORFs were discarded.

The peptide sequences encoded by these smORFs in human and fly were compared

using BLASTP. Scrambled human peptide sequences were used as controls to

compute false discovery rates and determine how many good alignments one would

expect by chance alone. Conservation was further interrogated using Reverse PSI

BLAST (RPS-BLAST) to search for known, conserved protein domains in the human

and fly smORFs. By setting the E value cutoff on the BLASTP hits of 10^{-1} and 40%

smORF coverage (corresponding to an FDR ~ 5%), and further insisting that both the

human and the fly smORFs encode the same conserved domains (E-value Threshold

1e-5, FDR < 1%), 194 smORFs were identified that are conserved with human.

Because both conserved domains and BLASTP were used, the actual false discovery

rate is likely lower than 5%. To assess the completeness of our catalog based on

transcriptomes, a full 6-frame translation analysis of both genomes was conducted,

using BLASTP and RPS-BLAST to compare the millions of non-repetitive smORFs in

the human (10M) and fly (2.2M) genomes. Only seven new smORFs (new compared to

the 194 described above) passed our stringent conservation threshold, suggesting that

the actual FDR is much less than 5%, and that the 194 smORFs based on the

transcriptome is largely complete.

Clustering of ontological anatomical annotations of embryonic expression

patterns

Embryos were clustered using a bagged and cross validated procedure to ensure

cluster stability. The importance of stability was made apparent to us when, during the

course of our study, one additional smORF was discovered and added to this analysis,

and the resulting clusters differed significantly. We stabilized the clustering as follows:

First, we subsampled 80% of smORFs and used hierarchical clustering with Ward

linkage to form candidate clusters, holding out 20%. Here, the hold-out is to assess

stability by inducing some randomness -- note that this differs from the use of a holdout

in supervised learning. We selected 10K 80/20 splits. Cluster number was selected

using the Gap Statistic -- the first local maximum value was selected. We computed a

proximity matrix for consensus clustering as follows: for each pair of smORFs we

recorded the fraction of our 10K bagged clusterings in which they appeared in the same

cluster. This matrix was then input to hierarchical clustering with Ward linkage, and the

Gap Statistic was used to select cluster number as above.

Embryo Collections for Coordinated Ribosome and RNA-Seq Profiling

Embryos from ~14 g of Oregon-R flies were collected on standard molasses collection

trays after flies were acclimated to the environmental conditions of the cage (27℃ and

70% humidity) for three days. Six, two-hour embryonic time periods (0-2, 2–4 hr., 4–6

hr., 10-12 hr., 14–16 hr., and 16–18 hr. were collected simultaneously, which allowed

for immediate RNA-seq library and ribosome profiling construction of all six stages. See

Supplemental File 7 for detailed the ribosome profiling library protocol.

RNA Preparation and Sequencing Methods

Embryos were homogenized using a Pellet Pestle Cordless Motor (Kimble Cat. No.

749540-0000; Pellet Pestles Sigma Cat. No. Z359947), RNA was extracted using

TRIzol Reagent (Thermo Fisher, Cat. No. 15596026) and purified with the RNeasy Mini

Kit (QIAGEN Cat. No. 74106). Libraries were constructed with the NEBNext Ultra

Directional RNA Library Prep Kit for Illumina according to manufacturer's

recommendations (NEB, cat. no. E7420) using 14 cycles of PCR. Libraries were

sequenced on the Illumina NovaSeq 6000. Raw sequencing data is available at XXXX.

We used the STAR aligner v2.73a to align RNA-seq data to the *D. melanogaster*

genome (Rel 6). The picard 2.20.1 MarkDuplicates tool was used to remove PCR

duplicates and the deduplicated BAM alignment files were converted to bigWig format

using a custom tool and the UCSC bedGraphToBigWig tool. We ran fastp 0.20.1 to get

FASTQ file statistics.

Ribosome Profiling Methods

Polysome profiling was performed on all six samples. Briefly, embryos from each time

period (i.e., sample) were treated with harringtonine (LKT Laboratories, H0169)

in mild lysis buffer followed by the addition of cycloheximide and immediate grinding.

Samples were subjected to a 10%-50% sucrose gradient and all polysomes were

collected and combined. Collected polysome fractions were pelleted via sucrose

cushion (34%) and subjected to RNaseI digestion. After resuspension another cushion

(34%) was performed and RNA was coprecipitated with GlycoBlue (Thermo Fisher, cat.

No. AM95150). Recovered RNA was then run on a 15% TBE-Urea Gel (Thermo Fisher

cat. no. EC68852BOX), followed by gel size selection to isolate ribosome protected

fragments (26-31 nt) (Zymo Research, cat. no. R1070). Following end-repair

phosphorylation of RNA molecules, libraries were constructed with the NEBNext Small

RNA Library Preparation Kit according to manufacturer's recommendations (NEB, cat.

no. E7330). See Supplemental File 7 or detailed protocol.

Sequencing, read processing and mapping

Ribo-seq libraries were sequenced with the Illumina NovaSeq 6000. Raw sequencing

data is available at XXXX. Read processing and mapping were performed on an Ubuntu

