Abstract

An abstract abstracts the thesis...

Zusammenfassung

Eine Zusammenfassung fasst die Arbeit zusammen...

Contents

1 Background

In this chapter, the fundamental principles of mass spectrometry-based proteomics and the computational strategies for peptide identification are discussed. Particular focus is placed on the challenges introduced by chemical labeling and the emergence of deep learning models in *de novo* sequencing.

1.1 Mass Spectrometry-Based Proteomics

1.1.1 Bottom-Up Proteomics Workflow

Mass spectrometry (MS)-based proteomics is the gold standard for large-scale protein analysis. The "bottom-up" approach is the most widely adopted strategy, where proteins are extracted and enzymatically digested—typically using trypsin—into smaller peptides before analysis [4]. This is essential as peptides are more easily fractionated and ionized than intact proteins. The resulting mixture is separated via liquid chromatography (LC) and ionized using Electrospray Ionization (ESI) [1].

1.1.2 Tandem Mass Spectrometry (MS/MS) and Peptide Fragment Ion Theory

Peptide sequences are identified using Tandem Mass Spectrometry (MS/MS). A precursor ion is isolated by its mass-to-charge ratio (m/z) and fragmented, often using Higher-energy Collisional Dissociation (HCD) [10].

According to fragment ion theory, the peptide backbone fragments primarily at amide bonds, resulting in b-ions (N-terminal) and y-ions (C-terminal) [9]. The mass difference between consecutive ions in a series corresponds to specific amino acids. However, post-translational modifications (PTMs) or chemical labels like Tandem Mass Tags (TMT) shift these masses, requiring advanced computational identification.

1.2 Peptide Identification Strategies

1.2.1 Database Search Engines (DBIS)

The most common identification method is database searching. Engines like MaxQuant or SEQUEST compare experimental MS/MS spectra against *in silico* digested sequences from databases like UniProt [2, 3]. While robust, DBIS is limited by the "search space" problem: it cannot identify modifications not explicitly included in the database, leading to missed novel PTMs [7].

1.2.2 Principles of De Novo Peptide Sequencing

In contrast, *de novo* sequencing reconstructs sequences directly from fragment ion peaks without a reference database [11]. While historically limited by noise, modern Transformer-based models now capture long-range dependencies between ions, making this approach ideal for discovering novel PTMs and variants in the "dark proteome" [13].

1.3 Tandem Mass Tag (TMT) Labeling

1.3.1 Isobaric Labeling Chemistry

Tandem Mass Tag (TMT) labeling is used for high-throughput multiplexed quantification. TMT tags are isobaric, meaning labeled peptides from different samples appear as a single peak in MS1 scans, reducing instrument time and missing values [12, 15].

1.3.2 Impact on Fragmentation Patterns

TMT tags introduce systematic mass shifts to the N-terminus and lysine side chains. Upon fragmentation, they release reporter ions (m/z 126–135) for quantification [6]. For *de novo* sequencing, these tags are challenging because they alter fragmentation efficiency and shift b- and y-ion series significantly [5].

1.4 Deep Learning and Transformer Models

The identification of peptides is a sequence-to-sequence (Seq2Seq) task. While early models used LSTMs [13], the Transformer architecture revolutionized the field with the Self-Attention mechanism [14].

In a proteomic context, the Transformer's encoder extracts structural features from continuous m/z and intensity values through point-based encoding [16]. The decoder then uses Beam Search to maintain a set of the k most likely sequences, ensuring the final result is globally consistent with the precursor mass [8].

2 Materials and Methods

3 Results and Discussion

4 Conclusion

Bibliography

[1] R. Aebersold and M. Mann. "Mass-spectrometry-based proteomics." In: *Nature* 537.7620 (2016), pp. 347–355. DOI: 10.1038/nature19949.

[2] J. Cox and M. Mann. "MaxQuant enables high peptide identification rates, individualized p.p.b.-range mass accuracies and proteome-wide protein quantification." In: *Nature Biotechnology* 26.12 (2008), pp. 1367–1372. DOI: 10.1038/nbt.1511.

[3] J. K. Eng, A. L. McCormack, and J. R. Yates. "An approach to correlate tandem mass spectral data of peptides with amino acid sequences in a protein database." In: *Journal of the American Society for Mass Spectrometry* 5.11 (1994), pp. 976–989. DOI: 10.1016/1044-0305(94)80016-2.

[4] S. A. Gevaert and J. Vandekerckhove. "Protein identification methods in proteomics." In: *Protein Science* 12.9 (2003), pp. 1913–1925. DOI: 10.1110/ps.0309203.

[5] J. P. Hogrebe, C. F. von Hagel, et al. "The impact of TMT labeling on the fragmentation of peptides." In: *Journal of Proteomics* 175 (2018), pp. 130–139. DOI: 10.1016/j.jprot.2017.11.012.

[6] G. C. McAlister, D. P. Nusinow, et al. "MultiNotch MS3 enables accurate, sensitive, and multiplexed detection of differential expression across cancer cell lines." In: *Analytical Chemistry* 86.14 (2014), pp. 7150–7158. DOI: 10.1021/ac502040v.

[7] A. I. Nesvizhskii. "A survey of computational methods and error rate estimation procedures for peptide and protein identification in shotgun proteomics." In: *Journal of Proteomics* 73.11 (2010), pp. 2092–2123. DOI: 10.1016/j.jprot.2010.08.009.

[8] R. Qiao et al. *Computationally efficient de novo peptide sequencing via a transformer-based model*. arXiv:2104.14501. 2021.

[9] R. Roepstorff. "All beginnings are easy: The early steps of peptide fragmentation." In: *Journal of the American Society for Mass Spectrometry* 21.7 (2010), pp. 1085–1090. DOI: 10.1016/j.jasms.2010.04.001.

[10] H. Steen and M. Mann. "The ABC's (and XYZ's) of peptide sequencing." In: *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* 5.9 (2004), pp. 699–711. DOI: 10.1038/nrm1468.

[11] J. A. Taylor and R. S. Johnson. "Sequence databases: a new iterative method for predicting amino acid sequences from tandem mass spectra." In: *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry* 11.10 (1997), pp. 1067–1075. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0231(19970630)11:10<1067::AID-RCM946>3.0.CO;2-9.

[12] A. Thompson, J. Schäfer, et al. "Tandem mass tags: a novel quantification strategy for comparative analysis of complex protein mixtures by MS/MS." In: *Analytical Chemistry* 75.8 (2003), pp. 1895–1904. DOI: 10.1021/ac0262560.

[13] N. H. Tran, R. Qiao, et al. "Deep learning enables de novo peptide sequencing from data-independent-acquisition mass spectrometry." In: *Nature Methods* 16.1 (2019), pp. 63–66. DOI: 10.1038/s41592-018-0260-3.

[14] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, et al. "Attention is all you need." In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 30. 2017.

[15] T. Werner, I. Becher, et al. "High-resolution sampled 10-plex TMT for proteomics." In: *Analytical Chemistry* 86.14 (2014), pp. 7025–7031. DOI: 10.1021/ac501510y.

[16] M. Yilmaz, W. Fondrie, et al. "De novo peptide sequencing with deep learning." In: *Nature Methods* 20.2 (2023), pp. 276–282. DOI: 10.1038/s41592-022-01712-9.