1 Title

2 Two strings to the systems biology bow - co-extracting the metabolome and proteome of yeast

3 Authors

- 4 Simon A. Schmidt^{1*}, Shana S. Jacob², Seong Beom Ahn³, Thusitha Rupasinghe⁴, Jens O. Krömer², Alamgir Khan³,
- 5 Cristian Varela¹

6 Addresses

- ⁷ ¹ The Australian Wine Research Institute, PO Box 197, Glen Osmond, SA 5064, Australia
- 8 ² Australian Institute for Bioengineering and Nanotechnology (AIBN), University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD
- 9 4072, Australia
- ³ Australian Proteome Analysis Facility (APAF), Level 4, Building F7B, Research Park Drive, Macquarie
- 11 University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia
- ⁴ Metabolomics Australia, Bio21 Institute for Molecular Science and Biotechnology Building 102, 30 Flemington
- 13 Road Parkville, Victoria, Australia, 3010

14

^{*}Corresponding author; Tel.: +61 08 830366600; fax.: +61 08 83036601; e-mail: Simon.Schmidt@awri.com.au

17 Abstract

18 Experimental samples are valuable and can represent a significant investment in time and resources. It is highly 19 desirable at times to obtain as much information as possible from a single sample. This is especially relevant for 20 systems biology approaches in which several 'omics platforms are studied simultaneously. Unfortunately, each 21 platform has a particular extraction methodology which increases sample number and sample volume requirements 22 when multiple 'omics are analyzed. We evaluated the integration of a yeast extraction method; specifically we 23 explored whether fractions from a single metabolite extraction could be apportioned to multiple downstream 'omics 24 analytical platforms. In addition, we examined how variations to a chloroform/methanol yeast metabolite extraction 25 regime influence metabolite recoveries. We show that protein suitable for proteomic analysis can be recovered from 26 a metabolite extraction and that recovery of lipids, while reproducible, are not wholly quantitative. Higher 27 quenching solution temperatures (-30°C) can be used without significant leakage of intracellular metabolites when 28 lower fermentation temperatures (20°C) are employed. However, extended residence time in quenching solution, in 29 combination with vigorous washing of quenched cell pellets, leads to extensive leakage of intracellular metabolites. 30 Finally, there is minimal difference in metabolite amounts obtained when metabolite extractions are performed at 31 4°C compared to extractions at -20°C. The evaluated extraction method delivers material suitable for metabolomic 32 and proteomic analyses from the same sample preparation.

33 Keywords:

34 Extraction, metabolome, sample preparation, proteomics, lipidomics

36 **1. Introduction**

37 The integration of reductionist techniques in the practice of systems biology (Kohl et al. 2010), into what has been 38 described as ensemble descriptions of the cell (Nurse and Hayles 2011) has increased the diversity of analytical 39 platforms used to obtain 'omics datasets and has, in general, increased the number and type of extraction methodologies applied in any given experiment (for example see Oliver et al. 1998; Trauger et al. 2008; Weeks et al. 40 41 2006). Such an array of sample preparation methods not only increases experimental complexity but also the 42 required amount of sample, which can be limited depending on the system under observation and experimental scale 43 (Börner et al. 2007). Integration of 'omics extraction methods, if possible, would have several advantages including 44 reduced sample volume requirements facilitating high-resolution temporal sampling regimes for multiple platform 45 analysis and simultaneous stabilization of transcriptome, proteome and metabolome. With metabolomic analyses 46 being the most sensitive to variations in extraction conditions any attempt at integration might reasonably begin with 47 metabolite extraction as a starting point.

48 Yeast metabolite extraction methods have been the subject of intense scrutiny and ongoing review since their initial 49 development (Canelas et al. 2009; Canelas et al. 2008a; de Koning and van Dam 1992; Villas-Bôas et al. 2005; 50 Villas-Bôas and Bruheim 2007; Wittmann et al. 2004; Hans et al. 2001). Metabolite extraction is fraught with the 51 difficulty that poorly applied preparation methods can generate greater variation than originally exists within the 52 biological sample itself. Only two methods, assessed by Canelas et al.(2009), have survived the rigor of the last 53 decade to emerge as near complete, such that comprehensive metabolite extraction can be achieved with a degree of 54 confidence (at least in yeast): boiling ethanol method (Gonzalez et al. 1997) and chloroform/methanol method (de 55 Koning and van Dam 1992).

There are several advantages to the boiling ethanol method. It is rapid, requires minimal sample handling and it can be conducted in a small volume. Small volume of extracts can be rapidly concentrated by vacuum centrifugation. In contrast, chloroform/methanol extractions are more labor intensive and the relatively larger volume of metabolitecontaining phases take longer to concentrate. However, the chloroform/methanol method has the promising feature that the extract is segregated into multiple fractions; a polar fraction (methanol/water), a non-polar fraction (chloroform) and a solvent insoluble fraction. Unlike the polar fraction, containing well characterized intracellular 62 metabolites, the contents of the other fractions are only implied in earlier work evaluating yeast metabolite

63 extraction; ie. lipids in the non-polar fraction and proteins in the solvent insoluble fraction.

64 Similarities between the de Koning and van Dam (1992) metabolite extraction and the Folch (1957) method of lipid 65 extraction from fish have previously been noted (Villas-Bôas et al. 2005; Canelas et al. 2008a). The basic Folch 66 method is generally robust and gives good recovery of all major lipid classes (Iverson et al. 2001). Given the 67 similarities of the two methods, it is expected that the chloroform fraction of a de Koning and van Dam (1992) 68 metabolite extraction will contain lipids, albeit extracted with varying degrees of efficiency. However, the methods 69 have significant differences including extraction temperature, time of extraction, and the use of glass or zirconia 70 beads to reliably extract lipids from yeast (Daum et al. 1999; Ejsing et al. 2009). 71 Recent work suggests that quantitative recovery of lipid species may be possible without the use of beads to first 72 create a cell extract (Guan et al. 2010). In addition to lipids, the complete absence of fatty acids in the polar extracts 73 of Villas-Bôas et al. (2005) suggests that the chloroform fraction may also extract this metabolite class. The 74 extraction of lipids by a chloroform/methanol/water system is generally preferable to the use of ethanol, the 75 alternative metabolite extraction method, due to the propensity of ethanol to oxidize to acetaldehyde, resulting in the

formation of aldehyde adducts with amine containing lipids (Radin 1989).

The solvent insoluble material, following removal of liquid phases from a biphasic extraction, contains protein and polysaccharides. The protein component has been used as a crude means of evaluating initial biomass (de Koning and van Dam 1992; Villas-Bôas and Bruheim 2007). In these reports the quality of the protein component was not evaluated.

Traditionally, yeast protein extraction for use in proteomic work is achieved using a washing, lysis and precipitation regime. Washing removes components that have carried over from the growth medium, desalts the sample and, when performed with trichloroacetic acid, can assist with proteome stabilization (Horvath and Riezman 1994; Grassl et al. 2009; Wright et al. 1989). Protein extraction is commonly achieved using glass beads (Futcher et al. 1999; Wright et al. 1989; Conzelmann et al. 1988) or French press (Lee et al. 2011) followed by precipitation with acetone to further remove salts and prepare the sample for solublization in electrophoresis buffer (Picotti et al. 2009; Kümmel et al. 2010). Proteome stabilization and salt removal are key functions of all protein sample preparationmethods.

89 Metabolite extractions also meet the requirements of protein extractions. Metabolite extractions are routinely 90 performed under extremely low temperature conditions in order to stabilize the metabolome. Quenching has already 91 been shown to stabilize the transcriptome (Pieterse et al. 2006; Martins et al. 2007) and is expected to do the same 92 for the proteome. When biphasic extractions are employed, low temperatures are combined with the use of a 93 denaturing solvent further enhancing proteome stability. In addition, a biphasic system can also quantitatively 94 remove residual salt and other growth medium components which can interfere with downstream proteomic 95 analyses (Wessel and Flügge 1984). Therefore, it is likely that the solvent insoluble material remaining after a 96 metabolite extraction would contain protein suitable for more than biomass estimation. The converse; the use of 97 protein extractions for the recovery of metabolites, is not so well matched. The use of acid as a stabilizing agent for 98 proteins can lead to metabolite loss (Villas-Bôas et al. 2005) and protein extraction reagents are not, in general, 99 compatible with direct use in mass spectrometry. Taken together these factors suggest a protocol in which 100 metabolite extraction should be followed by protein extraction and not the other way around.

101 The rigorous evaluation of metabolite extraction methods to date has made clear the necessity of extraction method 102 validation for each system to which it is applied. Therefore, this work explores how specific variations to the 103 standard chloroform/methanol metabolite-extraction method for yeast, applied to a batch-fermentation, contribute to 104 metabolite loss during the process of extraction. Specifically, the impact of quenching solution temperature, 105 washing regime and extraction temperature were evaluated. In addition, we explored whether recovery of source 106 material for proteomic and lipidomic work is possible from solvent insoluble and non-polar fractions respectively. 107 Finally we propose an extraction method that delivers material suitable for both metabolomic and proteomic 108 analyses from the same sample preparation.

