On the impact of the pangenome and annotation discrepancies while building protein sequence databases for bacteria proteogenomics

Machado, K.C.T.[1], Fortuin, S.[2], Tomazella, G.G.[1,3,4], Fonseca, A.F.[1], Warren, R.[2], Wiker, H.G.[3], de Souza S.J.[1,5] and de Souza, G.A.[1,6,*]

[1]Bioinformatics Multidisciplinary Environment, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil.

[2]DST/NRF Centre of Excellence for Biomedical Tuberculosis Research/SAMRC Centre for Tuberculosis Research, Division of Molecular Biology and Human Genetics, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch University, South Africa.

[3]The Gade Research Group for Infection and Immunity, Department of Clinical Science, University of Bergen, Norway.

[4]The Institute of Bioinformatics and Biotechnology, Natal-RN, Brazil.

[5]The Brain Institute, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil.

[6]Dept. of Biochemistry, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil

*Correspondence:

Gustavo de Souza

gadsouza@gmail.com

Keywords: databases, proteomics, proteogenomics, mass spectrometry, pangenome.

Running title: Multi-strain proteomics sequence databases

Abstract

In proteomics, peptide information within mass spectrometry data from a specific organism sample is routinely challenged against a protein sequence database that best represent such organism. However, if the species/strain in the sample is unknown or poorly genetically characterized, it becomes challenging to determine a database which can represent such sample. Building customized protein sequence databases merging multiple strains for a given species has become a strategy to overcome such restrictions. However, as more genetic information is publicly available and interesting genetic features such as the existence of pan- and core genes within a species are revealed, we questioned how efficient such merging strategies are to report relevant information. To test this assumption, we constructed databases containing conserved and unique sequences for ten different species. Features that are relevant for probabilistic-based protein identification by proteomics were then monitored. As expected, increase in database complexity correlates with pangenomic complexity. However, *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* and *Bortedella pertusis* generated very complex databases even having low pangenomic complexity or no pangenome at all. This suggests that discrepancies in gene annotation is higher than average between strains of those species. We further tested database performance by using mass spectrometry data from eight clinical strains from *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, and from two published datasets from *Staphylococcus aureus*. We show that by using an approach where database size is controlled by removing repeated identical tryptic sequences across strains/species, computational time can be reduced drastically as database complexity increases.

Introduction

While genome annotation approaches undertook considerable advances in the past years(Bocs

et al., 2003;Davidsen et al., 2010;Vallenet et al., 2013), correct gene prediction is still challenging

even for prokaryotes. Particularly, the correct assignment of open reading frames (ORFs), the

presence and classification of pseudogenes anddifferences in translational starting site (TSS)(de

Souza et al., 2008;de Souza et al., 2009;Cuklina et al., 2016) are the main sources of variability.

Consequently, for any given strain or species, its predicted protein sequence information will

normally contain inaccuracies that will interfere with peptide identification in mass spectrometry

(MS)-based proteomics. The use of accurate protein sequence databases is a key step in most

proteomic approaches, and this is particularly critical for studies involving samples containing strains

with little to none genetic information or samples containing multiple strains (metaproteomics)

(Tanca et al., 2013).

In such cases when the establishment of a gold-standard annotation that can represent the

sample under investigation is difficult, a viable alternative is to construct customized protein

sequence databases which are then inspected against peptide sequence data collected by MS

(Nesvizhskii, 2014). This has been largely employed in proteogenomics, where "novel" sequences

are inserted in the customized database and, if identified, are further used to validate and confirm

proposed gene models and other genetic polymorphisms (for recent reviews see (Renuse et al.,

2011;Ruggles et al., 2017)). Database customization is often achieved using two different strategies:

i) if the genomic information of the prokaryote under study is known, a 6-frame translation is

possible (Fermin et al., 2006;Baerenfaller et al., 2008); ii) if genomic information is unknown, an

alternative is to construct a database by merging *ab initio* gene predictions from related strains of the

same species, taking into consideration variations caused by SNPs, indels, divergent TSS choice,

among others (de Souza et al., 2010;Omasits et al., 2017). These approaches are not mutually

exclusive, as gene annotation from related strains can be used to further optimize 6-frame translation

approaches (Castellana et al., 2008).

However, peptide identification in MS-based proteomics is often performed through

probabilistic calculations between the observed peptide fragmentation pattern and theoretical data

from a sequence database. Therefore, database size will: i) alter the search space and consequently

the probabilistic calculations performed during peptide identification (Nesvizhskii, 2010); ii) make

protein inference more difficult, especially in multistrain databases (Nesvizhskii and Aebersold,

2005); and iii) demand more computational power due to the handling of larger files. Therefore,

building databases using either 6-frame translations or sequence merging approaches which are larger

than regular can become, at some point, detrimental for the proteomic analysis (Blakeley et al.,

2012).

Such issue might as well contribute differently depending on the species under study, how

much genomic information is available (number of strains with genome sequenced) and genomic

features particular to it. For example, with few sequenced strains at the time, we previously observed

that the size of such merged database for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (Mtb) complex was not

heavily incremented as more strains were considered (de Souza et al., 2011). Each new strain added

to the database contributed with only few genetic polymorphisms when compared to the reference

H37Rv strain. However, the current 65 Mtb strains with complete genome sequenced demonstrated

the existence of a pangenome in this species, i.e., the genome of all strains of a given species contains

only a set of genes from a larger pool of accessory genes for that species (Rasko et al.,

2008;McInerney et al., 2017). It is then critical to address the impact of such approach in the size of

customized databases used in MS-based proteomics, as well as in the performance for peptide

identification.

Many reports have demonstrated that database size could be controlled by creating protein

entries where identical peptides between homologue proteins are reported once and only unique

polymorphic tryptic peptides are inserted when merging sequences (Schandorff et al., 2007;Omasits

et al., 2017;Liao et al., 2018). It is unclear if genomic features such the presence of a pangenome

could impact database customization of specific species. We then decided to test this by creating

protein sequence databases for ten species using strains with complete genome sequences and a

modified version of MSMSpdbb (de Souza et al., 2010). Database parameters such as the number of

entries and unique peptide sequences for each species using increasing number of strains per round

were then quantified. As expected, species with large pangenomes such as *Escherichia coli* showed

the larger increase in database size per number of strains used, and database size in general correlated

with pangenome size. Finally we performed proteomic identification and computational performance

oftwo different datasets from: i) eight clinical strains of Mtb using a database with 65 complete strain

genomes; and ii) two *S. aureus* datasets (Depke et al., 2015;Hoegl et al., 2018) using a database with

194 complete strain genomes.