18.04 Linux cluster running Kubernetes v1.16. on 240 total cores with 1500 GB of total

RAM. Reads were processed with the following commands:

```
490
491  I. QC of raw reads with FastQC (http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/)
492                   fastqc file_one.fastq.gz file_two.fastq.gz
493
494    II.   Clip adapters from Illumina raw reads with the following commands with Cutadapt
495          (Martin 2011)
496                   cutadapt -a adapter sequence for file_one.fastq.gz \
497                   -A adapter sequence for file_one.fastq.gz -j 10 \
498                   -o file_one_clipped.fastq -p file_two_clipped.fastq \
499                   file_one.fastq.gz file_two.fastq.gz
500
501    III.  Trim clipped reads based on position quality with the following commands:
502                   cutadapt -q 33 -j 12 -o file_one_clipped_trimmed.fastq  file_one_clipped.fastq
503                   cutadapt -q 33 -j 12 -o file_two_clipped_trimmed.fastq  file_two_clipped.fastq
504
505    IV.   QC of processed reads:
506                   fastqc file_one_clipped_trimmed.fastq \ file_two_clipped_trimmed.fastq
507
508    V.    Remove reads smaller than 26 bp and larger than 31 bp:
509                   cutadapt --pair-filter=any --minimum-length=26 --maximum-length=31 -j 20 \
510                   -o file_one_clipped_trimmed_min_max_removed.fastq \
511                   -p file_two_clipped_trimmed_min_max_removed.fastq \
512                   file_one_clipped_trimmed.fastq file_two_clipped_trimmed.fastq
513
514    VI.   Map first to the rDNA reference with Bowtie2 (Langmead and Salzberg 2012) to 1)
515          remove rRNA sequences and decrease mapping time to nuclear reference genome, and
516          2) assess the percentage of rRNA contamination in each library:
```

```
517            Bowtie2 -x rDNA_reference_directory  \
518            -1 file_one_clipped_trimmed_min_max_removed.fastq  \
519            -2 file_two_clipped_trimmed_min_max_removed.fastq  \
520            --seedlen 12 --un-conc Bowtie2_mapping_directory -p 12  \
521            -S rDNA_mapping.sam
522
523 VII.    Map non-rRNA reads to nuclear reference genome with STAR (Dobin et al. 2013):
524            STAR --runThreadN 25 --genomeDir --outFileNamePrefix  \
525            --outSAMtype BAM SortedByCoordinate  \
526            --winAnchorMultimapNmax 100 --seedSearchStartLmax 20  \
527            --outFilterMismatchNmax 3 --readFilesIn  \
528            Bowtie2_mapping_directory/un-conc-mate.1  \
529            Bowtie2_mapping_directory/un-conc-mate.2
530

531
```

Iterative Random Forest analysis of ORFquant Ribo-seq results to identify translated ORFs

Identification of translated sequences was performed using ORFquant (Calviello et al.

2020). For each predicted ORF with mapped reads we recorded all ORFquant summary

statistics. This dataset was used as input for the iterative random forest (iRF) algorithm

(Basu et al. 2018). A random forest model was trained with "embryonic non-translated

genes" (lncRNAs and asRNAs) and "embryonic translated genes" (known protein

coding genes expressed in embryonic stages). This trained iRF model was the applied

to ORFquant output variables for each embryonic time period, producing a dataframe

with translated or nontranslated calls for each *Drosophila* ORF.

Molecular biology

Fly genomic DNA was isolated by grinding a single fly in 50µl squishing buffer (10 mM

Tris-Cl pH 8.2, 1 mM EDTA, 25 mM NaCl) with 200µg/ml Proteinase K (3115879001,

Roche), incubating at 37˚C for 30 min, and 95˚C for 2 minutes. PCR was performed

using Taq polymerase (TAKR001C, ClonTech) when running DNA fragments on a gel,

and Phusion polymerase (M-0530, NEB) was used when DNA fragments were

sequenced or used for molecular cloning. DNA fragments were run on a 1% agarose

gel for imaging or purified on QIAquick columns (28115, Qiagen) for sequencing

analysis. Sanger sequencing was performed at the DF/HCC DNA Resource Core facility

and chromatograms were analyzed using Lasergene 13 software (DNASTAR).

For isolating flies with frameshift indels in smORF genes, the target site was PCR

amplified from single fly genomic DNA and PCR fragments were Sanger sequenced.

For isolating flies with whole gene deletion of smORF genes by dual sgRNA cutting, the

target region was PCR amplified from single fly genomic DNA. Primers were designed

to flank the two sgRNA cut sites, such that a deletion of the intervening sequence would

produce a clear band size difference on an agarose gel. Deletion PCR fragments were

Sanger sequenced. Genotyping primer sequences are listed in Supplemental File 8.

For RT-qPCR analysis of smORF overexpression by CRISPRa, adult flies (tub-Gal4,

UAS-dCas9-VPR, sgRNA-OE) were flash frozen in liquid nitrogen. 4-14 frozen flies

(equal mixture of males and females) were homogenized in 1000ul Trizol (Invitrogen

15596026), RNA partially purified by chloroform extraction, and RNA extracted using a

Direct-zol RNA Miniprep kit (Zymo Research, R2050). cDNA was generated using the

iScript Reverse Transcription Supermix (BioRad 1708840). cDNA was analyzed by RT-

qPCR using iQ SYBR Green Supermix (BioRad 170-8880) on a CFX96 Real-Time

system (BioRad). qPCR primer sequences are listed in Supplemental File 8. Each

qPCR reaction was performed with five biological replicates (except *CG14818*, which

had two biological replicates), with two technical replicates each. Data from smORF

specific primers were normalized to primers that amplify GAPDH. Statistical significance

was calculated using a T-Test.

Molecular cloning

Plasmid DNAs were constructed and propagated using standard protocols. Briefly,

chemically competent TOP10 E.coli. (Invitrogen, C404010) were transformed with

plasmids containing either Ampicillin or Kanamycin resistance genes and were selected

on LB-Agar plates with 100µg/ml Ampicillin or 50µg/ml Kanamycin. Oligo sequences are

in Supplemental File 8.

sgRNA expression plasmids: Plasmids encoding sgRNAs were generated using

previously described protocols. For sgRNAs cloned into *pCFD3* (Port et al. 2014),

annealed oligos encoding a sgRNA spacer were ligated into *pCFD3* digested with BbsI

(NEB, R3539). For sgRNAs cloned into *pCFD4* (Port et al. 2014), dual sgRNAs were

PCR amplified from *pCFD4* template, and inserted by Gibson assembly (NEB, E2611)

into *pCFD4* digested with BbsI. For sgRNAs cloned into *pCFD5* (Port and Bullock

2016), dual sgRNAs were PCR amplified from *pCFD5* template, and inserted by Gibson

assembly into *pCFD5* digested with BbsI. sgRNAs cloned into *pCFD3* and were

performed by DRSC/TRiP (https://fgr.hms.harvard.edu/). Information on sgRNA-KO and

sgRNA-OE plasmids generated by the DRSC/TRiP is available at

https://www.flyrnai.org/tools/grna_tracker/web/. Information on remaining *pCFD4* and

pCFD5 sgRNA plasmids is in Supplemental File 8.

