
Towards data-driven mass spectrometry in atmospheric science

Hilda Sandström Matti Rissanen Juho Rousu Patrick Rinke**

Prof. M. Rissanen
Aerosol Physics Laboratory
Tampere University
FI-33720, Tampere, Finland
Email Address: matti.rissanen@tuni.fi

Prof. J. Rousu
Department of Computer Science
Aalto University
P.O. Box 11000
FI-00076 Aalto, Espoo, Finland

Prof. P. Rinke, Dr. H. Sandström
Department of Applied Physics
Aalto University
P.O. Box 11000
FI-00076 Aalto, Espoo, Finland
Email Address: patrick.rinke@aalto.fi

Prof. M. Rissanen
Department of Chemistry
University of Helsinki
A. I. Virtasen aukio 1
FI-00560, Helsinki, Finland

Keywords: *open science, machine learning, chemical ionization, database, aerosol, volatile organic compound, compound identification*

Aerosols found in the atmosphere affect the climate and worsen air quality. To mitigate these adverse impacts, aerosol formation and aerosol chemistry in the atmosphere need to be better mapped out and understood. Currently, mass spectrometry is the single most important analytical technique in atmospheric chemistry and is used to track and identify compounds and processes. Vast amounts of data are collected in each measurement of current time-of-flight and orbitrap mass spectrometers using modern rapid data acquisition practices. However, compound identification remains as a major bottleneck during data analysis due to lacking reference libraries and analysis tools. Data-driven compound identification approaches could alleviate the problem, yet remain rare to non-existent in atmospheric science. In this perspective, we review the current state of data-driven compound identification with mass spectrometry in atmospheric science, and discuss current challenges and possible future steps towards a digital mass spectrometry era in atmospheric science.

1 Introduction

In this perspective article, we review the current state of data-driven mass spectrometry in atmospheric science. We focus on automated compound identification, which refers to the large-scale identification of molecules facilitated by digital tools, open knowledge and data sharing practices. The past 50 years have seen the emergence of large mass spectral databases, which are filled with mass spectra for a variety of compounds.[1, 2] Mass spectral databases are used during compound identification and the development of data-driven identification tools. As a result, many research fields, which rely on high-throughput mass spectrometry, have been able to improve, accelerate and automate data analysis of mass spectrometry experiments. However, in atmospheric science, we believe that there is room for a broader application and more specific development of such tools. Here, we outline the potential and current barriers for data-driven compound identification in atmospheric mass spectrometry.

Atmospheric science includes the study of all chemical and physical processes that occur in the atmosphere. These processes drive a complex, interlinked system with global impact. The chemical com-

position of the atmosphere mostly consists of nitrogen (N_2) and oxygen (O_2) (around 99%), followed by noble gases (about 1%), water vapor (ca. 0.01 to 4%), and carbon dioxide (0.04%). In addition, the atmospheric gas mixture contains a vast number of trace gases, including methane and carbon monoxide (around 2 ppm and 100 ppb, respectively), inorganic vapors, such as nitrogen and sulfur compounds (e.g., NO, NO_2 and HNO_3 , and SO_2 , COS and CS_2), and a substantial number of organic compounds from either biogenic or anthropogenic emissions (e.g., terpenes and polyaromatics). These trace gases all transform in the atmosphere through reactions initiated by sunlight.[3, 4, 5]

Trace gases can alter the atmospheric composition at any given time. Certain trace gases are very reactive and have short lifetimes, while others are practically non-reactive and persist for far longer periods, allowing them to transport over long distances. Trace gas emissions of organic compounds enter the atmosphere mainly in reduced and poorly water-soluble forms. Through oxidation, the organic compounds increase their affinity for the condensed phase. This means they can be scavenged by liquid droplets and airborne particles. One example of such complex multi-phase chemistry is secondary organic aerosol (SOA) generation. SOA form via rapid gas-phase oxidation of emitted volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into low-volatile reaction products that can grow atmospheric aerosols,[6, 7, 8] or form them directly.[9, 10, 11] An autoxidation process drives this gas-to-particle conversion by generating a sequence of progressively more oxygenated, and often isomeric, reaction products from the same parent hydrocarbon.[12, 13] With each oxygenation step the reactant molecules can condense onto smaller nanoparticles.[14, 15]

