

Inclusion of Porous Graphitic Carbon Chromatography Yields Greater Protein Identification and Compartment and Process Coverage and Enables More Reflective Protein-Level Label-Free Quantitation

Daniel G. Delafield, Hannah N. Miles, William A. Ricke, and Lingjun Li*

Cite This: *J. Proteome Res.* 2023, 22, 3508–3518

Read Online

ACCESS |



Metrics & More




Article Recommendations



Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: The ubiquity of mass spectrometry-based bottom-up proteomic analyses as a component of biological investigation mandates the validation of methodologies that increase acquisition efficiency, improve sample coverage, and enhance profiling depth. Chromatographic separation is often ignored as an area of potential improvement, with most analyses relying on traditional reversed-phase liquid chromatography (RPLC); this consistent reliance on a single chromatographic paradigm fundamentally limits our view of the observable proteome. Herein, we build upon early reports and validate porous graphitic carbon chromatography (PGC) as a facile means to substantially enhance proteomic coverage without changes to sample preparation, instrument configuration, or acquisition methods. Analysis of offline fractionated cell line digests using both separations revealed an increase in peptide and protein identifications by 43% and 24%, respectively. Increased identifications provided more comprehensive coverage of cellular components and biological processes independent of protein abundance, highlighting the substantial quantity of proteomic information that may go undetected in standard analyses. We further utilize these data to reveal that label-free quantitative analyses using RPLC separations alone may not be reflective of actual protein constituency. Together, these data highlight the value and comprehension offered through PGC-MS proteomic analyses. RAW proteomic data have been uploaded to the MassIVE repository with the primary accession code MSV000091495.

KEYWORDS: porous graphitic carbon, proteomics, data completeness, liquid chromatography, mass spectrometry, LC-MS



INTRODUCTION

The long-standing need for human health- and disease-related biomolecular investigations has promoted the widespread development of numerous analytical disciplines. Among others, proteomic analyses remain a vital component of biological investigations as these studies provide a more robust representation of functioning cells and living systems. Holistic proteomic investigations require analysis of protein expression,¹ modification,² structure,³ and function,⁴ each presenting unique instrumental, preparatory, and bioinformatic requirements. Mass spectrometry (MS) is now the tool-of-choice in contemporary proteomics, as this modality facilitates the breadth of measurements required and remains the only high-throughput strategy for peptide sequencing and high-resolution mass measurements.⁵ The current acceptance, ubiquity, and ever-increasing expertise of MS-based proteomic analyses continues to expand the conduit toward rapid investigation of biomolecular alteration in response to external stress, disease, and treatment. However, this analytical pursuit demands continual method development and optimization. While the improvements desired in MS-based proteomics are diverse and

may be discussed separately,^{6–9} the most fundamental need is for methodologies that enhance acquisition efficiency,¹⁰ increase sample coverage,¹¹ and enhance profiling depth.¹² Efforts seeking to provide such improvements target either the sample preparation or instrumentation levels while chromatographic separation is relatively constant and potential improvements are underexplored.¹²

By and large, high-throughput bottom-up proteomic investigations utilize reversed-phase liquid chromatography (RPLC) due to its reliability, availability, relatively low cost, and extensive innovation.^{13–15} This modality is preferred in bottom-up experiments, as the hydrophobicity-based retention mechanism retains and separates a large portion of the average proteolytic mixture. RPLC does not, however, effectively retain hydrophilic

Received: June 22, 2023

Published: October 10, 2023



peptides, a shortcoming exacerbated in various analyses such as post-translational modification (PTM) discovery.^{16,17} Additionally, any hydrophilic peptides that do not elute in the void volume may be poorly resolved and suffer from significant ionization suppression in the presence of more hydrophobic, basic peptides.¹⁸ Within RPLC-MS analyses, the willful disposal of these peptides and their potential insight into protein structure and function are considered an acceptable loss in favor of high identification rates and simpler experimental setups. For this reason, there is a critical need to implement facile, flexible experimental components that allow these often-discarded analytes to be effectively retained, separated, and identified.

Traditionally, there have been few options in the search for chromatographic paradigms capable of retaining hydrophilic peptides. Hydrophilic interaction chromatography (HILIC) is the most common and widely reported^{19–21} modality but may be considered disadvantageous as it requires mixtures to undergo phase change into organic buffers prior to analysis, an obvious limitation for hydrophilic analytes. Electrostatic repulsion–hydrophilic interaction chromatography (ERLIC)^{22–25} is a recent addition to the chromatographic toolbox, reporting greater retention of hydrophilic peptides²⁶ and polar analytes.^{27–29} A limitation of both HILIC and ERLIC is the requirement of salt-containing buffers to mitigate charge effects^{23,30} or to maintain and improve separation capacity,³¹ which can hinder mass spectrometry detection. Porous graphitic carbon (PGC) chromatography is an emerging chromatographic regime that has gained popularity for its ability to retain polar, hydrophilic analytes^{32–34} particularly favorable for the analysis of released glycans.^{35–45} This separation strategy was shown to be suitable for the analysis of tryptic glycopeptides,^{46,47} suggesting the utility of PGC may extend beyond metabolomic and glycomic analyses. With a growing understanding of the retention mechanism, it was recently hypothesized that chromatography of this nature may be a suitable complement to traditional RPLC in untargeted, high-throughput analyses. Previous reports validated this hypothesis as PGC revealed a substantial improvement in peptide and protein identification, with additional benefits seen when column temperature is optimized.⁴⁸ Stating broadly the advantages that may be seen when PGC separations are included, these initial studies did not acutely detail to what extent this additional information serves to increase sample coverage, improve profiling depth, and affect our understanding of sample constituency.

Herein, we expand on the benefits of PGC chromatography within the discovery proteomics experiments. Utilizing offline fractionation to partition the prostate cancer cell line lysate, sequential analyses revealed a 43% increase in peptide identification when PGC separations are included, with almost all fractions revealing competitive identification rates between RPLC and PGC. Confident protein identifications were also increased by 23% when including PGC separations, providing greater coverage of numerous cellular compartments and biological process pathways. Interestingly, there was no significant difference in the known abundance of proteins identified through each separation, suggesting that proteomic profiling can be significantly improved without the need for exploring deeper into a given mixture. Finally, we compiled these data into spectral libraries that were deployed in data-independent label-free quantitative analyses. These evaluations reveal highly reproducible quantitation between PGC and RPLC separations when the same collection of peptide precursors is used for quantitation. However, including the

additional complementary peptide identifications provided through PGC during quantitation produces significantly different protein expression levels than those found through RPLC alone. Overall, our work demonstrates the level of information that may go undiscovered in traditional proteomic analyses and how a narrow view of the observable proteome can impact qualitative and quantitative measurements. Despite the incalculable number of experimental optimizations intended to improve analytical throughput, each will be fundamentally hindered by a limited, chromatography-specific view of the proteome. For this reason, future development of PGC that increases the retention capacity and reduces the time needed to perform sequential RPLC and PGC will play a pivotal role in comprehensive proteome profiling.

■ EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Materials

Water (H₂O, 223623), acetonitrile (ACN, A955), methanol (MeOH, A456), chloroform (C298), formic acid (FA, A117), tris(base) (BP152), urea (U15), and hydrochloric acid (HCl, A144SI) were purchased from Thermo Scientific. Acetone (179124), sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS, 7173C), dithiothreitol (DTT, D9779), and iodoacetamide (IAA, I6125) were purchased from Millipore Sigma. Trypsin (V5113) was purchased from Promega (Madison, WI). RPLC packing materials (4451IP, 4472IP) were purchased from Osaka Soda Co. (Osaka, Japan). The PGC packing material was harvested from ThermoFisher PGC guard columns (35003-014001). Capillary tubing (1068150019) was purchased from PolyMicro. All other sources are listed.

Cell Growth

Benign prostate hyperplasia to prostate cancer (BCaP) cell lines were generated and described previously.⁴⁹ A tumorigenic cell line (BCaP-T10) and an aggressive, metastatic tumorigenic cell line (BCaP-MT10) are used throughout these analyses. Growth conditions are listed in the [Supporting Information](#).

Protein Extraction and Digestion

Cell pellets were resuspended in 4 volumes 50 mM Tris–HCl, 4% SDS prior to lysis via ultrasonication. Lysates were centrifuged to remove cell debris and protein concentration was estimated by the bicinchoninic acid (BCA) assay (ThermoFisher Scientific, 23225). Disulfide bonds were reduced with 450 mM DTT for 30 min at 55 °C followed by alkylation with 10 mM IAA at room temperature for 15 min. Protein was extracted through repeated additions of cold 80% acetone and incubation at –20 °C. Protein was reconstituted in 8 M urea with 1× protease inhibitor cocktail (Roche, 05892791001 and 04906837001). Aliquots of crude protein were diluted 1:10 with 50 mM Tris–HCl to reduce urea concentration to <1 M followed by two additions of trypsin for digestion. Trypsin was added 1:100 w/w and incubated for 4 h at 37 °C followed by a second addition of trypsin 1:50 that was left to incubate overnight at 37 °C. Proteolytic mixtures were desalted, and dried under vacuum, and peptide concentration was estimated via the peptide assay (ThermoFisher Scientific, 23275).

High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) Fractionation

Samples were fractionated using a Waters e2695 separation module equipped with a Waters 2489 UV–vis detector operating at 214 and 280 nm. A Phenomenex Kinetex 2.6 μm PS C18 100 Å column (150 mm × 4.6 mm) was used for




Figure 1. Analytical workflow and offline fractionation. (a) Graphical representation of proposed analytical workflow whereby pooled prostate cancer cell line digests are fractionated offline and analyzed through both RPLC- and PGC-MS. (b) Absorbance (280 nm) trace collected during fractionation of pooled BCaP-T10 and BCaP-MT10; vertical lines represent the 1.5 min divisions of each fraction collected. The trace was integrated between 10 and 70 min and divided into 8 approximately equal components. All fractions within these 8 components (depicted by the gray boxes) were combined to make 8 final fractions used for analysis.

separation. Buffers A and B were $\text{H}_2\text{O} + 0.1\%$ FA and ACN + 0.1% FA, respectively. 100 μg each of T10 and MT10 lysate digest were combined, dried, and reconstituted in buffer A prior to separation. Samples were separated using a 94 min gradient of the following composition: 1% buffer B from 0 to 5 min, 40% buffer B at 50 min, 60% buffer B at 54 min, 70% buffer B at 58 min, 100% buffer B from 59 to 74 min, and 1% buffer B from 74.5 to 94 min. The flow rate was set to 0.2 mL/min. Fractions were collected at 1.5-min intervals between 10 and 70 min and were combined as described below (see the [Results and Discussion](#) section).

LC-MS/MS

Samples were analyzed by using a Dionex nanoUltimate 3000 chromatography stack coupled to a ThermoFisher Scientific Orbitrap Fusion Lumos. Separation was performed on 15 cm custom-packed capillary columns, which were prepared as described in the [Supporting Information](#). Buffers A and B were $\text{H}_2\text{O} + 0.1\%$ FA and ACN + 0.1% FA, respectively. A flow rate of 350 nL/min and the following a 110 gradient were used for all analyses: 3% buffer B from 0 to 18.3 min, 35% buffer B at 90 min, 95% buffer B from 90.5 to 100 min, and 3% buffer B from 101 to 110 min. The following MS1 parameters were used for DDA analyses: resolution, 120,000; scan range, 400–1250 m/z ; AGC target, 2×10^5 ; maximum injection time, 50 ms; intensity threshold, 2×10^4 ; charge state, 2–6; dynamic exclusion, after 1 occurrence for 45 s. The MS2 parameters were as follows: resolution, 60,000; isolation width 1 m/z ; activation, HCD 30; AGC target, 1×10^4 ; fixed first mass, 100 m/z . For DIA analyses, the following MS1 settings were used: resolution, 120,000; scan range, 400–1250 m/z ; AGC target, 1×10^6 ; maximum injection time, 50 ms. DIA MS2 parameters were as follows: resolution, 60,000; scan range, 200–2000 m/z ; isolation window 24 m/z ; activation, HCD 30; AGC target, 1×10^5 ; maximum injection

time, 45 ms; loop control $N = 9$. All fractions and samples were analyzed in technical duplicate.

Database Searching

DDA data were processed using FragPipe 18.0 with MSFragger⁵⁰ 3.5. An open-source Python library, easypqp, was used to generate spectral libraries from the processed DDA runs; RPLC and PGC libraries were generated separately. These spectral libraries were imported to DIA-NN⁵¹ for analysis of data-independent analyses. All parameters used within MSFragger and DIA-NN can be found in the [Supporting Information](#).

DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY

RAW proteomic data have been uploaded to the MassIVE repository with primary accession code MSV000091495. All code and files required to reproduce the analyses and figures presented within can be found at <https://github.com/lingjunli-research/pgc-rplc-frac-profiling>.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profiling Fractionated Prostate Cancer Cell Lysate

In mass spectrometry-based proteomic analyses, the profiling depth that may be achieved is directly tied to the efficiency with which biological mixtures are simplified during separation. Often, a single chromatographic modality does not provide the requisite simplicity for deep profiling, allowing to employ offline fractionation. As previous analyses have directly compared RPLC and PGC in shotgun analyses,⁴⁸ we chose to employ offline fractionation both to further profile the level of information gained through the addition of PGC separations, as well as mimic common decomplexation techniques within bottom-up proteomics. Pooling tumorigenic and metastatic prostate cancer cell lysate, reversed-phase offline fractionation was performed to partition the complex mixture, and each fraction was analyzed sequentially via RPLC- and PGC-MS




Figure 2. Peptide-level differences between PGC (orange) and RPLC (blue) analyses. (a) Density plots displaying the time points during which peptides were identified. (b) Total peptides (left) and the number of column-specific peptides (right) identified in each fraction. “Column-specific” refers to peptides identified only through that single separation modality. (c) Overlap of all peptides identified in all fractions. (d) Relative hydrophilicity of all peptides identified within a given separation method. Grand average of hydrophathy (GRAVY) calculations are grouped by retention time and are averaged across fractions. (e) Jitter plots displaying the length of peptides identified through both separations. (f) Line plots displaying the average hyperscore, an MSFragger metric of confidence, for all peptides in a single fraction partitioned according to the separation that retained them.

analysis (Figure 1a). After fractionation (see the Experimental Section), the 280 nm absorbance trace was integrated across the fractionation window (10–70 min). The integrated area was divided into 8 approximately equal segments; all fractions within a segment were pooled for LC-MS analysis (Figure 1b). As previous studies have reiterated the capacity of PGC to separate polar, hydrophilic analytes, we chose to combine fractions sequentially, keeping peptides of similar hydrophobicity together.

We hypothesized that the sequential combination would result in the greatest contrast between RPLC and PGC analyses. Theoretically, the early fractions containing predominantly hydrophilic analytes should be poorly retained and elute early in subsequent RPLC-MS, whereas PGC should retain these analytes far longer and have elution profiles inversely correlated with the fraction number (i.e., peptides in early fractions elute late and vice versa). Examining the time points of all confidently identified peptides, we see this theoretical expectation largely holds true in RPLC analyses but not for PGC separations (Figure 2a and Table S1). Rather, PGC separations demonstrate a progressive trend in peptide retention times, similar to that of RPLC analyses, suggesting that peptide hydrophobicity is not solely responsible for PGC retention. In addition, we anticipated the PGC elution profiles to be more broadly distributed than those in RPLC separations, which was only marginally observed.

This observation indicates the LC gradient used within our analyses—one modeled from typical RPLC experiments—is not the most appropriate for PGC separations and later optimizations will result in more effective PGC peptide separation (Supporting Figure S1).

Examining the overall peptide identifications within each fraction, initial comparisons show that RPLC outpaces PGC across all fractions (Figure 2b), mirroring those observations seen elsewhere.⁴⁸ However, given the anticipated redundancy in identifications, removing peptides detected through both separation modalities reveals that PGC separations are competitive, especially for those early, predominantly hydrophilic fractions (Figure 2b). Furthermore, the number of peptides specific to a single separation paradigm serves to highlight how much proteomic information may be lost during typical RPLC-MS analyses. Overall, RPLC analysis of offline fractions revealed 34,261 peptides with 21,266 unique to this separation. The inclusion of PGC separations revealed additional 14,783 peptides, a 43% increase compared to RPLC alone, culminating into 49,044 total peptide sequences (Figure 2c). As anticipated, PGC provided greater access to those hydrophilic peptides across all fractions (Figure 2d) in addition to selectively retaining shorter analytes compared to those with RPLC (Figure 2e). While these high-level results are encouraging at face value, they should be further contextualized within this experiment.




Figure 3. PGC analyses (orange) provide enhanced protein identification compared to RPLC (blue) alone. (a) Quantities of total (top) and column-specific (bottom) proteins identified in each fraction. “Column-specific” refers to peptides identified only through that single separation modality. (b) Overlap of proteins identified across all fractions. (c) Six representative cellular compartments displaying the number of proteins localized within those compartments and through separations they were identified; PGC (orange), RPLC (blue), and both columns (gray). (d) Proteins identified across all fractions sorted and ranked according to expected protein abundance within the human proteome of ~20,000 proteins. Expected abundances are normalized according to quantities estimated in the protein abundance database Pax-DB (see the [Supporting Information](#)). (e) Boxplots displaying the distribution of protein abundances identified in either separation. Statistical differences are noted within the main text or may be found within the code available alongside this report. (f) Representative biological processes identified across all fractions with boxplots displaying the distribution of protein abundances identified within those pathways. Statistical significance may be generated from [Supporting Table S3](#).

Here, we utilized offline fractionation, which empirically improves the profiling capability of RPLC analyses. As we compare the analysis of eight separate fractions between two independent fractions, complementary separation paradigms may be questioned as to whether the strategy used here is more beneficial than analyzing 16 less complex fractions through RPLC alone. This question should be investigated independently. We hypothesize that implementing a more extensive fractionation strategy would improve the number of peptide identifications but would not recover the entirety of those peptides found only in PGC analyses; the characteristics of those PGC-compatible peptides are incongruent with RPLC separations. Nevertheless, given that we are still able to extract such an extensive quantity of additional information through PGC analyses even when modest fractionation is performed, making clearer the level of information that is lost in single separation, RPLC shotgun proteomics.

One consideration in PGC analyses is the software and parameters used during peptide identification. Within this study,

we utilized MSFragger, a well-recognized suite of tools with demonstrated merit.⁵⁰ A highly beneficial component of this software is the ability to generate in silico tandem MS spectra and theoretical retention times that may be used as a scoring mechanism for identified peptides. Within our analyses, peptides identified in RPLC separations regularly scored higher and may be considered more confident matches than those in PGC separations ([Figure 2f](#)). Certainly, it is possible that all RPLC-retained peptides produced better spectra; however, peptides identified in PGC analyses also fell behind in the score of the next-best peptide sequence identification, match to theoretical retention time, and PeptideProphet expectation⁵² ([Supporting Figure S2](#)). Given the consistency with which PGC peptides score below RPLC peptides, this is most likely a reflection of how database searching tools, statistical models, and predicted expectations are largely trained upon data sets that utilize RPLC separations. We do not argue that the retention and separation capacity of RPLC is superior to that of PGC, as demonstrated here and previously,⁴⁸ but given these observations and further

discussion provided below, we posit that the heavy emphasis on RPLC separations in the construction and utilization of bioinformatic tools presents a fundamental limitation in the ability to correctly and confidently identify peptides in PGC-MS experiments.