Experimental Procedures

Species selection

Ten bacterial species were selected for database construction: *Acinetobacter baumannii* (89),

Bordetella pertusis (348), *Campylobacter jejuni* (114), *Chlamydia trachomatis* (82), *Escherichia coli*

(425), *Listeria monocytogenes* (148), *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (65), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

(105) and *Staphylococcus aereus* (194). *Burkholderia mallei* and *Burkholderia pseudomallei* (109)

are considered genetically very similar (Godoy et al., 2003;Song et al., 2010) and were analyzed

together. Number in parenthesis represents strains with complete genome sequenced according to

Genbank (Benson et al., 2013) in August 2017. Protein sequences were obtained using the assembly

file available at ftp://ftp.ncbi.nih.gov/genomes/genbank/bacteria/.

Script design and availability

We redesigned MSMSpdbb (de Souza et al., 2010) in PERL (version 5.24.1) and is present as

two modules: all_fasta.pl provides the sequence alignment and creates the outputs with unique entries

and homologues; create_bd.pl process the homologues output, and create the final database and the

log file. In house BLAST installation (version 2.7.1 or later) is required. All script outputs are saved

as txt files in the data folder. Rand.pl is also available to reproduce the experimental design described

below.

Data processing

Even though MSMSpdbb is already published, since we redesigned how homology is defined

(using a Bidirectional Best Hit rather than a Cluster BLAST approach), we provide below further

information about the method. To assign gene homology, our script initially gathers the protein

sequence data from all strains and then performs pair wise alignments using BLASTP (Altschul et

al., 1990) through a Bidirectional Best Hit (BHH) method (Overbeek et al., 1999). The script

performs in a manner that the strain with most number of protein entries is initially selected as the

query dataset and consequently aligned to the remaining strains sequence datasets (subjects). Two

sequences from different strains will be defined as homologues if: i) they are the best hit possible for

all alignments performed; ii) sequence identity is equal or higher than 50%; iii) sequence similarity is

equal or higher than 70%; and iv) sequence coverage is equal or higher than 70%. These have to be

correlated on both directions (BHH) of the alignment.

When homologues are defined between query and subject strains, our script will proceed by

indexing homologue IDs for later characterizations of polymorphisms. It will then define "unique"

protein sequences from the query dataset (i.e., a sequence without a defined homologue in any of the

subject strains), and add it to the partial version of the final database output (see Figure 1). In parallel,

all entries from the subject strains which were properly aligned to a query sequence will be removed

from the respective strains datasets. A new round of alignment will be performed after excluding the

query strain and selecting one of the previous subject datasets as a new query strain. This will be

performed successively until all strains are used as query. At this point, the script will had then

defined all "unique" protein entries from all datasets which did not aligned to any other annotated

sequence under the selected parameters.

Regarding all indexed homologues, our script then defines the longest version of the protein

as reference (not necessarily from same strain used as query for the BHH step above). The reference

sequence is copied integrally into the partial version of the final output. The script performs an *in*

silico trypsin digest of the protein sequences, and compare amino acid composition of all generated

tryptic peptides. Peptides shorter than 7 or longer than 35 amino acids are excluded. Whenever

different tryptic peptide sequences are observed in the non-reference dataset (due to differences of

TSS choices, SAAs or indels which result in frame shifts), they are added into the final output under

an artificially created protein entry (Omasits et al., 2017). Amino acid changes result from poorly

annotated sequences, where X or U are present in the sequence as an amino acid, are not considered.

Finally, a log file is created, reporting and classifying all differences observed, describing the amino

acid changes and also in which strains those were observed.

Database analysis – Experimental design and statistical rationale

To investigate how each dataset contributes to the final database size, for each species we

constructed databases using 5, 10, 15, 30 and 65 randomly selected strains. This was performed a

total of three times to decrease the chances that a randomly selected strain with very unique features

might interfere with the final result. Each database had its MS search space size measured regarding

number of entries and number of unique tryptic peptide sequences. Pangenomic size calculations

were based on the panX tool (Ding et al., 2018).

Mycobacterial Cell Culturing

Stock cultures of Mtb strains TB179, TB861, TB1430, TB1593, TB1659, TB1841, TB1945

and TB2666 were inoculated into mycobacterial growth indicator tubes and incubated until positive

growth was detected using the Bactec 460 TB system (BD Biosciences). Approximately 0.2 mL was

inoculated onto Löwenstein-Jensen medium and incubated over 6 weeks with weekly aeration until

colony formation. Colonies were transferred into 20 mL of supplemented 7H9 Middlebrook medium

(BD Biosciences) containing 0.2% (v/v) glycerol (Merck Laboratories), 0.1% Tween 80 (Merck

Laboratories), and 10% dextrose, catalase. Once the culture reached an A600 of 0.9, one mL was

inoculated into 80 mL of supplemented 7H9 Middlebrook medium and incubated until an A600

between 0.6 and 0.7 was reached. All steps were performed at 37 °C until Mtb cells in mid-log

growth phase were used for whole cell lysate protein extraction.

Preparation of Crude Mycobacterial Extracts

Mycobacterial cells were collected by centrifugation (10 min at 2500 x g) at 4°C and

resuspended in 1 mL of cold lysis buffer containing 10 mMTris-HCl, pH 7.4 (Merck Laboratories),

0.1% Tween 80 (Sigma-Aldrich), one tablet per 25 mL Complete protease inhibitor mixture (Roche

Applied Science), and one tablet per 10 mL phosphatase inhibitor mixture (Roche Applied Science).

Cells were transferred into 2 mL cryogenic tubes with O-rings, and the pellet was collected after

centrifugation (5 min at 6000 x g) at 21 °C. An equal volume of 0.1 mm glass beads (Biospec

Products Inc., Bartlesville, OK) was added to the pelleted cells. In addition, 300 μL of cold lysis

buffer including 10 μL of 2 units/ml RNase-free DNase I (New England Biolabs) was added, and the

cell walls were lysed mechanically by bead beating for 20 s in a Ribolyser (Bio101 Savant, Vista,

CA) at a speed of 6.4. Thereafter the cells were cooled on ice for 1 min. The lysis procedure was

repeated three times. The lysate was clarified by centrifugation (10,000 x g for 5 min) at 21 °C, and

the supernatant containing the whole cell lysate proteins was retained. Thereafter the lysate was

filter-sterilized through a 0.22 μm-pore Acrodisc 25 mm PF syringe sterile filter (PallLife Sciences,

Pall Corp., Ann Arbor, MI), quantified using the Coomassie Plus Assay Kit (Pierce), and stored at -

80 °C until further analysis.

Gel Electrophoresis and In-gel Trypsin Digestion

Each whole cell lysate (60 μg) were mixed with electrophoretic sample buffer (NuPAGE kit,

Invitrogen, CA) containing 100 mM DTT, and heated for 5 min at 95 °C prior to the electrophoretic

run. Proteins were separated in triplicate using a NuPage 4–12% Bis-Tris Gel in 2-N-morpholine

ethane sulfonic acid (MES) buffer (Invitrogen) at 200 V for approximately 40 min. Proteins were

visualized using a Colloidal Coomassie Novex kit (Invitrogen). After staining, each triplicate was cut

into 15 fractions, sliced into smaller pieces and submitted to in gel digestion with trypsin, as

previously described (Tomazella et al., 2012). Briefly, the proteins in the gel pieces were reduced

using10 mM DTT for 1 h at 56 °C and alkylated with 55 mM iodoacetamide for 45 min at room

temperature. The reduced and alkylated proteins were digested with 0.125 μg of trypsin (Sequence

grade modified, Promega, WI, USA) for 16 h at 37 °C in 50 mM NH4HCO3, pH 8.0. The reaction

was stopped by acidification with 2% trifluoracetic acid (Fluka, Buchs, Germany). The resulting

peptide mixture was eluted from the gel slices, and further desalted using RP-C18 STAGE tips

(Rappsilber et al., 2003). The peptide mixture was dissolved in 0.1% formic acid 5% acetonitrile for

nano-HPLC-MS analysis.