109 **2. Methods**

110 **2.1. Culture conditions**

Saccharomyces cerevisiae strain AWRI1631 was obtained from the Australian Wine Research Institute
 Microorganism culture collection (WDCM22). Cultures were maintained on 1% w/v yeast extract, 2% w/v bacto

113 peptone and 2% w/v glycerol (YPG) agar plates at 28°C. A progressive culturing regime, described below, from 114 YPD to 50% defined medium to 100% defined medium was used to generate biomass for the inoculation of 115 experimental cultures. This conditions the yeast to the defined medium environment and eliminates carry-over of 116 complex medium. Overnight starter cultures were grown in 1% w/v yeast extract, 2% w/v bacto peptone and 2% 117 w/v D-glucose (YPD) liquid broth on a rotating wheel at 28°C. YPD overnight cultures were used to inoculate 1:1 118 v/v defined medium:water, which were grown overnight in cotton-plugged Erlenmeyer flasks at 20°C. Bioreactor 119 vessels (New Brunswick Scientific, New Jersey, USA.) were inoculated from 1:1 v/v defined medium:water 120 overnight cultures to an optical density of 0.1 at 600 nm. Each bioreactor vessel contained 900 mL of defined 121 medium that had been sparged with N_2 gas until no further reduction in DO_2 was observed. Defined medium composition was as follows; D-glucose (20 gL⁻¹), K₂HPO₄ (1.1 gL⁻¹), MgSO₄.7H₂O (0.5 gL⁻¹), 122 CaCl₂.2H₂O (0.18 gL⁻¹), NH₄Cl (0.573 gL⁻¹), trace minerals and vitamins as given in Schmidt et al.(2011) and made 123 to a pH of 3.5 with potassium hydroxide. This minimal medium composition minimized the risk of interference by 124 125 medium components during metabolite analysis of quenching solution and was used for all experiments except when 126 the efficacy of washing steps was evaluated. For the evaluation of washing efficiency the growth medium was identical to that described above except that 100 gL^{-1} of both glucose and fructose was used. Fermentations were 127 continued until residual sugar was no longer detectable (less than 0.1 gL⁻¹). Glucose and fructose concentrations in 128 129 fermentations and metabolite extracts were determined enzymatically (Randox Laboratories Ltd., Crumlin, UK) 130 with modifications as described by Vermeir et al.(2007). Calibration curves relating glucose and fructose concentration to absorbance were fitted by least squares regression. The majority of work reported here used 131 stationary phase cultures, sampled at a biomass concentration of 2.24 gL⁻¹ dry cell weight (DCW), determined as 132 133 described in (Liccioli et al. 2011). When efficacy of washing was being evaluated cultures were sampled during late-log phase growth from high sugar defined medium at a biomass concentration of 2.8 gL⁻¹ (DCW). 134

135

2.2. Sampling of culture, quenching of metabolites and washing of biomass

A diagrammatic representation of the experimental workflow is shown in Figure 1. A 10 mL sample containing
0.0224 g dry cell weight was transferred from the fermenter vessel using an autosampler (Medicel, Helsinki,
Finland) to 40 mL of 60% v/v methanol in water (quenching solution) which had been pre-cooled, to either -30°C

139 (Q-30) or -40°C (Q-40) in a Lauda ecoline RE120 (Lauda, Königshofen, Germany) with 60% v/v ethylene glycol as 140 cryo fluid and the addition of dry ice when required. The mean residence time of cell culture in sample tubing 141 during sampling was less than 4 seconds. Different internal standard concentrations were used for quenching, 142 washing and intracellular metabolite solutions such that their final concentrations were equivalent after sample 143 drying and resuspension for analysis (see below). For the purpose of evaluating metabolite leakage during 144 quenching, the quenching solution contained the following internal standards; adipic acid $(0.04 \,\mu\text{M})$, norvaline $(0.5 \,\mu\text{M})$ 145 μ M) and sarcosine (0.5 μ M). Yeast were collected immediately after quenching (Q-30 and Q-40) or after 20 min in 146 quenching solution (Q-30T20) by centrifugation for 5 min at $1780 \times g$ in a Hettich Universal 32R benchtop 147 centrifuge (Tüttlingen, Germany) that had been pre-cooled to -20°C. Quenching solution was decanted into fresh 148 pre-weighed tubes and dried under nitrogen at 30°C to facilitate methanol removal prior to using a centrifugal 149 vacuum concentrator. The dried quenching solutions taken up in water (Q-40, Q-30 and Q-30T20) were used to 150 evaluate leakage of intracellular metabolites.

151 Cell pellets were washed with -40°C 60% v/v methanol containing the following internal standards: adipic acid 152 (0.4 μ M), norvaline (5.0 μ M) and sarcosine (5.0 μ M). Two wash protocols were evaluated. Pellets were either 153 vortexed in 5 mL of -40°C wash solution and centrifuged as above (Vo) or rinsed by running 5 mL of wash solution 154 around the rim of the tube with removal by decanting into fresh tubes (Ri). The rinsing procedure was performed 155 twice on each sample. Washing solutions were dried using a centrifugal vacuum concentrator and taken up in water 156 immediately prior to analysis. Washed cell pellets were extracted immediately (see below). Cell free medium 157 samples (CF) were obtained by direct filtration as described by Mashego et al.(2003).

158 **2.3. Extraction of metabolites**

Extraction of intracellular metabolites from washed cells was performed using an adaptation of the methods
described by de Koning and van Dam (1992). Yeast cell pellets isolated as described above were resuspended by
vortexing for 30 s in 5 mL chloroform containing lysophosphatidylcholine (LPC, 0.2 μM) and cholesterol esters
(CE, 0.2 μM) as internal standards for the non-polar fraction. Methanol (2.5 mL) was added to the chloroform
suspended cells, mixed again by vortexing and the chloroform/methanol suspension transferred to a fresh, preweighed, 10 mL polypropylene centrifuge tube. Pre-cooled water (4°C), containing 20 μM ribitol, 20 μM sarcosine,
1.5 μM adipic acid and 20 μM nor-valine as internal standards, was added to the chloroform/methanol suspension

166 and mixed by shaking at 200 r.p.m. for 45 min at either -20°C or 4°C on a Ratek RM2 reciprocating mixer (Boronia, 167 Victoria, Australia). The water/methanol and chloroform phases were separated by centrifugation for 5 min at 1,780 \times g and -20°C. The upper water-methanol phase was removed (intracellular polar metabolite fraction – PM) leaving 168 169 the non-polar lower phase (intracellular non-polar metabolite fraction - NpM) and protein containing interface. The 170 chloroform lower phase was back extracted by the addition of a further 2 mL methanol and 2 mL water followed by 171 vortexing for 30 s to create an emulsion and centrifuged as described above. The upper methanol/water phase was 172 again removed and combined with the upper phase from the first centrifugation (PM). Methanol (5 mL) was added 173 to the chloroform lower phase, samples were mixed by vortexing for 30 s and solvent insoluble material was 174 precipitated by centrifugation at $1,780 \times g$ for 5 min at -20°C. The supernatant was removed to a fresh pre-weighed 175 tube (intracellular non-polar metabolite fraction - NpM). The pellet was washed with 5 mL methanol and again 176 pelleted by centrifugation as described above. The methanol wash was discarded and the pellet was dried under a stream of N₂ gas until just dry. Tubes were sealed and pellets were stored at -80°C (solvent insoluble fraction - SIF). 177 178 Intracellular polar (PM) and non-polar (NpM) metabolite fractions were dried using a centrifugal vacuum 179 concentrator (Labconco, Kansas city, USA.) as recommended by Villas-Bôas et al.(2005). Dried PM and NpM 180 fractions were taken up in water and butanol:methanol (50:50) respectively prior to analysis. 181

A monophasic lipid extraction method as described previously (Bligh and Dyer 1959) was used for comparison.
Briefly, 2 mL of chloroform were added to quenched and washed cells and vortexed to resuspend the pellet. Then 4
mL of methanol and 2 mL of water were added and the cells were extracted by shaking at shaking at 200 r.p.m. for
45 min on a Ratek RM2 reciprocating mixer at either 4°C (ME4) or 20°C (ME20).

185 **2.4. Protein solublization from yeast pellets and solvent extracted material**

Proteins were extracted from solvent insoluble fractions (SIF) as follows; 1 mL of 2D buffer (7 M urea, 2 M thiourea, 20 mM tris and 4% w/v 3-[(3-Cholamidopropyl)dimethylammonio]-1-propanesulfonate (CHAPS)) was added to SIF fractions, probe sonicated for 2 × 10 s on ice using a probe sonicator (Branson sonifier 450, John Morris Scientific, Chatswood, Australia) and then water bath sonication (Transsonic 700/H, Elma GMBH, Singen, Germany) for 15 min. The supernatant (SIFE1) was collected by centrifuging at 20,000 × g for 10 min and pelleted material was re-extraction as above (SIFE2). Both SIFE1 and SIFE2 were pooled, desalted and concentrated by using 3 kDa cut off concentrators (Sartorius AG, Goettingen, Germany). Proteins were also extracted directly from

193 washed yeast cell pellets using the method of Herbert et al.(2006) to create a reference protein extract (Ref Ex).

194 Following protein extraction, supernatants were precipitated by addition of 9 volumes of acetone, incubation at -20C

195 for 1h and centrifugation at 4,000 × g for 15 min. Pellets were solubilized with 7M urea, 2M thiourea, 4% CHAPS

and 20mM Tris. For 2-D gel electrophoresis, conductivity was kept at, or below 300 μ Scm⁻¹, measured using

197 TwinCond conductivity meter B-173 (Horiba, Kyoto, Japan). Protein concentrations were determined with a

198 Bradford protein assay kit (Sigma, St Louis, USA) using BSA as a standard.

199

2.5. Separation of protein fraction by 2-D electrophoresis

200 Prior to protein separation by 2-D electrophoresis, extracted proteins were reduced with 5 mM Tributyl phosphine 201 (TBP) and alkylated with 15 mM acrylamide for 90 min at room temperature. Following reduction and alkylation, 202 100 µg of protein were loaded on a 17 cm pH 5-8 linear IPG strip (Bio-Rad, Regents Park, Australia). First 203 dimension isoelectric focusing was performed on an Ettan IPGphor II (GE Health Care, Uppsala, Sweden) for ~ 20 204 h at 20°C using the following program: 300 V for 4 h, linear increase from 300 V to 8000 V over 8 h and hold at 205 8000 V until approximately 100 kVh had been accumulated. The focused IPG strip was equilibrated for 206 approximately 2 x 15 min in equilibration buffer (6 M urea, 2% v/v SDS, 20% w/v glycerol, 0.375 M tris-HCl 207 buffer). Equilibrated IPG strips were overlaid onto 8 -18 % w/v SDS-polyacrylamide gradient gel (180 mm x 208 190 mm) and sealed with 0.5% w/v agarose solution containing 0.1% w/v bromophenol blue (Bio-Rad, Regents 209 Park, Australia). The SDS-polyacrylamide gradient gels were cast in our laboratory using ProteanII xi Multi-Gel 210 Casting Chamber (Bio-Rad, Regents Park, Australia) according to manufacture's instructions. Molecular weight 211 standards (Bio-Rad, Regents Park, Australia) were loaded at the edge of the cast gradient gel. IEF separated proteins 212 were then resolved in the second dimension at 5 mA/gel overnight followed by 40 mA/gel with a constant 213 temperature of 4°C until the bromophenol blue dye front had just run off the bottom of the gel. The gel was fixed in 10% v/v methanol and 7% v/v acetic acid for 4 h and stained with SYPRO[®] Ruby staining solution at room 214 215 temperature overnight. The gel was then destained twice with 10% methanol and 7% acetic acid for 4 h and $1 \times$ with 1% v/v acetic acid. Stained gels were imaged at 100 µm resolution using a Typhoon Trio 9400 variable mode 216 217 laser scanner (GE Life Sciences, Rydalmere, Australia) with 457 nm excitation and 610 nm BP 30 emission filter.

