Perspectives of species identification by MALDI-TOF MS in monitoring - stability of proteomic fingerprints in marine epipelagic copepods
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Abstract

We analyzed robustness of species identification based on proteomic composition to data processing and intraspecific variability, specificity and sensitivity of species-markers as well as discriminatory power of proteomic fingerprinting and its sensitivity to phylogenetic distance. Our analysis is based on MALDI-TOF MS data from 32 marine copepod species coming from 13 regions (North and Central Atlantic and adjacent seas). A random forest (RF) model correctly classified all specimens to species level with only small sensitivity to data processing, demonstrating the strong robustness of the method. Compounds with high specificity showed low sensitivity i.e., identification was rather based on complex pattern-differences than on presence of single markers. Proteomic distance was not consistently related to phylogenetic distance. A species-gap in proteome composition appeared at 0.8 Euclidean distance when using only specimens from the same sample. When other regions or seasons were included, intra-specific variability increased, resulting in overlaps of intra- and inter-specific distance. Highest intra-specific distances (> 0.8) were observed between specimens from brackish and marine habitats i.e., salinity likely affects proteomic patterns. When testing library sensitivity of the RF model to regionality, strong misidentification was only detected between two congener pairs. Still, choice of reference library may have an impact on identification of closely related species and should be tested before routine application. We envision high relevance of this time- and cost-efficient method for future zooplankton monitoring as it provides not only in-depth taxonomic resolution for counted specimens but also add-on information e.g., on developmental stage or environmental conditions.

Introduction

Marine zooplankton species are useful indicators of environmental variation and climate change as they rapidly respond to changes in biological and physical conditions. Awareness of the importance of time-series based zooplankton monitoring is increasingly growing. Time- and cost-efficient species identification methods are a strong need not only for time-series but for many fields of marine science, e.g., assessment of community turnover or biodiversity in the context of ecosystem-based management. Manual counts of these small organisms require well-trained personnel, as the taxonomic resolution is often very limited due to high morphological similarity or absence of diagnostic features in young developmental stages. Although taxonomic expertise remains a keystone for community monitoring, integration with molecular approaches can enhance and accelerate identification processes. However, DNA barcoding of single organisms is to date not suitable for routine species identification in time-series as it requires numerous steps in the working procedure accompanied with high costs. Genetic multi-species approaches such as organismal metabarcoding of bulk samples are finding their way more and more into zooplankton monitoring (Bucklin et al., 2016, 2019, 2021 and references therein) as they combine comprehensive information on species occurrences with
a good methodological efficiency (Laakmann et al., 2020). Also approaches focusing on environmental DNA metabarcoding are getting increasingly applied (Djurhuus et al., 2020, Suter et al., 2020). Although these multispecies approaches provide valuable extensive species information, they remain semi-quantitative so far.

Proteomic fingerprinting as a fast, efficient, and low-cost method for species identification (Rossel et al., 2019, Renz et al., 2021) has a large potential to evolve to a valuable add-on to the current classical and molecular toolbox in zooplankton identification. In short, sample tissue is extracted in a matrix-solution, which is then applied onto a target plate. The extracted compounds, mainly consisting of small cytosolic proteins and peptides (Ryzhov & Fenselau, 2001) are measured by matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF MS) producing species-specific mass spectra, allowing the differentiation and, in combination with a reference database, the identification of specimens. Within the last ten years several proof-of-concept studies on metazoans revealed its general applicability for invertebrates (Murugaiyan & Roesler, 2017), specifically for insects (El Hamzaoui et al., 2018, Chavy et al., 2019, Lawrance et al., 2019, Hasnaoui et al., 2022) and arachnids (Diarra et al., 2017, Karger et al., 2019, Gittens et al., 2020, Ngoy et al., 2021), which are relevant as vectors and pests. Far less studies address taxa less relevant to human health. In the aquatic realm, research is mainly focused on groups which hold pivotal positions in marine and limnic food webs, i.e. copepods (Riccardi et al., 2012, Laakmann et al., 2013, Bode et al., 2017, Kaiser et al., 2018, Rossel & Martinez Arbizu, 2019, Yeom et al., 2021, Renz et al., 2021), cladocerans (Hynek et al., 2018) and fish (Volta et al., 2012, Maasz et al., 2017, Rossel et al., 2021).