LC-MS/MS analysis

Peptides were separated by reversed-phase chromatography in an Acclaim PepMap 100

column (C18, 3 μm, 100 Å) (Dionex) capillary of 12 cm bed length and 100 μm inner diameter self-

packedwith ReproSilPur C18-AQ (Dr. Maisch GmbH, Ammerbuch-Entringen, Germany), using a

Dionex Ultimate 3000 nano-LC system connected to a linear quadrupole ion trap-Orbitrap (LTQ-

Orbitrap) mass spectrometer (Thermo Electron, Bremen, Germany) equipped with a nanoelectrospray

ion source. Peptides were onto loaded to the column with a flow rate of 0.3 mL/min of 7–40%

solvent B in 87 min and then 40–80% solvent B in 8 min. Solvent A was aqueous 2% ACN in 0.1%

formic acid, and solvent B was aqueous 90% ACN in 0.1% formic acid.

The mass spectrometer was operated in the data-dependent mode to automatically switch

between Orbitrap-MS and LTQ-MS/MS acquisition. Survey full-scan MS spectra (from m/z 300 to

2000) were acquired in the Orbitrap with resolution of R= 60,000 at m/z 400 (after accumulation to a

target of 1,000,000 charges in the LTQ). The method used allowed sequential isolation of the most

intense ions (up to six, depending on signal intensity) for fragmentation on the linear ion trap using

collisionally induced dissociation at a target value of100,000 charges. For accurate mass

measurements, the lock mass option was enabled in MS mode, and the polydimethylcyclosiloxane

ions generated in the electrospray process from ambient air were used for internal recalibration

during the analysis(Olsen et al., 2005). Target ions already selected for MS/MS were dynamically

excluded for 60 s. General mass spectrometry conditions were as follows: electrospray voltage, 1.5

kV; no sheath or auxiliary gas flow. Ion selection threshold was 500 counts for MS/MS, an activation

Q-value of 0.25 and activation time of 30 ms were also applied for MS/MS.

MS Data analysis

Raw MS files of all Mtb and *S. aureus* datasets were analyzed by MaxQuant version 1.5.2.8.

Peptides in MS/MS spectra were identified by the Andromeda search engine (Cox et al., 2011b). For

Mtb dataset, MS files were searched against a database containing all sequences from 65 strains

without any processing (263,683 entries), or the database generated by our tool using the same 65

strains (15,979 entries). The *S. aureus* dataset was searched against a database containing all

sequences from 194 strains without any processing (523,281 entries) or the MSMSpdbb generated

database (15,073 entries). All bacterial sequences were obtained from Genbank as written above

(August 2017). MaxQuant analysis included an initial search with a precursor mass tolerance of 20

ppm which were used for mass recalibration (Cox et al., 2011a). Trypsin without proline restriction

was used as enzyme specificity, with two allowed miscleavages and no unspecific cleavage allowed.

In the main Andromeda search precursor mass and fragment mass were searched with initial mass

tolerance of 6 ppm and 0.5 Da, respectively. The search included variable modifications of oxidation

of methionine and protein N-terminal acetylation. Carbamidomethyl cysteine was added as a fixed

modification. Minimal peptide length was set to 7 amino acids. The false discovery rate (FDR) was

set to 0.01 for peptide and protein identifications, and since the aim is to compare database

performance, no further score or PEP thresholds were used for individual MS spectra. In the case of

identified peptides that are shared between two proteins, these are combined and reported as one

protein group. Protein and peptide datasets were filtered to eliminate the identifications from the

reverse database and from common contaminants.

Results

Implementation and database format

MSMSpdbb was originally designed to use gene assembly data from Genbank from selected

bacterial strain genomes to construct protein sequence databases, which considered all possible

sequence variations (SAP, TSS choice, for example) on a non-redundant manner (i.e., without

extensive entry usage for very similar sequences). At the current version we modified it to perform

BBH BLAST, which is an approach more used to define orthologous sequences, rather than Cluster

BLAST. Database formatting was also modified; non-reference peptides are now inserted as new

entries in the database.

On average, the assemblies used on this work had a number of genes ranging from 910 in

Chlamydia trachomatis (average value to all strains) to 6092 in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. The

analyzed species were selected not solely due to a higher number of strains with complete genome

sequences available but also considering the complexity of their pangenomes. Nine of the selected

species have pangenomes that can be very diverse (for example, *Escherichia coli*, 2,459 core genes to

approximately 26,000 pangenomic genes) or just a fraction of the core genome (such as *Chlamydia*

trachomatis and Mtb, which have only one accessory gene to every five core genes) (Rasko et al.,

2008;McInerney et al., 2017;Ding et al., 2018).

Figure 1 illustrates the approach workflow: briefly, a query strain is selected, and a pair wise

comparison is performed with the remaining subject strains. Unique entries from the query strain

(i.e., sequences with no significant hit to any other protein entries in subject strains) are then saved in

the final database. Protein sequences across strains that share the required levels of identity and

similarity are further processed. The longest version is then used as a reference (regardless of which

strain it is originated from) and saved into the final database. Tryptic peptides between reference and

non-reference sequences are compared. When a tryptic peptide from a non-reference sequence do not

match any of the reference sequence (due to a different TSS choice or a SNP for example), a new

protein entry is created in the final database. This new entry will contain all non-reference tryptic

peptides that do not match the reference sequence. This process will be repeated until no strains are

left to be used as query, or until no protein entries are left in yet-to-be selected query strains. A log

file is also created, reporting all entries that were matched and classifying all tryptic peptides which

were added to the final database, showing the type of event (TSS choice, SNP etc) and in case of

SNP, the resulting amino acid substitution.

Figure 2 illustrates a typical homologue comparison leading to the detection of polymorphic

peptides, which will be added to the database as an artificial entry. The hypothetical protein

AEM98552 (Rv0104 on the Tuberculist annotation (Lew et al., 2011)) was set as reference, and 9

other different variants were observed. Those variants are the result of the different combinations

including: two additional TSS choices at position 9 and 118; three SAPs at positions 402 (Tyr →

His), 477 (Gly→Arg) and 493 (Leu→ Val); a not-classified genetic modification that leads to

alternate amino acid sequence after position 475 (yellow box, named as frameshift/indel); and finally,

two polymorphisms leading to premature stop codons and generating different c-terminal tryptic

peptides ending at position 378 and 426. For example, the variant from strain CAS/NITR204

(AGL25567) contains two SAPs, while the variant from strain CCDC5180 (AEJ48929) has a

different TSS choice at position 9 of reference, and a premature stop codon, truncating the protein at

position 378. Unique tryptic peptides characterizing all such polymorphisms are added in the

database as an additional entry.

