The *Drosophila* seminal proteome and its role in postcopulatory sexual selection

Authors: Stuart Wigby[1,2]*§ Nora C. Brown[3]§, Sarah E. Allen[3], Snigdha Misra[3], Jessica L. Sitnik[3,4], Irem Sepil[4], Andrew G. Clark[3]* & Mariana F. Wolfner[3]*

1. Institution for Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZB, UK
2. Faculty Biology, Applied Zoology, Technische Universität Dresden, 01069 Dresden, Germany
3. Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, United States
4. *Current address:* Biology Department, Northern Virginia Community College, Alexandria VA USA
5. Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3PS UK

*Authors for correspondence:
s.wigby@liverpool.ac.uk
ac347@cornell.edu
mariana.wolfner@cornell.edu

§ These authors contributed equally

ORCID IDs.
SW: 0000-0002-2260-2948
NCB: 0000-0001-8567-1273
SEA: 0000-0002-1646-629X
IS: 0000-0002-3228-5480
AGC: 0000-0001-7159-8511
MW: 0000-0003-2701-9505

Keywords: Accessory gland, seminal plasma, seminal fluid protein, reproduction, sexual selection, sexual conflict

Summary

Postcopulatory sexual selection, comprised of sperm competition and cryptic female choice (PCSS), has emerged as a widespread evolutionary force among polyandrous animals. There is abundant evidence that PCSS can shape the evolution of sperm. However, sperm are not the whole story: they are accompanied by seminal fluid substances that play many roles, including influencing PCSS. Foremost among seminal fluid models is *Drosophila melanogaster*, which displays ubiquitous polyandry, and exhibits intra-specific variation in a number of seminal fluid proteins (Sfps) that appear to modulate paternity share. Here we first consolidate current information on the identities of *D. melanogaster* Sfps. Comparing between *D. melanogaster* and human seminal proteomes, we find evidence of similarities between many protein classes and individual proteins, including some *D. melanogaster* Sfp genes linked to PCSS, suggesting evolutionary conservation of broad-scale functions. We then review experimental evidence for the functions of *D. melanogaster* Sfps in PCSS and sexual conflict. We identify gaps in our current knowledge and areas for future research, including enhanced identification of PCSS-related Sfps, their interactions with rival sperm and with females, the role of qualitative changes in Sfps, and mechanisms of ejaculate tailoring.

1. Introduction

When females mate with two or more males (polyandry), and the ejaculates of the different males overlap spatially and temporally, the potential for postcopulatory sexual selection (PCSS) arises [1]. Here we use the term PCSS to specify sperm competition and cryptic female choice, as is common usage [2]. Selection typically favours male adaptations that provide an advantage in sperm competition, because the carriers of those traits sire more offspring. PCSS also generates the opportunity for females to choose among the sperm of different males after mating ('cryptic female choice' [3]), which in turn creates selection that favours male ejaculate traits that are preferred by females. While much of the research on PCSS has focused on behavioural and sperm traits, sperm cells require the support of seminal fluid for successful gamete fusion [4–6]. Seminal fluid composition is a key player in PCSS, across a broad range of taxa (reviewed in [7–10]).

Drosophila melanogaster is an extremely powerful genetic model for studying seminal fluid molecules and their functions [11]. Although females have a sexual refractory period after mating, they are polyandrous and typically remate before they completely deplete their sperm stores. This results in the mixing of sperm from rival males, and the potential for PCSS [12,13]. *D. melanogaster* therefore represents an ideal system for dissecting the role of seminal fluid molecules in PCSS [7,14].

Here we focus on seminal fluid proteins (Sfps) and their roles in PCSS. We recognize that other types of molecules in the seminal fluid also play important roles, but we do not attempt to cover them here. We first synthesize the current data to provide a comprehensive list of known and candidate *D. melanogaster* Sfps. To explore the generality of *the D. melanogaster* seminal proteome as a model, we compare it to one of the other best characterized seminal proteomes, human seminal plasma, and examine similarities and differences between the species. We then review the experimental data for Sfp functions in PCSS, and explore the representation of these Sfps among those that show similarities to human Sfps. Finally, we suggest key future research directions for the field.

2. The *Drosophila melanogaster* seminal proteome

Sfps are the non-sperm proteins in the ejaculate. They are synthesized in the male's accessory glands (which contain secretory main and secondary cells), ejaculatory duct, ejaculatory bulb, testes and seminal vesicles [15–20]. Identification of Sfps ultimately requires demonstrating their transfer from males to females, which is a non-trivial experimental task. Early Sfp identification focussed on genes whose expression is exclusive to – or highly enriched in – the male accessory glands, and had predicted secretion signal-sequences (e.g. [20–27]; Supplemental Figure S1). A proteomic analysis on the reproductive tract of females, following matings to isotopically labelled, spermless males, has since provided a much higher throughput identification of additional Sfps [18]. This approach identified male-derived, transferred proteins, while excluding female-derived proteins and sperm proteins. An additional high-throughput approach used quantitative proteomics to identify additional Sfps, by finding proteins that deplete in the male and increase in the female reproductive tract after mating [16].

(a) Characterization of the *D. melanogaster* seminal proteome

To establish the best current estimate of the complete set of *D. melanogaster* Sfps we combined data from those past studies to generate a centralized database of the *D. melanogaster* seminal proteome, using a specific set of criteria that we developed (Supplemental Table S1). We provide a conservative 'high confidence' list of 292 proteins, based on convincing biochemical and bioinformatic data (Supplemental Data 1). We also provide a second 'candidate' list of 321 proteins that either a) have the potential to be Sfps based on expression data, but for which we lack evidence of transfer to females, b) fall into predicted functional categories that suggest intracellular "housekeeping" functions (i.e. they are involved in cytoskeletal structure, transcription, translation, cellular trafficking etc.), or c) were defined putatively as transferred Sfps but are also in the sperm proteome [28] (Whittington, Singh, Pitnick, Wolfner, and Dorus, unpublished data). More work is required to establish whether or

not proteins in this candidate list are Sfps. A full explanation of our categorizations given in Supplemental Table S1.

The 292 high-confidence Sfps fall into predicted functional classes described by previous studies. The largest categories include proteases, protease inhibitors, redox-related proteins, immunity-related proteins, and lipid metabolism-related proteins (functional classes predicted by FlyBase; Supplemental Figure S2), though 115 Sfps have as yet unknown molecular functions. High-confidence Sfps are significantly enriched in GO terms associated with these molecular functional classes, and – as expected – with biological processes such as reproduction, mating behavior, and regulation of female receptivity (determined using ClusterProfiler [29]; Supplemental Figure S3). Candidate Sfps have a very different set of enriched GO terms, consistent with the idea that they are mostly not Sfps, and instead represent proteins that have other functions within the male reproductive tract (Supplemental Figure S4). Although most high-confidence Sfps for whom the site of synthesis is known are made in the accessory glands, the site of synthesis is not known for most Sfps [15,16] (Supplemental Figure S5). 93.5% of the high-confidence Sfps contain predicted signal peptides, suggesting that minority rely on alternative mechanisms of secretion, or may be transferred to females in exosomes or as a consequence of whole-cell delamination from the accessory gland [30,31].

(b) Comparisons between the *D. melanogaster* and human seminal proteome

Even when relatively few Sfps were known, striking similarities in Sfp functional classes between *D. melanogaster* and human were apparent [32]. However, given the rapid evolution of many Sfp primary sequences in *Drosophila* [20,33,34] and more broadly across taxa [10,35,36] we might expect relatively little similarity between specific Sfp genes of distant animal taxa. Now that we have more comprehensive seminal proteomes for these species (and other taxa [10]), we can revisit the comparison between *D. melanogaster* and human Sfps. We used DIOPT version 8 (http://www.flyrnai.org/diopt [37]) to examine overall amino-acid similarity between *D. melanogaster* Sfps and all human proteins. This approach applies a voting score derived from 18 orthology-finding tools to determine which *D. melanogaster* proteins best match human proteins. We then determined which proteins were in the human seminal plasma proteome, using a recent database consisting of 2146 proteins [38] (out of a full all-tissue human proteome of 20050 proteins [39]).

