Protein structure, a genetic encoding for glycosylation

Benjamin P. Kellman,[1,2,3,4,5,*] Daniel Sandoval,[6] Olga O. Zaytseva,[7] Kelly Brock,[8] Sabyasachi Baboo,[9] Daniela Nachmanson,[2,3,10] Edward B. Irvine,[5,11] Erick Armingol,[1,2,3] Nathan Mih,[2,3] Yujie Zhang,[1] Mia Jeffris,[1,2] Philip Bartels,[6] Thi Nguyen,[6] Amy Tam,[8] Sarah Gasman,[12] Shlomi Ilan,[5] Isaac Shamie,[1,2,3] Jolene K. Diedrich,[9] Xiaoning Wang,[9] Esther van Woudenbergh,[5] Meghan Altman,[13] Anthony Aylward,[2,3] Bokan Bao,[1,2,3] Andrea Castro,[2,3] James Sorrentino,[1,2,3] Austin Chiang,[1,2] Matt Campbell,[14] Yannic Bartsch,[5] Patricia Aguilar-Calvo,[13,15,16] Christina Sigurdson,[13,15] Galit Alter,[5] Gordan Lauc,[7] John R. Yates III,[9] Debora Marks,[8,17] Frederique Lisacek,[18,19] Nathan E. Lewis[1,2,3,*]

[1] Department of Pediatrics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

[2] Department of Bioengineering, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

[3] Bioinformatics and Systems Biology Graduate Program, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

[4] Augment Biologics, La Jolla, CA 92092

[5] Ragon Institute of MGH, MIT, and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA

[6] Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

[7] Genos Glycoscience Research Laboratory, Borongajska 83H, Zagreb 10000, Croatia

[8] Department of Systems Biology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

[9] Department of Molecular Medicine, The Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, California 92037, United States

[10] Moores Cancer Center, University of California San Diego, 3855 Health Science Drive, San Diego, CA, 92093, USA

[11] Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

[12] Department of Pediatrics, Boston Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA

[13] Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA, USA

[14] Institute for Glycomics, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia

[15] Department of Pathology, University of California San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA, USA

[16] Department of Neurobiology, The University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL 35243

[17] Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142, United States

[18] Proteome Informatics Group, Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, CH-1227 Geneva, Switzerland

[19] Computer Science Department & Section of Biology, University of Geneva, route de Drize 7, CH-1227, Geneva, Switzerland

Summary (150 words)

Unlike DNA, RNA, and proteins, the dogma describes glycosylation as metabolically determined and unconstrained by template molecules. Without template-based expectations for glycan structures, research is hampered, obscuring how these critical molecules impact the behavior in thousands of human glycoproteins. Here, we challenge the assertion of template-free glycosylation and discover protein-encoded rules for glycan biosynthesis, by quantifying associations between glycan and protein features, which we call "glycoimpact." We estimate 45-55% of amino acids substitutions will minimally change protein structure, but significantly impact glycosylation. We find that "glycoimpact" influences canonical substitution matrices and genetic variant pathogenicity. We identify thousands of high-glycoimpact pathogenic variants spanning hundreds of diseases, including several linked to aberrant glycosylation including Oculocutaneous Albinism, Prion, and Gaucher's Disease. We also successfully predict glycosylation in HIV, SARS-CoV-2, and immunoglobulins. Overall, we present rules defining a genetic encoding for glycosylation, enabling glycan prediction and discovery of glycoprotein functions in health and disease.

Abstract

DNA, RNA, and proteins are synthesized using template molecules, but glycosylation is not believed to
be constrained by a template. However, if cellular environment is the only determinant of glycosylation,
all sites should receive the same glycans on average. This template-free assertion is inconsistent with
observations of microheterogeneity—wherein each site receives distinct and reproducible glycan
structures. Here, we test the assumption of template-free glycan biosynthesis. Through structural
analysis of site-specific glycosylation data, we find protein-sequence and structural features that predict
specific glycan features. To quantify these relationships, we present a new amino acid substitution
matrix that describes "glycoimpact" -- how glycosylation varies with protein structure. High-glycoimpact
amino acids co-evolve with glycosites, and glycoimpact is high when estimates of amino acid
conservation and variant pathogenicity diverge. We report hundreds of disease variants near glycosites
with high-glycoimpact, including several with known links to aberrant glycosylation (e.g.,
Oculocutaneous Albinism, Jakob-Creutzfeldt disease, Gerstmann-Straussler-Scheinker, and Gaucher's
Disease). Finally, we validate glycoimpact quantification by studying oligomannose-complex glycan
ratios on HIV ENV, differential sialylation on IgG3 Fc, differential glycosylation on SARS-CoV-2 Spike, and
fucose-modulated function of a tuberculosis monoclonal antibody. In all, we show glycan biosynthesis is
accurately guided by specific, genetically-encoded rules, and this presents a plausible refutation to the
assumption of template-free glycosylation.

Figure 1 – DNA, RNA, and protein biosynthesis are template-driven processes. Glycan biosynthesis is believed to be non-templated and regulated by metabolic and enzymatic constraints. Here we explore protein structure influence on glycan biosynthesis. In our theory of "bounded biosynthesis", the glycoprotein (black) surface requests glycans by permitting specific glycosyltransferases (blue and yellow) to dock and the metabolic and enzymatic constraints govern the extent to which those requests are fulfilled. Therefore, we posit that glycan biosynthesis is accurately and reproducibly constrained by protein structure; an effect visible after accounting for metabolic influence. Glycans are represented using IUPAC-extension for glycans and the Symbol Nomenclature for Glycans (SNFG[1,2]); Mannose (Man), Galactose (Gal), Sialic Acid (Neu5Ac), N-Acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc), Fucose (Fuc). Here, we discover, validate, and demonstrate glycotemplating through comparison to established computational results and methods, comparison to published experimental results, and prediction of novel experimental results across pathogenic gene variants, evolution, viral proteins, and antibodies.

Introduction

DNA, RNA, and protein synthesis follow DNA and RNA templates. However, glycosylation is considered non-templated, assumed to be primarily regulated by the cellular environment.[3] This assertion leads to a dilemma. If glycan biosynthesis is template-free, all glycosylation sites on a protein should have similar glycans with some stochastic variation. Yet, each specific site on a protein can reproducibly host different glycans, a phenomenon termed "glycosite-specific microheterogeneity."[4]

Though the template-free hypothesis remains, many observations show protein structure influences glycosylation. For example, protein primary sequence influences glycan diversity and identity. In the N-glycosylation sequon,[5] glycans covalently attach to asparagines (N) with a downstream (N+2) serine (S) or threonine (T) separated by any amino acid (X) except proline (NX[S/T]). Variation at N+1 impacts glycan complexity[6] and accessibility impacts glycosite occupancy.[7] Glycosylation of sequons ending in threonine is ~40 times more efficient than those with serine.[8] Upstream of the glycosite, a phenylalanine to alanine substitution in human IgG3 can increase bi-galactose structures with a core-fucose.[9] Additionally, influenza evolves hemagglutinin glycosylation sites to facilitate immune evasion.[10] Glycoprotein-determined glycan evolution, used by HIV for immune evasion, has been leveraged to engineer better vaccine epitopes.[11] Tools like GlycoSiteAlign[12] and mutagenesis studies have offered expansions of the founding sequon structure (NX[S/T]) including the enhanced aromatic sequon—an aromatic residue upstream of the glycosite (N-2) that can influence glycan complexity[13] with a variable impact given the N+1 variation.[14] In prediction, several works since 2002 have shown variable success in predicting glycosites from sequons and hidden features using machine learning,[15–18] though none have predicted beyond glycosite presence or the root monosaccharide.

Beyond the primary sequence, secondary structures (β-sheets and α-helices) can influence glycosylation[19] while concavity, accessibility and hydrophobicity also impact glycosite occupancy.[7] ERManI (MAN1B1) and Golgi Mannosidase IA (MAN1A1), crucial bottlenecks in glycan processing, have been co-crystalized with a Man9 glycan to study specific glycoconjugate features that permit or inhibit this interaction.[20–23] A study of >150 glycoproteins revealed differential glycosylation as a function of protein structure, wherein low accessibility sites impacted core fucosylation and branching;[24] similar accessibility constraints predicted oligomannose on the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.[25] Also, a structural analysis found FUT8 activity is impacted by glycosite depth.[26] Site-specific kinetics for glycosylation of Protein Disulfide Isomerase[27–29] and five additional glycoproteins[30] further showed that protein structure influences occupancy. Recent studies have shown interest is grafting glycans to proteins.[17,31–33] These

approaches provide valuable instruments for exploring mechanistic and steric associations between

glycans and folded proteins. Yet, they do not explore generalizable associations between glycan and

protein structure features that can be mapped back to the genome.

These studies represent a growing refutation of non-templated glycan biosynthesis. However, they have

not been consolidated into an interoperable mapping from the genome to the glycome. Here, we define

rules governing glycosylation by analyzing trends in site-specific glycosylation[34] in the context of glycan

biosynthesis[35] and site-specific protein structure features.[36] We describe this genetic encoding for

glycosylation as a mapping from "glycoimpactful" protein structure to expected glycan structures. We

validate these glycoimpact relations by comparison to evolutionary substitution matrices, variant

pathogenicity scores, and glycosite co-evolution. Further, we find that glycosite-proximal pathogenic

variants correspond to higher glycoimpact substitutions. Finally, we use glycoimpact to accurately

predict changes in glycan complexity, galactosylation, sialylation and functional glycosylation. Taken

together, we present a comprehensive argument for updating our understanding of glycosylation from

template-free, to bounded biosynthesis. Under bounded glycan biosynthesis, a range of feasible glycans

are "requested" by local protein structure and are "fulfilled" contingent on precursor availability (**Figure**

1); biosynthetic constraints represent a genetic encoding, making glycans predictable for any biologist.

Results

Constructing a database containing paired protein and glycan structures

Figure 2 – N- and O-glycan substructures associated with glycosite-proximal protein structure. (a) Dimensionality reduction trained on UniCarbKB glycosite structures. When projected into the UniCarbKB-trained space, all human Uniprot annotated glycosites in appear within original density implying that UniCarbKB glycosites are sufficiently representative of most documented glycosites. The scatterplots show a two-dimensional projection of the FAMD using a Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP).[37] Each point is a site on a glycoprotein, each color indicates the source of that protein. **(b)** Volcano plot of the log odds ratio and False Discovery Rate adjusted p-values from a Fisher exact test between glycan and protein structure occurrence. We observe many large and significant Intermolecular Relations (IMR), with most significant relations associated with alanine, cysteine, valine, and glutamine (A, C, V, Q, respectively). **(c)** Inter-Molecular Relations (IMR) were also estimated by logistic GEE controlling for protein-bias. The number of significant (FDR<0.1, |log(OR)|>0.1) IMR relating to structurally proximal AAs (N+6Å), sequence proximal AAs C-terminal (N+5), N-terminal (N-5) or either direction (N+/-5), predicted secondary structure from sequence (SSpro8) and structure (DSSP): alpha-helix (ss.H), extended strand (ss.E), beta-bridge (ss.B), turn (ss.T) bend (ss.S), other (ss.C).

We first tested if glycan structure correlates with protein structure. To do this, we built the Protein-Glycan Enriched Structure Database (PGES-DB), a compendium of experimentally measured and expert curated site-specific glycoprofiles on human glycoproteins collected from UniCarbKB[38] and GlyConnect[34] databases (**see Methods**). Glycan structures were decomposed into substructures (i.e., biosynthetic

intermediates) using GlyCompare. This maximizes statistical power by making explicit every permissible

precursor molecule at each site.[35] Glycosite-proximal protein structure features were extracted from

protein structure models, and proximity was defined by minimum distance—the minimum 3D Euclidean

distance between the nearest atoms in each residue. The resulting PDES database includes 98

glycoproteins with N-glycosylation sites and 38 glycoproteins with O-glycosylation sites and a total of

3,563 N-glycosylation and 700 O-glycosylation events (Supplementary **Figure** 1). In this work, we limited

training to human glycoproteins and limited predictions to glycoproteins expressed in humans.

We verified that the glycan-annotated glycosites in PGES-DB are representative of all glycosite

structures in the human secretome;[39] all secretome glycosites fall within a dimensionality reduction

trained only on PGES-DB glycosite structures (**Figure** 2a, see **Supplementary Results**, Supplementary

Figure 2). Thus, PGES-DB can provide generalizable conclusions about protein-glycan associations.

Furthermore, we examined the associations (termed "intermolecular relations (**IMR**)") between glycan

substructures (e.g., tri-mannose) and glycosite-proximal protein features (e.g., proximal tyrosine) within

PGES-DB, and we found that glycan substructures and protein features were significant and substantial

(Supplementary **Figure** 3a). Fisher exact test found 10,111 substantial and significant IMR with 9,296

positive and 815 negative associations (**Figure** 2b). Using multiple statistical tools (including Fisher's

Exact Test, conditional probability, and information gain, see **Supplementary Results**), we confirmed

that PGES-DB contains many notable IMR.

Highly deterministic IMR are consistent with canonical templating

We found several highly deterministic amino acid (AA) specific intermolecular relations (IMR) ((Pr(G|P)

is 0.999-1 or 0-0.001). In these high-confidence IMR (hcIMR), the impact of precursor-limitation is

minimal, so the protein-imposed "requests" are more easily "fulfilled" and observed. Overall, confidence

in glycan presence increases when a specific protein structure feature is present (Supplementary **Figure**

4). For IMR with a spatially proximal AA (within 6A), 20.2% are highly deterministic of glycan

substructures. Additionally, 32.4% and 17.5% of down- and upstream AA IMR (+/-5aa) are highly

deterministic. The certainty with which an AA determines a glycan structure decreases substantially

when proximal AA are absent (Supplementary **Figure** 4a). These hcIMR are not dominated by small

numbers of motifs as the high-confidence IMR count is proportional to the number of unique

substructures (Supplementary **Figure** 4b). The decrease in hcIMR when a protein structure feature is

absent suggests bounded glycan biosynthesis is an active rather than passive process.

Among the highly deterministic protein-glycan relations, we observe (among 1,725 N-glycosylation
events) 1,553 glycans that contain a N-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc) on the α-1,6-mannose branch
(Glc2NAc(β1-6)Man(α1-6)Man(β1-4)Glc2NAc); indicative of complex N-glycosylation. All 75 hcIMR with a
downstream tryptophan include glycans with the hybrid/complex substructure. These observations
suggest that tryptophan is sufficient to escape oligomannose structures. Similarly, in 454 O-glycosylation
hcIMR, 237 contain 6⍰-sialyl-N-acetyllactosamine (Neu5Ac(α2-6)Gal(β1-3)GalNAc). Of 6 events
containing a sequence-proximal tryptophan, every event also contained a sialyl-T antigen. Thus, several
IMR link protein features, such as proximal tryptophan, with specific glycan features.

Glycosite-proximal structure and chemistry correlate with glycan structure

The numerous glycan-protein relations suggest the plausibility of bounded glycan biosynthesis. To
generate testable protein structural constraints on bounded glycan biosynthesis, we modeled IMR using
hierarchical regression to minimize relevant bias. We quantified specific IMR using univariate logistic
generalized estimation equations (GEE) to probe the site-matched glycan-protein co-occurrences in
PGES-DB and to control for protein identity effects (see **Methods**). A list of GEE odds ratios (OR) (each
describing the association between a protein structure and one of several glycan substructures)
describes the typical glycosylation near a given protein structure; the OR list indicates the "expected
substructure abundance" or an "expected glycoprofile" related to a glycosite-proximal protein structure.
When expected glycoprofiles are compared between two protein structures (e.g., the expected
glycoprofile difference between valine and isoleucine), we can estimate a glycosylation impact, or
"glycoimpact," of making amino acid substitutions or other protein feature changes. Glycoimpact is the
difference (z-score normalized Euclidean distance) in expected glycoprofiles between two protein
structures (**Figure** 3, see **Methods**).

We discovered 1,715 significant N-glycan IMR (FDR<0.1, |log(OR)|>0.1), many of which were associated
with spatially proximal (N+6Å) and sequence-proximal AA (N+/-5 residues). Stratifying sequence-
proximal effects, we observed almost twice as many IMR involving upstream (N-5) than downstream
(N+5) AA. Among the downstream AA effects, tryptophan, alanine, serine, and phenylalanine are most
impactful (99, 55, 55, and 48 IMR respectively). Tryptophan also has many IMR when downstream or
spatially proximal (26). Spatially proximal arginine (70) and downstream glutamine (35) are the largest
effectors. Finally, glycosylation sites on turns have many IMR (61) (**Figure** 2c).