To advance the method on its way to becoming a standard tool for zooplankton identification, a thorough evaluation of the sensitivity and specificity of proteomic fingerprinting and the intra-specific variance of fingerprints is essential. For bacteria it was shown that culture conditions may influence peak numbers, spectrum quality and identification success based on MALDI-TOF MS (Goldstein et al., 2013, Balazova et al., 2021). Knowledge on spectra variations and factors influencing them is limited in metazoans, e.g. spectra of ticks varied with season and habitat (Karger et al., 2019) and population-specific patterns were identified for bed bugs (Benkacimia et al., 2020) and mosquitoes (Müller et al., 2013). However, underlying causes of differences between regions, being either of genetic or environmental origin, remain unclear. To our best knowledge, there is to date no information on seasonal and regional variability of proteomic patterns in marine invertebrates, their resilience against physiological or environmental impacts or the stability of markers between genetically more distant populations. As a first approach to these questions, we analyzed mass spectra of abundant epipelagic copepods from different zooplankton monitoring sites around the Atlantic and adjacent seas covering a wide spectrum of environments from Arctic to temperate zones, brackish and euryhaline waters as well as neritic and oceanic regimes.

The aim of our study was, based on data from various marine copepod populations and species (i) to validate the general robustness of the species differentiation and identification approach to data processing and data variance, (ii) to determine specificity and sensitivity of single proteomic markers for the species (iii) to estimate the discriminatory power of proteomic fingerprinting and its sensitivity to phylogenetic distance, (iv) to estimate inter- and intra-specific variability of spectra searching for stable species gaps and the impact of variation on identification success and finally (v) to present perspectives of proteomic fingerprinting for marine zooplankton studies.

**Material and methods**

**Sample collection**

Specimens were derived from ethanol samples, which were collected during diverse monitoring programs or field campaigns and from a copepod culture (Fig. 1, Supplement table 1). Age and storing conditions varied between samples, samples were stored at 4°C from 2018 onwards. Adult female copepods were identified morphologically to species level and stored in ethanol until further processing at 4°C. In total 752 specimens from 32 species and 13 different regions were used for proteomic fingerprinting analyses. Selected samples from the North Sea have been part of the pilot study on using MALDI-TOF MS for species discrimination...
Proteomic measurement

Proteomic profiles were determined for all 752 specimens. For small copepods (< 2 mm) the whole specimen, for larger copepods (such as *Calanus* spp., *Metridia* sp., *Paraeuchaeta* spp.) a piece of the cephalosome was shortly dried at room temperature and kept in an Eppendorf tube. Depending on sample size 5-10 μl matrix solution (α-Cyano-4-hydroxycinnamic acid as saturated solution in 50% acetonitrile, 47.5% LC-MS grade water, and 2.5% trifluoroacetic acid) was added. After at least 10 min extraction, 1.2 μl of each sample was added onto the target plate, with 2-3 replicates. Protein mass spectra were measured from 2 to 20 kDa using a linear-mode MALDI-TOF System (Microflex LT/SH, Bruker Daltonics). Peak intensities were analyzed during random measurement in the range between 2 and 20 kDa using a centroid peak detection algorithm, a signal to noise threshold of 2 and a minimum intensity threshold of 400 with a peak resolution higher than 400 for mass spectra evaluation. Proteins/Oligonucleotide method was employed for fuzzy control with a maximal resolution 10 times above the threshold. For each sample 240 satisfactory shots were summed up.

Data processing

Spectra in the range of 2-20 kDa were processed with MALDIquant (Gibb & Strimmer, 2012) and MALDIquantForeign (Gibb 2017) using square root transformation, savitzky golay smoothing with a half window size of 10, baseline removal by the statistics-sensitive non-linear iterative peak-clipping algorithm (SNIP, Ryan et al., 1988) and normalization setting the total ion current set to 1. Optimal peak detection parameters were derived by varying the signal to noise ratio (SNR) thresholds for peak identification and the half window size (HWS) of peak picking, both in the range of 3-15 with species classification success of the random forest model (method see below) as target variable. The highest classification success was reached with a SNR of 4 and a HWS of 3, these values were then used for final peak detection. Picked peaks were repeatedly binned to compensate for small variation in the m/z values between measurements until the intensity matrix reached a stable peak number (tolerance 0.002, strict approach). All signals below the SNR were set to zero in the final peak matrix. For all further analysis peak intensities were Hellinger transformed (Legendre & Gallagher, 2001) using the R package vegan (Oksanen et al., 2019) as this proved to be beneficial for proteomic data (Rossel & Martinez Arbizu, 2018a).

