Correcting for sparsity and non-independence in glycomic data through a systems biology framework

Bokan Bao[1,2,3,+], Benjamin P. Kellman[1,2,3,+], Austin W.T. Chiang[1,2], Austin K. York[1,2], Mahmoud A. Mohammad[4], Morey W. Haymond[4], Lars Bode[1], Nathan E. Lewis[1,2,5,*]

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

[2] The Novo Nordisk Foundation Center for Biosustainability at the 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] Department of Pediatrics, Children's Nutrition Research Center, US Department of Agriculture/Agricultural Research Service, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas 77030, USA

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

[+] These authors contributed equally to this work

[*] Corresponding author:

Name: Nathan E. Lewis

Address: 9500 Gilman Drive MC 0760, La Jolla, CA 92093

E-mail: nlewisres@ucsd.edu

Short running title: Comparative glycoprofile analysis with glycan substructures

Abstract

Glycans are fundamental cellular building blocks, involved in many organismal functions.

Advances in glycomics are elucidating the roles of glycans, but it remains challenging to

properly analyze large glycomics datasets, since the data are sparse (each sample often has only a

few measured glycans) and detected glycans are non-independent (sharing many intermediate

biosynthetic steps). We address these challenges with GlyCompare, a glycomic data analysis

approach that leverages shared biosynthetic pathway intermediates to correct for sparsity and

non-independence in glycomics. Specifically, quantities of measured glycans are propagated to

intermediate glycan substructures, which enables direct comparison of different glycoprofiles

and increases statistical power. Using GlyCompare, we studied diverse N-glycan profiles from

glycoengineered erythropoietin. We obtained biologically meaningful clustering of mutant cell

glycoprofiles and identified knockout-specific effects of fucosyltransferase mutants on tetra-

antennary structures. We further analyzed human milk oligosaccharide profiles and identified

novel impacts that the mother's secretor-status on fucosylation and sialylation. Our substructure-

oriented approach will enable researchers to take full advantage of the growing power and size of

glycomics data.

Introduction

Introduction

Glycosylation is a highly abundant and complex post-translational modification, decorating

between one-fifth and one-half of eukaryotic proteins[1,2]. These diverse carbohydrates account for

12-25% of dry cell mass and have important functional and pathological roles[3,4]. Despite their

importance, glycans have complex structures that are difficult to study. The complex structures

of glycans arise from a non-template driven synthesis through a biosynthetic network involving

dozens of enzymes. A simple change of a single intermediate glycan or glycosyltransferase will

have cascading impacts on the final glycans obtained[5,6]. Unfortunately, current data analysis

approaches for glycoprofiling and glycomic data lack the necessary systems perspective to easily

decode the interdependency of glycans. It is important to understand the network behind the

glycoprofiles so that we can better understand the behavior of the process.

New tools aiding in the acquisition and aggregation of glycoprofiles are emerging, making

large-scale comparisons of glycoprofiles possible. Advances in mass spectrometry now enable

the rapid generation of many glycoprofiles with detailed glycan composition[7–10], exposing the

complex and heterogeneous glycosylation patterns on lipids and proteins[11,12]. Large glycoprofile

datasets and supporting databases are also emerging, including GlyTouCan[13], UnicarbDB[14],

GlyGen and UniCarbKB[15].

These new technologies and databases provide opportunities to examine global trends in

glycan function and their association with disease. However, the rapid and accurate comparison

of glycoprofiles can be challenging with the size, sparsity and heterogeneity of such datasets.

Indeed, in any one glycoprofile, only a few glycans may be detected among the thousands of

possible glycans[16]. Thus, if there is a major perturbation to glycosylation in a dataset, few

glycans, if any, may overlap between samples. However, these non-overlapping glycans may

only differ in their synthesis by as few as one enzymatic step. Thus, it can be difficult to know

which glycans to compare. Furthermore, since glycans often share substantial portions of their

biosynthetic pathways with each other, statistical methods that assume independence (e.g., t-

tests, ANOVA, etc) are inappropriate for glycomics. Here we address these challenges by

proposing glycan substructures, or intermediates, as the appropriate functional units for

meaningful glycoprofile comparisons, since each substructure can capture one step in the

complex process of glycan synthesis. Thus, using substructures for comparison, we account for

the shared dependencies across glycans.

Previous work has investigated the similarity across glycans using glycan motifs, such as,

glycan fingerprinting to describe glycan diversity in databases[17], align glycan structures[18],

identify glycan epitopes in glycoprofiles[19], deconvolve LC-MS data to clarify glycan

abundance[20], or compare glycans in glycoprofiles leveraging simple structures[21]. These tools use

information on glycan composition or epitopes; however, further accounting for shared

biosynthetic steps across glycans could provide complete biosynthetic context to all glycan

epitopes. That context includes connecting all glycans to the enzymes involved in their synthesis,

the order of the enzyme reactions, and information on competition for glycan substrates. Thus, a

generalized substructure approach could facilitate the study of large numbers of glycoprofiles by

connecting them to the shared mechanisms involved in making each glycan.

Here we present GlyCompare, a method enabling the rapid and scalable analysis and

comparison of any number of glycoprofiles, while accounting for the biosynthetic similarities of

each glycan. This approach addresses current challenges in sparsity and hidden interdependence

across glycomic samples, and will facilitate the discovery of mechanisms underlying the changes

among glycoprofiles. We demonstrate the functionality and performance of this approach with

both protein-conjugated and unconjugated glycomic analysis, using recombinant erythropoietin

(EPO) N-glycosylation and human milk oligosaccharides (HMOs). Specifically, we analyzed

sixteen MALDI-TOF glycoprofiles of EPO, where each EPO glycoprofile was produced in a

different glycoengineered CHO cell line[9,11]. We also analyzed forty-eight HPLC glycoprofiles of

HMO from six mothers[22]. By analyzing these glycoprofiles with GlyCompare, we quantify the

abundance of important substructures, cluster the glycoprofiles of mutant cell lines, connect

genotypes to unexpected changes in glycoprofiles, and associate a phenotype of interest with

substructure abundance and flux. We further demonstrate that such analyses gain statistical

power since GlyCompare elucidates and uses shared intermediates. The analysis of the EPO and

HMO datasets demonstrate that our novel framework presents a convenient and automated

approach to elucidate novel insights into complex patterns in glycobiology.