Turn-associated IMR include >3-fold increases in di- and tri-sialylated tetra-antennary and >2-fold
increases in mono- and di-galactosylated structures with core fucose; all positively correlated structures

have at least one galactose while not all are core fucosylated. Structurally proximal glutamine is
associated with a >20-fold increase in monosialylated triantennary structures and a 10-fold decrease in
tetraantennary structures (**Figure** 3**a**). Histidine, threonine, and valine show correlation with increasing
GalNAc[4S] (**Figure** 3**b**). Expanding on **Figure** 3a-b, we further interrogated IMR for specific protein
structure features (i.e., proximal amino acid or local secondary structure) by comparing the IMR odds
ratio to monosaccharide count for several monosaccharides (**Figure** 3**c**). A biclustering highlights two
major types of protein structure influence, mirroring the N-glycan/O-glycan dichotomy in glycosylation.
Providing clues to the elusive O-glycosylation site, proximal alanine is negatively correlated with
galactose and GlcNAc but positively correlated with N-acetylgalactosamine (GalNAc). Conversely,
threonine and histidine are positively associated with GlcNAc and galactose but negatively correlated
with β-GalNAc. As expected, GlcNAc and complex-glycans follow similar trends to Neu5Ac. However,
Neu5Ac, GlcNAc and Gal trends diverge near proline, cysteine, and valine; these amino acids may act as
limiters of high-complexity (**Figure** 3**c**).

Figure 3 – Glycosite-proximal amino acids impact glycosylation. Specific Inter-Molecular Relations (IMR) were discovered by logistic GEE controlling for protein-bias. **(a-b)** IMR (FDR<0.1, |log(OR)|>0.1) relating structurally proximal amino acids to motifs stratified by the number of Sialic Acids **(a)** and 4-Sulfated GalNAc **(b)**. **(c)** Spearman correlation between the monosaccharide count of glycan substructures from protein-structure features; protein structure features with an average absolute correlation > 0.2 were retained. Terms used here are consistent with panel **a** but "aa" denotes a structurally proximal amino acid, "aaUp," "aaDown," and "aaAll" denotes N-terminus, C-terminus, or any sequence proximal amino acid. **(d-e)** IMR (FDR<0.1, |log(OR)|>0.1) compared across two sequence-proximal **(d)** and spatially proximal **(e)** amino acids, phenylalanine (F) and tryptophan (W). The direct comparison of proximal-amino acid effects visualized the expected change in glycosylation associated with that substitution. **(f)** Network depicting the glycoimpact (see **Methods**) of spatially proximal (within 5Å) substitutions for structurally low impact (Blosum64) substitutions. Panel **f** shows glycoimpact predicted from BLAMO 0.5:0.1 (|log(OR)| > 0.5, FDR<0.1), see **Supplementary Figure 5** for additional thresholds, raw scores and sequence-proximal substitution predictions. Note that plots including glycan substructures were manually curated to summarize the selected glycan substructures. **(g)** Overview of data flow and concepts examined in this manuscript.

Amino acid changes can predict glycan structural changes

We found that many AA-substitutions can have substantial "glycoimpact" (expected difference in

glycosylation) on glycan biosynthesis; exemplified by the phenylalanine-tryptophan substitution (**Figure**

3**d-e, Supplementary Results**). Upstream phenylalanine is associated with bi- and tri-antennary (>3-fold)

while upstream tryptophan is associated with tetraantennary terminal galactose (>2-fold) implicating

this substitution in branching (**Figure** 3**d**). Additionally, spatially proximal phenylalanine is strongly

associated with increased sialylation (>10-fold) implicating this amino acid in glycan maturation (**Figure**

3**e**). These predictions suggest that tryptophan-phenylalanine substitution has a large impact on

glycoprofiles.

We calculated all AA-substitution glycoimpact scores as the difference in expected glycoprofiles

between each AA-pair (see **Methods**, Supplementary **Figure** 5). Glycoimpact was calculated at multiple

IMR thresholds (Supplementary **Figure** 5). We highlight relevant substitution events as "glycoimpactful"

(significantly high glycoimpact) and structurally ambivalent (BLOSUM>0) (**Figure** 3**f**). As explained in the

next section, we call the glycoimpact AA-substitution matrix the BLOSUM-PAM Orthology matrix

(BLAMO X:Y); X and Y refer to the log odds ratio and FDR thresholds respectively. Sub-threshold odds

ratios, those insignificant or unsubstantial by the X:Y threshold, are excluded from the glycoimpact

calculation. **Figure** 3f displays a subset of BLAMO 0.5:0.1 relations.

Glycoimpact explains discrepancies between BLOSUM and PAM substitution matrixes

To further explore the relevance of glycoimpact, we compared it to conservation-based measures of

amino acid substitution impact. The PAM[41] and BLOSUM[42] AA substitution matrices are popular but

distinct estimates. PAM is based on global alignments within a protein and reflects more functional

conservation, while BLOSUM uses local alignment across proteins and highlights more structural

conservation.[43,44] Thus, these measures differ more when protein function is not fully described by

protein structure.

Since changes in glycan structure can modify protein function in a protein structure-independent

manner, we examined consistency between PAM and BLOSUM estimates across null and high

glycoimpact substitutions. Comparing PAM and BLOSUM scores at multiple thresholds

(RMSE($PAM_{i,j}$,$BLOSUM_{i,j}$)), we found that error in 4 of 5 PAM-BLOSUM comparisons was significantly

correlated to glycoimpact (BLAMO 0.5:0.1) for high-glycoimpact (GI>2.5) substitutions (**Figure 4a,**

Supplementary **Figure** 5). The correlation between high-glycoimpact substitutions and PAM-BLOSUM

inconsistency is maintained for most PAM and BLOSUM thresholds (Supplementary **Figure** 6). Both

protein structure and glycosylation are necessary to fully explain protein function, and these results

suggest a positive relationship between glycoimpact and the failure of structure (BLOSUM) to

completely explain function (PAM). Given this relationship, we refer to the glycoimpact substitution

matrix as the BLOSUM-PAM Orthology (BLAMO) matrix.

High glycoimpact residues are conserved around glycosites

If glycosite-proximal amino acids influence functional glycosylation, there should be evolutionary

pressure imposed beyond the classical NX[S/T] N-glycan sequon. To map the broader glycosite structure,

we aligned glycosites (**Figure 4b-c**) and examine conservation and evolutionary coupling (EC). Using EC

derived from 2,005 glycoprotein alignments (see **Methods**, **Supplementary Results**),[45] we observed

enriched coupling between N-glycosites and flanking residues (Supplementary **Figure** 7a). We also

observed several position-specific glycosite-coupled residues including serine and threonine at N+2,

phenylalanine at N-2, and tyrosine at N-1 (pooled hypergeometric, FDR<0.1, Supplementary **Figure** 7c,

Figure 4c). These findings are consistent with previous observations of the original sequon and

enhanced aromatic sequon.[14] Glycosite-coupled residues are also consistent with IMR-observed high-

impact residues (**Figure** 2**c**). Of the ten high-impact upstream residues, seven show enriched glycosite-

coupling when they appear upstream. To further highlight global glycosite structure, we clustered

glycosites using coupling probabilities (**Figure 4d,** Supplementary **Figure** 8, see **Methods**). The N+2

aspartic acid enriched in the univariate analysis (**Figure 4c**) co-occurs with an N-2 lysine (**Figure 4d,** motif

1). Alternatively, glutamic acid is more likely to co-occur with other glutamic acid residues (N -4, +1, and

+3) with an N+2 threonine sequon (**Figure 4d,** motif 4). These couplings are reflective of evolutionary

pressures surrounding the glycosylation sites.

We next aligned[12] glycosites permitting a tetraantennary N-glycan lacking fucose or sialic acids (**Figure**

4b). We examined the glycosite alignment for consistency with high-influence AA (**Figure 2c**) and

glycosite-coupled residues (**Figure 4c**). Of 20 glycosite-flanking AA, 16 show consistency between the

first or second most common AA and either the high-influence or glycosite coupled residues (see

Supplementary Results). At nearly every glycosite-flanking residue (N+/-10) there is consistency

between these three analyses, further corroborating that protein structure constrains glycosylation.

Figure 4 - **Glycoimpact of amino acid substitution correlate with evolution metrics and conservation.** (a) Comparison of the error between the PAM and BLOSUM substitution matrices and the glycoimpact for corresponding substitutions. Linear regressions are split into null glycoimpact (<2.5) and glycoimpactful (>2.5). Glycoimpact scores from BLAMO 0.5:0.1 were used; those computed from strong IMR (|log(OR)| > 0.5, FDR<0.1). Error (y-axis) was calculated as the root mean square error between PAM and BLOSUM scores. Correlation (R) significance indicated as <0.001 (***), <0.01 (**), and <0.05 (*). (b) Glycosite Alignments [12] corresponding to GlyConnect-documented tetraantennary structures (Hex:7 HexNAc:6) with no sialic acid or fucose. See *Supplementary Figure 9* for full alignment. The first (top line) and second (bottom line) most popular amino acids are displayed for each position N+/-30. Consensus AAs consistent with other analyses are highlighted in bold and marked with a "+" (Glycosite-coupled, *Figure 4*h) or "*" (high-influence AA, *Figure 2*c). (c) An aggregation of all residue-glycosite enrichments at N+/-10 (hypergeometric enrichment illustrated in panel *Supplementary Figure 7*c). The proportion of high-ranking Evolutionary Couplings (EC) for each amino acid (rows) at the column-specified relative position was compared with glycosites (GN), asparagines (N), or any residue (X). An opaque red circle indicates that for the residue (row) in the given position (column), high-EC proportion is higher with GN than N. An opaque black triangle indicates high-EC proportion is higher with GN than X. A transparent circle or square indicates GN was not significantly more coupled (hypergeometric test). Significance was assessed at multiple EC-rank thresholds between L/3 and 3L (see Methods) and pooled using Fisher's method (FDR <0.1). (d) Hierarchical clustering of coupling-masked (Rank<4L) amino acids surrounding a glycosite (+/-6 AA). Each of 5 clusters was summarized as a motif. Height is the log of cumulative reciprocal EC-Rank with a pseudo-count of 0.25. The asparagine at the center was fixed at 2 for context. Residues are colored by chemical properties. A more granular clustering, 25 clusters is included in the supplement (*Supplementary Figure 8*).

Glycoimpact correlates with discrepancy between functional variant predictions

Dozens of algorithms predict functional and pathogenic effects of genetic variants,[40,46,47] incorporating information ranging from sequences to protein structure, thus sometimes reporting different variants as deleterious. We hypothesized the differences in some pathogenicity scores between algorithms could be explained by glycoimpact (BLAMO 0.5:0.1, see **Methods**). Across 3,549,910 nonsynonymous mutations, we measured the disagreement (RMSE) between each of 27 rank-normalized functional impact prediction tools, precomputed with dbNSFP;[40] pathogenicity score divergence was then correlated with glycoimpact. After hierarchical clustering on the divergence-glycoimpact correlation coefficients, pathogenicity estimates separated into two major clusters: one containing nearly all (6/7) tools leveraging protein-structure and the other primarily containing conservation, sequence, and/or epigenetic-based tools (**Figure** 5**b**). Nearly all variant pathogenicity score differences across the two clusters correlated with glycoimpact. These correlations and clustering structure disappear when glycoimpact scores are shuffled (Supplementary **Figure** 10); thus, like BLOSUM-PAM discrepancies, glycoimpact correlates with discrepancies between conservation-based and protein structure-based pathogenicity estimates. These observations further implicate glycosylation as a potent functional regulator and glycoimpact as an appropriate proxy for the importance of glycosylation.

Figure 5 - **Substitution glycoimpact predicts pathogenicity.** (**a**) Boxplots show the min-distance from all residues within human
PrP to the N197 or N181 glycosylation sites. Residues are stratified by all sites (All) and causative mutations of prion disease
including Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (CJD) and Gerstmann-Straussler disease (GSS), (one-sided Wilcoxon test). For glycositesite-
specific proximity, see *Supplementary Figure 11*. (**b**) A hierarchical clustered heatmap (average-linkage with Euclidean distance)
of Spearman correlations coefficients between glycoimpact (BLAMO 0.5:0.1) and error between variant impact prediction
scores. Prediction-type and protein structure indicate the training data used to build various tools as described in dbNSFP [40].
Each row and column refer to a variant function prediction tool. (**c**) Null and impactful glycoimpact (BLAMO 0.5:0.1) stratified
by variant pathogenicity in ClinVar within 20Å (min-distance) of an N-glycosylation site. Two-dimensional density plots compare
glycoimpact and the glycosite-mutation distance.

Glycoimpact proposes mechanisms for pathogenic variants in ClinVar and PrP

Because glycoimpact correlates with evolutionary, structural, and functional AA-substitution metrics, we hypothesized it is also pathologically relevant. Thus, we compared glycoimpact and clinical impact for ClinVar-annotated variants within 15Å, 20Å, and 30Å of UniProtKB annotated glycosites. For all three distances tested, high glycoimpact (BLAMO 0.5:0.1) variants in ClinVar were robustly and significantly higher (Wilcoxon p=2.6e-4, 2.2e-7, and 1.6e-10) for pathogenic variants close to glycosylation sites compared to glycosite-proximal benign variants (**Figure 5c**). Similarly, glycoimpact is higher for likely-pathogenic variants and variants of unknown significance near glycosites.

Examining specific ClinVar-annotated variants, we identified multiple variants in glycosylation-related diseases For example, Tyrosinase:A355V (P14679) is a high-glycoimpact and glycosite-proximal causal variant in oculocutaneous albinism.[48,49] While tyrosinase:A355V has not been examined for aberrant glycosylation, deglycosylation disrupts tyrosinase function consistent with type 1 oculocutaneous albinism.[49–53] Therefore, tyrosinase:A355V may act through aberrant glycosylation. We also observe high-glycoimpact, glycosite-proximal (<30Å), pathogenic (ClinVar) variants in multiple other glycan-modulated diseases including prion diseases,[54,55] lysosomal storage disorders,[56,57] and Gaucher's disease.[58–61]

More broadly, of 1,228 non-benign ClinVar annotated variants on glycoproteins, 340 are high-glycoimpact (GI>2.5) and closer than 30Å to a glycosylation site (**Table 1,** Supplementary **Table 1, Supplementary Dataset 1**). This includes major diseases not typically considered related to N-glycosylation including cystic fibrosis, long QT syndrome, renal cell carcinoma, acquired immunodeficiency syndrome, and multiple blood coagulation factor deficiencies. Notably, approximately 36% of the non-benign ClinVar-annotated glycoprotein variants we examined may be impacted by aberrant glycosylation, a potentially underappreciated mechanism of pathogenesis.

We further analyzed glycosite proximity among causal variants in prion disease. We measured 3D Euclidean min-distance from the two PrP glycosylation sites, N181 and N197, to all residues in human prion protein (PrP) (including variants causing Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (CJD)[62,63] and Gerstmann-Sträussler-Scheinker disease (GSS))[64,65] (**Figure 5a,** Supplementary **Table** 2). CJD-causing variants were approximately twice as close to glycosylation sites than the background distribution of all PrP sites (One-sided Wilcoxon p=0.0003). GSS-causative variants also trend closer to glycosites (One-sided Wilcoxon p=0.07) (**Figure** 5a, Supplementary **Figure** 11a-b). Low expression mutants, an indication of possible

350 aberrant glycosylation, trend closer to site N180 (One-sided Wilcoxon p=0.16) and appeared further

351 from N197 (One-sided Wilcoxon p=0.04) (Supplementary **Figure** 11c-d).