<u>pEntr plasmids:</u> Entry plasmids were generated by PCR amplifying coding sequence

and inserting into *pEntr* using either dTopo (Invitrogen, K240020) or Gibson assembly

(NEB, E2611). cDNA sequence was PCR amplified from cDNA reverse transcribed from

total RNA (either S2R+ cell or adult fly) or adult fly genomic DNA.

<u>Gateway cloning LR reactions:</u> Gateway cloning reactions were performed using LR

Clonase II Enzyme mix (Invitrogen 11791-020). pEntr_cDNA plasmids were recombined

with *pWalium10-roe* (Perkins et al. 2015).

Fly Genetics

Flies were maintained on standard fly food at 25°C unless otherwise noted.

Fly stocks were obtained from the Perrimon lab collection, Bloomington Stock center

(indicated with BL#), or generated in this study (see below).

Perrimon Lab stocks:

yv; Gla/CyO

yw; nos-Cas9attP40/CyO

yw;; nos-Cas9attP2

lethal/FM7,GFP

yw; Gla/CyO

yw;; TM3, Sb/TM6b

lethal/FM7,GFP;; TM3, Ser

yw; Sp/CyO; MKRS/TM6B

Bloomington Stocks:

sgRNA lines (see Supplemental File 8)

UAS-dCas9-VPR; tub-Gal4/S-T (*tub>VPR*) (BL67048)

Actin-Cas9 (BL54590)

attP40 (BL36304)

Mhc>Cas9 (BL67079)

LSP>Cas9 (BL67087)

Myo1a>Cas9 (BL67088)

Pnr>Cas9 (BL67077)

Nub>Cas9 (BL67086)

Elav>Cas9 (BL67073)

yw (BL1495)

Information on the smORF KO alleles are described in Supplemental File 8.

<u>smORF knockout by frameshift indel by transgenic crossing:</u> Flies expressing a sgRNA

that targets the 5' coding sequence (see Supplemental File 8) were crossed with *nos-*

Cas9 flies. *nos-Cas9attP2* was used for targeting genes on Chromosomes X and II, and

nos-Cas9attP40 was used for targeting genes on chromosome III. F1 progeny were

crossed with a balancer strain. Single fly F2 progeny were crossed with a balancer

strain, taken for genotyping, and F2 crosses with a frameshift indel were kept and

balanced and homozygosed if possible. Frameshift knockout lines were generated

either by WellGenetics, Shu Kondo, or in the Perrimon lab.

<u>smORF knockout by full gene deletion by injection:</u> Plasmids encoding two sgRNAs that

flank a gene locus were injected into *nos-Cas9* embryos. Injected F0 adults were

crossed to with a balancer strain. Single fly F1 progeny were crossed with a balancer

strain, taken for genotyping, and F1 crosses with a full gene deletion were kept and

balanced and homozygosed if possible.

<u>smORF knockout by CRISPaint insertion by injection:</u> To generate the bc10 KO allele, a

plasmid encoding a sgRNA that targets the 5' coding sequence of bc10 (GP01409) was

co-injected with pCRISPaint-T2A-Gal4-3xP3-RFP (Addgene #127556) into *nos-*

Cas9attP40 embryos. Injected F0 adults were outcrossed to *yw*, single RFP+ F1

progeny were crossed with *yw;; TM3, Sb/TM6b,* and the insertion in bc10 was verified

by PCR and sanger sequencing. The *bc10-CRISPaint* allele contains *T2A-Gal4* inserted

in the reverse orientation relative to the 5'-3' *bc10* transcript, and thus is not a Gal4

reporter allele.

To generate double smORF knockout lines, smORF alleles on different chromosomes

were brought into the same strain by outcrossing to double balancer lines.

CRISPR-KO F1 crosses and phenotyping: Lines expressing sgRNAs that target smORF

5' coding sequence were crossed with a line ubiquitously expressing Cas9, *Act5c-Cas9*.

Specifically, male sgRNA flies were used that were heterozygous with a balancer

chromosome (CyO or TM3, Sb), and were crossed with homozygous *Act5c-Cas9*

female flies. To quantify the viability of F1 flies with somatic KO, we recorded the

number of balancer progeny (*Act5c-Cas9/Bal*) and non-balancer progeny

(*sgRNA/Act5c-Cas9*). The total number of F1 progeny counted per cross was

920>n>31. To calculate a viability score, the number non-balancer flies was divided by

the mendelian expected number of non-balancer flies (# F1 progeny/2) and multiplied

by 100 (# observed non-balancer/# expected non-balancer*100). Negative control

crosses were *attp40/CyO* males crossed with *Act5c-Cas9* females. For crosses leading

to reduced viability, a Chi-square test was used to determine significance by comparing

the # expected non-balancer flies from negative control (attp40) vs experimental

(sgRNA) crosses. Those sgRNA hits that had significant reduced viability (Figure 5,

Supplemental File 8) were crossed with tissue specific Cas9 lines (Figure S3). Viability

scores and Chi-square tests were performed similarly to *Act5c-Cas9* crosses.

CRISPRa F1 crosses and phenotyping: Lines expressing sgRNAs that target upstream

of a smORF transcriptional start site (TSS) were crossed with line ubiquitously

expressing dCas9-VPR, *tub>VPR* (*tub-Gal4, UAS-dCas9-VPR/S-T*). "S-T" are a second

and third chromosome balancer pair that segregate together due to a reciprocal

translocation, and are marked by Cy, Hu, and Tb (T(2;3)TSTL14, SM5: TM6B, Tb[1]).

Male sgRNA flies were crossed with tub>VPR females. A viability score was calculated

similar to CRISPR-KO F1 crosses, (# observed non-balancer/# expected non-

balancer*100). When using homozygous sgRNA males, the expected number of non-

balancer flies was # F1 progeny/2. When using heterozygous sgRNA/Bal males, the

expected number of non-balancer flies was # F1 progeny/4. The total number of F1

progeny counted per cross was 346>n>56. Negative control crosses were *attp40/CyO*

males crossed with *tub>VPR* females. Chi-square analysis was performed similarly to

CRISPR-KO F1 crosses. No crosses had significantly reduced viability.

cDNA overexpression crosses and phenotyping: Transgenic UAS-cDNA lines were

crossed with a ubiquitous Gal4 line. For convenience, we used the same driver used for

CRISPRa crosses, *tub>VPR* (*tub-Gal4, UAS-dCas9-VPR/S-T*). A viability score was

calculated similar to CRISPRa F1 crosses. Negative control crosses were *attp40/CyO*

males crossed with *tub>VPR* females. The total number of F1 progeny counted per

cross was 706>n>100. Chi-square analysis was performed similarly to CRISPR-KO F1

crosses.