Results

Glycomic data may fail to recover biologically meaningful clusters

Due to the sparsity and non-independence of glycoprofile, clustering and comparing different

glycoprofiles can be challenging[23]. We tested this by clustering glycoprofiles from a panel of

different Erythropoietin (EPO) glycoforms, each produced in different glycoengineered CHO

cell lines. In the clustering, many neighboring samples were not coming from the most

genetically similar mutants, and thus did not recapitulate the severity of glycosylation disruption

(**Fig. 1a and Supplementary Fig. 1**). These challenges prompted us to develop GlyCompare, a

substructure-based approach to glycan analysis. Using GlyCompare, we decomposed the

glycoprofiles of glycoengineered EPO into glyco-motif abundance profiles and easily recovered

the expected severity of glycoengineered effects (**Fig. 1b**). The glyco-motif abundances mitigate

major statistical challenges of working with glycoprofiles. In the next section, we describe how

we decompose glycoprofiles into glyco-motif abundance profiles.

GlyCompare decomposes glycoprofiles to facilitate glycoprofile comparison

Glycoprofiles can be decomposed into abundances of glycan intermediate substructures. The

resulting substructure profile has richer information than whole glycan profiles and enables more

precise comparison across conditions. Since glycan biosynthesis involves long, redundant

pathways, the pathways can be collapsed to obtain a subset of substructures while preserving the

information of all glycans in the dataset. We call this minimal set of substructures "glyco-

motifs." The GlyCompare workflow consists of several steps wherein glycoprofiles are

annotated and decomposed, glyco-motifs are prioritized, and each glyco-motif is quantified for

subsequent comparisons. The specific workflow is described as follows.

First, to characterize each glycoprofile with substructures, all substructures in the

glycoprofiles are identified and occurrence per glycan is quantified (**Fig. 1c-d**). Thus, a complete

set of glycan substructures is obtained for all glycans in all glycoprofiles being analyzed. For

each glycoprofile, the abundance of each substructure is calculated by summing the abundance

of all glycans containing the substructure. This results in a substructure profile, which stores

abundances for all glycan substructures (**Fig. 1e**) in given glycoprofile. The summation over

similar structures asserts that similar structures follow the same synthetic paths, which is

appropriate for glycosylation wherein synthesis is hierarchical and acyclic (**Supplementary Fig.**

2,3). Therefore, a substructure abundance is not simply a sum over similar structures, it is a

meaningful sum over biosynthetic pathways.

Second, to identify the most informative substructures (i.e., glyco-motifs), substructures are

prioritized using the substructure network. The substructure network is built by connecting all

substructures with biosynthetic steps (**Fig. 1f**). Starting from the monosaccharides, each level of

the network represents another biosynthetic step, with one more monosaccharide than the

previous level. The edges in the network represent enzymatic additions of each monosaccharide.

These edges are weighted by the correlation between the abundances of the substrate and product

substructures across all samples. Redundant substructures can be easily identified since their

parent-child substructure abundances will be perfectly correlated. Substructure network

reduction proceeds by collapsing links with a perfect correlation between substrate and product

substructures, and only retaining the product substructure (see methods section for further

details). We demonstrate this network reduction in **Fig. 1f**. We identify redundant substructures

when the abundance of parent substructures and descendant substructure are perfectly correlated

across all glycoprofiles (connected with solid arrow). We remove the parent substructure

(substrate) while keeping the child substructure (product). The remaining substructures are

termed glyco-motifs; they completely describe the variance at the substructure level. The

abundances of all glyco-motifs are then represented as a glyco-motif profile, the minimal subset

of meaningful substructure abundances represent glycoprofiles (**Fig. 1f**).

For larger datasets, summarizing the glyco-motifs becomes necessary. Glyco-motif vectors,

like glycoprofiles, can be clustered (**Fig. 1g and Supplementary Fig. 4**). We defined a

representative substructure as the common structure in a glyco-motif cluster (**Fig. 1h**). The

representative substructure describes the glycan features that vary the most across samples. To

extract the common structural features in each cluster, we calculated the average weight of each

monosaccharide. Monosaccharides with a weight larger than 51% are preserved, which

illustrates the predominant structure in the cluster. This allows one to quickly evaluate the

distinguishing glycan features that vary across samples in any given dataset.

The workflow we described here successfully connects all glycoprofiles in a data set through

their shared intermediate substructures, thus allowing robust analysis of the differences across

glycomics samples and the evaluation of the associated genetic bases.

GlyCompare accurately clusters glycoengineered EPO samples

The poor clustering of the engineered EPO glycosylation data[9] included clustering of

glycoprofiles with low phenotypic similarity (**Fig. 1a and Supplementary Fig. 1,5**). This

inconsistency and poor clustering stems from the inherent sparseness of glycoprofiles, i.e., each

glycoprofile only has a few glycans. Thus, the matrix of all samples is very sparse, unfit for

standard clustering approaches and hard to interpret. Particularly problematic is that pairs of

glycans differing in a single monosaccharide are treated as two completely different glycans

under standard clustering approaches. Thus, we found that clustering is affected more by the

presence or absence of a glycan, rather than structural similarity.

GlyCompare addresses these problems by elucidating hidden similarities between glycans

after decomposing glycoprofiles to their composite substructures. The 52 glycans were

decomposed into their constituent glycan substructures, resulting in a substructure vector with

613 glycan substructures and a further simplified 120 glyco-motif vector (**Supplementary Fig.**

6). The glyco-motif clustering clearly distinguished the samples based on the structural patterns

and separated profiles into groups more consistently associated with the extent of changes in the

profile than the raw glycan-based clusters (**Fig. 1b and Supplementary Fig. 5**).

The sixteen glycoprofiles clustered into three groups with a few severely modified outliers

(**Fig. 1b**), and the 120 glyco-motifs clustered into twenty-four groups, each summarized by

representative substructures Rep1 - Rep24 (**Fig. 2a and Supplementary Fig. 4**). The clusters of

glycoprofiles are consistent with the genetic similarities among the host cells. Specifically, the

major substructure patterns cluster individual samples into four categories: 'wild-type (WT)-

like', 'mild', 'medium' and 'severe'. The WT-like category contains one group, WT and

B4galt1/2/3/4/ knockouts, which contains most of the substructures seen in WT cells. The mild

group includes the Mgat4b/4a, Mgat4b, and Mgat5 knockouts, where each lose the tetra-

antennary structure, and an St3gal4/6 knockout, which loses the terminal sialylation. The

medium category is a group that contains knockouts of St3gal4/6 and Mgat4a/4b/5, knockouts of

Mgat4a/4b/5 and B3gnt2, knockouts of Mgat4a/4a/5 with a knock-in of human ST6GAL1, and

knockouts of Mgat4a/4b/5 and St3gal4/6. The medium disruption category lost the tri-antennary

structure. The 'severe' category includes three individual glycoprofiles with knockouts for Fut8,

Mgat2, and Mgat1, each of which generate many glycans not detected in the WT-like, mild or

medium categories. While some glyco-motif clusters can be seen in the glycoprofile clusters,

there are important differences, and the glyco-motif clusters provide more information and

improved cluster stability (**Supplementary Fig. 4,7**). These results demonstrate the performance

improvement of glyco-motif abundance over glycan abundance in assessing the structural

similarity between different glycoprofiles.

