Evolutionary rate covariation is pervasive between glycosylation pathways and points to

potential disease modifiers

ERC identifies potential genetic modifiers of glycosylation

Holly J. Thorpe[1], Raghavendran Partha[2], Jordan Little[1], Nathan L. Clark[2], Clement Y. Chow[1*]

[1] Department of Human Genetics, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah,

United States of America

[2] Department of Biological Sciences, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, United States of

America

*cchow@genetics.utah.edu

ABSTRACT

Mutations in glycosylation pathways, such as N-linked glycosylation, O-linked glycosylation, and GPI anchor synthesis, lead to Congenital Disorders of Glycosylation (CDG). CDGs typically present with seizures, hypotonia, and developmental delay but display large clinical variability with symptoms affecting every system in the body. This variability suggests modifier genes might influence the phenotypes. Because of the similar physiology and clinical symptoms, there are likely common genetic modifiers between CDGs. Here, we use evolution as a tool to identify common modifiers between CDG and glycosylation genes. Protein glycosylation is evolutionarily conserved from yeast to mammals. Evolutionary rate covariation (ERC) identifies proteins with similar evolutionary rates that indicate shared biological functions and pathways. Using ERC, we identified strong evolutionary rate signatures between proteins in the same and different glycosylation pathways. Genome-wide analysis of proteins showing significant ERC with GPI anchor synthesis proteins revealed strong signatures with ncRNA modification proteins and DNA repair proteins. We also identified strong patterns of ERC based on cellular sub-localization of the GPI anchor synthesis enzymes. Functional testing of the highest scoring candidates validated genetic interactions and identified novel genetic modifiers of CDG genes. ERC analysis of disease genes and biological pathways allows for rapid prioritization of potential genetic modifiers, which can provide a better understanding of disease pathophysiology and novel therapeutic targets.

AUTHOR SUMMARY

Congenital Disorders of Glycosylation (CDGs) are a group of rare disorders resulting from impaired protein glycosylation. Glycosylation is the addition of sugar chains onto proteins and is required for proper protein function. CDG patients typically present with seizures and hypotonia. However, they can have a large amount of clinical variability, which is likely influenced by modifier genes. Modifier genes are genes that affect a phenotype without causing the disease. Using an evolutionary method that examines proteins that evolve at similar rates, we identified proteins

within glycosylation pathways and among other unexpected pathways, such as ncRNA

modification and DNA repair, that could be potential genetic modifiers of CDG genes. We also

tested top protein pairs using the *Drosophila* eye as a model and identified novel genetic modifiers

of CDG genes. Broadening our understanding of CDG modifiers can help us to better understand

why loss of glycosylation results in specific patient symptoms and could provide new treatment

targets.

INTRODUCTION

Phenotypic variation is common in Mendelian diseases, even in patients with the same disease-

causing variant (1–3). Understanding the factors underlying variable disease presentation can be

difficult despite often knowing the causal disease gene. Genetic modifiers can enhance or

suppress the phenotype of a primary disease-causing mutation, but they may not independently

lead to disease phenotypes.

Congenital disorders of glycosylation (CDG) are a group of ultra-rare multisystemic disorders

typically characterized by seizures, hypotonia, and neurodevelopmental delays (4,5). However,

because of the ubiquity of glycosylation, symptoms of CDGs can affect most organ systems. Loss-

of-function mutations in >150 glycosylation genes lead to CDGs (6). Patients with the same CDG

and even the same disease-causing variant can show phenotypic variability, indicating that

genetic background and environment can influence clinical presentation (7,8). Current treatment

options for CDGs are limited, primarily focusing on symptom management (9,10). Identifying

genetic modifiers of glycosylation genes could lead to new therapeutic targets for CDG patients.

Protein glycosylation is essential for proper protein folding, stability, and localization (4,5,11).

There are three main types of glycosylation: N-linked glycosylation, O-linked glycosylation, and

glycosylphosphatidylinositol (GPI) anchor biosynthesis. N-linked glycosylation is the addition of a

glycan onto an asparagine (4,5). The glycan is synthesized on the endoplasmic reticulum (ER)

membrane, with the stepwise addition of sugars onto a dolichol-phosphate. The glycan is then

transferred from the dolichol-phosphate onto a protein and undergoes further glycan additions

and trimming in the ER and Golgi. O-linked glycosylation is the addition of a glycan to the hydroxyl

group of a serine, threonine, or hydroxylysine (4). O-linked glycosylation encompasses the most

extensive variety of glycans and can occur in the ER, Golgi, or cytoplasm (12). O-linked glycans

are classified by the first sugar attached to the protein. The rest of the glycan is built directly onto

that sugar.

GPI anchors are glycolipids that tether proteins to the cell membrane (8,13). GPI anchor synthesis

begins by adding an N-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc) onto a phosphatidylinositol on the

cytoplasmic side of the ER membrane. The acyl group is then removed before the glycan is flipped

onto the lumen side of the ER membrane. In the ER lumen, three mannoses (four in some

species/tissues) and three phosphoethanolamine groups are added before a protein is attached

to the GPI anchor. The GPI anchor then undergoes fatty acid remodeling before it is sent to the

Golgi for further remodeling. Then, the GPI-anchored glycoprotein is trafficked to the cell surface.

Standard methods for identifying genetic modifiers typically involve utilizing natural variation in

the population or performing large mutagenesis screens (1). Several recent studies reported

modifier screens in animal models of specific CDGs (14–16). However, with over 150 CDGs,

performing similar studies for each CDG is impractical. PMM2-CDG, the most common CDG, has

just over 1000 diagnosed patients worldwide (17). Most CDGs, however, have fewer than 100

patients, making it challenging to have enough statistical power to distinguish impactful variation

within the population (8,18). It is likely CDGs share common genetic modifiers because different

forms can have similar effects on glycosylation and similar clinical presentations. Instead of

examining each CDG independently, we sought to identify common modifier genes for all or a

subset of CDGs. To do this, we used evolutionary rate covariation (ERC), a computational

evolutionary method developed to identify proteins with evolutionary rates that covary across

species (19). Protein pairs with high ERC values have similar changes in evolutionary rate and

are thought to function together, either in a complex or in a pathway, and may genetically modify

each other. ERC allows us to identify proteins with evolutionary rates that covary with CDG

proteins, potentially identifying genetic modifiers.

A number of recent studies suggest that other glycosylation genes modify CDG genes. In 2002,

a study examined a small group of PMM2-CDG patients, the most common CDG, and identified

a variant in *ALG6*, an N-linked glycosylation gene, segregating with more severe outcomes (20).

A modifier screen and ERC analysis of NGLY1, a deglycosylating enzyme associated with a CDG,

identified multiple glycosylation genes showing high ERC with NGLY1, implicating them as

potential modifiers (15). A CRISPR screen in cells with reduced DPAGT1 function, the first step

in N-glycan synthesis, identified multiple glycosylation genes able to rescue glycosylation defects

caused by inhibition of DPAGT1 (14). In yet another study, a yeast model of PMM2-CDG was

evolved over 1000 generations to identify genetic changes that increased the viability of the

PMM2 mutant yeast strains (16). Several top genes that accumulated compensatory mutations

were also involved in glycosylation. These studies indicate that genetic variation in glycosylation

genes might potentially modify the outcomes of CDGs.

Applying a computational evolutionary method allows for more rapid and broad detection of

disease modifiers. Identifying genetic modifiers of CDGs will lead to a better understanding of the

physiology underlying variable symptoms in patients and could point to new therapeutic targets.

Using ERC, we performed an analysis to discover proteins that have correlated evolutionary rates

with glycosylation proteins to discover genetic modifiers of CDGs. We found strong intra-pathway

ERC signatures among glycosylation proteins in each of the three glycosylation pathways, with

the highest average score in GPI anchor synthesis. There were also high inter-pathway ERC

values between proteins in different glycosylation pathways. Strikingly, GPI anchor synthesis

proteins had many high ERC values with N-linked glycosylation proteins. Protein complexes and

proteins with similar functions in glycosylation were also enriched for strong ERC. When

examining the genome for non-glycosylation modifiers of GPI anchor synthesis proteins, we found

high ERC scores with proteins involved in multiple unrelated pathways, including ncRNA and DNA

repair. We found that the strength of these ERC scores is driven by the GPI anchor synthesis

enzyme's location in the cell. *In vivo* testing of top scoring protein pairs, including GPAA1 with

ALG1 and PIGA with RBSN, showed a genetic interaction in a *Drosophila* eye model. Using

computational evolutionary methods, we identified patterns of ERC between CDG proteins and

novel potential modifier proteins, many of which validated *in vivo.*

RESULTS

High ERC is pervasive between glycosylation proteins

To find potential candidate genetic modifiers of CDGs, we created a dataset of ERC scores across

the genome. Using evolutionary rate data from yeast, nematode worms, *Drosophila*, vertebrates,

and mammals (S1 Fig A), we calculated ERC scores for 19,149 proteins across the genome

resulting in 180,112,645 pairwise ERC values (S1 Fig B). The genome-wide dataset values range

from -10.73 – 19.30, with an average of 0.12 ± 1.47. Higher values indicate stronger covariation

of evolutionary rates. In this study, ERC values ≥ 3 are considered notably elevated because they

are two standard deviations from the mean. Using this dataset, we compared ERC scores

between subsets of proteins.