Finally, we consider the peak capacity of each separation paradigm. A limitation of this experimental design is inconsistent particle diameter between RPLC and PGC columns (RPLC d.p. = 1.7 μm , PGC d.p. = 3.0 μm). For this reason, the theoretical peak capacity and plate heights are substantially different between the two. If we assume all factors are consistent between the two separations, plate height should be approximately 3-fold shorter in the RPLC column. This discrepancy in plate height, and therefore peak capacity, does provide a substantial benefit to RPLC separations and may help explain the higher identification rates in RPLC analyses. However, if we look at the empirical differences in peak capacity, the two separations are comparable. Peak width and height are not reported directly in our analysis pipeline, making the analysis of thousands of peptides untenable. Examining, however, a collection of peptides identified in every sample and every replicate of our DIA analyses (read below), we binned peptides according to their RPLC retention time and selected the most abundant peptide within each 10-min bin. Extracting the signal for each of the 10 representative peptides and determining fwhm allows us to calculate plate number at a given time using the formula $N = 5.545 \left(\frac{t_r}{w_h} \right)^2$. As shown in

Supporting Figure S3 and Table S2, the plate number is generally higher in PGC columns for all eligible time points until the later portions of the gradient. Though these peptides are only a subset of the overall data, we can infer that it is not peak capacity, or plate height that significantly drives differences in analyte recognition, instead it is the compatibility of peptides with the retention mechanism of each column. These data demonstrate that PGC separations do not yield limitations in analyte resolution, peak capacity or plate heights and are a performant separation modality when compatible analytes are presented.

Enhanced Protein Identification, Compartment Coverage, and Pathway Completeness

Encouraged by the improved peptide recognition provided when PGC separations are used in addition to RPLC, we anticipated that the number of peptides identified would directly correlate to the number of proteins identified through both separations. Considering all proteotypic peptides identified in a given fraction, PGC and RPLC yielded virtually identical numbers of proteins except for those later fractions where RPLC excelled (Figure 3a). However, knowing the redundancy in peptide identifications between the two separations (Figure 2c), removing these redundant identifications reveals notable improvements in protein recognition enabled through PGC separations. Though both separations provided access to different collections of proteins, PGC outpaces RPLC in the number of unique protein identifications, especially within the innermost fractions (Figure 3a). This observation is particularly valuable when considered alongside the differences in peptide identifications shown in Figure 2. RPLC identified more peptides overall and in all fractions except for one; however, those peptides do not map to a larger collection of proteins. This likely speaks to the known limitations in typical RPLC-MS analyses where data-dependent acquisition experiments are biased toward the identification of those highly abundant,

hydrophobic peptides that ionize well and can cause signal suppression of unique, low-abundance analytes. PGC, which provided a greater number of unique protein species, likely benefits from the smaller number of peptides within each protein that are compatible with the separation modality, reducing the overall number of peptides but increasing the number of proteins being identified.

In total, 3868 proteins were identified through both separations with PGC and RPLC revealing 1130 and 752 separation-specific proteins, respectively (Figure 3b). Increased identification rates alone are notable, although we hypothesized that the significant increase in protein identification rates likely signaled greater profiling depth across the experiment. Organizing all identified proteins into their known subcellular compartments (as listed in the UniProt knowledgebase) reveals the improved compartment coverage when PGC separations are used (Figure 3c). While we anticipated that PGC would enable more comprehensive coverage of the cytoplasm, nucleus, and other compartments with predominantly cytosolic proteins, our data also revealed that PGC was able to improve the detection of membrane and membrane-associated proteins. These observations are encouraging as they demonstrate that PGC broadly provides more effective protein recognition and is not biased toward compartments dominated by hydrophilic species.

As PGC separations noticeably augmented the proteome coverage achieved through traditional RPLC-MS analyses, we allowed ourselves to consider the possibility that PGC was sampling deeper into the biological matrix, identifying species that were lower in abundance. To evaluate this possibility, we referenced the proteins in our data set against the anticipated expression of all proteins within the human proteome, as provided by Pax-DB⁵³ (see the Supporting Information, Table S3). As shown in Figure 3d,e, the proteins identified through both separations were those known to be highest in abundance. However, proteins unique to a single separation were not significantly different in abundance ($p\text{-value} = 8.68 \times 10^{-2}$, Mann–Whitney U test), with PGC separations showing only a slightly greater density of lower abundance species. This observation alone would lead us to believe PGC does not significantly enhance profiling depth; rather, it provides greater breadth. However, comparing the global protein populations provides an obtuse conclusion, as there is no information on protein relatedness or activity. As such, we further categorized proteins according to their biological processes to determine whether PGC separations provide better coverage of physiological pathways or protein communities. Of those biological processes represented by at least 50 members, many were enhanced through the inclusion of PGC separations, providing detection of lower abundance proteins (Figure 3f and Table S4). For example, PGC provided greater coverage of mRNA splicing, translation, lipid metabolic processes, and protein localization by identifying species lower in abundance than those seen in RPLC analyses. Note that there are other pathways where RPLC provides identification of lower abundance species (Figure 3f), PGC does still provide benefit in amplifying pathway coverage and revealing information that may be otherwise lost.

Overall, the peptide- and protein-level results presented here serve to illustrate the breadth and depth of information reclaimed when utilizing PGC analyses in addition to RPLC. Within this experiment, we utilized offline fractionation to reduce matrix complexity and enable greater sample coverage, anticipating that PGC separations would benefit analyses of those predominantly hydrophilic fractions but would provide




Figure 4. Spectral library-based DIA-MS analysis of prostate cell lines. (a) Overlap of peptides and proteins identified through both separations. Results are combined across the two cell lines analyzed. (b) Density plots representing the elution profiles of peptides identified in both PGC and RPLC experiments. (c) Retention times of representative peptides identified through both separation paradigms displaying the significantly later times associated with PGC analysis. (d) Intracsample reproducibility of protein-level abundance calculated after DIA-MS analyses. (e) Violin plots displaying the percent difference in protein abundance between technical replicates. (f) Scatter plot displaying the agreement of protein abundances when using peptide precursors identified in both separation regimes. (g) Protein abundances calculated using all proteotypic peptide precursors plotted against protein abundances estimated using only precursors found in RPLC analyses. (h) The count of proteins showing increased abundance estimations after PGC peptides are included. Vertical bars represent count, and the horizontal axis is the binned fold increase as calculated by fold increase = $\log_2(\text{RPLC} + \text{PGC abundance}) - \log_2(\text{RPLC abundance})$.

negligible enhancement of others. However, these expectations were largely subverted, as PGC separations provided substantial increases to peptide and protein recognition in almost all cases. More interestingly, the additional proteins identified in PGC experiments showed virtually no difference in known abundance compared to those seen in RPLC analyses. These observations indicate current proteomics should not only focus on exploring deeper into the proteome but also consider exploring broader coverage. Our data show within all analyses, not just shotgun experiments, using a single separation will most likely provide a limited, biased view of the proteome. By utilization and optimization of facile, complementary separation strategies, these limitations may be systematically addressed and overcome.