163 (57%) *D. melanogaster* Sfps show at least some evidence of similarity (high, moderate or low-ranked by DIOPT) to 444 human proteins, while 135 *D. melanogaster* Sfps were 'high' or 'moderate' hits to 279 human proteins (Supplemental Data 2). Note that among these hits are duplicates, whereby multiple *D. melanogaster* Sfps match to a single human protein, or *vice versa*. We focussed on the high and moderate ranked hits for further analyses, because these represent higher confidence matches. We found that 89 *D. melanogaster* Sfps had high/moderate hits to 110 known human Sfps. This represents a strong overrepresentation of human Sfps among the *D. melanogaster* hits to the human proteome, almost 3 times higher than expected based on chance (proportion test; $\chi^2_1 = 244.2$, $p < 0.001$; Table S2). An additional 10 hits (from 16 *D. melanogaster* Sfps) represent human proteins that are not currently listed in the human seminal plasma, but have known or likely roles in reproduction or reproductive tissues, based on Uniprot functional information [40].

30% of *D. melanogaster* Sfps therefore show high or moderate similarity to human Sfps. This could indicate cases of orthology or paralogy, or perhaps rare cases of convergent evolution, between *D. melanogaster* and human Sfps. However, distinguishing between these possibilities is beyond the scope of this paper. The representation and enrichment of protein classes is similar between *D. melanogaster* and human (using PANTHER [41], Figure 1; using ClusterProfiler, Supplemental Figures S3 and S6). 10 of 14 significantly over- or under-represented *D. melanogaster* Sfp classes show the same significant differences in human Sfps, and 13 of 14 show at least trends in the same direction (using PANTHER [41], Table 1). This supports previous findings of shared functional requirements of Sfps in species spanning insects to mammals [32]. Thus, a deeper understanding of *Drosophila* Sfps could provide insights that are broadly relevant to other species, including mammals.

3. The role of *D. melanogaster* seminal fluid proteins in PCSS

Two features of *D. melanogaster* Sfps indicate their likely involvement in PCSS. First, female responses to the receipt of Sfps often support the male's competitive paternity success: Sfp receipt regulates storage and release of sperm, females show decreased interest in mating with other males, and females increase egg production and ovulation (reviewed extensively in [7,11,42]). Second, many Sfps, both in *Drosophila* and other taxa, also show considerable inter-specific diversity, many evolve rapidly, driven by positive selection, and they show high turnover between species. These are all features expected of genes under strong sexual selection [34–36,43–46].

Laboratory assays of differential paternity outcomes between males are straightforward in *D. melanogaster*, simplified by the availability of visible markers that permit the determination of the relative paternity by males of different phenotypes that mate with a single female [47,48]. Furthermore, reciprocal matings allow the determination of P1 and P2 of the same male genotype, which are measures of first male paternity (sperm 'defence') and second male paternity (sperm 'offense') respectively [49]. The availability of *D. melanogaster* lines with GFP or RFP-labelled sperm also allows the unravelling of PCSS mechanisms via direct quantification of rival male sperm storage and sperm utilization within the female reproductive tract [13,50]. These methods and tools have allowed researchers to uncover roles of Sfps in PCSS, and to dissect the relative roles of males and females [51,52]. The main approaches to ascertaining the role of Sfps in paternity share or sperm dynamics have been 1) association studies, which examine correlations between the traits of interest and natural variation in Sfp alleles, and 2) functional genetic studies, involving the genetic manipulation of Sfps, or the cells and tissues that produce them. Note that these approaches have distinct strengths and caveats: association studies do not definitively prove that a particular Sfp directly influences PCSS, because a correlated third factor could be the cause. Meanwhile, functional genetic studies do not establish whether variation among males in the Sfp being studied alters PCSS outcomes. As such, the approaches provide complementary information about the potential role of Sfps in PCSS, and the evidence should be taken together. Moreover, it is important to note our knowledge is based heavily on lab studies. While frequent remating and mixed paternity has been ascertained from wild females [12,53], our understanding of PCSS processes under natural conditions remains limited.

(a) Population genetic associations between Sfps and paternity share

An initial study demonstrated associations between variation in paternity share among wild-derived *D. melanogaster* lines, and alleles of several accessory gland-derived Sfps: *ovulin [Acp26Aa], Acp29AB, Acp36DE* and *Acp53Ea* [49]. This suggested that natural populations contain variation for Sfp-mediated PCSS processes, upon which selection could potentially act. Subsequent studies using broadly similar approaches identified additional Sfps (e.g. *Acp33A, Acp62F, CG6168, CG14560, CG8137, sex peptide* [*Acp70A* or *SP*]) whose variation is associated with P1 or P2 [54–57]. (Note that knockout studies have failed to find an effect of *ovulin* on P1 or P2 [58] (and White and Wolfner, unpublished data), suggesting that its association with paternity share [49,54] may result from linkage disequilibrium with a gene that influences PCSS such as the closely linked gene *Acp26Ab*, or perhaps with natural variants that are gain-of-function).

A pressing question is why such variation exists at all; one might expect alleles that associate with high paternity to eliminate less successful ones. However, the complexities both within and between animals mean that there may be several optima. There is non-transitivity in genotypic effects on paternity share, due to at least two conditions. First, the paternity success of a given male genotype can depend on the genotype of his mate: i.e. male A outcompetes male B when they mate with female X, but A loses to B when they mate with female Y [59]. For example, specific variants of the male Sfp *SP* and its receptor in females (*SPR*), strongly interact to mediate P1 and female remating rates [56]. Second, the relative success of a male genotype can depend on the genetic background of the rival males with which he is competing: i.e. male A outcompetes male B, and male B outcompetes male C, but male C outcompetes male A, analogous to a 'rock–paper–scissors' game [60,61]. Three additional factors add to the complexity: 1) apparent epistatic interactions among some Sfp alleles on paternity share (e.g. between *Acp62F* and *Acp76A*) contribute to the considerable complexity [55],2) pleiotropic effects on

paternity share of some Sfp alleles that affect other post mating responses, such as female refractoriness and fecundity (described in the next section), and 3) in the wild there may be myriad environmental factors that interact with Sfps in mediating sperm success, so that relative successes of competitors becomes highly condition-dependent. These considerations suggest that there may be no single 'best' allele (or allelic combination) across every combination of male and female types, thus maintaining Sfp variation within populations.

(b) Functional genetics of PCSS

Genetic disruption of accessory gland development results in a near or complete failure of those male's mates to produce offspring, primarily due to deficiencies in the transport of sperm into, or release of sperm from, female storage organs [62–64]. Genetic removal of some individual Sfps can similarly cause considerable reductions in sperm storage, and thus fertilization success, even in the absence of competition [65,66]. Deficiencies like these would generally be expected to place males at a severe disadvantage in PCSS.

An example of a Sfp that is required for both non-competitive fertility and paternity share under competition is Acp36DE. This is a glycoprotein in seminal fluid and the mating plug that had previously been linked to paternity outcomes via genotype association [49], and is required for proper sperm entry into storage in mated females [65,66]. Males null for the *Acp36DE* gene display reduced P1 and P2, presumably because the poor initial storage of their sperm results in a smaller paternity share relative to rivals' [67].

It is possible that other Sfps required for non-competitive fertility could also lose paternity share under PCSS. For example, knockdown of *PEBme*, an Sfp that is derived from the ejaculatory bulb and contributes to the mating plug, also results in fewer sperm than normal getting stored in mated females [66]. Based on the results described above for Acp36DE, we would predict that PEBme-lacking males should suffer low P1 and P2, although this has not been tested to date. The Sfp lectin Acp29AB, which was previously associated with paternity outcomes [49], mediates efficient retention of sperm in storage. Thus, males lacking this protein have a low P1, presumably because their mates retained fewer sperm to compete with the second male's sperm [68]. However, consistent with Acp29AB's role in sperm retention, males that lack it have normal P2, presumably reflecting that normal numbers of sperm from the mutant males can enter storage, and displace a prior male's sperm.

Some genetic manipulations that remove Sfps, or otherwise alter the composition of the seminal proteome, counterintuitively improve male P1. For example, males null for *SP* (*SP*^{0}) display higher P1 [64,69]. This can be explained by SP's function in facilitating the release of sperm from storage: mates of *SP*^{0} males lay and fertilize fewer eggs, and more sperm are retained than normal [64]. Having more sperm present in the female's storage organs should, all else being equal, give the first male a competitive boost in defence against incoming rival sperm [13]. However, the reduced egg laying of their mates lowers *SP*^{0} male reproductive success prior to female remating. Moreover, females mated to *SP*^{0} males remate more readily [70,71] meaning that the male's sperm encounters competition sooner. These effects typically offset the reduction in P1, meaning that the normal transfer of SP is net beneficial to males under most conditions [69,72,73].