352 *Table 1 – Summary of variants by disease type where variants are high glycoimpact, close to glycosylation sites, and annotated*
353 *in ClinVar as non-benign. Each specific disease is listed followed by gene name(s) and an integer indicating the number (if larger*
354 *than 1) of variants in that gene corresponding to each specific disease. "*" indicates a multisystemic disorder.*

Cardiovascular Disorders	Ventricular tachycardia, polymorphic (*CASQ2* (2)); Arrhythmogenic right ventricular cardiomyopathy, dysplasia, hypertrophic (*DSG2* (4)); Long QT syndrome, Brugada syndrome (*KCNH2* (15) *KCNE1* (2) *KCNE2 TRHDE SCN1B* (3)); Primary pulmonary hypertension (*KCNK3*); Coronary artery disease, autosomal dominant (*LRP6*); Atrial fibrillation (*SCN3B*); Atrial septal defect 6 (*TLL1*); *Amyloidogenic transthyretin amyloidosis (*TTR* (6))
Coagulation & Hematologic Disorders	Upshaw-Schulman syndrome, Hereditary thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura (*TTP ADAMTS13*); Platelet glycoprotein IV deficiency (*CD35*); Hereditary factor XI deficiency disease (*F11* (2)); Factor VII deficiency (*F7* (2)); Hemophilia (*F9*); Hereditary factor IX deficiency disease (*F9* (5)); Glanzmann's thrombasthenia (*ITGA2B*); Platelet-activating factor acetylhydrolase deficiency (*PLA2G7*); Thrombophilia (*PROC* (3)); Antithrombin III deficiency (*SERPINC1* (3))
Endocrine Disorders	*Serkal syndrome (*WNT4*); Familial Hypobetalipoproteinemia (*ANGPTL3*); *Hypocalciuric hypercalcemia (*CASR* (7)); Laron syndrome (*CGHR*); *Deficiency of ferroxidase (*CP* (3)); *Dopamine beta hydroxylase deficiency (*DBH*); Laron-type isolated somatotropin defect, short stature (*GHR* (3)); Isolated growth hormone deficiency (*GHRHR* (2)); Diabetes mellitus, insulin-resistant (*INSR*); Leprechaunism syndrome (*INSR*); Hypercholesterolaemia (*LDLR* (2)); Gonadotropin-independent familial sexual precocity, Leydig cell agenesis (*LHCGR* (2)); Hyperlipoproteinemia, type I (*LPL*); Hemochromatosis (*TFR2 HFE* (2)); *Deficiency of iodide peroxidase (*TPO* (3)); Hypothyroidism, congenital, nongoitrous (*TSHR*); *Ladd syndrome (*FGF10*)
Hearing Disorders	Nonsyndromic Hearing Loss and Deafnes (*MET*)
Immune Disorders	Cyclical neutropenia (*ELANE* (5)); X-linked severe combined immunodeficiency (*IL2RG* (2)); Severe combined immunodeficiency disease (*IL7R* (2)); Myeloperoxidase deficiency (*MPO*); Complement deficiency, C1 esterase inhibitor deficiency (*SERPING1* (2)); Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) (*IL4R*)
Metabolic Disorders	*Aspartylglycosaminuria (*AGA*); Infantile hypophosphatasia (*ALPL* (2)); Farber's lipogranulomatosis (*ASAH*); Pseudocholinesterase deficiency, Bche, j variant (*BCHE*); *Biotinidase deficiency (*BTD* (13)); *Combined deficiency of sialidase and beta galactosidase, Galactosialidosis (*CTSA* (2)); Ceroid lipofuscinosis, neuronal 1, 10, and 13 (*CTSF PPT1* (5) *RP11-295K3.1 CTSD* (3)); Glycogen storage disease II (*GAA*); *Gaucher disease type 1, perinatal, lethal, subacute, acute, neuronopathic (*GBA* (13)); *Fabry disease (*GLA* (4)); Tay-Sachs disease, B1 variant (*HEXA* (4)); *Sandhoff disease (*HEXB* (2)); *Hurler syndrome, Gangliosidosis, Mucopolysaccharidosis, MPS-II, MPS-IV-B, MPS-I-H/S, MPS-III-A, MPS-III-B, MPS-IV-A, MPS-VII (*ARSB* (2) *IDS* (2) *GLB1* (5) *SGSH* (2) *NAGLU GALNS* (4) *MCOLN1 GUSB* (3)); *Danon disease (*LAMP*); *Sialidosis, type II (*NEU1*); *Niemann-Pick disease type A, B, C1, Sphingomyelin/cholesterol lipidosis (*NPC1* (7) *SMPD1* (2)); Hereditary acrodermatitis enteropathica (*SLC39A4*); *Congenital disorder of glycosylation type (*STT3A MOGS*); *Multiple sulfatase deficiency (*SUMF* (2)); Crigler-Najjar syndrome (*UGT1A8 UGT1A10* (2) *UGT1A9 UGT1A7 UGT1A6* (3) *UGT1A5 UGT1A4 UGT1A3* (2) *UGT1A1* (2))
Musculoskeletal Disorders	Geleophysic dysplasia (*ADAMTSL2*); Chondrodysplasia punctata 1, X-linked recessive (*ARSE*); Orofacial cleft (*BMP4*); Spondyloepiphyseal dysplasia with congenital joint dislocations (*CHST3*); Hypochondroplasia (*FGFR3*); Bruck syndrome (*FKBP10*); Brachydactyly, type A2, fibular hypoplasia, complex brachydactyly (*GDF5* (2)); Spondylocostal dysostosis (*LFNG*); Short stature with nonspecific skeletal abnormalities (*NPR2*); Hyperphosphatasemia with bone disease (*TNFRSF11B*); Osteogenesis imperfecta (*WNT1*); *Zimmermann-Laband syndrome (*KCNH1* (3))
Neurologic Disorders	Metachromatic leukodystrophy, late-onset, late infantile (*ARSA* (4)); Holoprosencephaly (*CDON*); Myasthenic syndrome, congenital, fast-channel, slow-channel (*CHRNA1* (5)); Epilepsy, nocturnal frontal lobe, type 3 (*CHRNB2*); *Congenital muscular dystrophy, Bethlem Myopathy (*COL6A2* (4)); Febrile seizures, familial, 11 (*CPA6*); *Lipid proteinosis (*ECM1* (1)); Familial febrile seizures 8|not provided (*GABRG2*); Focal epilepsy with speech disorder with or without mental retardation (*GRIN2A* (2)); Megalencephalic leukoencephalopathy (*HEPACAM*); Episodic ataxia type 1 (*KCNA1*); X-linked hydrocephalus syndrome (*L1CAM*); Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease (*MPZ* (2)); Early infantile epileptic encephalopathy 9, 19, 32 (*PCDH19 KCNA2 GABRA1*); *Congenital muscular dystrophy-dystroglycanopathy (*POMK*); Genetic prion diseases, Jakob-Creutzfeldt disease, Gerstmann-Straussler-Scheinker syndrome (*PRNP* (6)); Progressive myoclonic epilepsy (*SCARB2*); Infantile Parkinsonism-dystonia (*SLC6A3*); Hyperekplexia (*SLC6A5*); Dystonia (*TOR1A*); Temple-Baraister syndrome (*KCNH1*)
Oncogenic	*Hereditary diffuse gastric cancer, Endometrial carcinoma (*CDH1* (2)); *Lynch syndrome (*EPCAM*); Renal cell carcinoma, papillary (*MET* (2)); *Multiple endocrine neoplasia, type 2a, type 2 (*RET* (6))
Ophthalmological Disorders	Peters anomaly (*EPHB2*); Microphthalmia (*GDF3*); Retinitis pigmentosa 68, 12, 35, Cone-rod dystrophy 10 (*SLC7A14 CRB1 SEEMA4A* (2))
Pulmonary & Gastrointestinal	*Cystic fibrosis (*CFTR* (5)); *Alpha-1-antitrypsin deficiency (*SERPINA1* (2))
Renal Disorders	Renal dysplasia (*AGT*); Diabetes insipidus, nephrogenic (*AQP2*); Nephrotic syndrome (*LAMB2*); Finnish congenital nephrotic syndrome (*NPHS1* (5)); Cystinuria (*SLC3A1*)
Rheumatologic Disorders	*Polyarteritis nodosa (*CECR1* (2)); TNF receptor-associated periodic fever syndrome (*TRAPS TNFRSF1A*)

| Skin Disorders | Diffuse palmoplantar keratoderma, Bothnian type (*AQPS*); Familial progressive hyperpigmentation with or without hypopigmentation (*KITLG*); Adult junctional epidermolysis bullosa (*LAMB3*); *Kanzaki disease (*NAGA*); *Ectodermal dysplasia-syndactyly syndrome 1 (*PVRL4*); *Oculocutaneous albinism, Waardenburg syndrome, Tyrosinase-negative, Oculocutaneous albinism type 3 (*TYR* (5) *TYRP1*); Odonto Onycho Dermal dysplasia (*WNT10A*) |
| Vascular Disorders | *Arterial calcification of infancy (*ENPP1*); Rienhoff syndrome (*TGFB3*) |

Protein structure correlates with glycan complexity in HIV gp160

To validate our predictions, we compared IMR to glycosylation on specific glycoproteins. We first found consistency between previously measured IMR (**Figure 2b**) and site-specific glycan complexity measurements in HIV ENV gp160 (**Figure 6b**).[66] PGES-DB-measured GEE-estimated IMR suggest that downstream glutamine was significantly (FDR<1e-8; OR<0.5) predictive of complexity while spatially proximal proline and lysine were weaker but significant distinguishers (FDR<1e-3, FDR<0.1 respectively, **Figure 6a**). As predicted, proline-proximal (within 6Å, min-distance) gp160 glycosites present more oligomannose (Two-sided Wilcoxon p=0.0033), whereas C-terminus-proximal glutamine glycosites have more complex glycans (Two-sided Wilcoxon p=1e-4, **Figure 6c**). Spatially proximal lysine, while less significant (**Figure 6c**), had a nonlinear impact on glycan complexity in HIV gp160; first increasing with one proximal lysine then decreasing with two. The two most significant IMR predicted from PGES-DB (spatially proximal proline and C-terminal glutamine) were consistent with the site-specific glycosylation observed in HIV gp160.

IMR predict differential glycosylation on the SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein

We also predicted glycosylation on SARS-CoV-2 spike protein S1 subunit in the ancestral strain to the Gamma and Delta variants. Several of the >20 glycosylation sites[67,68] have been implicated with stability, target engagement, furin cleavage, and immune evasion.[68–72] We found multiple glycosite-proximal mutations within 15Å (min-distance, cubic (3D) expansion of the 6Å IMR training threshold). Gamma spike S1 contains multiple mutations close to glycosylation sites including N17 (L18F, T20N, & D138Y), N61 (P26S & R190S), N122 (L18F, D138Y, & R190S), N616 (D614G), and N657 (H655Y). In the Delta S1, N17 and N122 have 5 and 4 proximal mutations (relative to ancestral S1), respectively, while N165 and N616 each have one high-proximity mutation. Of the glycosite proximal substitutions, only L18F in Gamma and F157V in Delta have a high predicted glycoimpact by IMR. L18F appears within 15Å of N17, N74, N122 in Gamma. Similarly, F157V appears within 15Å of N17, N122, and N165 in Delta. High-impact substitutions appear close to N17 and N122 in both variants.

We measured HEK293-expressed SARS-CoV-2 S1 variant glycan heterogeneity using DeGlyPHER, a mass spectrometry (MS)-based glycoproteomics method,[73] to determine glycan state and occupancy at each glycosylation site. We performed two independent technical replicate analyses of the S1 subunit

comparing Ancestral to the Gamma and Delta variants and examined 11 of the 12 canonical S1
glycosites (N17 was excluded due to variable signal peptide trimming). Site-specific unoccupied,
complex, and oligomannose/hybrid proportions were compared between variants using a Mann-
Whitney U test.[73] P-values were pooled across the two independent replicate analyses using the Fisher
method and FDR-corrected. We observed three significant differential glycosylation events (**Figure** 6**d**).
Complex glycans observed at N122 in Ancestral S1 were converted to more oligomannose/hybrid in
both Delta (oligomannose/hybrid observations increased nearly 4-fold from 13.9% in S1 to 52.5%;
FDR=3.3e-9) and Gamma (oligomannose/hybrid observations nearly doubled to 27.6%; FDR=7.9e-4)
variants. Complex glycans at N331 increased marginally from Ancestral S1 in Delta variant (from 93.7%
to 99.7%; FDR=0.031). Complex glycans seen at N657 in Ancestral S1 decreased in Gamma variant (by
over 2-fold from 53.3% to 21.1%; FDR=1.27e3). The Gamma S1 monomer was consistently expressed
with two novel complex glycosylation sites at N20 and N188.

Based on proximal high-glycoimpact substitutions, we predicted changes at N17, N74 (Gamma only),
N122, and N165 (Delta only). Two of four (N122 in Gamma and Delta) predicted differential
glycosylation events were consistent with the four observed changes (sensitivity=0.5), while 15 sites
where no change was predicted were consistent with the 17 sites where no change was observed
(specificity=0.88). This proof of concept, wherein we correctly predicted the most substantial differential
glycosylation event at N122 in the S1 monomer, will motivate further inspection of differential
glycosylation on the more physiological spike trimer and whole virus, to elucidate how differential
glycosylation may participate in immune evasion by SARS-CoV-2 and other viruses.

Figure 6 – Changes in high-mannose, hybrid, and complex glycosylation are predicted by glycosite-proximal high-glycoimpact
substitutions in HIV, SARS-CoV2. (a) GEE-calculated IMR from PGES-DB denoting relations between sequence (triangle &
square) or structural protein features (circle & plus) and motifs containing >3 mannose (hybrid & high-mannose). (b) The range
of mass spectrometry peaks consistent with either oligomannose or hybrid glycans (N203) or complex glycan peaks (N3) at each
site on the HIV envelope gp160 (BG505 SOSIP.664, PDB:4TVP).[66] Relative abundance is represented as a ratio of oligomannose-
hybrid to complex glycan peaks (N203/N3). (c) Distributions of oligomannose-hybrid to complexity (N203/N3, panel b) glycan
peaks stratified by proximal protein structure features selected in panel a. For the N203/N3 distribution of select IMR, see
Supplementary Figure 12. (d) Mean proportion of mass-spectrometry-observed peptide with mass offsets corresponding to
complex glycan peaks (+3, purple), oligomannose or hybrid glycan peaks (+203, green), or no glycosylation (+0, grey) in the
SARS-CoV-2 S1 subunit at 3 sites with significant glycosylation differences between the original ancestral strain, and the Delta
and Gamma variants (see Supplementary Figure 13 for all sites). Peak count for each glycosylation offset type (+3, +203, or +0)
for each glycosylation site is divided by the total number of peaks for that site to determine the site-specific proportion of each
glycosylation type. Significant differential glycosylation (FDR<0.05) in VOC compared to ancestral is indicated by "*".

Glycosite-proximal variation in IgG sequence predicts differential Fc N-glycosylation

We next predicted differential glycosylation across *ighg1* missense mutation (F299I) in the IgG1 heavy chain.[75] IgG1 glycosylation impacts both adaptive humoral response[76–79] and monoclonal antibody (mAb) response.[80–83] Experimentally, the IgG1:F299I substitution shows a strong glycoimpact. The IgG1 variant expressed in C57BL/6 and BALB/c mouse strains shows less sialylation and digalactosylation compared to similarly expressed *wt* IgG1.[84–86] Additionally, BALB/c-expressed IgG1:F299I glycosylation is more similar to C57BL/6-expressed IgG1:F299I glycosylation than to glycans on *wt* IgG1 expressed in the same BALB/c animals (**Figure** 7**b-c**). Fc N-glycans on IgG1:F299I expressed in both BALB/c and C57BL/6 animals have more agalactosylation (Mann-Whitney p=1.02e-6), less digalactosylation, and less mono-, di- and total sialylation (Mann-Whitney p<0.0073) compared to *wt* IgG1 expressed in the same animals (**Figure** 7**c**, Supplementary **Table** 3). The increase in galactosylation in *wt* IgG1:F299 is consistent with PGES-DB predicted IMR for upstream (N-terminal) phenylalanine (**Figure** 7**a**). Upstream phenylalanine is associated with increased di-galactosylated biantennary structures (OR>2), while upstream isoleucine is associated with tetraantennary galactosylation. Since only biantennary structures are generally permitted on IgG, the galactose-promoting function of upstream isoleucine should be unrealized in this glycoprotein. The increased sialylation in *wt* IgG1:F299 is also consistent with PGES-DB IMR which show an association between structurally proximal phenylalanine and disialylated structures (OR>10). These results suggest that glycoimpact can accurately predict several specific glycan epitopes.

Figure 7 –Differential glycosylation is predicted by high-glycoimpact events near glycosylation sites in IgG (**a**) GEE-learned IMR
relating to sequence-proximal (upstream/N-terminal) effects of I and F. IgG allotypes, F299 and I299, segregated by Principal
Component Analysis of relative abundance (**b**) separate by allotype, not strain. (**c**) Galactose (Gal), Sialylation (Neu5Ac) and
Bisecting GlcNAc abundance distributions for IgG1 F299 and I299 allotypes across BALB/c and C57BL/6 mice (see *Supplementary
Figure 14*). (**d-e**) Core-fucose preference (see **Methods**, *Supplementary Figure 15*) for each glycosite-proximal variant in the
REFORM Fc variant panel.[74] Variants are colored by index. (**d**) Variants are stratified continuously (top) by percent of
fucosylated Fc-cleaved glycans observed on the 24C5 monoclonal antibody. (**e**) Variants are stratified categorically (bottom) by
association with enhanced ADCC.[74] Variants appearing in Fc regions associated with both no-enhancement and enhanced ADCC
are shown as transparent. Only L235A and G236A are uniquely associated with ADCC.