We first examined the pairwise correlated evolutionary rates among all glycosylation proteins. We

included 296 glycosylation proteins in our analyses (43,660 protein pairs), including all known

CDG proteins and glycosylation proteins not yet associated with a disease (S1 Data). These

include enzymes and support proteins involved in synthesizing and modifying glycans, enzymes

required to form glycosylation building blocks, and proteins involved in transporting glycoproteins

throughout the cell. We calculated ERC scores between all 296 glycosylation proteins (S2 Fig,

S1 Data). Glycosylation protein pairs showed higher average values of ERC than expected by

chance (mean ERC = 0.41, p < 1×10^{-5} Permutation test) (S3 Fig, Table 1). The mean ERC score

for glycosylation protein pairs is more than 12 standard deviations above the mean of the

permutations.

Table 1: Average pairwise ERC scores in glycosylation pathway				
Pathway	Proteins in pathway	Pairwise scores	Average ERC score	P-value
All Glycosylation	296	43,660	0.41	<1×10^{-5}
GPI Anchor Synthesis	27	351	1.69	<1×10^{-5}
N-linked Glycosylation	71	2,485	0.64	<1×10^{-5}
O-linked Glycosylation	122	7,381	0.31	<1×10^{-5}
Other	76	2,850	0.47	<1×10^{-5}

Average of the pairwise ERC scores between the proteins in each pathway. Significance tested against 100,000 permutations.

Proteins in a pathway are often under similar evolutionary constraints and typically have high ERC

values (19). To determine if each of the individual glycosylation pathways exhibited even higher

ERC than when all glycosylation proteins are considered, we analyzed pairwise ERC of proteins

in each major glycosylation pathway (GPI anchor synthesis, N-linked glycosylation, and O-linked

glycosylation) as well as proteins that contribute to multiple glycosylation pathways (Other) (Table

1). As before, permutation testing was used to determine the significance of the ERC values. GPI

anchor synthesis had a mean ERC score of 1.69 (27 proteins, p < 1×10^{-5}) (Figure 1), N-linked

glycosylation had a mean ERC score of 0.64 (71 proteins, p < 1×10^{-5}) (S4 Fig A), and O-linked

glycosylation had a mean ERC score of 0.31 (122 proteins, p < 1×10^{-5}) (S4 Fig B). The proteins

involved in multiple pathways (Other) also showed higher than expected ERC with an average of

0.47 (76 proteins, p < 1x10^{-5}) (S4 Fig C). Strikingly, the average score of the GPI anchor synthesis

pathway was nearly four times as high as the average of all glycosylation proteins (GPI average

= 1.69, all glycosylation average =

0.41). O-linked glycosylation (average

ERC = 0.31) is the only pathway with a

lower average ERC score than the

overall glycosylation average. This

lower score is likely because O-linked

glycosylation comprises eleven

independent pathways that form

different types of O-linked glycans,

reducing the number of proteins in this

category that work directly with each

other.

Figure 1: Heatmap showing significant (>3) pairwise ERC scores between proteins involved in GPI anchor synthesis.

Strong evolutionary covariation between proteins in different glycosylation pathways

Glycosylation is a broad term encompassing multiple pathways with hundreds of proteins in

different organelles. While some proteins associated with CDGs impact different types of glycans,

nearly all enzymatic proteins are specific to one of the three main glycosylation pathways. We

asked if the high mean ERC score observed across all glycosylation proteins (mean ERC = 0.41,

p < 1x10^{-5}) was driven primarily by high scores between proteins in the same pathway or if high

ERC scores between proteins in different pathways were also observed. Proteins in all three

glycosylation pathways showed strong ERC with proteins in different pathways (Table 2, S5 Fig,

S6 Fig). As within the pathway, GPI anchor synthesis had the highest scores with other

glycosylation pathways. The average ERC score between proteins in GPI anchor synthesis and

proteins in N-linked glycosylation is 0.81 (p < 1x10^{-5}), O-linked glycosylation is 0.46 (p < 0.014),

and Other is 0.61 ($p < 1.30^{-4}$). The average scores between GPI anchor synthesis and either N-

linked, O-linked glycosylation, or Other are higher than the average of all glycosylation proteins

(mean ERC = 0.41). This strong signal between glycosylation proteins in different pathways,

especially those in GPI anchor synthesis and N-linked glycosylation, could indicate unexpected

interactions between pathways.

Table 2: Average ERC values between glycosylation pathways				
	GPI	N-linked	O-linked	Other
GPI	1.69 $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$	-	-	-
N-linked	0.81 $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$	0.64 $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$	-	-
O-linked	0.46 $p < 1.44 \times 10^{-2}$	0.42 $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$	0.31 $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$	-
Other	0.61 $p < 1.30 \times 10^{-4}$	0.34 $p < 1.80 \times 10^{-3}$	0.26 $p = 4.87 \times 10^{-3}$	0.47 $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$

Average of the pairwise ERC scores between the proteins in different glycosylation pathways.
Significance tested against 100,000 permutations.

Not all glycosylation complexes have high correlated evolutionary rates

We next examined whether glycosylation proteins that form physical complexes have high ERC

values. The GlcNAc transferase complex (GlcNAc-T) performs the first step in GPI anchor

synthesis, attaching a GlcNAc to the phosphatidylinositol base (13). GlcNAc-T consists of seven

proteins: PIGA, PIGC, PIGH, PIGP, PIGQ, PIGY, and DPM2. The proteins in the GlcNAc-T

complex do not have enriched rate covariation with each other (mean ERC = 0.18, p = 0.41)

(Figure 2A, S7 Fig A). Only one pair of proteins shows significant ERC, PIGQ and DPM2 (ERC =

3.58). The low ERC scores between proteins in this complex suggest that physical interaction

does not drive evolutionary rate changes in these proteins. The other complex in GPI anchor

synthesis is the GPI transamidase complex which is comprised of five proteins: PIGS, PIGT,

PIGU, PIGK, and GPAA1 (13). The GPI transamidase complex attaches the protein to the

synthesized GPI anchor. The mean ERC score among proteins in the GPI transamidase complex

is 5.86 (p < 1x10^{-5}), which is more than 11 standard deviations higher than the average expected

based on permutation testing (permutations mean = 0.12) (Figure 2B, S7 Fig B). All pairwise ERC

scores between GPI transamidase proteins show significant rate correlation (ERC ≥ 3), except

between PIGU and PIGK (ERC = 0.80).

Figure 2: Heatmaps of significant pairwise ERC values for proteins in complexes involved glycosylation. The GlcNAc-T complex (A) does not show significant ERC (p = 0.41). The GPI transamidase complex (B), the OST complex (C), and the COG complex (D) all have significant ERC (p < 1x10^{-4}).

In N-linked glycosylation, the oligosaccharyltransferase (OST) complex attaches the synthesized

glycan onto a protein (11). This complex is made up of 13 proteins. The average pairwise ERC

score of the OST complex is 1.26 and is higher than expected based on permutation testing (p =

4.0×10^{-5}) (Figure 2C, S7 Fig C). The highest value is between MLEC and RPN2 (ERC = 7.02).

Both MAGT1 and OST4 have no significant ERC scores with any other proteins in the complex.

MAGT1 acts as a scaffold protein for STT3B in the OST complex, but it also functions as a

magnesium transporter (21). Because MAGT1 has functions outside of this complex, it might have

multiple evolutionary pressures that reduce its covariation rate with OST complex proteins. OST4

plays a critical role in the OST complex, binding the catalytic subunits STT3A or STT3B to the

rest of the complex (22). Despite this, it does not show strong ERC with OST complex components

suggesting that it might have another unknown, unrelated function.

The COG complex is a group of eight proteins (COG1-8) that acts as a tethering factor in intra-

Golgi trafficking (23). Pairwise ERC scores between the proteins in the COG complex show

significant ERC (mean ERC = 3.00, $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$) (Figure 2D, S7 Fig D). Only half of the protein

pairs show a significant correlation (ERC ≥ 3). The COG complex is organized into two lobes, with

COG1-4 making up one lobe and COG5-8 making up the second lobe. Within the first lobe, COG1

has significant ERC with both COG2 and COG3. Strikingly, COG4 does not have any significant

ERC scores with the other proteins in the same lobe; however, COG4 has the highest ERC value

of the whole complex with COG6 (ERC = 8.46), a protein in the opposite lobe. The second lobe

has slightly more protein pairs with significant ERC. COG6, COG7, and COG8 all have significant

ERC with each other. COG5 has no significant ERC with other proteins in the same lobe. A bond

between COG1 and COG8 connects the two lobes. COG1 and COG8 have the second highest

ERC score of the complex (ERC = 7.16). The average ERC score between proteins in the first

lobe is 2.70, and the average ERC score between proteins in the second lobe is 2.51.

