GRable version 1.0: A software tool for site-specific glycoform analysis with improved MS1-based glycopeptide detection with parallel clustering and confidence evaluation with MS2 information

Chiaki Nagai-Okatani,[*,†,‡] *Daisuke Tominaga,*[†,‡,||] *Azusa Tomioka,*[†,‡] *Hiroaki Sakaue,*[‡] *Norio Goda,*[§,**]

Shigeru Ko,[§,**] *Atsushi Kuno,*[‡] *Hiroyuki Kaji* [*,†,¶]

[‡] Molecular and Cellular Glycoproteomics Research Group, Cellular and Molecular Biotechnology Research Institute, National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST), Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8565, Japan

[§] Department of Systems Medicine, Keio University School of Medicine, Shinjuku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan

[¶] Institute for Glyco-core Research (iGCORE), Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa, Nagoya, Aichi 464-8601, Japan

[||] Present address: Education and Research Center for Pharmacy, Meiji Pharmaceutical University, Kiyose, Tokyo 204-8588, Japan

[**] Present address: Center for Preventive Medicine, Keio University, Shinjuku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan

19   *Correspondence

20   E-mail: chiaki-okatani@aist.go.jp (C.N.-O.); kaji.hiroyuki.j8@f.mail.nagoya-u.ac.jp (H.K.)

RUNNING TITLE

25   This article contains supplemental data.

KEYWORDS

28   glycoproteomics, site-specific glycoform, glycan heterogeneity, retention time, software

ABBREVIATIONS

Glyco-RIDGE, Glycan heterogeneity-based Relational IDentification of Glycopeptide signals on Elution

profile; hAGP, serum α1-acid glycoprotein; HILIC, hydrophilic interaction chromatography; HPT,

haptoglobin; HL-60, human promyelocytic leukemia-60; IGOT, isotope-coded glycosylation site-specific

tagging; LC/MS, liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry; MALDI-TOF, matrix-assisted laser

desorption/ionization time-of-flight; mgf, Mascot generic format; MS, mass spectrometry; PNGase F,

peptide-N-glycosidase F; rCM, reduction and carbamidomethylation; RT, retention time; TFA,

trifluoroacetic acid

ABSTRACT

High-throughput intact glycopeptide analysis is crucial for elucidating the physiological and pathological status of the glycans attached to each glycoprotein. Mass spectrometry-based glycoproteomic methods are challenging because of the diversity and heterogeneity of glycan structures. Therefore, we have developed an MS1-based site-specific glycoform analysis method named "Glycan heterogeneity-based Relational IDentification of Glycopeptide signals on Elution profile (Glyco-RIDGE)" for a more comprehensive analysis. This method detects glycopeptide signals as a cluster based on the mass and chromatographic properties of glycopeptides and then searches for each combination of core peptides and glycan compositions by matching their mass and retention time differences. Here we developed a novel browser-based software named GRable for semi-automated Glyco-RIDGE analysis with significant improvements in glycopeptide detection algorithms, including "parallel clustering." This unique function improved the comprehensiveness of glycopeptide detection and allowed the analysis to focus on specific glycan structures, such as pauci-mannose. The other notable improvement is evaluating the "confidence level" of the GRable results, especially using MS2 information. This function facilitated reduced misassignment of the core peptide and glycan composition and improved the interpretation of the results. Additional improved points are: "correction function" for accurate monoisotopic peak picking; one-to-one correspondence of clusters and core peptides even for multiply sialylated glycopeptides; and "inter-cluster analysis" function for understanding the reason for detected but unmatched clusters. The significance of these improvements was demonstrated using purified and crude glycoprotein samples, showing that GRable allowed site-specific glycoform analysis of intact sialylated glycoproteins on a large scale and in depth. Therefore, this software will help to analyze the status and changes in glycans to obtain biological and clinical insights into protein

60   glycosylation by complementing the comprehensiveness of MS2-based glycoproteomics. GRable can run

61   freely online using a web browser via the GlyCosmos Portal (https://glycosmos.org/grable).

INTRODUCTION

Protein glycosylation is a common and complex post-translational modification in eukaryotes (1) that plays pivotal roles in various biological processes (2). This post-translational modification regulates the glycoprotein function and localization by modulating their tertiary structures and interactions with other molecules (2). However, revealing the glycan structure-function relationship is challenging because glycan structures are highly diverse and heterogeneous and differ in organisms, cells, proteins, and the attached sites (3). Furthermore, the post-translational modification alters the cell state change through differentiation, carcinogenesis, infection, nutrition, medicine, and stimuli (3). Glycans are naturally heterogeneous, and elucidating their function of glycans by uncovering the state and changes in glycans with heterogeneities at each level is important. Heterogeneous levels include the micro (glycan variation of one glycosite), macro (with or without glycosylation of one glycosite), and meta (glycan variation of the entire glycoprotein molecule) levels, which are important features responsible for the presence of different proteoforms (4).

Although current improvements in mass spectrometry (MS) have made it possible to perform an in-depth structural analysis of glycopeptide peptide backbones and glycomes, elucidating the glycan compositions of specific sites for proteins with multiple glycosylated sites (i.e., micro-heterogeneity) is challenging (5). First, the glycan compositions of each site must be determined to estimate the site-specific glycoforms. For this purpose, analysis of only glycomes and deglycosylated peptides is insufficient; thus, intact glycopeptides must be analyzed directly. Current standard glycoproteomic approaches rely on MS2 spectra to identify site-specific glycoforms (6). For MS2-based glycoproteomics, the commercial software Byonic (7) is often used (6) and many in-house software programs have been developed (8–20). However, these MS2-based methods have a critical problem in that they require glycopeptide fragmentation, leading to lower detection sensitivity than the corresponding naked peptides. The decreased detection sensitivity

results from the lower ionization efficiency of glycopeptides, which is notable, especially for sialylated

glycopeptides because of their negative properties. In addition, glycan heterogeneity decreases the

abundance of each glycopeptide. Therefore, in some MS1 spectra, many signals are not selected for MS2

analysis, and frequently, MS2 spectra do not contain sufficient information for confident glycopeptide

identification.

To overcome this limitation, we developed an MS1-based glycoproteomic approach named

"Glycan heterogeneity-based Relational IDentification of Glycopeptide signals on Elution profile" (Glyco-

RIDGE) (21), which was first introduced in 2015 (22). One limitation of MS1-based approaches is to

"estimate" combinations of core peptides and glycans, having a possibility of misassignment because of

isobaric combination issues caused by adducts and core peptide modifications observed even in MS2-based

approaches (23, 24). To minimize such errors, a general workflow of the Glyco-RIDGE analysis using

liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry (LC/MS) data of glycopeptide samples requires information on

core peptides present in the analyte, as well as presumed glycans (Figure 1); these sequences and N-

glycosites can be identified by isotope-coded glycosylation site-specific tagging (IGOT)-LC/MS/MS (25,

26), in which N-glycosites are specifically labeled by peptide-N-glycosidase F (PNGase F)-mediated

incorporation of a stable isotope tag (^{18}O). In the Glyco-RIDGE workflow, MS1 signals derived from

glycopeptides with the same core peptide are assigned as a cluster in the LC/MS data based on their mass

differences and closeness of retention times (RTs). Then, the combination of the core peptide and glycan

composition for these glycopeptides is annotated by matching the observed accurate glycopeptide mass

with the sum of the masses of the pre-identified core peptide candidates and presumed glycans. A notable

feature of Glyco-RIDGE is the detection of glycopeptide signals based only on MS1 data, in contrast to

other MS1-based approaches that employ MS2 data to identify at least one glycopeptide for each core

peptide (27–31). With this feature, the Glyco-RIDGE method is expected to achieve a more high-sensitive

and comprehensive analysis of protein glycosylation than current fragmentation-dependent identification

methods. Notably, a previous study (32) has demonstrated that among the MS2 spectra assigned using the

Glyco-RIDGE method and Byonic search, the ratio of the same assignment was quite high (349/353 =

98.9%), demonstrating that the reliability of this method is similar to that of Byonic.