Core-fucose preference is associated with percent fucosylation and high-ADCC

To further demonstrate IMR accuracy and functional importance, we compared predicted core-fucose preference to observed fucosylation abundance and ADCC in a Fab-constant Fc-variant antibody panel[74] (**Figure 7d-e**). Core-fucose preference was calculated as the preference of variant compared to the wild type for N-glycan core motif with or without a core fucose, i.e., Man(b1-4)GlcNAc(b1-4)[Fuc(a1-6)]GlcNAc(b1-4)-Asn and Man(b1-4)GlcNAc(b1-4)GlcNAc(b1-4)-Asn, respectively (see **Methods**).

We compared core-fucose preference for Fc-variant glycosylation on a surface-binding *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*-specific monoclonal antibody (clone 24c5) to demonstrate the accuracy of IMR-based predictions. We determined core-fucose preference predicted from GEE-derived IMR (see **Methods**) for multiple Fc-variants. We then compared predicted core-fucose preference to the capillary electrophoresis measured relative abundance of fucosylated glycans. The Fc-variants naturally stratified into fucose-saturated (fucosylated glycans > 90%) and unsaturated variants (Supplementary **Figure** 16). Fucose saturated variants showed no significant association with predicted fucose preference. However, fucose-unsaturated variants alone (**Figure 7d**) show a strong correlation between predicted core-fucose preference and percent fucosylation (R=0.9, p=0.013). 24c5 Fc glycosylation profiles therefore demonstrate another instance of glycan predictability.

To determine if predicted changes in glycosylation can also predict glycan-modulated behaviors, we examined our ability to predict increases in antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) from predicted decreases in core-fucosylation, a well-characterized property of therapeutic antibodies.[83] We identified 10 glycosite-proximal variants (**Figure 7e**) from the REFORM Fc variant panel[74] and stratified the ADCC-enhancing variants from those associated with no change in ADCC. Of the five sequence-proximal variants, the non-enhancing variant (T307A) shows a positive preference for core-fucose while all four ADCC associated variants have a negative core-fucose preference. Among spatially proximal variants, several substitutions occur in multiple variants and are not uniquely associated with ADCC enhancement or non-enhancement (greyed out, **Figure 7e**). Of the two-remaining spatially proximal variants, the non-enhancing variant (L235A) shows a positive preference for core-fucose while the ADCC associated variant (G236A) has a negative core-fucose preference. These ADCC associations with core-fucose preference are consistent with percent fucosylation in 24c5 Fc. T307A and L235A are highly fucosylated in 24c5, predicted to prefer core-fucose, and do not enhance ADCC. Conversely, S298A is least fucosylated in 24c5, shows a negative preference for core-fucose, and is associated with ADCC

enhancement. Our predictions therefore recapitulate the immunological implications of allotype-driven

differential glycosylation.

Discussion

Here, we have identified constraints on glycan biosynthesis through the analysis of site-specific protein

features[36] and glycan substructures.[35] With our Protein-Glycan Enriched Structure Database (PGES-DB),

we enumerated and quantified intermolecular relations (IMR) between protein and glycan structure in

human glycoproteins. We then computed the expected differential glycosylation, the "glycoimpact,"

associated with specific protein structure changes. We validated glycoimpact importance by comparison

to substitution matrices, evolutionary couplings, and pathogenicity scores. We further examined

glycoimpact sensitivity and specificity comparing predictions with observed glycosylation on PrP, HIV

gp160, and IgG glycoproteins. The existence and utility of glycoimpact suggests that glycans are not

synthesized template-free. Rather, the glycoprotein surface constrains glycan biosynthesis, deciding

which glycosyltransferases may dock and continue glycosylation. Thus, glycosylation is a bounded

biosynthesis wherein a range of glycans within biosynthetic pathways are requested through local

glycosite structural constraints (likely dictated by glycoprotein-glycosyltransferase docking feasibility)

and those requests are variably fulfilled given metabolic precursor-availability.

The significant associations between glycan and protein structures seen in PGES-DB is not consistent

with the expected independence if glycan biosynthesis was template-free. Instead, it suggests protein

structure provides substantial information regarding glycan structure. However, the observation that

larger glycans are less determined by protein structure supports precursor-limitations of bounded

biosynthesis, wherein larger glycans require more precursors, any of which can limit fulfillment.

Similarly, low fulfillment is seen in high-yield expression systems[87] necessitating, in some cases,

supplementation with maturing glycoenzymes.[88–90]

Our quantified protein-glycan IMR describe an expanded glycosite structure, beyond the original sequon

definition (NX[S/T]).[5] We discovered many new sequence-proximal AA IMR both upstream and

downstream of traditional glycosites. The enhanced aromatic sequon (EAS)[14] corroborates one such

sequon-expanding IMR. Upstream phenylalanine IMR predicts an increase in Man7 structures (i.e., N-

glycan with seven-mannoses) and a decrease in Man6 structures, suggesting an increase in larger high-

mannose structures (**Figure** 3**d**). The predicted difference in oligomannose is consistent with reported

EAS glycosylation; upstream phenylalanine (N-2) can decrease glycan processing and increase

homogeneity.[14] Structurally, tryptophan and tyrosine are known to stabilize the chitobiose core through

dispersion and increasing glycan accessibility for maturation; phenylalanine lacks a dipole and therefore

does not support similar maturation[91–95]. Both the EAS and selective aromatic stacking results are

consistent with glycoimpact. We predict limited expected differential glycosylation following a

tryptophan-tyrosine substitution but a substantial decrease in processing following substitution from

tryptophan or tyrosine to phenylalanine (**Figure** 3f, Supplementary **Figure** 5). The expanded sequon

scaffolded by the IMR (**Figure** 2), glycoimpact substitution matrix (**Figure** 3f, Supplementary **Figure** 5),

and glycosite-coupled residues (**Figure** 4**c-d**) together represent a portable and dynamic summary of our

findings that can be easily applied to predict glycosylation following novel substitutions. We believe that

the large number of both high glycoimpact and low structural impact substitutions (around 50% of AA

have one such substitution) will be useful in understanding pathogenic variants, viral evolution, and

glycoprotein engineering.

Glycoimpact can be further used to inform the mechanism of pathogenesis when disease variants are

close to glycosites that impact glycosylation. We can examine known annotated-pathogenic variants and

propose novel mechanisms of pathogenesis. Unannotated variants can be automatically labelled for

likelihood of glycan modulation. Though this work does not deeply interrogate causal associations with

glycan-modulated pathogenesis, we found several prior works implicating high-glycoimpact glycosite

proximal variants as pathogenic, including one thorough study of oculocutaneous albinism implicating

variant-proximal glycosylation as a causal pathogenic modulator. Examining the highest glycoimpact

relation with a high BLOSUM score, Ile/Val; the substitution should have a negligible structural impact

while dramatically changing glycosylation. As expected, pathogenic variant PrP:V180I (adjacent to

glycosite N181) is a causal mutation in Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease.[96] Similarly, a glycosite-proximal V84I

substitution in HIV-gp120 deactivates the virus; otherwise achieved by mutagenic glycosite-ablation.[97]

Similarly, tyrosinase:A355V (P14679) is a sufficient cause of oculocutaneous albinism.[48,49] A355V is also a

high glycoimpact variant and close to the function-critical N371 glycosite (<20Å; PDB:5M8N); tyrosinase

glycosylation is critical for proper folding,[51,98] N371 glycosite ablation results in decreased protein

abundance and activity,[99] and non-mutagenic post-expression tyrosinase deglycosylation also interrupts

function.[53] Using glycoimpact, we can propose A335V as a glycan-based mechanism of pathogenicity.

Beyond tyrosinase, we identified thousands of variants across hundreds of diseases that may be

similarly explained by aberrant glycosylation. There may be millions of high glycoimpact variants close to

glycosites beyond the narrow scope of ClinVar annotation for which glycoimpact can suggest a possible

pathogenic mechanism.

Just as amino acid substitution can assert pathogenic glycosylation on human proteins, similar
substitutions can enable immune evasion for viruses. Consistent with glycoimpact predictions, we show
that glycosite proximal proline and glutamine are associated with glycan complexity across HIV gp160.
These results both validate our model and propose mechanisms for evolutionary control over the viral
glycan shield.[11,25,100,101] Across three SARS-CoV-2 Variants of Concern, we show that high glycoimpact
variations close to glycosites produce IMR-consistent differential spike glycosylation. If IMR can predict
differential glycosylation as viruses evolve, these predictions could help predict immune evasion and
predict the viral evolutionary landscape for many viruses.[11,101,102]

Functional differential glycosylation is also critical in protein therapeutics. Glycoengineering for
therapeutics is often costly, application specific, and siloed from protein design. Glycans can be modified
indirectly through genome editing of glycosyltransferases[103–105] or media optimization,[106–108] and such
strategies can be guided by models of the biosynthetic pathways.[109–114] Here, we examined AA-specific
differential glycosylation events on antibodies. On the previously characterized and differentially
glycosylated mouse IgG1 allotype (I299F), we see IMR-predictable glycosylation encoded directly into
the glycoprotein primary sequence. Similarly, in glycosite-proximal and high glycoimpact mAb-Fc-
variants both fucosylation and fucose-modulated functional response (ADCC) correlated with GEE-IMR
core-fucose preference. In these examples, IMR is a biologically[76–78] and therapeutically[74,115–118] useful
method for connecting allotype, glycosylation, and effector function. Therefore, IMR represent an
opportunity to embed glycoengineering directly into the glycoprotein sequence and combine the
currently separate paradigms of glycoengineering and protein engineering to a unified practice of
glycoprotein engineering: considering the structure of both protein and glycan and their mutual
influence.

Our direct results focus on human-expressed glycoproteins and global trends rather than specific
mechanisms such as aromatic chemistry, or chaperone proteins. While the specific glycoimpact trends
may not extend to other organisms, the chemistry of carbohydrate-protein interactions suggest that
glycoimpact is foundational and therefore exists in some form across glycosylated proteins.

We believe the evidence presented demonstrates the utility of glycoimpact. Further, the predictability
of glycosylation from protein structure demonstrates that glycosylation is a genetically-encoded
bounded biosynthesis. Due to the high degree of accuracy, precision, and reproducibility with which
protein structure appears to bound glycosylation, we believe protein structure may be described as a
template for glycan biosynthesis. Predictability in glycobiology from such templates will unlock a wealth

of theoretical, exploratory, and corroborative analysis making it inexpensive and easy to leverage
glycobiological insights in fields throughout biology.

573   Conclusions

Our results are incompatible with the template-free principle of glycan biosynthesis. Glycoimpact,
defined and validated here, presents a metric for estimating the influence of a protein structure on
glycosylation. The evidence presented asserts that once the precursor-limitations of biosynthesis are
considered, protein structure influence on glycans becomes visible. Because precursor-limitations are a
substantial force in glycan biosynthesis, protein structure describes a less obvious mapping than
canonical templates such as DNA, RNA, or protein biosynthesis. It is nonetheless predictable, accurate,
and reproducible within a requested range of permissible glycans.

Notably, bounded biosynthesis, imposed through local protein structural constraints, is not a behavior
unique to glycans. Within biology there are likely other cases of biosynthesis or modification constrained
or directed by local protein structure. Because molecules exist in physical space and possess chemical
properties, both the target molecules and the modifying proteins may influence each other by
generalizable steric and chemical interactions between their surfaces. Other target-modifier relations
likely exist in similar interactions such as chromatin and epigenetic modification (e.g. neither histone
deacetylases nor chromatin demethylases uniformly impact accessible chromatin),[119] post-translational
modification,[120,121] and RNA-binding protein actuated splicing.[122-124] Any instance involving a target
molecule placed in distinct local protein structures modified by a small set of enzymes could be an
instance of bounded biosynthesis.

592   Acknowledgements

Thank you to Terry Platt who inspired me with tales of the *Trp* operon[125-129] and in doing so planted the
seed of thought that substrate-limitation is not mutually exclusive with templated biosynthesis. Thanks
also to Lorenzo Casalino, Christian Seitz, and Rommie Amaro for their early insights into the project in
the context of influenza glycoprotein structure. We would like to acknowledge the invaluable
contribution of Dr. Jasminka Krištić, Prof. Dr. Grant Morahan and Prof. Dr. Falk Nimmerjahn to the
studies of IgG N-glycome that are referred to in this paper. EA is supported by ANID (DOCTORADO
BECAS CHILE/2018 - 72190270), the Fulbright Chile Commission, and the Siebel Scholar Foundation. This

work was supported by NIGMS (R35 GM119850, NEL) and the Novo Nordisk Foundation
(NNF20SA0066621, NEL).

Conflicts

This work is associated with a provisional patent filed by the authors, and Augment Biologics, founded
by BK and NEL.

Methods

Enrichment of glycan-protein site-matched data to generate the Protein-Glycan Enriched
Structure Database (**PGES-DB**)

Starting from site-specific glycosylation events, we extended the annotation of each glycosylation site
and glycan to include detailed site-specific protein structural annotation and recorded the number of
times each substructure appeared in each glycan. Only human glycoproteins were analyzed. The final
database includes 111 proteins, 306 glycosylation sites and 4,263 glycans. We initially used site-specific
glycosylation events documented in UniCarbKB.[38] Later and current work was informed by glycosylation
events documented in GlyConnect[130] with supplemental information from GlyGen.[131] Empirical and
expert-curated site-specific glycosylation events from the UniCarbKB and GlyConnect were used to
inform much of the core analysis. Glycoprofiles from UniCarbKB were collected from GlycosuiteDB,[132]
EUROCarbDB,[133] and expanded meta-analysis data.[24] GlyConnect glycoprofiles were predominantly
(70%) curated from novel experiments but includes GlycosuiteDB[132], and select large scale studies.

The protein structure annotation was done using the Structural Systems Biology (ssbio) package in
python.[36] The package uses several tools to perform a variety of annotations. For each human protein,
empirical and homology modeled structures were collected from the Protein Data Bank (PDB)[134] and
SWISMOD,[135] respectively. Proteins without existing models were modelled using I-TASSER.[136] Protein
structures and chemistry close to the glycosylation sites were annotated multiple software packages
through ssbio: sequence properties (EMBOS:*pepstats*),[137] sequence alignment (EMBOS:*needle*),[137]
secondary structure (DSSP,[138] SCRATCH::SSpro[139] and SCRATCH::SSpro8), solvent accessibility (DSSP and
FreeSASA), and residue depth (MSMS). Additional amino acid aggregate features were calculated using

R::seqinr. Spatial proximity was defined using "min-distance" between two amino acids; the minimum

distance between any pair of atoms spanning the amino acids.

Glycan structures were annotated using a combination of glypy[140] and GlyCompare[35] for structure

parsing and comparison respectively. All glycan substructures, a connected subset of monosaccharides

with and without linkage information, were extracted from each glycan, merged to make a superset of

substructures, then mapped to each glycan. Thus, resulting in a mapping from every glycan in the input

database to shared substructures.

Software and packages

Protein structure analysis was performed in Python v2.7.15 using ssbio v0.9.9.8 to retrieve and

calculate: existing empirical and homology models from PDB and SWISSMOD (PDBe SIFTS),[141] *de novo*

homology models (I-TASSER v5.1), sequence properties (EMBOS v6.6.0.0 pepstats), sequence

alignment(EMBOS v6.6.0.0 needle), secondary structure (DSSP v3.0.0, SCRATCHv1.1::SSpro and

SCRATCHv1.1::SSpro8), solvent accessibility (DSSPv3.0.0 and FreeSASAv2.0.2), and residue depth

(MSMSv2.2.6.1). Additional amino acid aggregate features were calculated using R::seqinr.

Statistical analysis was performed in R v3.6.1. R::entropy v1.2.1 was used for entropy, Kullback-Leibler

divergence and other information theoretic calculations. Generalized Estimating Equations (GEE) were

fit using R::geepack v1.3.1. Gaussian Mixture Models were used to z-score normalize the glycoimpact

using R::mixtools v1.1.0. BLOSUM and PAM substitution matrixes were accessed from R::Biostrings

v2.52.

Probability event space, information gain and conditional probability

Here we define an event (a row in our enriched glycosylation-glycosite database) as "the observation of

a glycan at a glycosylation site in an experiment." If two separate experiments in the input database

both observe the same glycan at the same site on the same protein, we consider that event to have

occurred twice. Within each event, we ask if the glycan structure random variable (the presence or

absence of a specific glycan substructure) is present or absent in the observed glycosylation event and if

the protein structure random variable (a proximal amino acid, a secondary structure or another discrete

protein structure). A Fisher exact test (R::base::fisher.test) was used to estimate the odds ratio (OR) and

significance (p) of each inter-molecular relation (IMR). P-values were corrected for False Discovery Rate

(FDR, q) permitting 10% false discovery (q<0.1). Conditional probability was calculated by dividing joint

probability by the marginal probability of protein and glycan structure presence. Kullback-Leibler

divergence (KLd, R::entropy::KL.Dirichlet, pseudo count=1/6) was calculated by comparing the

conditional probability distribution to the marginal probability distributions.