Species classification

Species classification was performed by a random forest (RF) model using the R package randomForest (Liaw & Wiener, 2002) using 2000 trees and the square root of peak number as randomly sampled variables at each split. To avoid overrepresentation of most abundant species, the number of specimens per species in each tree was limited to the abundance of the least abundant species, respectively. The species classification RF model was applied to all specimens from these 27 species: *Acartia (Acanthacartia) bifilosa* (N=5), *A. (Acanthacartia) tonsa* (N=34), *A. (Acartiura) clausi* (N=48), *A. (Acartiura) longiremis* (N=81), *A. (Acartia) danae* (N=18), *A. (Acartia) negligens* (N=6), *Anomalocera patersonii* (N=9), *Calanus finmarchicus* (N=77), *C. helgolandicus* (N=29), *C. glacialis* (N=10), *C. hyperboreus* (N=29), *Centropages bradyi* (N=4), *C. typicus* (N=47), *C. hamatus* (N=53), *C. chierchiae* (N=6), *Ditrichocorycaeus anglicus* (N=10), *Eurytemora affinis affinis* (N=12), *Limnocalanus macrurus macrurus* (N=12), *Metridia longa* (N=13), *M. lucens* (N=24), *Microcalanus* sp. (N=12), *Nannocalanus minor* (N=24), *Paraeuchaeta norvegica* (N=10), *Pseudocalanus elongatus* (N=16), *P. moultoni* (N=15), *Temora longicornis* (N=91) and *T. sytlifera* (N=16). Please note that these are the taxa names accepted as valid by the World Register of Marine Species, but for simplification we will use genus and species name only from here on.

Species-specific markers

The most important peaks for species identification including all peaks with a maximum of class-specific mean decrease in accuracy of more than 0.015 (leading to 170 important peaks) were derived from the final species RF model. Species-mean Euclidean distances were calculated using the R package vegan (Oksanen et al., 2017) based on individual distances using intensities of the whole peak spectrum and used for hierarchical
clustering with average linkage.

**Phylogenetic patterns**

All genera represented by at least two congener species in the dataset (i.e., *Acartia, Calanus, Centropages, Metridia, Pseudocalanus* and *Temora*) were included into a Principal Coordinates Analysis based on Euclidean distances derived from Hellinger transformed peak intensities. The analysis was performed using the R-package ape (Paradis & Schliep, 2019).

**Stability of proteomic signals and choice reference library**

Stability of proteomic signals between samples and regions was analyzed comparing the intra-specific variances of Euclidean distances between all specimens within a sample, within a region from different samples and seasons as well as between all specimens coming from different regions. In a next step we tested how reliable species identification can be done using inter-regional libraries: species RF models excluding all specimens from a certain region were used to assign these specimens to a RF model species class, respectively. A post hoc test for false positive discovery of proteomic profile-based RF models (Rossel & Martinez Arbizu, 2018a, https://github.com/pmartinezarbizu/RFtools) was applied, using a significance of <0.01 to reject a classification as potential false positive. Heatmaps presenting the distance between single specimens from different regions were created for congener pairs *A. tonsa* (three regions) and *A. longiremis* (six regions), *C. typicus* (two regions) and *C. hamatus* (five regions), *T. stylifera* (one region) and *T. longicornis* (seven regions) as well as *C. hyperboreus* (three regions) and *C. finmarchicus* (six regions).

**Results**

**Species classification and species-specific markers**

The main two parameters of resolution for peak detection, i.e., half-window-size (HWS) on the m/z axis and signal to noise ratio (SNR) on the intensity axis, influenced the success of species classification. The out-of-bag error rate was below 0.6% in the range of SNR 4 to 8 and HWS 4 to 8 (Fig. 2). Peak number decreased with increasing SNR from around 3,000 to quite stable 500 from an SNR of 10 onwards. All specimens were correctly identified by the RF model at a SNR of 4 and a HWS of 3. These parameter settings were then used for all further analysis.

Overall, 2,418 peaks from all species and specimens were included in the analysis. Peaks per specimen ranged between 163 and 562 with an average of around 300 peaks per individual. To search for ubiquitous compounds and to estimate specificity and sensitivity of specific peaks, compound occurrence and abundance was analyzed. Only three peaks were present in all species, albeit not in all specimens: m/z 3,920 (in 33% of all specimens), 3,417 (in 22% of all specimens) and 3,065 (in 8% of all specimens). Common peaks between species (disregarding varying intra-specific peak frequency) showed a bimodal distribution of occurrence, with 70% of all peaks occurring in more than 10 species (Fig. 3A). In total, 398 peaks were observed with a 100% intra-specific frequency, i.e. they occurred in all specimens of a species. While 315 peaks were found with 100% in only one species, 83 peaks were found in up to six species (Fig 3B). These peaks were generally of higher intensity than average peaks (Fig. 3C). No peak with 100% frequency was observed in *T. longicornis* and *C. hamatus* and only one peak in *A. longiremis* and two in *C. typicus*. These are the species in the data set with most included regions and/or regions with strong environmental variation in salinity and temperature. Peaks with highest specificity (i.e., the 315 peaks with 100% intra-specific frequency in only one species) were compared for occurrence in other species, a measure for the sensitivity of potential markers. Mean intra-specific frequency of these peaks varied around 25% and maximum frequency around 75% (Fig. 3D). Hence, no single species-specific marker could be identified in the proteomic spectra of the copepods, when integrating over seasons, samples and regions.