Stressful food recipes: For all food types, standard lab fly food was melted in a

microwave, and distilled water (dH20) was added as 10% boiled volume (100ml boiled

food + 10ml dH20) to replace the evaporated water. This is used as control food. For

high salt food, solid NaCl (Fisher Scientific, S271) was added at 30% weight per volume

of control food (e.g. 100ml control food + 30g NaCl) and mixed well. For high fat food,

solid coconut oil (Sigma, W530155) was added at 30% weight per volume of control

food (e.g. 100ml control food + 30g coconut oil) and mixed well. For starvation food,

control food was diluted to 30% in 1% melted agar (BD, 214030) in 1x PBS (Gibco,

10010-023) (e.g. 30ml control food + 70ml melted 1% agar in 1x PBS). Melted liquid

food types were poured into empty vials and cooled at 4˚C.

<u>Quantification of developmental timing on stressful food:</u> 24hr larvae from homozygous

viable smORF lines were transferred to stressful food or control food and raised on this

food until pupal eclosion as adults. To increase the fecundity of the adult flies, four days

prior to the 24hr larval collection, ~150 adult flies from each KO line were transferred to

fresh food containing yeast paste. Adult flies were transferred onto fresh food bottles

containing yeast paste and allowed to lay for 4hr. 24hr after the end of egg deposition,

30 freshly hatched larvae (24hr-28hr old) were transferred into vials containing either

control food or stressful food (control, high fat, high salt, starvation). The time of

pupariation and fly eclosion was determined once at least 15 flies pupariated and

eclosed, respectively. yw flies were included as a negative control genotype. Each

genotype-foodtype experiment was carried out in at least triplicate. For those genotype-

foodtypes with a developmental delay, significance was calculated using a One-Way

ANOVA test run with a Dunnet post-hoc test using GraphPad Prism.

<u>Adult wing mounting, imaging, analysis:</u> sgRNA-KO lines were crossed with *nub>Cas9*

and the wings of adult progeny were removed using forceps under a dissecting

microscope. For each genotype, at least 6 wings were collected. Removed wings were

placed onto a drop of mounting medium (50% Permount (Fisher Scientific, SP15), 50%

Xylenes (Fisher Scientific X5)) on a microscope slide (Thermo Scientific, 3050) and

mounted using a coverslip (VWR, 48393059). The coverslip was sealed to the

microscope slide with clear nail polish. Images of the wings were taken using a stereo

microscope (Zeiss Axio Zoom V16) at 32x magnification. The area of each wing was

measured using the polygon function in ImageJ. The area measurements were

analyzed in Graphpad Prism. A One-way ANOVA test was carried out with a Dunnett

Post-Hoc test to determine the significance of the area of the wings of the experimental

cross progeny when compared with the control cross progeny (*attP40 X nub>Cas9*).

Bioinformatics and literature searching

For protein alignments in Figure S5, we downloaded protein sequence files from

Flybase.org or NCBI, aligned them using Clustal Omega

(https://www.ebi.ac.uk/Tools/msa/clustalo), and generated alignment images using

JalView (https://www.jalview.org/).

For literature searching for smORF homolog characterization, we queried every

ultraconserved *Drosophila* smORF using the following online tools: Gene2function

(Gene2function.org), HUGO Gene Nomenclature Committee (genenames.org), Interpro

(ebi.ac.uk/interpro), and Alliance of Genome Resources (alliancegenome.org). Those

smORF genes (25) that had no or minimal characterization in orthologs were selected.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Conservation of smORF dataset. (*A*) Number of conserved smORFs in

dataset with and without homologs in a selection of species with well-annotated

transcriptomes. *(B)* Multiple-species alignments of conserved smORFs, including mean

amino acid hydrophobicity at each alignment position. *bc10* (upper transcript) is

encodes one smORF, whereas *CG42497* and *Tim10* (lower transcript) is polycistronic.

Figure 2. Gene Ontology (GO) and KEGG enrichment analysis of conserved

smORFs. Significantly enriched GO terms for molecular function ("MF"), biological

process ("BP"), cellular component ("CC") are plotted. GO and KEGG enrichment

analyses were performed with g:Profiler (Raudvere et al. 2019). Significantly enriched

terms $<10^{-5}$ are shown that also encompass all conserved smORFs classified as serine-

type endopeptidase inhibitors and mitochondria-associated conserved smORFs.

Figure 3. *In situ* mRNA hybridization patterns of mitochondria-associated

smORFs. (*A*) Clustering of mitochondria-associated conserved smORF *in situ* mRNA

expression patterns (Supplemental Methods). For each mitochondrial conserved

smORF, the organs where expression patterns were assigned are represented by red

boxes, while blue boxes represent no annotated expression. Expression patterns across

embryo stages are collapsed. "DPPM" = dorsal prothoracic pharyngeal muscle; "MT" =

Malpighian tubules; "VNC" = ventral nerve cord; "D and V epidermis" = dorsal and

ventral epidermis. **(*B*)** In-situ mRNA hybridization images for each mitochondria-

associated conserved smORF with patterned expression. Each image was taken

between embryonic stages 13-16.

Figure 4. Ribosome Profiling. *(A)* Overview of ribosome profiling workflow, where

polysomes are isolated followed by digestion of inter-ribosome RNA. Ribosome

protected fragments are then collected. *(B)* Recovered RNA was run on a page urea gel

and RNA molecules in the range of ribosome protected fragments (RPFs) are excised

and purified. After sequencing, the number of in frame reads are analyzed *(C)* to

determine if RPFs were successfully sequenced. *(D)* Distribution of tags per million

(TPM) for six, embryonic time periods. Comparison of ribosome profiling sequencing to

mRNA-seq sequencing showing ribosome profiling libraries are constrained to CDS

while mRNA libraries map to the entire annotated transcript.