Compound volatility and tendency to form atmospheric SOA can be described conceptually by the volatility basis set (VBS).[14, 16, 17] The basis set contains information on the vapour concentration and oxygen content (the oxygen to carbon ratio, O:C, or the average carbon oxidation state, OSc) and correlates the volatility evolution with structural changes. The most oxygenated, and generally also the most polar, compounds contribute most to aerosol formation and typically have the highest O:C ratios and lowest saturation vapour concentrations. The most extreme case are the so-called ultra low volatile organic compounds (ULVOC) with saturation vapour concentrations lower than 3×10^{-9} mg m^{-3} . [14, 16, 17, 10] At the opposite end of the volatility basis set scale, we find the most volatile, and the least polar VOC gases.

The sheer number of emitted VOCs, combined with the many plausible oxidation reaction schemes alluded to above, lead to a combinatorial explosion of possible reaction products. The number of different, emitted VOC molecules is estimated to lie in the thousands or even millions.[18, 19] Through atmospheric reactions, each emitted VOC multiplies into thousands of reaction products. For example, a decane molecule (10-carbon alkane) with around 100 isomers, could already yield over one million distinct compounds,[18] illustrating the complexity of atmospheric chemistry.

Atmospheric chemistry and SOA formation must be understood better to meet the United Nations' sustainable development goals on health and climate. Aerosols adversely affect air quality and pose a threat to our health.[20] Currently, air pollution is responsible for seven to nine million premature deaths per year.[21, 22] Aerosols also affect the climate by reflecting and absorbing solar radiation. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) regularly reviews aerosol research in their climate assessments, which inform and guide legislation and action plans to mitigate climate change.[23]

To observe and detail the complex multi-phase atmospheric chemistry, which leads to clustering and subsequent SOA formation, is a formidable task and requires a holistic approach. Combining experimental techniques, such as mass spectrometry, with data-driven approaches, such as machine learning (**Figure 1**), has the potential to significantly accelerate knowledge gain and will bring us closer to solutions for air pollution and climate change mitigation.




Figure 1: Particles in the atmosphere form through complex processes spanning multiple spatial-scales. First, emissions of volatile compounds enter the atmosphere and oxidize into lower volatility compounds. These low-volatility compounds eventually form clusters which, in turn, can grow into atmospheric nanoparticles. Mass spectrometry has become the measurement method of choice to study atmospheric molecular processes like these. Introducing data-driven methods such as machine learning to the mass spectrometry workflow can help unlock the full analytical potential of mass spectrometry, and provide unprecedented insight into atmospheric processes.

2 Mass spectrometry as a window into molecular-level atmospheric processes

Much of what is currently known about atmospheric molecular-level processes was obtained with mass spectrometry. Mass spectrometers primarily reveal the molecular mass of the measured compounds. Additional information on the molecular structure can be obtained from other detection channels,[19, 24] such as chromatographic separation,[25] carefully induced fragmentation (MS/MS[26, 27] and electron impact (EI)-mass spectrometry [28]), ion mobility spectrometry,[29, 30] and ionization characteristics [31, 32, 33]. Together, the molecular composition and structure are enough for a definite compound identification. Thus, available mass spectrometric techniques could identify compounds and be applied to a wide range of research questions, including high-throughput analysis. However, the use of mass spectrometry in atmospheric science faces many challenges, which we outline below.

In the introduction, we alluded to the fact that atmospheric chemistry (gas, molecular clusters and particles) involves compounds with widely different volatility. Since mass spectrometry is inherently a gas-phase detection method any specimen must first be volatilized. For this purpose, specialized techniques have been developed to study low-volatile molecules with mass spectrometry.