Nevertheless, species identification was reliable using random forest. The 170 most important markers given by the class-specific mean decrease in accuracy (i.e. those peaks with high discriminatory power in the nodes of the decision trees) were extracted from the random forest model (Fig. 4). These discriminant peaks were quite evenly distributed over the whole m/z range of 2-11 kDa, also including peaks of different intensities.
Generally, species-characteristic peaks were of lower importance in species that included specimens from many regions compared to species analyzed in only one or two regions.

**Phylogenetic patterns**

No strong multi-species clusters (based on species means) could be identified for a particular genus (Fig. 4), although there is a tendency of some congener pairs to form common clusters, e.g. *Calanus, Pseudocalanus* and some *Acartia* and *Centropages* species. Prominent similarity was found between the congener pairs *A. danae* and *A. neglecta*, as well as *C. chierchiae* and *C. typicus*. The latter also shows strong overlaps in the important peaks for species classification. The Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) on proteomic spectra of congener species revealed a general similarity between congeners of *Acartia, Calanus, Centropages, Metridia, Pseudocalanus* and **Temora** (Fig. 5), however with overlap between congener groups.

**Stability of proteomic signals and choice reference library**

To evaluate the stability of proteomic signals of a species between regions and seasons we compared mean intra- and inter-specific Euclidean distances (Fig. 6). Intra-specific variability was lowest within samples and increased when different regions or sampling seasons were included. The species gap between the lower 10% quantile of inter-specific distances and the 90% quantile of intra-specific distances was quite prominent and large, when only specimens from single samples were included. The threshold was around a Euclidean distance of 0.8. This species gap strongly narrowed with increasing intra-specific variance in multi-sample/season specimens and nearly closed, when specimens from all regions were included.

To test whether the wide plasticity of proteomic profiles will be relevant for species identification and the choice of reference library, we determined species classification success of RF models, excluding specimens from specific regions respectively (Tab. 1). No impact of the reference library was observed for *C. finmarchicus, C. hyperboreus, M. longa* and *P. norvegica*. Species identification was specifically affected for specimens from the Mediterranean (*A. clausi*) and the Baltic Sea (*A. longiremis, C. hamatus, T. longicornis*). Strongest misidentification was observed for *C. typicus* from the North Sea and *A. danae* from the Central East Atlantic, with error rates of 0.9 and 0.8 respectively. Their rates of misidentification remained high even when applying the post-hoc test for false positive discovery, in contrast to all other species, where corrected error rates revealed all potential misidentifications. While all *C. typicus* specimens from the North Sea were identified as *C. chierchiae*, specimens of *A. danae* from the Central East Atlantic were assigned to *A. neglecta*. The application of the post-hoc test resulted in overall higher rejection rates of identification, with up to 100% rejection in *N. minor*. Mean Euclidean distances within regions varied from 0.4 to 0.7 and the maximum observed distance between specimens from different regions between 0.7 and 0.9. The latter distances were in the same range as the observed inter-specific distances (Fig. 6).

To evaluate variances between regions we compared the distances between of the congener pairs *A. clausi* and *A. longiremis, T. stylifera* and *T. longicornis, C. hyperboreus* and *C. finmarchicus* as well as *C. typicus* and *C. hamatus* (Fig. 7). Strongest homogeneity was observed for the *Calanus* species, only some specimens showed distances on the inter-specific level, i.e. distances which can also been observed between specimens of different species. However, also for *Calanussome* substructures on a regional level occurred, i.e. specimens from different regions were less similar to each other. These were much more distinct for *A. longiremis*, *C. hamatus* and *T. longicornis*. Here, specimens differed in their proteomic spectrum between regions nearly on inter-species level. For *A. longiremis* four subclusters could be identified, including specimens from the Baltic Sea, from Canada and the White Sea, from the Balsfjorden (Norway) and from the waters around Iceland, respectively. Similarly, specimens for the Baltic Sea formed strong subclusters in *T. longicornis* and *C. hamatus*. North Sea specimens of *C. hamatus* showed two sub-groups, one forming a distinct cluster and one clustering together with animals from the White Sea.

**Discussion**

**Species identification and species-specific markers**

This study focused on characterizing the variability and stability of proteomic fingerprints using widely
distributed, epipelagic copepod species from various coastal zooplankton communities around the North Atlantic as model case.

In line with previous studies on marine copepods (Riccardi et al., 2012, Laakmann et al., 2013, Bode et al., 2017, Kaiser et al., 2018, Rossel & Martinez Arbizu, 2018a, Rossel et al., 2019, Renz et al., 2021, Yeom et al., 2021), our results clearly support the high discriminatory power of proteomic fingerprinting on species level in this taxonomic group. All specimens were correctly assigned to the different 27 species by a RF model for classification with only low sensitivity to data processing indicating high robustness of the method. Many of the included species e.g., *Acartia* spp. and *Calanus* spp. can either only be separated with time consuming morphological analyses, such as preparation of the fifth swimming leg, or by genetic analysis, such as the cryptic species of *Pseudocalanus*. Their reliable identification by proteomic fingerprinting again highlights the high value that MALDI-TOF MS could contribute to routine monitoring of marine communities, especially since most of the species investigated here are dominant at many North Atlantic monitoring sites.