The feasibility and usefulness of the Glyco-RIDGE method have been demonstrated using in-house

software by applying it to the analysis of specific glycan motifs (i.e., Lewis X and polylactosamine)-

containing glycopeptides in complex glycoprotein mixtures after the removal of sialic acids (22, 32). Then,

this method has been used also for site-specific glycoform analysis of intact (i.e., sialylated) glycopeptides

(33–36), revealing site-specific "glycostem" and "glycoleaf" features (36). However, the prototype software

has several limitations. One limitation was the misfinding of monoisotopic signals from MS1 data, causing

a decreased number of detected glycopeptide signals. Regarding clustering, glycopeptides with the same

core peptide and different numbers of sialic acid residues were detected as discrete clusters, impairing the

detection and interpretation of microheterogeneity. Another issue was the presence of glycopeptide clusters

that were detected but not assigned, which might result from adducts or peptide modifications; however, the

reason is unclear and thereby remains to be improved. In addition, selecting the most plausible match for

each glycopeptide cluster as the final assignment and evaluating the assignments for each glycopeptide were

performed manually by searching the MS2 spectra, which is time-consuming. Accordingly, it is also

difficult to optimize search parameter settings and acceptance criteria while balancing the coverage and

accuracy of the analysis, which is an important consideration also in MS2-based approaches (37).

The present study introduces a novel software named "GRable" to semi-automatically execute the

Glyco-RIDGE analysis with some technical improvements for the above issues. The notable features are

"parallel clustering" for efficient and comprehensive finding of glycopeptide clusters and adding a Selection

step for selecting and evaluating assignments using MS2 information as a "confidence level." Additional

improved points are: "correction function" for accurate monoisotopic peak picking; one-to-one

correspondence of clusters and core peptides even for multiply sialylated glycopeptides; and "inter-cluster

analysis" function for understanding the reason for detected but unmatched clusters; To demonstrate the

feasibility and utility of this software, we analyzed MS data obtained with intact glycopeptides prepared

from human serum α1-acid glycoprotein (hAGP), a glyco-biomarker candidate for liver fibrosis (38), as a

model of targeted analysis. In addition, we used data on glycopeptides obtained from human promyelocytic

leukemia-60 (HL-60) cell lysates (32), as a crude sample model.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

GRable version 1.0 requires the following four files: LC/MS data of glycopeptides after

deconvolution (.mzML); a core peptide list (.xlsx); a glycan point list (.xlsx); and LC/MS/MS data for

glycopeptides (.mgf) (Figure 2). Details of the input files and their preparation are described below and in

the user manual (Document S1). Note that this version of GRable is guaranteed only for Thermo Fisher

Scientific data.

Preparation of hAGP glycopeptide samples

To prepare large-scale analytes for repeated verification, 5 mg of freeze-dried hAGP (Sigma-

Aldrich, St.Louis, MO, USA) was dissolved in Milli-Q water (500 μL) and the aliquot was denatured with

0.1% Rapigest (Waters, Milford, MA, USA) in 50 mM Tris-HCl, reduced with dithiothreitol (Fujifilm

Wako, Osaka, Japan), alkylated with iodoacetamide (Fujifilm Wako), and digested with Lys-C (1/200

weight of protein; Fujifilm Wako) and sequencing grade modified trypsin (1/100 weight of protein;

Promega, Madison, WI, USA) at 37 °C overnight in 0.1 % Rapigest. After digestion, Rapigest was cleaved

by acidification with 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid (TFA; Fujifilm Wako). Glycopeptides from hAGP tryptic

digests were then captured using an Amide-80 column (TSK-gel Amide-80, 2 × 50 mm; TOSOH, Tokyo,

Japan) equilibrated with 75% acetonitrile (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany)/0.1% TFA, and eluted

isocratically with 50 % acetonitrile/0.1% TFA after washing.

LC/MS/MS analysis of hAGP glycopeptide samples

Glycopeptides were analyzed using an LC-electrospray ionization-MS system equipped with a

nanoflow LC system (UltiMate-3000; Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) and a tandem mass

spectrometer (Orbitrap Fusion Tribrid mass spectrometer; Thermo Fisher Scientific). Glycopeptides were

trapped on a C18 cartridge column (Acclaim PepMap100 C18, 0.3 mm I.D. × 5 mm; Thermo Fisher

Scientific) and separated on a C18 tip column (75 μm I.D. × 15 cm, 3 μm particle; Nikkyo Technos, Tokyo,

Japan) using 2–36% acetonitrile/0.1% formic acid (Fujifilm Wako) gradient (90 min) at a flow rate of 300

nL/min. The ionization voltage was 2.0 kV (positive), and the temperature of the ion transfer tube was

275 °C. Data were acquired using the data-dependent mode (cycle time: 2.5 s) with internal mass calibration

(lock mass) at 445.12003. The mass range was 377–2,000 m/z (MS1) and 135–2,000 m/z (MS2). The mass

resolutions were 120,000 (MS1, Orbitrap) and 15,000 (MS2, Orbitrap). The fragmentation mode was high-

energy collision-induced dissociation with stepped collision energies of 25, 30, and 35%. The acquired raw

data file was deconvoluted using the Xtract of Proteome Discoverer (ver. 2.4, Thermo Fisher Scientific),

and exported as an mzML file for GRable analysis.

IGOT-LC/MS/MS analysis of hAGP glycopeptide samples

IGOT-LC/MS analysis was performed for core peptide identification as reported previously (25,

26). Glycopeptides were treated with PNGase F (Takara Bio, Shiga, Japan) in 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.5,

prepared with $H_2^{18}O$ (isotope purity: 95%; Taiyo Nippon Sanso, Tokyo, Japan) at 37 °C overnight.

Deglycosylated peptides (IGOT peptides) were analyzed before glycopeptide analysis using LC/MS/MS

under the same conditions as for the glycopeptide sample.

Preparation of a core peptide list

The format of the core peptide list required by the software was fixed and created in a manner

similar to that used in this study (Data S1). The details of the preparation are documented in the manual

(Document S1, Section 4). Items minimally required for preparing a core peptide list are the calculated mass,

retention time of each peptide and at least one peptide identifier such as CP (core peptide) number. These

information are used to detect the combinations of glycopeptides and core peptides by calculating the mass

differences within the limited RT range in the Matching step. For the identification of core peptides, IGOT-

LC/MS analysis, as described above, is recommended to confirm their *N*-glycosylations, but it is possible

to list the peptides identified by proteomic analysis. Confirmation of the presence of core peptides for

glycoproteins is crucial for crude samples. For the analysis of a highly purified glycoprotein, it is also possible

to list the peptides predicted based on protease digestion patterns.

For hAGP, the raw data acquired by IGOT-LC/MS/MS were converted to mgf using Mascot

Distiller (ver. 2.7.0; Matrix Science, Boston, MA, USA), and searched using Mascot (ver. 2.5.1; Matrix

Science) using a human protein sequence file (SwissProt_UniProtKB_isoform; downloaded in April 2019;

entry: 42,431). The search parameter settings were as follows: enzyme: trypsin (full or semi); missed

cleavage: 2; mass tolerance: 7 ppm (MS1) and 0.02 Da (MS2); fixed modification: carbamidomethyl (C);

variable modifications: Gln to pyro-Glu (peptide N-term, Q), ammonia-loss (peptide N-term,

carbamidomethyl C), oxidation (M), and Delta: H(-1)N(-1)18O(1)(N); and target false discovery rate: 1%.

Mascot search results with a peptide rank of 1 and peptide expectation value of <0.05 were selected.

Matched sequences containing IGOT modifications at Asn on the consensus sequence for *N*-glycosylation

(Asn-Xaa-[Ser/Thr]; Xaa is not Pro) obtained using trypsin (full) and trypsin (semi) were combined. The

resulting glycopeptide list was used to create a core peptide list for GRable analysis. To ensure the

comprehensive analysis, hAGP peptide sequences that were not identified in the data used here but found

in other analyses were manually added to the list with observed or predicted RTs (Data S1). That is, five

core peptides with predicted hAGP sequences were added to the list, and three core peptides were matched

with glycopeptides as clusters.