The experimentally resolvable fraction of compounds, in terms of their volatility, has expanded steadily, as techniques have improved. [26, 34] For example, large biomolecules have been detected using several spray ionization sources (e.g., electrospray ionization, ESI,[35, 36] and atmospheric pressure photoionization, APPi), and surface bound species by desorption techniques such as matrix assisted laser desorption ionization (MALDI).[37, 26] Particulate bound targets, the constituents of nanoparticles, can be detected through direct aerosol sampling by e.g., using an aerodynamic lens with subsequent flash vaporization and EI ionization in aerosol mass spectrometry (AMS),[38] or by collecting the particles onto a filter (or a wire) with subsequent rapid thermal desorption vaporization of the condensed-phase constituents. The latter is a method applied in multiple methodologies taking advantage of chemical ionization mass spectrometry (CIMS)[39, 40] detection (filter inlet for gas and aerosols, FIGAERO,[41] and thermal desorption multi-scheme chemical ionization inlet, TD-MION,[42] respectively).

Figure 2 shows examples of mass spectrometric techniques used to study different compounds in atmospheric chemistry.[24] Of the atmospheric compounds, the numerous VOC gases are commonly quantified using either gas-chromatography mass spectrometry (GC-MS)[43] or proton transfer reaction mass spectrometry (PTRMS).[44] The least volatile fraction (corresponding to the lowest gas-phase

concentrations) can generally only be measured by atmospheric pressure interface (Api) CIMS methods employing anion attachment.[45, 7, 10] Finding techniques that are applicable to the whole range of molecular species present in the atmosphere is a major challenge in atmospheric mass spectrometry, and multiple techniques are currently required to cover the whole volatility range (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Example overview of mass spectrometric techniques used to study atmospheric compounds ranging from molecules in the gas-phase, clusters to aerosols and aerosol surfaces. The arrows at the bottom of the figure indicate the inverse relation between measurable scale and detectable volatility. The acronyms in the figure are: GC - gas chromatography; EI - electron impact; DMA - differential mobility analysis; IM - ion mobility; CI - chemical ionization; LC - liquid chromatography; ESI - electrospray ionization; EESI - extractive electrospray ionization; AMS - aerosol mass spectrometry; MALDI - matrix assisted laser desorption ionization; FIGAERO - filter inlet for gas and aerosols ; TDCI - thermal desorption chemical ionization; FAB - fast atom bombardment; BBI - bursting bubble ionization; ISAT - interfacial sampling with an acoustic transducer.

Besides a broad compound coverage, the ideal mass spectrometric technique in atmospheric science should be able to analyse ambient gas-phase samples directly without the need for sample pre-treatment.[46] However, such techniques are rare, and are often limited by, for example, sampling requirements (e.g., poor time resolution of chromatographic sampling), sensitivity, and interference from background compounds (e.g., spectral overlaps in spectroscopic techniques).[47, 48] Api-CIMS is popular, because it can sample ambient air, usually through a differentially pumped interface (see e.g., ref [49]). Samples do not need to be pre-treated, which enables direct, online analysis. Without sample pre-treatment, Api-CIMS can be coupled with other research methodologies, which provide complimentary information, such as ion mobility.[30, 29] Api-CIMS is most commonly applied in ambient field measurements and environmental chamber campaigns where it is combined with several other measurement techniques [7, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54].

The atmospheric composition at a research site can be monitored for days, weeks, or sometimes even years. These time-consuming field campaigns are characteristic of atmospheric mass spectrometry, and set atmospheric science apart from other research fields that use mass spectrometry (e.g., metabolomics or pharmaceuticals).[55] Field instruments usually produce relatively long time series for a selected group of target ion signals.[31, 32] At the opposite end of the time spectrum, specimens are collected on a filter or a filament and then analyzed within a few minutes in an Api-CIMS[33, 41, 42] enabling high-throughput studies of e.g., aerosols. While early quadrupole-based Api-CIMS instruments were by necessity only monitoring selected target ions, modern mass spectrometric methods measure the whole mass spectrum continuously.[26] The field measurements are often performed up to a mass resolution of 200 000 (the higher the mass resolution, the smaller the resolvable changes in the target mass), which generates large amounts of data that make data analysis challenging.