Unexpectedly, the average ERC score among inter-lobe protein pairs is 3.29. Strong ERC scores

in this complex are not solely driven by direct physical contact between the proteins and are, on

average, higher between proteins in different lobes.

Glycosylation enzymes with similar functions have increased ERC

Next, we examined whether glycosylation proteins with similar enzymatic functions, but from

different pathways display high ERC. There are twelve mannosyltransferases across the three

glycosylation pathways. These mannosyltransferases are not known to physically interact with

each other, and each one functions in only one specific glycosylation pathway. Pairwise ERC

scores between these twelve mannosyltransferases show significant ERC by permutation testing

(mean ERC = 3.07, $p < 1\times10^{-5}$) (Figure 3, S7 Fig E). Of these 55 ERC values, 27 are above the

significance cut-off (≥3). The top score is between

ALG12 and ALG2 (ERC = 8.02), which are both in

the N-linked glycosylation pathway. The second

highest score is between POMT1, involved in O-

mannosylation, and ALG2, involved in N-linked

glycosylation (ERC = 7.97). The six

mannosyltransferases involved in N-linked

glycosylation have an average ERC of 4.40. The

four GPI anchor synthesis specific

mannosyltransferases have an average of 2.32.

O-linked glycosylation has only two

mannosyltransferases (POMT1 and POMT2), and

their average ERC score is 6.86.

Figure 3: Heatmap showing significant ERC values between mannosyltransferases. N-linked glycosylation (yellow), GPI-anchor synthesis (red), O-linked glycosylation (blue). Mannosyltransferases have significant ERC with each other across pathways ($p < 1\times10^{-5}$).

Glycosylation protein pairs with strongest ERC

Some of the top ten highest-scoring glycosylation protein pairs show overlapping functions, which

could explain the high ERC scores (Table 3). For example, COG3 and TRIP11 (ERC = 9.62) are

proteins bound to the outer membrane of the Golgi involved in vesicle tethering and assembly

and maintenance of the Golgi. PIGZ and PIGW also have a high ERC score (ERC = 9.10). PIGZ

and PIGW are both involved in GPI anchor synthesis in the ER, and they share a common GPI

recognition domain in their transmembrane domains (24). While these two pairs have high ERC

scores supported by current knowledge, the top scores also include pairs with high scores that

are not easily explained based on our current knowledge of their function. FKRP, an enzyme that

adds ribitol to O-linked alpha-dystroglycans in the Golgi (25), and MOGS, an enzyme that cleaves

glucose from the synthesized N-glycan in the

ER (26), have an ERC score of 10.63. EXTL3,

a   GlcNAc   transferase   for   O-linked

glycosaminoglycan synthesis located in the

Golgi (27), and GMPPA, a proposed inhibitor of

GDP-mannose synthesis localized to the

cytoplasm (28), have an ERC score of 9.62.

The remaining six pairs in the top 10 show

similar patterns of high ERC with no obvious

overlap in function, localization, or glycosylation

pathway. These unrelated pairs of proteins with

high ERC values could signal novel interactions

between glycosylation proteins.

Table 3: Top 10 pairwise ERC scores among glycosylation proteins		
Protein 1	Protein 2	ERC score
MOGS	FKRP	10.63
EXTL3	GMPPA	9.62
DOLK	PIGG	9.59
TRIP11	PIGG	9.50
TRIP11	COG3	9.48
GNPTAB	ALG6	9.38
ALG1	GPAA1	9.29
B3GNT1	DOLK	9.18
PIGZ	PIGW	9.10
COG2	PIGG	9.00

Genome-wide patterns of evolutionary rate correlation for GPI Anchor Synthesis Proteins

We next examined whether proteins with unrelated, non-glycosylation functions might also have

high ERC values with glycosylation proteins. To do this, we extended our analyses to a full

genome-wide comparison. Because the

GPI anchor synthesis pathway had the

highest average ERC score of all

glycosylation pathways (GPI mean ERC

= 1.61), we focused the genome-wide

analyses on the GPI anchor

biosynthesis pathway. We included the

27 proteins specific to the GPI anchor

synthesis pathway and DPM1, DPM2,

and DPM3. DPM2 is a component of the

Figure 4: Histogram of genome-wide ERC values for with GPI anchor synthesis proteins. Vertical red line indicates top 1% of values.

GlcNAc-transferase complex in GPI anchor synthesis and the dolichol-phosphate-mannose

(DPM) synthase complex with DPM1 and DPM3. DPM synthase is required to add mannose to

the GPI anchor (29). We calculated pairwise ERC values for each of the 30 proteins involved in

GPI anchor biosynthesis with all 19,149 proteins in our dataset (Figure 4, S1 Data). This resulted

in 568,438 pairwise values ranging from -8.97 to 11.28, with an average of 0.32. 31,483 protein

pairs had significant ERC scores (ERC ≥ 3).

Gene Ontology enrichment of proteins showing high ERC with GPI Anchor Synthesis

Gene Ontology (GO) analysis of the top 1% of GPI anchor synthesis genome-wide ERC values

(5685 values, ERC > 4.77, 3386 proteins) (Figure 5, S2 Data) revealed enrichment in two

glycosylation related pathways, *GPI anchor biosynthetic process GO:0006506* (fold enrichment =

3.86, q = 1.03×10^{-3}) and *dolichol-linked oligosaccharide biosynthetic process GO:0006488* (fold

enrichment = 4.70, q= 1.36×10^{-3}), which support the finding described above that GPI anchor

synthesis proteins show strong signals with themselves and other glycosylation pathways.

Figure 5: GO terms from analysis of proteins in the top 1% of GPI anchor synthesis genome-wide ERC values. P-values are indicated by red-to-blue gradient, with red the lowest p-values and blue the highest p-values. Gene number identified in each category is indicated by the size of the circle.

GO analysis also returned multiple terms relating to ncRNA modification: *regulation of rRNA*

processing GO:2000232 (fold enrichment = 4.63, q = 1.37×10^{-2}), *regulatory ncRNA 3'-end*

processing GO:0043628 (fold enrichment = 4.23, q = 1.34×10^{-2}), and *tRNA methylation*

GO:0030488 (fold enrichment = 3.16, q = 3.48×10^{-3}) (Figure 5, S2 Data). Previous work from our

lab also identified ncRNA processing proteins as potential modifiers of NGLY1-CDG (15). The

enrichment of ncRNA processing proteins in this analysis further supports an unexplored

connection between glycosylation proteins and ncRNAs. There were also multiple GO terms

related to DNA repair: *base excision repair GO:006284* (fold enrichment = 3.24, q = 2.71×10^{-3}),

nucleotide-excision repair GO:0006289 (fold enrichment = 2.60, q = 1.83×10^{-2}), and *double-strand*

break repair via homologous recombination GO:0000724 (fold enrichment = 2.24, q = 2.27×10^{-3}).

This enrichment was unexpected as no previous evidence links DNA repair to GPI anchor

synthesis and suggests a possible interaction between the two pathways.

Loss of function in most GPI anchor synthesis proteins leads to a CDG. To identify potential

proteins that could modify multiple CDG genes across the pathway, we also ran GO analysis on

proteins that had a significant ERC score with at least a third (10 or more) of the 30 GPI anchor

synthesis proteins (Figure 6, S2 Data). Unsurprisingly, GO analysis again showed high

enrichment for glycosylation proteins (*GPI anchor biosynthetic process* GO:0006506, fold

enrichment 18.53, q = 1.59×10^{-4}; *dolichol-linked oligosaccharide biosynthetic process*

GO:0006488, fold enrichment 15.63, q = 4.48×10^{-2}) as well as terms related to ncRNA (*tRNA*

aminoacylation for protein translation GO:0006418, fold enrichment = 15.63, q = 8.10×10^{-5}; *tRNA*

methylation GO:0030488, fold enrichment = 11.45, q = 7.69×10^{-3}; *rRNA processing GO:0006364*,

fold enrichment = 4.52, q = 7.26×10^{-3}). Unlike what was found when analyzing the top 1% of

values, there was also enrichment for ribosome assembly (*ribosomal small subunit biogenesis*

GO:0042274, fold enrichment = 8.51, q = 9.95×10^{-5}; *ribosome assembly GO:0042255,* fold

enrichment = 7.46, q = 4.73×10^{-2}) and m*itotic recombination GO:0006312* (fold enrichment =

Figure 6: GO terms from analysis of proteins with significant ERC values with at least 10 GPI anchor synthesis proteins. P-values are indicated by red-to-blue gradient, with red the lowest p-values and blue the highest p-values. Gene number identified in each category is indicated by the size of the circle.