Database size increase ratio per species

Databases were created for ten species to measure if the rate of increase in the database size

could be impacted by unique features of each genome, such as the size of a pangenome. For a fair

comparison among species, we built databases using a maximum of 65 strains, since at the time Mtb

had only 65 strains with complete sequenced genomes available. To assist the visualization of how

the database size is incremented as more strains are used, we also created databases using 5, 10, 20

and 30 randomly selected strains of each species. And to avoid outlier behavior in casea strain with

very unique annotation being randomly selected, every database was created three times in total. The

rand.pl script provided with the tool performs all such steps automatically, if the data needs to be

reproduced. We then counted total number of protein entries and tryptic peptides in each database.

Supplementary Table 1 shows all values measured for all tests including: number of proteins

(Supplementary Figure S1), number of annotated proteins (excluding artificial entries created to

accommodate polymorphisms) (Figure 3 and Table I), and number of peptides with or without

miscleavages allowed (Supplementary Figure S2). Figure 3 shows graphically the increase in number

of annotated proteins in all species, and Table I describe number of annotated proteins in the database

using 65 strains, rate of database size increase, number of annotated proteins added per strain on

average, and size of pangenome for each species. As expected, the increase rate in the number of

annotated proteins in the final database correlated with the size of the gene pool in the pangenome. *E.*

coli, which has the largest genetic pool described, had indeed the larger database increase rate of all

species, at 4.6x increase compared to the average number of genes per strain. The three exceptions

for this were: *B. pseudomallei/mallei* with the 2nd increase rate (3.53x) even though the pangenome

size of *B. pseudomallei* is the 4th most complex (no data is available regarding *B. mallei* pangenome);

Mtb, which has the 2nd less complex pangenome size, representing only 21% of total genetic pool,

yet it has 4th database increase rate (2.83x), surpassing *P. aeruginosa* which has a larger genome size

and a bigger genetic pool; and *B. pertussis*, with no pangenome described so far and yet with a

database increase rate (2.46x) which surpassed three species with characterized pangenomes.

Proteomic performance in diverse MS datasets

When we first developed the MSMSpdbb approach (de Souza et al., 2010), the number of

genomic information available was a fraction of the amount currently in existence. For example, the

analysis validation performed on an Mtb dataset used a database with only 8 strains (5 from *M.*

tuberculosis and 3 from *M. bovis*). We then wondered if the approach would still be valuable as

hundreds of genome information is available to a single species. This was tested by performing

proteomic analysis in two independent datasets.

The MSMSpdbb processed database created by the tool contained 15,996 (Mtb), 15,073 (*S.*

aureus) protein entries. In comparison, merely concatenated databases using all sequences from the

available strains for each species created a database with 263,683 protein entries for Mtb and 523,281

protein entries for *S. aureus*. From now on, all MSMSpdbb processed databases are called DB1, and

simply concatenated databases are named DB2 for simplicity. The MS datasets were then challenged

for peptide identification using the respective DB1 and DB2 databases for each species. It is

important to note that all theoretical unique tryptic peptides present in DB2 are also present in DB1

(data not show). This means that MSMSpdbb did not lose peptide sequences during its database

construction, and that the differences observed below regarding number of identified peptides is not

due to missing information in DB1. The complete results folders from each MaxQuant search

including protein and peptide lists with relevant identification parameters are provided (see Data

availability section).

In all datasets, when comparing the results from DB1 and DB2 searches, the number of

peptides identified was very similar in both searches (Figure 4). For example, the Mtb dataset

identified 32,986 unique peptides in both searches, while 515 peptides were identified only in the

DB1 search and 1,116 peptides only in the DB2 search result (Figure 4A). When all peptides are

considered, 95.28% of the peptides were identified in both searches. For *S. aureus,* DB1 and DB2

searches were in agreement for 92% of the identified peptides in all searches combined. We observed

that the majority of such database exclusive identifications are distributed in the lower range of the

spectra scoring. For all datasets, the median MaxQuant score for peptides identified in only DB1 and

DB2 were in the range of 52 to 75, while the median scores of peptides identified both searches was

from 128-137 (see histograms Figure 4). If a MaxQuant posterior error probability (PEP) score lower

than 0.01 is also considered together with regular MS2 score, the numbers of exclusive peptides drop

by half in DB1 and DB2 for all datasets considered (data not show).

Multiple TSS polymorphisms for the same protein were also observed even for the same

strains. Figure S3 shows the position of three peptides; all predicted as possible N-terminal peptides

of the protein lipase lipV. MIIDLHVQR (Score 93.4, PEP 0.0019, Figure S3B) represents the most

5' prediction; LTIHGVTEHGR (Score 85.9, PEP 0.0005, Figure S3C) starts at position 19 of

reference protein and HGVTEHGR (Score 100, PEP 0.0077, Figure S3D) starts at position 22 of

reference. The longer form is the most abundant in almost all samples, except S1430 where only

LTIHGVTEHGR was identified and S2666 where the N-terminal HGVTEHGR is slightly

overrepresented than MIIDLHVQR. Finally, the DB1 results also included 5 polymorphic peptides

from the artificial entries, which could not be found in the DB2 database. Closer inspection of these

peptides revealed that they all contain missing cleavage sites. For example, the identification of

peptide GEGAAVVVIKEGSIGGGTVFVYSGR from gene PpsC includes two polymorphic peptides

that were concatenated in DB1, GEGAAVVVIK corresponding to positions 274-283 in the reference

protein, and EGSIGGGTVFVYSGR corresponding to positions 564-578. Clearly, the artificial

entries in this case contain two concatenated polymorphic peptides which are not adjacent in the

reference protein. The fact that we accept miscleavages as a parameter during the search allows a

clearly false-positive identification for artificial entries. The spectra and identification score for this

concatenated peptide is given in Supplementary Figure S7, and as expected, the identified spectra has

poor score and sequence coverage. Supplementary Table 2 lists all five false-positive peptides.

Database size impact in computational performance

As shown before, database size reduction from DB2 to DB1 was approximately 16x to Mtb

and 35x to *S. aureus*. By inspecting MaxQuant log folder we calculated the amount of minutes used

for each step in its proteomics pipeline. For Mtb, the time spent for the whole pipeline was reduced

by half, from 853 minutes for DB2 to 434 minutes to DB1 (Figure 5). Main differences were

observed for steps related to the peptide search, i.e., the 'main search' (5x) and the 'second peptide

search' (4x) steps, and during the creation of results and other final files named 'writing tables'

(3.5x). For *S. aureus* the differences were far more evident, as the complete pipeline took 7,553

minutes for DB2 and 2,147 minutes for DB1. Time reduction in peptide search steps were similar to

Mtb at 4.5x and 4x respectively. But in addition to those, other steps which are related to read and

finish the main and the second search results had improvements of 42 and 19.6 times respectively.