Figure 5. Functional characterization of conserved smORFs by F1 CRISPR in vivo

screening. (*A*) Genetic cross to perform CRISPR somatic knockout in F1 generation.

(*B*) Quantification of viability of F1 flies from 115 sgRNA-KO crosses. Number of F1

progeny counted per cross was 918>n>33. *(C)* Genetic cross to perform CRISPR gene

overexpression in F1 generation. *(D)* Quantification of viability of F1 flies from 123

sgRNA-OE crosses. Number of F1 progeny counted per cross was 220>n>56. **(E)**

Images of adult female flies aged seven days after eclosion for two indicated genotypes.

(F) Quantification of viability of F1 flies from 68 UAS-cDNA crosses. Number of F1

progeny countered per cross was 706>n>101.

Figure 6. Full CRISPR knockout of 25 uncharacterized smORFs raised on

stressful foods. Developmental timing of egg deposition to adult eclosure in smORF

KO mutants raised on *(A)* control food, *(B)* high salt food (30% NaCl), *(C)* high fat food

(30% coconut oil), *(D)* starvation food (30% food, 70% PBS+1%agar). Significance was

determined by One Way Anova test followed by a Dunnet Post-Hoc, P=0.05(*),

P=0.01(**), P=0.001(***), error bars calculated with SD.

References

Adams, M.D., Celniker, S.E., Holt, R.A., Evans, C.A., Gocayne, J.D., Amanatides, P.G.,
Scherer, S.E., Li, P.W., Hoskins, R.A., Galle, R.F*., et al.* (2000). The genome sequence
of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Science 287*, 2185-2195.

Aspden JL, Eyre-Walker YC, Phillips RJ, Amin U, Mumtaz MA, Brocard M, Couso JP.
Extensive translation of small Open Reading Frames revealed by Poly-Ribo-Seq. Elife.
2014 Aug 21;3:e03528. doi: 10.7554/eLife.03528. PMID: 25144939; PMCID:
PMC4359375.

Aradska, J., Bulat, T., Sialana, F.J., Birner-Gruenberger, R., Erich, B., and Lubec, G.
(2015). Gel-free mass spectrometry analysis of *Drosophila melanogaster* heads.
Proteomics 15, 3356-3360.

Basrai, M.A., Hieter, P., and Boeke, J.D. (1997). Small open reading frames: beautiful
needles in the haystack. *Genome Res 7*, 768-771.

Basu S, Kumbier K, Brown JB, Yu B. 2018. Iterative random forests to discover
predictive and stable high-order interactions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 115:1943-1948.

Beall, C.J., and Fyrberg, E. (1991). Muscle abnormalities in *Drosophila melanogaster*
heldup mutants are caused by missing or aberrant tropinin-I isoforms. *J Cell Biol 114*,
941-951.

Bersuker, K., Peterson, C.W.H., To, M., Sah, S.J., Savikhin, V., Grossman, E.A.,
Nomura, D.K., Olzmann, J.A. (2018). A proximity labeling strategy provides insights into
the composition and dynamics of lipid droplet proteomes. *Dev Cell 44*, 97-112.

Birse, R.T., Choi, J., Reardon, K., Rodriguez, J., Graham, S., Diop, S., Ocorr, K.,
Bodmer, R., and Oldham, S. (2010). High-fat-diet-induced obesity and heart dysfunction
are regulated by the TOR pathway in *Drosophila*. *Cell Metab 12*, 533-544.

Bosch, J., Ugur, B., Pichardo-Casas, I., Rabasco, J., Escobedo, F., Zuo, Z., Brown,
J.B., Celniker, S., Sinclair, D., Bellen, H*., et al.* (2020). Two neuronal peptides encoded
from a single transcript regulate mitochondrial function in *Drosophila*. *BioRxiv*.

Brown, C.J., Kaufman, T., Trinidad, J.C., and Clemmer, D.E. (2018). Proteome changes
in the aging *Drosophila melanogaster* head. *Int J Mass Spectrom 425*, 36-46.

Brown, J.B., Boley, N., Eisman, R., May, G.E., Stoiber, M.H., Duff, M.O., Booth, B.W.,
Wen, J., Park, S., Suzuki, A.M., et al. (2014). Diversity and dynamics of the *Drosophila*
transcriptome. *Nature* 512, 393-399.

Bucio-Mendez, A., Cruz-Becerra, G., Valadez-Graham, V., Dinkova, T.D., and Zurita, M.
(2019). The Dmp8-Dmp18 bicistron messenger RNA enables unusual translation during
cellular stress. *J Cell Biochem 120*, 3887-3897.

Cammarato, A., Ahrens, C.H., Alayari, N.N., Qeli, E., Rucker, J., Reedy, M.C., Zmasek,
C.M., Gucek, M., Cole, R.N., Van Eyk, J.E.*, et al.* (2011). A mighty small heart: the
cardiac proteome of adult *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS One 6*, e18497.

Casas-Vila, N., Bluhm, A., Sayols, S., Dinges, N., Dejung, M., Altenhein, T., Kappei, D.,
Altenhein, B., Roignant, J.Y., and Butter, F. (2017). The developmental proteome of
Drosophila melanogaster. *Genome Res 27*, 1273-1285.

Calviello L, Hirsekorn A, Ohler U. 2020. Quantification of translation uncovers the
functions of the alternative transcriptome. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 27:717-725.

Couso, J., Patriquim, P. (2017). Classification and function of small open reading
frames. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 9*, 575-589.

Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, et al. 2013. STAR:
Ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics* 29:15-21.

Dorus, S., Busby, S.A., Gerike, U., Shabanowitz, J., Hunt, D.F., and Karr, T.L. (2006).
Genomic and functional evolution of the *Drosophila melanogaster* sperm proteome. *Nat*
Genet 38, 1440-1445.

Ewen-Campen, B., Yang-Zhou, D., Fernandes, V.R., Gonzalez, D.P., Liu, L.P., Tao, R.,
Ren, X., Sun, J., Hu, Y., Zirin, J.*, et al.* (2017). Optimized strategy for in vivo Cas9-
activation in *Drosophila*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 114*, 9409-9414.