17.27, q = 3.43x10^{-2}). These pathways interacting

with multiple proteins in GPI anchor synthesis may

represent compelling therapeutic targets for multiple

GPI anchor deficiencies.

Top scoring pairs across the genome

Many top-scoring pairs from the genome-wide

analysis fall under the categories enriched in the GO

analyses. Four of the top 30 scoring pairs were

between known glycosylation proteins (Table 4).

PIGN, a phosphoethanolamine transferase (13), had

high ERC with MAN2B2, a protein involved in glycan

recycling (ERC = 10.01) (10). PIGG, a

phosphoethanolamine transferase (13), had strong

ERC with DOLK, a kinase that creates dolichol-

phosphate upon which the N-glycan is built (ERC =

9.59) (30), and TRIP11, a protein involved in Golgi

vesicle tethering (ERC = 9.50) (31). GPAA1, a

member of the GPI transamidase complex (13), had

high ERC with ALG1, a mannosyltransferase in N-

linked glycosylation (ERC = 9.29) (11). All seven

glycosylation proteins in these top-scoring pairs are

associated with their own CDGs, further suggesting

that known CDG genes are likely candidates for

genetic modifiers of other CDGs (14–16,20).

Table 4: Top scoring protein pairs from genome-wide analysis of GPI anchor synthesis proteins.

Rank	GPI Protein	Protein 2	ERC score
1	PIGG	HTT	11.28
2	PIGQ	WDR90	10.50
3	PIGG	TUBGCP2	10.49
4	PIGG	ATG7	10.44
5	PIGB	UTP20	10.33
6	PIGW	DHODH	10.32
7	PIGG	TTC8	10.22
8	PIGO	ZNF622	10.19
9	PIGB	AP4E1	10.09
10	PIGG	PRKDC	10.01
11	PIGN	MAN2B2	10.01
12	GPAA1	MCM7	9.97
13	PIGG	ERCC6	9.76
14	PIGN	WDR36	9.74
15	PIGG	DOLK	9.59
16	PIGA	ZFYVE20	9.58
17	PIGZ	C12orf65	9.57
18	PIGB	GEMIN5	9.57
19	PIGG	TRIP11	9.50
20	PIGG	GTF3C5	9.47
21	PIGM	INF2	9.45
22	PIGQ	PKD1	9.40
23	PIGN	CTDP1	9.39
24	PGAP4	DHX40	9.38
25	PIGG	PHRF1	9.36
26	PIGB	MSH6	9.33
27	PIGO	SHPRH	9.31
28	GPAA1	ALG1	9.29
29	PIGG	AP5Z1	9.26
30	PGAP1	SMYD3	9.22

Top scores in our dataset revealed high ERC between PIGB and UTP20 (ERC = 10.33) and PIGN

and WDR36 (ERC = 9.74). UTP20 and WDR36 are both involved in rRNA processing (32,33).

Top scores also included PIGG and PRKDC (ERC = 10.01), a DNA damage sensing protein (34),

ERCC6 (ERC = 9.76), a protein important for transcription-coupled excision repair (35), and

AP5Z1 (ERC = 9.26), a protein involved in homologous recombination DNA repair (36). GPAA1

had high ERC with MCM7 (ERC = 9.97), a protein that signals DNA damage (37). These top pairs

further support the hypothesis of a relationship between GPI anchor synthesis genes and the GO

terms identified and offer targeted protein pairs to begin testing to explore these pathways.

Cytoplasmic GPI anchor synthesis proteins have lower ERC

Among the top 1% of genome-wide GPI anchor scores, nearly 10% are with PIGG (552/5685).

To determine if this enrichment was significant, we compared the actual number of ERC values

each GPI anchor synthesis protein had in the top 1% to an expected number of values, assuming

an equal distribution of all the GPI anchor synthesis proteins (expected ~189 occurrences per

protein) (Figure 7A, S1 Table). PIGG (552 occurrences, 2.91 fold change, $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$) was the

most overrepresented, with nearly three times as many ERC values in the top 1% as expected,

followed by PIGW (526 occurrences, 2.78 fold change, $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$). On the other hand, PIGY

(8 occurrences, -23.68 fold change, $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$), PIGH (7 occurrences, -27.06 fold change, $p <$

2.2×10^{-16}), and DPM2 (6 occurrences, -31.57 fold change, $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$) all have more than 20

fold less than the expected frequency. We tested whether this enrichment/depletion followed the

pathway order (Figure 7B, 7C). Analyses of the GPI anchor synthesis proteins by pathway order

demonstrated that 8/10 proteins on the cytoplasmic side are underrepresented, and none are

overrepresented. In the ER lumen, only 4/17 proteins are underrepresented, and 9/17 of the

proteins are overrepresented.

Figure 7: Proportion of expected occurrences of all GPI anchor synthesis proteins in the top 1% of genome-wide scores. Overrepresented proteins are shown in red, underrepresented in blue, and proteins not significantly different from expected are in grey. A) Proteins sorted from most to least represented. B) Proteins sorted in pathway order with lines dividing genes active on the cytoplasmic side of the ER, the lumen side of the ER, and in the Golgi. C) GPI anchor synthesis pathway diagram. Synthesis begins on the cytoplasmic side of the ER. The anchor is flipped to the lumen side. After the protein is attached, the glycan is sent to the Golgi for lipid remodeling.

Proteins acting on the cytoplasmic side of the ER were significantly underrepresented in the top

1% of ERC values, and proteins acting on the lumen side were highly overrepresented. We

hypothesized that high ERC with other ER resident proteins may be driving the overrepresentation

of lumen proteins. However, GO analysis for cellular compartment of the top 1% of proteins with

high ERC with GPI anchor synthesis proteins revealed the top enriched compartments are

associated with the exosome, ribosome, and mitochondria (S8 Fig, S2 Data). Some ER-related

terms were enriched, but over 50 other terms were more enriched. This indicates that while ER

resident proteins may contribute to some of the high scores observed among lumen GPI anchor

synthesis proteins, it is unlikely that high scores with ER resident proteins are solely responsible

for driving the overrepresentation of lumen GPI anchor synthesis proteins in the top 1% of ERC

scores.

We examined the N-linked glycosylation pathway to determine if lower ERC scores for

cytoplasmic enzymes were unique to GPI anchor synthesis or common in glycosylation pathways.

The N-linked glycosylation pathway is similar in that the first few steps occur on the cytoplasmic

side, and the glycan is completed and attached to a protein on the ER lumen side. We calculated

ERC scores for proteins in the N-linked glycosylation pathway across the genome and ran the

same analysis as we did for GPI anchor synthesis. We took the top 1% of values and determined

the number of scores for each N-linked glycosylation protein and compared this to the expected

distribution, as we did above (S9 Fig). Among the eight cytoplasmic proteins, three were under-

represented, and four were over-represented. Among the ER lumen proteins, eight of the 23

proteins were under-represented, and ten of the 23 lumen proteins were over-represented. The

N-linked glycosylation enzymes acting on the cytoplasmic did not have an enrichment of lower

scores as observed for GPI anchor synthesis. The ERC pattern for cytoplasmic vs. ER lumen

proteins appears specific to the GPI anchor synthesis pathway.

***In vivo* testing of top ERC pairs confirms genetic interactions**

A strong ERC score is an indicator of shared function between proteins in a complex or across a

pathway (19). Therefore, we tested top ERC scoring protein pairs to find new genetic interactions

with GPI anchor synthesis proteins (Table 5, S3 Data). Because many GPI anchor synthesis

proteins are necessary for survival in *Drosophila*, ubiquitous loss-of-function experiments are

challenging. The *Drosophila* eye provides a powerful alternative model for testing genetic

interactions with glycosylation genes (14). Using the GAL4-UAS system with the *eyes absent*

composite GAL4 driver (*eya*) (38), we expressed RNAi in an eye-specific manner to create

knockdown models for each GPI anchor gene tested. Many of these GPI anchor knockdown

models have changes in eye size/quality/color. We can observe genetic interactions by creating

double knockdowns of the highest scoring protein pairs in our genome-wide list and comparing

the effects of each gene's single knockdown with the effects of the double knockdown.