PGC Analyses Enable More Representative Label-Free Protein Quantitation

Data-independent acquisition (DIA) MS is rapidly gaining interest in analysis of biological mixtures as it provides higher throughput and greater profiling depth.⁵⁴ Critically, the comprehensive and reproducible nature of DIA-MS has promoted its widespread use in label-free protein quantitation.^{54–56} After confident precursor assignment, protein quantitation in DIA analyses is enabled through summing peptide or transition ion abundances or peak area, though variations to this workflow have been described.⁵⁷ As we have established the vast, complementary proteomic information provided when PGC separations are used to augment RPLC-MS analyses, our ability to quantify proteins is similarly enhanced. However, while PGC enables identification and therefore quantitation of proteins previously unseen in RPLC-MS, PGC also enabled the retention and identification of additional peptides from protein sequences already identified. Knowing

that common label-free protein quantitation in DIA analyses utilizes summated precursor abundances, the additional peptides identified through PGC are likely to significantly impact quantitative estimations.

To investigate this claim, we compiled data-dependent analyses of the offline fractions into two spectral libraries, one for each separation regime. After DIA analyses of tumorigenic (T10) and metastatic (MT10) prostate cancer cell line digests, these libraries were deployed for precursor assignment. Peptide identification rates resembled the trend observed in DDA analyses of fractions, though fewer were identified overall (Figure 4a and Table S5). The number of identified proteins, however, was comparable between the two separations. This observation, which does not coincide with our DDA analyses, is likely a result of the compressed elution profile observed through PGC separations (Figure 4b), rearticulating the need to investigate the optimal gradient composition for this paradigm. During manual interrogation of these identifications, we noted an additional aspect of chromatographic behavior that may present limitations. Focusing on peptides identified in both separations, these peptides were almost unanimously retained longer in PGC separations (Figure 4c), 11.68 min longer on average. Expectedly, those with the greatest retention time difference were generally those with the highest hydrophilicity and polarity (Supporting Figure S4). These differences in retention time do not impact our DIA analyses as we are using empirical spectral libraries where the experimental MS spectra and retention time are known and used for identification. However, library-free analyses are gaining popularity as they are efficient and can expand profiling capacity while eliminating the need to generate extensive libraries. We posit library-free

analysis built into current software is not suitable for PGC-DIA-MS analyses.

Library-free analyses, such as those offered through DIA-NN, work by using machine-learning approaches to generate theoretical tandem MS spectra and peptide retention times. These tools are constructed on the extensive body of RPLC-MS proteomics data, making them accurate, reliable tools when RPLC is the separation regime. However, the significant difference in peptide retention time observed in our PGC analyses means that library-free tools such as DIA-NN would struggle to make accurate retention time predictions and provide limited peptide and protein identifications. We briefly investigated this claim by performing library-free analyses of our DIA data sets (see the [Supporting Information](#)). Agreeing with the previous literature, library-free data processing resulted in significant improvements in the number of precursors and proteins identified in RPLC analyses ([Supporting Figure S5](#)). These improvements are largely due to the rigorous, well-aligned *in silico* spectra and retention times predicted for our RPLC separations. Nevertheless, library-free results for our PGC data sets were rather poor, as expected, identifying only marginally more peptides but far fewer proteins compared to our chosen spectral-library approach ([Supporting Figure S5](#)). As we are confident that these deficiencies stem from the inability to correctly predict precursor retention time, users must either rely on empirical spectral libraries or develop custom machine-learning approaches that provide rigorous, accurate retention time predictions for PGC-DIA-MS analyses.

Notwithstanding these limitations, we turned our attention to ensuring technical reproducibility and quantitative accuracy. DIA-NN implements strict requirements for precursor assignment, offers matching between runs, and has a built-in FDR estimation. These features, alongside the implementation of the MaxLFQ algorithm,⁵⁸ allow for highly reproducible protein-level estimations. Within our analyses, both separation paradigms provided excellent intrasample reproducibility (Pearson $R^2 > 0.99$, [Figure 3d](#)) and low variance ([Figure 3e](#)) in protein abundance estimations, indicating both separations are suitable for high-throughput quantitative DIA-MS analyses. To directly compare protein abundance estimations between PGC and RPLC experiments, all proteotypic peptides identified in both separations were compiled and grouped by protein precursor, and peptide MS1 areas were summed and then averaged across technical duplicates. For each of the two prostate cancer samples analyzed, approximately 2100 proteins could be directly compared between each separation paradigm, demonstrating excellent correlation ($R^2 \approx 0.95$, [Figure 4f](#)). This observation indicates that the extracted precursor area is conserved regardless of the separation modality employed and that protein-level estimations made through one separation modality will largely hold true in the other. Knowing this, we may reliably combine the extracted precursor areas of separation-specific peptides to achieve more representative protein abundances.

To evaluate how protein quantity estimations change when PGC separations are used in tandem with RPLC, we compiled all proteotypic peptides regardless of their identifying separation, summated peptide areas, and averaged technical replicates as above. We observed a poor correlation (Pearson $R^2 \leq 0.5$, [Figure 4g](#)) of these new, adjusted protein abundances to those calculated using peptides from RPLC experiments alone. Moreover, protein quantities were significantly different between the two calculations, 963 proteins having notably

greater calculated abundance (≥ 0.25 -fold increase) with 465 and 133 proteins shown to be at least 1- and 2-fold greater, respectively ([Figure 4h](#)). These substantial differences in protein-level estimations further evidence the swath of information lost or left undiscovered in routine RPLC analyses. Even if our quantitative approach was altered to utilize averaged peptide abundances or only the N-most-abundant peptides from each protein, our data suggest the resulting protein abundance estimations could be significantly impacted.

Within this single experiment, PGC separations enable the retention and identification of topical peptide precursors that not only enhance proteomic coverage but also present the possibility of significantly impacting our perception of protein regulation, pathway activity, and sample constituency. As such, we hold the position that RPLC separations may never be replaced or supplanted, but we can and should turn our attention to developing facile, high-throughput strategies that enable complementary proteomic investigations. Our data validate PGC not as a single solution to these endeavors but as one suitable strategy that enables more comprehensive, representative analyses. We are confident that PGC can gain purchase within the ever-changing analytical landscape and that engineering developments, targeted optimization, and increased utilization will help drive future proteomic investigations.

CONCLUSIONS

Validated methodologies that increase efficiency and enable more comprehensive sample coverage are an ever-present need in mass spectrometry-based proteomics. Whereas high-throughput measurements continue to rely on RPLC as the principal separation strategy, this report details the extent to which the incorporation of PGC chromatography may enhance routine analyses. Without changes to sample preparation, gradient composition, or acquisition parameters, the inclusion of porous graphitic carbon provided a significant increase in peptide and protein identifications and resulted in greater coverage of cellular compartments and biological pathways. Our report also demonstrates how these additional peptide identifications significantly impact downstream protein quantitation when compared to RPLC-MS-based measurements. These data further highlight the utility of PGC separations within broad proteome profiling and the effort to provide more comprehensive analyses.