Fecher, C., Trovo, L., Muller, S.A., Snaidero, N., Wettmarshausen, J., Heink, S., Ortiz,
O., Wagner, I., Kuhn, R., Hartmann, J.*, et al.* (2019). Cell-type-specific profiling of brain
mitochondria reveals functional and molecular diversity. *Nat Neurosci 22*, 1731-1742.

Graveley, B.R., Brooks, A.N., Carlson, J.W., Duff, M.O., Landolin, J.M., Yang, L., Artieri,
C.G., van Baren, M.J., Boley, N., Booth, B.W.*, et al.* (2011). The developmental
transcriptome of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Nature 471*, 473-479.

Hammonds, A.S., Bristow, C.A., Fisher, W.W., Weiszmann, R., Wu, S., Hartenstein, V.,
Kellis, M., Yu, B., Frise, E., and Celniker, S.E. (2013). Spatial expression of transcription
factors in *Drosophila* embryonic organ development. *Genome Biol 14*, R140.
888

889   Henderson, C.A., Gomez, C.G., Novak, S.M., Mi-Mi, L., Gregorio, C.C. (2017).
890   Overview of the muscle cytoskeleton. *Compr Physiol 7,* 891-944.
891

892   Henras, A., Henry, Y., Bousquet-Antonelli, C., Noaillac-Depeyre, J., Gelugne, J.P., and
893   Caizergues-Ferrer, M. (1998). Nhp2p and Nop10p are essential for the function of
894   H/ACA snoRNPs. *EMBO J 17*, 7078-7090.
895

896   Jia, Y., Xu, R.G., Ren, X., Ewen-Campen, B., Rajakumar, R., Zirin, J., Yang-Zhou, D.,
897   Zhu, R., Wang, F., Mao, D*., et al.* (2018). Next-generation CRISPR/Cas9 transcriptional
898   activation in *Drosophila* using flySAM. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 115*, 4719-4724.
899

900   Kanehisa, M., Furumichi, M., Sato, Y., Ishiguro-Watanabe, M., and Tanabe, M. (2021).
901   KEGG: integrating viruses and cellular organisms*. Nucleic Acids Res 49*, D545-D551.
902

903   Langmead B, Salzberg SL. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with bowtie 2. *Nat
904   Methods* 9:357-359.
905

906   Larkin A, Marygold SJ, Antonazzo G, Attrill H, Dos Santos G, Garapati PV, et al. 2021.
907   FlyBase: Updates to the *Drosophila melanogaster* knowledge base. *Nuc Acids Res
908   49:D899-D907.
909

910   Lim, S.C., Smith, K.R., Stroud, D.A., Compton, A.G., Tucker, E.J., Dasvarma, A.,
911   Gandolfo, L.C., Marum, J.E., McKenzie, M., Peters, H.L*., et al.* (2014). A founder
912   mutation in PET100 causes isolated complex IV deficiency in Lebanese individuals with
913   Leigh syndrome. *Am J Hum Genet 94*, 209-222.
914

915   Lynch, M., and Conery, J.S. (2003). The origins of genome complexity. *Science 302*,
916   1401-1404.
917

918   Mackowiak, S.D., Zauber, H., Bielow, C., Thiel, D., Kutz, K., Calviello, L., Mastrobuoni,
919   G., Rajewsky, N., Kempa, S., Selbach, M*., et al.* (2015). Extensive identification and
920   analysis of conserved small ORFs in animals. *Genome Biol 16*, 179.
921

922   Martin M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput
923   sequencing reads. *EMBnet* 17:10-12.
924

925   Martinez, T.F., Chu, Q., Donaldson, C., Tan, D., Shokhirev, M.N., and Saghatelian, A.
926   (2020). Accurate annotation of human protein-coding small open reading frames. *Nat
927   Chem Biol 16*, 458-468.
928

929   Olexiouk, V., Van Criekinge, W., and Menschaert, G. (2018). An update on sORFs.org:
930   a repository of small ORFs identified by ribosome profiling. *Nucleic Acids Res 46*, D497-
931   D502.
932
933   Pearson, R.K., Anderson, B., and Dixon, J.E. (1993). Molecular biology of the peptide
934   hormone families. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am 22*, 753-774.
935
Perkins LA, Holderbaum L, Tao R, Hu Y, Sopko R, McCall K, Yang-Zhou D, Flockhart I,
Binari R, Shim HS, Miller A, Housden A, Foos M, Randkelv S, Kelley C, Namgyal P,
Villalta C, Liu LP, Jiang X, Huan-Huan Q, Wang X, Fujiyama A, Toyoda A, Ayers K,
Blum A, Czech B, Neumuller R, Yan D, Cavallaro A, Hibbard K, Hall D, Cooley L,
Hannon GJ, Lehmann R, Parks A, Mohr SE, Ueda R, Kondo S, Ni JQ, Perrimon N. The
Transgenic RNAi Project at Harvard Medical School: Resources and Validation.
Genetics. 2015 Nov;201(3):843-52. doi: 10.1534/genetics.115.180208. Epub 2015 Aug
28. PMID: 26320097; PMCID: PMC4649654.
944
945   Plaza, S., Menschaert, G., Payre, F. (2017). In search of lost small peptides. *Annu Rev*
946   *Cell Dev Biol 33* 391-416.
947
948   Port F, Chen HM, Lee T, Bullock SL. Optimized CRISPR/Cas tools for efficient germline
949   and somatic genome engineering in Drosophila. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014 Jul
950   22;111(29):E2967-76. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1405500111. Epub 2014 Jul 7. PMID:
951   25002478; PMCID: PMC4115528.
952
953   Port, F., and Bullock, S.L. (2016). Augmenting CRISPR applications in *Drosophila* with
954   tRNA-flanked sgRNAs. *Nat Methods 13*, 852-854.
955
956   Port, F., Strein, C., Stricker, M., Rauscher, B., Heigwer, F., Zhou, J., Beyersdorffer, C.,
957   Frei, J., Hess, A., Kern, K.*, et al.* (2020). A large-scale resource for tissue-specific
958   CRISPR mutagenesis in *Drosophila*. *eLife* 9, e53865.
959
960   Rathore, A., Chu, Q., Tan, D., Martinez, T.F., Donaldson, C.J., Diedrich, J.K., Yates,
961   J.R., 3rd, and Saghatelian, A. (2018). MIEF1 microprotein regulates mitochondrial
962   translation. *Biochemistry 57*, 5564-5575.
963
964   Rawlings, N.D., Tolle, D.P., Barrett, A.J. (2004). Evolutionary families of peptidase
965   inhibitors. *Biochem J 378,* 705-716.
966
967   Remmelzwaal, S., Geisler, F., Stucchi, R., van der Horst, Suzanne., Pasolli, M., Kroll,
968   J.R., Jarosinska, O.D., Akhmanova, A., Richardson, C.A., Altelaar, M., Leube, R.E.,
969   Ramalho, J.J., Boxem, M. (2021). BBLN-1 is essential for intermediate filament
970   organization and apical membrane morphology. *Curr Biol 31*, 2334-2346.
971
972   Snyder, S.H., and Innis, R.B. (1979). Peptide neurotransmitters. *Annu Rev Biochem 48*,
973   755-782.
974