Table 5: *In vivo* testing for genetic interactions of top scoring protein pairs					
	GPI protein	Protein 2	Protein 2 function	ERC score	Interaction
GPI x CDG	PIGG	DOLK	Dolichol-phosphate synthesis involved in N-linked glycosylation	9.59	YES
	PIGG	TRIP11	Golgi maintenance and homeostasis	9.50	NO
	GPAA1	ALG1	First mannosyltransferases in N-linked glycosylation	9.29	YES
GPI x Genome-wide	PIGA	RBSN	Early endocytic membrane fusion and membrane trafficking of recycling endosomes	9.58	YES
	PIGW	DHODH	Pyrimidine synthesis	10.32	NO
	PIGM	INF2	Actin polymerization and depolymerization	9.45	YES
	PIGZ	C12orf65	Mitochondrial gene translation	9.57	NO
	PIGO	ZNF622	Ribosomal maturation	10.19	YES
	PIGO	SMPD4	Sphingomyelin catabolism to form phosphorylcholine and ceramide	9.13	YES
	PIGG	HTT	Vesicle transport	11.28	NO
	PIGG	TUBGCP2	Microtubule nucleation	10.49	YES
	PIGG	ATG7	Autophagy	10.44	NO
	PIGG	TTC8	Cilia membrane protein sorting	10.22	YES
	PIGG	PHRF1	Protein ubiquitination	9.36	NO
	PIGG	ZGPAT	Transcription repressor, negatively regulates EGFR expression	9.18	YES
	PIGT	HDHD3	Function unknown	9.20	YES

Top scoring protein pairs tested for interaction in a *Drosophila* eye model. GPI proteins sorted by pathway order. Interactions tested with two-way ANOVA $p < 0.05$.

This tissue-specific eye model provides an efficient way to screen for genetic interactions.

However, there are caveats in using an eye knockdown model. Most genetic interactions are

context-specific. Because we are knocking down the genes only in the eye, we may not be testing

in the correct tissues for the interactions identified by ERC. All the genes tested have expression

in the *Drosophila* eye (39), but the eye does not always have the highest tissue expression.

Another major caveat to this model is the use of RNAi to knockdown the genes of interest.

Different RNAi transgenes reduce the expression level of their target genes by different levels (S3

Data). It is possible that the interactions in our models require specific

expression levels that a particular RNAi does not achieve.

We tested the top sixteen pairs from our genome-wide list with available RNAi lines (Table 5, S10

Fig, S3 Data). Of the sixteen pairs tested, 10 showed significant interactions. With over half of the

tested pairs validating, this is a higher hit rate than typically seen with ERC (40–42). When multiple

RNAi lines were available for a gene, we tested all RNAi lines. qPCR was performed on all RNAi

lines to determine knockdown levels for each line. The RNAi line resulting in the lowest expression

showed the interaction for almost all pairs with multiple RNAi lines tested. In two interaction pairs,

the lower knockdown RNAi line showed interaction while the strongest knockdown line did not.

This indicates expression level may play a role in identifying genetic interactions. Here we

highlight two interactions: one pair between a GPI anchor synthesis protein and another

glycosylation protein, and one pair between a GPI anchor synthesis protein and a non-

glycosylation protein.

GPAA1 and ALG1 had one of the highest scores between a GPI anchor synthesis protein and a

glycosylation protein outside of GPI anchor synthesis (ERC = 9.29). GPAA1 is a catalytic

component of the GPI-transamidase complex that attaches a protein to the synthesized GPI

anchor (13,43). ALG1, located on the cytoplasmic side of the ER, adds the first mannose onto the

N-linked glycan (11). Both *GPAA1* and *ALG1* are associated with their own respective CDGs (44).

While eye-specific knockdown of *ALG1* alone resulted in no change in eye size, it did result in

structural disorganization and occasional necrosis. Eye-specific knockdown of *GPAA1* alone

resulted in a significant reduction in eye size, but there was little qualitative change (Figure 8 A,

B). Double knockdown of *GPAA1* and *ALG1* resulted in a significantly smaller eye than the

expected additive effect of both single knockdowns (p = 9.91×10^{-5}), and the eye was structurally

disorganized. This indicates a genetic interaction between *GPAA1* and *ALG1*, two genes involved

in distinct glycosylation pathways.

Figure 8: *In vivo* testing for genetic interactions in the eye. A),C) Quantification of eye sizes. Quantification in pixels (px) is along the Y axis. X axis has expression level of Protein 2, Wild Type (WT) or Knockdown (KD), and line color indicates expression level of GPI anchor synthesis protein (WT or KD). Interaction p-value calculated using a two-way ANOVA. B),D) Representative images of *Drosophila* eyes showing WT control, single KDs, and double KD eyes.

RBSN has the top ERC score with PIGA (ERC = 9.58), the enzymatic component of GlcNAc-

transferase in GPI anchor synthesis (13). RBSN is recruited to the early endosome and plays a

role in sorting cargo between lysosomal degradation and membrane recycling (45,46). While

single knockdown of *RBSN* in the eye yields no change in eye size or structure (Figure 8 C, D),

single knockdown of *PIGA* results in a significantly decreased eye size. *PIGA* knockdown also

has structural disorganization, necrosis, and glassiness in the eye. Double knockdown of *PIGA*

and *RBSN* enhances the small eye *PIGA* phenotype in a non-additive manner indicating a genetic

interaction between *PIGA* and *RBSN* (p = 1.95 x 10^{-7}). The double knockdown continues to show

necrotic tissue and disorganization. This same interaction was seen with a second RNAi line for

PIGA, where the loss of *RBSN* enhances the phenotype, in a non-additive manner (p = 2.70 x 10^{-4}

) (S10 Fig D).

High ERC scores suggest a connection between GPI anchor synthesis and the endosome

It may not be immediately apparent why GPI anchor synthesis proteins like PIGA might show

strong ERC and a genetic interaction with endosomal proteins like RBSN. However, many GPI-

anchored proteins are frequently endocytosed and are either recycled back to the cell membrane

or sent to the lysosome for degradation (47). RBSN is recruited to the early endosome by Rab5

where it aids in vesicle fusion to form the early endosome (46). Interestingly, Rab5 also binds

HTT (48). HTT is an essential protein implicated in many cell functions, including cell transport

and autophagy, and had the highest genome-wide ERC score with a GPI anchor synthesis protein

(HTT and PIGG, ERC = 11.28) (49). Many interactors have been identified for HTT, but none are

involved in GPI anchor synthesis. Because of the genetic interaction between RBSN and PIGA

and the link between RBSN, Rab5, and HTT, we further examined the evolutionary covariation

between RBSN, HTT, and the GPI anchor pathway.

RBSN and HTT show significant ERC scores with 15 and six of the 30 GPI anchor synthesis

proteins, respectively. Strikingly, all six GPI anchor synthesis proteins, including PIGG, that had

high ERC scores with HTT also had high scores with RBSN (PIGG with RBSN, ERC = 9.05; PIGG

with HTT, ERC = 11.28) (green proteins in Figure 9). HTT and RBSN also had a very high ERC

score with each other (ERC = 8.21). These high ERC scores suggest a previously unknown

functional connection between GPI anchor synthesis proteins, HTT, and RBSN, and more

broadly, with the endosome pathway. This also highlights the need to examine all proteins in the

GPI anchor synthesis pathway together. A high ERC score between HTT and PIGG or between

PIGA and RBSN is individually interesting but challenging to contextualize. However, the fact that

the majority of GPI anchor synthesis pathway proteins show high ERC with RBSN, which is

directly linked to HTT, allows for better contextualization of the top hit in the genome-wide data.

Figure 9: RBSN and HTT show strong ERC with each other and proteins in the GPI anchor synthesis pathway. ERC scores between proteins are indicated by the width of the edges and shown next to the GPI anchor protein. GPI anchor synthesis proteins showing significant ERC with both HTT and RBSN are shown in green. GPI anchor synthesis proteins are listed in pathway order.

DISCUSSION

CDGs are poorly understood, multi-systemic disorders with extensive phenotypic variability, suggesting a role for genetic background and modifier genes. Identifying genetic modifiers of CDGs could help clarify the pathology of these disorders. In this study, we used evolutionary methods to explore genetic modifiers of CDGs and prioritize candidate genes for *in vivo* testing.

Until now, ERC has been used primarily to characterize unknown proteins or identify new proteins involved in specific pathways (19,40–42,50–53). One previous study used evolutionary similarities between disease genes to prioritize novel disease-causing genes (54). Because modifier genes genetically interact with their disease genes, it is logical that they would also be evolutionarily related to each other. Glycosylation is highly conserved from yeast to mammals allowing for strong evolutionary signals to have developed over time (11,55,56). Previously identified modifier genes for CDGs have high ERC values, including PMM2 – PGM1 (7.08) and DPAGT1 – DPM1 (4.17) (14,16). *In* vivo testing of top hits from our analysis had a hit rate (10 out of 16) higher than previously found in other ERC studies (40–42). Using ERC to identify disease modifiers is a novel application that could be applied to help better understand and treat rare diseases.