Though our data suggests PGC is not biased toward any cellular compartment or toward proteins at higher abundance, the retention mechanism of PGC makes it naturally adept for the retention and identification of shorter, more hydrophilic peptides and those with a high proportion of aromatic residues. Furthermore, the analyses presented here do not target or take into consideration protein post-translational modification. Empirical evidence suggests there is benefit in utilizing PGC separations in the analysis of glycopeptides, where the relative hydrophilicity of analytes will shift higher, though other modifications are yet to be explored. It may very well be the case that other classes of modified peptides show a similar increase in retention and identification when PGC separations are employed. We are confident that the results presented here, alongside our previous works and others in the field, provide readers with sufficient evidence to make rational decisions over experimental design and to determine when PGC separations will significantly support analytical objectives. In all, this report should serve to highlight the emerging potential of this separation paradigm in discovery analyses. Upon development

of tailored chromatographic and MS acquisition parameters, it is clear that PGC separations present a valid, worthwhile avenue toward comprehensive analysis across a range of applications.

■ ASSOCIATED CONTENT

SI Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge at <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.jproteome.3c00373>.

Supporting methods: cell growth, column preparation, data processing, and expected protein abundance; supporting figures: comparison of peptide elution/identification times with respect to gradient composition (Figure S1); quality metrics of peptides identified using MSFragger (Figure S2); evaluations of peak width, peak capacity, and plate number across a panel of representative peptides and time points (Figure S3); peptide characteristics driving retention time differences in PGC separations (Figure S4); and overlap of peptide precursors and protein identifications identified in the library-free analysis (Figure S5) (PDF)

As a note, these data are not needed to recreate the analyses used within the manuscript; the database search output from MSFragger and DIA-NN have been uploaded to the github repository. Cloning the repository will allow to recreate all figures. Fractionated DDA Results (Table S1) and plate number determinations (Table S2). DDA data combined with Pax-DB data (Table S3). DDA data combined with Pax-DB and uniprot pathways (Table S4); and DIA results (Table S5) (XLSX)

■ AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

Lingjun Li – Department of Chemistry, University of Wisconsin—Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, United States; Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Wisconsin—Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53705, United States; Lachman Institute for Pharmaceutical Development, School of Pharmacy and Wisconsin Center for NanoBioSystems, School of Pharmacy, University of Wisconsin—Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53705, United States; orcid.org/0000-0003-0056-3869; Email: lingjun.li@wisc.edu

Authors

Daniel G. Delafield – Department of Chemistry, University of Wisconsin—Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, United States

Hannah N. Miles – Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Wisconsin—Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53705, United States

William A. Ricke – Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Wisconsin—Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53705, United States; Department of Urology and George M. O'Brien Urology Research Center of Excellence, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, Wisconsin 53705, United States

Complete contact information is available at:

<https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.jproteome.3c00373>

Author Contributions

D.G.D. conceptualized the experiment, performed research, provided analysis, and wrote the manuscript. H.N.M. performed research and wrote the manuscript. W.A.R. provided funding and wrote the manuscript. L.L. supervised the research, provided funding, and wrote the manuscript.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Support for this research is provided in part by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) grants R01 AG052324 (L.L.), R01 DK071801 (L.L.), and U54DK104310 (WAR, L.L.). The Orbitrap instruments were purchased through the support from an NIH shared instrument grant (NIH-NCRR S10RR029531) and Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. D.G.D. acknowledges a Luminex Summer Fellowship provided by the Department of Chemistry at UW-Madison. L.L. acknowledges the National Science Foundation funding support (CHE-2108223 and IOS-2010789), NIH grant support R01 AG078794, R21AG065728, S10OD028473, and S10OD025084 as well as a Vilas Distinguished Achievement Professorship and Charles Melbourne Johnson Distinguished Chair Professorship with funding provided by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation and University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Pharmacy.

■ REFERENCES

- (1) Ankney, J. A.; Muneer, A.; Chen, X. Relative and Absolute Quantitation in Mass Spectrometry-Based Proteomics. *Ann. Rev. Anal. Chem.* **2018**, *11* (1), 49–77.
- (2) Brandi, J.; Noberini, R.; Bonaldi, T.; Cecconi, D. Advances in enrichment methods for mass spectrometry-based proteomics analysis of post-translational modifications. *J. Chromatogr. A* **2022**, *1678*, No. 463352.
- (3) Timp, W.; Timp, G. Beyond mass spectrometry, the next step in proteomics. *Sci. Adv.* **2020**, *6* (2), No. eaax8978.
- (4) Parker, C. G.; Pratt, M. R. Click Chemistry in Proteomic Investigations. *Cell* **2020**, *180* (4), 605–632.
- (5) Gillet, L. C.; Leitner, A.; Aebersold, R. Mass Spectrometry Applied to Bottom-Up Proteomics: Entering the High-Throughput Era for Hypothesis Testing. *Ann. Rev. Anal. Chem.* **2016**, *9* (1), 449–472.
- (6) Addie, R. D.; Balluff, B.; Bovée, J. V. M. G.; Morreau, H.; McDonnell, L. A. Current State and Future Challenges of Mass Spectrometry Imaging for Clinical Research. *Anal. Chem.* **2015**, *87* (13), 6426–6433.
- (7) Reinders, J.; Lewandrowski, U.; Moebius, J.; Wagner, Y.; Sickmann, A. Challenges in mass spectrometry-based proteomics. *Proteomics* **2004**, *4* (12), 3686–3703.
- (8) Smits, A. H.; Vermeulen, M. Characterizing Protein–Protein Interactions Using Mass Spectrometry: Challenges and Opportunities. *Trends Biotechnol.* **2016**, *34* (10), 825–834.
- (9) Karch, K. R.; Snyder, D. T.; Harvey, S. R.; Wysocki, V. H. Native Mass Spectrometry: Recent Progress and Remaining Challenges. *Ann. Rev. Biophys.* **2022**, *51* (1), 157–179.
- (10) Zhang, F.; Ge, W.; Ruan, G.; Cai, X.; Guo, T. Data-Independent Acquisition Mass Spectrometry-Based Proteomics and Software Tools: A Glimpse in 2020. *Proteomics* **2020**, *20* (17–18), No. 1900276.
- (11) Furtwängler, B.; Uresin, N.; Motamedchaboki, K.; Huguet, R.; Lopez-Ferrer, D.; Zabrouskov, V.; Porse, B. T.; Schoof, E. M. Real-Time Search-Assisted Acquisition on a Tribrid Mass Spectrometer Improves Coverage in Multiplexed Single-Cell Proteomics. *Mol. Cell Proteomics* **2022**, *21* (4), No. 100219.