Quantitative characterization of Inter-Molecular Relations (IMR) using Generalized Estimation Equations (GEE)

To characterize the IMR in the PGES-DB while controlling for protein-specific confounding effects and

handle nonlinear relations we used a population-averaging approach; logistic Generalized Estimating

Equations (GEE) with glycoprotein identity as the cluster identifier.[142] We used an exchangeable

correlation structure to describe and balance the in-protein similarity. Models were fit to predict glycan

substructure binary (presence or absence) from either z-score normalized continuous or binary

(presence or absence) protein structures. For each model, the data from PGES-DB was isolated for one

glycan-type (N-glycan or O-glycan), one glycan substructure and one protein structure. Incomplete

observations (events/rows) were removed and then several checks on each data-slice were run to

minimize overfitting. Glycan substructures were excluded from modelling if standard deviation was less

than 1e-6 or if there were fewer than 5 observations of the structure within the pertinent data-slice.

Discrete protein structure features were excluded if there were fewer than 4 observations within the

data-slice. Models were excluded if there were fewer than 4 instances in any cell (of the 2x2

absence/occurrence matrix) or if the chi-squared expected value of any cell was less than or equal to 5.

Observations were weighted by the reciprocal-count of the corresponding label type to balance label

contributions to the model and scaled by exponentiated cscore to maximize the contribution of high-

quality protein structure models ($w_i = 2^c / n$); c is the c-score given by I-TASSER and n is the number of

times a structure is present (1) or absent (0). Models with $|\log(OR)| > 50$ were excluded as likely overfit.

Quasi-likelihood under independent model criterion (QIC) and the Wald tests were used to evaluate the

significance and magnitude of the estimated IMR. We also ran this analysis using publication identifiers

as a control variable to account for researcher and group biases; this produced similar results likely

because protein identity is strongly correlated with the publications in which they appear.

Calculating glycoimpact from IMR and populating a BLAMO matrix

Glycoimpact is the z-score normalized Euclidean distance between the significant log(OR) for all motifs

associated with a protein structure; the null distribution of Euclidean distances was determined using

Gaussian mixture models (Supplementary **Figure** 5)

Glycoimpact is calculated for every pair of AAs as the Euclidean distance between significant and
substantial log odds ratios for each AA; the Euclidean distance between expected glycoprofiles for each
AA. The substantial (log(OR)>X) and significant (FDR<Y) log(OR) values are retained while insignificant or
unsubstantial log(OR) values are set to zero. The resulting matrix describes the expected glycoimpact
due to each AA-substitution, termed the BLAMO XY matrix where X and Y denote the log(OR) and FDR
thresholds respectively.

Glycoimpact values from a BLAMO XY matrix can then be z-score normalized to a Gaussian Mixture
Model[143] estimated null distribution.   We use z=2.5 as a heuristic but stringent cutoff between
"impactful" (z>2.5) and "null" (z<2.5) substitutions.

Comparison of SNP pathogenicity scores with glycoimpact
Functional prediction rank normalized scores were obtained from dbNSFP (v3.2) for the following 27
tools: SIFT, PolyPhen-2 HDIV, PolyPhen-2 HVAR, GERP++, MutationTaster, Mutation Assessor, FATHMM,
LRT, SiPhy, 2x PhyloP, MetaSVM, MetaLR, CADD, VEST3, PROVEAN, 4× fitCons scores, fathmm-MKL,
DANN, 2× phastCons, GenoCanyon, Eigen and Eigen-PC.[40] Variants were excluded from the analysis if
they had more than 3 missing functional score predictions, did not result in an amino acid change, or not
on proteins that had known glycosylation sites.

Assignments of "prediction-type" and "structure-usage" (**Figure** 5b) were adapted from classifications
provided by dbNSFP.[40]

Estimation and Analysis of Evolutionary Couplings (EC)
For EVCouplings calculation, hits composed of more than 50% gaps were filtered from the alignment,
and sequences with homologs more than 80% identical were down-weighted to compute N_{eff}, the
effective number of sequences.[45] ECs were calculated using pseudo-likelihood maximization,[144,145] as
implemented previously.[146] The λ_J term was scaled by the number of amino acids minus one times the
number of sites in the model minus one. Pre- and post-processing was performed using the EVCouplings
Python package.[147]

High-ranking EC events are generally considered those ranking less than L a measure of sequence length
where only residues with fewer than 30% gaps were counted.[45] Specifically, the gap threshold (minimum
column coverage parameter) was set to 70%. Therefore, residue positions with more than 30% gaps
disregarded. We also used a fragment filter of 70%, meaning that individual sequences had to have 30%
non-gap characters in each row as well. We explored multiple high-rank thresholds between $L/5$ and $3L$.

To explore the increased coupling with glycosylation sites, we examined couplings between each amino

acid with glycosites (GN), asparagines (N) and any amino acid (AA). We compared the number of high-

ranking coupling events, the distributions of EC probabilities and the relative numbers of high and low-

ranking ECs for each group with various amino acids at relative positions N+/-6. Distributions were

compared with a one-sided Wilcoxon test and high/low-ranking counts were compared with

hypergeometric enrichment. The hypergeometric enrichment of glycosite-coupling was performed at

multiple high-rank thresholds (*L/3, L/2, L, 2L, 3L*) and p-values were pooled for each amino acid at each

relative position across ranks using Fisher's method. Finally, the pooled p-values were corrected for

multiple tests using the Benjamini-Hotchberg method.

To examine larger structures in ECs, we used EC rank to mask extended sequons (N+/-6) then clustered

the sequons and extracted motifs. For each sequon, the residues were retained if the residue-glycosite

coupling rank was less than *L4*. The extended and masked sequons were distinguished using a hamming

distance   (DECIPHERv2.18.1)[148]   then   clustered   using   agglomerative   hierarchical   clustering

(factoextra::hcut v1.0.7). Motif logos were generated using custom-scaled position-specific scoring

matrices[149] reflecting the cumulative rank of amino acids at each glyco-site relative position. Specifically,

the aggregate score, *S,* for each amino acid, *a*, at each position, *p*, was aggregated over EC score ranks, *r,*

within each extended-masked sequons, *s*, in a cluster, *c*, such that $S_{a,p} = log_{10} \left(\sum_{s \in c} L/r \right)$

Mouse breeding and Samples

The Collaborative Cross (CC) recombinant inbred mouse strains (N = 333, 95 strains, age 20-117 weeks)

were produced by Geniad Pty Ltd and housed at Animal Resources Centre (Murdoch, WA, Australia).[150]

The CC strains were genotyped using the MegaMUGA platform (GeneSeek; Lincoln, NE). C57BL/6 (N =

10) and BALB/c mice (N = 10), sex- and age-matched (10 weeks old, 1:1 male:female) were obtained

from Elevage Janvier (Le Genest-Saint-Isle, France).[86] The studies received appropriate ethics approvals

from the Animal Ethics Committee of the Animal Resources Centre[75] and the Ethical Committee of the

District Government of Lower Franconia.[86]

Liquid Chromatography – Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS), Normalization and Statistical Analysis of Mouse Fc-linked IgG N-glycopeptides

Immunoglobulin G was isolated from 100-500 μl of mouse serum on 96-well Protein G monolithic plates

(BIA Separations) as described previously.[75,85] LC-MS analysis of tryptic Fc-glycopeptides was performed

as described in.[75,85] In brief, approximately 10–20 μg of isolated IgG was digested with 200 ng trypsin

(Worthington, USA). The resulting glycopeptides were purified by reverse-phase solid phase extraction

using Chromabond C18ec beads (Marcherey-Nagel, Germany) as described in.[85] Tryptic digests were

analyzed on a nanoACQUITY UPLC system (Waters, USA) coupled to a Compact mass spectrometer

(Bruker Daltonics, Germany). Peak areas were calculated by summing areas for doubly and triply

charged ions determined with LaCyTools v 1.0.1 b.7 software[151] and normalized to the total integrated

area per IgG subclass.

Batch correction was performed on the log-transformed values using the ComBat method (R package

"sva") to remove possible experimental variations due to LC-MS analysis having been performed on

several 96-well plates within each cohort. Derived glycosylation traits describing relative abundance of

N-glycans sharing specific structural features (agalactosylated, galactosylated, sialylated,

monogalactosylated, digalactosylated, monosialylated, disialylated structures, structures with bisecting

GlcNAc) were calculated in a subclass-specific manner.[86] Statistical analysis and data visualization were

performed using R programming language v 4.0.3.

Glycoproteomics for SARS-CoV-2 Spike glycoproteins

His-tagged recombinant SARS-CoV-2 Spike S1 protein, expressed in HEK293 cells were purchased from

Sino Biologics (Wayne, PA). Lyophilized glycoproteins corresponding to the original 2019 strain (40591-

V08H), the Gamma variant (40591-V08H14 with L18F, T20N, P26S, D138Y, R190S, K417T, E484K, N501Y,

D614G and H655Y mutations), and the Delta variant (40591-V08H23 with T19R, G142D, E156G, 157-158

deletion, L452R, T478K, D614G and P681R mutations). Samples were analyzed using DeGlyPHER.[73]

Briefly, glycoproteins were digested with Proteinase K (30 min or 4 h) or trypsin, sequentially

deglycosylated with Endo H (creating residual mass signature of +203 Da) to signify high

mannose/hybrid glycans, and then with PNGase F in $H_2^{18}O$ (creating residual mass signature of +3 Da) to

signify the remnant complex glycans on any sequon (NXS|T, where X is any amino acid except P)

asparagine. Unoccupied sequons will have no additional signature mass. Analysis of samples was done

on a Q Exactive HF-X mass spectrometer (Thermo), injecting directly onto a 25 cm, 100 μm ID column

packed with BEH 1.7 μm C18 resin (Waters). Liquid chromatography separation was achieved at a flow

rate of 300 nL min−1 on an EASY-nLC 1200 (Thermo). Buffers A and B were 0.1% formic acid in 5 and

80% acetonitrile, respectively. The gradient used was 1–25% B over 160 min, an increase to 40% B over

40 min, an increase to 90% B over another 10 and 30 min at 90% B for a total run time of 240 min. The

column was re-equilibrated with solution A before injecting sample. Peptides eluting from the tip of the

column were nanosprayed directly into the mass spectrometer by application of 2.8 kV at the back of

the column. The mass spectrometer was operated in a data-dependent mode. Full MS1 scans were

collected in the Orbitrap at 120000 resolution. The 10 most abundant ions per scan were selected for

HCD MS/MS at 25 NCE. Dynamic exclusion was enabled with a 10 s duration and +1 ions were excluded.

Peptides were identified with Integrated Proteomics Pipeline (IP2, Bruker Scientific LLC). Tandem mass

spectra were extracted from raw files using RawConverter[152] and searched with ProLuCID[153] against a

database comprising UniProt reviewed proteome for Homo sapiens (UP000005640), including additional

UniProt amino acid sequences for Endo H (P04067), PNGase F (Q9XBM8), and Proteinase K (P06873), the

amino acid sequences for the SARS-CoV-2 S1 subunits, and a list of general protein contaminants. The

search included no protease specificity (all fully tryptic and semitryptic peptide candidates when treated

with trypsin). Carbamidomethylation (+57.02146 C) was used as a static modification. Deamidation in

the presence of $H_2^{18}O$ (+2.988261 N), GlcNAc (+203.079373 N), oxidation (+15.994915 M), and N-

terminal pyroglutamate formation (−17.026549 Q) were used as differential modifications. Data were

searched with 50 ppm parent mass tolerance and 50 ppm fragment mass tolerance. Identified proteins

were filtered using DTASelect2[154] while using a target-decoy database search strategy to limit the false

discovery rate to 1%, at the spectrum level.[155] At least one peptide per protein and no tryptic end (or

one tryptic end when treated with trypsin) per peptide were necessary, and precursor delta mass cutoff

was fixed at 10 ppm. Statistical models for peptide mass modification (modstat) were applied (trypstat

was additionally applied for trypsin-treated samples). Semi-quantitative label-free analysis was

performed based on the precursor peak area, with a 10 ppm parent mass tolerance and 0.1 min

retention time tolerance, Census2.[156] "Match between runs" was used to find missing peptides between

runs. GlycoMSQuant (v.1.4.1, https://github.com/proteomicsyates/GlycoMSQuant)[73] was used,

summing precursor peak areas across the 3 conditions – 30 min and 4 h Proteinase K, and trypsin,

discarded peptides without glycosites, and discarded misidentified peptides when N-glycan remnant

mass modifications were localized to non-glycosite asparagines and corrected/fixed N-glycan

mislocalization where appropriate, to finally calculate proportions of 3 glycosylation states at each

glycosite, with +/-SEM (standard error of mean). Pairwise statistical comparison between variants was

performed using Mann-Whitney U Test.

The entire DeGlyPHER pipeline and measurement were run twice to collect two independent technical

replicates. Using the Fisher's method for pooling independent p-values, we combined the Mann-

Whitney U-derived p-values for each glycosite comparison. Pooled p-values were adjusted for multiple-

testing using FDR. The N17 glycosite was inconsistently cleaved with the signal peptide precluding stable

measurements needed for robust comparison.

Estimation of glycomotif preference from IMR

Here, we define glycomotif (e.g., core-fucose) preference. Briefly, this is the preference for a glycomotif

following a substitution compared to the wildtype (WT) and a close (within one monosaccharide)

precursor of the glycomotif of interest. When the IMR relating the lost (WT, x-axis) and gained (variant,

y-axis) amino acids association (IMR) to the glycomotif and glycomotif precursor, the variant preference

can be calculated as the distance between the glycomotif and glycomotif-precursor points; distance is

the component perpendicular to the line of equity (y=x). Supplementary **Figure** 15 demonstrates this

calculation visually.

Glycomotif preference can be described in more precise terms. Given a substitution where X and Y are

WT and mutant amino acids respectively at an amino acid residue at index I, we may describe the

substitution as XIY. When I is glycosite-proximal, we may describe a substitution, XIY, as a point, p,

with a pair of IMR (ρ) relating each amino acid to a single glycomotif, $p_{XIY} = (\rho_X, \rho_Y)$. The IMR-pair,

$p_{XIY} = (\rho_X, \rho_Y)$, may also be described as a vector terminating on that point, $\vec{p}_{XIY}$. We may also

represent the line of equality ($y = x$) by the normalized vector $\vec{n} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$. Here, the glycoimpact is

the minimum distance, $G = d(\vec{p}, \vec{n})$. To calculate the component of $\vec{p}$ parallel to $\vec{n}$, we project $\vec{p}$ onto $\vec{n}$,

$\vec{p}_{\vec{n}} = \frac{\vec{p} \cdot \vec{n}}{\vec{n} \cdot \vec{n}} \cdot \vec{n}$. Therefore, $G = d(\vec{p}, \vec{n}) = \vec{p} - \vec{p}_{\vec{n}}$

With this definition of G, we can define G_i and G_c as the glycoimpact corresponding to the glycomotif of

interest and the contract glycomotif respectively. Then, the relative preference by first calculating the

perpendicular component of the difference in glycoimpact vectors projected onto $\vec{n}$, such that

$r_{\vec{n}} = (G_i - G_c)_{\vec{n}}$. Then R is the l^2-norm of the vector difference, $R = s|r_{\vec{n}}|$. For $r_{\vec{n}} = \langle x, y \rangle$, we define

the sign, s, as positive if $y > x$ and negative if $x > y$. The sign is not defined if $x = y$.

Glycoprofiling of 25c4 monoclonal antibody using capillary electrophoresis

As was recently described,[157] 54 Fc variants of 25c4 were cloned from the REFORM Fc variant panel.[74]

The REFORM plasmid library[74] is comprised of golden gate cloning plasmids[158] with Bsal restriction sites

flanking distinct antibody domains and a furin 2A cleavage site to enable self-cleavage and successful

assembly of a complete antibody from a single open reading frame.[159] Variable Light chains containing

REFORM variants and 25c4 Variable Heavy chains were simultaneously transfected at a 1:1 ratio in CHO

cells, purified using a Protein A chromatography resin, then dialyzed and concentrated with Phosphate

Saline Buffer (PBS).

Fc glycosylation was then measured on purified 25c4 antibodies. Purified antibodies were incubated

with magnetic G protein beads (Millipore) and separated from Fab fragments following enzymatic

digestion (IdeZ, NEB). Fc glycans were released and labelled using the GlycanAssure ATPS kit (Thermo

Fisher Scientific) then separated using 3500xL Genetic Analyzer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). As previously

described,[160] retention times (RT) were matched to glycan standards using Glycan Acquisition Software

Version 3500 v1.0.3 and Glycan Analysis Software v1.1. Abundance (area under peaks) was normalized

to total area per sample to calculate relative abundance of each glycan. Non-uniquely determined

glycans were excluded (where the difference in RT was below the detection threshold).