On average, glycosylation protein pairs showed high ERC regardless of whether the two proteins were in the same pathway. However, we found exceptionally high ERC scores between proteins involved in GPI anchor synthesis and N-linked glycosylation. One hypothesis for this might be both pathways' shared reliance on mannose. N-glycans and GPI anchors have multiple mannoses added to their glycan chains, and they both rely on the DPM complex to supply mannose into the lumen of the ER (11,29). Only one type of O-linked glycan incorporates mannose, which could explain why O-linked glycosylation does not have as high of ERC scores with the other glycosylation pathways (57). Another potential explanation could be the necessity

of N-linked glycosylation for proper folding of GPI-anchored proteins (58). In the ER, N-glycans

on GPI-anchored proteins allow them to interact with chaperone proteins for proper protein

folding. This requirement for both N-linked glycosylation and GPI anchor synthesis for protein

folding might explain why the two different glycosylation pathways are evolutionarily linked. High

ERC between N-linked glycosylation and GPI anchor synthesis could also suggest unexplored

connections between these pathways, and they may need to be studied together instead of in

isolation.

High ERC scores occur when two proteins are under similar evolutionary constraints (19,59).

When analyzing ERC scores of GPI anchor synthesis proteins across the genome, we found that

GPI anchor synthesis proteins acting on the cytoplasmic side of the ER had fewer high ERC

scores than proteins acting on the luminal side of the ER. This was unexpected because all the

proteins in the GPI anchor synthesis pathway are only known to act in that pathway. It is feasible

that cytoplasmic components interact with a wider variety of proteins, which also influence their

evolutionary rates in different ways, making it more difficult for them to have strong ERC scores.

Cytoplasmic GPI anchor synthesis proteins may perform more functions than are currently known.

GO analysis of proteins showing high ERC with GPI anchor synthesis proteins resulted in multiple

terms related to ncRNA. Until recently it was thought there was no overlap between RNA and

glycosylation. In 2021, a group isolated glycosylated ncRNAs (60). It is currently unknown how

these glycans are synthesized and attached to RNA (61). It is possible the same enzymes

responsible for building the glycans for protein glycosylation also build RNA glycans. This

relationship could explain the evolutionary connection between ncRNAs and glycosylation

proteins.

Among the ncRNA GO terms, many were related to rRNA biology. However, it is unclear how

glycosylation is involved in rRNA biology. Since glycosylation is a co-translational/post-

translational modification, it suggests the evolutionary relationship identified between

glycosylation proteins and rRNA processing proteins could be due to glycosylation's dependence

on the ribosome functioning properly and translating proteins (62). Further studies need to be

performed to identify the specific protein interactions driving the association between these two

pathways.

CDG patients have a broad clinical spectrum influenced by different disease-causing variants,

environmental factors, and genetic background (63,64). Previous attempts to identify genetic

modifiers with standard methods (i.e., mutagenesis screens and using natural variation in the

population) have found promising candidates (14–16,20). These time and effort-intensive

methods can only be applied to one disorder at a time. The different CDGs are likely connected

because they all affect protein glycosylation and show similar symptoms in patients (65). Because

of their relatedness, it is probable that common modifiers affect multiple CDGs. Here, we

leveraged evolutionary tools to analyze all glycosylation genes and identify potential modifiers for

all CDG genes. Further exploration of these common modifiers could lead to novel therapeutic

targets for CDG patients that may be broadly applied to multiple types of CDGs.

METHODS

Evolutionary Rate Covariation

Evolutionary rate covariation (ERC) was calculated independently for orthologous sets of genes

from: 62 mammal species, 39 non-mammalian vertebrate species, 22 drosophila species, 18

yeast species, and 17 nematode species. The gene-specific rate of evolution was calculated for

each gene in all five independent phylogenies using the PAML package (66). The evolutionary

rate for each gene was then normalized into relative evolutionary rates (RERs) by comparing the

gene-specific branch length to the genome-wide average. The RERs for each pair of orthologous

genes in each of the five datasets were correlated using a Pearson correlation. The correlation

(i.e. the ERC value) was then Fisher transformed to adjust for the number of branches contributing

to a score. This allowed us to sum all five datasets into one integrated FtERC dataset. The

orthologs from drosophila, yeast, and nematodes were mapped to the hg19 human orthologs

using InParanoid (67). Only 1:1 orthologs were retained, but we did not require that an ortholog

be present in every independent phylogeny. This resulted in a dataset of FtERC values for 19,149

orthologous genes.

Statistics

Significance of elevated ERC scores was determined using proteome-wide permutation testing.

For significance testing in one group of proteins, the mean ERC value observed between all pairs

in a group is calculated. Then it is compared to the mean ERC values of 100,000 groups with the

same number of proteins chosen at random from the entire proteome. A p-value is calculated as

the proportion of random groups of proteins that had a mean ERC value of equal or greater value

than the mean of the tested group. Using 100,000 permutations, the most significant p-value

possible is $<1 \times 10^{-5}$.

ERC significance between two different groups of proteins also used proteome-wide permutation

testing. The mean ERC of scores between proteins in two different groups is calculated. Then it

is compared to the mean ERC value between proteins where one of the testing groups is

maintained, and the other group is substituted by the same number of proteins chosen at random

from the entire genome. This is repeated 100,000 times, and a p-value is calculated as the

proportion of random groups of proteins that had a mean ERC value of equal or greater value

than the mean of the tested group. This process is repeated while maintaining the second group

of proteins and replacing the first group with random proteins. The p-value for that testing is

calculated as described above, and the higher p-value between the two tests is used.

Enrichment of each GPI anchor synthesis protein in the genome-wide dataset was determined

using chi-squared testing to compare the number of observed occurrences of each protein in the

dataset compared to number of expected occurrences if they were evenly distributed.

Genetic interactions between knockdown groups were determined using a two-way ANOVA run

in RStudio. GPI anchor gene level (wild type or knockdown) and gene 2 gene level (wild type or

knockdown) were the variables compared in the analysis.

Gene Ontology Analyses

Gene Ontology (GO) analysis was performed using the GO enrichment analysis

(geneontology.org) powered by the PANTHER Classification System. Enriched pathways were

identified using the "GO biological process complete" annotation dataset, and enriched cell

compartments were identified using the "GO cellular compartment complete" annotation dataset

with the *Homo sapiens* gene reference list using the default parameters (Fisher's Exact, Calculate

False Discovery Rate). Figures 5 and 6 and S8 Fig show most specific subclass term as sorted

by Panther hierarchical soring.

Fly stocks and maintenance

Stocks were maintained on standard Archon Scientific glucose fly food at 25°C on a 12-h

light/dark cycle. The *w-;; eya composite-GAL4* and *w-;eya composite-GAL4/CyO;+* lines were a

gift from Justin Kumar (Indiana University Bloomington) and were characterized previously (38).

Drosophila orthologues of candidate genes were determined using DIOPT, requiring a score ≥6

(68). RNAi lines used in this study were ordered from the Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center

and the Vienna Drosophila Resource Center (Line IDs in S3 Data).

To create double knockdown flies, either *w-; GPI RNAi/CyO;eya-GAL4/TM3, Sb* or *w-;eya-*

GAL4/CyO; GPI RNAi/TM3, Sb was crossed to either the candidate modifier RNAi lines or the

equivalent control lines (*attP40, attP2, attP, w1118)* selecting progeny that were negative for both

CyO and *TM3, Sb* balancers.

Eye imaging and quantification

Adult female flies aged 3-5 days were collected under CO_2 anesthesia then frozen at -80°C for

later imaging. Eyes were imaged at 3x magnification using the Leica EC3 Camera. Eye area was

measured as previously described (14,69).

qPCR

Knockdown efficiency for each RNAi line used was tested using qPCR. RNAi lines were crossed

to a *Tubulin-GAL4*/*Sb, Dfd-YFP* driver (BDSC: 5138) to test full-body knockdown amounts. 5-8

adult female flies aged 3-5 days old were collected, and RNA was extracted using a Direct-zol

RNA Miniprep (Zymo Research R2061) using TRIzol Reagent (ThermoFisher Cat # 15596026)

and including the DNAse step. RNA was converted to cDNA using a ProtoScript® II First Strand

cDNA Synthesis Kit (NEB Cat # E6560L). RT-qPCR was performed using a QuantStudio 3 96-

well 0.2 ml block instrument and PowerUp SYBR Green Master Mix (ThermoFisher Cat #

A25741). If *Tubulin* driving the RNAi line was adult lethal, 5-10 YFP-negative larvae were used.

If   available,   we   used   primers   from   the   FlyPrimerBank   (70)   located   at

http://www.flyrnai.org/flyprimerbank. Other primers were designed using Primer3Plus (71) located

at *www.primer3plus.com*. All primer sequences listed in S3 Data.

References

1.   Chow CY. Bringing genetic background into focus. Nat Rev Genet. 2016 Feb;17(2):63–4.

2.   Nadeau JH. Modifier genes in mice and humans. Nat Rev Genet. 2001 Mar;2(3):165–74.

3.   Rahit KMTH, Tarailo-Graovac M. Genetic Modifiers and Rare Mendelian Disease. Genes.

2020 Feb 25;11(3):239.

4.   Chang IJ, He M, Lam CT. Congenital disorders of glycosylation. Ann Transl Med. 2018 Aug

11;6(24):12.