218 **2.6. Protein identification**

219

220 camera and 1 mm diameter cutting head (Bio-Rad, Regents Park, Australia). The gel plugs were washed 3 times 221 with 25 mM ammonium bicarbonate in 50% v/v acetonitrile (ACN) for 15 minutes at 37°C with gentle agitation, 222 dehydrated with 100% ACN for 10 min at room temperature and incubated at 37°C until the gel plugs were 223 completely dry. Dry gel plugs were rehydrated with trypsin solution (5 ng/µL, Sigma, St Louis, USA) for 1 h at 4°C. 224 The excess trypsin solution was removed and 25 mM ammonium bicarbonate was added to cover the gel plugs 225 which were incubated overnight at 37°C for digestion. Tryptic digestion was quenched by adding 0.1% 226 trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) and peptides were extracted from gel plugs by water bath sonication (Transsonic 700/H, 227 Elma GMBH, Singen, Germany). The peptides were desalted and concentrated using Perfect Pure C18 zip-tip 228 (Eppendorf, North Ryde, Australia) and were spotted onto a Matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization (MALDI) sample plate with 1 μ L of matrix (α -cyano-4-hydroxycinnamic acid, 4 mgmL⁻¹ in 90% v/v ACN, 0.1% v/v TFA) and 229 230 allowed to air dry. 231 MALDI mass spectrometry was performed with an Applied Biosystems 4800 Plus MALDI TOF/TOF™ Analyser 232 (Carlsbad, USA). A neodymium-doped yttrium aluminium garnet laser (355 nm) was used to irradiate the sample. 233 Spectra were acquired in reflectron mode in the mass range 700 to 3500 Da and were externally calibrated using 234 known peptide standards (bradykinin, neurotensin, angiotensin and adrenocorticotropic hormone). The eight 235 strongest peptides from the MS scan were isolated and fragmented in tandem time of flight mode (by collision-236 induced dissociation using filtered laboratory air), then re-accelerated to measure their masses and intensities. A near 237 point calibration was applied to give a typical mass accuracy better than 50 ppm. The peptide peak list was used to 238 interrogate the Mascot database (Matrix Science Ltd, London, UK). All samples were searched against 239 Saccharomyces cerevisiae (baker's yeast) in SwissProt with the following search parameters; type of search: PMF 240 and MSMS, enzyme: trypsin, variable modifications: methyl (DE), oxidation (M), propionamide (C), mass values: 241 monoisotopic, protein mass: unrestricted, peptide mass tolerance: \pm 50 ppm, fragment mass tolerance: \pm 0.8 Da,

Protein spots on 2-D gel were excised using an ExQuest Robotic fluorescent spot cutter equipped with a CCD

- 242 peptide charge state: 1+, max missed cleavages: 1). High MOWSE scores in the database search indicated a likely
- 243 match, confirmed by manual inspection. Percentage sequence coverage, the difference between calculated and

observed peptide masses, the number of missed cleavages was taken into account for positive identification in
addition to how well the MW and pI of the identified protein matched other experimental data such as 2-DE.

246

2.7. Quantification of intracellular and extracellular metabolites

247 γ-Aminobutyric acid and 20 proteinogenic amino acids in the cell extract as well as the quenching solution, washing

solutions and the culture broth were quantified using high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC). The

249 protocol employed precolumn o-phtalaldehyde derivatization followed by fluorescence detection and is described

elsewhere (Dietmair et al. 2010). Norvaline and sarcosine were used as internal standards for primary and secondary

amines, respectively. The concentration of internal standard in all samples was 250 µM. This was achieved by

appropriate concentration / dilution steps.

253 Analyses of 32 intracellular metabolites (18 glycolysis and TCA intermediaries, 11 nucleotides phosphate and 3 254 nicotinamide adenine dinucleotides) were conducted on a Dionex UltiMate 3000 liquid chromatography system 255 (Thermo Fischer, Scoresby, Australia) coupled to an ABSciex 4000 QTRAP mass spectrometer (Waverly, 256 Australia). Chromatographic separation was achieved on a Gemini-NX C18 150×2 mm I.D., 3 µm, 110 Å particle column (Phenomenex, Aschaffenburg, Germany) operated at 55°C. Mobile phase adapted from Luo et al.(2007) 257 was 7.5 mM tributylamine aqueous solution adjusted to pH 4.95 with glacial acetic acid (eluent A) and acetonitrile 258 259 (eluent B). The linear HPLC gradient profile was 0% B for 8 min, 0-20% B for 12 min, 20-27% B for 10 min, 27-260 100% B for 1 min, followed by a column wash at 100% B for 3 min and re-equilibration back to initial conditions for 16 min, all at 0.3 mLmin⁻¹. Injection volumes of 10 µL were used. Mobile phase was directly introduced into 261 262 the mass spectrometer.

The mass spectrometer was equipped with a TurboV electrospray source operated in negative ion mode. Infusions of analyte standards dissolved in purified water were used for tuning compound dependent MS parameters. Declustering potential (DP), collision energy (CE) and collision cell exit potential (CXP) of each transition were optimized and are shown in Online Resource 1. Entrance potential (EP) was fixed to -10 V for all transitions. To tune source dependent parameters an analyte standard mix was infused along with mobile phase (7.5 mM tributylamine : acetonitrile 50:50 (v/v), 100 µL/min) connected by a T-port. A combination of parameters was chosen based on highest abundance for the majority of analytes. These optimized parameters were ionspray voltage

270 -4500 V, nebulizer (GS1), auxiliary (GS2), curtain (CUR) and collision (CAD) gases were 60, 60, 20 and medium 271 (arbitrary units), respectively, being generated from pressurized air in a N300DR nitrogen generator (Peak 272 Scientific, Massachusetts, USA). The auxiliary gas temperature was maintained at 350°C. To obtain adequate selectivity and sensitivity, the mass spectrometer was set to unit resolution and scheduled Multiple Reaction 273 274 Monitoring mode after determining the retention time of each analyte under the chromatographic conditions 275 described above. The acquisitions were made with a Target Scan Time setting of 1 s. Peaks varied in width with the 276 narrowest peak being 0.3 minutes at the baseline. During acquisition, the number of points acquired across this 277 particular peak was 18. For peaks with a greater peak width, the number of points defining the peak would increase.

278 Calibration curves were constructed by plotting peak area of the analyte against the concentration of the compound 279 from reference standards. The relative concentration of each metabolite in the cell extract sample was determined

by back-calculating the metabolite peak area against the calibration curve.

281

280

282

2.8. Quantification of cellular lipids

283 Dried chloroform or monophasic cellular extracts were resuspended in butanol/methanol (1:1, v/v) containing 5 μ M 284 ammonium formate. Cellular lipids were separated by injecting 5 μ L aliquots onto a 50 mm \times 2.1 mm \times 2.7 μ m Ascentis Express RP Amide column (Supelco, Sigma, St Louis, USA) at 35 °C using an Agilent LC 1200 285 286 (Mulgrave, Australia). Lipids were eluted at 0.2 mLmin⁻¹ over a 5 min gradient of water/methanol/tetrahydrofuran 287 (50:20:30, v/v/v) to water/methanol/tetrahydrofuran (5:20:75, v/v/v), with the final buffer held for 3 min. Lipids 288 were analysed by electrospray ionisation-mass spectrometry (ESI-MS) using an Agilent Triple Quad 6460 (Mulgrave, Australia). Lipid species from each lipid class were identified using precursor ion scanning from 100 -289 290 1000 m/z , in positive ion mode, phosphatidylcholines (PC, precursors of m/z 184.1), sphingomyelins (SM, m/z291 184.1), ceramides (CER, m/z 264.6), cholesterol esters (CE, m/z 369.4), phosphatidylglycerols (PG, m/z 189) and in 292 negative ion mode phosphatidylinositols (PI, m/z 241). Neutral loss scanning was used to identify 293 phosphatidylethanolamines (PE, in positive ion mode, neutral loss of m/z 141) and phosphatidylserines (PS, negative 294 ion mode, m/z 87). Identified lipid species were quantified using multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) with a 50 ms 295 dwell time for the simultaneous measurements of ~20 to 50 compounds and the chromatographic peak width of 30 296 sec to 45 sec, a minimum data points collected across the peak was 12 to 16. Optimised parameters for capillary,

297 fragmentor, and collision voltages were 4000 V, 140 - 380, and 15-60 V, respectively. In all cases, the collision gas was nitrogen at 7 Lmin⁻¹. ESI-MS data was processed using Agilent Mass Hunter (Mulgrave, Australia). Lipid 298 299 standards (Avanti Polar Lipids, Alabaster, USA) were prepared by combining equal volumes of individual lipid 300 stock solutions. The standard solution was then diluted to provide a set of calibration solutions ranging in 301 concentration from 0.1 to 10 µM. Calibration curves were constructed by least squares linear regression, fitting 302 reverse phase peak area of the analyte against the concentration of the lipid in the reference standards. The 303 concentration of each lipid species in the cell extract sample was estimated by normalizing the lipid peak area 304 against the internal standard (LPC) and then using the regression model to convert normalized peak area to lipid 305 concentration. Detected lipid species, 55 in total from 8 lipid classes, were annotated as follows; lipid class (sum of 306 carbon atoms in the two fatty acid chains:sum of double bonds in the fatty acid chains).

307 **2.9. Statistical Methods**

308 All samples were taken from the same bioreactor vessel (no biological replication). Each treatment or extraction 309 condition (ie. quenching at -30°C or -40°C) was performed in triplicate (3 technical replicates for each treatment). A 310 2-tailed pairwise t-test at p < 0.05 was used to make comparisons of amounts obtained between two treatments. 311 Comparison of more than two treatments was made using ANOVA (p < 0.05). Dunnet's multiple comparison post 312 test was applied when multiple comparisons were made to a control sample. All results are expressed as means \pm standard deviation. Statistical analyses were performed using Graphpad PRISM (GraphPad Software Inc. LaJolla, 313 314 CA, USA). The degree of difference between treatments was explored by calculating the percent difference (% diff 315 = $([m_1 - m_2]/[(m_1 + m_2)/2)]) \times 100)$ where m = mean metabolite concentration.

316 **3. Results and Discussion**

317 3.1. Effect of quenching solution temperature on metabolite leakage

318 Evaluations of quenching solution temperature by a number of laboratories have indicated that sub -40°C

temperatures are necessary in order to limit wholesale leakage of intracellular metabolites during sample

320 preparation. This temperature requirement is based, in part, on the maximal permissible temperature of the

321 quenching solution following addition of a warm sample, such that leakage of intracellular metabolites is minimized.