Currently, only a fraction of compounds in atmospheric mass spectrometry measurements are definitively identified due to the various challenges we will review later.[19] Here we present a number of possible mass spectrometry approaches suitable for compound identification following or during field campaigns. For example, compounds collected on-site can be analyzed later in the laboratory with chromatography and fragmentation mass spectrometry.[56, 57, 58] Current developments for improved com-

pound identification by other mass spectrometry techniques used during field-campaigns are ongoing, and outlined below.

Field campaigns often employ soft ionization approaches such as Api-CIMS, which minimize ion fragmentation. In Api-CIMS, reagent ions attach to target molecules (adduction mode), revealing molecular formula information. Details on the molecular structure can be obtained by coupling Api-CIMS with molecular fragmentation techniques (MS/MS).[59] Changing the reagent ion increases sensitivity and selectivity, with detectable target ion concentrations ranging down to 10^{-4} cm⁻³. [45, 15, 60, 61] New methods, e.g., selected ion flow tube mass spectrometry (SIFT-MS) and specialized CIMS,[62] have been developed to improve compound identification by varying the ion-molecule interaction. Noteworthy is the 2019 development of the MION inlet platform,[46] facilitating rapid transitions between ionization modes (e.g., nitrate in anion mode[63] and aminium or proton-transfer in the cation mode[64]). MION has already increased the number of detectable atmospheric molecules[46, 65] and further methodological synergy promises even better compound identification in atmospheric mass spectrometry.[66, 60]

Summarizing this section, atmospheric science is in a state of dichotomy. Field campaigns have produced large amounts of data, but this data has not been uploaded to mass spectral databases (see following sections). The vast atmospheric compound space, the heterogeneity of studies (field- vs laboratory), and the multiple mass spectrometric techniques have produced a data landscape that is difficult to navigate. Standardisation procedures for data collection, processing and analysis are still lacking. Combined, these challenges have aggravated compound identification in atmospheric science.

3 Mass spectrometry and machine learning

Before diving into data-driven compound identification, we first stay with the challenge of managing the large amounts data generated by high-throughput mass spectrometry in atmospheric science, as the two are closely related. The large data volumes collected in atmospheric mass spectrometry consisting of time-series data are collected at high frequency. Such data volumes are challenging to analyse without computer-assistance. At the same time, such data could be used to develop machine learning tools, which would then assist in both data pre-processing and analysis.

Figure 3 illustrates a typical mass spectrometry data acquisition process. Spectral information is extracted through data processing and analysis. In part, data processing serves to mitigate statistical effects such as batch-to-batch variations, or missing data. Other processing steps include peak processing, alignment, integration, and annotation. Conversely, data analysis aids in the classification or detection of molecules, and the identification of chemical pathways to the observed molecules. Machine learning tools have been utilized to automate and improve data processing and analysis (see a recent review in ref [67]). The application of machine learning in atmospheric mass spectrometry includes some, but not all, of these steps.




Figure 3: Data processing and analysis steps of a mass spectrometry experiment which have been performed using machine learning methods. Acronyms: ANN - Artificial neural network; CNN - convolutional neural network; RF - random forest model; SVM - support vector machine.

