

Guidelines for reporting the use of gel electrophoresis in proteomics

To the editor:

We wish to alert your readers to the MIAPE Gel Electrophoresis (MIAPE-GE) guidelines specifying the minimum information that should be provided when reporting the use of *n*-dimensional gel electrophoresis in a proteomics experiment. Developed through a joint effort between the gel-based analysis working group of the Human Proteome Organisation's Proteomics Standards Initiative (HUPO-PSI; <http://www.psdev.info/>) and the wider proteomics community, they constitute one part of the overall Minimum Information about a Proteomics Experiment (MIAPE) documentation system published last August in *Nature Biotechnology*¹.

MIAPE-GE comprises a checklist of information that should be provided about gel electrophoresis performed in the course of generating a data set that is submitted to a public repository or when

such an experimental step is reported in a scientific publication (for instance, in the materials and methods section; see **Box 1**). MIAPE-GE specifies neither the format in which information should be transferred



nor the structure of any repository or document. However, HUPO-PSI is not developing the MIAPE modules in isolation; several compatible data exchange standards are now well established and supported both by public databases and by data processing software in proteomics. MIAPE-GE will be implemented by public repositories, such

as PRIDE, Swiss2DPAGE and Gelbank, and the PSI's GelML data format is designed to support MIAPE-GE-compliant submission².

Gel electrophoresis facilitates the separation of protein (or peptide) mixtures, usually in a gel matrix under the application of an electric field. MIAPE-GE contains a glossary (**Supplementary Table 1** online) specifying the minimum

information to report about a gel electrophoresis experiment so as to enable the extraction of the maximum value from data generated, specifically addressing: gel matrix manufacture and preparation; running conditions; visualization techniques, such as staining; the method of image capture; and a technical description of the image obtained. The module does not explicitly cover sample preparation, although it requires the recording of which samples were loaded onto a gel and whether the protein complement had been labeled. Neither does the module cover the informatics process or the analysis of digitized gel images; this is addressed in a separate module, MIAPE-GI (Gel Informatics). These and other items falling outside the scope of this module may be captured in complementary modules, the latest versions of which can be obtained from the MIAPE home page.

These guidelines are intended to evolve, and readers are directed to MIAPE homepage (<http://www.psdev.info/miape/>) to check compliance with the most up-to-date version. They may also view the most recent version of MIAPE-GE at the module's homepage (<http://www.psdev.info/miape/ge/>); the content at the time of publication can be found in **Supplementary Table 1** online.

Note: Supplementary information is available on the Nature Biotechnology website.

Frank Gibson¹, Leigh Anderson², Gyorgy Babnigg³, Mark Baker⁴, Matthias Berth⁵, Pierre-Alain Binz^{6,7}, Andy Borthwick⁸, Phil Cash⁹, Billy W Day¹⁰, David B Friedman¹¹, Donita Garland¹², Howard B Gutstein¹³, Christine Hoogland⁶, Neil A Jones¹⁴, Alamgir Khan⁴, Joachim Klose¹⁵, Angus I Lamond¹⁶, Peter F Lemkin¹⁷, Kathryn S Lilley¹⁸, Jonathan Minden¹⁹, Nicholas J Morris¹, Norman W Paton²⁰, Michael R Pisano²¹, John E Prime²², Thierry Rabilloud²³, David A Stead²⁴, Chris F Taylor^{25,26}, Hans Voshol²⁷, Anil Wipat²⁸ & Andrew R Jones²⁹

¹Institute for Cell and Molecular Biosciences, The Medical School, University of Newcastle, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK. ²Plasma Proteome Institute, PO Box 21466, Washington, DC 20009-1466, USA. ³Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 S. Cass Ave., Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA. ⁴Australian Proteome Analysis Facility Ltd.

Box 1 Content snapshot for MIAPE-GE

The full MIAPE-GE document is divided into three parts: an introduction providing background and context; a summary list of the items to be reported; and a glossary with definitions and examples.

The MIAPE-GE guidelines themselves are subdivided as follows:

1. General features. Initiation date; contact information for the data set; type of electrophoresis.
2. Sample. The material applied to the gel matrix and its role; labels or tags used; loading buffer.
3. Gel matrix and electrophoresis. Physicochemical components and properties of the gel matrix; electrophoresis protocol.
4. Inter-dimension process. Any process or processes carried out between the running of separation dimensions, such as equilibration, or reduction and alkylation.
5. Detection process. Examples include direct methods such as staining proteins on the gel and indirect methods such as exposing a gel matrix containing a radiolabeled sample to photographic film or the transfer of proteins to an alternate matrix (e.g., immunoblotting).
6. Image acquisition. Equipment and procedure used to capture a digitized representation of an electrophoresed gel matrix and sample, or a detection medium.
7. Image. Descriptors for the digitized image produced as a result of the Image Acquisition, such as name and dimensions, resolution and bit-depth.