Steps related to assignment and assembly of protein groups had improvements of 42 times, and

'writing tables' had a time improvement of 10.4 times.

Discussion

Database size is a known bottleneck in proteomics, and its implications had been already

discussed in proteogenomics and metaproteomics research (Jagtap et al., 2013;Heyer et al., 2017).

Therefore, controlling database information is of key importance. A manner to achieve this is to

construct customized databases where identical sequences/tryptic peptides from homologue proteins

are not exhaustively present in different entries within the database. We had already applied this for

the characterization of samples with unknown genetic background such as bacterial clinical strains

(de Souza et al., 2011;Tomazella et al., 2012). Such databases allow the validation of coding regions

and confirmation of sequence polymorphisms normally omitted from reference databases. This is a

critical characterization, considering that even genomes with two decades of considerable

investigation still have gene annotation issues (Abascal et al., 2018). It is true even for prokaryotes

(de Souza et al., 2008;de Souza et al., 2009), with their simpler genomic structure and higher coding

density. However, as the amount of genomic information exponentially increases with time, we

wished to further evaluate the impact of such approach with the current amount of available genomic

data.

First, we were curious to investigate how different species with diverse genetic features (such

as the presence of a pangenome) would impact database size and structure. As expected, database

size increase correlated with the pangenome complexity of each species. Surprisingly Mtb and *B.*

pertussis databases size increased at rates higher than expected based on the low complexity of their

core and pangenomic genes. Previous data from Mtb suggested that database size increment was not

heavy, when at the time only five Mtb strains and three strains of *M. bovis* were considered (de Souza

et al., 2011). Our data here however shows that Mtb database size increment was one of the most

prominent, arguably the most relevant if its small pangenome is considered. This suggests that as

additional strains were sequenced, variations in gene annotation performed were more acute then

observed for the other nine species. Something similar could be assumed about *B. pertusis* databases,

which has no pangenome and database increase was higher than three species with characterized

pangenomes. However, *C. trachomatis, L. monocytogenes* and *C. jejuni* have smaller genomes than

compared to *B. pertussis*, all also having higher density of coding regions (Parkhill et al.,

2000;Parkhill et al., 2003;Thomson et al., 2008). More nucleotide regions in the genome marked as

non-coding will offer more opportunity for different strategies to generate conflicting gene

annotation data, which could explain *B. pertussis* database size increase in our analysis. The database

size increase for *Burkholderia pseudomallei* and *Burkholderia mallei* was not taken into

consideration by us on this analysis, because while we decided to merge both species as one based on

genotyping data (Godoy et al., 2003), large scale rearrangements in *B. mallei* (Losada et al., 2010)

might be interfering with our approach.

We then selected two MS datasets from Mtb and from *S. aureus* to identify peptides using a

routine probabilistic-based approach, but now using the complete set of available genomes (194

strains) for *S. aureus*. Overall, DB1 and DB2 performance was very similar, and differences were

negligible and mostly could be ignored to their low scoring nature. A minority of valid identifications

exclusive to DB2 were N-terminal peptides containing miscleavages that were not selected by

MSMSpdbb (i.e., the peptides without miscleavages were shorter than 7 amino acids and not present

in the selected reference protein) and therefore were absent in DB1 due to the parameters used for

DB1 construction. It is worth mentioning that surprisingly, we have identified multiple N-terminal

predictions for the same protein, in some cases observed in the same strain (Supplementary Figure 3).

While normally the identification of a protein N-terminal peptide in proteogenomics is used to

validate and confirm the TSS of the protein, our data suggest that excluding the remaining TSS

choices from the database might be undesirable, considering they might be later identified when

additional strains are analyzed by MS.

The advantage of using a concatenated database is evident when computational performance

is measured. The main steps in Andromeda/MaxQuant pipeline which involve Fasta reading ('main'

and 'second peptide' searches) were similarly improved in both datasets tested. In *S. aureus* dataset,

where DB1 concatenation is larger when compared to DB2 (from approximately 500,000 entries to

15,000 entries), time processing improvements were observed in additional stages of the pipeline.

Particularly steps related to handle of peptide search engine results and assembly of the protein

groups to be reported as final protein identifications. The step which creates the final output files

('Writing tables'), even though do not directly use the Fasta file, was also significantly improved.

This makes sense, as MaxQuant will report all entries from the database that share identical peptides.

Entries from a protein with high sequence identity present in all 194 strains for *S. aureus*, for

example, will have all 194 entries recorded in the output if that protein is identified. For DB1, since

those 194 highly identical sequences are concatenated into a single reference entry, the output

reporting is vastly simplified.

As mass spectrometry evolves and as detection sensitivity and peptide identification coverage

improves, one of the last bottlenecks in metaproteomics research is database design. Building

databases for metaproteomics is often achieved by two approaches: either by collecting metagenomic

or metatranscriptomic data from the sample; or by concatenating protein sequences from a public

repository such as Uniprot (for recent reviews see (Heyer et al., 2017;Starr et al., 2018)). Regarding

the metagenomic approach, even with the advances of next-generation sequencing methods, reads

and contigs assembly in complex samples is still challenging (Heyer et al., 2017). On the other hand,

concatenating protein sequences from multiple organisms from a public repository results in very

large databases, making the analysis time costly and susceptive to high false-positive rates (Tanca et

al., 2013). False-positive issues had been mostly solved by database size restrictions using a multi-

step peptide search or multiple peptide searches using smaller datasets of refined sequences on each

search and further analysis to combine results (Jagtap et al., 2013;Muth et al., 2016;Zhang et al.,

2016;Liao et al., 2018;Muth et al., 2018). While those are successful methods, they are mostly

provided as complete pipelines. We believe that providing solutions solely at Fasta file level offers

more freedom to researchers, as they can use whichever peptide search engines or pipelines they

prefer. We predict that controlling database size such as done by MSMSpdbb without losing peptide

identification coverage and drastically reducing computational processing time will be of key

importance for metaproteomics.

Data availability

Scripts are fully available at https://github.com/karlactm/Proteogenomics. All Mtb mass spectrometry

files, and MaxQuant search parameters and results are available at ProteomeXchange with the

accession number PXD011080. *S. aureus* mass spectrometry files are found in ProteomeXchange as

PXD006483 (Hoegl et al., 2018) and PXD000702 (Depke et al., 2015).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by: grant 23038.004629/2014-19 to SJS and GAS from the Coordenação de

Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal do Ensino Superior; grants 305233/2015-7 to SJS and 406630/2016-0 to

GAS from Conselho Nacional de DesenvolvimentoCientífico e Tecnológico (CNPq); and grants

175141 (HWG) and 183418 (HGW/RW) from the Norwegian Research Council. The manuscript has

been released as a Pre-Print at bioRxiv with doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/378117.