Below we briefly review how machine learning has so far been applied in atmospheric mass spectrometry. For example, aerosol- and single particle mass spectrometry data have been used to develop machine learning models for aerosol classification and source apportionment,[68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76] to predict fractional mass contributions of different organic aerosols,[77] and to identify drivers of cloud condensation nuclei formation.[78] Machine learning has also been proposed for surveying the viral content in aerosols.[79] Proton-transfer mass spectrometry measurements informed machine learning models to predict aerosol size distributions based on aerosol composition and the presence of volatile organic compounds. [80] Inductively coupled-plasma mass spectrometry measurements were used to predict the trace element concentration from environmental factors.[81, 82] With electrospray ionization Fourier transform ion cyclotron resonance mass spectrometry, the relationship between the composition of dissolved atmospheric organic matter and aerosol light absorption was revealed.[83] Moreover, a recent review highlighted the role of machine learning in data pre-processing during measurements of volatile organic compounds.[84]

In summary, machine learning is being integrated into the data analysis of atmospheric mass spectrometry, but little attention is devoted to structure elucidation. A GC-MS machine learning model for molecular formula annotation of atmospheric, halogenated compounds,[85] or for molecular property and quantification factor prediction,[57] are two notable exceptions.

4 Compound identification with mass spectrometry

The identification of unknown compounds and processes is the holy grail of atmospheric mass spectrometry [86]. With compound identification, unknown processes can be better understood and previously unidentified sources revealed. In many cases, it is sufficient to track the molecular or elemental composition, or to follow specific compounds and sources, which an easier objective. The identification of unknown processes and compounds is more challenging, because it requires a high identification accuracy and suitable identification techniques. Since only a few hundred atmospheric compounds out of potentially millions have been identified in aerosol samples,[58, 56, 57] the chemical space of atmospheric sci-

ence remains highly uncertain. In this perspective, we highlight three factors that affect the accuracy of compound identification in mass spectrometry: the chosen experimental technique, the compound identification tool (or approach) and the existence of reference standards.

Mass spectrometry methods can identify compounds to a varying degree. In 2015 Noziere *et al.* introduced the I-factor to quantify the identification accuracy of a mass spectrometric technique in terms of the ability to narrow down the number of plausible candidate structures [19]. In the best case, only one plausible structure is identified and the I-factor is equal to one. If the identification method is not able to discern between isomers of the molecular formula, the I-factor goes up to the number of isomers (two or higher). Uncertainties in the determination of the molecular formula can further increase the I-factor.

A 2015 review compared different atmospheric mass spectrometric techniques in terms of their compound identification ability as quantified by their I-factor [19]. The best I-factors were achieved when two or more techniques, such as chromatography and mass spectrometry, were combined. Fragmentation mass spectrometry methods such as tandem MS and EI-MS, coupled to chromatography methods, reached I-factors of 1-3. The I-factor of soft ionization techniques like CIMS were estimated around 4-40 at the time of publication. The newly developed MION-CIMS method that uses multiple ion chemistries (see Section 2) has the potential to achieve similarly low I-factors as the combination of techniques given above [46, 47].

The identification accuracy of compound identification methods and tools is determined by their ability to match a recorded spectrum to a molecular structure. In Section 6 we summarize these tools and their principles. The performance of a compound identification tool is measured by the *Top-k* accuracy. Unlike the I-factor, which quantifies the ability of a mass spectrometer to resolve the identity of a compound, the *Top-k* accuracy gives the percentage of instances in which the correct compound is found among the k best matching compounds during a compound search. For example, a benchmark study in ref [87] reported a Top-1 accuracy of 39.4 for their highest-ranking identification tool. This means that the tool identified the correct molecular structure in two out of five cases (Top-1 accuracy of 39.4) and found it among the ten best matches in three fourths of all cases (Top-10 accuracy of 74.8). Here it should be noted that the absolute numbers are highly dependent on both the data size used in training and the molecular database used to retrieve candidate molecular structures.

The accuracy of a compound identification tool often depends on the existence of appropriate reference standards, i.e., measured mass spectra of compounds, which are either identical or similar to the unknown compound. In the compound identification process, most approaches search for the measured spectrum, or a very similar one, in a database. Even if the identification method does not employ a spectral database search, it has still likely been developed, parameterized or trained with data from one or more such databases. In atmospheric science, the lack of reference standards is a large barrier for effective compound identification,[19, 15, 47] which we will return to later in this perspective.