and Department of Chemistry & Biomolecular Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia. ⁵Decodon, GmbH W.-Rathenau-Str., 49a, 17489 Greifswald, Germany. ⁶Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, 1 Rue Michel-Servet, CH-1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland. ⁷GeneBio SA, 25 Av. de Champel, CH-1206 Geneva, Switzerland. ⁸Nonlinear Dynamics, Cuthbert House, All Saints, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE1 2ET Newcastle, UK. ⁹Department of Medical Microbiology, University of Aberdeen, Foresterhill, Aberdeen AB25 2ZD, UK. ¹⁰Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Department of Chemistry, Proteomics Core Lab University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA. ¹¹Mass Spectrometry Research Center, Proteomics Laboratory, 465 21st Ave S. Room 9160, Medical Research Building III, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37232, USA. ¹²National Eye Institute, National Institutes of Health, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, USA. ¹³Departments of Anesthesiology and Molecular Genetics, University of Texas-MD Anderson Cancer Center, 1515 Holcombe Blvd., Houston, Texas 77030, USA. ¹⁴Disease & Biomarker Proteomics, Genomic and Proteomic Sciences, Genetics Research, GlaxoSmithKline R&D, Stevenage, Herts SG1 2NY, UK. ¹⁵Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Institute of Human Genetics, D-13353 Berlin, Germany. ¹⁶Wellcome Trust Biocentre MSI/WTB Complex, University of Dundee, Dow Street, Dundee, DD1 5EH, UK. ¹⁷National Cancer Institute, Building 469, Room 150B, Frederick,

Maryland 21702, USA. ¹⁸Cambridge Centre for Proteomics, Department of Biochemistry, University of Cambridge, Tennis Court Road, Cambridge, CB2 1QR, UK. ¹⁹Carnegie Mellon University, 4400 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA. ²⁰School of Computer Science, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, UK. ²¹Proteomic Research Services, Inc., 4401 Varsity Drive, Suite E, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108, USA. ²²KuDOS Pharmaceuticals, 327 Cambridge Science Park, Milton Road, Cambridge, CB4 0WG, UK. ²³DRDC/ICH, INSERM U548, CEA-Grenoble, 17, rue des martyrs, F-38054 Grenoble, CEDEX 9, France. ²⁴Aberdeen Proteomics, School of Medical Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, IMS Building, Foresterhill, Aberdeen AB25 2ZD, UK. ²⁵EMBL Outstation, European Bioinformatics Institute, Wellcome Trust Genome Campus, Hinxton, Cambridge, UK. ²⁶NERC Environmental Bioinformatics Centre, Mansfield Road, Oxford, OX1 3SR, UK. ²⁷Novartis Institutes for Biomedical Research, 250 Mass Ave., Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA. ²⁸School of Computing Science, 8th Floor, Claremont Tower, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK. ²⁹Department of Pre-clinical Veterinary Science, Faculty of Veterinary Science, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 7ZJ, UK. e-mail: frank.gibson@ncl.ac.uk

1. Taylor, C.F. et al. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **25**, 887–893 (2007).
2. Jones, A.R. & Gibson, F. *Proteomics* **7** Suppl 1, 35–40 (2007).

decomposition products ordered by mass difference⁶. These web resources were not designed to provide the consistent, hierarchically ordered definitions that are required to support dissemination of data under the PSI data exchange standards. Mass spectrometry-based protein identification and structural characterization software, from public or commercial sources, use dedicated or proprietary databases of modifications that do not provide the required hierarchically ordered definitions. Researchers find it difficult to integrate protein modification data because the underlying terms and criteria they rely on are incompatible. As in other areas of proteomics, research is hampered by the fragmentation of publicly available information. Protein modification data, in particular, is sometimes difficult to interpret because of the frequent use of different nomenclatures or ways of describing protein modifications, especially when experimental methods give ambiguous or incomplete determinations of those modifications. A community effort is required to deal with these difficulties.

Two PSI working groups, Proteomics Informatics (PSI-PI) and Molecular Interactions (PSI-MI), are developing data exchange standards⁷ that provide a community consensus based on a standard data exchange document format specified in an XML (extensible markup language) schema, hierarchical controlled vocabularies relating to the data schema in the Open Biomedical Ontologies (OBO) file format⁸ and minimum requirement recommendations for release of data in the public domain. In the development of these standards, both PSI-PI and PSI-MI require the precise annotation of protein modifications at different levels of experimental resolution. To avoid both duplication of effort and the introduction of more conflicting terminologies, PSI-MOD is designed to be a shared ontology for protein modifications⁹. It attempts to represent both naturally occurring and nonnatural modifications with a comprehensive, hierarchical, controlled vocabulary, providing terms for the annotation of ambiguous structures, and includes searchable information on modifications that would allow them to be identified by experimentally determined masses or mass differences.

In addition to complementing the data standardization efforts of the PSI-PI and PSI-MI, the proposed PSI-MOD provides a comprehensive controlled vocabulary for

The PSI-MOD community standard for representation of protein modification data

To the editor:

As workers in proteomics, mass spectrometry and bioinformatics, acting with others to develop and promote standards for storing data, and submitting and publishing results, we propose a community standard ontology that reconciles complementary descriptions of protein residue modifications in a hierarchical representation and serves as a tool for precisely annotating ambiguous or incomplete experimental results. This ontology is being developed and maintained by a work group of the Proteomics Standards Initiative (PSI), founded by the Human Proteome Organization (HUPO), as a community effort to create standards for the representation and exchange of proteomics data^{1,2}.

Three freely accessible web resources dedicated to protein modifications follow different approaches in describing those modifications. The RESID Database of Protein Modifications (<http://www.ebi.ac.uk/RESID/index.html>) is a comprehensive compilation of naturally occurring modifications³ annotated in the UniProt Protein Knowledgebase⁴. The RESID database focuses on naturally occurring modifications. Proposed modifications later shown not to exist or to be artifacts are tagged as 'deprecated'. The UNIMOD database (<http://www.unimod.org/>) is dedicated to mass spectrometry and contains both natural and nonnatural modifications with essential annotations in a relational database⁵. DeltaMass (<http://www.abrf.org/index.cfm/dm.home>) is a list of modifications and mass spectrometry