205   It is noteworthy that considering oxidized Met in the deglycopeptide search for improving

coverage may cause incidental mismatching for one glycopeptide; for example, oxidation of the peptide and

HexNAc and Hex and carbamidomethylation of the peptide (23). However, in the Glyco-RIDGE method,

such a misassignment is removed at the selection step because the core peptide of each glycopeptide is

evaluated as a glycopeptide cluster. Similarly, carbamidomethylation of the Met within a core peptide,

which was not considered in the peptide list preparation and has the possibility of mismatching (23), should

be omitted from the selection results. It should also be noted that the Mascot search for O-glycosylation of

IGOT-treated N-deglycopeptides may be useful for evaluating the possibility of misinterpretation of the

GRable results of site-specific N-glycoform analysis because this software is intended to assign

glycopeptides with single glycosite.

Preparation of a glycan composition list

217   The format of the core peptide list required by the software was fixed and created in a manner

similar to that used in this study (Data S2). The details of the preparation are documented in the manual

(Document S1). In the Matching setting, users can define the permissible glycan compositions (i.e., the type

and number of each glycan unit). The default settings were as follows: Hex: 0–12, HexNAc: 1–12, dHex:

0–4, and NeuAc: 0–4. The maximum numbers of Hex and HexNAc were determined using the

approximate masses of the ionizable glycopeptides. The maximum number of NeuAc was limited to four

because our sample preparation conditions did not allow the remaining oligo- or polysialic acids. The

number of dHex (fucose) was also limited to four or fewer because the mass of dHex(5) is similar to that of

Hex(2)HexNAc(2) (difference = 0.025), corresponding to approximately 5 ppm of 5,000 Da. If the

measurement is performed with an accuracy greater than 2 ppm, five or more fucoses may be

distinguishable. Within the range of glycan compositions, users can provide arbitrary points for likely

compositions in the glycan list. In contrast, among the possible compositions, many are considered unlikely

based on biosynthetic pathways, and matches with such unusual compositions can be considered incorrect.

Accordingly, users can also define unusual compositions in the glycan list and such incorrect matches are

marked in the match results by giving negative points, and thus, will be considered in the selection.

The format of the glycan point list was fixed (Data S2). The list used in this study can be used to

analyze human cell-derived protein samples and was not considered for NeuGc. In this list, 139 glycan

compositions were assigned 1 point if the composition is matched. The list contained glycan compositions

in N-glycan major biosynthetic pathways, from the glycan produced by oligosaccharide transferase to the

glycan   processed   by   many   glycosyltransferases   and   glycosidases.   The   largest   is

Hex(7)HexNAc(6)dHex(4)NeuAc(4), which corresponds to a tetra-antennary glycan with four Fuc and

four NeuAc. The smallest is HexNAc(1), a breakdown product remaining in GlcNAc on Asn. Unusual

compositions were determined by considering N-glycan biosynthetic pathways.

This study considered four glycan units (Hex, HexNAc, dHex, and NeuAc) as the glycan

components attached to hAGP. N-glycan compositions were expressed as the generic monosaccharide

composition as "Hex(*)HexNAc(*)dHex(*)NeuAc(*)", where * represents the number of individual

monosaccharide residues. The glycan composition list for hAGP was almost identical to the human N-

glycome list supplied by Byonic, except for one composition (Hex(7)HexNAc(6)) (Table S1), which was

manually added because this composition is considered common in the human N-glycome. In the glycan

composition list, unusual compositions were defined based on *N*-glycan biosynthetic pathways; however,

negative points were not given for these unusual compositions in this study.

Byonic search for hAGP data

250   Glycopeptide MS2 data were searched using the Byonic search engine ver. 2.15.7 (Protein

Metrics, Cupertino, CA, USA) using the human protein sequence file from SwissProt (downloaded on May

19, 2020; entry: 42,296) and the glycan composition list (Table S1). Search parameter settings were as

follows: enzyme: Trypsin_KR (Full or Semi), max missed cleavages: 2, static modifications:

carbamidomethyl (C), dynamic modifications: ammonia-loss (N-term C), Gln to pyro-Glu (N-term Q),

oxidation (M), peptide mass tolerance: $\pm$ 3 ppm, fragment mass tolerance: 0.02 Da. The search results used

estimated glycopeptides with Confidence = High and Byonic Score $\geq$ 200 to compare GRable results. The

two results obtained with Trypsin_KR (full) and Trypsin_KR (semi) were combined, and the resultant

glycopeptide list was compared with the GRable results.

GRable analysis of HL-60 cell data

261   LC/MS/MS data for HL-60 cell lysates were obtained from a previous study (Figure S1) (32). A

protease digest of the HL-60 cell lysate was prepared in a manner similar to that for hAGP. An aliquot of

the digest was acidified and heated to remove sialic acid, decreasing glycan heterogeneity and increasing the

relative abundance of each glycopeptide. An aliquot of the desialylated glycopeptide fraction was subjected

to HILIC to collect four glycopeptide fractions, which were then analyzed using LC/MS/MS and IGOT-

LC/MS/MS to obtain glycopeptide and deglycopeptide MS data, respectively. The glycans obtained from

the IGOT procedure were analyzed using matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization time-of-flight

(MALDI-TOF) MS to prepare a glycan composition list. Because the HL-60 cell data were for desialylated

glycopeptides, only three glycan units (Hex, HexNAc, and dHex) were considered glycan components.

The definition of unusual composition was the same as that used for the hAGP. The resulting core peptide

list (Data S3) and glycan point list (Data S4) for fraction 2 were used for the GRable analysis.

Software implementation

GRable was implemented as a web application by Hitachi Solutions Technology Ltd. The user

interface was mostly written in JavaScript, data management in Java, and scientific calculations in Python.

PostgreSQL was used as the background for the user and data file management. The software was

developed and tested on Ubuntu Linux 22.04 LTS.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

GRable is a web application that users can access through web browsers. It should be noted that

the deconvoluted LC/MS data must be uploaded in the current version. For data processing (Figure 2), all

steps were executed step-by-step after uploading the required data and setting the appropriate parameters. A

detailed instruction manual for GRable is provided in Document S1. The data processing, search parameter

settings, and results of each step are described below, primarily focusing on improved points compared with

the prototype.

Monoisotopic peak picking (Step 4) with improved accuracy using the correction function

After the ranges of RT and mass were set in the Range setting (Step 3), monoisotopic peaks were

selected using the original algorithm in Step 4. In a previous in-house prototype, the search for monoisotopic

peaks started from the highest signal, which is time-consuming. Therefore, GRable uses a new algorithm to

improve data processing speed. First, a filter of five scans × 5 Da was used to search for a local peak in each

group comprising a single ion. When the highest signal was centered in the filter, it was recorded as a local

peak, and the other signals within the filter were excluded from the local peak candidates. The local peaks

were used as the starting points for identifying the corresponding groups comprising the same ion. The local

peak signal spectrum was integrated with the same ion spectra before and after the scans, and the resulting

spectrum was used to determine the monoisotopic signal. This algorithm change greatly speeds up the

monoisotopic peak-picking process.

In addition, the algorithms for finding monoisotopic signals were also modified to improve the

accuracy of the monoisotopic assignment in GRable. The prototype used a monoisotopic signal assignment

method with criteria based on the relative intensity of the isotope signals; however, the misdetection of

monoisotopic ions was frequently observed. The accuracy of the monoisotopic ions is important for

accurate glycopeptide assignment. Accordingly, GRable has a function that evaluates the selected

monoisotopic peaks using a multinomial distribution based on averagine for a peptide as the abundance ratio

of five isotopes, including C, H, N, O, and S. By fitting the observed spectrum with the calculated spectrum,

the need to correct the monoisotopic signal obtained in the preceding step is suggested. This correction

function facilitated an increased number of matched glycopeptide group members compared to the GRable

results obtained without using this function. Users can confirm corrected monoisotopic peaks by the update

flag=1 in a "Monoiso Peak List" sheet and in other results sheets of subsequent steps, where the peak no.

was identical to that indicated in the monoisotopic peak list. For hAGP, 5,369 monoisotopic signals were

detected, of which 2,140 were automatically corrected by the correction function (Data S6), demonstrating

its utility for the accurate selection of monoisotopic signals.