References

1. Varki, A., Cummings, R.D., Aebi, M., Packer, N.H., Seeberger, P.H., Esko, J.D., Stanley, P., Hart, G., Darvill, A., Kinoshita, T., et al. (2015). Symbol Nomenclature for Graphical Representations of Glycans. Glycobiology *25*, 1323–1324.

2. Neelamegham, S., Aoki-Kinoshita, K., Bolton, E., Frank, M., Lisacek, F., Lütteke, T., O'Boyle, N., Packer, N.H., Stanley, P., Toukach, P., et al. (2019). Updates to the Symbol Nomenclature for Glycans guidelines. Glycobiology *29*, 620–624.

3. Pothukuchi, P., Agliarulo, I., Russo, D., Rizzo, R., Russo, F., and Parashuraman, S. (2019). Translation of genome to glycome: role of the Golgi apparatus. FEBS Lett. *593*, 2390–2411.

4. Johnson, R.L., and Deutsch, H.F. (1970). Preparation and studies of myeloma Fab subfractions. Immunochemistry *7*, 207–215.

5. Marshall, R.D. (1974). The nature and metabolism of the carbohydrate-peptide linkages of glycoproteins. Biochem. Soc. Symp., 17–26.

6. Shakin-Eshleman, S.H., Spitalnik, S.L., and Kasturi, L. (1996). The amino acid at the X position of an Asn-X-Ser sequon is an important determinant of N-linked core-glycosylation efficiency. J. Biol. Chem. *271*, 6363–6366.

7. Petrescu, A.-J., Milac, A.-L., Petrescu, S.M., Dwek, R.A., and Wormald, M.R. (2004). Statistical analysis of the protein environment of N-glycosylation sites: implications for occupancy, structure, and folding. Glycobiology *14*, 103–114.

8. Kasturi, L., Eshleman, J.R., Wunner, W.H., and Shakin-Eshleman, S.H. (1995). The hydroxy amino acid in an Asn-X-Ser/Thr sequon can influence N-linked core glycosylation efficiency and the level of expression of a cell surface glycoprotein. J. Biol. Chem. *270*, 14756–14761.

9. Lund, J., Takahashi, N., Pound, J.D., Goodall, M., and Jefferis, R. (1996). Multiple interactions of IgG with its core oligosaccharide can modulate recognition by complement and human Fc gamma receptor I and influence the synthesis of its oligosaccharide chains. The Journal of Immunology *157*, 4963–4969.

10. Altman, M.O., Angel, M., Košík, I., Trovão, N.S., Zost, S.J., Gibbs, J.S., Casalino, L., Amaro, R.E., Hensley, S.E., Nelson, M.I., et al. (2019). Human Influenza A Virus Hemagglutinin Glycan Evolution Follows a Temporal Pattern to a Glycan Limit. Preprint, 10.1128/mbio.00204-19 10.1128/mbio.00204-19.

11. Yu, W.-H., Zhao, P., Draghi, M., Arevalo, C., Karsten, C.B., Suscovich, T.J., Gunn, B., Streeck, H., Brass, A.L., Tiemeyer, M., et al. (2018). Exploiting glycan topography for computational design of Env glycoprotein antigenicity. PLoS Comput. Biol. *14*, e1006093.

12. Gastaldello, A., Alocci, D., Baeriswyl, J.-L., Mariethoz, J., and Lisacek, F. (2016). GlycoSiteAlign: Glycosite Alignment Based on Glycan Structure. J. Proteome Res. *15*, 3916–3928.

13. Huang, Y.-W., Yang, H.-I., Wu, Y.-T., Hsu, T.-L., Lin, T.-W., Kelly, J.W., and Wong, C.-H. (2017).
Residues comprising the enhanced aromatic sequon influence protein N-glycosylation efficiency. J.
Am. Chem. Soc. *139*, 12947–12955.

14. Murray, A.N., Chen, W., Antonopoulos, A., Hanson, S.R., Wiseman, R.L., Dell, A., Haslam, S.M.,
Powers, D.L., Powers, E.T., and Kelly, J.W. (2015). Enhanced aromatic sequons increase
oligosaccharyltransferase glycosylation efficiency and glycan homogeneity. Chem. Biol. *22*, 1052–
1062.

15. Gupta, R., and Brunak, S. (2002). Prediction of glycosylation across the human proteome and the
correlation to protein function. Pac. Symp. Biocomput., 310–322.

16. Steentoft, C., Vakhrushev, S.Y., Joshi, H.J., Kong, Y., Vester-Christensen, M.B., Schjoldager, K.T.-B.G.,
Lavrsen, K., Dabelsteen, S., Pedersen, N.B., Marcos-Silva, L., et al. (2013). Precision mapping of the
human O-GalNAc glycoproteome through SimpleCell technology. EMBO J. *32*, 1478–1488.

17. Ives, C.M., Singh, O., D'Andrea, S., Fogarty, C.A., Harbison, A.M., Satheesan, A., Tropea, B., and
Fadda, E. (2023). Restoring Protein Glycosylation with GlycoShape. bioRxiv.
10.1101/2023.12.11.571101.

18. Blom, N., Sicheritz-Pontén, T., Gupta, R., Gammeltoft, S., and Brunak, S. (2004). Prediction of post-
translational glycosylation and phosphorylation of proteins from the amino acid sequence.
Proteomics *4*, 1633–1649.

19. Silverman, J.M., and Imperiali, B. (2016). Bacterial N-Glycosylation Efficiency Is Dependent on the
Structural Context of Target Sequons. J. Biol. Chem. *291*, 22001–22010.

20. Kawatkar, S.P., Kuntz, D.A., Woods, R.J., Rose, D.R., and Boons, G.-J. (2006). Structural Basis of the
Inhibition of Golgi α-Mannosidase II by Mannostatin A and the Role of the Thiomethyl Moiety in
Ligand–Protein Interactions. Preprint, 10.1021/ja061216p 10.1021/ja061216p.

21. Li, B., Kawatkar, S.P., George, S., Strachan, H., Woods, R.J., Siriwardena, A., Moremen, K.W., and
Boons, G.-J. (2004). Inhibition of Golgi Mannosidase II with Mannostatin A Analogues: Synthesis,
Biological Evaluation, and Structure-Activity Relationship Studies. Chembiochem *5*, 1220–1227.

22. Hang, I., Lin, C.-W., Grant, O.C., Fleurkens, S., Villiger, T.K., Soos, M., Morbidelli, M., Woods, R.J.,
Gauss, R., and Aebi, M. (2015). Analysis of site-specific N-glycan remodeling in the endoplasmic
reticulum and the Golgi. Glycobiology *25*, 1335–1349.

23. Xiang, Y., Karaveg, K., and Moremen, K.W. (2016). Substrate recognition and catalysis by GH47 α-
mannosidases involved in Asn-linked glycan maturation in the mammalian secretory pathway. Proc.
Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *113*, E7890–E7899.

24. Thaysen-Andersen, M., and Packer, N.H. (2012). Site-specific glycoproteomics confirms that protein
structure dictates formation of N-glycan type, core fucosylation and branching. Glycobiology *22*,
1440–1452.

25. Allen, J.D., Chawla, H., Samsudin, F., Zuzic, L., Shivgan, A.T., Watanabe, Y., He, W.-T., Callaghan, S.,
Song, G., Yong, P., et al. (2021). Site-specific steric control of SARS-CoV-2 spike glycosylation. Cold
Spring Harbor Laboratory, 2021.03.08.433764. 10.1101/2021.03.08.433764.

26.   García-García, A., Serna, S., Yang, Z., Delso, I., Taleb, V., Hicks, T., Artschwager, R., Vakhrushev, S.Y.,
Clausen, H., Angulo, J., et al. (2021). FUT8-directed core fucosylation of N-glycans is regulated by
the glycan structure and protein environment. ACS Catal. *11*, 9052–9065.

27.   Losfeld, M.-E., Scibona, E., Lin, C.-W., Villiger, T.K., Gauss, R., Morbidelli, M., and Aebi, M. (2017).
Influence of protein/glycan interaction on site-specific glycan heterogeneity. FASEB J. *31*, 4623–
4635.

28.   Losfeld, M.-E., Scibona, E., Lin, C.-W., and Aebi, M. (2022). Glycosylation network mapping and site-
specific glycan maturation in vivo. iScience, 105417.

29.   Mathew, C., Weiß, R.G., Giese, C., Lin, C.-W., Losfeld, M.-E., Glockshuber, R., Riniker, S., and Aebi,
M. (2021). Glycan-protein interactions determine kinetics of N-glycan remodeling. RSC Chem Biol *2*,
917–931.

30.   Adams, T.M., Zhao, P., Chapla, D., Moremen, K.W., and Wells, L. (2022). Sequential in vitro
enzymatic N-glycoprotein modification reveals site-specific rates of glycoenzyme processing. J. Biol.
Chem., 102474.

31.   Bagdonas, H., Fogarty, C.A., Fadda, E., and Agirre, J. (2021). The case for post-predictional
modifications in the AlphaFold Protein Structure Database. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol. *28*, 869–870.

32.   Tsai, Y.-X., Chang, N.-E., Reuter, K., Chang, H.-T., Yang, T.-J., von Bülow, S., Sehrawat, V., Zerrouki,
N., Tuffery, M., Gecht, M., et al. (2024). Rapid simulation of glycoprotein structures by grafting and
steric exclusion of glycan conformer libraries. Cell *187*, 1296-1311.e26.

33.   Abramson, J., Adler, J., Dunger, J., Evans, R., Green, T., Pritzel, A., Ronneberger, O., Willmore, L.,
Ballard, A.J., Bambrick, J., et al. (2024). Accurate structure prediction of biomolecular interactions
with AlphaFold 3. Nature. 10.1038/s41586-024-07487-w.

34.   Alocci, D., Mariethoz, J., Gastaldello, A., Gasteiger, E., Karlsson, N.G., Kolarich, D., Packer, N.H., and
Lisacek, F. (2019). GlyConnect: Glycoproteomics Goes Visual, Interactive, and Analytical. J.
Proteome Res. *18*, 664–677.

35.   Bao, B., Kellman, B.P., Chiang, A.W.T., Zhang, Y., Sorrentino, J.T., York, A.K., Mohammad, M.A.,
Haymond, M.W., Bode, L., and Lewis, N.E. (2021). Correcting for sparsity and interdependence in
glycomics by accounting for glycan biosynthesis. Nat. Commun. *12*, 4988.

36.   Mih, N., Brunk, E., Chen, K., Catoiu, E., Sastry, A., Kavvas, E., Monk, J.M., Zhang, Z., and Palsson, B.O.
(2018). ssbio: a Python framework for structural systems biology. Bioinformatics *34*, 2155–2157.

37.   McInnes, L., Healy, J., and Melville, J. (2018). UMAP: Uniform Manifold Approximation and
Projection for Dimension Reduction. arXiv [stat.ML].

38.   Campbell, M.P., Peterson, R., Mariethoz, J., Gasteiger, E., Akune, Y., Aoki-Kinoshita, K.F., Lisacek, F.,
and Packer, N.H. (2014). UniCarbKB: building a knowledge platform for glycoproteomics. Nucleic
Acids Res. *42*, D215-21.

39.   Uhlén, M., Fagerberg, L., Hallström, B.M., Lindskog, C., Oksvold, P., Mardinoglu, A., Sivertsson, Å.,
Kampf, C., Sjöstedt, E., Asplund, A., et al. (2015). Proteomics. Tissue-based map of the human

proteome. Science *347*, 1260419.

40. Liu, X., Wu, C., Li, C., and Boerwinkle, E. (2016). DbNSFP v3.0: A one-stop database of functional
predictions and annotations for human nonsynonymous and splice-site SNVs. Hum. Mutat. *37*,
235–241.

41. Fitch, W.M., and Dayhoff, M.O. (1973). Atlas of protein sequence and structure, 1972. Syst. Zool.
22, 196.

42. Henikoff, S., and Henikoff, J.G. (1992). Amino acid substitution matrices from protein blocks. Proc.
Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *89*, 10915–10919.

43. Mount, D.W. (2008). Comparison of the PAM and BLOSUM amino acid substitution matrices. CSH
Protoc. *2008*, db.ip59.

44. Pearson, W.R. (2013). Selecting the right similarity-scoring matrix. Curr. Protoc. Bioinformatics *43*,
3.5.1-3.5.9.

45. Marks, D.S., Colwell, L.J., Sheridan, R., Hopf, T.A., Pagnani, A., Zecchina, R., and Sander, C. (2011).
Protein 3D structure computed from evolutionary sequence variation. PLoS One *6*, e28766.

46. Thusberg, J., Olatubosun, A., and Vihinen, M. (2011). Performance of mutation pathogenicity
prediction methods on missense variants. Hum. Mutat. *32*, 358–368.

47. Cheng, N., Li, M., Zhao, L., Zhang, B., Yang, Y., Zheng, C.-H., and Xia, J. (2020). Comparison and
integration of computational methods for deleterious synonymous mutation prediction. Brief.
Bioinform. *21*, 970–981.

48. Simeonov, D.R., Wang, X., Wang, C., Sergeev, Y., Dolinska, M., Bower, M., Fischer, R., Winer, D.,
Dubrovsky, G., Balog, J.Z., et al. (2013). DNA variations in oculocutaneous albinism: an updated
mutation list and current outstanding issues in molecular diagnostics. Hum. Mutat. *34*, 827–835.

49. Spritz, R.A., Ho, L., Furumura, M., and Hearing, V.J., Jr (1997). Mutational analysis of copper binding
by human tyrosinase. J. Invest. Dermatol. *109*, 207–212.

50. Halaban, R., Svedine, S., Cheng, E., Smicun, Y., Aron, R., and Hebert, D.N. (2000). Endoplasmic
reticulum retention is a common defect associated with tyrosinase-negative albinism. Proc. Natl.
Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *97*, 5889–5894.

51. Branza-Nichita, N., Negroiu, G., Petrescu, A.J., Garman, E.F., Platt, F.M., Wormald, M.R., Dwek, R.A.,
and Petrescu, S.M. (2000). Mutations at critical N-glycosylation sites reduce tyrosinase activity by
altering folding and quality control. J. Biol. Chem. *275*, 8169–8175.

52. Dolinska, M.B., Kovaleva, E., Backlund, P., Wingfield, P.T., Brooks, B.P., and Sergeev, Y.V. (2014).
Albinism-causing mutations in recombinant human tyrosinase alter intrinsic enzymatic activity.
PLoS One *9*, e84494.

53. Dolinska, M.B., and Sergeev, Y.V. (2017). The consequences of deglycosylation of recombinant
intra-melanosomal domain of human tyrosinase. Biol. Chem. *399*, 73–77.

54.　Sevillano, A.M., Aguilar-Calvo, P., Kurt, T.D., Lawrence, J.A., Soldau, K., Nam, T.H., Schumann, T.,
Pizzo, D.P., Nyström, S., Choudhury, B., et al. (2020). Prion protein glycans reduce intracerebral
fibril formation and spongiosis in prion disease. J. Clin. Invest. *130*, 1350–1362.

55.　Yi, C.-W., Wang, L.-Q., Huang, J.-J., Pan, K., Chen, J., and Liang, Y. (2018). Glycosylation Significantly
Inhibits the Aggregation of Human Prion Protein and Decreases Its Cytotoxicity. Preprint,
10.1038/s41598-018-30770-6 10.1038/s41598-018-30770-6.

56.　Ng, B.G., and Freeze, H.H. (2018). Perspectives on Glycosylation and Its Congenital Disorders.
Trends Genet. *34*, 466–476.

57.　Joshi, H.J., Hansen, L., Narimatsu, Y., Freeze, H.H., Henrissat, B., Bennett, E., Wandall, H.H., Clausen,
H., and Schjoldager, K.T. (2018). Glycosyltransferase genes that cause monogenic congenital
disorders of glycosylation are distinct from glycosyltransferase genes associated with complex
diseases. Glycobiology *28*, 284–294.

58.　Berg-Fussman, A., Grace, M.E., Ioannou, Y., and Grabowski, G.A. (1993). Human acid beta-
glucosidase. N-glycosylation site occupancy and the effect of glycosylation on enzymatic activity. J.
Biol. Chem. *268*, 14861–14866.

59.　Pol-Fachin, L., Siebert, M., Verli, H., and Saraiva-Pereira, M.L. (2016). Glycosylation is crucial for a
proper catalytic site organization in human glucocerebrosidase. Glycoconj. J. *33*, 237–244.