GlyCompare summarizes structural changes across glycoprofiles

GlyCompare helps to more robustly group samples by accounting for the biosynthetic and

structural similarities of glycans. Further analysis of the representative structures provides

detailed insights into which structural features vary the most across samples. To accomplish this,

we rescaled the representative structure abundances and identified significant changes in

representative substructure abundances between mutant cells and WT (**Fig. 2a,b**). This highlights

the specific structural features of glycans that are impacted when glycoengineering recombinant

EPO.

As expected, in the Mgat1 knockout glycoprofile, only high mannose N-glycans are seen.

Also, in the Mgat2 knockout, the glycan substructure of bi-antennary on one mannose linkage

significantly increases, and the unique structure of bi-antennary LacNac elongated in the N-

glycans emerges in the St3gal4/6 and Mgat4a/4b/5 knockouts. Along with expected changes in

α-1,6 fucosylation in the Fut8 knockout glycoprofile, we also observed an increase in the tetra-

antennary poly-LacNac elongated N-glycan without fucose, which has not been previously

reported (One-sided one-sample wilcoxon test, Rep19: $p=2.7 \times 10^{-4}$, Rep21: $p=2.0 \times 10^{-4}$)

(**Fig. 2c**). In the St3gal4/6 knockout (**Fig. 2c**), we observed the relative abundance of structures

with sialylation significantly decreased, while the tetra-antennary and triantennary poly-LacNAc

elongated N-glycan substructure without sialylation significantly increased (Rep13: p=

1.3×10^{-3}, Rep20: $p=2.3 \times 10^{-4}$). Finally, the Mgat4b, Mgat4a/4b and Mgat5 knockouts (**Fig.**

2d) lose all core tetra-antennary substructures (Rep16: unscaled abundance=0). While

triantennary substructures with GlcNac elongation increased significantly for Mgat4b (Rep13:

$p=2.6 \times 10^{-3}$, Rep14: $p=2.5 \times 10^{-4}$), the poly-LacNac elongation structure disappeared.

Interestingly, while both the Mgat4b and Mgat5 knockouts do not have the tri-antennary poly-

LacNac elongated N-glycan, the Mgat4a/4b mutant keeps a highly abundant poly-LacNac branch

(Rep15: $p= 2.4 \times 10^{-4}$). Thus, through the use of GlyCompare, we identified the specific glycan

features that are impacted not only in individual glycoengineered cell lines, but also features

shared by groups of related cell lines.

GlyCompare reveals phenotype-associated substructures and trends invisible at the whole

glycan level

Many secreted and measured glycans are also precursors, or substructures, of larger glycans (**Fig.**

3a). Thus, the secreted and observed abundance of one glycan may not equal to the total amount

synthesized. GlyCompare can quantify the total abundance of a glycan by combining the glycan

abundance with the abundance of its products. To demonstrate this capability of GlyCompare,

we analyzed HMO abundance, and examined the impact of secretor status and days postpartum

on HMO abundance. We obtained forty-seven HMO glycoprofiles from 6 mothers (1, 2, 3, 4, 7,

14, 28 and 42 days postpartum (DPP)), 4 "secretor" mothers with functioning FUT2 (α-1,2

fucosyltransferase), and 2 "non-secretor" mothers with non-functional FUT2. With GlyCompare

addressing the non-independence of HMOs, we could use powerful statistical methods to study

trends in HMO synthesis. Specifically, we used regression models predicting secretor status and

DPP from substructure abundance.

We first checked both the glycan-level and substructure-level clustering of the glycoprofile.

Samples with same secretor status and days postpartum (DPP) were successfully grouped

(**Supplementary Fig. 8**). Further examination of the glyco-motif abundance (i.e., the total

amount of substructure synthesized) revealed phenotype-related trends invisible at the level of

the whole glycan profile. For example, the LSTb substructure (X62) increased in secretor

mothers (Wald $p = 2 \times 10^{-16}$) and decreased in non-secretor mothers over time (Wald $p <$

2×10^{-16}; **Fig. 3b**). Yet, the same trend was weak or inconsistent for all glycans containing the

X62 substructure: LSTb, DSLNT and DSLNH (**Fig. 3b-e**). LSTb weakly shows a similar trend

to X62. LSTb decreases over time in non-secretors (Wald p $= 6.53 \times 10^{-4}$) but the time-

dependent increase in secretors is barely significant (Wald p = 0.046) and the effect size is small

(marginal R^2 = 0.088). Unlike X62, DSLNT shows no significant increase over time (Coef=-

0.39, Wald p = 0.17) in secretor mothers. Finally, unlike the decrease over time seen in non-

secretors in X62, DSLNH shows a significant increase over time in non-secretors (Wald p =

2.91×10^{-8}). The secretor-specific trends in total LSTb are only clearly visible by examining the

X62 substructure abundance (**Fig. 3c**). Thus, while secretor status is expected to impact HMO

fucosylation, GlyCompare reveals associations with non-fucosylated substructures. Viewing

substructure abundance as total substructure synthesized provides a new fundamental measure to

the study of glycoprofiles, it also creates an opportunity to explore trends in synthesis.

GlyCompare identifies flux in HMO biosynthesis

We next applied GlyCompare to explore changes in HMO synthesis over time. For this, we

estimate the flux for each biosynthetic reaction by quantifying the abundance ratio of products

and substrates from parent-child pairs of glycan substructures. Thus, we could study changes in

HMO synthesis through the systematic estimation of reaction flux across various conditions.

We found several reactions strongly associated with secretor status. As expected, the estimated

reaction flux from the LNT substructure (X40) to the LNFPI substructure (X65), was strongly

associated with secretor status (Wilcox p $=1.3 \times 10^{-12}$). In secretors, 36.2% (s.d. 12.7%) of X40

was converted to X65, compared to non-secretors, wherein only 5% (s.d. 1.3%) of X40 was

converted.