5.   Frappaolo A, Sechi S, Kumagai T, Karimpour-Ghahnavieh A, Tiemeyer M, Giansanti MG.

Modeling Congenital Disorders of N-Linked Glycoprotein Glycosylation in Drosophila

melanogaster. Front Genet [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Jun 16];9. Available from:

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fgene.2018.00436/full

6.   Piedade A, Francisco R, Jaeken J, Sarkhail P, Brasil S, Ferreira CR, et al. Epidemiology of

congenital disorders of glycosylation (CDG)—overview and perspectives. J Rare Dis. 2022

Dec 7;1(1):3.

7.   Bayat A, Knaus A, Pendziwiat M, Afenjar A, Barakat TS, Bosch F, et al. Lessons learned

from 40 novel PIGA patients and a review of the literature. Epilepsia. 2020;61(6):1142–55.

8.   Bellai-Dussault K, Nguyen TTM, Baratang NV, Jimenez-Cruz DA, Campeau PM. Clinical

variability in inherited glycosylphosphatidylinositol deficiency disorders. Clin Genet.

2019;95(1):112–21.

9.   Brasil S, Pascoal C, Francisco R, Marques-da-Silva D, Andreotti G, Videira PA, et al. CDG

Therapies: From Bench to Bedside. Int J Mol Sci. 2018 May;19(5):1304.

10. Verheijen J, Tahata S, Kozicz T, Witters P, Morava E. Therapeutic approaches in

Congenital Disorders of Glycosylation (CDG) involving N-linked glycosylation: an update.

Genet Med. 2020 Feb;22(2):268–79.

11. Aebi M. N-linked protein glycosylation in the ER. Biochim Biophys Acta BBA - Mol Cell Res.

2013 Nov 1;1833(11):2430–7.

12. Schjoldager KTBG, Clausen H. Site-specific protein O-glycosylation modulates proprotein

processing — Deciphering specific functions of the large polypeptide GalNAc-transferase

gene family. Biochim Biophys Acta BBA - Gen Subj. 2012 Dec 1;1820(12):2079–94.

13. Almeida A, Layton M, Karadimitris A. Inherited glycosylphosphatidyl inositol deficiency: A

treatable CDG. Biochim Biophys Acta BBA - Mol Basis Dis. 2009 Sep;1792(9):874–80.

14. Dalton HM, Viswanatha R, Jr RB, Zuno JS, Berman AR, Rushforth R, et al. A genome-wide

CRISPR screen identifies DPM1 as a modifier of DPAGT1 deficiency and ER stress. PLOS

Genet. 2022 Sep 27;18(9):e1010430.

15. Talsness DM, Owings KG, Coelho E, Mercenne G, Pleinis JM, Zuberi AR, et al. A

Drosophila natural variation screen identifies NKCC1 as a substrate of NGLY1

deglycosylation and a modifier of NGLY1 deficiency. bioRxiv. 2020 Apr

14;2020.04.13.039651.

16. Vignogna RC, Allocca M, Monticelli M, Norris JW, Steet R, Perlstein EO, et al. Evolutionary

rescue of phosphomannomutase deficiency in yeast models of human disease. Shou W,

Perry GH, Freeze HH, Shou W, editors. eLife. 2022 Oct 10;11:e79346.

17. Gámez A, Serrano M, Gallego D, Vilas A, Pérez B. New and potential strategies for the

treatment of PMM2-CDG. Biochim Biophys Acta BBA - Gen Subj. 2020 Nov

1;1864(11):129686.

18. Pajusalu S, Vals MA, Mihkla L, Šamarina U, Kahre T, Õunap K. The Estimated Prevalence

of N-Linked Congenital Disorders of Glycosylation Across Various Populations Based on

Allele Frequencies in General Population Databases. Front Genet [Internet]. 2021 [cited

2023 Jul 16];12. Available from:

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fgene.2021.719437

19. Clark NL, Alani E, Aquadro CF. Evolutionary rate covariation reveals shared functionality

and coexpression of genes. Genome Res. 2012 Apr 1;22(4):714–20.

20. Westphal V, Kjaergaard S, Schollen E, Martens K, Grunewald S, Schwartz M, et al. A

frequent mild mutation in ALG6 may exacerbate the clinical severity of patients with

congenital disorder of glycosylation Ia (CDG-Ia) caused by phosphomannomutase

deficiency. Hum Mol Genet. 2002 Mar 1;11(5):599–604.

21. Blommaert E, Péanne R, Cherepanova NA, Rymen D, Staels F, Jaeken J, et al. Mutations

in MAGT1 lead to a glycosylation disorder with a variable phenotype. Proc Natl Acad Sci.

2019 May 14;116(20):9865–70.

22. Chaudhary BP, Zoetewey D, Mohanty S. 1H, 13C, 15N resonance assignments and

secondary structure of yeast oligosaccharyltransferase subunit Ost4 and its functionally

important mutant Ost4V23D. Biomol NMR Assign. 2020 Oct;14(2):205–9.

23. Blackburn JB, D'Souza Z, Lupashin VV. Maintaining order: COG complex controls Golgi

trafficking, processing, and sorting. FEBS Lett. 2019;593(17):2466–87.

24. Kinoshita T. Biosynthesis and biology of mammalian GPI-anchored proteins. Open Biol.

2020 Mar 11;10(3):190290.

25. Bailey EC, Alrowaished SS, Kilroy EA, Crooks ES, Drinkert DM, Karunasiri CM, et al. NAD+

improves neuromuscular development in a zebrafish model of FKRP-associated

dystroglycanopathy. Skelet Muscle. 2019 Aug 7;9(1):21.

26. Anzai R, Tsuji M, Yamashita S, Wada Y, Okamoto N, Saitsu H, et al. Congenital disorders

of glycosylation type IIb with MOGS mutations cause early infantile epileptic

encephalopathy, dysmorphic features, and hepatic dysfunction. Brain Dev. 2021 Mar

1;43(3):402–10.

27. Oud MM, Tuijnenburg P, Hempel M, van Vlies N, Ren Z, Ferdinandusse S, et al. Mutations

in EXTL3 Cause Neuro-immuno-skeletal Dysplasia Syndrome. Am J Hum Genet. 2017 Feb

2;100(2):281–96.

28. Franzka P, Henze H, Jung MJ, Schüler SC, Mittag S, Biskup K, et al. GMPPA defects cause

a neuromuscular disorder with **α**-dystroglycan hyperglycosylation. J Clin Invest [Internet].

2021 May 3 [cited 2023 Nov 22];131(9). Available from:

https://www.jci.org/articles/view/139076#B6

29. Maeda Y, Kinoshita T. Dolichol-phosphate mannose synthase: Structure, function and

regulation. Biochim Biophys Acta BBA - Gen Subj. 2008 Jun 1;1780(6):861–8.

30. Rush ET, Baker CV, Rizzo WB. Dolichol kinase deficiency (DOLK-CDG): Two new cases

and expansion of phenotype. Am J Med Genet A. 2017;173(9):2428–34.

31. Ondruskova N, Cechova A, Hansikova H, Honzik T, Jaeken J. Congenital disorders of

glycosylation: Still "hot" in 2020. Biochim Biophys Acta BBA - Gen Subj. 2021 Jan

1;1865(1):129751.

32. Skarie JM, Link BA. The Primary open-angle glaucoma gene WDR36 functions in ribosomal

RNA processing and interacts with the p53 stress–response pathway. Hum Mol Genet.

2008 Aug 15;17(16):2474–85.

33. Wang Y, Liu J, Zhao H, Lü W, Zhao J, Yang L, et al. Human 1A6/DRIM, the homolog of

yeast Utp20, functions in the 18S rRNA processing. Biochim Biophys Acta BBA - Mol Cell

Res. 2007 Jun 1;1773(6):863–8.

34. Chen Y, Li Y, Xiong J, Lan B, Wang X, Liu J, et al. Role of PRKDC in cancer initiation,

progression, and treatment. Cancer Cell Int. 2021 Oct 26;21(1):563.

35. Kuang L, Liu B, Xi D, Gao Y. A novel heterozygous ERCC6 variant identified in a Chinese

family with non-syndromic primary ovarian insufficiency. Mol Genet Genomic Med.

2022;10(10):e2040.

36. Corsello T, Kudlicki AS, Liu T, Casola A. Respiratory syncytial virus infection changes the

piwi-interacting RNA content of airway epithelial cells. Front Mol Biosci [Internet]. 2022 [cited

2023 Sep 10];9. Available from:

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmolb.2022.931354

37. Tsao CC, Geisen C, Abraham RT. Interaction between human MCM7 and Rad17 proteins is

required for replication checkpoint signaling. EMBO J. 2004 Nov 24;23(23):4660–9.