Clustering (Step 5) for efficient and comprehensive detection of glycopeptide signals using parallel
clustering function

In this step, glycopeptide signals were detected from the monoisotopic peaks selected in Step 4

as a cluster, based on the relationship between the masses and retention times. The prototype could set a

single RT range to find the glycopeptide group as a cluster because the time difference was considered for

extending the neutral monosaccharides, namely Hex, HexNAc, and dHex. Glycopeptide groups with

different numbers of acidic saccharides, such as NeuAc, were found as clusters (33), because adding neutral

saccharides slightly shortens the RT, whereas adding acidic sugar units increases it (39). In the previous RT

setting, as the acidic shift increased in proportion to the number of sialic acid units, four glycopeptide clusters

with asialo-, monosialo-, disialo-, and trisialo-glycans were found separately in a representative hAGP

cluster (Figure 3A). Therefore, glycopeptide groups with the same core but different numbers of acidic units

cannot be combined. To improve this, GRable was constructed to allow setting the RT difference separately

for each acidic and neutral saccharide and any motif, such as Hex + HexNAc (LacNAc). In the current

version, four clusters with the same core peptide were successfully connected into a single cluster, because

the range of RT shifts for each unit could be set separately (Figure 3B). This improvement facilitated a better

understanding of the microheterogeneity of a glycosite by visualizing the signal intensity of each

glycopeptide plot. Notably, a new tetrasialo-glycan was also detected. Such highly sialylated members

could not be detected as a cluster because of the limited variety of the glycan stem portion with the four

sialylations. Accordingly, this improvement facilitated the increased detection of glycan microheterogeneity

for one glycosite. In addition, considering the RT difference separately for each glycan unit is also useful for

reducing misdetection caused by isobaric combinations, especially neutral and acidic combinations, such as

NeuAc + NH4$^+$ and Hex + dHex (24).

As is the case with MS2-based approaches, optimization of search parameter settings is crucial

for obtaining reliable results in glycopeptide identification (40); thus, optimization is needed for the purpose

of analysis. For this need, GRable can integrate multiple clustering results obtained in parallel under different

(up to five) search parameter settings for more comprehensive detection of glycopeptide clusters. As the

clustering results of each processing step were combined into a single cluster, each search parameter setting

was independent of the processing order. This "parallel clustering" function facilitates optimization for the

minimum No. of members for clustering, which is the most important parameter that should be optimized

according to the purpose of the analysis; a smaller No. of members is expected to result in an increase in the

detected clusters; however, the ratio of clusters without supportive information for evaluating certainty will

also increase. For example, using this function, the clusters obtained using the previous setting with the No.

of members = 4 (setting 1; Figure 3A), and the current setting with No. of members = 10 (setting 2; Figure

3B) can be easily compared. When the results with No. of members = 2, 3, and 4 were compared for hAGP,

the No. of members = 2 resulted in an increased number of detected clusters, but most of the increased

clusters were excluded in the subsequent selection step (Table S2). In addition, manual inspection after the

selection step was required with No. of members = 2. In contrast, with No. of members = 3, more

assignments were obtained without manual inspection after selection compared to No. of members = 4,

demonstrating that the No. of members = 3 is the most suitable for hAGP analysis.

352   We often use a setting that considers only the number of Hex to find clusters, with the aim of

detecting glycopeptide clusters with only high- or oligo-mannosylated glycans. There are many possible

compositions of complex- and hybrid-type glycans; however, many oligo-mannosylated glycans are

limited to M9–M5. Thus, the minimum cluster number was lowered to three to estimate oligo-

mannosylated glycan carriers. In the hAGP samples, the abundance of oligo-mannosylated glycans was

low, resulting in no detection in this setting (Setting 3; Figure 3C). This finding is consistent with previous

reports that glycan structures attached to hAGP are branched, sialylated and fucosylated at the branches, and

slightly extended by polylactosamine (41–44).

360   The individual time settings for each type of glycan unit and parallel clustering with different

settings effectively increased the detection sensitivity, and multiple clusters with the same core but different

sialic acid numbers could now be combined into one cluster. With parallel clustering of these three search

parameter settings for hAGP, 65 clusters comprising 1,422 types of glycopeptides were detected (Figure

3D). Notably, among these clustered monoisotopic peaks of glycopeptides, 532 (37%) were corrected by

correction functions, demonstrating their utility in improving glycopeptide detection efficiency. The average

number of members in each cluster was 19.1. Among the detected monoisotopic signals, 2,309 signals were

assigned to glycopeptide clusters.

To evaluate the usefulness of the parallel clustering function for detecting glycopeptides with a

specific glycan structure, such as oligo-mannosylated glycopeptides, we used a dataset of HL-60 cell lysates

(HILIC fraction 2) as a complex mixture of unknown proteins containing glycopeptides decorated with

oligo-mannose (32). Because the sample glycopeptides used were desialylated, parallel clustering was

performed under two search parameter settings: setting 1 (previous setting) and setting 3 (oligo-

mannosylated glycans) for the hAGP sample. Figure 4A shows the clusters detected in setting 1, in which

the minimum number of clusters was set to four. When setting 2 (only Hex was considered a glycan unit

and the minimum number of clusters was three) was added to the setting 1 search, the number of detected

clusters increased (Figure 4B). For clarity, only the increased numbers of clusters (No. of members: 3) were

visualized (Figure 4C), demonstrating the presence of oligo-mannosylated glycopeptides. Thus, GRable

can be applied to large-scale and in-depth analyses of glycoproteins, in which the comprehensiveness of

glycan heterogeneity is improved, and glycan structure-specific search is allowed.

Matching (Step 6) with improved evaluation of the analysis using inter-clustering analysis function

In this step, GRable comprehensively searches all combinations of core peptide and glycan

compositions for each glycopeptide cluster by consistency in their masses, based on the lists of possible

peptide and glycan compositions provided by users. Accordingly, the results sheet shows information on

the three matched components (glycopeptides, peptides, and glycans) and the differences from the

calculated mass values for each cluster. Note that this step considers matching by mass alone; thus, all

matched results that meet the criteria can be provided for a single cluster. In the subsequent step, the most

plausible match was selected from among the matching candidates for each cluster, and the accuracy of the

selected match was evaluated. The likelihood of the assigned glycan composition was crucial for this

selection. Accordingly, positive points for likely compositions (and negative points for unusual

compositions as an option), which can be defined in the glycan composition list, were assigned to the glycan

compositions that matched with the matching result list, and the total score was calculated for each cluster

as the sum of the points of all members.

Regarding this step, the previous Glyco-RIDGE analysis was limited by a low match rate. Mass

calculations assume that peptides are ionized with protons such as MH^+. Some clusters with no appropriate

match were non-proton adduct clusters. Accordingly, GRable was equipped with an inter-cluster analysis

function in the Matching step to detect clusters comprising glycopeptides ionized with non-proton cations

such as iron (Fe^{3+}) and ammonium (NH^{4+}). In this inter-cluster analysis, the presence of such adducts was

judged for each unit of the glycopeptide cluster and was unlikely to include unintended misdetection caused

by isobaric combinations (e.g., NeuAc + NH_4^+ and Hex + dHex (24)). In the matching results for hAGP,

using lists of 56 core peptides (Data S1) and 134 glycan compositions (Data S2), 65 clusters were identified.

Among them, 46 clusters matched; however, 19 did not (Data S6). Over half of the clusters (i.e., 44 clusters)

were related to the corresponding iron or ammonium adducts with the inter-cluster analysis function, as

shown in the "relation between clusters" sheet (Data S6). This information facilitates technical evaluation

because non-proton adducts cause sensitivity loss; thus, reducing these adducts during sample preparation

and analysis is essential. The remaining unmatched clusters may be attributed to the lack of core peptides

in the list; therefore, the inter-cluster analysis function provides clues as to how the list should be improved.

Selection (Step 7) with improved selecting and evaluating of assignments using MS2 information

This last step is crucial because selecting the most plausible match is essential for guaranteeing

the certainty of the Glyco-RIDGE analysis results, considering that the false discovery rate cannot be defined.