Although secretor status is defined by the fucosyltransferase-2 genotype, not all secretor-

associated reactions were fucosylation reactions. We further explored the secretor-X62

association using the product-substrate ratio to estimate flux. Specifically, we examined the

upstream reaction (**Fig. 3f**) of LNT (X40) to LSTb (X62) and the downstream reaction (**Fig. 3g**)

of LSTb (X62) to DSLNT (X106). We measured the upstream reaction of LNT converting to

LSTb, using the X62/X40 ratio over time, however, no significant change was observed with

respect to secretor status (Wald p=0.55). In the conversion of LSTb to DSLNT, we found a

secretor-specific reaction increase in flux. Specifically, the X106/X62 ratio was significantly

higher (Wald p=0.018) in secretor mothers (**Fig. 4g; Supplementary Table 3c**) In the average

non-secretor mother, 52.3% (s.d. 15.1%) of LSTb is converted to DSLNT. Meanwhile in

secretors, the average conversion rate is 81.8% (s.d. 7.2%). The LSTb to DSLNT conversion rate

appears higher in secretors while conversion from the LSTb precursor, LNT, appears unchanged;

any changes in sialylation is intriguing, considering secretor status is associated with genetic

variation of a fucosyltransferase. Examining the product-substrate ratio has revealed a

phenotype-specific reaction propensity thus providing insight to the condition-specific synthesis.

GlyCompare increases statistical power of glycomics data

GlyCompare successfully provides new insights by accounting for shared biosynthetic routes of

measured oligosaccharides. Since it includes information on the similarities between different

glycans, we wondered how our approach impacts statistical power in glycan analysis. Thus, to

quantify the benefit of glyco-motif analysis, we constructed a large number of regression models

associating either glyco-motif abundance or glycan abundance, with a DPP and secretor status

(see **Methods**). We found that regressions trained with glyco-motif abundance are more robust

than those trained on whole glycan HMO abundance, as indicated by the increased coefficient

magnitude (Wilcoxon p = 0.0047, **Fig. 4a**), and decreased standard error (Wilcoxon p = 0.033,

Fig. 4b). An increase in the stability of a statistic can result in an increased effect size. Consistent

with the increased coefficient magnitude and decreased standard error, the effect size also

increased, as measured by the marginal R^2 (mR^2) of glyco-motif-trained regressions (Wilcoxon

p=0.04, **Fig. 4c**). These effects were confirmed with a bootstrapping t-test; bootstrapping p-

values were less than or equal to Wilcoxon p-values within 0.001. Increases in statistic

magnitude, statistic stability, and effect size are all expected to increase the power of an analysis.

Using the median, 1st quartile, and 3rd quartile of observed mR^2, we estimated the expected

power of glyco-motif-trained and glycan-trained regressions at various sample sizes. The

expected power of a glyco-motif-trained regression reaches 0.8 at 36 samples and 0.9 with 57

samples while a glycan-trained regression requires more than double the sample size to reach a

comparable power (**Fig. 4d**). Thus, using GlyCompare for glyco-motif-level analysis can

substantially increase the robustness and statistical power in glycomics data analysis since it

allows for the comparison of different glycans who share biosynthetic steps.

Discussion

Glycosylation has generally been studied from the whole-glycan perspective using mass

spectrometry and other analytical methods. From this perspective, two glycans that differ by only

one monosaccharide are distinct and are not directly comparable. Thus, the comparative study of

glycoprofiles has been limited to changes between glycans shared by multiple glycoprofiles or

small manually curated glycan substructures[17]. GlyCompare sheds light on the hidden

biosynthetic interdependencies between glycans by integrating the biosynthetic pathways into the

comparison. Glycoprofiles are converted to glyco-motif profiles, wherein each substructure

abundance represents the cumulative abundance of all glycans containing that substructure. This

enumeration and quantification of substructures can be easily scaled up to include many

glycoprofiles in large datasets. Additionally, since no prior information is required beyond

glycan identities and quantities, the method can even facilitate analysis of glycans with limited

characterization. Thus, it brings several advantages and new perspectives to enable the

systematic study of glycomics data.

First, the GlyCompare platform computes a glyco-motif profile (i.e., the abundances of the

minimal set of glycan substructures) that maintains the information of the original glycoprofiles,

while exposing the shared intermediates of measured glycans. These sample-specific glyco-motif

profiles more accurately quantify similarities across glycoprofiles. This is made possible since

glycans that share substructures also share many biosynthetic steps. If the glycan biosynthetic

network is perturbed, all glycans synthesized will be impacted and the nearest substructures will

directly highlight where the change occurred. For example, in EPO glycoprofiles studied here,

the tetra-antennary structure is depleted in the Mgat4a/4b/5 knockout group and the downstream

sialylated substructure depleted when St3gal4/6 were knocked out. Such structural patterns

emerge in GlyCompare since the tool leverages shared intermediate substructures for clustering,

thus identifying common features in glycans measured across diverse samples.

Second, new trends in glycan biosynthetic flux become visible at the substructure level. For

example, in the HMO data set, multiple HMOs are made through a series of steps from LNT to

DSLNH (**Fig. 4a**). Only when the substructure abundances and product-substrate ratios are

computed are we able to observe the secretor-dependent differences in the abundance of the

LSTb substructure, X62. This is particularly interesting since secretor status is defined by

changes in α-1,2 fucosylation, but we see here additional secretor-dependent changes to

sialylated structures with no fucose. These are the systemic effects invisible without a systems-

level perspective due to the interconnected nature of glycan synthesis; this disparity underlines

the power of this method.

Third, the sparse nature of glycomic datasets and the synthetic connections between glycans

make glycomic data unfit for many common statistical analyses. However, the translation of

glycoprofiles into substructure abundance provides a framework for more statistically powerful

and robust analysis of glycomic datasets. Single sample perturbations, such as the knockouts in

the glycoengineered EPO, can be compared to wild-type; all substructure data can be normalized

and then rigorously distinguished from the control using a one sample Wilcoxon-test.

Furthermore, conditions or phenotypes with many glycoprofiles, such as the secretor status in the

HMO dataset, can be compared using a variety of statistical methods to evaluate the association

between the phenotypes and glycosylation. For example, in HMO data, we revealed that the α-

1,2 fucose substructure is enriched in secretor status, consistent with the previous studies[24–26].

Because the substructure approach includes comparisons of glycans that are not shared across the

different samples, but that share intermediates, GlyCompare decreased sparsity and increased

statistical power. Thus, one can obtain richer glycan comparisons of representative substructures,

total synthesized abundance, and flux.

Finally, in combination with the substructure network, we can systematically study glycan

synthesis. The product-substrate ratio provides an estimation of flux through the glycan

biosynthetic pathways. Using the HMO dataset, we demonstrate the power of this perspective by

showing that more LSTb is converted to DSLNT in the secretor mother. The perspectives made

available through GlyCompare are not limited to Wilcoxon-tests and regression models. Because

the substructure-level perspective minimizes biosynthetic dependency between glycans, glyco-

motif abundances can be used with nearly any statistical model or comparison demanded by a

dataset. We have reduced the sparse and non-independent nature of glycoprofiles, thereby

making countless comparisons and new analyses possible.

