## SUPPLEMENTAL

Supplemental Table I. The whole model of a set of 24 LC-ESI-MS/MS experiments at the level of sample treatments, proteins, peptides and parent and fragment ion types. A model total of 48,198 log transformed parent fragment ions intensity values identified by fragment $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ values by X!TANDEM resulting in 822 observations of 302 peptides from 119 proteins separated over 24 column fractions. The probability that the transformed LC-ESI-MS/MS data fails to show significant variation apparently approaches zero. Note the differences between sample treatments and proteins achieved an F value of 1930 and 234 respectively indicating the approach shows great statistical power. The data from 12 QA and 12 PS column pH fractions are shown.

## Analysis of Variance $\log$ peptide or fragment intensity

| Source | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Model | 338 | 22564.545 | 66.7590 | 213.1918 |
| Error | 47859 | 14986.598 | 0.3131 | Prob $>$ F |
| C. Total | 48197 | 37551.143 |  | $0.0000^{*}$ |

## Effect Tests

| Source | Nparm | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | F Ratio | Prob > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| sample treatment | 24 | 23 | 1930.0361 | 267.9774 | $0.0000^{*}$ |
| Protein accession number | 118 | 11 | 224.1555 | 65.0755 | $<.0001^{*}$ |
| Peptide sequence | 301 | 196 | 9243.4962 | 150.6055 | $0.0000^{*}$ |
| ion type (peptide versus fragment) | 1 | 1 | 2773.6519 | 8857.528 | $0.0000^{*}$ |

Supplemental Table II. The one way ANOVA tables from the 24 column fractions with 119 proteins and 302 peptides from a set of LC-ESI-MS/MS Chromatography fraction samples. From the 24 column fractions, 15 difference groups were revealed (see Panel D). From the 119 protein identified in the small experiment, 52 groups of pair wise differences were obtained (see supplemental data tables). From the 302 peptide sequences identified in the small experiment, approximately 145 groups of pair wise differences were obtained (see supplemental data tables). The data from 12 QA and 12 PS column pH fractions are shown.

## A, Analysis of variance of column fractions

| Source | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio | Prob > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| sample treatment | 24 | 6617.320 | 275.722 | 429.3792 | $0.0000^{*}$ |
| Error | 48173 | 30933.823 | 0.642 |  |  |
| C. Total | 48197 | 37551.143 |  |  |  |

B, Analysis of variance of proteins

| Source | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio | Prob $>$ F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Protein accession number | 118 | 6863.040 | 58.1614 | 91.1213 | $0.0000^{*}$ |
| Error | 48079 | 30688.102 | 0.6383 |  |  |
| C. Total | 48197 | 37551.143 |  |  |  |

## C, Analysis of variance of peptides

| Source | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio | Prob $>$ F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peptide sequence | 301 | 17381.928 | 57.7473 | 137.1329 | $0.0000^{*}$ |
| Error | 47896 | 20169.215 | 0.4211 |  |  |
| C. Total | 48197 | 37551.143 |  |  |  |

D, Means Comparisons for all fraction pairs using Tukey-Kramer HSD


[^0]Supplemental Table III. Whole model and one way ANOVA of Complement C3 at the level of sample treatment, peptides and ion type (parent versus fragment). The data from 12 QA and 12 PS column $\mathbf{p H}$ fractions are shown. Portions of the SAS output are shown without modification.

A, Whole model ANOVA

| Source | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Model | 9 | 765.42394 | 85.0471 | 529.4423 |
| Error | 1067 | 171.39783 | 0.1606 | Prob $>$ F |
| C. Total | 1076 | 936.82177 |  | $0.0000^{*}$ |


| Source | Nparm | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | F Ratio | Prob $>$ F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| FileName | 3 | 3 | 197.09233 | 408.9852 | $<.0001^{*}$ |
| PeptideSequence | 5 | 5 | 37.99711 | 47.3085 | $<.0001^{*}$ |
| parent versus fragment | 1 | 1 | 58.27820 | 362.7983 | $<.0001^{*}$ |

B, One way ANOVA of $\log$ transformed parent intensity values from complement C3 across sample treatments

| Source | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio | Prob $>$ F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| FileName | 3 | 12.518440 | 4.17281 | 32.7114 | $<.0001^{*}$ |
| Error | 12 | 1.530773 | 0.12756 |  |  |
| C. Total | 15 | 14.049213 |  |  |  |

C, One way ANOVA of log transformed parent and fragment intensity values from complement C 3 across sample treatments.

| Source | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio | Prob > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| sample treatment | 3 | 667.46243 | 222.487 | 886.2847 | $<.0001^{*}$ |
| Error | 1073 | 269.35934 | 0.251 |  |  |
| C. Total | 1076 | 936.82177 |  |  |  |

D, One way ANOVA of log transformed fragment intensity values from the many complement C3 peptides across sample treatments.

| Source | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio | Prob > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| sample treatment | 3 | 655.64324 | 218.548 | 1113.874 | $0.0000^{*}$ |
| Error | 1057 | 207.38875 | 0.196 |  |  |
| C. Total | 1060 | 863.03199 |  |  |  |

Figure Legends


Supplemental Figure 1. Fit of the gamma function to parent and fragment intensity values with and without Log transformation. Panels: A, the gamma function fitted to the distribution of the raw parent intensity values; B , the distribution of the parent intensity data plotted along the gamma function probability plot; C , the gamma function fitted to the log transformed parent intensity distribution; D , the distribution of the transformed parent intensity data plotted along the gamma function probability plot; E, the gamma function fitted to the distribution of the raw fragment intensity values; F , the distribution of the fragment intensity data plotted along the gamma function probability plot; G , the gamma function fitted to the log transformed fragment intensity distribution; $H$, the distribution of the transformed fragment intensity data plotted along the gamma function probability plot.


Supplementary Figure 2. Cartesian plot of peptide and protein expectation scores showing the distribution of peptides that are associated with expectation values of E-2 (p $\leq 0.01$ ). The arrows indicate the location of the E-2 values for peptides and proteins. data outside the small enclose space near the origin have expectation values of $p \leq 0.01$ or less.



Analysis of Variance

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio | Prob $>$ F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Column | 1 | 3035.421 | 3035.42 | 4238.507 | $<.0001^{*}$ |
| Error | 48196 | 34515.722 | 0.72 |  |  |
| C. Total | 48197 | 37551.143 |  |  |  |

Supplemental Figure 3. Oneway Analysis of all log peptide or fragment intensity by Column resin. A portion of the unmodified SAS output for all peptides compared over the QA and PS chromatography is shown.



Analysis of Variance

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio | Prob > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| column type | 1 | 601.8619 | 601.862 | 642.4175 | $<.0001^{*}$ |
| Error | 2041 | 1912.1522 | 0.937 |  |  |
| C. Total | 2042 | 2514.0140 |  |  |  |

Supplemental Figure 4. Oneway Analysis of all Apolipoprotein AI log peptide or fragment intensity by column resin. A portion of the unmodified SAS output for all Apolipoprotein AI peptides by column is shown.

See also supplemental data tables for one-way ANOVA results with Tukey-Kramer HSD test for nominal proteins, peptides or ordinal $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}$ values and the table of peptides and proteins.


[^0]:    Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