- (12) Lenz, C.; Urlaub, H. Separation methodology to improve proteome coverage depth. *Expert Rev. Proteomics* **2014**, *11* (4), 409–414.
- (13) Mao, Z.; Hu, C.; Li, Z.; Chen, Z. A reversed-phase/hydrophilic bifunctional interaction mixed-mode monolithic column with biphenyl and quaternary ammonium stationary phases for capillary electrochromatography. *Analyst* **2019**, *144* (14), 4386–4394.
- (14) Liang, Y.; Zhang, L.; Zhang, Y. Monolithic Materials-Based RPLC-MS for Proteoform Separation and Identification. In *Proteoform Identification: Methods and Protocols*; Sun, L.; Liu, X., Eds.; Springer US: New York, NY, 2022; pp 43–53.
- (15) Rozing, G. Micropillar array columns for advancing nanoflow HPLC. *Microchem. J.* **2021**, *170*, No. 106629.
- (16) Badgett, M. J.; Boyes, B.; Orlando, R. Predicting the Retention Behavior of Specific O-Linked Glycopeptides. *J. Biomol. Tech.* **2017**, *28* (3), 122–126.
- (17) Zhu, R.; Zacharias, L.; Wooding, K. M.; Peng, W.; Mechref, Y. Glycoprotein Enrichment Analytical Techniques: Advantages and Disadvantages. In *Methods in Enzymology*; Shukla, A. K., Ed.; Academic Press, 2017; Chapter 21, Vol. 585, pp 397–429.
- (18) Oss, M.; Krueve, A.; Herodes, K.; Leito, I. Electrospray Ionization Efficiency Scale of Organic Compounds. *Anal. Chem.* **2010**, *82* (7), 2865–2872.
- (19) Boersema, P. J.; Mohammed, S.; Heck, A. J. R. Hydrophilic interaction liquid chromatography (HILIC) in proteomics. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **2008**, *391* (1), 151–159.
- (20) Sun, Z.; Ji, F.; Jiang, Z.; Li, L. Improving deep proteome and PTMome coverage using tandem HILIC-HPRP peptide fractionation strategy. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **2019**, *411* (2), 459–469.
- (21) Badgett, M. J.; Boyes, B.; Orlando, R. Peptide retention prediction using hydrophilic interaction liquid chromatography coupled to mass spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr. A* **2018**, *1537*, 58–65.
- (22) Yeh, T.-T.; Ho, M.-Y.; Chen, W.-Y.; Hsu, Y.-C.; Ku, W.-C.; Tseng, H.-W.; Chen, S.-T.; Chen, S.-F. Comparison of different fractionation strategies for in-depth phosphoproteomics by liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **2019**, *411* (15), 3417–3424.
- (23) Cui, Y.; Tabang, D. N.; Zhang, Z.; Ma, M.; Alpert, A. J.; Li, L. Counterion Optimization Dramatically Improves Selectivity for Phosphopeptides and Glycopeptides in Electrostatic Repulsion-Hydrophilic Interaction Chromatography. *Anal. Chem.* **2021**, *93* (22), 7908–7916.
- (24) Cui, Y.; Yang, K.; Tabang, D. N.; Huang, J.; Tang, W.; Li, L. Finding the Sweet Spot in ERLIC Mobile Phase for Simultaneous Enrichment of N-Glyco and Phosphopeptides. *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* **2019**, *30* (12), 2491–2501.
- (25) Alpert, A. J. Electrostatic Repulsion Hydrophilic Interaction Chromatography for Isocratic Separation of Charged Solutes and Selective Isolation of Phosphopeptides. *Anal. Chem.* **2008**, *80* (1), 62–76.
- (26) Zhen, J.; Kim, J.; Zhou, Y.; Gaidamauskas, E.; Subramanian, S.; Feng, P. Antibody Characterization Using Novel ERLIC-MS/MS-Based Peptide Mapping. *mAbs* **2018**, *10* (7), 951–959, DOI: 10.1080/19420862.2018.1505179.
- (27) Yan, J.; Ding, J.; Jin, G.; Duan, Z.; Yang, F.; Li, D.; Zhou, H.; Li, M.; Guo, Z.; Chai, W.; Liang, X. Profiling of Human Milk Oligosaccharides for Lewis Epitopes and Secretor Status by Electrostatic Repulsion Hydrophilic Interaction Chromatography Coupled with Negative-Ion Electrospray Tandem Mass Spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.* **2019**, *91* (13), 8199–8206.
- (28) Qing, G.; Yan, J.; He, X.; Li, X.; Liang, X. Recent advances in hydrophilic interaction liquid chromatography materials for glycopeptide enrichment and glycan separation. *TrAC, Trends Anal. Chem.* **2020**, *124*, No. 115570.
- (29) Bermudez, A.; Pitteri, S. J. Enrichment of Intact Glycopeptides Using Strong Anion Exchange and Electrostatic Repulsion Hydrophilic Interaction Chromatography. In *Mass Spectrometry of Glycoproteins: Methods and Protocols*; Delobel, A., Ed.; Methods in Molecular Biology; Springer US: New York, NY, 2021; Vol. 2271, pp 107–120.
- (30) Alpert, A. J. Effect of salts on retention in hydrophilic interaction chromatography. *J. Chromatogr. A* **2018**, *1538*, 45–53.
- (31) West, C.; Auroux, E. Deconvoluting the effects of buffer salt concentration in hydrophilic interaction chromatography on a zwitterionic stationary phase. *J. Chromatogr. A* **2016**, *1461*, 92–97.
- (32) West, C.; Elfakir, C.; Lafosse, M. Porous graphitic carbon: A versatile stationary phase for liquid chromatography. *J. Chromatogr. A* **2010**, *1217* (19), 3201–3216.
- (33) Bapiro, T. E.; Richards, F. M.; Jodrell, D. I. Understanding the Complexity of Porous Graphitic Carbon (PGC) Chromatography: Modulation of Mobile-Stationary Phase Interactions Overcomes Loss of Retention and Reduces Variability. *Anal. Chem.* **2016**, *88* (12), 6190–6194.
- (34) Stavenhagen, K.; Hinneburg, H.; Kolarich, D.; Wührer, M. Site-Specific N- and O-Glycopeptide Analysis Using an Integrated C18-PGC-LC-ESI-QTOF-MS/MS Approach. In *High-Throughput Glycomics and Glycoproteomics: Methods and Protocols*; Lauc, G.; Wührer, M., Eds.; Springer New York: New York, NY, 2017; pp 109–119.
- (35) Jingjing, X. U.; Xing, L. I. U.; Hu, Z. H. O. U. Recent advances in separation methods for post-translational modification proteomics. *Chin. J. Chromatogr.* **2016**, *34* (12), 1199–1205.
- (36) Zhou, S.; Huang, Y.; Dong, X.; Peng, W.; Veillon, L.; Kitagawa, D. A. S.; Aquino, A. J. A.; Mechref, Y. Isomeric Separation of Permethylated Glycans by Porous Graphitic Carbon (PGC)-LC-MS/MS at High Temperatures. *Anal. Chem.* **2017**, *89* (12), 6590–6597.
- (37) Zhou, S.; Dong, X.; Veillon, L.; Huang, Y.; Mechref, Y. LC-MS/MS analysis of permethylated N-glycans facilitating isomeric characterization. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **2017**, *409* (2), 453–466.
- (38) Huang, Y.; Zhou, S.; Zhu, J.; Lubman David, M.; Mechref, Y. LC-MS/MS isomeric profiling of permethylated N-glycans derived from serum haptoglobin of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) and cirrhotic patients. *Electrophoresis* **2017**, *38* (17), 2160–2167.
- (39) Ashwood, C.; Lin, C.-H.; Thaysen-Andersen, M.; Packer, N. H. Discrimination of Isomers of Released N- and O-Glycans Using Diagnostic Product Ions in Negative Ion PGC-LC-ESI-MS/MS. *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* **2018**, *29* (6), 1194–1209.
- (40) Hinneburg, H.; Chatterjee, S.; Schirmeister, F.; Nguyen-Khuong, T.; Packer, N. H.; Rapp, E.; Thaysen-Andersen, M. Post-Column Make-Up Flow (PCMF) Enhances the Performance of Capillary-Flow PGC-LC-MS/MS-Based Glycomics. *Anal. Chem.* **2019**, *91* (7), 4559–4567.
- (41) Ashwood, C.; Pratt, B.; MacLean, B. X.; Gundry, R. L.; Packer, N. H. Standardization of PGC-LC-MS-based glycomics for sample specific glycotyping. *Analyst* **2019**, *144* (11), 3601–3612.
- (42) Ashwood, C.; Waas, M.; Weerasekera, R.; Gundry, R. L. Reference glycan structure libraries of primary human cardiomyocytes and pluripotent stem cell-derived cardiomyocytes reveal cell-type and culture stage-specific glycan phenotypes. *J. Mol. Cell. Cardiol.* **2020**, *139*, 33–46.
- (43) Wei, J.; Tang, Y.; Bai, Y.; Zaia, J.; Costello, C. E.; Hong, P.; Lin, C. Toward Automatic and Comprehensive Glycan Characterization by Online PGC-LC-EED MS/MS. *Anal. Chem.* **2020**, *92* (1), 782–791.
- (44) Chen, C.-H.; Lin, Y.-P.; Ren, C.-T.; Shivatare, S. S.; Lin, N.-H.; Wu, C.-Y.; Chen, C.-H.; Lin, J.-L. Enhancement of fucosylated N-glycan isomer separation with an ultrahigh column temperature in porous graphitic carbon liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr. A* **2020**, *1632*, No. 461610.
- (45) Riley, N. M.; Bertozzi, C. R.; Pitteri, S. J. A Pragmatic Guide to Enrichment Strategies for Mass Spectrometry-Based Glycoproteomics. *Mol. Cell Proteomics* **2021**, *20*, No. 100029.
- (46) Zhu, R.; Huang, Y.; Zhao, J.; Zhong, J.; Mechref, Y. Isomeric Separation of N-Glycopeptides Derived from Glycoproteins by Porous Graphitic Carbon (PGC) LC-MS/MS. *Anal. Chem.* **2020**, *92* (14), 9556–9565.
- (47) Delafield, D. G.; Miles, H. N.; Ricke, W. A.; Li, L. Higher Temperature Porous Graphitic Carbon Separations Differentially Impact Distinct Glycopeptide Classes. *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* **2023**, *34* (1), 64–74.