322 In two comprehensive evaluations of quenching conditions (Canelas et al. 2008a; Villas-Bôas et al. 2005) the

- 323 cultures being evaluated were grown at 30°C which, once added to quenching solution, resulted in temperatures at
- around -10°C. We routinely perform fermentations at 20°C. Therefore we tested whether lower sample

325 temperatures permitted the use of higher quenching solution temperatures.

326 Quenching solution temperature following addition of 20°C sample did not exceed -17°C irrespective of whether the 327 quenching solution was -30°C or -40°C. Nanomole recoveries of amino acids from the sub -40°C quenched sample 328 (Q-40) were compared with all other treatments and amino acids recovered from cell free media (CF). The higher 329 quenching solution temperature (Q-30) did not result in significantly increased leakage of amino acids into the 330 quenching solution (Table 1). The low level of leakage observed agreed with some reports (Gonzalez et al. 1997; Bolten and Wittmann 2008) but differed to some degree with others (Canelas et al. 2008a; Tredwell et al. 2011). 331 332 The losses of glutamate (>50%) reported by Canelas et al.(2008a) or the losses of alanine, tyrosine and isoleucine 333 reported by Tredwell et al. (2011) in otherwise identical conditions were not observed in this study. Extensive 334 leakage of amino acids occurred during 20 min incubation at -30°C (Q-30T20), demonstrating the importance of 335 sample processing soon after quenching.

336 3.2. Choice of yeast cell washing regime can increase metabolite leakage

337 Washing of biomass is a critical and at times overlooked component of metabolite preparation. It is especially 338 important when analysis of batch cultures or cultures growing in complex media is being undertaken, not only 339 because leakage into the washing solution can contribute to variations in metabolite estimation but because medium carryover can interfere with post extraction analytical methods. Two cell pellet washing procedures are described 340 341 in reports in which the washing step is explicitly given: vortexing of the pellet in cold methanol followed by 342 centrifugation (Castrillo et al. 2003) or methanol addition to the pellet and decanting (Canelas et al. 2008a). Canelas 343 et al.(2008a) reported that a small but significant proportion of metabolites could be recovered from the washing 344 solution.

345 The above two washing regimes (vortexing and rinsing) were evaluated following quenching at -30°C. A

346 significant increase in amino acid leakage into wash solution was observed when cells were washed by vortexing

- rather than rinsing (Table 2). The efficiency of washing, i.e. how well each washing regime removed medium
- components, was also evaluated. This was achieved through a separate extraction of early exponential phase cells

growing in defined medium containing 165 gL⁻¹ of glucose and fructose at the time of sampling. Measures of culture medium removal efficiency by each washing regime were based on the recovery of glucose and fructose in the polar phase of a biphasic extraction. Intracellular metabolite extracts from cells that had been washed by vortexing had 2.5 fold less sugar than when cells were washed by rinsing (Table 2). Despite the higher sugar concentrations in metabolite extracts of 'rinsed' cells, rinsing still achieved an 850-fold reduction in medium component concentrations, which ultimately did not interfere with mass spectral analysis of intracellular metabolites.

356

3.3. Metabolite extraction temperature does not effect estimation of intracellular

357

metabolite concentrations

Biphasic extraction of metabolites from yeast usually involves extended shaking at -20°C (de Koning and van Dam 1992) or more recently at -40°C (Canelas et al. 2009). Such cryo-extractions require specialized equipment or extensive modification of existing facilities. Extractions at 4°C have been reported (Fairchild et al. 2010; t'Kindt et al. 2009) but the effect of this extraction temperature on metabolite recoveries were not compared to lower temperature extractions. We assessed if the use of higher extraction temperature compromised the recovery of intracellular metabolites from yeast.

364 The effect of temperature on the extraction of 53 intracellular metabolites was evaluated; nanomole amounts 365 obtained from extractions performed at either 4°C or -20°C of quenched and washed yeast cell pellets are reported in Table 3. For the majority of metabolites the amounts obtained were indistinguishable, irrespective of extraction 366 temperature. Of the 8 metabolites that were significantly different, we observed increased amounts of ATP, GTP, 367 CTP, UTP, GDP, malate and E4P but decreased amounts of NADH and FBP when extractions were performed at 368 369 4°C. Percent differences were greater than 15% for nine metabolites, most notably NADH (-51%) and GTP (42%). 370 NADH and FBP have previously been shown to be unstable during extraction (Klimacek et al. 2010). However, 371 instability does not explain the increased amounts obtained from 4°C extractions of all the nucleoside triphosphates, 372 which were also shown to be unstable in the same study. An alternative explanation for the decreased quantities of 373 NADH and FBP obtained during extraction at 4°C is that these differences reflect both measurement variation and 374 comparatively small intracellular concentrations. The large increase in GTP obtained by extraction at 4°C is

375 consistent with increased amounts of other nucleoside triphosphates and point towards either more favourable 376 conditions for the extraction of nucleoside triphosphates or metabolite conversion due to residual enzymatic activity. 377 Mean metabolite specific yields expressed as µmol/gDCW are given in the last column of Table 3 in order to 378 compare with the work of others. While direct comparison is difficult due to the differing experimental 379 circumstances (such as strain, growth medium composition, oxygen status, growth phase, etc.) the recoveries of 380 intracellular metabolites presented in Table 3 are, in general, consistent with the intracellular metabolite 381 concentrations in S. cerevisiae estimated using varying extraction methods (Canelas et al. 2008b; Canelas et al. 382 2009; Gonzalez et al. 1997).

383 3.4. Overall contributions of sample preparation method to metabolite loss

384 Figure 2 shows total amino acid amounts obtains from all stages of the metabolite processing pipeline. Less than 2% of the total recoverable molar amount of each amino acid was lost during quenching regardless of the quenching 385 386 temperature. After a 20 min incubation in quenching solution amino acid leakage into the quenching solution 387 increased from an average of 2% to between 10% and 20% for many of the amino acids in Table 1. The increase in 388 metabolite leakage with increasing residence time in quenching solution shows that time in quenching solution is of 389 significantly greater importance than quenching solution temperature, at least when lower culture temperatures are 390 used. Increased metabolite leakage was also reported in a study exploring differences in extraction of intracellular 391 metabolites following extended incubation in quenching solution at different temperatures (Villas-Bôas and 392 Bruheim 2007).

393 Leakage of amino acids during a vortex wash resulted in an additional average loss of 2% of the total. Leakage of 394 glycine (6.8%) and alanine (5.2%) into wash solution were higher than leakage of other amino acids and represented 395 significant fractions of the total amounts obtained of those amino acids. Four of the top five amino acids with the 396 greatest loss during washing correspond to amino acids with low molecular weights (less than 120 Da) indicating 397 that loss of small metabolites could be exacerbated by the use of a vortex washing regime. Losses incurred during 398 both quenching and washing were on average less than 1.5 % (max 3.9 %) when rapid quenching was combined 399 with washing by rinsing (Figure 2B). Therefore, if washing is required and if the residual concentration of medium 400 components can be accommodated in the analytical platform used for intracellular metabolite analysis, then it would be preferable to rinse cell pellets at least twice rather than using the more vigorous vortex and centrifugation
method. If extensive cell pellet washing were to be combined with an extended residence time in quenching
solution, extensive leakage of intracellular metabolites should be anticipated (Figure 2C).

404

3.5. Biphasic extraction yields protein suitable for proteomic analysis

405 Standard yeast protein extraction protocols for proteomic analysis generally utilize TCA or thermal pre-treatment in 406 order to stabilize proteins prior to storage and extraction (Grassl et al. 2009) or extract directly into lysis buffer 407 containing protease inhibitors and denaturants (Futcher et al. 1999). The quenching step of metabolite preparation 408 should effectively stabilize the proteome in preparation for extraction. The subsequent biphasic extraction removes 409 medium components that may interfere with subsequent electrophoretic analysis or proteolytic treatments as 410 discussed by Wessel and Flügge (1984). That protein for use in proteomic work can be derived using sequential 411 extraction methodologies has been shown for systems other than yeast (Weckwerth et al. 2004). We evaluated the 412 quality of protein in metabolite extracted insoluble material using our preferred extraction method (sample 413 quenching at -30°C, rinsing of the cell pellet and metabolite extraction at 4°C) by comparison with a reference 414 protein extraction method.

Figure 3 shows the equivalence of general protein profiles between (A) protein extracted using a reference protein extraction method (Herbert et al. 2006) and (B) protein from metabolite extracted yeast. One of the features of the metabolite extraction method described in this work is centrifugation at $1,575 \times g$ as opposed to centrifugation at $10,000 \times g$ that is commonly used to isolate protein. Comparison of the two gels in figure 3 shows no additional recovery of small molecular weight proteins or alteration in overall protein profile when a higher centrifugation speed is used. We did observe an increased overall amount of protein extracted per gram dry cell weight using the reference method (data not shown).

422 Subsequently, proteome stability was evaluated using 2-D PAGE (Figure 4) and MALDI-MS/MS. Resolution in 423 2D-PAGE stained with sypro ruby was comparable with previous reports (Grassl et al. 2009). One hundred and 424 ninety protein spots were excised and identified using MALDI MS/MS. We observed little evidence of large scale 425 degradation, with most proteins running in accordance with their predicted molecular weights (Online Resource 2). 426 Only 9 spots were identified as proteins whose predicted molecular weights were higher than was observed on the 427 gel. Spots 8 and 9 were identified as VMA1, a protein known to undergo post-translational intein-mediated splicing 428 to generate a 69 kDa subunit of the vacuolar adenosine triphosphatase (Kane et al. 1990), which concurs with the 429 observed molecular weight. Spot 164 was identified as CCP1, a mitochondrial protein that undergoes processing to 430 remove a mitochondrial import signal resulting in a 33 kDa mature protein (Maccecchini et al. 1979), also in 431 accordance with observation. Fragments of Eno1 (spot 181), Eno2 (spots 179, 180) and SSA2 (spots 168 and 169) 432 were detected at sizes that could not be explained by cellular protein processing events and were detected at very 433 low abundance, indicating limited degradation of those proteins (circled, Figure 3). However, we cannot rule out 434 that these fragments arise as a result of normal protein turnover rather than artifacts of sample isolation. This 435 protein survey demonstrates that solvent insoluble material remaining after a biphasic metabolite extraction of yeast 436 is capable of yielding intact protein of a quality suitable for proteomic work.