Removal of several other Sfps, including some that modulate SP activity (CG9997, lectin-46Ca (aka CG1656), lectin-46Cb (aka CG1652), and CG17575; [74–76]), or disruption to the secondary cells that make some Sfps [77,78] also increases P1 [79] (but see also reference [80] which found the opposite pattern for CG9997). Again, these effects are due to the over-retention of the manipulated male's sperm, and are accompanied by decreased rate of oviposition following a single mating, an effect that would likely hamper male fitness under normal conditions. Curiously, adult-specific inhibition of BMP-signalling in male accessory gland secondary cells [30], alters the seminal proteome and boosts P1, but does not alter oviposition rates [30,81]. In this case, females mated to these genetically manipulated males appear to release fewer sperm per fertilized egg; again resulting in the over-retention of sperm [81]. However, mates of these males remate much more quickly [30,81] meaning that net effect of the manipulation would again likely harm male fitness. Removal of the Sfp protease inhibitor Acp62F from males has a similar P1 effect, but the mechanism for this is unknown [82].

(c) Quantitative variation: evolved and plastic allocation of Sfps

So far we have focussed on variation in Sfp gene sequences and the presence/absence of Sfps, but variation can also be quantitative: the amount of Sfps males make and transfer can vary between species, populations, and individuals, or even within individuals across different contexts, and can have important consequences for male and female reproduction [10,83,84]. For example, males that mate repeatedly in quick succession become depleted of Sfps, which can lead to male infertility even while sperm continue to be transferred. This suggests that, in the short-term, Sfp supplies are limiting in *D. melanogaster* [85] (a pattern also seen in bed bugs [86]).

Lab evolution studies represent a powerful approach to exploring Sfp quantity variation and PCSS. For example, artificial selection for large accessory glands led to significantly increased levels of the Sfp SP but not of ovulin, revealing separable, selectable variation for Sfp quantity [87]. Furthermore, experimental evolution under enforced random monogamy – which removes all aspects of sexual selection, including PCSS – led to reductions in male competitive paternity share, and reduced RNA expression levels of many Sfp genes, including some with known PCSS roles (*Acp29AB, Acp36DE, SP, Acp62F*) [88]. This suggests that PCSS favours higher expression of many Sfp genes relative to mating systems that lack PCSS.

In PCSS situations, males also display plastic changes in the production and/or transfer of Sfps (as well as sperm). Strategic allocation of sperm in response to the risk of PCSS is well established both in theory and empirical studies, across a range of taxa [89,90]. Sperm production is predicted to be costly [91], so males of many polyandrous species, including *D. melanogaster*, can adjust sperm numbers in response to their local social environment, boosting sperm numbers when there is a high risk of PCSS [92,93]. Similar principles could apply to Sfps, which might also be energetically demanding to make [10]. Several studies have shown male *D. melanogaster* can alter Sfp production and transfer in response to their social environment [87,93–96]. For example, quantitative proteomics revealed that Sfp production and transfer peaked when males encountered many rival males, relative to 1 or 0 rivals, which was associated with improved oviposition stimulation in their mates [93]. Sfp gene expression can also change: reduced RNA levels of *ovulin* and *Acp62F* have been found in males exposed to rivals [94]. The latter data are difficult to reconcile with the results of studies that quantify Sfps at the protein level, but may reflect the existence of important post-transcriptional regulation [97–99], or they may simply reflect strain differences, or differences in experimental design. In any case, males display modulation of Sfp production and transfer in response to perceived PCSS, which may represent an adaptive strategy to maximize reproductive returns from costly ejaculate investment and/or result from constraints imposed by resource limitation [100].

A further potential influence on Sfp allocation is the exploitation of a previous males' ejaculate [101]. If a single dose of an Sfp causes strong long-lasting effects, that extend beyond the time when a female remates, then subsequent males do not need to transfer this Sfp (or as much of it); they can save their resources for future matings, or investment into other traits. In support of this idea, when mating with previously mated females, males transfer less ovulin, but normal amounts of SP [95]. The receipt of ovulin boosts egg production after mating by modulating neural connections in females in what appears to be a long-lasting way [102,103]. Although SP receipt also has long-term effects on females, such as increasing refractoriness to remating [22,70,104,105], a second dose of SP from a subsequent male boosts female refractoriness [95]. The data suggest that second males may exploit the first male's ovulin investment, strategically saving their ovulin supplies for future matings, but still transferring normal amounts of SP. Consistent with the idea that one male's Sfps can help another, seminal fluid can boost the offspring production of rivals [106]. For example, female receipt of Acp36DE from a subsequent male can improve the offspring production of an Acp36DE-deficient male [67], and SP can bind to a previous rival male's sperm and provide SP function to those sperm [107].

(d) Role of Sfps in sexual conflict and female-mediated PCSS

Sfps are central to conflicts between the sexes in *D. melanogaster* [7,42]. First, some Sfps can reduce female lifespan and fitness, under certain conditions in the lab [72,108–113] (although whether this effect occurs in the wild is unclear). Moreover, male genotypes that have higher sperm defence (P1) tend to generate higher female

mortality [114]. These findings are consistent with the idea that Sfps can harm females as a side-effect of functions that promote male reproductive success [42]. Females are expected to evolve resistance to male harm, which has potential to spark an evolutionary arms race between the sexes. If female resistance reduces the benefits to males of their trait (such as Sfps that boost paternity share), then this may, in turn, select males to increase the level of their trait, resulting in increased harm to females, and so on [115].

PCSS also presents the opportunity for females to exert cryptic female choice (CFC) between the sperm of rival males [3]. PCSS simultaneously creates an inevitable and insoluble postcopulatory conflict between the sexes, because one or more males will lose paternity after mating [116]. Unequivocally identifying CFC, and its underlying mechanisms, is experimentally challenging, but evidence is accumulating for a number of species [7,51,117]. A potential CFC mechanism in *D. melanogaster* is regulation by the female of the timing of ejaculate ejection. Ejection of the ejaculate (~1-2h post-mating) terminates sperm storage and – if the female contains sperm from previous mates – sperm displacement. It can therefore affect relative paternity outcomes, such that delayed ejection benefits the current male's sperm [118]. The sperm mass also contains Sfps (such as Acp36DE; [119]), whose removal might also give the female more control over Sfp-mediated sperm dynamics. Neuronal pathways that control sperm ejection [120] or other aspects of sperm use, storage, and retention [51] might represent targets for interference by Sfps, to promote success of that male's sperm. Consistent with this idea, males whose secondary cell function has been manipulated transfer an altered seminal proteome, and when these males are the first of two males their mates are slower to eject the sperm of second males [81].

Females could also exert CFC by altering how they process Sfps or the sensitivity of their receptors to them [7,9]. SP, ovulin and Acp36DE undergo processing within the female reproductive tract after mating, for which other Sfps and unknown female factors can be required [27,105,121–125]. In some cases Sfp processing is important for the Sfp's function (e.g. Acp36DE [124]), but whether Sfp processing by the female can alter Sfp activity to benefit the female remains unknown. Nor do we know whether there is variation in these processes among individual females or populations, or whether it correlates with variation in paternity shares. Similarly, females could modulate Sfp receptor levels, production, or activity. For example, oviduct expression of the *SPR* evolved in the *melanogaster* species group, coinciding with these species showing postmating responses to SP [126,127]. It is unknown whether natural variation or plasticity in the SPR could allow females to alter their response to SP in order to bias paternity.

In summary, there is clearly great potential for *D. melanogaster* females to use molecular interactions with male Sfps in their exertion of CFC [7]. To date there are no studies that unequivocally differentiate between Sfp-mediated CFC and sperm competition in this species. However, it is important to note that the criteria that are generally accepted for demonstrating CFC tend to be more stringent than those applied to claims of sperm competition. Nonetheless, the combination of sperm competition, CFC, and an ongoing antagonistic arms races with females, may ultimately be responsible for the rapid evolution and turnover of many Sfps in *D. melanogaster* and other taxa [10,35,128].