In depth analysis of proteomic spectra revealed that no discrete species-markers exist, and that identification is rather based on complex pattern differences than on the presence or absence of single compounds. Although several peaks show high specificity for a species, their sensitivity remains too low to serve as a single marker. The uniqueness of compounds in a species becomes increasingly blurred as more species and more specimens from different regions and seasons are included in the analysis. This has strong implications for the applicability of the method in multi-species research. Since the mere presence of individual species-specific peaks cannot serve as an indicator for the presence of a species in a bulk sample, multiplexing of proteomic fingerprints similar to metabarcoding appears to remain unlikely. Therefore, future application of this method in zooplankton monitoring will likely focus more on quantitative approaches as part of a bug-by-bug strategy and thereby improve species resolution and identification of challenging taxa. Given that the time- and cost-effectiveness of MALDI-TOF is much better than, for example, DNA barcoding (Rossel et al., 2019, Renz et al., 2021), it is nevertheless a powerful tool to accelerate biodiversity assessment and facilitate early and timely detection of changes in communities and ecosystems.

It is remarkable that apparently no conservative homologous compound was detected in all specimens, and only three peaks were expressed in at least some specimens from all species. This variability in peak abundance may be subject to genotypic or natural physiology-related variability, or probably at least partly to methodological or sample quality-related variability. One essential step in data processing is a slight shift of m/z values to align potential homologous peaks during binning and to account for observed small mass deviations caused e.g. by the relatively short trajectory of the Biotyper. As peak alignment is not independent of peak-neighbors, universal compounds may therefore be hidden in the fuzziness of the method. However, as we detected more than 300 peaks with 100% intra-specific frequency, and as more than 70% of peaks were detected in more than 10 of the 27 species, we argue that most homologous peaks were correctly identified in most cases and assume that this methodological effect is unlikely the main reason for absence of universal peaks. No or only one or two peaks with 100% intra-specific frequency were found in those species with highest diversity in terms of included regions and environmental surroundings. This suggests that the observed variance in patterns is likely driven more by different genotypes or by phenotypic expression driven by physiological state.

Despite the absence of discrete peaks, species were reliably identified by RF based on several discriminant peaks. These were found in all mass ranges and intensities. In general peaks with higher m/z values were of lower intensity. Consistent with the findings on intra-specific peak frequencies, the importance of species-specific peaks in the model decreased with increasing sample size. The disconnection of peak intensity and peak importance for species identification has previously been observed in other taxa, e.g. insects (Dieme et al., 2014; Müller et al., 2013) and crustaceans (Paulus et al., 2022).

**Phylogenetic patterns**

We observed some phylogenetic structure within the data, such as highest similarities between certain con-
gener pairs and an overall resemblance of congeneric species. Consistently, only very small deviations in proteomic pattern have been reported in cryptic species complexes (Müller et al., 2013, Dieme et al., 2014), specifically those with only recent speciation (Maasz et al., 2020, Paulus et al., 2022). However, when including all six calanoid genera with congeners in the analysis, similarity was not consistently related to phylogenetic distance and was partly higher between non-congeners than between congeners. Phylogenetic relationships have successfully been identified using proteomic composition (Telleria et al., 2010, Maltseva et al., 2020) and it was suggested that proteomic fingerprints may describe phylogenetic relationships (Zurita et al., 2019). However, our data indicate that proteomic fingerprints are not suitable to address phylogenetic questions in calanoid copepods. This makes sense as proteomic fingerprints are a potpourri of around 300 mainly cytosolic molecules with genes of quite different mutation rates behind them, also influenced by various physiological processes.

For most genera the higher similarity between congeners was not influencing species identification success and is therefore probably not of practical relevance. However, the strongest misidentification while testing library robustness against regionality (i.e., the library did not include specimens from the respective region, but only from other regions), derived from the highly similar congener pairs from the same sub-genus A. danae and A. negligens, as well as C. typicus and C. chierchiae. This misidentification was not resolvable by the post-hoc test, which has been shown to detect false positives quite reliably (Rossel & Martinez Arbizu, 2018a). Since this only occurred when a non-region-specific library was used, this problem may only be relevant to monitoring studies in which a rare species in the habitat or a neobiota of a very similar congener pair is not included in the library used. We have demonstrated here that the composition of the reference library can have a significant impact on the identification of closely related species and therefore needs to be thoroughly tested.