38. Weasner BM, Weasner BP, Neuman SD, Bashirullah A, Kumar JP. Retinal Expression of

the Drosophila eyes absent Gene Is Controlled by Several Cooperatively Acting Cis-

regulatory Elements. PLOS Genet. 2016 Dec 8;12(12):e1006462.

39. Krause SA, Overend G, Dow JAT, Leader DP. FlyAtlas 2 in 2022: enhancements to the

Drosophila melanogaster expression atlas. Nucleic Acids Res. 2022 Jan 7;50(D1):D1010–5.

40. Brunette GJ, Jamalruddin MA, Baldock RA, Clark NL, Bernstein KA. Evolution-based

screening enables genome-wide prioritization and discovery of DNA repair genes. Proc Natl

Acad Sci. 2019 Sep 24;116(39):19593–9.

41. Findlay GD, Sitnik JL, Wang W, Aquadro CF, Clark NL, Wolfner MF. Evolutionary Rate

Covariation Identifies New Members of a Protein Network Required for Drosophila

melanogaster Female Post-Mating Responses. PLOS Genet. 2014 Jan 16;10(1):e1004108.

42. Raza Q, Choi JY, Li Y, O'Dowd RM, Watkins SC, Chikina M, et al. Evolutionary rate

covariation analysis of E-cadherin identifies Raskol as a regulator of cell adhesion and actin

dynamics in Drosophila. PLOS Genet. 2019 Feb 14;15(2):e1007720.

43. Kawaguchi K, Sato T, Kondo S, Yamamoto-Hino M, Goto S. Stability of the transamidase

complex catalyzing GPI anchoring of proteins. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2019 May

7;512(3):584–90.

44. Freeze HH, Ng BG, Wolfe LA. 5 - Disorders Affecting Glycosylation. In: Pyeritz RE, Korf BR,

Grody WW, editors. Emery and Rimoin's Principles and Practice of Medical Genetics and

Genomics (Seventh Edition) [Internet]. Academic Press; 2021 [cited 2024 Jan 30]. p. 157–

81. Available from:

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780128125359000054

45. Eathiraj S, Pan X, Ritacco C, Lambright DG. Structural basis of family-wide Rab GTPase

recognition by rabenosyn-5. Nature. 2005 Jul;436(7049):415–9.

46. Morrison HA, Dionne H, Rusten TE, Brech A, Fisher WW, Pfeiffer BD, et al. Regulation of

Early Endosomal Entry by the Drosophila Tumor Suppressors Rabenosyn and Vps45. Mol

Biol Cell. 2008 Oct;19(10):4167–76.

47. Verheijen J, Wong SY, Rowe JH, Raymond K, Stoddard J, Delmonte OM, et al. Defining a

new immune deficiency syndrome: MAN2B2-CDG. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2020 Mar

1;145(3):1008–11.

48. Pal A, Severin F, Lommer B, Shevchenko A, Zerial M. Huntingtin–HAP40 complex is a

novel Rab5 effector that regulates early endosome motility and is up-regulated in

Huntington's disease. J Cell Biol. 2006 Feb 13;172(4):605–18.

49. Saudou F, Humbert S. The Biology of Huntingtin. Neuron. 2016 Mar 2;89(5):910–26.

50. Böhm S, Szakal B, Herken BW, Sullivan MR, Mihalevic MJ, Kabbinavar FF, et al. The

Budding Yeast Ubiquitin Protease Ubp7 Is a Novel Component Involved in S Phase

Progression *. J Biol Chem. 2016 Feb 26;291(9):4442–52.

51. Godin SK, Meslin C, Kabbinavar F, Bratton-Palmer DS, Hornack C, Mihalevic MJ, et al.

Evolutionary and Functional Analysis of the Invariant SWIM Domain in the Conserved

Shu2/SWS1 Protein Family from Saccharomyces cerevisiae to Homo sapiens. Genetics.

2015 Apr 1;199(4):1023–33.

52. Huang JW, Acharya A, Taglialatela A, Nambiar TS, Cuella-Martin R, Leuzzi G, et al.

MCM8IP activates the MCM8-9 helicase to promote DNA synthesis and homologous

recombination upon DNA damage. Nat Commun. 2020 Jun 11;11(1):2948.

53. Ziegler AB, Augustin H, Clark NL, Berthelot-Grosjean M, Simonnet MM, Steinert JR, et al.

The Amino Acid Transporter Jhl-21 Coevolves with Glutamate Receptors, Impacts NMJ

Physiology and Influences Locomotor Activity in Drosophila Larvae. Sci Rep. 2016 Jan

25;6(1):19692.

54. Priedigkeit N, Wolfe N, Clark NL. Evolutionary Signatures amongst Disease Genes Permit

Novel Methods for Gene Prioritization and Construction of Informative Gene-Based

Networks. PLOS Genet. 2015 Feb 13;11(2):e1004967.

55. Lommel M, Strahl S. Protein O-mannosylation: Conserved from bacteria to humans.

Glycobiology. 2009 Aug 1;19(8):816–28.

56. Orlean P, Menon AK. *Thematic review series: Lipid Posttranslational Modifications.* GPI

anchoring of protein in yeast and mammalian cells, or: how we learned to stop worrying and

love glycophospholipids. J Lipid Res. 2007 May;48(5):993–1011.

57. Van den Steen P, Rudd PM, Dwek RA, Opdenakker G. Concepts and principles of O-linked

glycosylation. Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol. 1998;33(3):151–208.

58. Liu YS, Guo XY, Hirata T, Rong Y, Motooka D, Kitajima T, et al. N-Glycan–dependent

protein folding and endoplasmic reticulum retention regulate GPI-anchor processing. J Cell

Biol. 2018 Feb 5;217(2):585–99.

59. Little J, Chikina M, Clark NL. Evolutionary rate covariation is a reliable predictor of co-

functional interactions but not necessarily physical interactions. Weigel D, editor. eLife. 2024

Feb 28;12:RP93333.

60. Flynn RA, Pedram K, Malaker SA, Batista PJ, Smith BAH, Johnson AG, et al. Small RNAs

are modified with N-glycans and displayed on the surface of living cells. Cell. 2021

Jun;184(12):3109-3124.e22.

61. Caldwell RM, Flynn RA. Discovering glycoRNA: Traditional and Non-Canonical Approaches

to Studying RNA Modifications. Isr J Chem. 2023;63(1–2):e202200059.

62. Chavan M, Lennarz W. The molecular basis of coupling of translocation and N-

glycosylation. Trends Biochem Sci. 2006 Jan 1;31(1):17–20.

63. Bortot B, Cosentini D, Faletra F, Biffi S, De Martino E, Carrozzi M, et al. PMM2-CDG:

Phenotype and genotype in four affected family members. Gene. 2013 Dec 1;531(2):506–9.

64. Jaeken J, Péanne R. What is new in CDG? J Inherit Metab Dis. 2017 Jul 1;40(4):569–86.

65. Lefeber DJ, Freeze HH, Steet R, Kinoshita T. Congenital Disorders of Glycosylation. In:

Varki A, Cummings RD, Esko JD, Stanley P, Hart GW, Aebi M, et al., editors. Essentials of

Glycobiology [Internet]. 4th ed. Cold Spring Harbor (NY): Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory

Press; 2022 [cited 2023 Aug 23]. Available from:

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK579928/

66. Yang Z. PAML 4: Phylogenetic Analysis by Maximum Likelihood. Mol Biol Evol. 2007 Aug

1;24(8):1586–91.

67. Sonnhammer ELL, Östlund G. InParanoid 8: orthology analysis between 273 proteomes,

mostly eukaryotic. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015 Jan 28;43(D1):D234–9.

68. Hu Y, Flockhart I, Vinayagam A, Bergwitz C, Berger B, Perrimon N, et al. An integrative

approach to ortholog prediction for disease-focused and other functional studies. BMC

Bioinformatics. 2011 Dec;12(1):357.

69. Chow CY, Kelsey KJP, Wolfner MF, Clark AG. Candidate genetic modifiers of retinitis

pigmentosa identified by exploiting natural variation in Drosophila. Hum Mol Genet. 2016

Feb 15;25(4):651–9.

70. Hu Y, Sopko R, Foos M, Kelley C, Flockhart I, Ammeux N, et al. FlyPrimerBank: an online

database for Drosophila melanogaster gene expression analysis and knockdown evaluation

of RNAi reagents. G3 Bethesda Md. 2013 Sep 4;3(9):1607–16.

71. Untergasser A, Cutcutache I, Koressaar T, Ye J, Faircloth BC, Remm M, et al. Primer3—

new capabilities and interfaces. Nucleic Acids Res. 2012 Aug;40(15):e115.