437 **3.6. Effectiveness of lipid extraction is dependent on extraction temperature**

It has been suggested that the lower chloroform fraction may be of use for the evaluation of lipid metabolism
(implied in Canelas et al. 2009; Smart et al. 2010). Although it has previously been shown that lipid recovery can be
highly variable when using the Folch method without prior cell disruption (Hanson and Lester 1980) we evaluated
lipid recoveries from biphasic metabolite extractions (BPE) of stationary phase yeast, at -20°C or 4°C compared
with monophasic Bligh and Dyer (1959) extractions (ME) at 4°C or 20°C.

443 There were no significant differences in amounts obtained from biphasic extractions performed at either -20°C 444 (BPE-20) or 4°C (BPE4) of either whole lipid classes (Online Resource 3) or individual lipid species (Online 445 Resource 4), with the exception of PC(26:0), PC(26:1) and PC(38:1). BPE4 resulted in slightly higher recovery of 446 these lipid species. Monophasic extraction at 4°C (ME4) gave significantly lower yields of total LPG, PC and PE 447 lipid classes but significantly higher yields of total PI and PS than BPE4. This pattern of recovery was true for all species within each class. When monophasic extractions were performed at 20°C, yields of total LPC, LPG, PC, PE 448 449 and PG lipid classes were no different than yields from BPE4 extractions. However, total yields of PI, PS and 450 ergosterol were significantly higher than for any other extraction condition including ME4. These lipid classes are 451 both apolar and polar and individually represent significant proportions of total cellular lipid. Much of the increase 452 in yield was recovered during a second extraction step that was performed as part of the ME protocol (data not

453 shown).

A broad range of lipids were recovered from the chloroform phase of a biphasic extraction, which is commonly used for the preparation of intracellular metabolites from yeast. However, yields of individual lipids can vary with extraction temperature and extraction method. Specifically, extraction at 20°C favoured recovery of serine, inositol and sterol-based lipids. Additional optimization will be required before quantitative extraction of lipids is achieved from an integrated metabolite extraction protocol. Re-extraction with the same solvent system is beneficial and, in combination with the use of increasingly hydrophobic solvents as outlined by Guan et al.(2010), may provide the necessary improvement in lipid recoveries.

461 **4. Concluding remarks**

462 Experimental samples are valuable and can represent a significant investment in time and resources. It is therefore 463 desirable to extract as much information as possible from a single experiment. Specifically, volume limitation either 464 due to culture miniaturization or multiple sequential sampling from batch systems, can lead to situations where 465 additional biomass for parallel 'omics extractions is not viable. For example, microtiter plate cultures provide 466 enough cell biomass for a single metabolite extraction but unfortunately there is not enough biological material left 467 for other analyses. Additionally, sequential sampling from individual batch cultures in order to derive temporal 468 'omic datasets can decrease dramatically residual volume and therefore affect growth kinetics and cell metabolism. 469 This is exaggerated at early time point samples, when biomass concentration is low and large sample volumes are 470 required. We have shown that additional value can be obtained from yeast metabolite extractions through the 471 recovery of material from fractions that are often discarded.

472 Solvent insoluble material recovered following a standard biphasic chloroform/methanol extraction of polar 473 metabolites contains protein of a quality that is suitable for proteomic analysis. Solubilization in an appropriate 474 buffer can deliver protein preparations for either electrophoretic or mass spectral proteomic work. The metabolite 475 extraction procedure has the additional advantage that the proteome is rapidly stabilized through cold and 476 chloroform denaturation and that interfering environmental contaminants are removed. As expected the chloroform 477 fraction obtained during this procedure contained lipids that could be quantitatively and reproducibly recovered. 478 However, overall lipid yields were significantly less compared with lipids extracted using a monophasic system at 479 higher temperature. It is possible that repeated extractions of insoluble material at low temperature may lead to 480 increased recoveries.

481 A comprehensive characterization of the yeast metabolite extraction method reported here, which was performed at 482 higher temperatures than usually recommended, revealed minimal metabolite leakage during quenching. It is likely that this was the result of the lower fermentation temperature. However, considerable metabolite leakage was 483 484 observed when quenched cells were vigorously washed, even when very cold quenching solution was used. 485 Therefore, washing of yeast cells is generally counter productive and should not be undertaken in situations when 486 the analytical platform can withstand the associated introduction of environmental material. Even when very high 487 concentrations of environmental components are present a simple rinse of tube walls is generally sufficient to reduce 488 contaminating components to levels compatible with mass spectral analyses.

489 Finally, very little difference was found in metabolite yields from extractions performed at either 4°C or -20°C.

490 Even in those instances when differences were statistically significant it is not entirely clear that the magnitude of

those differences were biologically meaningful. Based on our results metabolite extraction at 4°C is sufficient both

492 qualitatively and quantitatively when facilities for very low temperature extractions are not available.

493 Acknowledgements

494 This project was supported by Australia's grape growers and winemakers through their investment body the Grape

495 and Wine Research and Development Corporation, with matching funds from the Australian Government. The

496 AWRI is part of the Wine Innovation Cluster, Adelaide, South Australia. Systems Biology research at the AWRI is

497 performed using resources provided by Bioplatforms Australia as part of the National Collaborative Research

498 Infrastructure Strategy, an initiative of the Australian Government, in addition to funds from the South Australian

499 State Government. We would like to acknowledge Paul Chambers for his review of the manuscript and Wade Hines

and Nathan Watson-Haigh for their input during manuscript preparation.

501 **References**

 Bligh, E. G., & Dyer, W. J. (1959). A rapid method of total lipid extraction and purification. *Canadian* Journal of Biochemistry and Physiology, 37(8), 911-917.

Bolten, C. J., & Wittmann, C. (2008). Appropriate sampling for intracellular amino acid analysis in five
 phylogenetically different yeasts. *Biotechnology Letters*, 30(11), 1993-2000.

- Börner, J., Buchinger, S., & Schomburg, D. (2007). A high-throughput method for microbial metabolome
 analysis using gas chromatography/mass spectrometry. *Analytical Biochemistry*, 367(2), 143-151.
- Canelas, A. B., Ras, C., ten Pierick, A., van Dam, J. C., Heijnen, J. J., & Van Gulik, W. M. (2008a).
 Leakage-free rapid quenching technique for yeast metabolomics. *Metabolomics*, 4(3), 226-239.

- Canelas, A. B., ten Pierick, A., Ras, C., Seifar, R. M., van Dam, J. C., van Gulik, W. M., et al. (2009).
 Quantitative evaluation of intracellular metabolite extraction techniques for yeast metabolomics.
 Analytical Chemistry, 81(17), 7379-7389.
- Canelas, A. B., van Gulik, W. M., & Heijnen, J. J. (2008b). Determination of the cytosolic free
 NAD/NADH ratio in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* under steady-state and highly dynamic
 conditions. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, *100*(4), 734-743.
- Castrillo, J. I., Hayes, A., Mohammed, S., Gaskell, S. J., & Oliver, S. G. (2003). An optimized protocol
 for metabolome analysis in yeast using direct infusion electrospray mass spectrometry.
 Phytochemistry, 62(6), 929-937.
- Conzelmann, A., Riezman, H., Desponds, C., & Bron, C. (1988). A major 125 kD membrane
 glycoprotein of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is attached to the lipid bilayer through and inositol containing phospholipid. *EMBO Journal*, 7(7), 2233-2240.
- Daum, G., Tuller, G., Nemec, T., Hrastnik, C., Balliano, G., Cattel, L., et al. (1999). Systematic analysis
 of yeast strains with possible defects in lipid metabolism. *Yeast*, 15(7), 601-614.
- de Koning, W., & van Dam, K. (1992). A method for the determination of changes of glycolytic
 metabolites in yeast on a subsecond time scale using extraction at neutral pH. *Analytical Biochemistry*, 204(1), 118-123.
- Dietmair, S., Timmins, N. E., Gray, P. P., Nielsen, L. K., & Kroemer, J. O. (2010). Towards quantitative
 metabolomics of mammalian cells: Development of a metabolite extraction protocol. *Analytical Biochemistry*, 404(2), 155-164.
- Ejsing, C. S., Sampaio, J. L., Surendranath, V., Duchoslav, E., Ekroos, K., Klemm, R. W., et al. (2009).
 Global analysis of the yeast lipidome by quantitative shotgun mass spectrometry. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106(7), 2136-2141.
- Fairchild, J. N., Horvath, K., Gooding, J. R., Campagna, S. R., & Guiochon, G. (2010). Two-dimensional
 liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry/mass spectrometry separation of water-soluble
 metabolites. *Journal of Chromatography A*, *1217*(52), 8161-8166.
- Folch, J., Lees, M., & Sloane-Stanley, G. H. (1957). A simple method for the isolation and purification of
 total lipides from animal tissues. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 226(1), 497-509.
- Futcher, B., Latter, G. I., Monardo, P., McLaughlin, C. S., & Garrels, J. I. (1999). A sampling of the yeast
 proteome. *Molecular and Cellular Biology*, *19*(11), 7357-7368.
- Gonzalez, B., Francois, J., & Renaud, M. (1997). A rapid and reliable method for metabolite extraction in
 yeast using boiling buffered ethanol. *Yeast*, *13*(14), 1347-1355.
- Grassl, J., Westbrook, J. A., Robinson, A., Boren, M., Dunn, M. J., & Clyne, R. K. (2009). Preserving the
 yeast proteome from sample degradation. *Proteomics*, 9(20), 4616-4626.
- Guan, X. L., Riezman, I., Wenk, M. R., & Riezman, H. (2010). Yeast lipid analysis and quantification by
 mass spectrometry. *Methods in Enzymology*, 470, 369-391.
- Hans, M. A., Heinzle, E., & Wittmann, C. (2001). Quantification of intracellular amino acids in batch
 cultures of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, *56*(5-6), 776779.
- Hanson, B. A., & Lester, R. L. (1980). The extraction of inositol-containing phospholipids and
 phophatidylcholine from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Neurospora crassa*. *Journal of Lipid Research*, 21(3), 309-315.
- Herbert, B. R., Grinyer, J., McCarthy, J. T., Isaacs, M., Harry, E. J., Nevalainen, H., et al. (2006).
 Improved 2-DE of microorganisms after acidic extraction. *Electrophoresis*, 27(8), 1630-1640.
- Horvath, A., & Riezman, H. (1994). Rapid protein extraction from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Yeast, 10*(10), 1305-1310.
- Iverson, S. J., Lang, S. L. C., & Cooper, M. H. (2001). Comparison of the Bligh and Dyer and Folch
 methods for total lipid determination in a broad range of marine tissue. *Lipids*, *36*(11), 1283 1287.