60.　Smith, L., Mullin, S., and Schapira, A.H.V. (2017). Insights into the structural biology of Gaucher
disease. Exp. Neurol. *298*, 180–190.

61.　Souffrant, M.G., Yao, X.-Q., Momin, M., and Hamelberg, D. (2020). N-glycosylation and gaucher
disease mutation allosterically alter active-site dynamics of acid-β-glucosidase. ACS Catal. *10*, 1810–
1820.

62.　Di Fede, G., Catania, M., Atzori, C., Moda, F., Pasquali, C., Indaco, A., Grisoli, M., Zuffi, M., Guaita,
M.C., Testi, R., et al. (2019). Clinical and neuropathological phenotype associated with the novel
V189I mutation in the prion protein gene. Acta Neuropathol. Commun. *7*, 1.

63.　Ladogana, A., and Kovacs, G.G. (2018). Genetic Creutzfeldt–Jakob disease. In Human Prion Diseases
Handbook of clinical neurology. (Elsevier), pp. 219–242.

64.　Liberski, P.P. (2012). Gerstmann-Sträussler-Scheinker disease. Adv. Exp. Med. Biol. *724*, 128–137.

65.　Cohen, M.L. (2014). Human Prion Diseases. In Pathobiology of Human Disease (Elsevier), pp. 2045–
2054.

66.　Cao, L., Diedrich, J.K., Kulp, D.W., Pauthner, M., He, L., Park, S.-K.R., Sok, D., Su, C.Y., Delahunty,
C.M., Menis, S., et al. (2017). Global site-specific N-glycosylation analysis of HIV envelope
glycoprotein. Preprint, 10.1038/ncomms14954 10.1038/ncomms14954.

67.　Zhao, P., Praissman, J.L., Grant, O.C., Cai, Y., Xiao, T., Rosenbalm, K.E., Aoki, K., Kellman, B.P.,
Bridger, R., Barouch, D.H., et al. (2020). Virus-Receptor Interactions of Glycosylated SARS-CoV-2
Spike and Human ACE2 Receptor. Cell Host Microbe *28*, 586-601.e6.

68. Watanabe, Y., Allen, J.D., Wrapp, D., McLellan, J.S., and Crispin, M. (2020). Site-specific glycan
analysis of the SARS-CoV-2 spike. Science *369*, 330–333.

69. Casalino, L., Gaieb, Z., Dommer, A.C., and Harbison, A.M. (2020). Shielding and Beyond: The Roles
of Glycans in SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein. bioRxiv.

70. Grant, O.C., Montgomery, D., Ito, K., and Woods, R.J. (2020). 3D Models of glycosylated SARS-CoV-2
spike protein suggest challenges and opportunities for vaccine development. bioRxiv.

71. Wintjens, R., Bifani, A.M., and Bifani, P. (2020). Impact of glycan cloud on the B-cell epitope
prediction of SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein. NPJ Vaccines *5*, 81.

72. Zhang, L., Mann, M., Syed, Z.A., Reynolds, H.M., Tian, E., Samara, N.L., Zeldin, D.C., Tabak, L.A., and
Ten Hagen, K.G. (2021). Furin cleavage of the SARS-CoV-2 spike is modulated by O-glycosylation.
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *118*, e2109905118.

73. Baboo, S., Diedrich, J.K., Martínez-Bartolomé, S., Wang, X., Schiffner, T., Groschel, B., Schief, W.R.,
Paulson, J.C., and Yates, J.R., 3rd (2021). DeGlyPHER: An ultrasensitive method for the analysis of
viral spike N-glycoforms. Anal. Chem. *93*, 13651–13657.

74. Gunn, B.M., Lu, R., Slein, M.D., Ilinykh, P.A., Huang, K., Atyeo, C., Schendel, S.L., Kim, J., Cain, C.,
Roy, V., et al. (2021). A Fc engineering approach to define functional humoral correlates of
immunity against Ebola virus. Immunity *54*, 815-828.e5.

75. Krištić, J., Zaytseva, O.O., Ram, R., Nguyen, Q., Novokmet, M., Vučković, F., Vilaj, M., Trbojević-
Akmačić, I., Pezer, M., Davern, K.M., et al. (2018). Profiling and genetic control of the murine
immunoglobulin G glycome. Nat. Chem. Biol. *14*, 516–524.

76. Cheng, H.D., Tirosh, I., de Haan, N., Stöckmann, H., Adamczyk, B., McManus, C.A., O'Flaherty, R.,
Greville, G., Saldova, R., Bonilla, F.A., et al. (2020). IgG Fc glycosylation as an axis of humoral
immunity in childhood. J. Allergy Clin. Immunol. *145*, 710-713.e9.

77. Lofano, G., Gorman, M.J., Yousif, A.S., Yu, W.-H., Fox, J.M., Dugast, A.-S., Ackerman, M.E.,
Suscovich, T.J., Weiner, J., Barouch, D., et al. (2018). Antigen-specific antibody Fc glycosylation
enhances humoral immunity via the recruitment of complement. Sci. Immunol. *3*, eaat7796.

78. Atyeo, C., Pullen, K.M., Bordt, E.A., Fischinger, S., Burke, J., Michell, A., Slein, M.D., Loos, C., Shook,
L.L., Boatin, A.A., et al. (2021). Compromised SARS-CoV-2-specific placental antibody transfer. Cell
184, 628-642.e10.

79. Grace, P.S., Dolatshahi, S., Lu, L.L., Cain, A., Palmieri, F., Petrone, L., Fortune, S.M., Ottenhoff,
T.H.M., Lauffenburger, D.A., Goletti, D., et al. (2021). Antibody subclass and glycosylation shift
following effective TB treatment. Front. Immunol. *12*, 679973.

80. Majewska, N.I., Tejada, M.L., Betenbaugh, M.J., and Agarwal, N. (2020). N-glycosylation of IgG and
IgG-like recombinant therapeutic proteins: Why is it important and how can we control it? Annu.
Rev. Chem. Biomol. Eng. *11*, 311–338.

81. Li, W., Zhu, Z., Chen, W., Feng, Y., and Dimitrov, D.S. (2017). Crystallizable fragment
glycoengineering for therapeutic antibodies development. Front. Immunol. *8*.

10.3389/fimmu.2017.01554.

82.   Zhang, P., Woen, S., Wang, T., Liau, B., Zhao, S., Chen, C., Yang, Y., Song, Z., Wormald, M.R., Yu, C.,
et al. (2016). Challenges of glycosylation analysis and control: an integrated approach to producing
optimal and consistent therapeutic drugs. Drug Discov. Today *21*, 740–765.

83.   Shields, R.L., Lai, J., Keck, R., O'Connell, L.Y., Hong, K., Meng, Y.G., Weikert, S.H.A., and Presta, L.G.
(2002). Lack of Fucose on Human IgG1 N-Linked Oligosaccharide Improves Binding to Human FcγRIII
and Antibody-dependent Cellular Toxicity. J. Biol. Chem. *277*, 26733–26740.

84.   de Haan, N., Reiding, K.R., Krištić, J., Hipgrave Ederveen, A.L., Lauc, G., and Wuhrer, M. (2017). The
N-Glycosylation of Mouse Immunoglobulin G (IgG)-Fragment Crystallizable Differs Between IgG
Subclasses and Strains. Front. Immunol. *8*, 608.

85.   Zaytseva, O.O., Jansen, B.C., Hanić, M., Mrčela, M., Razdorov, G., Stojković, R., Erhardt, J., Brizić, I.,
Jonjić, S., Pezer, M., et al. (2018). MIgGGly (mouse IgG glycosylation analysis) - a high-throughput
method for studying Fc-linked IgG N-glycosylation in mice with nanoUPLC-ESI-MS. Sci. Rep. *8*,
13688.

86.   Zaytseva, O.O., Seeling, M., Krištić, J., Lauc, G., Pezer, M., and Nimmerjahn, F. (2020). Fc-Linked IgG
N-Glycosylation   in   FcγR   Knock-Out   Mice.   Preprint,   10.3389/fcell.2020.00067
10.3389/fcell.2020.00067.

87.   Karch, C.P., Paquin-Proulx, D., Eller, M.A., Matyas, G.R., Burkhard, P., and Beck, Z. (2020). Impact of
the expression system on the immune responses to self-assembling protein nanoparticles (SAPNs)
displaying HIV-1 V1V2 loop. Nanomedicine *29*, 102255.

88.   Hombu, R., Neelamegham, S., and Park, S. (2021). Cellular and molecular engineering of glycan
sialylation in heterologous systems. Molecules *26*, 5950.

89.   Zhong, X., Ma, W., Meade, C.L., Tam, A.S., Llewellyn, E., Cornell, R., Cote, K., Scarcelli, J.J., Marshall,
J.K., Tzvetkova, B., et al. (2019). Transient CHO expression platform for robust antibody production
and its enhanced N-glycan sialylation on therapeutic glycoproteins. Biotechnol. Prog. *35*, e2724.

90.   Zhong, X., Schwab, A., Ma, W., Meade, C.L., Zhou, J., D'Antona, A.M., Somers, W., and Lin, L. (2022).
Large-scale transient production in ExpiCHO-S^TM with enhanced N-galactosylation-sialylation and
PEI-based transfection. Methods Mol. Biol. *2313*, 143–150.

91.   Hudson, K.L., Bartlett, G.J., Diehl, R.C., Agirre, J., Gallagher, T., Kiessling, L.L., and Woolfson, D.N.
(2015). Carbohydrate-aromatic interactions in proteins. J. Am. Chem. Soc. *137*, 15152–15160.

92.   Chen, W., Enck, S., Price, J.L., Powers, D.L., Powers, E.T., Wong, C.-H., Dyson, H.J., and Kelly, J.W.
(2013). Structural and energetic basis of carbohydrate-aromatic packing interactions in proteins. J.
Am. Chem. Soc. *135*, 9877–9884.

93.   Asensio, J.L., Ardá, A., Cañada, F.J., and Jiménez-Barbero, J. (2013). Carbohydrate-aromatic
interactions. Acc. Chem. Res. *46*, 946–954.

94.   Montalvillo-Jiménez, L., Santana, A.G., Corzana, F., Jiménez-Osés, G., Jiménez-Barbero, J., Gómez,
A.M., and Asensio, J.L. (2019). Impact of aromatic stacking on glycoside reactivity: Balancing CH/π

and cation/π interactions for the stabilization of glycosyl-oxocarbenium ions. J. Am. Chem. Soc. *141*,
13372–13384.

95. Ardejani, M.S., Noodleman, L., Powers, E.T., and Kelly, J.W. (2021). Stereoelectronic effects in
stabilizing protein-N-glycan interactions revealed by experiment and machine learning. Nat. Chem.
13, 480–487.

96. Goldfarb, L.G., Petersen, R.B., Tabaton, M., Brown, P., LeBlanc, A.C., Montagna, P., Cortelli, P.,
Julien, J., Vital, C., and Pendelbury, W.W. (1992). Fatal familial insomnia and familial Creutzfeldt-
Jakob disease: disease phenotype determined by a DNA polymorphism. Science *258*, 806–808.

97. Wang, W.K., Essex, M., and Lee, T.H. (1996). Single amino acid substitution in constant region 1 or 4
of gp120 causes the phenotype of a human immunodeficiency virus type 1 variant with mutations
in hypervariable regions 1 and 2 to revert. J. Virol. *70*, 607–611.

98. Branza-Nichita, N., Petrescu, A.J., Negroiu, G., Dwek, R.A., and Petrescu, S.M. (2000). N-
glycosylation processing and glycoprotein folding-lessons from the tyrosinase-related proteins.
Chem. Rev. *100*, 4697–4712.

99. Dolinska, M.B., Kus, N.J., Farney, S.K., Wingfield, P.T., Brooks, B.P., and Sergeev, Y.V. (2017).
Oculocutaneous albinism type 1: link between mutations, tyrosinase conformational stability, and
enzymatic activity. Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. *30*, 41–52.

100. Grant, O.C., Montgomery, D., Ito, K., and Woods, R.J. (2020). Analysis of the SARS-CoV-2 spike
protein glycan shield reveals implications for immune recognition. Sci. Rep. *10*, 14991.

101. Peng, W., Rayaprolu, V., Parvate, A.D., Pronker, M.F., Hui, S., Parekh, D., Shaffer, K., Yu, X., Saphire,
E.O., and Snijder, J. (2022). Glycan shield of the ebolavirus envelope glycoprotein GP. Commun.
Biol. *5*, 785.

102. Wei, C.-J., Boyington, J.C., Dai, K., Houser, K.V., Pearce, M.B., Kong, W.-P., Yang, Z.-Y., Tumpey,
T.M., and Nabel, G.J. (2010). Cross-neutralization of 1918 and 2009 influenza viruses: role of
glycans in viral evolution and vaccine design. Sci. Transl. Med. *2*, 24ra21.

103. Schulz, M.A., Tian, W., Mao, Y., Van Coillie, J., Sun, L., Larsen, J.S., Chen, Y.-H., Kristensen, C.,
Vakhrushev, S.Y., Clausen, H., et al. (2018). Glycoengineering design options for IgG1 in CHO cells
using precise gene editing. Glycobiology *28*, 542–549.

104. Narimatsu, Y., Joshi, H.J., Nason, R., Van Coillie, J., Karlsson, R., Sun, L., Ye, Z., Chen, Y.-H.,
Schjoldager, K.T., Steentoft, C., et al. (2019). An atlas of human glycosylation pathways enables
display of the human glycome by gene engineered cells. Mol. Cell *75*, 394-407.e5.

105. Narimatsu, Y., Büll, C., Chen, Y.-H., Wandall, H.H., Yang, Z., and Clausen, H. (2021). Genetic
glycoengineering in mammalian cells. J. Biol. Chem. *296*, 100448.

106. Sumit, M., Dolatshahi, S., Chu, A.-H.A., Cote, K., Scarcelli, J.J., Marshall, J.K., Cornell, R.J., Weiss, R.,
Lauffenburger, D.A., Mulukutla, B.C., et al. (2019). Dissecting N-Glycosylation Dynamics in Chinese
Hamster Ovary Cells Fed-batch Cultures using Time Course Omics Analyses. iScience *12*, 102–120.

107. Ehret, J., Zimmermann, M., Eichhorn, T., and Zimmer, A. (2019). Impact of cell culture media

additives on IgG glycosylation produced in Chinese hamster ovary cells. Biotechnol. Bioeng. *116*,
816–830.

108. Fan, Y., Kildegaard, H.F., and Andersen, M.R. (2017). Engineer medium and feed for modulating N-
glycosylation of recombinant protein production in CHO cell culture. Methods Mol. Biol. *1603*, 209–
226.

109. Kotidis, P., and Kontoravdi, C. (2020). Harnessing the potential of artificial neural networks for
predicting protein glycosylation. Metabolic Engineering Communications, e00131.

110. Jimenez del Val, I., Nagy, J.M., and Kontoravdi, C. (2011). A dynamic mathematical model for
monoclonal antibody N-linked glycosylation and nucleotide sugar donor transport within a
maturing Golgi apparatus. Biotechnol. Prog. *27*, 1730–1743.

111. Sou, S.N., Jedrzejewski, P.M., Lee, K., Sellick, C., Polizzi, K.M., and Kontoravdi, C. (2017). Model-
based investigation of intracellular processes determining antibody Fc-glycosylation under mild
hypothermia. Biotechnol. Bioeng. *114*, 1570–1582.

112. Spahn, P.N., Hansen, A.H., Hansen, H.G., Arnsdorf, J., Kildegaard, H.F., and Lewis, N.E. (2016). A
Markov chain model for N-linked protein glycosylation – towards a low-parameter tool for model-
driven glycoengineering. Preprint, 10.1016/j.ymben.2015.10.007 10.1016/j.ymben.2015.10.007.

113. Spahn, P.N., Hansen, A.H., Kol, S., Voldborg, B.G., and Lewis, N.E. (2017). Predictive
glycoengineering of biosimilars using a Markov chain glycosylation model. Biotechnol. J. *12*.
10.1002/biot.201600489.

114. Liang, C., Chiang, A.W.T., Hansen, A.H., Arnsdorf, J., Schoffelen, S., Sorrentino, J.T., Kellman, B.P.,
Bao, B., Voldborg, B.G., and Lewis, N.E. (2020). A Markov model of glycosylation elucidates isozyme
specificity and glycosyltransferase interactions for glycoengineering. Curr Res Biotechnol *2*, 22–36.

115. Michaeli, Y., and Reiter, Y. (2006). Optimised Fc variants with enhanced effector function. Expert
Opin. Ther. Pat. *16*, 1449–1452.

116. Liu, R., Oldham, R.J., Teal, E., Beers, S.A., and Cragg, M.S. (2020). Fc-engineering for modulated
effector functions-improving antibodies for cancer treatment. Antibodies (Basel) *9*, 64.