975　Stein, C.S., Jadiya, P., Zhang, X., McLendon, J.M., Abouassaly, G.M., Witmer, N.H.,
976　Anderson, E.J., Elrod, J.W., and Boudreau, R.L. (2018). Mitoregulin: a lncRNA-encoded
977　microprotein that supports mitochondrial supercomplexes and respiratory efficiency.
978　*Cell Rep 23*, 3710-3720.
979

980　Stergiopoulos, K., Cabrero, P., Davies, S.A., and Dow, J.A. (2009). Salty dog, an SLC5
981　symporter, modulates *Drosophila* response to salt stress. *Physiol Genomics 37*, 1-11.
982

983　Wasbrough, E.R., Dorus, S., Hester, S., Howard-Murkin, J., Lilley, K., Wilkin, E.,
984　Polpitiya, A., Petritis, K., and Karr, T.L. (2010). The *Drosophila melanogaster* sperm
985　proteome-II (DmSP-II). *J Proteomics 73*, 2171-2185.
986

987　Welter, D., MacArthur, J., Morales, J., Burdett, T., Hall, P., Junkins, H., Klemm, A.,
988　Flicek, P., Manolio, T., Hindorff, L.*, et al.* (2014). The NHGRI GWAS Catalog, a curated
989　resource of SNP-trait associations. *Nucleic Acids Res 42*, D1001-1006.
990

991　Wray, G.A., Hahn, M.W., Abouheif, E., Balhoff, J.P., Pizer, M., Rockman, M.V., and
992　Romano, L.A. (2003). The evolution of transcriptional regulation in eukaryotes. *Mol Biol
993　Evol 20*, 1377-1419.
994

995　Yang, P., Maguire, J.J., and Davenport, A.P. (2015). Apelin, Elabela/Toddler, and
996　biased agonists as novel therapeutic agents in the cardiovascular system. *Trends
997　Pharmacol Sci 36*, 560-567.
998

999　Zirin, J., Hu, Y., Liu, L., Yang-Zhou, D., Colbeth, R., Yan, D., Ewen-Campen, B., Tao,
1000　R., Vogt, E., VanNest, S.*, et al.* (2020). Large-scale transgenic *Drosophila* resource
1001　collections for loss- and gain-of-function studies. *Genetics 214*, 755-767.
1002

1003　Zirin, J., Nieuwenhuis, J., Samsonova, A., Tao, R., and Perrimon, N. (2015). Regulators
1004　of autophagosome formation in *Drosophila* muscles. *PLoS Genet 11*, e1005006.
1005

		stats			Serine-type Endopeptidase Inhibitors	Mitochondria-associated
Term name	Term ID	Padj	-log10(Padj)			

MF

serine-type endopeptidase inhibitor activity	GO:0004867	2.91E-22
enzyme inhibitor activity	GO:0004857	1.55E-19
electron transfer activity	GO:0009055	4.09E-10
cytochrome-c oxidase activity	GO:0004129	7.06E-10
proton transmembrane transporter activity	GO:0015078	5.13E-07

BP

negative regulation of proteolysis	GO:0045861	1.25E-20
negative regulation of peptidase activity	GO:0010466	1.33E-20
negative regulation of endopeptidase activity	GO:0010951	1.33E-20
mitochondrion organization	GO:0007005	3.82E-09
cytochrome complex assembly	GO:0017004	8.02E-09
electron transport chain	GO:0022900	8.69E-08
respiratory chain complex IV assembly	GO:0008535	2.67E-07
protein insertion into mitochondrial membrane	GO:0051204	4.46E-07
ATP metabolic process	GO:0046034	6.05E-07
regulation of catalytic activity	GO:0050790	1.01E-06

CC

mitochondrial envelope	GO:0005740	1.07E-21
mitochondrial inner membrane	GO:0005743	1.13E-19
mitochondrial protein-containing complex	GO:0098798	1.71E-18
mitochondrion	GO:0005739	1.55E-18
mitochondrial membrane	GO:0031966	3.07E-18
membrane protein complex	GO:0098796	5.53E-12
cytochrome complex	GO:0070069	2.79E-11

| Oxidative phosphorylation | KEGG:00190 | 3.58E-14 |

- 🟧 Biological Aspect of Ancestor
- 🟦 Electronic Annotation
- 🟪 Inferred by High Throughput Experiment
- 🟥 Inferred from Experiment
- 🟩 Inferred by Curator
- ⬛ KEGG, Reactome

A Polysome Isolation and RNase Treatment

Sucrose Gradient Analysis

Absorbance (260nm)

Fraction

Polysomes

Polysomes

rRNA

mRNA

Ribosome

RNaseI treatment

RPF

RPF

RPF

RPF

B Size selection on PAGE-Urea Gel (26-34 bp)

Ribosome Protected Fragments, "RPFs"

34bp
26bp

C Ribosome Profiling

Start codon

Stop codon

Position (Nucleotide Resolution)

Frame 1   Frame 2   Frame 3

D smORF Expression

TPM (Tags per Million)