Authors' contribution

KCTM designed the tool and performed bioinformatic analysis; SF and GGT generated Mtb samples

and proteomics data; RW, HGW, SJS and GAS supervised work and data analysis. GAS provided

S.aureus proteomic analysis. KCTM and GAS designed experiments and analysis.

Disclosure declaration

All authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest associated to this research.

References

Abascal, F., Juan, D., Jungreis, I., Martinez, L., Rigau, M., Rodriguez, J.M., Vazquez, J., and Tress, M.L. (2018).
Loose ends: almost one in five human genes still have unresolved coding status. *Nucleic Acids Res*.
Altschul, S.F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E.W., and Lipman, D.J. (1990). Basic local alignment search tool. *J
Mol Biol* 215**,** 403-410.
Baerenfaller, K., Grossmann, J., Grobei, M.A., Hull, R., Hirsch-Hoffmann, M., Yalovsky, S., Zimmermann, P.,
Grossniklaus, U., Gruissem, W., and Baginsky, S. (2008). Genome-scale proteomics reveals
Arabidopsis thaliana gene models and proteome dynamics. *Science* 320**,** 938-941.

Benson, D.A., Cavanaugh, M., Clark, K., Karsch-Mizrachi, I., Lipman, D.J., Ostell, J., and Sayers, E.W. (2013).
GenBank. *Nucleic Acids Res* 41**,** D36-42.
Blakeley, P., Overton, I.M., and Hubbard, S.J. (2012). Addressing statistical biases in nucleotide-derived
protein databases for proteogenomic search strategies. *J Proteome Res* 11**,** 5221-5234.
Bocs, S., Cruveiller, S., Vallenet, D., Nuel, G., and Medigue, C. (2003). AMIGene: Annotation of MIcrobial
Genes. *Nucleic Acids Res* 31**,** 3723-3726.
Castellana, N.E., Payne, S.H., Shen, Z., Stanke, M., Bafna, V., and Briggs, S.P. (2008). Discovery and revision of
Arabidopsis genes by proteogenomics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 105**,** 21034-21038.
Cox, J., Michalski, A., and Mann, M. (2011a). Software lock mass by two-dimensional minimization of peptide
mass errors. *J Am Soc Mass Spectrom* 22**,** 1373-1380.
Cox, J., Neuhauser, N., Michalski, A., Scheltema, R.A., Olsen, J.V., and Mann, M. (2011b). Andromeda: a
peptide search engine integrated into the MaxQuant environment. *J Proteome Res* 10**,** 1794-1805.
Cuklina, J., Hahn, J., Imakaev, M., Omasits, U., Forstner, K.U., Ljubimov, N., Goebel, M., Pessi, G., Fischer,
H.M., Ahrens, C.H., Gelfand, M.S., and Evguenieva-Hackenberg, E. (2016). Genome-wide
transcription start site mapping of Bradyrhizobium japonicum grown free-living or in symbiosis - a
rich resource to identify new transcripts, proteins and to study gene regulation. *BMC Genomics* 17**,**
302.
Davidsen, T., Beck, E., Ganapathy, A., Montgomery, R., Zafar, N., Yang, Q., Madupu, R., Goetz, P., Galinsky, K.,
White, O., and Sutton, G. (2010). The comprehensive microbial resource. *Nucleic Acids Res* 38**,** D340-
345.
De Souza, G.A., Arntzen, M.O., Fortuin, S., Schurch, A.C., Malen, H., Mcevoy, C.R., Van Soolingen, D., Thiede,
B., Warren, R.M., and Wiker, H.G. (2011). Proteogenomic analysis of polymorphisms and gene
annotation divergences in prokaryotes using a clustered mass spectrometry-friendly database. *Mol*
Cell Proteomics 10**,** M110 002527.
De Souza, G.A., Arntzen, M.O., and Wiker, H.G. (2010). MSMSpdbb: providing protein databases of closely
related organisms to improve proteomic characterization of prokaryotic microbes. *Bioinformatics* 26**,**
698-699.
De Souza, G.A., Malen, H., Softeland, T., Saelensminde, G., Prasad, S., Jonassen, I., and Wiker, H.G. (2008).
High accuracy mass spectrometry analysis as a tool to verify and improve gene annotation using
Mycobacterium tuberculosis as an example. *BMC Genomics* 9**,** 316.
De Souza, G.A., Softeland, T., Koehler, C.J., Thiede, B., and Wiker, H.G. (2009). Validating divergent ORF
annotation of the Mycobacterium leprae genome through a full translation data set and peptide
identification by tandem mass spectrometry. *Proteomics* 9**,** 3233-3243.
Depke, M., Michalik, S., Rabe, A., Surmann, K., Brinkmann, L., Jehmlich, N., Bernhardt, J., Hecker, M.,
Wollscheid, B., Sun, Z., Moritz, R.L., Volker, U., and Schmidt, F. (2015). A peptide resource for the
analysis of Staphylococcus aureus in host-pathogen interaction studies. *Proteomics* 15**,** 3648-3661.
Ding, W., Baumdicker, F., and Neher, R.A. (2018). panX: pan-genome analysis and exploration. *Nucleic Acids*
Res 46**,** e5.
Fermin, D., Allen, B.B., Blackwell, T.W., Menon, R., Adamski, M., Xu, Y., Ulintz, P., Omenn, G.S., and States,
D.J. (2006). Novel gene and gene model detection using a whole genome open reading frame
analysis in proteomics. *Genome Biol* 7**,** R35.
Godoy, D., Randle, G., Simpson, A.J., Aanensen, D.M., Pitt, T.L., Kinoshita, R., and Spratt, B.G. (2003).
Multilocus sequence typing and evolutionary relationships among the causative agents of melioidosis
and glanders, Burkholderia pseudomallei and Burkholderia mallei. *J Clin Microbiol* 41**,** 2068-2079.
Heyer, R., Schallert, K., Zoun, R., Becher, B., Saake, G., and Benndorf, D. (2017). Challenges and perspectives
of metaproteomic data analysis. *J Biotechnol* 261**,** 24-36.
Hoegl, A., Nodwell, M.B., Kirsch, V.C., Bach, N.C., Pfanzelt, M., Stahl, M., Schneider, S., and Sieber, S.A.
(2018). Mining the cellular inventory of pyridoxal phosphate-dependent enzymes with functionalized
cofactor mimics. *Nat Chem* 10**,** 1234-1245.