Conclusions

In conclusion, GlyCompare provides a novel paradigm for describing complex glycoprofiles,

thus enabling a wide range of analyses and facilitating the acquisition of detailed insights into the

molecular mechanisms controlling all types of glycosylation.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Joshua Klein for providing guidance on using glypy

(https://github.com/mobiusklein/glypy). Thanks to Philip Gordts for insightful comments. This

work was conducted with support from the Novo Nordisk Foundation provided to the Center for

Biosustainability at the Technical University of Denmark (NNF10CC1016517: A.W.T.C.),

NIGMS (R35 GM119850: B.B., B.K.P., N.E.L.) , NICHD (R21 HD080682: L.B.) and USDA

(USDA/ARS 6250-6001; M.W.H). This work is a publication of the U.S. Department of

Agriculture/Agricultural Research Service, Children's Nutrition Research Center, Department of

Pediatrics, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas. The contents of this publication do not

necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, nor does mention

of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement from the U.S.

government.

Author contributions

381 B.B, B.P.K. designed the work. B.B., B.P.K., A.W.T.C., A.K.Y., and N.E.L. performed data

382 analysis. M.A.M., M.W.H., and L.B. provided HMO data. The manuscript was written by B.B.,

383 B.P.K., A.W.T.C., L.B., and N.E.L.

Competing interests

386 The authors declare no competing financial interests.

References

References

1. Khoury, G. A., Baliban, R. C. & Floudas, C. A. Proteome-wide post-translational modification

statistics: frequency analysis and curation of the swiss-prot database. *Sci. Rep.* **1**, (2011).

2. Apweiler, R., Hermjakob, H. & Sharon, N. On the frequency of protein glycosylation, as deduced

from analysis of the SWISS-PROT database. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1473**, 4–8 (1999).

3. RodrÍguez, E., Schetters, S. T. T. & van Kooyk, Y. The tumour glyco-code as a novel immune

checkpoint for immunotherapy. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* **18**, 204–211 (2018).

4. Gutierrez, J. M. *et al.* Genome-scale reconstructions of the mammalian secretory pathway predict

metabolic costs and limitations of protein secretion. *bioRxiv* 351387 (2018). doi:10.1101/351387

5. Gabius, H.-J., André, S., Kaltner, H. & Siebert, H.-C. The sugar code: functional lectinomics.

Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - General Subjects **1572**, 165–177 (2002).

6. Spahn, P. N. & Lewis, N. E. Systems glycobiology for glycoengineering. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.*

30, 218–224 (2014).

7. Holst, S. *et al.* N-glycosylation Profiling of Colorectal Cancer Cell Lines Reveals Association of

Fucosylation with Differentiation and Caudal Type Homebox 1 (CDX1)/Villin mRNA Expression.

Mol. Cell. Proteomics **15**, 124–140 (2016).

8. Reiding, K. R., Blank, D., Kuijper, D. M., Deelder, A. M. & Wuhrer, M. High-throughput profiling

of protein N-glycosylation by MALDI-TOF-MS employing linkage-specific sialic acid esterification.

Anal. Chem. **86**, 5784–5793 (2014).

9. Yang, Z. *et al.* Engineered CHO cells for production of diverse, homogeneous glycoproteins. *Nat.*

Biotechnol. **33**, 842–844 (2015).

10. Anugraham, M. *et al.* Specific glycosylation of membrane proteins in epithelial ovarian cancer cell

lines: glycan structures reflect gene expression and DNA methylation status. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics*

13, 2213–2232 (2014).

11. Čaval, T., Tian, W., Yang, Z., Clausen, H. & Heck, A. J. R. Direct quality control of

413  glycoengineered erythropoietin variants. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 3342 (2018).

414 12. Riley, N. M., Hebert, A. S., Westphall, M. S. & Coon, J. J. Capturing site-specific heterogeneity

415  with large-scale N-glycoproteome analysis. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1311 (2019).

416 13. Aoki-Kinoshita, K. *et al.* GlyTouCan 1.0--The international glycan structure repository. *Nucleic*

417  *Acids Res.* **44**, D1237–42 (2016).

418 14. Campbell, M. P. *et al.* Validation of the curation pipeline of UniCarb-DB: building a global glycan

419  reference MS/MS repository. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1844**, 108–116 (2014).

420 15. Campbell, M. P. *et al.* UniCarbKB: building a knowledge platform for glycoproteomics. *Nucleic*

421  *Acids Res.* **42**, D215–21 (2014).

422 16. Cummings, R. D. The repertoire of glycan determinants in the human glycome. *Mol. Biosyst.* **5**,

423  1087–1104 (2009).

424 17. Rademacher, C. & Paulson, J. C. Glycan fingerprints: calculating diversity in glycan libraries. *ACS*

425  *Chem. Biol.* **7**, 829–834 (2012).

426 18. Hosoda, M. *et al.* MCAW-DB: A glycan profile database capturing the ambiguity of glycan

427  recognition patterns. *Carbohydr. Res.* **464**, 44–56 (2018).

428 19. Alocci, D. *et al.* Understanding the glycome: an interactive view of glycosylation from

429  glycocompositions to glycoepitopes. *Glycobiology* **28**, 349–362 (2018).

430 20. Klein, J., Carvalho, L. & Zaia, J. Application of network smoothing to glycan LC-MS profiling.

431  *Bioinformatics* **34**, 3511–3518 (2018).

432 21. Sharapov, S. *et al.* Defining the genetic control of human blood plasma N-glycome using genome-

433  wide association study. *bioRxiv* 365486 (2018). doi:10.1101/365486

434 22. Mohammad, M. A., Hadsell, D. L. & Haymond, M. W. Gene regulation of UDP-galactose synthesis

435  and transport: potential rate-limiting processes in initiation of milk production in humans. *Am. J.*

436  *Physiol. Endocrinol. Metab.* **303**, E365–76 (2012).

437 23. Ashwood, C., Pratt, B., MacLean, B. X., Gundry, R. L. & Packer, N. H. Standardization of PGC-LC-

438  MS-based glycomics for sample specific glycotyping. *Analyst* **144**, 3601–3612 (2019).

24. Koda, Y., Soejima, M., Liu, Y. & Kimura, H. Molecular basis for secretor type alpha(1,2)-

fucosyltransferase gene deficiency in a Japanese population: a fusion gene generated by unequal

crossover responsible for the enzyme deficiency. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **59**, 343–350 (1996).