- Kane, P. M., Yamashiro, C. T., Wolczyk, D. F., Neff, N., Goebl, M., & Stevens, T. H. (1990). Protein
 splicing converts the yeast TFP1 gene-product to the 69 kD subunit of the vacuolar H⁺-adenosine
 triphosphatase. *Science*, 250(4981), 651-657.
- Klimacek, M., Krahulec, S., Sauer, U., & Nidetzky, B. (2010). Limitations in xylose-fermenting
 Saccharomyces cerevisiae, made evident through comprehensive metabolite profiling and
 thermodynamic analysis. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 76(22), 7566-7574.
- Kohl, P., Crampin, E. J., Quinn, T. A., & Noble, D. (2010). Systems Biology: An Approach. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, 88(1), 25-33.
- Kümmel, A., Ewald, J. C., Fendt, S.-M., Jol, S. J., Picotti, P., Aebersold, R., et al. (2010). Differential
 glucose repression in common yeast strains in response to HXK2 deletion. *Fems Yeast Research*,
 10(3), 322-332.
- Lee, M. V., Topper, S. E., Hubler, S. L., Hose, J., Wenger, C. D., Coon, J. J., et al. (2011). A dynamic
 model of proteome changes reveals new roles for transcript alteration in yeast. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 7, 514.
- Liccioli, T., Tran, T. M. T., Cozzolino, D., Jiranek, V., Chambers, P. J., & Schmidt, S. A. (2011).
 Microvinification-how small can we go? *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 89(5), 1621 1628.
- Luo, B., Groenke, K., Takors, R., Wandrey, C., & Oldiges, M. (2007). Simultaneous determination of
 multiple intracellular metabolites in glycolysis, pentose phosphate pathway and tricarboxylic acid
 cycle by liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry. *Journal of Chromatography A*, *1147*(2), 153 164.
- Maccecchini, M. L., Rudin, Y., & Schatz, G. (1979). Transport of proteins across the mitochondrial outer membrane; A precursor form of the cytoplasmically made intermembrane enzyme cytochrome c
 peroxidase. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 254(16), 7468-7471.
- Martins, A. M., Sha, W., Evans, C., Martino-Catt, S., Mendes, P., & Shulaev, V. (2007). Comparison of
 sampling techniques for parallel analysis of transcript and metabolite levels in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Yeast, 24*(3), 181-188.
- Mashego, M. R., van Gulik, W. M., Vinke, J. L., & Heijnen, J. J. (2003). Critical evaluation of sampling
 techniques for residual glucose determination in carbon-limited chemostat culture of
 Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 83(4), 395-399.
- 589 Nurse, P., & Hayles, J. (2011). The cell in an era of systems biology. *Cell*, 144(6), 850-854.
- Oliver, S. G., Winson, M. K., Kell, D. B., & Baganz, F. (1998). Systematic functional analysis of the
 yeast genome. *Trends in Biotechnology*, *16*(9), 373-378.
- Picotti, P., Bodenmiller, B., Mueller, L. N., Domon, B., & Aebersold, R. (2009). Full dynamic range
 proteome analysis of *S. cerevisiae* by targeted proteomics. *Cell*, 138(4), 795-806.
- Pieterse, B., Jellema, R. H., & van der Werf, M. J. (2006). Quenching of microbial samples for increased
 reliability of microarray data. *Journal of Microbiological Methods*, 64(2), 207-216.
- Radin, N. S. (1989). Lipid Extraction. In A. A. Boulton, G. B. Baker, & L. A. Horrocks (Eds.), *Lipids and Related Compounds* (1 ed., Vol. 7, pp. 1-61, Neuromethods). Clifton, New Jersey: Humana Press.
- Schmidt, S. A., Dillon, S., Kolouchova, R., Henschke, P. A., & Chambers, P. J. (2011). Impacts of
 variations in elemental nutrient concentration of Chardonnay musts on *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*fermentation kinetics and wine composition. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, *91*(2),
 365-375.
- Smart, K. F., Aggio, R. B. M., Van Houtte, J. R., & Villas-Boas, S. G. (2010). Analytical platform for
 metabolome analysis of microbial cells using methyl chloroformate derivatization followed by
 gas chromatography-mass spectrometry. *Nature Protocols*, 5(10), 1709-1729.
- t'Kindt, R., Morreel, K., Deforce, D., Boerjan, W., & Van Bocxlaer, J. (2009). Joint GC-MS and LC-MS
 platforms for comprehensive plant metabolomics: Repeatability and sample pre-treatment.
 Journal of Chromatography B, 877(29), 3572-3580.

- Trauger, S. A., Kalisak, E., Kalisiak, J., Morita, H., Weinberg, M. V., Menon, A. L., et al. (2008).
 Correlating the transcriptome, proteome, and metabolome in the environmental adaptation of a hyperthermophile. *Journal of Proteome Research*, 7(3), 1027-1035.
- Tredwell, G. D., Edwards-Jones, B., Leak, D. J., & Bundy, J. G. (2011). The development of
 metabolomic sampling procedures for *Pichia pastoris*, and baseline metabolome data. *PLoS ONE*,
 6(1).
- Vermeir, S., Nicolai, B. M., Jans, K., Maes, G., & Lammertyn, J. (2007). High-throughput microplate
 enzymatic assays for fast sugar and acid quantification in apple and tomato. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 55(9), 3240-3248.
- Villas-Bôas, S. G., & Bruheim, P. (2007). Cold glycerol-saline: The promising quenching solution for
 accurate intracellular metabolite analysis of microbial cells. *Analytical Biochemistry*, *370*, 87-97.
- Villas-Bôas, S. G., Højer-Pedersen, J., Åkesson, M., Smedsgaard, J., & Nielsen, J. (2005). Global
 metabolite analysis of yeast: evaluation of sample preparation methods. *Yeast*, 22(14), 1155 1169.
- Weckwerth, W., Wenzel, K., & Fiehn, O. (2004). Process for the integrated extraction identification, and
 quantification of metabolites, proteins and RNA to reveal their co-regulation in biochemical
 networks. *Proteomics*, 4(1), 78-83.
- Weeks, M. E., Sinclair, J., Butt, A., Chung, Y.-L., Worthington, J. L., Wilkinson, C. R. M., et al. (2006).
 A parallel proteomic and metabolomic analysis of the hydrogen peroxide- and Sty1p-dependent
 stress response in *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*. *Proteomics*, 6(9), 2772-2796.
- Wessel, D., & Flügge, U. I. (1984). A method for the quantitative recovery of protein in dilute solution in
 the presence of detergents and lipids. *Analytical Biochemistry*, 138(1), 141-143.
- Wittmann, C., Krömer, J. O., Kiefer, P., Binz, T., & Heinzle, E. (2004). Impact of the cold shock
 phenomenon on quantification of intracellular metabolites in bacteria. *Analytical Biochemistry*,
 327(1), 135-139.
- Wright, A. P. H., Bruns, M., & Hartley, B. S. (1989). Extraction and rapid inactivation of proteins from
 Saccharomyces cerevisiae by trichloroacetic acid precipitation. *Yeast*, 5(1), 51-53.

635 Table 1 Effect of quenching temperature on loss of amino acids from S. cerevisiae

636 Nanomoles of amino acids obtained from 60% v/v methanol quenching solution at -40°C (Q-40) were compared to

637 amounts obtained from -30°C quenching solution (Q-30), following extended incubation (20min) in -30°C

638 quenching solution (Q-30T20) and filtered culture supernatant (CF). Comparisons were made by ANOVA (n=3 for

639 all samples).

	Q-40	Q-30		Q-30T20		Culture filtrate (CF)	
	$Mean \pm SD$	$Mean \pm SD$	P < 0.05	$Mean \pm SD$	P < 0.05	$Mean \pm SD$	P < 0.05
ASP	2.17 ± 0.06	2.47 ± 0.46	ns	11.60 ± 0.36	*	nd	*
GLU	4.63 ± 0.11	5.73 ± 1.94	ns	63.42 ± 3.84	*	1.72 ± 1.58	ns
ASN	2.65 ± 0.08	3.04 ± 0.70	ns	18.97 ± 0.76	*	1.45 ± 0.15	ns
SER	3.36 ± 0.23	4.11 ± 1.32	ns	31.26 ± 0.97	*	nd	*
GLN	5.57 ± 0.19	7.45 ± 3.38	ns	92.89 ± 3.74	*	2.46 ± 0.86	ns
HIS	1.16 ± 0.91	1.26 ± 0.83	ns	13.29 ± 0.78	*	nd	ns
GLY	10.37 ± 0.51	13.22 ± 5.38	ns	83.15 ± 2.16	*	2.62 ± 0.35	*
THR	2.00 ± 0.05	2.49 ± 0.84	ns	23.86 ± 0.94	*	nd	*
ARG	9.41 ± 0.46	11.18 ± 3.33	ns	176.76 ± 10.28	*	2.24 ± 2.05	ns
ALA	7.40 ± 0.19	9.18 ± 3.24	ns	65.69 ± 1.78	*	1.05 ± 0.26	*
GABA	1.29 ± 0.03	1.30 ± 0.04	ns	3.14 ± 0.08	*	1.40 ± 0.47	ns
TYR	0.82 ± 0.04	0.72 ± 0.19	ns	3.71 ± 0.17	*	nd	*
VAL	nd	nd	-	nd	-	nd	-
MET	nd	nd	-	0.69 ± 0.01	*	nd	-
TRP	nd	nd	-	nd	-	nd	-
PHE	0.34 ± 0.05	0.39 ± 0.06	ns	3.20 ± 0.12	*	nd	*
ILE	4.49 ± 0.10	4.98 ± 0.91	ns	37.78 ± 1.74	*	1.50 ± 1.31	*
ORN	nd	3.42 ± 5.92	ns	14.66 ± 0.89	*	13.64 ± 1.76	*
LEU	0.89 ± 0.19	1.00 ± 0.18	ns	8.36 ± 0.35	*	nd	*
LYS	2.23 ± 0.28	2.30 ± 0.37	ns	14.63 ± 0.97	*	nd	*
PRO	1.42 ± 0.07	2.33 ± 1.52	ns	12.35 ± 0.78	*	2.60 ± 0.69	ns

⁶⁴⁰ * Metabolites for which amounts obtained were significantly different from Q-40, determined using Dunnett's

641 Multiple Comparison Test (P < 0.05, df = (3,11)); ns = not significantly different; nd = not detected.

Table 2 Effect of cell washing regime on loss of amino acids from *S. cerevisiae* and washing efficacy.