Jagtap, P., Goslinga, J., Kooren, J.A., Mcgowan, T., Wroblewski, M.S., Seymour, S.L., and Griffin, T.J. (2013). A
two-step database search method improves sensitivity in peptide sequence matches for
metaproteomics and proteogenomics studies. *Proteomics* 13, 1352-1357.
Lew, J.M., Kapopoulou, A., Jones, L.M., and Cole, S.T. (2011). TubercuList--10 years after. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)*
91, 1-7.
Liao, B., Ning, Z., Cheng, K., Zhang, X., Li, L., Mayne, J., and Figeys, D. (2018). iMetaLab 1.0: a web platform for
metaproteomics data analysis. *Bioinformatics* 34, 3954-3956.
Losada, L., Ronning, C.M., Deshazer, D., Woods, D., Fedorova, N., Kim, H.S., Shabalina, S.A., Pearson, T.R.,
Brinkac, L., Tan, P., Nandi, T., Crabtree, J., Badger, J., Beckstrom-Sternberg, S., Saqib, M., Schutzer,
S.E., Keim, P., and Nierman, W.C. (2010). Continuing evolution of Burkholderia mallei through
genome reduction and large-scale rearrangements. *Genome Biol Evol* 2, 102-116.
Mcinerney, J.O., Mcnally, A., and O'connell, M.J. (2017). Why prokaryotes have pangenomes. *Nat Microbiol*
2, 17040.
Muth, T., Kohrs, F., Heyer, R., Benndorf, D., Rapp, E., Reichl, U., Martens, L., and Renard, B.Y. (2018). MPA
Portable: A Stand-Alone Software Package for Analyzing Metaproteome Samples on the Go. *Anal*
Chem 90, 685-689.
Muth, T., Renard, B.Y., and Martens, L. (2016). Metaproteomic data analysis at a glance: advances in
computational microbial community proteomics. *Expert Rev Proteomics* 13, 757-769.
Nesvizhskii, A.I. (2010). A survey of computational methods and error rate estimation procedures for peptide
and protein identification in shotgun proteomics. *J Proteomics* 73, 2092-2123.
Nesvizhskii, A.I. (2014). Proteogenomics: concepts, applications and computational strategies. *Nat Methods*
11, 1114-1125.
Nesvizhskii, A.I., and Aebersold, R. (2005). Interpretation of shotgun proteomic data: the protein inference
problem. *Mol Cell Proteomics* 4, 1419-1440.
Neuhauser, N., Nagaraj, N., Mchardy, P., Zanivan, S., Scheltema, R., Cox, J., and Mann, M. (2013). High
performance computational analysis of large-scale proteome data sets to assess incremental
contribution to coverage of the human genome. *J Proteome Res* 12, 2858-2868.
Olsen, J.V., De Godoy, L.M., Li, G., Macek, B., Mortensen, P., Pesch, R., Makarov, A., Lange, O., Horning, S.,
and Mann, M. (2005). Parts per million mass accuracy on an Orbitrap mass spectrometer via lock
mass injection into a C-trap. *Mol Cell Proteomics* 4, 2010-2021.
Omasits, U., Varadarajan, A.R., Schmid, M., Goetze, S., Melidis, D., Bourqui, M., Nikolayeva, O., Quebatte, M.,
Patrignani, A., Dehio, C., Frey, J.E., Robinson, M.D., Wollscheid, B., and Ahrens, C.H. (2017). An
integrative strategy to identify the entire protein coding potential of prokaryotic genomes by
proteogenomics. *Genome Res* 27, 2083-2095.
Overbeek, R., Fonstein, M., D'souza, M., Pusch, G.D., and Maltsev, N. (1999). The use of gene clusters to infer
functional coupling. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 96, 2896-2901.
Parkhill, J., Sebaihia, M., Preston, A., Murphy, L.D., Thomson, N., Harris, D.E., Holden, M.T., Churcher, C.M.,
Bentley, S.D., Mungall, K.L., Cerdeno-Tarraga, A.M., Temple, L., James, K., Harris, B., Quail, M.A.,
Achtman, M., Atkin, R., Baker, S., Basham, D., Bason, N., Cherevach, I., Chillingworth, T., Collins, M.,
Cronin, A., Davis, P., Doggett, J., Feltwell, T., Goble, A., Hamlin, N., Hauser, H., Holroyd, S., Jagels, K.,
Leather, S., Moule, S., Norberczak, H., O'neil, S., Ormond, D., Price, C., Rabbinowitsch, E., Rutter, S.,
Sanders, M., Saunders, D., Seeger, K., Sharp, S., Simmonds, M., Skelton, J., Squares, R., Squares, S.,
Stevens, K., Unwin, L., Whitehead, S., Barrell, B.G., and Maskell, D.J. (2003). Comparative analysis of
the genome sequences of Bordetella pertussis, Bordetella parapertussis and Bordetella
bronchiseptica. *Nat Genet* 35, 32-40.
Parkhill, J., Wren, B.W., Mungall, K., Ketley, J.M., Churcher, C., Basham, D., Chillingworth, T., Davies, R.M.,
Feltwell, T., Holroyd, S., Jagels, K., Karlyshev, A.V., Moule, S., Pallen, M.J., Penn, C.W., Quail, M.A.,
Rajandream, M.A., Rutherford, K.M., Van Vliet, A.H., Whitehead, S., and Barrell, B.G. (2000). The
genome sequence of the food-borne pathogen Campylobacter jejuni reveals hypervariable
sequences. *Nature* 403, 665-668.