25. Kudo, T. *et al.* Molecular genetic analysis of the human Lewis histo-blood group system. II. Secretor

gene inactivation by a novel single missense mutation A385T in Japanese nonsecretor individuals. *J.*

Biol. Chem. **271**, 9830–9837 (1996).

26. Viverge, D., Grimmonprez, L., Cassanas, G., Bardet, L. & Solere, M. Discriminant carbohydrate

components of human milk according to donor secretor types. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **11**,

365–370 (1990).

27. Mohammad, M. A. & Haymond, M. W. Regulation of lipid synthesis genes and milk fat production

in human mammary epithelial cells during secretory activation. *Am. J. Physiol. Endocrinol. Metab.*

305, E700–16 (2013).

28. Bode, L. *et al.* Human milk oligosaccharide concentration and risk of postnatal transmission of HIV

through breastfeeding. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **96**, 831–839 (2012).

29. Alderete, T. L. *et al.* Associations between human milk oligosaccharides and infant body

composition in the first 6 mo of life. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **102**, 1381–1388 (2015).

30. Rosenthal, R. & Rubin, D. B. Further issues in effect size estimation for one-sample multiple-choice-

type data. *Psychological Bulletin* **109**, 351–352 (1991).

31. Yan, J. & Fine, J. Estimating equations for association structures. *Stat. Med.* **23**, 859–74; discussion

875–7,879–80 (2004).

32. Halekoh, U., Højsgaard, S., Yan, J. & Others. The R package geepack for generalized estimating

equations. *J. Stat. Softw.* **15**, 1–11 (2006).

33. Zeger, S. L. & Liang, K. Y. Longitudinal data analysis for discrete and continuous outcomes.

Biometrics **42**, 121–130 (1986).

34. Zheng, B. Summarizing the goodness of fit of generalized linear models for longitudinal data. *Stat.*

Med. **19**, 1265–1275 (2000).

Methods

Data, source code, examples, Jupyter notebooks for generating manuscript figures, and CodeOcean capsule available at:

https://github.com/LewisLabUCSD/GlyCompare

N-glycosylation of EPO glycoprofile collection and analysis

N-glycosylation data were previously published and described elsewhere[9]. Briefly, these data were generated as follows. Different combinations of glycosyltransferase genes were knocked out using zinc-finger nucleases. Both single gene and multigene mutants were generated. Erythropoietin (EPO) was transfected into the library of glycoengineered cell lines. After overexpression of EPO, glycans were cleaved using PNGase, and then assayed by mass spectrometry. Upon retrieval of these data from the study, we picked 16 glycoprofiles that are used again in their following up study [11] and further processed the data as follows. All measurements were taken from distinct samples.

Glycan substructures were extracted from the observed glycans. Substructure abundance was calculated from glycan abundance of all glycans containing the substructure. A minimal set of 120 glyco-motifs substructures identified by substructure network to compare the mutants. Finally, representative substructures were extracted to pool abundance and summarize the structural changing across mutants. Each of these operations is further specified below.

HMO glycoprofile collection and analysis

Following Institutional Review Board approval (Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX), lactating women were given written informed consent. Women with diabetes or impaired

glucose tolerance, anemia, or renal or hepatic dysfunction were excluded from the study. Women

were 18-35 years of age, had uncomplicated singleton pregnancies with vaginal delivery at term

(>37 weeks) and pregnancy Body Mass Index (BMI) remained <26kg/m2. Infants were healthy

and exclusively breastfed. Forty-eight milk samples were collected from 6 human mothers (1, 2,

3, 4, 7, 14, 28, and 42 days postpartum (DPP)). More information on subject selection, exclusion,

study design, and breast milk collection has already been published [22,27]

HMO composition and abundance was measured by high-performance liquid chromatography

(HLPC) following fluorescent derivatization with 2-aminobenzamide (2AB, CID: 6942) as

previously described [28,29]. Raffinose (CHEBI:16634, CID:439242), a non-HMO oligosaccharide,

was added to each milk sample as an internal standard at the very beginning of sample

preparation to allow for absolute quantification. Of the 300-500 predicted HMO, the 16 most

abundant HMO were detected based on retention time comparison with commercial standard

oligosaccharides and mass spectrometry analysis including 2-fucosyllactose (2'FL), 3-

fucosyllactose (3'FL), 3-sialyllactose (3'SL), lacto-N-tetrose (LNT), lacto-N-neotetraose (LNnT),

lacto-N-fucopentaose (LNFP1, LNFP2 and LNFP3), sialyl-LNT (LSTb and LSTc), difucosyl-

LNT (DFLNT), disialyllacto-N-tetraose (DSLNT), fucosyl-lacto-N-hexaose (FLNH), difucosyl-

lacto-N-hexaose (DFLNH), fucosyl-disialyl-lacto-N-hexaose (FDSLNH) and disialyl-lacto-N-

hexaose (DSLNH). Because these are the most abundant HMOs, these glycoprofiles represent

the least sparse subset of the entire HMO glycoprofile which is extremely sparse. GlyTouCan

IDs for each HMO are listed in **Supplementary Table 2**. Technicians were blinded to metadata

associated with each sample. In addition to absolute concentrations, the proportion of each HMO

per total HMO concentration (sum of all integrated HMO) was calculated and expressed as

relative abundance (% of total, $w_i/\Sigma w_*$). The presence of 2-FL defines secretor status. All

measurements were taken from distinct samples.

HMO abundances profiles were treated similarly to the N-glycans. We identified and

quantified 26 glyco-motifs from 121 substructures. We compared glyco-motif abundance and

their abundance ratios directly to secretor status along the log of days postpartum.

Glycoprofile preprocess procedures

Three procedures were used for preprocessing the studied glycoprofiles (**Fig. 1c**). First,

glycoprofiles are parsed into glycans with abundance. In each glycoprofile, the glycans are

manually drawn and exported with GlycoCT format using the GlyTouCan Graphic Input tool[13].