We will next address the reasons for the gap between the perceived demand and utility of smart high-throughput compound identification tools for atmospheric mass spectrometry and the lack of corresponding availability of such tools. We will also identify the major barriers for introducing compound identification models in atmospheric mass spectrometry. A key to both these points are currently available mass spectral databases and their link to the success story of machine learning for compound identification in the field of metabolomics.

5 Mass spectral databases

Digital mass spectrometry libraries with reference mass spectra, so called mass spectral databases, have been used for compound identification since the 1960s.[1, 2] Over time, mass spectral databases have grown in size and usage, partly as a result of increased data processing and storage capabilities as well as adoption of open science practices. Table 1 summarizes a select number of mass spectral databases that are hosted by research institutions, or distributed by companies and mass spectrometry vendors. The mass spectral data is either collected through research community contributions (e.g., refs

[88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94]), or curation of scientific publications, measurements and computations (e.g., refs [95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102]) .

Table 1: List of select mass spectrometry databases. The list is divided into open access (top) and commercial (bottom). Data volumes reflect the state in August 2023 (In lack of updated size number, the data was taken from an associated publication, and the number is therefore not necessarily up-to-date).

<i>Name</i>	<i>Website</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Reference</i>
Global Natural Product Social Molecular Networking (GNPS)	gnps.ucsd.edu	In 2016, the mass spectral library contained 18163 compounds. The GNPS database contains data contributions from the public and other mass spectral libraries.	[88]
Golm Metabolome Database	gmd.mpimp-golm.mpg.de	Public database maintained by the Max Plack Institute of molecular plant physiology. Contains GC-MS spectra for 2222 metabolites, and 36650 reference spectra.	[89]
Human Metabolome Database (HMDB), v5	hmdb.ca	Freely available database containing experimental and predicted mass spectrums of 28817 metabolites, 7064 out of which have recorded experimental spectra. Also contains predicted retention times and collision cross sections.	[95]
LipidBank	lipidbank.jp	Curated database containing > 6000 lipids and their spectral information (EI-MS, FAB-MS)	[96]
LipidBlast	fiehnlab.ucdavis.edu	An in silico tandem mass spectral library for lipid identification containing predicted spectra for 119200 compounds. Provides a tool for users to predict new spectra for their molecules, available in MS-Dial software.	[97]
Lipid Maps Structure Database	lipidmaps.org	Experimental and computational LC-MS and LC-MS/MS spectra of 47884 unique lipids (25837 experimental). Contains MS/MS data in positive and negative mode. Downloadable and open for user uploads.	[90]
MaConDa, v1	maconda.bham.ac.uk	Freely available, manually annotated database of 200 known small molecule contaminant and their LC-MS and GC-MS peaks. Contains unannotated data. Downloadable and searchable in batch format.	[98]
MassBank (EU), v2023.06	massbank.eu	Public repository of >90190 mass spectra of 15075 molecules in metabolomics, exposomics and environmental samples.	[91]
MassBank of North America (MoNA)	mona.fiehnlab.ucdavis.edu	Auto-curated public database with experimental and computational mass spectra of 650292 compounds. Includes quality estimation of the mass spectra	[92]
Advanced Mass Spectral Database (mzCloud)	beta.mzcloud.org	Commercial database maintained by HighChem LLC, Slovakia with manually curated high-resolution LC-MS/MS spectra for 26417 compounds.	[94]
ReSpect	spectra.psc.riken.jp	A curated database with tandem mass spectra of 8649 spectra of 3595 plant metabolite compounds collected from scientific literature in 2011 and authentic standards. Has grown since and now contains 9017 (+368) spectra.	[93]
Maurer/Wissenbach/Weber LC-MS ⁿ Library of Drugs, Poisons, and their Metabolites, (2nd edition)	sciencesolutions.wiley.com	LC-MS ⁿ library of over 2299 compounds (poison or drug compounds and their metabolites) curated for forensic use.	[101, 102]
Metlin Gen2 (Mass consortium)	massconsortium.com	A curated commercial database with experimental spectra for over 20000 compounds (2018) (LC-MS/MS, LC-MS, FTMS) as well as in silico fragmentation spectra for a 600000 molecular standards.	[103, 104, 105]
NIST Tandem and Electron Ionization Mass spectral library, 2023 release	nist.gov	Curated spectra of 51501 compounds (tandem) and 34100 (EI), mainly metabolites, drugs, pesticides, peptides and lipids. Also contains a retention index database, incl. predicted values.	[99]
LipidSearch (Thermofisher)	thermofisher.com	Computational database containing > 1.5 million lipid compounds and their predicted LC-MS and LC-MS/MS spectra.	[100]


