Supplementary Materials for:

Scribe: next generation library searching for DDA experiments

Brian C. Searle^{1, 2, 3, 4*}, Ariana E. Shannon^{1, 2, 3}, and Damien Beau Wilburn^{1, 2, 3}

¹Department of Biomedical Informatics, The Ohio State University Medical Center, Columbus, Ohio 43210, United States.

²Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, United States.

³Pelotonia Institute for Immuno-Oncology, The Ohio State University Comprehensive Cancer Center, Columbus, Ohio 43210, United States. ⁴Proteome Software Inc., Portland, OR

*Corresponding Address: Brian C. Searle, Ph.D., brian.searle@osumc.edu



Figure S1: Fragmentation examples of peptides with Scribe scores. Butterfly

fragmentation plots show acquired spectra on top and predicted spectra on bottom for five peptides at five different NCE settings. Each peptide was detected at a 1% peptide-level FDR in every NCE acquisition, and each form of that peptide was found within tight retention time windows of each other. This additional level of stringency ensures that the peptide detections are high quality matches even though some have very low scores.





Figure S3: Performance with tryptic PSMs. The number of peptide-spectrum matches (PSMs) detected by MSFragger, Scribe, or SpectraST in HeLa experiments acquired on an Exporis 480 at different NCE settings. Scribe and SpectraST were provided with either the Pan Human Library or Prosit predicted spectrum libraries tuned specifically for the acquired NCE setting on this instrument.



Figure S4: Scribe performance with entrapment searches. The number of unique peptides detected by Scribe in the first round (before retention time fitting, light color) or final round (after retention time fitting, dark color) using either a normal (blue) or a shuffled entrapment (orange) database search. The shuffled entrapment database doubles the size of the normal target/decoy search, and consequently Scribe detects slightly fewer peptides. Matches to the entrapment database are colored purple and the number of entrapment peptide hits is labeled above the bars. In all cases, the number of entrapment peptides is less than 1% of the total assigned peptides, matching the 1% peptide-level FDR.

Table S1:

#	Score Name	Score Description
1	averageParentDeltaMass	Average mass error of matched precursors (including isotopes) in PPM
2	averageFragmentDeltaMasses	Average mass error of matched fragments in PPM
3	DotProduct	$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(A_i * L_i \right)$
4	contrastAngle	$1 - (2 * acos(DotProduct))/\pi$
5	logit	log(DotProduct)/(1 - DotProduct)
6	primary	<pre>log(DotProduct) * !(numberOfMatchingPeaks)</pre>
7	xCorrLib	XCorr comparing against Sequest normalized library spectrum
8	xCorrModel	XCorr comparing against Sequest model spectrum
9	scribeScore	$- ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(A_i - L_i \right)^2 \right)$
10	numberOfMatchingPeaks	Total number of matching peaks between library and acquired spectra
11	isotopeDotProduct	Normalized DotProduct of acquired and predicted precursor isotope intensities
12	percentBlankOverMono	Precursor isotope-1 intensity divided by the monoisotopic intensity
13	numberPrecursorMatch	Number of precursor isotopes with >0 intensity (up to 3)
14	logSp	Log ₁₀ of the Sp score from Sequest
15	maxLadderLength	Maximum connected fragment ions in a ladder
16	eValue	E-value of scribeScore as calculated by the Fenyo et al 2003 method
17	deltaScore	(bestScribeScore - secondBestScribeScore) / (bestScribeScore + 10)
18	numConsidered	Total number of candidate library entries considered
19	chargeMatch	1 if acquired charge matches library entry, 0 if mismatch