Because this selection step was conducted with manual inspections in our previous procedure, using this

step with clear criteria in GRable represents a large technical improvement. As previously described, a

crucial criterion is the total score of each matched cluster. Accordingly, this step sets the total score threshold,

and only matches within the threshold are shown in the selection result sheet. When the Clustering and

Matching steps are performed correctly, all members match any composition, and many points are obtained

based on the glycan point list. In addition to the total score, additional criteria were the delta mass and delta

RT between the glycopeptide and the corresponding core peptide, albeit unused for automated selection by

GRable. The usefulness of relative RT information has also been demonstrated in MS2-based *N*-

glycoproteomics (24). Thus, all members within these criteria are highlighted in the results sheet, visually

confirming the certainty of the results. Notably, identical results were obtained for hAGP analysis, even

without the RT of the core peptide (i.e., RT=0 for all peptides in the core peptide list), suggesting that it is

possible to use predicted peptide lists when an analyte is a purified glycoprotein.

The commercial hAGP glycoprotein specimen used here also contained serum glycoproteins

such as haptoglobin (HPT) in the core peptide list (Data 1). For cluster 1, two candidate core peptides, hAGP

isoform 1 (A1AG1) and HPT, were used. The total scores for A1AG1 and HPT were 28 and 11,

respectively. However, the delta RTs of all members for HPT are over 15 min, whereas the delta RT of

A1AG1 members is within -6.5–5.1 min, meeting the defined criteria. Accordingly, A1AG1 was selected

as the core peptide for cluster 1. Similarly, the most plausible matching can be easily selected for all matched

clusters.

As the other important improved point, this selection step allows evaluating the "confidence level"

of the selected results by using MS2 information. This scrutiny and curation step to reduce misassignment

and ambiguity is critical in current *N*-glycoproteomics (37). Therefore, as with many MS2-based

glycopeptide identification methods (12), GRable first searches glycan fragment ions called "diagnostic

ions" in MS2 spectra for cluster members to evaluate whether the spectrum is attributed to a glycopeptide.

Diagnostic ions, such as fragments of HexNAc and HexNAc + Hex, were searched as defaults. The

variation in the diagnostic ions can be set without restricting the number of ions. These diagnostic ions are

not used for selection and are only added to the selection result list, allowing users to utilize this information

for different purposes. In addition, glycopeptide fragments such as Y0, Y1, and Y2 were searched to

estimate the mass of Y0, namely, the peptide moiety. Because the Y0 signals are often too weak to be

detected, GRable is equipped with a function for predicting the Y0 mass based on the masses of other related

signals if multiple signals are present. A matched peptide was considered correct if the mass value coincided

with that of the matched peptide. This MS2 information is summarized for the selected clusters in the "MS2

info for Clusters" sheet, and all the search results are available in the "All MS2 info" sheet of an exported file

(Data S6). The presence of such MS2 information is visible in the "Selection results" sheet and accessible

directly via an intra-file link for all glycopeptides in the sheet.

For hAGP, all assigned glycopeptides showed MS2 spectra with HexNAc(204) and HexNAc +

Hex(366) as diagnostic ions characteristic of glycopeptides, supporting the certainty of assignment. In

addition, 45 of the 78 monoisotopic peaks in cluster 1 were accompanied by MS2 information, and the

predicted peptide sequence was an A1AG1-derived peptide (WFYIASAFRNEEYNK). Therefore, the

selection result for this cluster was confirmed using the MS2 information.

In this context, the Glyco-RIDGE results were presented with the "confidence level" using

GRable. The probability/confidence of the assignment for core peptides is ranked as follows: 1) "High";

clusters having any member(s) showing Y0-related ions corresponding to the presumed core, 2) "High";

clusters having any member(s) identified as the same core using the MS2-based search engine, 3)

"Medium"; clusters having any member(s) showing glycan diagnostic ions, 4) "Low"; clusters without any

MS2 support. We believe that the confidence of the assignment is high even in the "Low" rank when their

mass and RT differences fit under the threshold and the glycan point is the highest in the cluster. This was

also supported when the assigned core peptide for a low-rank cluster was found in the core peptide list based

on confident deglycopeptide identification for the identical samples with 1% FDR. Originally, GRable was

designed to estimate signals that MS2 spectra could not identify; thus, cluster members without MS2

support and clusters with no MS2 data for all members are notable features of GRable. Such a glycopeptide

detection methodology allows the evaluation of the certainty of MS2 information-lacking assignments

based on their connected members in the same cluster. In this evaluation, visualization of the two-

dimensional (i.e., RT and mass) relationship of each cluster member in the cluster sheet allows manual

inspection of whether an unexpected glycan composition is likely; with this manual evaluation,

unconvincing assignments can be excluded from final results.

469   Improved in-depth glycoproteomics results using GRable

Two isoforms of hAGP exist, isoform 1 (A1AG1) and isoform 2 (A1AG2), of which A1AG1

is the major component. Based on the improved GRable procedure, five glycoproteins, including HPT,

plasma protease C1 inhibitor, and lymphatic vessel endothelial hyaluronic acid receptor 1 as serum-derived

contaminants, were assigned to the hAGP samples (Table S3). Among the 14 assigned clusters, seven (1,

4, 13, 23, 26, 43, and 48) and six (1, 3, 6, 11, 19, and 23) were assigned as A1AG1 and A1AG2, respectively.

These clusters covered all five N-glycosylation potential sites of A1AG1 and A1AG2 (the two sites are

common in A1AG1), except for site 93 of A1AG2; N-glycosylation impairment at this site is consistent

with a previous report (44). The estimated core peptides for each cluster were the same as those estimated

using the MS2 information utilization function of GRable and Byonic, increasing the confidence of the

results. Each cluster strictly corresponded to one core peptide; thus, the clustering view facilitated effective

glycan macroheterogeneity visualization for each glycosite (Figure 5). Notably, two N-glycosites (sites 33

and 103) were detected in almost the same core peptide, except for one residue between the two isoforms;

however, their site-specific glycoforms could be visualized separately. This result highlights the usefulness

of GRable for elucidating differences in the glycosylation status of target glycoproteins, even with other

contaminated glycoproteins.

Using GRable, 123 and 108 site-specific glycoforms of A1AG1 and A1AG2 were estimated,

respectively (Table 1 and Table S4). For some N-glycosites, the same glycan compositions were estimated

for multiple core peptides, supporting the certainty of the results. In the case of site 103 of A1AG1, 24 of 29

compositions assigned for ENGTISR were also detected for the other two peptide sequences. hAGP had

N-glycosylations with highly sialylated and fucosylated branches and extended with polylactosamine (43,

44). Similar results were obtained with GRable (Table S4); tetrasialo-glycans were estimated at all five

A1AG1 sites, indicating high sialylation. Glycans with dHex $\geq$ 2 were estimated at four A1AG1 sites,

indicating its fucosylation at both its core and branches. In addition, glycan components for polylactosamine

(i.e., Hex + HexNAc $\geq$ 10) were estimated at four sites, indicating the presence of such extended glycans.

Evaluation of the certainty of glycoproteomic results using GRable

To evaluate the suitability of the search parameter settings used here for accurate glycopeptide detection, we performed a GRable analysis of the IGOT-LC/MS data (i.e., *N*-deglycoproteomic data) used for preparing the core peptide list using the same search parameter settings as those for the *N*-glycoproteomic data. As expected, the detected clusters for *N*-deglycoproteomic data significantly decreased for both hAGP (from 65 to 4 clusters) and HL-60 (from 207 to 32 clusters), and all assigned glycopeptides were also observed for *N*-glycoproteomic data. These results indicate that the settings used for GRable analysis were appropriate.

In the hAGP analysis, the confidence level of all assigned clusters was High or Medium, indicating that at least one member had MS2 information for every glycopeptide cluster. To validate the certainty of the obtained results for hAGP analysis, 110 MS2 spectra of all the assigned glycopeptides with MS2 information were manually checked (Figure S2), confirming that the core peptides were correctly assigned. It is noteworthy that NeuAc-derived diagnostic ions were observed for several glycopeptides without NeuAc owing to insufficient isolation, highlighting the risk of evaluating the accuracy of glycoforms based only on diagnostic ions.