Continued on next page

Table 1 - continued from previous page

<i>Name</i>	<i>Website</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Reference</i>
Wiley Registry of Mass Spectral data, 12th edition	sciencesolutions.wiley.com	A curated GC-MS library with 817290 spectra of 668435 unique compounds with relevance in environmental, food & cosmetics, forensics & toxicology, metabolomics, quality assurance. Unlear whether computational.	[106]
Wiley Registry of Tandem Mass Spectral Data - MS for ID	sciencesolutions.wiley.com	Curated LC-MS/MS library with spectra for 1163 compounds including illicit drugs, pharmaceutical compounds, pesticides, and other small bioorganic molecules.	[107]

By design, mass spectral databases either cover a specific compound space or aim for some level of generality. However, in reality, the data in large mass spectral databases tends to reflect the interest of the primary users and contributors of the specific database. For example, **Table 1** includes specific mass spectral databases, which have been created for the metabolomics community, containing small molecules called metabolites, found in organisms, cells or tissues. As in atmospheric science, metabolomics research uses mass spectrometry to identify and quantify molecules of interest. The plethora of mass spectral databases in metabolomics can be attributed to open science initiatives in the research field and the ensuing rapid growth over the past 25 years. In this perspective, we emphasize metabolomics, because large general mass spectral databases contain mostly metabolites,[99, 91, 92] despite no stated limitation or constraints on the compounds coverage. Besides metabolites, other common compound classes in general databases include molecules found in drug- or environmental samples (see an overview of NIST 2023 tandem mass spectral library in **Figure 4a**).

a. Compound coverage in the NIST 2023 MS/MS library



b. MS techniques reported in MassBank, EU




Figure 4: Example of listed contents in mass spectral databases. a. The reported compound coverage of the NIST23 tandem mass spectral library. b. The different reported mass spectrometric techniques in the European MassBank. These two databases are represent general mass spectral databases. Acronyms: E&L - extractables and leachables.

Mass spectral databases provide data collected with a variety of mass spectrometric techniques. As can be seen in Table 1, some databases focus on only one technique, such as LC-MS/MS,[97, 90, 94, 93, 101, 102, 105, 100, 107] or GC-MS,[89, 96, 106] while others provide data from two or more techniques.[88, 95, 99, 98, 91, 92] The most common technique is LC-MS/MS mass spectrometry followed by GC-MS. For example, the MassBank of North America contains approximately 30 times fewer MS1 spectra (22500) than tandem mass spectra (including all MSⁿ) (May, 2023). As expected, these most common mass spectrometric techniques found in mass spectral databases are those that have a high degree of compound identification (see Section 4).

The number of compounds in the mass spectral databases of Table 1 varies considerably, although a direct comparison of the database size is complicated by the non-standardized way in which the size is reported (e.g., number of ions, or number of unique compounds, or number of spectra). The data volumes reflect the state in August 2023, as reported on the associated web page or brochure. If no such

information was available, the data was taken from an associated publication, and thus might not reflect current state. LipidSearch by Thermofisher is the largest mass spectral database with spectra for over 1.5 million lipid ions. Massbank of North America is the largest open access database with spectra for over 650000 compounds. The smallest database reports spectra for only 200 compounds [98]. The median size of all databases reported in Table 1 is 26417 (average > 270000). However, the different databases have overlap in terms of the compounds they cover,[108] thus the total amount of compounds in the databases is likely to be significantly less than the sum of the compound counts in them.