**Stability of proteomic signals**

To specify a potential stable species gap in proteomic composition, we compared the intra- and inter-specific variability of proteomic fingerprints using Euclidean distance as measure. A distinct gap at a Euclidean distance of approx. 0.8 occurred when intra-specific variability was minimized by excluding variation between samples, seasons, and regions. A similar threshold between inter- and intra-specific distances was observed e.g. for calanoid deep-sea copepods (Renz et al., 2021). Intra-specific variability increased, when specimens from different regions or sampling seasons were included leading to a stronger overlap of the maximal intra-specific and minimal inter-specific distance. While also sample history, e.g. sample storage conditions (temperature, pH, organic material in sample etc.) may impact proteomic spectra (Rossel and Martinez Arbizu 2018b), the narrowing of the species gap is most likely mainly driven by changes in proteomic spectra based on population specific patterns and environment-induced variations in cell composition. In line with this interpretation of our data, proteomic patterns of mosquitoes discriminated between colonies (Müller et al., 2013) and those of ticks varied with season and habitat (Karger et al., 2019). Strongest intra-specific distances, on the level of species distance, were observed between specimens from the brackish Baltic Sea and those from other regions in i.e. A. longiremis, C. hamatus and T. longicornis. In these cases, species identification by means of a universal classification approach seems to come to its limits. A larger number of Baltic Sea specimens could not be determined unambiguously based on a database only containing North Atlantic animals. Apparently, salinity has a quite strong additive effect on proteomic patterns compared to other factors. This seems conclusive as copepods have been found to change protein expression not only under thermal stress (Rahlffs et al., 2017) and over the seasonal cycle (Semmouri et al., 2020) but also under osmotic stressful conditions (DeBiasse et al., 2018). Copepods are capable to osmoregulate and change the osmolarity of the hemolymph (Roddie et al., 1984, Lee et al., 2012). Specifically marine copepods in brackish environments need to permanently control osmotic and cellular volume (Dutz & Christensen, 2018). Although most of the so far described changes in functional proteins are in the size fraction larger than measured by MALDI-TOF MS, it seems realistic that changes in cell physiology will become visible to some extent in the proteomic fingerprint from 2-20 kDa.

In addition to a physiological response, the observed pattern could also be due to a population-specific genetic
aspect. The Baltic Sea was suggested to act as diversification hotspot to many native inhabitants (Geburzi et al., 2022) and a reduced gene flow between North and Baltic Sea populations was observed (Sjöqvist et al., 2015). However, to our knowledge, no information is available on population genetics and connectivity of Baltic *A. longiremis*, *T. longicornis*, *C. hamatus* with the North Sea, the North Atlantic and Arctic populations. Further field and experimental studies will be necessary and useful to disentangle the multiple effects of environment, ontogeny, and underlying genetic variation on proteome spectra and to assess their impact on the ability to discriminate at the species level.