In addition, to evaluate the certainty and significance of the Glyco-RIDGE results obtained using GRable, the results were compared with those obtained using the representative MS2-based software Byonic. Notably, GRable could estimate more than four-fold more site-specific glycoforms than Byonic and covered most of the site-specific glycoforms estimated by Byonic. Only two of the site-specific glycoforms (Hex(2)HexNAc(1) and Hex(3)HexNAc(2)) were estimated by Byonic but not by GRable at

site 56) because one component was absent (Hex(3)HexNAc(3) or Hex(3)HexNAc(2)NeuAc(1)). As

expected, the MS2-based estimation by Byonic succeeded on higher-intensity glycopeptides (Data S9 and

S10). Notably, such highly sialylated and polylactosamine-attached glycopeptides were not detected by

Byonic (Table S4), and the median number of NeuAc for 38 glycopeptides assigned by GRable but not by

Byonic was 3, whereas the median number of 27 glycopeptides assigned by Byonic was 2. Accordingly, it

is likely that MS2 spectra was too poor to assign a glycopeptide, partly due to their low ionization efficiency.

Thus, these results confirm the reliability of the Glyco-RIDGE results obtained by GRable, highlighting the

usefulness of this method as a complementary method to the current gold standard, MS2-based

glycoproteomics.

CONCLUSION

We developed a novel software program, GRable, to enable semiautomated Glyco-RIDGE analysis. GRable version 1.0 can run online freely with a demo or user data using a web browser via the GlyCosmos Portal (https://glycosmos.org/grable). Note that the current version is guaranteed only for Thermo Fisher Scientific data. Some algorithms of the existing Glyco-RIDGE method were improved during the implementation of GRable version 1.0, which can be applied to in-depth site-specific glycoform analysis of intact sialylated glycopeptides derived from purified and crude glycoproteins. Thus, this software will help analyze the status and changes in glycans to obtain biological and clinical insights into protein glycosylation. The novel parallel clustering function enabled a targeted search focusing on multiple glycan structural layers, including the stem, branching, and terminal moieties, such as Lewis epitopes. This software also allows evaluating of a "confidence level" especially using MS2 information, for each glycopeptide obtained by MS1-based detection methodology. Using the MS2 utilization function opened doors to all glycoproteomics researchers who considered MS2-based glycoproteomics as the gold standard, allowing for the community evaluation of GRable by comparing it with other glycoproteomics software. The combined use of MS1-based glycoproteomics will be useful for expanding glycopeptide detection and providing supporting evidence for MS2-based glycoproteomics. Thus, the Glyco-RIDGE method with its unique MS1-based glycopeptide detection principle has complementary roles to MS2-based glycoproteomic methods, and GRable will be a powerful glycoproteomics tool when combined with currently developed MS2-based software. Accordingly, GRable will be updated by continuously improving the Glyco-RIDGE methodology and software while comparing the upcoming MS2-based methods and software.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was funded by a project for utilizing glycans in the development of innovative drug discovery technologies (grant number JP20ae0101021) from the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development (AMED). We thank Dr. Mika Fujita and Ms. Masako Sukegawa for their technical assistance. We also appreciate Dr. Kiyoko F Aoki-Kinoshita and Dr. Akihiro Fujita of Soka University for releasing GRable at the GlyCosmos Portal (https://glycosmos.org/).

DATA AVAILABILITY

The MS data set for hAGP presented in this study has been deposited in the ProteomeXchange Consortium via the jPOST partner repository with the dataset identifiers PXD046226 (ProteomeXchange) and JPST001876 (jPOST).

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Author Contributions

All authors contributed to writing the manuscript. All authors have approved the final version of the manuscript. [†]C.N.-O., D.T., and A.T. contributed equally.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

REFERENCES

1. Pascovici, D., Wu, J. X., McKay, M. J., Joseph, C., Noor, Z., Kamath, K., et al. (2018) Clinically relevant post-translational modification analyses—maturing workflows and bioinformatics Tools. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **20**, 16

2. Varki, A. (2017) Biological roles of glycans. *Glycobiology* **27**, 3–49

3. Varki, A., Cummings, R. D., Esko, J. D., Stanley, P., Hart, G. W., Aebi, M., Mohnen, D., Kinoshita, T., Packer, N. H., Prestegard, J. H., Schnaar, R. L., and Seeberger, P. H. eds. (2022) *Essentials of Glycobiology* (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press) 4th ed.

4. Čaval, T., Heck, A. J. R., and Reiding, K. R. (2021) Meta-heterogeneity: Evaluating and describing the diversity in glycosylation between sites on the same glycoprotein. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics.* **20**, 100010

5. Fang, P., Ji, Y., Oellerich, T., Urlaub, H., and Pan, K. T. (2022) Strategies for proteome-wide quantification of glycosylation macro- and micro-heterogeneity. *Int J Mol Sci.* **23**, 1609

6. Kawahara, R., Chernykh, A., Alagesan, K., Bern, M., Cao, W., Chalkley, R. J., Cheng, K., Choo, M. S., Edwards, N., Goldman, R., Hoffmann, M., Hu, Y., Huang, Y., Kim, J. Y., Kletter, D., Liquet, B., Liu, M., Mechref, Y., Meng, B., Neelamegham, S., Nguyen-Khuong, T., Nilsson, J., Pap, A., Park, G. W., Parker, B. L., Pegg, C. L., Penninger, J. M., Phung, T. K., Pioch, M., Rapp, E., Sakalli, E., Sanda, M., Schulz, B. L., Scott, N. E., Sofronov, G., Stadlmann, J., Vakhrushev, S. Y., Woo, C. M., Wu, H. Y., Yang, P., Ying, W., Zhang, H., Zhang, Y., Zhao, J., Zaia, J., Haslam, S. M., Palmisano, G., Yoo, J. S., Larson, G., Khoo, K. H., Medzihradszky, K. F., Kolarich, D., Packer, N. H., and Thaysen-Andersen, M. (2021) Community evaluation of glycoproteomics informatics solutions reveals high-performance search strategies for serum glycopeptide analysis. *Nat. Methods.* **18**, 1304–1316

7.   Bern, M., Kil, Y. J., and Becker, C. (2012) in *Current Protocols in Bioinformatics* (John Wiley &

Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA), p Unit13.20.

8.   Fang, Z., Qin, H., Mao, J., Wang, Z., Zhang, N., Wang, Y., Liu, L., Nie, Y., Dong, M., and Ye, M.

(2022) Glyco-Decipher enables glycan database-independent peptide matching and in-depth

characterization of site-specific N-glycosylation. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 1900

9.   He, S.-M., Yang, P.-Y. ✉, Zeng, W.-F., Cao, W.-Q., Liu, M.-Q., and Yang, P.-Y. (2021) Precise,

fast and comprehensive analysis of intact glycopeptides and modified glycans with pGlyco3. *Nat.*

Methods. **2021**, 1–9

10.   Polasky, D. A., Yu, F., Teo, G. C., and Nesvizhskii, A. I. (2020) Fast and comprehensive N- and O-

glycoproteomics analysis with MSFragger-Glyco. *Nat. Methods.* **17**, 1125–1132

11.   Shen, J., Jia, L., Dang, L., Su, Y., Zhang, J., Xu, Y., Zhu, B., Chen, Z., Wu, J., Lan, R., Hao, Z.,

Ma, C., Zhao, T., Gao, N., Bai, J., Zhi, Y., Li, J., Zhang, J., and Sun, S. (2021) StrucGP: de novo

structural sequencing of site-specific N-glycan on glycoproteins using a modularization strategy.

Nat. Methods. **18**, 921–929

12.   Cao, W., Liu, M., Kong, S., Wu, M., Zhang, Y., and Yang, P. (2021) Recent advances in software

tools for more generic and precise intact glycopeptide analysis. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* **20**, 100060

13.   Baker, P. R., Trinidad, J. C., and Chalkley, R. J. (2011) Modification site localization scoring

integrated into a search engine. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics.* **10**, M111.008078

14.   Cheng, K., Chen, R., Seebun, D., Ye, M., Figeys, D., and Zou, H. (2014) Large-scale

characterization of intact N-glycopeptides using an automated glycoproteomic method. *J.*

Proteomics. **110**, 145–154

15.   Toghi Eshghi, S., Shah, P., Yang, W., Li, X., and Zhang, H. (2015) GPQuest: A spectral library

matching algorithm for site-specific assignment of tandem mass spectra to intact N-glycopeptides.

