1	Unveiling molecular signatures of preeclampsia and gestational
2	diabetes mellitus with multi-omics and innovative cheminformatics
3	visualization tools
4	Melanie T. Odenkirk <sup>1</sup> , Kelly G. Stratton <sup>2</sup> , Marina A. Gritsenko <sup>3</sup> , Lisa M. Bramer <sup>2</sup> , Bobbie-Jo M. Webb-
5	Robertson <sup>3,4</sup> , Kent J. Bloodsworth <sup>3</sup> , Karl K. Weitz <sup>3</sup> , Anna K. Lipton <sup>3</sup> , Matthew E. Monroe <sup>3</sup> , Jeremy
6	Ash <sup>1,5,6</sup> , Denis Fourches <sup>1,5*</sup> , Brandie D. Taylor <sup>7*</sup> , Kristin E. Burnum-Johnson <sup>8*</sup> , Erin S. Baker <sup>1*</sup>
7	
8	<sup>1</sup> Department of Chemistry, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695
9	<sup>2</sup> National Security Division, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA 99354
10	<sup>3</sup> Biological Sciences Division, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA 99354
11	<sup>4</sup> Department of Biostatistics and Informatics, University of Colorado, Aurora, CO 80045
12	<sup>5</sup> Bioinformatics Research Center, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695
13	<sup>6</sup> Department of Statistics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695
14	<sup>7</sup> College of Public Health, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19133
15	<sup>8</sup> Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA
16	99354
17	
18	*Commente a l'income d'anne
19	Co-corresponding authors:
20	Denis Fourches Correspondence: dfourch@necu edu
21	Correspondence. drouren@nesu.edu
22	Brandie D. Taylor
23 24	Correspondence: h depaoli-taylor@temple.edu
2 <del>4</del> 25	correspondence. 0.depuor-mytor@temple.edu
26	Kristin E. Burnum-Johnson
27	Correspondence: kristin burnum-johnson@pnnl gov
28	5 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
29	Erin S. Baker
30	Correspondence: ebaker@ncsu.edu
31	· · ·
32	

## 33 Supplementary Materials





**Figure S1. Complication vs. Control outlier assessment.** RMD-PAV (left) identifies LC-MS datasets that are extreme deviants from the remaining datasets (above red line) for negative ion lipidomics (a), positive ion lipidomics (b) and proteomics (c) statistical analysis. Heatmap of Pearson correlation (right) confirms one control patient outliers for proteomics, three PRE outliers for negative ion lipidomics and one GDM outlier was removed from positive ion lipidomics.

- 35
- 36 37

38

Table S1- Clinical Information. Expansion of patient cohort information for GDM,PRE and Control patients provided in Table 1. Each row represents clinical informationfor each of the 186 patients analyzed by LC-IMS-MS analysis, with identification numbersfor each patient given in column B. Variable descriptions are given across row 1.

39 40 41

42

Table S2- HPLC Gradient. HPLC gradient and column wash profiles used for the lipidomic LC analyses.

Election Conditiont

Elution Gradient					
Time (min)	% MPA	% MPB	Flow Rate (mL/min)		
0	60	40	0.25		

2	50	50	0.25
3	40	60	0.25
12	30	70	0.25
15	25	75	0.25
17	22	78	0.25
19	15	85	0.25
22	8	92	0.25
25	1	99	0.25
34	1	99	0.25

Column Wash				
Time (min)	% MPA	% MPB	Flow Rate (mL/min)	
34.5	60	40	0.3	
35	1	99	0.3	
35.5	1	99	0.3	
36	60	40	0.35	
37	60	40	0.3	
38	60	40	0.25	

43 44

Table S3 - Filtered Proteins. List of all identified proteins following peptide filtering. Column A through C, protein reference number, accession number and name are given for 45 all identified proteins. Column D through E, protein peptide count and number of unique 46 peptides. Columns E-H, results of differential abundance analysis comparing control to 47 GDM (columns F,G) and PRE (columns H,I) samples (F,H = p-values; G,I =  $\log_2$  fold 48 changes). Adjusted p-values are from ANOVA (quantitative comparison) with a Dunnett 49 test correction. Column J-K, flags for statistical significance based on ANOVA and q-test 50 analyses with p-value < or = 0.05 for GDM (J) and PRE (K). 0=does not meet criteria for 51 statistical significance by ANOVA or g-test; ++ =meets criteria for statistical significance 52 by Holm-adjust g-test and case is upregulated compared to control; + =meets criteria for 53 statistical significance by ANOVA and case is upregulated compared to control; - =meets 54 criteria for statistical significance by ANOVA and case is downregulated compared to 55 control; -- =meets criteria for statistical significance by Holm-adjust g-test and case is 56 downregulated compared to control (only proteomics). Columns L-GN, patient log<sub>2</sub> 57 normalized protein abundances. Protein sequence coverage (GO) with associated peptides 58 (GP) identified by mass spectrometry. 59 60

Table S4 - More Sig Protein. List of all statistically significant proteins for either
complication vs. control comparison. Columns B, C, D and E contain protein reference
number and uniprot annotations. Column F and G, GDM vs. Control (F) and PRE vs.
Control (G) Flag annotations. Columns H and I, peptide coverage of total (H) and unique

65 (I) peptides. Columns O-U, additional information for significant proteins that met filtering 66 requirements.