To test this idea – that PCSS drives evolutionary novelty in Sfps – we conducted further analysis of sequence similarity between *D. melanogaster* Sfps and human genes. We examined the set of *D. melanogaster* Sfps for which there is evidence of a role in PCSS, from association studies or functional genetic approaches (and where there are reporting inconsistencies, we preferentially used the findings from functional genetic studies. E.g. ovulin, which shows associations with paternity share [49,54], was excluded due to negative results from functional genetic experiments [58] (and White and Wolfner, unpublished data)). We tested what proportion of these PCSS Sfps, relative to the remaining *D. melanogaster* Sfps, show sequence similarity to human genes from the DIOPT analysis. However, we found no evidence that PCSS Sfps differ from what would be expected by chance in their representation among the *D. melanogaster* Sfps that show similarity to human genes. This was true either when comparing across all hits (low, moderate or high ranking), or in analyses restricted to high and moderate hits, or to hits specifically against human seminal plasma proteins (Supplemental Data 2; all $\chi^2_1 < 2.3$, $p > 0.12$). Thus, our analysis does not suggest that Sfps which function in PCSS are any less likely to show sequence similarity to

human genes in general, or to human Sfps. One possible explanation for this apparent lack of evolutionary novelty among PCSS Sfps is that many of the Sfps we labelled as playing a role in PCSS have additional functions in non-competitive fertility. Thus, additional factors beyond PCSS likely shape their evolution, and may in some cases result in conservation.

4. Conclusions and future research prospects

In conclusion, we now have a good understanding of the makeup of the *D. melanogaster* seminal proteome and the evolutionary dynamics of many Sfps. Seminal proteomes appear to retain protein class representation across species, pointing to some degree of shared functional requirements. There is an accumulating body of evidence demonstrating how *D. melanogaster* Sfps are involved in PCSS, derived from association studies, functional genetics and analysis of protein levels. Here we suggest some important questions in the field to address in future research.

(a) Are there more Sfps that impact PCSS?

To date, we know of 14 Sfps that have been implicated in competitive paternity outcomes, via genetic association studies, or through genetic manipulation, out of our best-estimate seminal proteome of 292 Sfps (Supplemental Data 2). This small proportion might be because not many Sfps are involved in PCSS, though we suspect more likely it simply reflects the fact that we have a good understanding of the function of, at best 30 Sfps. As more population and functional genetic studies of Sfps take place in the future, we would expect to find more that have roles in PCSS. In particular we might predict that recently evolved proteins, or those differentially expressed across species, represent prime candidates, due to sperm competition and CFC driving evolutionary novelty [33,35,129]. One further potential route to identifying good candidates is to apply evolutionary rate covariation approaches to already-known PCSS-mediating Sfps, a method employed to successfully target and identify novel SP-network Sfps [76].

(b) Can Sfps target and harm rival sperm?

Currently, the individual Sfps understood to link to competitive paternity outcomes are thought primarily to influence the movement of the sperm transferred with them in or out of the sperm storage organs. But could Sfps influence PCSS by interacting with, and harming, rival male sperm directly? In social insects there is evidence that sperm survival suffers in the seminal fluid of non-self males, suggesting that in those species Sfps might directly bias against rival sperm [130]: but there is no compelling evidence to date for the same in *D. melanogaster*. In contrast, SP can associate with rival sperm and restore its function, potentially benefitting the rival male [107]. There is also evidence that seminal fluid can promote the survival of self or rival sperm equally [131] (but see also [132]). A greater understanding of interactions between the Sfps of one male and the sperm and Sfps of rivals is sorely needed for a clearer picture of cooperation and conflict between rival ejaculates.

(c) Do qualitative changes in Sfps play a role?

Our focus in this review was on the genetics and quantity of Sfps. However, Sfps could potentially vary in qualitative ways. For example, as males age some Sfps show evidence of qualitative changes associated with poor competitive fertilization success, that might reflect post-translational modifications (PTMs), degradation or aggregation [132]. More broadly, inappropriate PTMs are of human biomedical interest as potential markers of infertility [38,133]. However, in *D. melanogaster*, we know almost nothing about the overall prevalence or function of Sfp PTMs. One hypothetical possibility is that males might be capable of strategically altering Sfp function via PTMs in response to PCSS cues, in order to better compete against rival ejaculates when PCSS is high, or alternatively to minimize harm to females when competition is low, and male and female interests coincide. Another possibility is that varying PTMs might allow males to target Sfp effects to self or rival sperm.

(d) How do males tailor ejaculates to PCSS?

Males appear capable of quite sophisticated alterations to the composition of their sperm and seminal proteome in response to the social environment, including cues of PCSS [87,92,93,95,96,100,134]. It appears that males use a mix of sensory cues to assess the presence of rival males, which ultimately results in altered reproductive investment [135–139]. At the other end, the diversity of male secretory cells and tissues [6] may provide ample opportunity for males to 'fine tune' the composition of their seminal proteome. However, the process by which males translate sensory information into changes in Sfp production and/or transfer is unclear. Possible mechanisms include the actions of neurons that control reproductive tissue activity [140], and/or steroid signaling. For example, ecdysteroids show quantitative responsiveness to social stimuli [141], and they are involved in secretory tissue, cell growth and Sfp expression [142–144]. They therefore represent a key candidate for mediating signals between the male sensory and reproductive organs.

(e) What female proteins interact with Sfps, and how do they function?

Symptomatic of the sexual selection field more widely, we have a much better understanding of the roles of males than of females in PCSS. However, mating and reproduction are intricate processes that involve a carefully choreographed "dance" between males and females both physically and at the molecular level. As long as our knowledge is biased towards one sex, it will be incomplete. To date, we only know of one direct male-female molecular interaction: the male *SP* and its receptor in females, *SPR,* which can influence female remating rates and paternity outcomes [56,145]. We also know that *SP* can enter the female haemolymph when it can be cleaved by trypsin [146]. A key challenge for the future is to identify other female receptors to male Sfps, and female reproductive proteins that modify or process them. Once we know what the female proteins are, we can use genetic approaches to assess their function, determine whether they influence sperm competition or CFC, and determine whether they represent conflict or cooperation between the sexes by analyzing their impact on male and female fitness.

Acknowledgements

S.W. and I.S were funded by a BBSRC fellowship to S.W. (BB/K014544/1), and S.W. received additional support from a Dresden fellowship (Technische Universität Dresden). Support was received from NIH grants R01-HD059060 (to A.G.C. and M.F.W.) and R01-HD-038921 (to M.F.W.). We thank Dr. Akanksha Singh for assistance with curation of an early Sfp list, and to 3 anonymous reviewers for thoughtful comments that helped improve the paper.