Anal. Chem. **87**, 5181–5188

16.   Park, G. W., Kim, J. H. J. Y., Hwang, H., Lee, J. Y., Ahn, Y. H., Lee, H. K., Ji, E. S., Kim, K. H.,

Jeong, H. K., Yun, K. N., Kim, Y. S., Ko, J. H., An, H. J., Kim, J. H. J. Y., Paik, Y. K., and Yoo, J.

S. (2016) Integrated GlycoProteome Analyzer (I-GPA) for automated identification and

quantitation of site-specific N-glycosylation. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 21175

17.   Nasir, W., Toledo, A. G., Noborn, F., Nilsson, J., Wang, M., Bandeira, N., and Larson, G. (2016)

SweetNET: A bioinformatics workflow for glycopeptide MS/MS spectral analysis. *J. Proteome*

Res. **15**, 2826–40

18.   Pioch, M., Hoffmann, M., Pralow, A., Reichl, U., and Rapp, E. (2018) glyXtool MS: An open-

source pipeline for semiautomated analysis of glycopeptide mass spectrometry data. *Anal. Chem.*

90, 11908–11916

19.   An, Z., Shu, Q., Lv, H., Shu, L., Wang, J., Yang, F., and Fu, Y. (2018) N-linked glycopeptide

identification based on open mass spectral library search. *Biomed Res. Int.* **2018**, 1564136

20.   Devabhaktuni, A., Lin, S., Zhang, L., Swaminathan, K., Gonzalez, C. G., Olsson, N., Pearlman, S.

M., Rawson, K., and Elias, J. E. (2019) TagGraph reveals vast protein modification landscapes from

large tandem mass spectrometry datasets. *Nat Biotechnol.* **37**, 469–479

21.   Narimatsu, H., Kaji, H., Vakhrushev, S. Y., Clausen, H., Zhang, H., Noro, E., Togayachi, A., Nagai-

Okatani, C., Kuno, A., Zou, X., Cheng, L., Tao, S.-C., Sun, Y. (2018) Current technologies for

complex glycoproteomics and their applications to biology/disease-driven glycoproteomics. *J*

Proteome Res. **17**, 4097–4112

22. Noro, E., Togayachi, A., Sato, T., Tomioka, A., Fujita, M., Sukegawa, M., Suzuki, N., Kaji, H., and

Narimatsu, H. (2015) Large-scale identification of N-glycan glycoproteins carrying Lewis x and

site-specific N-glycan alterations in Fut9 knockout mice. *J Proteome Res.* **14**, 3823–3834

23. Darula, Z., and Medzihradszky, K. F. (2015) Carbamidomethylation side reactions may lead to

glycan misassignments in glycopeptide analysis. *Anal. Chem.* **87**, 6297–6302

24. Klein, J., and Zaia, J. (2020) Relative retention time estimation improves N-glycopeptide

identifications by LC-MS/MS. *J. Proteome Res.* **19**, 2113–2121

25. Kaji, H., Saito, H., Yamauchi, Y., Shinkawa, T., Taoka, M., Hirabayashi, J., Kasai, K., Takahashi,

N., and Isobe, T. (2003) Lectin affinity capture, isotope-coded tagging and mass spectrometry to

identify N-linked glycoproteins. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **21**, 667–72

26. Kaji, H., Yamauchi, Y., Takahashi, N., and Isobe, T. (2006) Mass spectrometric identification of N-

linked glycopeptides using lectin-mediated affinity capture and glycosylation site-specific stable

isotope tagging. *Nat. Protoc.* **1**, 3019–27

27. Goldberg, D., Bern, M., Parry, S., Sutton-Smith, M., Panico, M., Morris, H. R., and Dell, A. (2007)

Automated N-glycopeptide identification using a combination of single- and tandem-MS. *J.*

Proteome Res. **6**, 3995–4005

28. Deshpande, N., Jensen, P. H., Packer, N. H., and Kolarich, D. (2010) GlycoSpectrumScan: fishing

glycopeptides from MS spectra of protease digests of human colostrum sIgA. *J. Proteome Res.* **9**,

1063–1075

29. Choo, M. S., Wan, C., Rudd, P. M., and Nguyen-Khuong, T. (2019) GlycopeptideGraphMS:

Improved glycopeptide detection and identification by exploiting graph theoretical patterns in mass

and retention time. *Anal. Chem.* **91**, 7236–7244

30.   Trinidad, J. C., Schoepfer, R., Burlingame., A. L., and Medzihradszky, K. F. (2013) N- and O-

654   glycosylation in the murine synaptosome. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* **12**, 3474–3488

655   31.   Chalkley, R. J., Medzihradszky, K. F., Darula, Z., Pap, A., and Baker, P. R. (2020) The effectiveness

656   of filtering glycopeptide peak list files for Y ions. *Mol. Omics.* **16**, 147–155

657   32.   Togayachi, A., Tomioka, A., Fujita, M., Sukegawa, M., Noro, E., Takakura, D., Miyazaki, M.,

658   Shikanai, T., Narimatsu, H., and Kaji, H. (2018) Identification of poly-N-acetyllactosamine-

659   carrying glycoproteins from HL-60 human promyelocytic leukemia cells using a site-specific

660   glycome analysis method, Glyco-RIDGE. *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* **29**, 1138–1152

661   33.   Noro, E., Matsuda, A., Kyoutou, T., Sato, T., Tomioka, A., Nagai, M., Sogabe, M., Tsuruno, C.,

662   Takahama, Y., Kuno, A., Tanaka, Y., Kaji, H., and Narimatsu, H. (2021) N-glycan structures of

663   *Wisteria floribunda* agglutinin-positive Mac2 binding protein in the serum of patients with liver

664   fibrosis. *Glycobiology* **31**, 1268–1278

665   34.   Mitani, Y., Yasuno, R., Kihira, K., Chung, K. M., Mitsuda, N., Kanie, S., Tomioka, A., Kaji, H.,

666   and Ohmiya, Y. (2022) Host-dependent producibility of recombinant *Cypridina noctiluca*

667   luciferase with glycosylation defects. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* **10**, 92

668   35.   Sogabe, M., Kojima, S., Kaya, T., Tomioka, A., Kaji, H., Sato, T., Chiba, Y., Shimizu, A.,

669   Tanaka, N., Suzuki, N., Hayashi, I., Mikami, M., Togayachi, A., and Narimatsu, H. (2022) A

670   sensitive new assay system for serum *Wisteria floribunda* agglutinin-reactive ceruloplasmin that

671   distinguishes ovarian clear cell carcinoma from endometrioma. *Anal. Chem.* **94**, 2476–2484

672   36.   Hiono, T., Sakaue, H., Tomioka, A., Kaji, H., Sasaki, M., Orba, Y., Sawa, H., and Kuno, A. (2024)

673   Combinatorial approach with mass spectrometry and lectin microarray dissected site-specific

674   glycostem and glycoleaf features of the virion-derived spike protein of ancestral and γ variant

675   SARS-CoV-2 Strains. *J. Proteome Res.* **23**, 1408–1419

676 37. Chau, T. H., Chernykh, A., Kawahara, R., and Thaysen-Andersen, M. (2023) Critical

677   considerations in N-glycoproteomics. *Curr Opin Chem. Biol.* **73**, 102272

678 38. Kuno, A., Ikehara, Y., Tanaka, Y., Angata, T., Unno, S., Sogabe, M., Ozaki, H., Ito, K., Hirabayashi,

679   J., Mizokami, M., and Narimatsu, H. (2011) Multilectin assay for detecting fibrosis-specific glyco-

680   alteration by means of lectin microarray. *Clin. Chem.* **57**, 48–56

681 39. Medzihradszky, K. F. (2005) Characterization of protein N-glycosylation. *Methods Enzymol.* **405**,

682   116–138

683 40. Go, E. P., Zhang, S., Ding, H., Kappes, J. C., Sodroski, J., and Desaire, H. (2021) The opportunity

684   cost of automated glycopeptide analysis: case study profiling the SARS-CoV-2 S glycoprotein.