- 644 Amino acid leakage from *S. cerevisiae* during two washing treatments, rinsing and vortexing, was evaluated.
- 645 Amounts of amino acid obtained from triplicate wash treatments are given as mean nanomoles of amino acid ± SD
- 646 (n=3 for all samples). Total reducing sugars present in polar metabolite extracts of late exponential phase cells
- 647 following application of either of the two washing regimes is given as an indicator of washing efficacy.

	Rinse	Vortex	% diff
ASP	1.10 ± 0.10	3.40 ± 1.90	-102.2
GLU	7.62 ± 1.02	17.76 ± 7.08	-79.9
ASN	1.45 ± 0.11	4.19 ± 1.17	-97.4
SER	2.15 ± 0.07	9.80 ± 3.47	-128.1
GLN	8.95 ± 0.89	29.33 ± 10.47	-106.5
HIS	1.14 ± 0.24	1.00 ± 0.46	13.2
GLY	4.77 ± 0.09	28.94 ± 7.20	-143.4
THR	1.71 ± 0.13	6.14 ± 2.16	-112.8
ARG	16.76 ± 3.30	19.92 ± 8.07	-17.2
ALA	4.04 ± 0.05	24.09 ± 6.49	-142.6
GABA	0.19 ± 0.00	0.74 ± 0.14	-120.2
TYR	0.31 ± 0.04	1.19 ± 1.23	-117.2
VAL*	2.23 ± 0.20	6.87 ± 2.29	-101.9
MET	nd	0.18 ± 0.10	-200.0
TRP	nd	0.02 ± 0.03	-200.0
PHE	0.32 ± 0.03	1.04 ± 0.55	-105.0
ILE	3.52 ± 0.39	8.33 ± 2.76	-81.3
ORN	1.97 ± 0.22	2.65 ± 1.16	-29.2
LEU	0.74 ± 0.06	2.37 ± 0.98	-104.4
LYS	1.68 ± 0.33	2.07 ± 0.92	-20.8
PRO	2.36 ± 0.17	4.10 ± 1.23	-53.8
[†] Total	0.194 ± 0.011	0.075 ± 0.011	200
Sugar*	0.174 ± 0.011	0.075 ± 0.011	200

⁶⁴⁸ * Metabolites for which amounts obtained from wash solutions were significantly different, determined using a

650 \dagger Concentration in polar phase of metabolite extract (PM), given in gL⁻¹.

⁶⁴⁹ pairwise t-test (P < 0.05, df = 4); nd = not detected.

652 Table 3 Effect of extraction temperature on amounts of intracellular polar metabolites obtained from S.

653 cerevisiae.

Equal volumes of yeast cell culture were quenched at -40°C, washed by vortexing and intracellular polar metabolites were extracted from yeast cell pellets by shaking at either 4°C or -20°C for 40 min. Extractions were performed using a biphasic chloroform/methanol/water method. Following extraction the aqueous phase was separated from the polar phase and insoluble material and dried. Metabolite amounts for each extraction are givens as average nanomoles of metabolite \pm SD from triplicate extractions. Since there was no statistical different between the two treatments for the majority of metabolites the data from both extractions was combined to give a mean amount extracted which is the average of all extractions (4°C and 20°C) normalized to dry cell weight (DCW).