Rappsilber, J., Ishihama, Y., and Mann, M. (2003). Stop and go extraction tips for matrix-assisted laser
desorption/ionization, nanoelectrospray, and LC/MS sample pretreatment in proteomics. *Anal Chem*
75**,** 663-670.
Rasko, D.A., Rosovitz, M.J., Myers, G.S., Mongodin, E.F., Fricke, W.F., Gajer, P., Crabtree, J., Sebaihia, M.,
Thomson, N.R., Chaudhuri, R., Henderson, I.R., Sperandio, V., and Ravel, J. (2008). The pangenome
structure of Escherichia coli: comparative genomic analysis of E. coli commensal and pathogenic
isolates. *J Bacteriol* 190**,** 6881-6893.
Renuse, S., Chaerkady, R., and Pandey, A. (2011). Proteogenomics. *Proteomics* 11**,** 620-630.
Ruggles, K.V., Krug, K., Wang, X., Clauser, K.R., Wang, J., Payne, S.H., Fenyo, D., Zhang, B., and Mani, D.R.
(2017). Methods, Tools and Current Perspectives in Proteogenomics. *Mol Cell Proteomics* 16**,** 959-
981.
Schandorff, S., Olsen, J.V., Bunkenborg, J., Blagoev, B., Zhang, Y., Andersen, J.S., and Mann, M. (2007). A mass
spectrometry-friendly database for cSNP identification. *Nat Methods* 4**,** 465-466.
Song, H., Hwang, J., Yi, H., Ulrich, R.L., Yu, Y., Nierman, W.C., and Kim, H.S. (2010). The early stage of bacterial
genome-reductive evolution in the host. *PLoS Pathog* 6**,** e1000922.
Starr, A.E., Deeke, S.A., Li, L., Zhang, X., Daoud, R., Ryan, J., Ning, Z., Cheng, K., Nguyen, L.V.H., Abou-Samra,
E., Lavallee-Adam, M., and Figeys, D. (2018). Proteomic and Metaproteomic Approaches to
Understand Host-Microbe Interactions. *Anal Chem* 90**,** 86-109.
Tanca, A., Palomba, A., Deligios, M., Cubeddu, T., Fraumene, C., Biosa, G., Pagnozzi, D., Addis, M.F., and
Uzzau, S. (2013). Evaluating the impact of different sequence databases on metaproteome analysis:
insights from a lab-assembled microbial mixture. *PLoS One* 8**,** e82981.
Thomson, N.R., Holden, M.T., Carder, C., Lennard, N., Lockey, S.J., Marsh, P., Skipp, P., O'connor, C.D.,
Goodhead, I., Norbertzcak, H., Harris, B., Ormond, D., Rance, R., Quail, M.A., Parkhill, J., Stephens,
R.S., and Clarke, I.N. (2008). Chlamydia trachomatis: genome sequence analysis of lymphogranuloma
venereum isolates. *Genome Res* 18**,** 161-171.
Tomazella, G.G., Risberg, K., Mylvaganam, H., Lindemann, P.C., Thiede, B., De Souza, G.A., and Wiker, H.G.
(2012). Proteomic analysis of a multi-resistant clinical Escherichia coli isolate of unknown genomic
background. *J Proteomics* 75**,** 1830-1837.
Vallenet, D., Belda, E., Calteau, A., Cruveiller, S., Engelen, S., Lajus, A., Le Fevre, F., Longin, C., Mornico, D.,
Roche, D., Rouy, Z., Salvignol, G., Scarpelli, C., Thil Smith, A.A., Weiman, M., and Medigue, C. (2013).
MicroScope--an integrated microbial resource for the curation and comparative analysis of genomic
and metabolic data. *Nucleic Acids Res* 41**,** D636-647.
Zhang, X., Ning, Z., Mayne, J., Moore, J.I., Li, J., Butcher, J., Deeke, S.A., Chen, R., Chiang, C.K., Wen, M., Mack,
D., Stintzi, A., and Figeys, D. (2016). MetaPro-IQ: a universal metaproteomic approach to studying
human and mouse gut microbiota. *Microbiome* 4**,** 31.

660 **Tables**

661 **Table I -** Database size increase and pangenome size in ten selected species

	1 strain	Final DB Ref	gain per strain	DB increase	pangenome?	Pangenome size (%/100)*
E. coli	4893	22525	271	4.60	Y	0.92
B. pseudomallei/mallei	5917	20876	230	3.53	Y	0.71**
A. baumanii	3746	12536	135	3.35	Y	0.83
M. tuberculosis	4056	11490	114	2.83	Y	0.21
P. aeruginosa	6092	15814	150	2.60	Y	0.79
S. aureus	2697	6735	62	2.50	Y	0.66
B. pertussis	3619	8902	81	2.46	N	0
C. jejuni	1644	3934	35	2.39	Y	0.6
L. monocytogenes	2913	6511	55	2.24	Y	0.58
C. trachomatis	910	1255	5	1.38	Y	0.19
* As described in panX database (Ding et al, 2018).						
** Pangenome size for *B. pseudomallei*						

Figure Legends

Figure 1 – **Building concatenated databases from related strains.** (A) For a given set of fasta
files, a Query file is selected and BLASTP is performed against the remaining files. A bidirectional
approach is performed. (B) Uniquely annotated entries in the Query are defined and moved to the
final fasta database (D), while entries where homologues were found in the subject files are indexed
for further processing. (C) For each homologue group, a reference sequence is chosen, and
polymorphic peptides are added into a customized entry ("Artificial Seq"), both being copied into the
final database. (E) The Query file is removed from the dataset, the remaining subject files will have
entries removed (proteins which were already defined as a homologue of a Query protein), and a new
fasta file is selected as Query for a new BLASTP round. Such rounds will be performed until all files
are analyzed.

Figure 2 – Typical homologue comparison. For protein Rv0104, in this case selected as reference,
three SAPs were identified across all Mtb strains, in addition to two TSS choices, two premature stop
codons, and a complete amino acid sequence change (region in yellow) most probably from an indel.

Figure 3 – Number of entries per database after redundancy removal. The graph shows data
when only considering reference and uniquely annotated sequences in all strains, i.e., customized
entries containing polymorphic peptides where not counted. Values in x axis show the number of
strains used for database creation. All values plotted in the graph are given in Supplementary Table 1.

Figure 4 – DB1 vs. DB2 peptide identification performance. All unique tryptic peptides identified
in DB1 and DB2 in the Mtb (A) and *S. aureus* (B) datasets are compared. Venn diagrams show that
majority of tryptic peptides were identified in both searches. Peptide scores of each group were
plotted in a histogram, and a median was calculated. Median of the score distribution for peptides

exclusive to DB1 or DB2 ranged from 51.03 to 75.67, while median scores of peptides identified on
both searches were 138.28 for Mtb and 128.88 for *S. aureus*.
691

Figure 5 – DB1 vs DB2 computational demand. Processing times for Mtb (A) and *S. aureus* (B)
datasets. The bar is divided into MaxQuant stage number, as described in (Neuhauser et al., 2013)
(value at bottom) and time in minutes is at the top of the bar. For Mtb, analysis was hasten mainly at
stage 12 (Main search), 22 (Second peptide search) and 40 (Writing tables); in addition to those, for
S. aureus improvements were also observed for post-search steps 13-21 and 23-29, and step 30
("Protein groups assembly").
698

699 **Figure S1 – Total number of entries per MSMSpdbbdatabase**. Values in x axis show the number
700 of strains used for database creation. All values plotted in the graph are given in Supplementary
701 Table 1.
702

703 **Figure S2 – Number of tryptic peptides per MSMSpdbbdatabase**. In (A) only fully tryptic
704 peptides are considered, while in (B) peptides with up to two miscleavages are also counted, a
705 standard search parameter choice in proteomics. Values in x axis show the number of strains used in
706 the database. All values plotted in the graph are given in Supplementary Table 1.
707

Figure S3 - Multiple TSS identified in protein lipV. (A) Three possible TSS choices were
identified in clinical Mtb strains. The most upstream prediction (MIIDLHNQR) is the most abundant
variant observed in all strains, except strain S1430 which has only the variant with TSS at position 19
(ITIHGVTEHGR) of the reference sequence, and strain S2666 which TSS at position 22
(HGVTEHGR) is predominant. Two possible TSS choice variants were also observed at high levels
for strain S1593. (B-D) MS2 spectra for all three peptides mentioned above.
714

715 **Figure S4 – False-positive identification in DB1.** MS2spectrum of identified peptide
716 GEGAAVVVIKEGSIGGGTVFVYSGR, a concatenated sequence of peptide GEGAAVVVIK (pos
717 274-283 on PpsC protein) and peptide EGSIGGGTVFVYSGR (pos 564-578 on same protein). Note
718 the low scoring of the peptide identification. All five false-positives identified due to concatenation
719 of non-neighboring peptides are given in Supplementary Table 2.