685   *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **413**, 7215–7227

686 41. Nakano, M., Kakehi, K., Tsai, M. H., and Lee, Y. C. (2004) Detailed structural features of glycan

687   chains derived from alpha1-acid glycoproteins of several different animals: the presence of

688   hypersialylated, O-acetylated sialic acids but not disialyl residues. *Glycobiology* **14**, 431–441

689 42. Hevér, H., Nagy, K., Xue, A., Sugár, S., Komka, K., Vékey, K., Drahos, L., and Révész, Á. (2022)

690   Diversity matters: Optimal collision energies for tandem mass spectrometric analysis of a large set

691   of N-glycopeptides. *J. Proteome Res.* **21**, 2743–2753

692 43. Wong, T. L., Mooney, B. P., Cavallero, G. J., Guan, M., Li, L., Zaia, J., and Wan, X. F. (2023)

693   Glycoproteomic analyses of influenza A viruses using timsTOF Pro MS. *J. Proteome Res.* **22**, 62–

694   77

695 44. Keser, T., Tijardović, M., Gornik, I., Lukić, E., Lauc, G., Gornik, O., and Novokmet, M. (2021)

696   High-throughput and site-specific N-glycosylation analysis of human alpha-1-acid glycoprotein

697   offers a great potential for new biomarker discovery. *Mol. Cell Proteomics.* **20**, 100044

699   **TABLE**

700   **Table 1. Site-specific hAGP glycoforms estimated using GRable and Byonic.**

Site	Sequence[a]	No. of site-specific glycoforms[b]			
		A1AG1		A1AG2	
		GRable	Byonic	GRable	Byonic
33(NAT)	A1AG1: QIPLCANLVPVPITNATLDQITGK A1AG2*: QIPLCANLVPVPITNATLDRITGK	21 (14)	7 (0)	23 (13)	10 (0)
56(NKS)	WFYIASAFRNEEYNK	35 (31)	6 (2)	35 (31)	6 (2)
72(NKT)	SVQEIQATFFYFTPNK	24 (18)	6 (0)	24 (18)	6 (0)
93(NTT)	A1AG1: QDQCIYNTTYLNVQR A1AG2: QNQCFYNSSYLNVQR	13 (11)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
103(NGT)	A1AG1*: ENGTISR A1AG2*: ENGTVSR	29 (23)	6 (0)	25 (21)	4 (0)
		122 (97)	27 (2)	107 (83)	26 (2)

[a]N-glycosylation sites are indicated in bold. Different residues in the two isoforms are underlined. The

asterisks indicate the presence of other peptide sequences of different lengths.

[b]Numbers within parentheses indicate the number of glycoforms estimated using only GRable or Byonic.

FIGURES

Figure 1. Workflow of glycoproteomic analysis for hAGP using GRable. hAGP was subjected to
reduction and carbamidomethylation (rCM) using dithiothreitol and iodoacetamide, respectively, and
digested with trypsin and Lys-C endopeptidase. The digest was used in hydrophilic interaction
chromatography (HILIC) on an Amide-80 column to capture glycopeptides. A small aliquot of the
glycopeptide fraction was treated with peptide-N-glycosidase F (PNGase F) in ^{18}O-labeled water to remove
N-glycans and to label deglycosylated Asn as ^{18}O-labeled Asp (isotope-coded glycosylation site-specific
tagging; IGOT) (25, 26). The IGOT-treated deglycopeptides were analyzed using liquid chromatography-
tandem mass spectrometry (LC/MS/MS), and the MS2 data were used for database search using Mascot
to prepare a core peptide list. In parallel, another aliquot of the glycopeptide fraction was analyzed through
LC/MS/MS. MS1 data of the glycopeptide analysis underwent GRable analysis. GRable used the core
peptide (Data S1) and glycan composition (Data S2) lists to assign each glycopeptide signal, whereas MS2
data are used for adding the confidence level to the GRable results. Glycopeptide analysis MS2 data was
also used for glycopeptide estimation using Byonic. The resulting glycopeptide lists of GRable and Byonic
analyses were compared.

GRable software for glycoproteomics using Glyco-RIDGE

Figure 2. Overview of data processing by GRable. GRable proceeds in seven steps using the four files
indicated in gray font. In Step 1, GRable allows the registration of the LC/MS data of glycopeptides in the
mzML format, which ensures great versatility and ease of data processing. In the current version, the
deconvolution function (Step 2) is not applicable although it is visible in the user interface for future
implementation. Step 3 was designed to set the RT range, mass range, and minimum signal intensity
(threshold) over which the analysis was performed. Step 4 was intended to find and group signals of an
identical ion based on three parameters: time (scan), mass (MH+), and intensity, and to obtain the
monoisotopic mass of each signal group at the peak time, using our unique algorithms. In Step 5, a series of
signals from the glycopeptide group were found as a cluster based on the elution behavior and mass
difference of its members. In Step 6, GRable searches for a combination of core peptides and glycan
compositions that match the mass of the putative glycopeptide within the allowed mass error (user setting)
according to the following equation: Observed M(glycopeptide) = calculated M(core peptide identified) +
M(Hex)*i + M(HexNAc)*j + M(dHex)*k + M(NeuAc)*l (M is a mass value, and i, j, k, and l are integers).
In Step 7, the most plausible combination among multiple candidate combinations suggested for one
glycopeptide cluster was selected. Then, their reliability at the cluster level as well as the single glycopeptide
level was evaluated using information from the results and additional MS2 information. The results of Steps
3–5 were visually confirmed using a viewer in the main window of the software. The detailed results of
Steps 4–7 can be exported as an Excel file with each setting, as shown for hAGP (Data S5 and S6) and HL-
60 cell lysates (Data S7 and S8).

Figure 3. hAGP clustering results. Representative results (Cluster 3) of parallel clustering with three
search parameter settings: **(A)** Setting 1 (a setting in our previous prototype), **(B)** Setting 2 (an extra setting
for detecting sialylated glycopeptides), and **(C)** Setting 3 (an extra setting for detecting oligo-mannosylated
glycopeptides). The detailed settings are as follows: for Setting 1, neutral saccharides (Hex, HexNAc, dHex,
Hex+HexNAc): -1–0 (min), and the minimum number of members: 4 (setting for maximizing No. of
detected clusters with minimized misdetection); for Setting 2, neutral saccharide: -1–0 (min), acidic
saccharide (NeuAc for human): 1–4 (min), and minimum number of members: 10 (setting for guaranteeing
the accuracy of assignment); and for Setting 3, neutral saccharide (Hex only): -1–0 (min), and minimum
number of members: 3. Dots indicate the monoisotopic masses of the glycopeptide signals at each RT peak,
and the size and color depth of the dot indicates the signal intensity. Deep red and larger dots indicate high
intensity, and small pale red dots indicate low intensity. All the clusters for hAGP shown in Data S6 can be
visualized in the viewer of the GRable main window **(D)**. The colors of lines that connect the signals indicate
the type of glycan unit between the signals: red: Hex, blue: HexNAc, green: dHex, Hex + HexNAc: brown,
and NeuAc: purple.

Figure 4. Clustering view of HL-60 cell lysate samples. All the clusters for HL-60 cell lysates (HILIC Fr.2) shown in Data S8 can be visualized in the viewer of the GRable main window. Parallel clustering was performed under two search parameter settings: **(A)** Setting 1 (a setting of the prototype) and **(B)** Setting 2 (a setting for detecting oligo-mannosylated glycopeptides). The detailed settings are as follows: for Setting 1, neutral saccharides (Hex, HexNAc, dHex, Hex+HexNAc): -1–0 (min), and minimum number of members: 4; for Setting 2, neutral saccharide (Hex only): -1–0 (min), and minimum number of members: 3. Among the detected clusters in Setting 2, only clusters with three members having oligo-mannosylated glycans is presented **(C)**.

Figure 5. Glycopeptide clusters assigned for 5 *N*-glycosylation sites of hAGP isoforms. Corresponding core peptide sequences for each cluster are indicated in Table 1. Since the core peptide of two isoforms is identical for sites 56 and 72, the same clusters are indicated for both isoforms.

776   **Graphical Abstract**