2000

1500

1000

0–2   2–4   4–6   10–12   14–16   16–18

Hours

E Comparison of Ribo-seq and RNA-seq Profiles

REPTOR-BP

Ribo-seq

RNA-seq

124 insects basewise conservation by PhyloP

-4.5

A

Act-Cas9 X smORF sgRNA-KO / Balancer

Control F1 sibling: Act-Cas9 / Balancer

Somatic KO F1 sibling: Act-Cas9 / smORF sgRNA-KO

B

(Observed # flies/Expected # flies)*100

Control Cross

Strongly lethal hits

115 sgRNA-KO lines

Fly smORF	Human smORF
* CG42496	COX19
CG40127	RNASEK
CG34191	UFM1
CG6610	LSM5
CG32069	IER3IP1
* ATPsynE	ATP5ME
CG14057	POP5
* CG14483	PET100
* CG17776	Cox14
CG33774	OST4
* CG42376	COA6
CG4650	Trypsin-like serine proteases
Rpb12	POLR2K
CG18508	C18orf32

* = mitochondrial

C

tub-Gal4; UAS-VPR S-T X smORF sgRNA-OE / Balancer

Control F1 sibling: tub-Gal4; UAS-VPR / Balancer

Somatic KO F1 sibling: tub-Gal4; UAS-VPR / smORF sgRNA-OE

D

(Observed # flies/Expected # flies)*100

Control Crosses

123 sgRNA-OE lines

E

tub>VPR; attP40 control   *tub>VPR; CG13838 CRISPRa*

F

(Observed # flies/Expected # flies)*100

Control Crosses

CG18508, CG13838

68 UAS-cDNA lines

A

B

C

D

Supplemental Figures

A

B *NADH dehydrogenase*

Ndufs1	Ndufs2	Ndufs3	Ndufs4	Ndufs5	Ndufs6	Ndufs7	Ndufs8	Ndufv1	Ndufv2	Ndufv3		
Ndufa1	Ndufa2	Ndufa3	Ndufa4	Ndufa5	Ndufa6	Ndufa78	Ndufa8	Ndufa9	Ndufa10	Ndufab1	Ndufa11	Ndufa12	Ndufa13
Ndufb1	Ndufb2	Ndufb3	Ndufb4	Ndufb5	Ndufb6	Ndufb7	Ndufb8	Ndufb9	Ndufb10	Ndufb11	Ndufc1	Ndufc2

C *Cytochrome c oxidase*

Lorem ipsum

COX10	COX3	COX1	COX2	COX4	COX5A	COX5B	COX6A*	COX6B	COX6C	COX7A*	COX7B	COX7C	COX8	COX11	COX15	COX17

D F-type ATPase

alpha	beta	gamma	delta	epsilon*
OSCP	a	b	c	d	e

E *Cytochrome c reductase*

ISP	Cytb	Cyt 1

COR1	QCR2	QCR6*	QCR7	QCR8	QCR9	QCR10*

Figure S1. A) Electron transport takes place in the mitochondria and is the site of oxidative phosphorylation in eukaryotes. The complexes I to V and the enzymes required for human mitochondrial function are diagramed (Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (Kanehisa et al., 2021; KEGG). B) Part of Complex I, NADH dehydrogenases are used in the electron transport chain for generation of ATP and to convert NADH to NAD+. Of the thirty-eight members, eight are smORFs in humans (green shading). In flies there are two orthologs for the human genes with asterisks, Ndufa7 with orthologs ND-B14.5A (103aa) and ND-B14.5AL (145aa) and Ndufb2 with orthologs CG40472 (94aa) and ND-AGGG (54aa). C) Complex IV or Cytochrome C Oxidase is a large protein complex. Of the seventeen members, seven are smORFs in humans (green shading). In flies there are two orthologs for the human genes with asterisks, *COX6A* with orthologs *levy* and *COX6AL* and *COX7A* with orthologs *COX7AL* and *COX7AL2* (62aa). There is a third ortholog of *COX6A* but it is not a smORF *COX6AL2* (289aa). D) Part of Complex V, ATPases produce ATP from ADP in the presence of a proton gradient. The human F-type ATPase episilon (ATP5F1E) has two fly orthologs *ATPsynepsilonL* (64aa) and *sun* (57aa). E) Part of Complex III, cytochrome C reductases pass electrons to Cytochrome C. Of the ten members two are smORFs and one QCR10 has two fly orthologs UQCR-6.4 (57aa) and CG43206 (72aa

Figure S2. The developmental stage/condition of maximum mRNA gene expression (modENCODE) are plotted for ucsmORFs without Ribo-seq or proteomics support.

Figure S3 – Tissue-specific somatic knockout of lethal smORF hits in Figure 1B.
Quantification of viability from CRISPR somatic knock out in **A)** fat body using 3.1Lsp2>Cas9,
B) muscle using Mhc>Cas9, **C)** gut enterocytes using Myo1A>Cas9, **D)** dorsal thorax using
pnr>Cas9, **E)** wing disc using nub>Cas9, or **F)** neurons using elav>Cas9. Significance calculated
with a Chi-Squared Test. P=0.05(*), P=0.01(**), P=0.001(***) **G)** Images of adult wings with
somatic KO.

Figure S4 – qPCR verification of CRISPRa lines. smORF transcript expression normalized to (A) *Rp49* and (B) *Gapdh* for indicated genotypes. Each sgRNA-OE expression data is normalized to negative control (attP40) expression data. Significance between sgRNA-OE and attP40 control expression levels determined by a T-test. For each genotype, N=5 biological replicates, except CG14818 sgRNA-OE which had 2 biological replicates. P=0.05(*), P=0.01(**), P=0.001(***), P ≤ 0.0001 (****)

Figure S5 – Full CRISPR knockout of 25 uncharacterized smORF genes and muligene knockout of paralogs. (*A*) Protein sequence alignment of smORF paralogs listed in Figure 2B with their human homologs. **(B)** List of 25 uncharacterized smORFs, their human homologs and fly paralogs, type of molecular knockout, and homozygous fly phenotype. **(C, D)** Genomic views paralogs with location of sgRNA target sites for multi-paralog deletion.