**Perspectives of proteomic fingerprinting for marine zooplankton monitoring studies**

Despite the extensive use of MALDI-TOF for pathogen screening in medicine (Croxatto et al. 2012), the method has, to our best knowledge, not found its way into any standard protocols in metazoan monitoring. Proteomic fingerprinting has been successfully used in pioneer survey studies on insects, specifically vectors, proving its general value for monitoring (Müller et al., 2020). Yet, it is still far from being an established and validated method in biodiversity assessments or time-series approaches. All recent findings on metazoans promise great potential, and proteomic fingerprinting has several advantages that argue for its own role in species identification. Sample processing is quite easy, fast and cost-efficient (Rossel et al., 2019) and measurement success rates are extremely high (Renz et al., 2021), if sample quality is sufficient (Rossel & Martinez Arbizu, 2018b, Rossel et al., 2021). These properties make the method a potential gap filler in marine monitoring approaches despite the rapidly evolving use of single and multi-species genetic methods. Standard morphological identification and counting procedures in zooplankton monitoring would not need to be changed as the approach is not intended to replace established routines but to provide additional rapid in-depth taxonomic resolution of specimens where needed. Formalin sampling becomes more and more replaced or supplemented by alcohol sampling in marine zooplankton research, opening the floor for many molecular approaches to add to classical counting, including proteomics. Bearing an additional physiological signature the fingerprint may provide information beyond pure species name, e.g. on developmental stage (Laakmann et al., 2013, Rossel et al., accepted), gender (Lafri et al., 2016), environmental conditions (Karger et al., 2013) or feeding status (Niare et al., 2017, Tandina et al., 2018, Hlavackova et al., 2019). Successful detection of microplastics by MALDI-TOF MS (Adhikari et al., 2022) may even open future options for simultaneous detection of contamination. However, the method is still in its infancy, proteomic barcodes need to be established for most marine taxa, species delimitation models are under development and collateral information of proteomic signals still needs to be deciphered. Our understanding for marker variability is growing, for marine copepods we showed here that due to regional variability a construction of local databases covering seasonal variability is strongly recommended. Impacts of library composition need to be thoroughly tested. The establishment of curated, freely accessible databases, accompanied by the development of standardized data processing steps and adapted classification algorithms, will be a fundamental step in elevating the method from an experimental state to an applied standard procedure in marine science.
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Table 1. Classification success of specimens from different regions by random forest (RF) models (based on *Acartia bifilosa*, *A. clausi*, *A. danae*, *A. negligens*, *A. longiremis*, *A. tonsa*, *Calanus finmarchicus*, *C. helgolandicus*, *C. glacialis*, *C. hyperboreus*, *Centropages bradyi*, *C. kroyeri*, *C. typicus*, *C. hamatus*, *C. chierchiae*, *Metridia longa*, *M. lucens*, *Pseudocalanus elongatus*, *P. moultoni*, *Temora longicornis*, *T. syltfera*, *Paraeuchaeta norvegica*, *Microcalanus sp.*, *Anomalocera patersonii*, *Nannocalanus minor*, *Eurytemora
excluding specimens from the respective region; region: abbreviation see Fig. 1, N = number of specimens, RF error = rate of false negative specimens, RF error corr. = rate false negative specimens after post hoc test for false positive discovery (Rossel and Martínez Arbizu 2018a), rejec. rate = rate of specimen identified as false positive by post hoc test, mean dist. intra-reg. = mean intra-regional Euclidean distance, mean dist. inter-reg. (max) = mean inter-regional Euclidean distance, only the highest distance within the species is given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>region</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>RF error</th>
<th>RF error corr. (sign &lt; 0.01)</th>
<th>rejec. rate</th>
<th>mean dist. intra-reg.</th>
<th>mean dist inter-reg. (max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acartia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFJ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td><strong>0.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.78</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>danae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.78</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acartia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFJ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>longiremis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calanus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>finmarchicus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFJ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calanus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hyperboreus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centropages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>typicus</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.72</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nannocalanus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paraeuchaeta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temora</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>region</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>RF error</td>
<td>RF error corr. (sign &lt;0.01)</td>
<td>rejec. rate</td>
<td>mean dist. intra-reg.</td>
<td>mean dist inter-reg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longicornis</td>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NWA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OFJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Overview on included regions, NWA: North-West Atlantic, CAN: Canada, ICE: Icelandic waters, CEA: Central-East Atlantic, MED: Mediterranean, NOS: North Sea, CBS: Central Baltic Sea, NWS: Norwegian Sea, WHS: White Sea, BAR: Barents Sea, OFJ: Oslofjord, GFJ: Gullmarsfjord, BFJ: Balsfjord (also see supplement table 1)

Figure 2: left panel: impact of peak detection parameters (SNR = signal to noise ratio threshold for peak picking, influencing resolution on intensity axis and HWS = half window size of peak picking algorithm, influencing resolution on m/z axis) on species classification success of the random forest model, right panel: impact of SNR on number of peaks

Figure 3: A : number of peaks, grouped by number of species with these peaks in common, B : number of peaks, grouped by intra-specific frequency, C : peak intensity as boxplot (without outliers) for all peaks and for peaks with 100% intra-specific frequency, D : max. and mean intra-specific peak frequency of the 315 potential single-markers in other species (100% intra-specific frequency in only one species)

Figure 4: Heatmap of 170 most important peaks for the species classification random forest model (peaks with maximum of class-specific mean decrease in accuracy of >0.015 are presented): clustering of species is based on hierarchical clustering (average linkage) of the species-mean Euclidean distance based on the whole peak spectrum, the annotation gives maximum peak intensity of the given m/z peak over the whole dataset; heatmap scaling: 0-0.1 class-specific mean decrease in accuracy, peak intensity scaling: 1-7*10^-3 arbitrary unit), species included in this analysis: Acartia bifilosa (Abif), A. clausi (Acla), A. danae (Adan), A. negilgens (Aneg), A. longiremis (Alon), A. tonsa (Aton), Calanus finmarchicus (Cfin), C. helgolandicus (Chel), C. glacialis (Cgla), C. hyperboreus (Chyp), Centropages brudyi (Cbra), C. typicus (Ctyp), C. hamatus (Cham), C. chierchiae (Cchi), Metridia longa (Mlon), M. lucens (Mluc), Pseudocalanus elongatus (Pelo), P. moultoni (Pmou), Temora longicornis (Tlon), T. stylifera (Tsty), Paraeuchaeta norvegica (Pnr), Microcalanus sp. (Mcal), Anomalocera patersonii (Apat), Nannocalanus minor (Nmin), Eurytemora affinis (Eaff), Limnocalanus macrurus (Lmac), Corycaeus anglicus (Cang)