Metabolite4*C-20*C% diff $\mu mol/gDCW$ D-glucose-6-phosphate16.0 ± 1.915.7 ± 0.61.80.71 ± 0.06D-fructose-6-phosphate1.8 ± 0.42.0 ± 0.1-10.70.08 ± 0.01D-fructose-16-bisphosphate*7.0 ± 0.48.3 ± 0.2-17.30.34 ± 0.092-and 3-phosphoglyceric acid27.7 ± 2.827.6 ± 1.50.31.24 ± 0.09Phosphoenolpyruvate8.0 ± 0.37.7 ± 0.42.90.35 ± 0.01Pyruvate2.0 ± 0.02.1 ± 0.2-8.30.09 ± 0.01Acetirate3.7 ± 0.23.8 ± 0.2-2.90.17 ± 0.01Aconitrate3.7 ± 0.23.8 ± 0.2-2.90.17 ± 0.01acketoglutarate9.2 ± 0.39.3 ± 0.4-0.80.41 ± 0.01Succinic acid2.66.3 ± 15.2284.3 ± 16.7-10.41.215 ± 0.94Fumaric acid2.5 ± 0.32.8 ± 0.2-12.10.51 ± 0.03Succinic acid1.1.1 ± 0.71.1.6 ± 0.7-3.70.51 ± 0.03Lactic acid8.0 ± 1.68.2 ± 1.7-2.10.36 ± 0.07D-glucose-1-phosphate2.5 ± 0.32.8 ± 0.2-12.10.12 ± 0.01UDP-D-Glucose267.1 ± 9.2264.9 ± 5.60.811.96 ± 0.31D-erythose-4-phosphate*1.3 ± 0.01.2 ± 0.07.80.06 ± 0.01UDP1.2 ± 0.01.3 ± 0.1-12.10.06 ± 0.010.06 ± 0.01UDP1.2 ± 0.01.3 ± 0.1-12.10.06 ± 0.03GMP4.1 ± 0.24.4 ± 0.3 </th
D-glucose-6-phosphate 16.0 ± 1.9 15.7 ± 0.6 1.8 0.71 ± 0.06 D-fructose-6-phosphate 1.8 ± 0.4 2.0 ± 0.1 -10.7 0.08 ± 0.01 D-fructose 1.6-bisphosphate $*$ 7.0 ± 0.4 8.3 ± 0.2 -17.3 0.34 ± 0.04 2- and 3-phosphoglyceric acid 27.7 ± 2.8 27.6 ± 1.5 0.3 1.24 ± 0.09 Phosphoenolpyruvate 8.0 ± 0.3 7.7 ± 0.4 2.9 0.35 ± 0.01 Pyruvate 2.0 ± 0.0 2.1 ± 0.2 -8.3 0.09 ± 0.01 Acetyl-CoA 0.5 ± 0.1 0.4 ± 0.0 12.3 0.02 ± 0.00 Isocitrate and Citrate 451.3 ± 73.1 360.8 ± 62.1 22.3 18.26 ± 3.52 Aconitrate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 Succinic acid 226.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid $*$ 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate $*$ 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 <
D-fructose-6-phosphate1.8 \pm 0.42.0 \pm 0.1-10.70.08 \pm 0.01D-fructose 1,6-bisphosphate*7.0 \pm 0.4 8.3 ± 0.2 -17.30.34 \pm 0.042- and 3-phosphoglyceric acid27.7 \pm 2.827.6 \pm 1.50.31.24 \pm 0.09Phosphoenolpyruvate 8.0 ± 0.3 7.7 \pm 0.42.90.35 \pm 0.01Pyruvate 2.0 ± 0.0 2.1 ± 0.2 8.3 0.09 \pm 0.01Acetyl-CoA 0.5 ± 0.1 0.4 ± 0.0 12.30.02 \pm 0.00Isocitrate and Citrate 451.3 ± 73.1 360.8 ± 62.1 22.3 18.26 ± 3.52 Aconitrate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 α -ketoglutarate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 Succinic acid 266.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid*115.9 \pm 6.0103.9 \pm 2.110.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxalocetic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 Deglucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 \pm 0.31D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 UMP 8.0 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 D-erythose-4-phosphate* <t< td=""></t<>
D-fructose 1,6-bisphosphate*7.0 ± 0.48.3 ± 0.2-17.30.34 ± 0.042- and 3-phosphoglyceric acid27.7 ± 2.827.6 ± 1.50.31.24 ± 0.09Phosphoenolpyruvate 2.0 ± 0.0 2.1 ± 0.2 -8.30.09 ± 0.01Pyruvate 2.0 ± 0.0 2.1 ± 0.2 -8.30.09 ± 0.01Accultrate 0.5 ± 0.1 0.4 ± 0.0 12.30.02 ± 0.00Isocitrate and Citrate 451.3 ± 73.1 360.8 ± 62.1 22.3 18.26 ± 3.52 Accultrate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.80.41 ± 0.01 α -ketoglutarate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.80.41 \pm 0.01Succinic acid $2.56.3 \pm 15.2$ 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.40.11 \pm 0.00Malic acid*115.9 \pm 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid11.1 \pm 0.711.6 \pm 0.7-3.70.51 \pm 0.03Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.10.36 \pm 0.07D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.10.12 \pm 0.01UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.811.96 \pm 0.31D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.80.06 \pm 0.00CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.10.06 \pm 0.01UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.30.43 \pm 0.07AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.40.45 \pm
2- and 3-phosphoglyceric acid 27.7 ± 2.8 27.6 ± 1.5 0.3 1.24 ± 0.09 Phosphoenolpynuvate 8.0 ± 0.3 7.7 ± 0.4 2.9 0.35 ± 0.01 Pyruvate 2.0 ± 0.0 2.1 ± 0.2 8.3 0.09 ± 0.01 Acetyl-CoA 0.5 ± 0.1 0.4 ± 0.0 12.3 0.02 ± 0.00 Isocirrate and Citrate 451.3 ± 73.1 360.8 ± 62.1 22.3 18.26 ± 3.52 Aconitrate 3.7 ± 0.2 3.8 ± 0.2 -2.9 0.17 ± 0.01 a -ketoglutarate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 Succinic acid 256.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid $* 115.9 \pm 6.0$ 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate $* 1.3 \pm 0.0$ 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.66 ± 0.03 OMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 2.13 0.43 ± 0.07 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 2.13 0.43 ± 0.07 UMP $8.0.6$ 10.4 ± 0.6 <t< td=""></t<>
Phosphoenolpyruvate 8.0 ± 0.3 7.7 ± 0.4 2.9 0.35 ± 0.01 Pyruvate 2.0 ± 0.0 2.1 ± 0.2 8.3 0.09 ± 0.01 Acetyl-CoA 0.5 ± 0.1 0.4 ± 0.0 12.3 0.002 ± 0.00 Isocitrate and Citrate 451.3 ± 73.1 360.8 ± 62.1 22.3 18.26 ± 3.52 Aconitrate 3.7 ± 0.2 3.8 ± 0.2 -2.9 0.17 ± 0.01 a -ketoglutrate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 a -ketoglutrate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 Succinic acid 256.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid $*$ 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate $*$ 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.03 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2
Pyrwate 2.0 ± 0.0 2.1 ± 0.2 -8.3 0.09 ± 0.01 Acetyl-CoA 0.5 ± 0.1 0.4 ± 0.0 12.3 0.02 ± 0.00 Isocitrate and Citrate 451.3 ± 73.1 360.8 ± 62.1 22.3 18.26 ± 3.52 Aconitrate 3.7 ± 0.2 3.8 ± 0.2 -2.9 0.17 ± 0.01 α -ketoglutarate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 Succinic acid 256.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid* 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 GDP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34
Acetyl-CoA 0.5 ± 0.1 0.4 ± 0.0 12.3 0.02 ± 0.00 Isocitrate and Citrate 451.3 ± 73.1 360.8 ± 62.1 22.3 18.26 ± 3.52 $Aconitrate$ 3.7 ± 0.2 3.8 ± 0.2 -2.9 0.17 ± 0.01 α -ketoglutarate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 Succinic acid 256.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid* 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.001 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
Isocirate and Citrate 451.3 ± 73.1 360.8 ± 62.1 22.3 18.26 ± 3.52 Aconitrate 3.7 ± 0.2 3.8 ± 0.2 -2.9 0.17 ± 0.01 α -ketoglutarate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 Succinic acid 256.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid* 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 JMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
Aconitrate 3.7 ± 0.2 3.8 ± 0.2 -2.9 0.17 ± 0.01 α -ketoglutarate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 Succinic acid 256.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid* 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid11.1 \pm 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 GDP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
a -ketoglutarate 9.2 ± 0.3 9.3 ± 0.4 -0.8 0.41 ± 0.01 Succinic acid 256.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid $*$ 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate $*$ 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
Succinic acid 256.3 ± 15.2 284.3 ± 16.7 -10.4 12.15 ± 0.94 Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid* 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid11.1 \pm 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 JUMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 GDP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
Fumaric acid 2.4 ± 0.0 2.3 ± 0.1 1.4 0.11 ± 0.00 Malic acid* 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
Malic acid* 115.9 ± 6.0 103.9 ± 2.1 10.9 4.94 ± 0.35 Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 D-erythose-4-phosphate $*$ 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 MAR 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 GDP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
Oxaloacetic acid 11.1 ± 0.7 11.6 ± 0.7 -3.7 0.51 ± 0.03 Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 GDP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
Lactic acid 8.0 ± 1.6 8.2 ± 1.7 -2.1 0.36 ± 0.07 D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
D-glucose-1-phosphate 2.5 ± 0.3 2.8 ± 0.2 -12.1 0.12 ± 0.01 UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
UDP-D-Glucose 267.1 ± 9.2 264.9 ± 5.6 0.8 11.96 ± 0.31 D-erythose-4-phosphate* 1.3 ± 0.0 1.2 ± 0.0 7.8 0.06 ± 0.00 CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 177.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP* 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
$ \begin{array}{c ccccc} D-erythose-4-phosphate & * & 1.3 \pm 0.0 & 1.2 \pm 0.0 & 7.8 & 0.06 \pm 0.00 \\ CMP & & 1.2 \pm 0.0 & 1.3 \pm 0.1 & -12.1 & 0.06 \pm 0.01 \\ UMP & & 8.6 \pm 0.6 & 10.7 \pm 1.4 & -21.3 & 0.43 \pm 0.07 \\ AMP & & 9.8 \pm 0.6 & 10.4 \pm 0.6 & -6.4 & 0.45 \pm 0.03 \\ GMP & & 4.1 \pm 0.2 & 4.4 \pm 0.3 & -7.1 & 0.19 \pm 0.01 \\ UDP & & 10.1 \pm 0.4 & 10.3 \pm 1.1 & -1.3 & 0.46 \pm 0.03 \\ ADP & & 200.2 \pm 29.1 & 171.9 \pm 27.5 & 15.2 & 8.36 \pm 1.34 \\ GDP & & * & 16.3 \pm 0.7 & 14.8 \pm 0.4 & 9.5 & 0.70 \pm 0.04 \\ \end{array} $
CMP 1.2 ± 0.0 1.3 ± 0.1 -12.1 0.06 ± 0.01 UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
UMP 8.6 ± 0.6 10.7 ± 1.4 -21.3 0.43 ± 0.07 AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 20.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
AMP 9.8 ± 0.6 10.4 ± 0.6 -6.4 0.45 ± 0.03 GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP $*$ 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
GMP 4.1 ± 0.2 4.4 ± 0.3 -7.1 0.19 ± 0.01 UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP* 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
UDP 10.1 ± 0.4 10.3 ± 1.1 -1.3 0.46 ± 0.03 ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP * 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
ADP 200.2 ± 29.1 171.9 ± 27.5 15.2 8.36 ± 1.34 GDP * 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
GDP * 16.3 ± 0.7 14.8 ± 0.4 9.5 0.70 ± 0.04
CTP * 58.8 ± 1.2 49.8 ± 1.2 16.6 2.44 ± 0.23
UTP * 136.7 ± 8.7 114.5 ± 10.6 17.6 5.65 ± 0.67
ATP * 386.4 ± 2.5 328.6 ± 14.2 16.2 16.08 ± 1.48
GTP * 187.7 ± 7.5 122.9 ± 17.5 41.8 6.98 ± 1.69
NAD 218.3 ± 6.9 214.5 ± 8.5 1.8 9.73 ± 0.32
NADH * 3.2 ± 0.3 5.4 ± 0.8 -49.9 0.19 ± 0.06
NADP 8.5 ± 0.5 8.2 ± 0.2 2.5 0.38 ± 0.02
ASP 90.4 ± 3.4 89.5 ± 3.0 1.0 4.05 ± 0.13
GLU 1376.3 ± 39.3 1424.2 ± 32.5 -3.4 62.96 ± 1.87
ASN 214.5 ± 10.3 225.2 ± 6.5 -4.8 9.88 ± 0.44
SER 251.8 ± 11.7 262.7 ± 9.2 -4.2 11.57 ± 0.50
GLN 7750.8 ± 110.2 7834.2 ± 264.2 -1.1 350.38 ± 8.40
HIS 208.3 ± 4.3 208.7 ± 4.4 -0.2 9.38 ± 0.18
GLY 375.5 ± 20.3 381.3 ± 24.6 -1.5 17.02 ± 0.92
THR 228.0 ± 6.6 232.8 ± 8.1 -2.1 10.36 ± 0.32
ARG 2064.6 ± 77.8 2146.4 ± 56.9 -3.9 94.67 ± 3.40
ALA 423.0 ± 18.0 430.1 ± 22.2 -1.7 19.18 ± 0.83
GABA 26.5 ± 0.9 26.6 ± 0.9 -0.4 1.20 ± 0.04
TYR 49.9 ± 0.8 51.0 ± 1.0 -2.2 2.27 ± 0.05
VAL 403.0 ± 12.0 413.6 ± 12.4 -2.6 18.36 ± 0.56
MET 6.1 ± 0.4 6.7 ± 0.1 -9.2 0.29 ± 0.02

TRP	8.1 ± 0.1	8.2 ± 0.2	-1.1	0.37 ± 0.01
PHE	45.1 ± 1.2	46.1 ± 1.4	-2.3	2.05 ± 0.06
ILE	1037.8 ± 66.2	1030.8 ± 43.7	0.7	46.51 ± 2.26
ORN	287.3 ± 6.8	280.1 ± 7.1	2.5	12.76 ± 0.33
LEU	96.3 ± 2.4	98.1 ± 3.0	-1.9	4.37 ± 0.12
LYS	336.0 ± 7.4	334.3 ± 8.0	0.5	15.07 ± 0.31
PRO	123.1 ± 4.2	126.1 ± 5.8	-2.4	5.60 ± 0.22

661 * Metabolites for which amounts obtained were significantly different between treatments (P < 0.05, df = 4).

663 Figure Legends

Figure 1 Outline of experimental workflow used for preparation of yeast cellular material prior to metabolite
 and protein extraction.

Figure 2 Contribution of different processing methods to total loss of metabolites during extraction from S.
 cerevisiae.

- 668 The molar amounts of amino acids obtained from quenching solution (Q), washing solution (Vo and Ri) and
- 669 metabolite extract (EX) were summed and the total number of moles obtained for each process combination was
- 670 regarded as 100%. The molar amount obtained individually from quenching solution, washing solution and polar
- extract is then expressed as a percentage of that total. A; Quenched at -30°C, washed by vortexing and extracted at
- $4^{\circ}C$ (Q-30:Vo:EX4), B; Quenched at -30°C, washed by rinsing and extracted at $4^{\circ}C$ (Q-30:Ri:EX4), C; . Quenched
- at -30°C for 20min, washed by vortexing and extracted at 4°C (Q-30T20:Vo:EX4).

674 Figure 3 Comparison of protein recoveries from yeast cultures at different growth phases

675 Protein from stationary phase cultures was extracted from whole cells (A) using method of Herbert et al. (2006), and

676 from solvent insoluble material remaining following a biphasic chloroform/methanol extraction of metabolites (B)

- 677 as described in the materials and methods. Extracted proteins were separated in the first dimension using pH 5-8
- 678 immobilized gradient isoelectric focusing strips and in the second dimension by 8 16% SDS-PAGE. Separated
- 679 proteins were stained with Sypro ruby.

680 Figure 4 2-D PAGE separation of proteins recovered from solvent-insoluble material.

Protein was solubilized from solvent-insoluble material following a biphasic metabolite extraction of a stationary phase culture. Separated proteins were stained with Sypro-ruby and the identity of individual spots (numbered) was determined by MALDI-MS/MS. Highlighted numbers indicate protein identifications that do not correspond to predicted molecular weights.





University Library



A gateway to Melbourne's research publications

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Schmidt, SA; Jacob, SS; Ahn, SB; Rupasinghe, T; Krömer, JO; Khan, A; Varela, C

Title:

Two strings to the systems biology bow: Co-extracting the metabolome and proteome of yeast

Date:

2013-02-01

Citation:

Schmidt, S. A., Jacob, S. S., Ahn, S. B., Rupasinghe, T., Krömer, J. O., Khan, A. & Varela, C. (2013). Two strings to the systems biology bow: Co-extracting the metabolome and proteome of yeast. Metabolomics, 9 (1), pp.173-188. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11306-012-0437-1.

Persistent Link:

http://hdl.handle.net/11343/282567

File Description: Accepted version