

---

# Minutes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> MIRAGE meeting

---

*Athens, GA, August 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup>, 2012*

## **Participants**

- Sanjay Agravat, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
- Matthew Campbell, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia
- Catherine Costello, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA
- Stuart Haslam, Imperial College London, UK
- Carsten Kettner, Beilstein-Institut, Frankfurt/Main, Germany
- Daniel Kolarich, MPI for Colloids and Surfaces, Berlin, Germany
- Ryan McBride, The Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, CA, USA
- René Ranzinger, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
- Pauline Rudd, NIBRT, Dublin, Ireland
- Weston Struwe, NIBRT, Dublin, Ireland
- Will York, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
- Joe Zaia, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

## **Program**

brief overview

### **August, 6th**

Finalization of the agenda for the following days

### **August, 7th**

1. MIRAGE and MCP:
  - Introduction in the aims of the MCP guidelines (by Lance Wells)
  - Preparation for MCP meeting on the 8th
  - Relationship between MCP guidelines and MIRAGE guidelines
2. MS Reporting Guidelines
  - Discussion and Development
  - Promotion and Distribution
3. Outlook

### **August, 8th MCP meeting**

- Presentation of the draft MCP guidelines
- Discussion and further development of these guidelines

## Outcomes

### MS Guidelines

A draft of the MS guidelines which has been worked out previously by the [Structural Analysis working group](#), a task group of the MIRAGE working group, has been circulating before this meeting. Thus, the group did not develop a new document from the scratch but could discuss in detail the proposed guideline. A number of changes and modification were introduced during this discussion. Additionally, at every entry a decision was made whether this information should be given mandatory or optionally. The preliminary final version the MIRAGE MS Guidelines will be available here soon.

### Review of the MS Guidelines

This pre-final version of the MS Guidelines are planned to send to the advisory board for review and comments.

*DONE:* The Guidelines were sent just after the meeting and reviewed by the members of the board. They provided the working group with very valuable [comments and suggestions](#) that should be considered at the forthcoming re-reviewing meeting. Additionally, mid of October Will, René and Carsten sent a letter to the glycomics community asking to review the MIRAGE MS guidelines. These responses can be found at the same site.

### Promotion and Distribution

- **White Paper** about MS Guidelines and the aims of MIRAGE: Daniel, first draft by mid/end of September. This white paper is aimed to make the community aware of the presence of MIRAGE and its aims. Additionally, information is provided about the pre-final version of the guidelines for which the community is invited to contribute to improvements, changes and minor modifications.
- **MS Guidelines into public wiki:** René, after the guidelines were approved by the advisory board. This will be the most prominent access to the MS Guidelines.
- **MIRAGE flyer:** Carsten will create a flyer about MIRAGE by mid/end of November. This flyer is intended to be used for conferences to distribute the essential information about MIRAGE widely among the community. It is inherently important to make also young scientists aware of reporting glycomics data in compliance with community-based rules.
- **contact journals:** Stuart, Daniel and Cathy will contact the editors of [selected journals](#) to inform about the activities of MIRAGE. The awareness of guidelines that are appropriate to improve the quality of data in the journals is an essential prerequisite that these guidelines will be discussed and approved by the editorial boards. In the following there is the hope that these journals will recommend authors to refer to the MIRAGE guidelines when reporting glycomics data.

### MCP Meeting and Guidelines

A number of representatives from the glyco community was invited by the editors of MCP (*Molecular and Cellular Proteomics*) both to attend a series of short presentations on diverse issues that underline the need for standardization of data and to discuss the draft of the MCP

guidelines. The aim of this meeting was to compile a list of information to assess glycan / glycopeptide / glycolipid information in the manuscript.

The following key words are intended to reflect the view of MCP's editors on publication guidelines. This list may not be complete and can be extended.

- in publications sufficient information should be provided to enable the readers to understand the experiments and interpretations;
- data should be included in the paper or in supplementary files;
- data should be submitted to the journal rather than stored at the author's home;
- should be raw data supplied? → journals do not want to store raw data;
- @MCP there is a guideline for peptide and protein identification;
- since 2005 this guidelines is enforced and since 2007 a checklist is provided to the authors to enable them to explain why their manuscript is compliant;
- this level of enforcement is less consistent in other journals;
- the quality of data in MPC has improved;
- authors have been very supportive of this guideline;
- repositories have made efforts to try to be able to store all information required in MCP guidelines;
- guidelines are not intended to substitute the review process and it must be emphasized that it is aimed at providing appropriate information rather than defining acceptance criteria;
- the guidelines should enable researchers to reproduce research data from other labs;
- it is essential that authors clearly define the level of structural analysis to support structural models that are presented in their paper;
- this is especially important for readers who are not experts in glycosciences;
- however, the depth of information required depends on the biological question(s) asked;

**Aim** of this workshop: Setup of guidelines/standards: What is needed?

The outcome of this discussion will be a pre-final/draft of guidelines for glycan information which will be sent to the community by the end of October 2012 asking for comments.

### Further To-do's

- Compilation of an overview of **glyco data types**: Joe, by mid of September.
- **Array guidelines**, first draft: Ryan by the end of 2012. This draft will be the basis for the discussion on a subsequent guideline for reporting glycomics array data.
- Overview of **glyco data**: Matthew by end of 2012. This list will help the group to identify glyco data for which additional supporting information (guidelines) for authors and journals might be useful. The entire group is asked to pass keywords, suggestions and ideas to Matthew who will compile this list. What is looked for are glycomics data on sample preparation, selection, data acquisition and storage.
- **MIRAGE meeting 2013**: Carsten, René, Will and Pauline. Organization of the next meeting which is planned to be held in Dublin in spring 2013.

*Please note:* the [recent Doodle poll](#) shows that most of the members of the working group of MIRAGE will be available in the last week of April, 2013, i.e. from 22nd to 25th.