Table S5 - Lipidomics. List of all statistically significant lipids for either complication 68 vs. control comparison. Column A, Lipid species identified in plasma. Isomers whose 69 peaks are separated in retention time are annotated with '\*' and '\*\*'. Multiple lipid 70 identifications from the same MS/MS spectra are separated by a semi-colon. Note that some 71 of the lipid species identified in positive ionization were also identified in negative 72 ionization. Mode of ionization is specified in column D. Column B, the sum of carbons 73 composing the chains (fatty acid and long base for sphingolipids). Column C, the sum of 74 number of double bonds composing the chains (fatty acid and long base for sphingolipids). 75 Columns E-H, results of differential abundance analysis comparing control to GDM 76 (columns E,F) and PRE (columns G,H) samples (E,G = p-values; F,H =  $\log_2$  fold changes). 77 78 Adjusted p-values are from ANOVA (quantitative comparison) with a Dunnett test correction. Column J-K, flags for statistical significance based on p-value < or = 0.05 for 79 GDM (J) and PRE (K). 0=does not meet criteria for statistical significance by ANOVA or 80 g-test; + =meets criteria for statistical significance by ANOVA and case is upregulated 81 compared to control; - =meets criteria for statistical significance by ANOVA and case is 82 downregulated compared to control. Columns O-GR, normalized, log<sub>2</sub> transformed values 83 (1 column per sample) of control (O-DC) and GDM (DD-EU) and PRE (EV- GR). For 84 negative mode lipidomics, three samples were determined to be outliers (TAM 7194, PE; 85 TAM 721, PE; TAM 7635, GDM) and were not included for statistical analysis of negative 86 ion lipidomics results. For negative mode lipidomics, one sample was determined to be an 87 outlier (TAM 205, GDM) and was not included for statistical analysis for positive ion 88 lipidomics results. 89 90

Table S6- GDM vs. PRE test. Statistical output for GDM vs. PRE comparison. 91 Statistical analyses were conducted using an unpaired t-test on proteomics, negative 92 lipidomics and positive lipidomics separately to assess disease differentiation between 93 pregnancy complication PRE and GDM (GDM v. PRE). Species that were significant in 94 original disease versus control comparisons are specified in Column A. Subsequent 95 statistical results are outlined in columns B-E. Column F-H, flags for statistical significance 96 based on p-value < or = 0.05 for GDM v. PRE (F), GDM vs. Ctrl (G) and PRE vs. Ctrl (H). 97 0=does not meet criteria for statistical significance by ANOVA or g-test; ++ =meets criteria 98 for statistical significance by Holm-adjust g-test and case is upregulated compared to control 99 (only proteomics); + =meets criteria for statistical significance by ANOVA and case is 100 upregulated compared to control; - =meets criteria for statistical significance by ANOVA 101 and case is downregulated compared to control: -- =meets criteria for statistical significance 102 by Holm-adjust g-test and case is downregulated compared to control (only proteomics). 103

104

67

105Table S7- STRING Enrichment. Functionally enriched biological processes of106significant proteins in Complication versus Control comparisons.

	Go Term	Biological Process	Count in Gene Set	False Discovery Rate
1882 8. 483 882 6. 67 6. 67	GO:0042981	regulation of apoptotic process	24 of 1501	0.0119
	GO:0060326	cell chemotaxis	7 of 183	0.0097
	GO:0006957	complement activation, alternative pathway	5 of 13	6.07E-06
	GO:0006956	complement activation	12 of 49	5.06E-12
	GO:0019835	cytolysis	5 of 32	0.00021
E	GO:0006887	exocytosis	43 of 774	1.86E-20
Ы	GO:0042730	fibrinolysis	6 of 21	1.71E-06
	GO:0007596	blood coagulation	21 of 288	6.02E-12
	GO:0006954	inflammatory response	26 of 482	4.57E-12
	GO:0045087	innate immune response	26 of 676	3.07E-09
	GO:0006869	lipid transport	9 of 272	0.0057
	GO:0006810	transport	73 of 4130	1.69E-10
	GO:0007155	cell adhesion	20 of 843	0.00039
	GO:0033344	cholesterol efflux	3 of 24	0.0073
Z	GO:0006954	inflammatory response	8 of 482	0.0144
Q	GO:0045087	innate immune response	8 of 676	0.0447
9	GO:0006810	transport	28 of 4130	0.0188
	GO:0006950	response to stress	27 of 3267	0.0042
	GO:0007155	cell adhesion	12 of 843	0.0063