References

1. Parker GA. 1970 Sperm competition and its evolutionary consequences in the insects. *Biol. Rev.* **45**, 525–567. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-185X.1970.tb01176.x)
2. Birkhead TR, Pizzari T. 2002 Postcopulatory sexual selection. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **3**, 262–273. (doi:10.1038/nrg774)
3. Eberhard WG. 1996 *Female control: sexual selection by cryptic female choice.* Princeton and Chichester: Princeton University Press.
4. Hopkins BR, Sepil I, Wigby S. 2017 Seminal Fluid. *Curr. Biol.* **27**, 404–405. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2017.03.063)
5. Poiani A. 2006 Complexity of seminal fluid: a review. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **60**, 289–310. (doi:10.1007/s00265-006-0178-0)
6. McGraw LA, Suarez SS, Wolfner MF. 2015 On a matter of seminal importance. *BioEssays* **37**, 142–147. (doi:10.1002/bies.201400117)
7. Sirot LK, Wolfner MF. 2015 Who's zoomin' who? Seminal fluid proteins and cryptic female choice in diptera. In *Cryptic Female Choice in Arthropods: Patterns, Mechanisms, and Prospects* (eds A Aisenberg, A Peretti), Springer Press.
8. Panhuis TM, Clark NL, Swanson WJ. 2006 Rapid evolution of reproductive proteins in abalone and *Drosophila*. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* **361**, 261–268. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2005.1793)
9. Sirot LK. 2019 Modulation of seminal fluid molecules by males and females. *Curr. Opin. Insect Sci.* **35**, 109–116. (doi:10.1016/j.cois.2019.07.009)
10. Ramm SA. In press. Seminal fluid and accessory male investment in sperm competition. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London B Biol. Sci.*
11. Avila FW, Sirot LK, LaFlamme BA, Rubinstein CD, Wolfner MF. 2011 Insect seminal fluid proteins: identification and function. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **56**, 21–40. (doi:10.1146/annurev-ento-120709-144823)
12. Imhof M, Harr B, Brem G, Schlötterer C. 1998 Multiple mating in wild *Drosophila melanogaster* revisited by microsatellite analysis. *Mol. Ecol.* **7**, 915–917. (doi:10.1046/j.1365-294x.1998.00382.x)
13. Manier MK, Belote JM, Berben KS, Novikov D, Stuart WT, Pitnick S. 2010 Resolving mechanisms of competitive fertilization success in *Drosophila melanogaster. Science* **328**, 354–357. (doi:10.1126/science.1187096)
14. Civetta A, Ranz JM. 2019 Genetic factors influencing sperm competition. *Front. Genet.* **10**, 1–15. (doi:10.3389/fgene.2019.00820)
15. Takemori N, Yamamoto MT. 2009 Proteome mapping of the *Drosophila melanogaster* male reproductive system. *Proteomics* **9**, 2484–2493. (doi:10.1002/pmic.200800795)
16. Sepil I, Hopkins BR, Dean R, Thézénas M-L, Charles PD, Konietzny R, Fischer R, Kessler BM, Wigby S. 2019 Quantitative proteomics identification of seminal fluid proteins in male *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* **18**, S46–S58. (doi:10.1074/mcp.RA118.000831)
17. Avila FW, Sánchez-López JA, McGlaughon JL, Raman S, Wolfner MF, Heifetz Y. 2016 Nature and functions of glands and ducts in the *Drosophila* reproductive tract. In *Extracellular Composite Matrices in Arthropods*, pp. 411–444. Springer.
18. Findlay GD, Yi X, MacCoss MJ, Swanson WJ. 2008 Proteomics reveals novel *Drosophila* seminal fluid proteins transferred at mating. *PLoS Biol.* **6**, e178. (doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0060178)
19. Ayroles JF, Laflamme BA, Stone EA, Wolfner MF, Mackay TFC. 2011 Functional genome annotation of *Drosophila* seminal fluid proteins using transcriptional genetic networks. *Genet. Res. (Camb).* **93**, 387–395. (doi:10.1017/S0016672311000346)
20. Swanson WJ, Clark AG, Waldrip-Dail HM, Wolfner MF, Aquadro CF. 2001 Evolutionary EST analysis identifies rapidly evolving male reproductive proteins in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **98**, 7375–7379.

(doi:10.1073/pnas.131568198)
21. Chapman KB, Wolfner MF. 1988 Determination of male-specific gene expression in *Drosophila* accessory glands. *Dev. Biol.* **126**, 195–202. (doi:10.1016/0012-1606(88)90253-9)
22. Chen PSS, Stumm-Zollinger E, Aigaki T, Balmer J, Bienz M, Böhlen P. 1988 A male accessory gland peptide that regulates reproductive behavior of female *D. melanogaster*. *Cell* **54**, 291–298. (doi:10.1016/0092-8674(88)90192-4)
23. DiBenedetto a J, Lakich DM, Kruger WD, Belote JM, Baker BS, Wolfner MF. 1987 Sequences expressed sex-specifically in *Drosophila melanogaster* adults. *Dev. Biol.* **119**, 242–51. (doi:10.1016/0012-1606(87)90225-9)
24. Wolfner MF *et al.* 1997 New genes for male accessory gland proteins in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **27**, 825–34. (doi:10.1016/s0965-1748(97)00056-8)
25. Walker MJ, Rylett CM, Keen JN, Audsley N, Sajid M, Shirras AD, Isaac RE. 2006 Proteomic identification of *Drosophila melanogaster* male accessory gland proteins, including a pro-cathepsin and a soluble γ-glutamyl transpeptidase. *Proteome Sci.* **4**, 1–10. (doi:10.1186/1477-5956-4-9)
26. Ravi Ram K, Wolfner MF. 2007 Seminal influences: *Drosophila* Acps and the molecular interplay between males and females during reproduction. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **47**, 427–445. (doi:10.1093/icb/icm046)
27. Monsma SA, Wolfner MF. 1988 Structure and expression of a *Drosophila* male accessory gland gene whose product resembles a peptide pheromone precursor. *Genes Dev.* **2**, 1063–73. (doi:10.1101/gad.2.9.1063)
28. Wasbrough ER, Dorus S, Hester S, Howard-Murkin J, Lilley K, Wilkin E, Polpitiya A, Petritis K, Karr TL. 2010 The *Drosophila melanogaster* sperm proteome-II (DmSP-II). *J. Proteomics* **73**, 2171–2185. (doi:10.1016/j.jprot.2010.09.002)
29. Yu G, Wang L-G, Han Y, He Q-Y. 2012 clusterProfiler: an R package for comparing biological themes among gene clusters. *Omi. A J. Integr. Biol.* **16**, 284–287. (doi:10.1089/omi.2011.0118)
30. Leiblich A, Marsden L, Gandy C, Corrigan L, Jenkins R, Hamdy F, Wilson C. 2012 Bone morphogenetic protein- and mating-dependent secretory cell growth and migration in the *Drosophila* accessory gland. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **109**, 19292–19297. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1214517109)
31. Corrigan L *et al.* 2014 BMP-regulated exosomes from *Drosophila* male reproductive glands reprogram female behavior. *J. Cell Biol.* **206**, 671–688. (doi:10.1083/jcb.201401072)
32. Mueller JL, Ripoll DR, Aquadro CF, Wolfner MF. 2004 Comparative structural modeling and inference of conserved protein classes in *Drosophila* seminal fluid. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **101**, 13542–7. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0405579101)
33. Begun DJ, Lindfors HA. 2005 Rapid evolution of genomic Acp complement in the *melanogaster* subgroup of *Drosophila*. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **22**, 2010–2021. (doi:10.1093/molbev/msi201)
34. Haerty W *et al.* 2007 Evolution in the fast lane: rapidly evolving sex-related genes in *Drosophila*. *Genetics* **177**, 1321–1335. (doi:10.1534/genetics.107.078865)
35. Swanson WJ, Vacquier VD. 2002 The rapid evolution of reproductive proteins. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **3**, 137–144. (doi:10.1038/nrg733)
36. Wilburn DB, Swanson WJ. 2016 From molecules to mating: Rapid evolution and biochemical studies of reproductive proteins. *J. Proteomics* **135**, 12–25. (doi:10.1016/j.jprot.2015.06.007)
37. Hu Y, Flockhart I, Vinayagam A, Bergwitz C, Berger B, Perrimon N, Mohr SE. 2011 An integrative approach to ortholog prediction for disease-focused and other functional studies. *BMC Bioinformatics* **12**. (doi:10.1186/1471-2105-12-357)
38. Gilany K, Minai-Tehrani A, Savadi-Shiraz E, Rezadoost H, Lakpour N. 2015 Exploring the human seminal plasma proteome: an unexplored gold mine of biomarker for male infertility and male reproduction disorder. *J. Reprod. Infertil.* **16**, 61–71.
39. Fagerberg L *et al.* 2014 Analysis of the human tissue-specific expression by genome-wide integration of transcriptomics and antibody-based proteomics. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* **13**, 397–406. (doi:10.1074/mcp.M113.035600)
40. The Uniprot Consortium. 2019 UniProt: a worldwide hub of protein knowledge. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **47**, D506–D515. (doi:10.1093/nar/gky1049)
41. Mi H, Muruganujan A, Ebert D, Huang X, Thomas PD. 2019 PANTHER version 14: More genomes, a new PANTHER GO-slim and improvements in enrichment analysis tools. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **47**, D419–D426. (doi:10.1093/nar/gky1038)
42. Sirot LK, Wong A, Chapman T, Wolfner MF. 2014 Sexual conflict and seminal fluid proteins: a dynamic landscape of sexual interactions. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* (doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a017533)
43. Wong A, Turchin MC, Wolfner MF, Aquadro CF. 2008 Evidence for positive selection on *Drosophila melanogaster* seminal fluid protease homologs. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **25**, 497–506. (doi:10.1093/molbev/msm270)