GlycoCT formatted glycans are loaded into Python (version 3+) and initialized as glypy.glycan

objects using the *glypy* (version 0.12.1). Assuming we have a glycoprofile $\boldsymbol{i}$, the corresponding

abundance of each glycan $\boldsymbol{j}$ in glycoprofile $\boldsymbol{i}$ is represented by g_{ij}. For example, the relative m/z

peak in the mass spectrum or the abundance value in an HPLC trace, is calculated relative to the

total abundance of glycans in this glycoprofile $g_{ij}/\Sigma g_{i*}$. Glycans with ambiguous topologies are

handled by assuming they belong to every possible structure with equal probability, thereby

creating all possible $\boldsymbol{n}$ structures but with $g_{ij}/n\Sigma g_{i*}$ abundance of each. Second, glycans are

annotated with glycan substructure information, and this information is transformed into the

substructure vector. Substructures within a glycan are exhaustively extracted by breaking down

each linkage or a combination of linkages of the studied glycan. Note that this method cannot

currently deal with glycans with ring topology. All substructures extracted are merged into a

substructure set $\boldsymbol{S}$. Substructures are sorted by the number of monosaccharides and duplicates are

removed. Then, each glycan is matched to the substructure set $\boldsymbol{S}$ producing a binary glycan

substructure presence (1) or absence (0) vector, x_{ij}. Lastly, a substructure (abundance) vector is

calculated as $p_i = \Sigma x_{ij} g_{ij} / \Sigma g_{i*}$ representing the abundance of the substructures s in this

glycoprofile, where $p_i = (s_{1i}, \ldots, s_{ni})$. Third, a substructure network is built based on the

substructure vectors. The substructure network is a directed acyclic graph wherein each node

denotes a glycan substructure. Given the substructure set S, the root node starts from the

monosaccharides or a defined root core structure, and a child node is a substructure that has only

one monosaccharide added to its parent node. We note that one child node might have multiple

parent nodes and vice versa. The child node depends on its parent node(s) since it cannot exist

alone without any parent node.

Generating the glyco-motif vector bases on the substructure abundance

A larger subset of the substructure network is necessary to uniquely describe a more diverse set

of glycoprofiles while fewer substructures are needed to describe more similar glycoprofiles

sufficiently. Comparisons become more focused when only examining these variable

substructures. By checking the substructure network, the substructures that have the same

abundance can be merged without any information loss. In other words, after the substructure

network is generated, it is simplified by merging the substructure nodes. As illustrated in **Fig. 1f**,

the parent-child substructure pairs with perfectly correlated abundance (solid arrow), can be

merged. We remove the parent node while keeping the child node. Furthermore, an epitope

substructure can also be removed if they are 100% correlated with the bigger substructure

containing that epitope. Base on our rule, the merging criteria are based on how child

substructure node s_b depends on the parent substructure node s_a. The dependency is the Pearson

correlation of their abundance across all glycoprofiles, $corr(s_{a*}, s_{b*})$. If the correlation is 1, we

can conclude that the addition of the specific monosaccharide is not perturbed across all

glycoprofiles, which means they carry the same information. Thus, the parent node can be

pruned without information loss. All remaining nodes, namely, the glyco-motifs, are used to

cluster the glycoprofiles.

Meanwhile, we use the "monosaccharides weight" to track the nodes merging process. All

node weights are initialized as 1. When a node is removed, the weight is equally divided and

distributed to child nodes whose correlation with the removed node is 1. Since this method

redistributes weight from the root to leaves, the last decedent substructure node with a non-

unique abundance pattern gains the most weight. The weights **W** are used later for generating the

representative substructures.

Procedures for glycoprofile clustering and identifying representative glycan substructures

The preprocessed glycoprofiles (see details in the "glycoprofile preprocess procedures") generate

the substructure vectors to enable further clustering analysis. Here we used the Pearson

correlation and 'complete' distance to cluster the glycoprofiles. This procedure clusters the

glycoprofiles and substructures.

To identify the representative glycan substructures, a set of glycan substructures with weights

W are first aligned. Then, we calculate the sum of monosaccharide weights for each glycan

substructure. The representative substructure is thus defined as the glycan substructures with

their summed monosaccharide weights greater than 51% of the total weight of glycan

substructures. Lastly, the averaged abundances of the representative substructures are generated

to assess their differential expressions between different glycoprofiles.

Test the abundance changes on representative substructures

We use the representative substructures to summarize and analyze the structural and quantitative changes across glycoprofiles. For the abundance of a representative substructure in a glyco-motif cluster, we use the substructure monosaccharide weights to calculate the weighted average of substructure abundance. Since the abundance range of representative substructures across different glycoprofiles are different, we re-centralized the representative substructure abundance based on WT and scaled them with standard deviation. We can find many interesting signals since there are many representative substructures extremely deviating from the WT's abundance. Since the abundance distributions are not normally distributed, we used a one-sided 1-sample Wilcoxon test to test if the abundance of a representative substructure in a glycoprofile is significantly divergent. Effect size, r, was calculated as $z/\sqrt{N}$[30]. A Bonferroni correction (n=16) was used to correct for multiple testing, so p=0.0031 is used as criteria and effect sizes are all above 0.68.

Testing the substructure-phenotype association

We estimated the influence of Secretor status on HMO and glyco-motif abundance using generalized estimating equation (GEE, R3.6::geepack[31,32]). GEE models account for resampling bias in longitudinal measurements[33]; other regression models, like generalized linear models, overestimate the sample size and power by ignoring this bias. Unlike mixed effect models, which can account for resampling bias, GEE allows non-linear relations between the outcome and covariates, while accounting for correlation among repeated measurements from the same subject. Here we used GEE with exchangeable correlation structure (assuming the within-subject correlation between any two time-points is ρ). To stabilize the variance and equalize the range,

we log and z-score standardized each HMO and glyco-motif measurement. We also used the log

of days postpartum (DPP) to linearize the relationship over time. The Wald test was used to

measure the significance of Secretor status contribution. For additional information and

diagnostic statistics for specific regressions, see **Supplementary Table 3a,b**. All regression can

be found in **Supplementary Fig. 9.**

Product-substrate ratio as a proxy for flux and estimating flux-phenotype associations

To further isolate glyco-motif-specific effects from biosynthetic biases, we explored methods to

control for the product-substrate relations. First, we isolated the relative abundance of parent-

child pairs of glyco-motifs in the substructure network; these are product-substrate relations like

LNT and LSTb. Glyco-motif abundance represents the total substructure synthesized; therefore,

when we examine the product-substrate ratio, we measure the total amount of the substrate

substructure converted to the product substructure in the sample. Thus, the product-substrate

ratio is a proxy for flux. Using logistic GEE regression modeling, similar to the approach used

for testing substructure-phenotype associations, we can measure the influence of estimated flux

between two glycans on secretor status; here we predicted secretor status from estimated flux

log(DPP). For additional information and diagnostic statistics, see **Supplementary Table 3c.**

Glyco-motif Abundance Robustness and Power Analysis

GEE models, similar to those used in **Supplementary Fig. 9**, were trained using either glyco-

motif or whole HMO relative abundance. To stabilize the variance, equalize the range and make

the regressions comparable, we used a square root and z-score normalization on each HMO and

glyco-motif measurement. Glyco-motif or glycan relative abundance was predicted from either