Figure 5: Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) on proteomic spectra of congener species, species included: Acartia bifilosa (Abif), A. clausi (Acla), A. danae (Adan), A. negilgens (Aneg), A. longiremis (Alon), A. tonsa (Aton), Calanus finmarchicus (Cfin), C. helgolandicus (Chel), C. glacialis (Cgla), C. hyperboreus (Chyp), Centropages brudyi (Cbra), C. kroyeri (Ckro), C. typicus (Ctyp), C. hamatus (Cham), C. chierchiae (Cchi), Metridia longa (Mlon), M. lucens (Mluc), Pseudocalanus elongatus (Pelo), P. moultoni (Pmou), Temora longicornis (Tlon), T. stylifera (Tsty)

Figure 6: Boxplots based on species-specific means (upper panel) and 10 or 90% quantiles (lower panel) of Euclidean distances, providing inter-specific distances and intra-specific distances based on specimen from different regions, from only the same region and the same sample respectively

Figure 7: Heatmaps of Euclidean distance based on the proteomic spectrum of specimens from different regions (annotation, abbreviations see Fig. 1), hierarchical clustering with average linkage, congener pairs included: Acartia clausi and A. longiremis, Centropages typicus and C. hamatus, Temora stylifera, and T. longicornis, Calanus hyperboreus and C. finmarchicus
Fig. 1 Overview on included regions, NWA: North-West Atlantic, CAN: Canada, ICE: Icelandic waters, CEA: Central-East Atlantic, MED: Mediterranean, NOS: North Sea, CBS: Central Baltic Sea, NWS: Norwegian Sea, WHS: White Sea, BAR: Barents Sea, OFJ: Oslofjord, GFJ: Gullmarsfjord, BFJ: Balsfjord (also see supplement table 1)
Fig. 2 left panel: impact of peak detection parameters (SNR = signal to noise ratio threshold for peak picking, influencing resolution on intensity axis and HWS = half window size of peak picking algorithm, influencing resolution on m/z axis) on species classification success of the random forest model, right panel: impact of SNR on number of peaks
Fig. 3 A: number of peaks, grouped by number of species with these peaks in common, B: number of peaks, grouped by intra-specific frequency, C: peak intensity as boxplot (without outliers) for all peaks and for peaks with 100% intra-specific frequency, D: max. and mean intra-specific peak frequency of the 315 potential single-markers in other species (100% intra-specific frequency in only one species)

---

Fig. 4 Heatmap of 170 most important peaks for the species classification random forest model (peaks with maximum of class-specific mean decrease in accuracy of >0.015 are presented); clustering of species is based on hierarchical clustering (average linkage) of the species-mean Euclidean distance based on the whole peak spectrum, the annotation gives maximum peak intensity of the given m/z peak over the whole dataset; heatmap scaling: 0-0.1 class-specific mean decrease in accuracy, peak intensity scaling: 1-7×10⁻³ arbitrary unit), species included in this analysis: Acartia bifilosa (Abif), A. clausi (Acla), A. danae (Adan), A. negligens (Aneg), A. longiremis (Alon), A. tonsa (Aton), Calanus finmarchicus (Cfin), C. helgolandicus (Chel), C. glacialis (Cgla), C. hyperboreus (Chyp), Centropages bradyi (Cbra), C. typicus (Ctyp), C. hamatus (Cham), C. chierchiae (Cchi), Metridia longa (Mlon), M. lucens (Mluc), Pseudocalanus elongatus (Pelo), P. moultoni (Pmou), Temora longicornis (Tlon), T. stylifera (Tsty), Paraeuchaeta norvegica (Pnor), Microcalanus sp. (Mcal), Anomalocera patersonii (Apat), Nannocalanus minor (Nmin), Eurytemora affinis (Eaff), Limnocalanus macrurus (Lmac), Corycaeus anglicus (Cang)
Fig 5. Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) on proteomic spectra of congener species, species included: Acartia bifilosa (Abif), A. clausi (Acla), A. danae (Adan), A. negligens (Aneg), A. longiremis (Alon), A. tonsa (Aton), Calanus finmarchicus (Cfin), C. helgolandicus (Chel), C. glacialis (Cgla), C. hyperboreus (Chyp), Centropages bradyi (Cbra), C. kroyeri (Ckro), C. typicus (Ctyp), C. hamatus (Cham), C. chierchiae (Cchi), Metridia longa (Mlon), M. lucens (Mluc), Pseudocalanus elongatus (Pelo), P. moultoni (Pmou), Temora longicornis (Tlon), T. stylifera (Tsty)
Fig. 6 Boxplots based on species-specific means (upper panel) and 10 or 90% quantiles (lower panel) of Euclidean distances, providing inter-specific distances and intra-specific distances based on specimen from different regions, from only the same region and the same sample respectively.
Fig. 7 Heatmaps of Euclidean distance based on the proteomic spectrum of specimens from different regions (annotation, abbreviations see Fig. 1), hierarchical clustering with average linkage, congener pairs included: *Acartia clausi* and *A. longiremis*, *Centropages typicus* and *C. hamatus*, *Temora stylifera*, and *T. longicornis*, *Calanus hyperboreus* and *C. finmarchicus*.