44. Aguadé M. 1999 Positive selection drives the evolution of the Acp29AB accessory gland protein in *Drosophila*. *Genetics* **152**, 543–551.
45. Swanson WJ, Yang Z, Wolfner MF, Aquadro CF. 2001 Positive Darwinian selection drives the evolution of several female reproductive proteins in mammals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **98**, 2509–2514. (doi:10.1073/pnas.051605998)
46. Wyckoff GJ, Wang W, Wu C-I. 2000 Rapid evolution of male reproductive genes in the descent of man. *Nature* **403**, 304–309. (doi:10.1038/35002070)
47. Prout T, Bundgaard J. 1977 The population genetics of sperm displacement. *Genetics* **85**, 95–124.
48. Gilbert DG, Richmond RC. 1981 Studies of esterase 6 in *Drosophila melanogaster*. VI. ejaculate competitive abilities of males having null or active alleles. *Genetics* **97**, 85–94.
49. Clark AG, Aguadé M, Prout T, Harshman LG, Langley CH. 1995 Variation in sperm displacement and its association with accessory gland protein loci in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **139**, 189–201.
50. Laturney M, van Eijk R, Billeter J-C. 2018 Last male sperm precedence is modulated by female remating rate in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evol. Lett.* , 1–10. (doi:10.1002/evl3.50)
51. Chen DS, Delbare SYN, White SL, Sitnik J, Chatterjee M, DoBell E, Weiss O, Clark AG, Wolfner MF. 2019 Female genetic contributions to sperm competition in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **212**, 789–800. (doi:10.1534/genetics.119.302284)
52. Chow CY, Wolfner MF, Clark AG. 2013 Large neurological component to genetic differences underlying biased sperm use in *Drosophila. Genetics* **193**, 177–185. (doi:10.1534/genetics.112.146357)
53. Giardina TJ, Clark AG, Fiumera AC. 2017 Estimating mating rates in wild *Drosophila melanogaster* females by decay rates of male reproductive proteins in their reproductive tracts. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* **17**, 1202–1209. (doi:10.1111/1755-0998.12661)
54. Fiumera AC, Dumont BL, Clark AG. 2005 Sperm competitive ability in *Drosophila melanogaster* associated with variation in male reproductive proteins. *Genetics* **169**, 243–257. (doi:10.1534/genetics.104.032870)
55. Fiumera AC, Dumont BL, Clark AG. 2007 Associations between sperm competition and natural variation in male reproductive genes on the third chromosome of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **176**, 1245–1260. (doi:10.1534/genetics.106.064915)
56. Chow CY, Wolfner MF, Clark AG. 2010 The genetic basis for male x female interactions underlying variation in reproductive phenotypes of *Drosophila*. *Genetics* (doi:10.1534/genetics.110.123174)
57. Reinhart M, Carney T, Clark AG, Fiumera AC. 2015 Characterizing male-female interactions using natural genetic variation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J Hered* **106**, 67–79. (doi:10.1093/jhered/esu076)
58. Herndon LA, Wolfner MF. 1995 A *Drosophila* seminal fluid protein, Acp26Aa, stimulates egg laying in females for 1 day after mating. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **92**, 10114–10118. (doi:10.1073/pnas.92.22.10114)
59. Clark AG. 1999 Female x male interactions in *Drosophila* sperm competition. *Science* **283**, 217–220. (doi:10.1126/science.283.5399.217)
60. Bjork A, Starmer WT, Higginson DM, Rhodes CJ, Pitnick S. 2007 Complex interactions with females and rival males limit the evolution of sperm offence and defence. *Proc. R. Soc. London B* **274**, 1779–1788. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.0293)
61. Zhang R, Clark AG, Fiumera AC. 2013 Natural genetic variation in male reproductive genes contributes to nontransitivity of sperm competitive ability in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Mol. Ecol.* **22**, 1400–1415. (doi:10.1111/mec.12113)
62. Kalb JM, Dibenedetto AJ, Wolfner MF. 1993 Probing the function of *Drosophila melanogaster* accessory glands by directed cell ablation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **90**, 8093–8097. (doi:10.1073/pnas.90.17.8093)
63. Xue L, Noll M. 2000 *Drosophila* female sexual behavior induced by sterile males showing copulation complementation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **97**, 3272–3275. (doi:10.1073/pnas.97.7.3272)
64. Avila FW, Ram KR, Bloch Qazi MC, Wolfner MF. 2010 Sex peptide is required for the efficient release of stored sperm in mated *Drosophila females*. *Genetics* **186**, 595–600. (doi:10.1534/genetics.110.119735)
65. Neubaum DM, Wolfner MF. 1999 Mated *Drosophila melanogaster* females require a seminal fluid protein, Acp36DE, to store sperm efficiently. *Genetics* **153**, 845–57.
66. Avila FW, Cohen AB, Ameerudeen FS, Duneau D, Suresh S, Mattei AL, Wolfner MF. 2015 Retention of ejaculate by *Drosophila melanogaster* females requires the male-derived mating plug protein PEBme. *Genetics* **200**, 1171–1179. (doi:10.1534/genetics.115.176669)
67. Chapman T, Neubaum DM, Wolfner MF, Partridge L. 2000 The role of male accessory gland protein Acp36DE in sperm competition in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **267**, 1097–1105. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2000.1114)
68. Wong A, Albright SN, Giebel JD, Ravi Ram K, Ji S, Fiumera AC, Wolfner MF, Ram KR. 2008 A role for Acp29AB, a predicted seminal fluid lectin, in female sperm storage in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **180**, 921–931. (doi:10.1534/genetics.108.092106)

69. Fricke C, Wigby S, Hobbs R, Chapman T. 2009 The benefits of male ejaculate sex peptide transfer in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Evol. Biol.* **22**, 275–286. (doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01638.x)
70. Liu H, Kubli E. 2003 Sex-peptide is the molecular basis of the sperm effect in *Drosophila melanogaster. Proc. Natl. Acad.* **100**, 9929–9933. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1631700100)
71. Chapman T, Bangham J, Vinti G, Seifried B, Lung O, Wolfner MF, Smith HK, Partridge L. 2003 The sex peptide of *Drosophila melanogaster*: Female post-mating responses analyzed by using RNA interference. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **100**, 9923–9928. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1631635100)
72. Fricke C, Green D, Mills WE, Chapman T. 2013 Age-dependent female responses to a male ejaculate signal alter demographic opportunities for selection. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **280**, 20130428–20130428. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.0428)
73. Fricke C, Chapman T. 2017 Variation in the post-mating fitness landscape in fruit flies. *J. Evol. Biol.* **30**, 1250–1261. (doi:10.1111/jeb.13090)
74. Ravi Ram K, Wolfner MF, Ram KR. 2007 Sustained post-mating response in *Drosophila melanogaster* requires multiple seminal fluid proteins. *PLoS Genet.* **3**, e238. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.0030238)
75. Ravi Ram K, Wolfner MF. 2009 A network of interactions among seminal proteins underlies the long-term postmating response in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 15384–15389. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0902923106)
76. Findlay GD, Sitnik JL, Wang W, Aquadro CF, Clark NL, Wolfner MF. 2014 Evolutionary rate covariation identifies new members of a protein network required for *Drosophila melanogaster* female post-mating responses. *PLoS Genet.* **10**, e1004108. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004108)
77. Sitnik JL, Gligorov D, Maeda RK, Karch F, Wolfner MF. 2016 The female post-mating response requires genes expressed in the secondary cells of the male accessory gland in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **202**, 1029–1041. (doi:10.1534/genetics.115.181644)
78. Gligorov D, Sitnik JL, Maeda RK, Wolfner MF, Karch F. 2013 A novel function for the hox gene Abd-B in the male accessory gland regulates the long-term female post-mating response in *Drosophila*. *PLoS Genet.* **9**, e1003395. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1003395)
79. Avila FW, Wolfner MF. 2009 Acp36DE is required for uterine conformational changes in mated *Drosophila* females. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 15796–15800. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0904029106)
80. Castillo DM, Moyle LC. 2014 Intraspecific sperm competition genes enforce post-mating species barriers in *Drosophila*. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **281**, 20142050–20142050. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.2050)
81. Hopkins BR, Sepil I, Bonham S, Miller T, Charles PD, Fischer R, Kessler BM, Wilson C, Wigby S. 2019 BMP signaling inhibition in *Drosophila* secondary cells remodels the seminal proteome and self and rival ejaculate functions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* , 201914491. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1914491116)
82. Mueller JL, Linklater JR, Ram KR, Chapman T, Wolfner MF. 2008 Targeted gene deletion and phenotypic analysis of the *Drosophila melanogaster* seminal fluid protease inhibitor Acp62F. *Genetics* **178**, 1605–1614. (doi:10.1534/genetics.107.083766)
83. Dhole S, Servedio MR. 2014 Sperm competition and the evolution of seminal fluid composition. *Evolution (N. Y).* **68**, 3008–3019. (doi:10.1111/evo.12477)
84. Smith DT, Sirot LK, Wolfner MF, Hosken DJ, Wedell N. 2012 The consequences of genetic variation in sex peptide expression levels for egg laying and retention in females. *Heredity (Edinb).* **109**, 222–225. (doi:10.1038/hdy.2012.32)
85. Hihara F. 1981 Effects of male accessory gland secretion on oviposition and remating in females of *Drospohila melanogaster*. *Zool. Mag.* **90**, 307–316.
86. Reinhardt K, Naylor R, Siva-Jothy MT. 2011 Male mating rate is constrained by seminal fluid availability in bedbugs, *Cimex lectularius. PLoS One* **6**, e22082. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0022082)
87. Wigby S, Sirot LK, Linklater JR, Buehner N, Calboli FCF, Bretman A, Wolfner MF, Chapman T. 2009 Seminal fluid protein allocation and male reproductive success. *Curr. Biol.* **19**, 751–757. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2009.03.036)
88. Hollis B, Koppik M, Wensing KU, Ruhmann H, Genzoni E, Erkosar B, Kawecki TJ, Fricke C, Keller L. 2019 Sexual conflict drives male manipulation of female postmating responses in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* , 201821386. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1821386116)
89. Parker GA, Ball MA, Stockley P, Gage MJG. 1997 Sperm competition games: A prospective analysis of risk assessment. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **264**, 1793–1802. (doi:10.1098/rspb.1997.0249)
90. Kelly CD, Jennions MD. 2011 Sexual selection and sperm quantity: meta-analyses of strategic ejaculation. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* (doi:10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00175.x)
91. Dewsbury DA. 1982 Ejaculate cost and male choice. *Am. Nat.* **119**, 601–610. (doi:10.1086/283938)
92. Garbaczewska M, Billeter JC, Levine JD. 2013 *Drosophila melanogaster* males increase the number of sperm in their ejaculate when perceiving rival males. *J Insect Physiol* **59**, 306–310. (doi:10.1016/j.jinsphys.2012.08.016)