DPP alone, Secretor status alone, DPP + Secretor status, or DPP + Secretor status +

DPP:Secretor. To avoid biasing the analysis with misfit or uninformative models, models with

small coefficients ($|\text{coef}|<0.5$) or extremely non-normal abundance distributions (Shapiro-Wilks

$p < 0.001$) were removed. Model robustness measures including, coefficient magnitude ($n_{\text{glycan-stats}}=39$, $n_{\text{motif-stats}}=86$), standard error ($n_{\text{glycan-stats}}=39$, $n_{\text{motif-stats}}=86$) and marginal R^2 ($n_{\text{glycan-stats}}=21$,

$n_{\text{motif-stats}}=47$) were used to compare model performance. Robustness measures from glycan-

trained and glyco-motif-trained models were compared using one-sided Wilcoxon rank sum test

with continuity correction. We validated these findings using a 10,000 iteration one-sided, two-

sample bootstrapping t-tests (Rv3.6::nonpar::boot.t.test); bootstrapping p-values were less than

or equal to Wilcoxon rank sum p-values within 0.001. Finally, using the Rv3.6::pwr::pwr.r.test

v1.2.2 package, statistical power was predicted between n=5 and n=200 for the median and

interquartile range of effect sizes observed in glyco-motif-trained and glycan-trained models.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1 | The GlyCompare workflow for glycoprofile decomposition and comparison. a, Sixteen glycoprofiles from glycoengineered recombinant EPO cluster poorly when based solely on raw glycan abundance. **b**, GlyCompare was used to compute and cluster EPO glyco-motif vectors, resulting in three dominant clusters of glycoprofiles and a few individuals that have severe changes in their glycan structural pattern (distance threshold=0.5) and twenty-four clusters of glycan substructures (distance threshold=0.19). **c and d**, A glycoprofile with annotated structure and relative abundance is obtained and the glycans are decomposed to a substructure set S and the presence/absence vectors is built. Presence/absence vectors are weighted by the glycan abundance, and are summed into a substructure vector p. **e** , Seven example glycoprofiles are represented here with their substructure vectors. **f,** To simplify the substructure vectors to contain a minimal number of substructures, a substructure network is constructed to identify the non-redundant glyco-motifs that change in abundance from their precursor substructures. **g**, The glycoprofiles can be re-clustered with simplified glyco-motif vectors for a clearer result. **h**, Clustered substructures can be analyzed to identify the most representative structure in the group. For example, four substructures with different relative abundance were aligned together and the monosaccharides with weight over 51% were preserved.

Fig. 2 | Changes in representative substructures can be quantified and compared to WT. a, The representative substructure table contains representative substructures for each of the 24 substructure clusters. The color scale represents the averaged abundances of the substructures in each cluster. The substructures are sorted based on the glycan structure complexity, followed by

the number of branches, the degree of galactosylation, sialylation, and fucosylation. **b**, The

significantly differentially expressed glycan substructures are illustrated by Standard-scaled

abundance of twenty-four glycan substructures, compared with WT. **c**, Differential fucosylation

is illustrated for the Fut8 knockout. The red (black) triangles represent the presence/absence of

fucose in the representative substructures. Differential sialylation is illustrated for the St3gal4/6

knockout. The purple/black diamonds represent the presence/absence of the sialylation in the

representative substructures. **d**, Changes in branching are presented for the Mgat4a/4b/5

knockouts. The tetra-antennary substructures (Rep16 - 22) decreased considerably. The

triantennary substructures with elongated GlcNac (Rep13 -14) increase significantly (p-value <

0.0031). However, the elongated triantennary structure (Rep15) decreases considerably for the

Mgat5 and Mgat4b knockouts, while the Mgat4a/4b knockouts remain high abundance (p-value<

0.0031). In the CHO dataset, the glycan substructure generated by Mgat4a/4b and Mgat5 will be

considered as the same topologically.

Fig. 3 | Analysis of intermediate substructures with GlyCompare elucidates associations in

abundance and flux with secretor status over time, which are missed in the standard whole-

glycan analysis. a, The substructure intermediates for four connected HMOs are shown here.

The synthesis of larger HMOs must pass through intermediate substructures that are also

observed HMOs, where the substructures are as associated with measured HMOs as follow

X40=LNT, X62=LSTb, X106=DSLNT, X138=DSLNH. **b-e**, Over time (DPP), X62, LSTb,

DSLNT, and DSLNH show different trends for secretors and non-secretors. Furthermore, the

abundance of aggregated X62 shows significant positive-correlation with secretor and negative-

correlation with non-secretor. **f and g**, Panels examine the product-substrate ratio for two

reactions in panel **a**. X40, the LNT substructure, is a precursor to X62, the LSTb substructure,

which is a precursor to X106, the DSLNT substructure. We estimate the flux of these

conversions from X40 to X62 and X62 to X106 by examining the product-substrate ratio, i.e.,

the proportion of the total synthesized substrate converted to the product. LSTb/LNT

substructure relative abundance ratios are not associated with secretor status while DSLNT/LSTb

ratios are. Odds ratios (OR) corresponding the ratio association with secretor status.

Fig. 4 | Glyco-motif level statistics require half as many samples to reach the same level of

statistical power. a and b, The use of glyco-motifs improves measures of regression robustness.

The coefficient magnitude and Standard Error indicate the magnitude of the measured effect and the

confidence with which a coefficient can be estimated. **c**, The R^2 describes the effect size of a regression;

we used marginal R^2 (mR^2) because it was appropriate for the regression models used[34]. **d,** We predicted

power for a range of sample sizes (n=5-200) given the median effect size (solid line) within the

interquartile range (shaded region) for glyco-motif-trained regressions (mR^2: median=0.45, Q1=0.31,

Q3=0.68) and the median effect size for glycan-trained regressions (mR^2: median=0.33, Q10.18,

Q3=0.44). Here, the use of GlyCompare and glyco-motif abundances required approximately half the

number of samples to achieve equivalent power as standard glycan measures.

Fig. 1 | GlyCompare effectively clusters panels of distinct glycoprofiles through glycoprofile

decomposition and glyco-motif identification.

706 **Fig. 2 | Changes in representative substructures can be quantified and compared to WT**

707 **with the standard-scaled abundance bar plot**

708

709 **Fig. 3 | Analysis of intermediate substructures with GlyCompare elucidates associations in**

710 **abundance and flux with secretor status, which are missed in the standard whole-glycan**

711 **analysis.**

713 **Fig. 4 | Glyco-motif level statistics require half as many samples to reach the same level of**

714 **statistical power**