- (48) Delafield, D. G.; Miles, H. N.; Liu, Y.; Ricke, W. A.; Li, L. Complementary proteome and glycoproteome access revealed through comparative analysis of reversed phase and porous graphitic carbon chromatography. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **2022**, *414* (18), 5461–5472.
- (49) Liu, T. T.; Ewald, J. A.; Ricke, E. A.; Bell, R.; Collins, C.; Ricke, W. A. Modeling human prostate cancer progression in vitro. *Carcinogenesis* **2019**, *40* (7), 893–902.
- (50) Kong, A. T.; Leprevost, F. V.; Avtonomov, D. M.; Mellacheruvu, D.; Nesvizhskii, A. I. MSFragger: ultrafast and comprehensive peptide identification in mass spectrometry-based proteomics. *Nat. Methods* **2017**, *14* (5), 513–520.
- (51) Demichev, V.; Messner, C. B.; Vernardis, S. I.; Lilley, K. S.; Ralser, M. DIA-NN: neural networks and interference correction enable deep proteome coverage in high throughput. *Nat. Methods* **2020**, *17* (1), 41–44.
- (52) Keller, A.; Nesvizhskii, A. I.; Kolker, E.; Aebersold, R. Empirical Statistical Model To Estimate the Accuracy of Peptide Identifications Made by MS/MS and Database Search. *Anal. Chem.* **2002**, *74* (20), 5383–5392.
- (53) Wang, M.; Herrmann, C. J.; Simonovic, M.; Szklarczyk, D.; von Mering, C. Version 4.0 of PaxDb: Protein abundance data, integrated across model organisms, tissues, and cell-lines. *Proteomics* **2015**, *15* (18), 3163–3168.
- (54) Li, K. W.; Gonzalez-Lozano, M. A.; Koopmans, F.; Smit, A. B. Recent Developments in Data Independent Acquisition (DIA) Mass Spectrometry: Application of Quantitative Analysis of the Brain Proteome. *Front. Mol. Neurosci.* **2020**, *13*, No. 564446, DOI: 10.3389/fnmol.2020.564446.
- (55) Meyer, J. G.; Schilling, B. Clinical applications of quantitative proteomics using targeted and untargeted data-independent acquisition techniques. *Expert Rev. Proteomics* **2017**, *14* (5), 419–429.
- (56) Meyer, J. G.; Niemi, N. M.; Pagliarini, D. J.; Coon, J. J. Quantitative shotgun proteome analysis by direct infusion. *Nat. Methods* **2020**, *17* (12), 1222–1228.
- (57) Ludwig, C.; Gillet, L.; Rosenberger, G.; Amon, S.; Collins, B. C.; Aebersold, R. Data-independent acquisition-based SWATH-MS for quantitative proteomics: a tutorial. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* **2018**, *14* (8), No. e8126.
- (58) Cox, J.; Hein, M. Y.; Luber, C. A.; Paron, I.; Nagaraj, N.; Mann, M. Accurate proteome-wide label-free quantification by delayed normalization and maximal peptide ratio extraction, termed MaxLFQ. *Mol. Cell Proteomics* **2014**, *13* (9), 2513–26.