93. Hopkins BR *et al.* 2019 Divergent allocation of sperm and the seminal proteome along a competition gradient in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* , 201906149. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1906149116)
94. Fedorka KM, Winterhalter WE, Ware B. 2011 Perceived sperm competition intensity influences seminal fluid protein production prior to courtship and mating. *Evolution* **65**, 584–90. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.01141.x)
95. Sirot LK, Wolfner MF, Wigby S. 2011 Protein-specific manipulation of ejaculate composition in response to female mating status in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 9922–9926. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1100905108)
96. Wigby S, Perry JC, Kim Y-H, Sirot LK. 2016 Developmental environment mediates male seminal protein investment in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Funct. Ecol.* **30**, 410–419. (doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12515)
97. Khan Z, Ford MJ, Cusanovich DA, Mitrano A, Pritchard JK, Gilad Y. 2013 Primate transcript and protein expression levels evolve under compensatory selection pressures. *Science* **342**, 1100–1104. (doi:10.1126/science.1242379)
98. Mohorianu I, Bretman A, Smith DT, Fowler EK, Dalmay T, Chapman T. 2017 Genomic responses to the socio-sexual environment in male *Drosophila melanogaster* exposed to conspecific rivals. *RNA* **23**, 1048–1059. (doi:10.1261/rna.059246.116)
99. Mohorianu I, Fowler EK, Dalmay T, Chapman T. 2018 Control of seminal fluid protein expression via regulatory hubs in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **285**. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2018.1681)
100. Perry JC, Sirot L, Wigby S. 2013 The seminal symphony: how to compose an ejaculate. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **28**, 414–422. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2013.03.005)
101. Hodgson DJ, Hosken DJ. 2006 Sperm competition promotes the exploitation of rival ejaculates. *J. Theor. Biol.* **243**, 230–234. (doi:Doi 10.1016/J.Jtbi.2006.06.024)
102. Heifetz Y, Lung O, Frongillo EA, Wolfner MF. 2000 The *Drosophila* seminal fluid protein Acp26Aa stimulates release of oocytes by the ovary. *Curr. Biol.* **10**, 99–102. (doi:10.1016/S0960-9822(00)00288-8)
103. Rubinstein CD, Wolfner MF. 2013 *Drosophila* seminal protein ovulin mediates ovulation through female octopamine neuronal signaling. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* (doi:10.1073/pnas.1220018110)
104. Gioti A, Wigby S, Wertheim B, Schuster E, Martinez P, Pennington CJ, Partridge L, Chapman T. 2012 Sex peptide of *Drosophila melanogaster* males is a global regulator of reproductive processes in females. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **279**, 4423–4432. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.1634)
105. Peng J, Chen S, Büsser S, Liu H, Honegger T, Kubli E, Busser S. 2005 Gradual release of sperm bound sex-peptide controls female postmating behavior in *Drosophila*. *Curr. Biol.* **15**, 207–213. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2005.01.034)
106. Nguyen TTX, Moehring AJ. 2018 A male's seminal fluid increases later competitors' productivity. *J. Evol. Biol.* **31**, 1572–1581. (doi:10.1111/jeb.13352)
107. Misra S, Wolfner MF. 2020 The *Drosophila* seminal Sex Peptide can associate with rival as well as own sperm and provide function for SP in polyandrous females. *bioRxiv* (doi:10.1101/2020.02.20.958108)
108. Chapman T, Liddle LF, Kalb JM, Wolfner MF, Partridge L. 1995 Cost of mating in *Drosophila melanogaster* females is mediated by male accessory gland products. *Nature* **373**, 241–244. (doi:10.1038/373241a0)
109. Wigby S, Chapman T. 2005 Sex peptide causes mating costs in female *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Curr. Biol.* **15**, 316–21. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2005.01.051)
110. Fricke C, Bretman A, Chapman T. 2010 Female nutritional status determines the magnitude and sign of responses to a male ejaculate signal in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Evol. Biol.* **23**, 157–165. (doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01882.x)
111. Smith DT, Clarke NVE, Boone JM, Fricke C, Chapman T. 2017 Sexual conflict over remating interval is modulated by the sex peptide pathway. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **284**, 20162394. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.2394)
112. Lung O, Tram U, Finnerty CM, Eipper-Mains MA, Kalb JM, Wolfner MF. 2002 The *Drosophila melanogaster* seminal fluid protein Acp62F is a protease inhibitor that is toxic upon ectopic expression. *Genetics* **160**, 211–224.
113. Mueller JL, Page JL, Wolfner MF. 2007 An ectopic expression screen reveals the protective and toxic effects of *Drosophila* seminal fluid proteins. *Genetics* **175**, 777–783. (doi:10.1534/genetics.106.065318)
114. Civetta A, Clark AG. 2000 Correlated effects of sperm competition and postmating female mortality. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **97**, 13162–13165. (doi:10.1073/pnas.230305397)
115. Edward DA, Stockley P, Hosken DJ. 2015 Sexual Conflict and Sperm Competition. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* **7**, a017707. (doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a017707)
116. Kokko H, Jennions MD. 2014 The relationship between sexual selection and sexual conflict. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* **6**, a017517–a017517. (doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a017517)
117. Firman RC, Gasparini C, Manier MK, Pizzari T. 2017 Postmating Female Control: 20 Years of Cryptic Female Choice. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **32**, 368–382. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2017.02.010)