117. van Erp, E.A., Luytjes, W., Ferwerda, G., and van Kasteren, P.B. (2019). Fc-mediated antibody
effector functions during respiratory syncytial virus infection and disease. Front. Immunol. *10*, 548.

118. Leon, P.E., He, W., Mullarkey, C.E., Bailey, M.J., Miller, M.S., Krammer, F., Palese, P., and Tan, G.S.
(2016). Optimal activation of Fc-mediated effector functions by influenza virus hemagglutinin
antibodies requires two points of contact. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *113*, E5944–E5951.

119. Zhou, M., Palanca, A.M.S., and Law, J.A. (2018). Locus-specific control of the de novo DNA
methylation pathway in Arabidopsis by the CLASSY family. Nat. Genet. *50*, 865–873.

120. Nováček, V., McGauran, G., Matallanas, D., Vallejo Blanco, A., Conca, P., Muñoz, E., Costabello, L.,
Kanakaraj, K., Nawaz, Z., Walsh, B., et al. (2020). Accurate prediction of kinase-substrate networks
using knowledge graphs. PLoS Comput. Biol. *16*, e1007578.

121. Malaker, S.A., Riley, N.M., Shon, D.J., Pedram, K., Krishnan, V., Dorigo, O., and Bertozzi, C.R. (2022).
1180   Revealing the human mucinome. Nat. Commun. *13*, 3542.

1181   122. Madhani, H.D., and Guthrie, C. (1994). Dynamic RNA-RNA interactions in the spliceosome. Annu.
1182   Rev. Genet. *28*, 1–26.

1183   123. Bao, P., Boon, K.-L., Will, C.L., Hartmuth, K., and Lührmann, R. (2018). Multiple RNA–RNA tertiary
1184   interactions are dispensable for formation of a functional U2/U6 RNA catalytic core in the
1185   spliceosome. Preprint, 10.1093/nar/gky966 10.1093/nar/gky966.

1186   124. Corley, M., Burns, M.C., and Yeo, G.W. (2020). How RNA-Binding Proteins Interact with RNA:
1187   Molecules and Mechanisms. Mol. Cell *78*, 9–29.

1188   125. Farnham, P.J., and Platt, T. (1982). Effects of DNA base analogs on transcription termination at the
1189   tryptophan operon attenuator of EScherichia coli. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *79*, 998–1002.

1190   126. Lee, F., and Yanofsky, C. (1977). Transcription termination at the trp operon attenuators of
1191   Escherichia coli and Salmonella typhimurium: RNA secondary structure and regulation of
1192   termination. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *74*, 4365–4369.

1193   127. Oxender, D.L., Zurawski, G., and Yanofsky, C. (1979). Attenuation in the Escherichia coli tryptophan
1194   operon: role of RNA secondary structure involving the tryptophan codon region. Proc. Natl. Acad.
1195   Sci. U. S. A. *76*, 5524–5528.

1196   128. Farnham, P.J., and Platt, T. (1980). A model for transcription termination suggested by studies on
1197   the trp attenuator in vitro using base analogs. Cell *20*, 739–748.

1198   129. Wu, A.M., and Platt, T. (1978). Transcription termination: nucleotide sequence at 3' end of
1199   tryptophan operon in Escherichia coli. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *75*, 5442–5446.

1200   130. Mariethoz, J., Alocci, D., Gastaldello, A., Horlacher, O., Gasteiger, E., Rojas-Macias, M., Karlsson,
1201   N.G., Packer, N.H., and Lisacek, F. (2018). Glycomics@ExPASy: Bridging the Gap. Preprint,
1202   10.1074/mcp.ra118.000799 10.1074/mcp.ra118.000799.

1203   131. York, W.S., Mazumder, R., Ranzinger, R., Edwards, N., Kahsay, R., Aoki-Kinoshita, K.F., Campbell,
1204   M.P., Cummings, R.D., Feizi, T., Martin, M., et al. (2020). GlyGen: Computational and Informatics
1205   Resources for Glycoscience. Glycobiology *30*, 72–73.

1206   132. Cooper, C.A., Joshi, H.J., Harrison, M.J., Wilkins, M.R., and Packer, N.H. (2003). GlycoSuiteDB: a
1207   curated relational database of glycoprotein glycan structures and their biological sources. 2003
1208   update. Nucleic Acids Res. *31*, 511–513.

1209   133. Al Jadda, K., Porterfield, M.P., Bridger, R., Heiss, C., Tiemeyer, M., Wells, L., Miller, J.A., York, W.S.,
1210   and Ranzinger, R. (2015). EUROCarbDB(CCRC): a EUROCarbDB node for storing glycomics standard
1211   data. Bioinformatics *31*, 242–245.

1212   134. Berman, H.M., Westbrook, J., Feng, Z., Gilliland, G., Bhat, T.N., Weissig, H., Shindyalov, I.N., and
1213   Bourne, P.E. (2000). The Protein Data Bank. Nucleic Acids Res. *28*, 235–242.

135. Waterhouse, A., Bertoni, M., Bienert, S., Studer, G., Tauriello, G., Gumienny, R., Heer, F.T., de Beer,

T.A.P., Rempfer, C., Bordoli, L., et al. (2018). SWISS-MODEL: homology modelling of protein
structures and complexes. Nucleic Acids Res. *46*, W296–W303.

136. Yang, J., Yan, R., Roy, A., Xu, D., Poisson, J., and Zhang, Y. (2015). The I-TASSER Suite: protein
structure and function prediction. Nat. Methods *12*, 7–8.

137. Madeira, F., Park, Y.M., Lee, J., Buso, N., Gur, T., Madhusoodanan, N., Basutkar, P., Tivey, A.R.N.,
Potter, S.C., Finn, R.D., et al. (2019). The EMBL-EBI search and sequence analysis tools APIs in 2019.
Nucleic Acids Res. *47*, W636–W641.

138. Zhang, Y., and Sagui, C. (2015). Secondary structure assignment for conformationally irregular
peptides: comparison between DSSP, STRIDE and KAKSI. J. Mol. Graph. Model. *55*, 72–84.

139. Magnan, C.N., and Baldi, P. (2014). SSpro/ACCpro 5: almost perfect prediction of protein secondary
structure and relative solvent accessibility using profiles, machine learning and structural similarity.
Bioinformatics *30*, 2592–2597.

140. Klein, J., and Zaia, J. (2019). glypy: An Open Source Glycoinformatics Library. J. Proteome Res. *18*,
3532–3537.

141. Velankar, S., Dana, J.M., Jacobsen, J., van Ginkel, G., Gane, P.J., Luo, J., Oldfield, T.J., O'Donovan, C.,
Martin, M.-J., and Kleywegt, G.J. (2013). SIFTS: Structure Integration with Function, Taxonomy and
Sequences resource. Nucleic Acids Res. *41*, D483-9.

142. Zeger, S.L., and Liang, K.-Y. (1986). Longitudinal Data Analysis for Discrete and Continuous
Outcomes. Preprint, 10.2307/2531248 10.2307/2531248.

143. Benaglia, T., Chauveau, D., Hunter, D.R., and Young, D. (2009). mixtools: AnRPackage for Analyzing
Finite Mixture Models. Preprint, 10.18637/jss.v032.i06 10.18637/jss.v032.i06.

144. Balakrishnan, S., Kamisetty, H., Carbonell, J.G., Lee, S.-I., and Langmead, C.J. (2011). Learning
generative models for protein fold families. Proteins *79*, 1061–1078.

145. Ekeberg, M., Lövkvist, C., Lan, Y., Weigt, M., and Aurell, E. (2013). Improved contact prediction in
proteins: using pseudolikelihoods to infer Potts models. Phys. Rev. E Stat. Nonlin. Soft Matter Phys.
87, 012707.

146. Weinreb, C., Riesselman, A.J., Ingraham, J.B., Gross, T., Sander, C., and Marks, D.S. (2016). 3D RNA
and Functional Interactions from Evolutionary Couplings. Cell *165*, 963–975.

147. Hopf, T.A., Green, A.G., Schubert, B., Mersmann, S., Schärfe, C.P.I., Ingraham, J.B., Toth-Petroczy,
A., Brock, K., Riesselman, A.J., Palmedo, P., et al. (2019). The EVcouplings Python framework for
coevolutionary sequence analysis. Bioinformatics *35*, 1582–1584.

148. Wright, E.S. (2016). Using DECIPHER v2. 0 to analyze big biological sequence data in R. R J. *8*.

149. Wagih, O. (2017). ggseqlogo: a versatile R package for drawing sequence logos. Bioinformatics *33*,
3645–3647.

150. Morahan, G., Balmer, L., and Monley, D. (2008). Establishment of "The Gene Mine": a resource for

rapid identification of complex trait genes. Mamm. Genome *19*, 390–393.

151. Jansen, B.C., Falck, D., de Haan, N., Hipgrave Ederveen, A.L., Razdorov, G., Lauc, G., and Wuhrer, M.
(2016). LaCyTools: A Targeted Liquid Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry Data Processing Package
for Relative Quantitation of Glycopeptides. J. Proteome Res. *15*, 2198–2210.

152. He, L., Diedrich, J., Chu, Y.-Y., and Yates, J.R., 3rd (2015). Extracting accurate precursor information
for tandem mass spectra by RawConverter. Anal. Chem. *87*, 11361–11367.

153. Xu, T., Park, S.K., Venable, J.D., Wohlschlegel, J.A., Diedrich, J.K., Cociorva, D., Lu, B., Liao, L., Hewel,
J., Han, X., et al. (2015). ProLuCID: An improved SEQUEST-like algorithm with enhanced sensitivity
and specificity. J. Proteomics *129*, 16–24.

154. Tabb, D.L., McDonald, W.H., and Yates, J.R., 3rd (2002). DTASelect and Contrast: tools for
assembling and comparing protein identifications from shotgun proteomics. J. Proteome Res. *1*,
21–26.

155. Peng, J., Elias, J.E., Thoreen, C.C., Licklider, L.J., and Gygi, S.P. (2003). Evaluation of
multidimensional chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry (LC/LC-MS/MS) for
large-scale protein analysis: the yeast proteome. J. Proteome Res. *2*, 43–50.

156. Park, S.K., Venable, J.D., Xu, T., and Yates, J.R., 3rd (2008). A quantitative analysis software tool for
mass spectrometry-based proteomics. Nat. Methods *5*, 319–322.

157. Irvine, E.B., Peters, J.M., Lu, R., Grace, P.S., Sixsmith, J., Wallace, A., Schneider, M., Shin, S.,
Karpinski, W., Hsiao, J.C., et al. (2022). Fc-engineered antibodies leverage neutrophils to drive
control of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. bioRxiv. 10.1101/2022.05.01.490220.

158. Engler, C., and Marillonnet, S. (2014). Golden Gate cloning. Methods Mol. Biol. *1116*, 119–131.

159. Fang, J., Qian, J.-J., Yi, S., Harding, T.C., Tu, G.H., VanRoey, M., and Jooss, K. (2005). Stable antibody
expression at therapeutic levels using the 2A peptide. Nat. Biotechnol. *23*, 584–590.

160. Mahan, A.E., Tedesco, J., Dionne, K., Baruah, K., Cheng, H.D., De Jager, P.L., Barouch, D.H.,
Suscovich, T., Ackerman, M., Crispin, M., et al. (2015). A method for high-throughput, sensitive
analysis of IgG Fc and Fab glycosylation by capillary electrophoresis. J. Immunol. Methods *417*, 34–
44.

161. Benjamini, Y., and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and
Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. J. R. Stat. Soc. Series B Stat. Methodol. *57*, 289–300.

162. Xu, C., and Ng, D.T.W. (2015). Glycosylation-directed quality control of protein folding. Nat. Rev.
Mol. Cell Biol. *16*, 742–752.

163. Shental-Bechor, D., and Levy, Y. (2008). Effect of glycosylation on protein folding: a close look at
thermodynamic stabilization. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *105*, 8256–8261.

164. Shihab, H.A., Gough, J., Mort, M., Cooper, D.N., Day, I.N.M., and Gaunt, T.R. (2014). Ranking non-
synonymous single nucleotide polymorphisms based on disease concepts. Hum. Genomics *8*, 11.

165. Shihab, H.A., Gough, J., Cooper, D.N., Day, I.N.M., and Gaunt, T.R. (2013). Predicting the functional
1286   consequences of cancer-associated amino acid substitutions. Bioinformatics *29*, 1504–1510.

1287   166. Shihab, H.A., Gough, J., Cooper, D.N., Stenson, P.D., Barker, G.L.A., Edwards, K.J., Day, I.N.M., and
1288   Gaunt, T.R. (2013). Predicting the functional, molecular, and phenotypic consequences of amino
1289   acid substitutions using hidden Markov models. Hum. Mutat. *34*, 57–65.

1290   167. Baković, M.P., Selman, M.H.J., Hoffmann, M., Rudan, I., Campbell, H., Deelder, A.M., Lauc, G., and
1291   Wuhrer, M. (2013). High-throughput IgG Fc N-glycosylation profiling by mass spectrometry of
1292   glycopeptides. J. Proteome Res. *12*, 821–831.

1293   168. Pucić, M., Knezević, A., Vidic, J., Adamczyk, B., Novokmet, M., Polasek, O., Gornik, O., Supraha-
1294   Goreta, S., Wormald, M.R., Redzić, I., et al. (2011). High throughput isolation and glycosylation
1295   analysis of IgG-variability and heritability of the IgG glycome in three isolated human populations.
1296   Mol. Cell. Proteomics *10*, M111.010090.

1297   169. Klarić, L., Tsepilov, Y.A., Stanton, C.M., Mangino, M., Sikka, T.T., Esko, T., Pakhomov, E., Salo, P.,
1298   Deelen, J., McGurnaghan, S.J., et al. (2020). Glycosylation of immunoglobulin G is regulated by a
1299   large network of genes pleiotropic with inflammatory diseases. Sci. Adv. *6*, eaax0301.

1300   170. Rose, R.J., van Berkel, P.H.C., van den Bremer, E.T.J., Labrijn, A.F., Vink, T., Schuurman, J., Heck,
1301   A.J.R., and Parren, P.W.H.I. (2013). Mutation of Y407 in the CH3 domain dramatically alters
1302   glycosylation and structure of human IgG. MAbs *5*, 219–228.

1303   171. Vidarsson, G., Dekkers, G., and Rispens, T. (2014). IgG subclasses and allotypes: from structure to
1304   effector functions. Front. Immunol. *5*, 520.

1305   172. Hutton, S.M., and Spritz, R.A. (2008). Comprehensive analysis of oculocutaneous albinism among
1306   non-Hispanic caucasians shows that OCA1 is the most prevalent OCA type. J. Invest. Dermatol. *128*,
1307   2442–2450.

1308   173. Rademacher, C., Bru, T., McBride, R., Robison, E., Nycholat, C.M., Kremer, E.J., and Paulson, J.C.
1309   (2012). A Siglec-like sialic-acid-binding motif revealed in an adenovirus capsid protein. Glycobiology
1310   *22*, 1086–1091.

1311   174. Chavent, M., Kuentz-Simonet, V., Labenne, A., and Saracco, J. (2014). Multivariate analysis of mixed
1312   data: The R package PCAmixdata. arXiv [stat.CO].

Validation
Types

Specific Applications

Computational

Pathogenic Variants

Retrospective
Experiments

Evolutionary Statistics

Novel
Experiments

Viral Proteins

Antibodies

ClinVar mutations within 20Å of a glycosite

Proximal Isoleucine (I) Odds Ratio

- ■ Sequence Proximal (N-term)
- ○ Structure Proximal (Å)

5.0
3.0
1.0
0.5

Proximal Phenylalanine (F) Odds Ratio

0.1   0.5   1.0   5   10

IgG1 Ile299

IgG1 Phe299

PC2 (7.71%)

0.25
0.00
0.25

PC1 (61.62%)
-0.2   0.0   0.2

IgG1 Allotype
● F299
▲ I299

Strain
● PdLEv
● CS7BL/6N

Antenna Gal (G)

% of total Fc glycan

32
28
24

F299   I299

Antenna Neu5Ac (S)

30
20
10

F299   I299

IgG1 allotype

Core-fucose preference by percent-fucosylation: 24C5 mAb

1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4

L235A
L235A
T307A
H268F
H268F
S298A

Core-fucose preference (fucosylated: afucosylated)

-0.01   0.00   0.01   0.02   0.03

Core-fucose preference by ADCC Enhancement REFORM

0.02
0.00
-0.02
-0.04

T307A
L235A
H268F
S298A   S239D   S239D
Y300L   G236A
R292P   S267E   S267E
V305I

No Change   Enhanced   No Change   Enhanced
Sequence-proximal   Structure-proximal