118. Lüpold S, Pitnick S, Berben KS, Blengini CS, Belote JM, Manier MK. 2013 Female mediation of competitive fertilization success in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **110**, 10693–10698. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1300954110)
119. Bertram MJ, Neubaum DM, Wolfner MF. 1996 Localization of the *Drosophila* male accessory gland protein Acp36DE in the mated female suggests a role in sperm storage. *Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **26**, 971–980. (doi:10.1016/S0965-1748(96)00064-1)
120. Lee K, Daubnerová I, Isaac RE, Zhang C, Choi S, Chung J, Kim Y. 2015 A neuronal pathway that controls sperm ejection and storage in female *Drosophila*. *Curr. Biol.* **25**, 790–797. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2015.01.050)
121. Park M, Wolfner MF. 1995 Male and female cooperate in the prohormone-like processing of a *Drosophila melanogaster* seminal fluid protein. *Dev. Biol.* **171**, 694–702. (doi:10.1006/dbio.1995.1315)
122. LaFlamme BA, Ravi Ram K, Wolfner MF. 2012 The *Drosophila melanogaster* seminal fluid protease "seminase" regulates proteolytic and post-mating reproductive processes. *PLoS Genet.* **8**, e1002435. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1002435)
123. LaFlamme BA, Avila FW, Michalski K, Wolfner MF. 2014 A *Drosophila* protease cascade member, seminal metalloprotease-1, is activated stepwise by male factors and requires female factors for full activity. *Genetics* **196**, 1117–1129. (doi:10.1534/genetics.113.160101)
124. Avila FW, Wolfner MF. 2017 Cleavage of the *Drosophila* seminal protein Acp36DE in mated females enhances its sperm storage activity. *J. Insect Physiol.* **101**, 66–72. (doi:10.1016/j.jinsphys.2017.06.015)
125. Ravi Ram K, Sirot LK, Wolfner MF. 2006 Predicted seminal astacin-like protease is required for processing of reproductive proteins in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **103**, 18674–18679. (doi:Doi 10.1073/Pnas.0606228103)
126. Tsuda M, Peyre JB, Asano T, Aigaki T. 2015 Visualizing molecular functions and cross-species activity of sex-peptide in *Drosophila*. *Genetics* **200**, 1161–1169. (doi:10.1534/genetics.115.177550)
127. Tsuda M, Aigaki T. 2016 Evolution of sex-peptide in *Drosophila*. *Fly (Austin).* **10**, 172–177. (doi:10.1080/19336934.2016.1193655)
128. Civetta A, Singh RS. 2007 Rapid evolution of sex-related genes. In *Selective Sweep*, pp. 13–21. Springer. (doi:10.1007/0-387-27651-3_2)
129. Harrison PW, Wright AE, Zimmer F, Dean R, Montgomery SH, Pointer MA, Mank JE. 2015 Sexual selection drives evolution and rapid turnover of male gene expression. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 4393–4398. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1501339112)
130. den Boer SP a, Baer B, Boomsma JJ. 2010 Seminal fluid mediates ejaculate competition in social insects. *Science* **327**, 1506–9. (doi:10.1126/science.1184709)
131. Holman L. 2009 *Drosophila melanogaster* seminal fluid can protect the sperm of other males. *Funct. Ecol.* **23**, 180–186. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2008.01509.x)
132. Sepil I *et al.* 2020 Male reproductive aging arises via multifaceted mating-dependent sperm and seminal proteome declines, but is postponable in *Drosophila. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **In press**, 202009053. (doi:10.1073/pnas.2009053117)
133. Samanta L, Parida R, Dias TR, Agarwal A. 2018 The enigmatic seminal plasma: A proteomics insight from ejaculation to fertilization. *Reprod. Biol. Endocrinol.* **16**, 1–11. (doi:10.1186/s12958-018-0358-6)
134. Lüpold S, Manier MK, Ala-Honkola O, Belote JM, Pitnick S. 2011 Male *Drosophila melanogaster* adjust ejaculate size based on female mating status, fecundity, and age. *Behav. Ecol.* **22**, 184–191. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arq193)
135. Bretman A, Westmancoat JD, Gage MJGG, Chapman T. 2011 Males use multiple, redundant cues to detect mating rivals. *Curr. Biol.* **21**, 617–622. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.03.008)
136. Bretman A, Fricke C, Hetherington P, Stone R, Chapman T. 2010 Exposure to rivals and plastic responses to sperm competition in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Behav. Ecol.* **21**, 317–321. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arp189)
137. Bretman A, Westmancoat JD, Chapman T. 2013 Male control of mating duration following exposure to rivals in fruitflies. *J. Insect Physiol.* **59**, 824–827. (doi:10.1016/j.jinsphys.2013.05.011)
138. Rouse J, Bretman A. 2016 Exposure time to rivals and sensory cues affect how quickly males respond to changes in sperm competition threat. *Anim. Behav.* **122**, 1–8. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.09.011)
139. McDowall LS, Rouse J, Sait SM, Bretman A. 2019 Social cues of future sperm competition received during development affect learning in adult male fruit flies, *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Insect Behav.* (doi:10.1007/s10905-019-09712-1)
140. Tayler TD, Pacheco DA, Hergarden AC, Murthy M, Anderson DJ. 2012 A neuropeptide circuit that coordinates sperm transfer and copulation duration in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **109**, 20697–20702. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1218246109)
141. Ishimoto H, Sakai T, Kitamoto T. 2009 Ecdysone signaling regulates the formation of long-term courtship memory in adult *Drosophila melanogaste*r. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106**, 6381–6386. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0810213106)

142. Leiblich A *et al.* 2019 Mating induces switch from hormone-dependent to hormone-independent steroid receptor–mediated growth in *Drosophila* secondary cells. *PLOS Biol.* **17**, e3000145. (doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000145)
143. Herndon L., Chapman T, Kalb J., Lewin S, Partridge L, Wolfner M. 1997 Mating and hormonal triggers regulate accessory gland gene expression in male *Drosophila. J. Insect Physiol.* **43**, 1117–1123. (doi:10.1016/S0022-1910(97)00062-0)
144. Sharma V, Pandey AK, Kumar A, Misra S, Gupta HPK, Gupta S, Singh A, Buehner NA, Ravi Ram K. 2017 Functional male accessory glands and fertility in *Drosophila* require novel ecdysone receptor. *PLOS Genet.* **13**, e1006788. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1006788)
145. Yapici N, Kim Y-JYJY-J, Ribeiro C, Dickson BJBJ. 2007 A receptor that mediates the post-mating switch in *Drosophila* reproductive behaviour. *Nature* **451**, 33–37. (doi:10.1038/nature06483)
146. Pilpel N, Nezer I, Applebaum SW, Heifetz Y. 2008 Mating-increases trypsin in female *Drosophila* hemolymph. *Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **38**, 320. (doi:10.1016/j.ibmb.2007.11.010)

Tables

Table 1

PANTHER Protein Classes	*D. mel* Over / Under	*D. mel* Fold Enrichment	*D. mel* FDR corrected p-value	Human Direction same? yes / no	Human Significance same? yes / no	Human Over / Under	Human Fold Enrichment	Human FDR corrected p-value
protease inhibitor (PC00191)	+	11.33	**0.000**	Yes	Yes	+	4.5	**0.000**
defense/immunity protein (PC00090)	+	16.8	**0.000**	No	No	-	0.73	0.217
protease (PC00190)	+	2.99	**0.000**	Yes	Yes	+	2.48	**0.000**
lipase (PC00143)	+	8.02	**0.000**	Yes	No	+	1.49	0.493
serine protease (PC00203)	+	4.13	**0.000**	Yes	Yes	+	2.23	**0.000**
hydrolase (PC00121)	+	3.17	**0.000**	Yes	Yes	+	2.65	**0.000**
protein-binding activity modulator (PC00095)	+	2.81	**0.006**	Yes	Yes	+	1.88	**0.000**
protein modifying enzyme (PC00260)	+	1.81	**0.038**	Yes	Yes	+	1.71	**0.000**
apolipoprotein (PC00052)	+	13.33	**0.042**	Yes	No	+	1.68	0.523
gene-specific transcriptional regulator (PC00264)	-	< 0.01	**0.002**	Yes	Yes	-	0.15	**0.000**
nucleic acid binding protein (PC00171)	-	0.09	**0.004**	Yes	Yes	-	0.52	**0.000**
DNA-binding transcription factor (PC00218)	-	< 0.01	**0.004**	Yes	Yes	-	0.14	**0.000**
RNA binding protein (PC00031)	-	0.11	**0.041**	Yes	Yes	-	0.36	**0.000**
transporter (PC00227)	-	0.19	**0.045**	Yes	No	-	0.88	0.616

Figure and table captions

Table 1. Significantly overrepresented and underrepresented *D. melanogaster* Sfp classes, and matched human Sfp classes, determined using PANTHER [41]. P-values are FDR (false discovery rate) corrected. We have indicated whether the direction and significance of enrichment matches between the species.

Figure 1. Protein class categorization of *D. melanogaster* and human seminal proteomes using PANTHER [41]. Classes in the pie charts are ordered the same as in the legend, clockwise from the top. Values in each segment indicate the number of Sfps classed in that category. The grey and white outer donut indicates the number of Sfps that have high or moderate DIOPT hits [37] to the other species.