Synthetic (i.e. computational) mass spectra have been important for creating large mass spectral databases. Table 1 also lists mass spectral libraries with computationally predicted (so called in-silico) tandem mass spectra[90, 97, 100, 105, 92, 95] or GC-MS spectra [92]. For example, LipidBlast is a purely computational database, which also provides a tool for users to build their own tandem mass spectrometry database.[97] The motivation for generating computational databases, and sometimes combining them with experimental ones, is the need to accelerate data collection. The large number of predicted mass spectra can greatly increase the average mass spectral database size. For example, HMDB contains experimental data for approximately 7000 compounds, but computational data for more than 280000 compounds. The quality and information content of in silico spectra is, however, a subject of debate at the moment.

The retention time provides useful additional information and is often enough for correct compound annotation in LC- and GC- mass spectrometry. However, for certain isomeric compounds even the simple chromatographic separation does not provide a positive compound identification and further separation can be necessary [109]. Retention times in GC-MS are collected in MassBanks[91, 110, 92], GMD,[89] and NIST23,[99] among others. In addition, computationally predicted retention times are supplied in, e.g., HMDB.[95]. However, retention times tend to vary significantly between laboratories which hampers their utility for compound identification. Machine learning techniques can help in alleviating this problem (see Section 6).

Vinaixa and colleagues have reviewed the features of mass spectral databases in 2016 [108]. They identified beneficial features such as open access, downloadable, large size, curation, data from different platforms, functionality to merge spectra, inclusion of chemical standards and addition of unknown compounds. On the adverse side, they list commercial licenses, lack of curation and spectrum information, limited sample sources, only negative polarity mode, or only computational data. The review also surmises that there might be a trade-off between too many and too few instrument types as well as collision energies. Following Vinaixa *et al.*, we summarize some features of the mass spectral databases presented in Table 1 in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Features of the mass spectrometry databases. Open access - partial of full free access to mass spectral data. Data upload - anyone can contribute. Comp. data - Contains computationally (in silico) generated mass spectra. Exp. data - Experimental mass spectrometry data. Collects unknowns - Collects and adds unknown spectral queries. Machine learning tools - has associated machine learning tools (for compound identification or spectrum prediction).

	<i>Open access</i>	<i>Data upload</i>	<i>Comp. data</i>	<i>Exp. data</i>	<i>Collects unknowns</i>	<i>ML tools</i>
Global Natural Product Social Molecular Networking (GNPS)	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Golm Metabolome Database	✓			✓	✓	✓
Human Metabolome Database (HMDB), v5	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
LipidBank	✓			✓		
LipidBlast	✓	✓ ¹	✓			
Lipid Maps Structure Database	✓	✓	✓	✓		
MaConDa, v1	✓		✓	✓		
MassBank (EU), v2023.06	✓	✓		✓		
MassBank of North America (MoNA)	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Advanced Mass Spectral Database (mzCloud)	✓			✓		
ReSpect	✓			✓		
Maurer/Wissenbach/Weber LC-MSn Library of Drugs, Poisons, and their Metabolites, (2nd edition)				✓		
Metlin Gen2 (Mass consortium)			✓	✓	✓	✓
NIST Tandem and Electron Ionization Mass spectral library, 2023 release				✓		
LipidSearch (Thermofisher)			✓			
Wiley Registry of Mass Spectral data, 12th edition				✓		
Wiley Registry of Tandem Mass Spectral Data - MS for ID				✓		

¹ Provides a tool to make your own database with computational data.

5.1 Dedicated tools and pipelines for mass spectral databases and mass spectra

Mass spectrometry data pipelines and infrastructures are important to further grow mass spectral databases and to facilitate data management, curation and reproducibility [111]. For example, Pedrioli and colleagues developed the open, vendor-independent data representation `mzXML` in 2004, which enables cross-platform data analysis and management [112]. In addition, a plethora of freely available software has been developed to facilitate mass spectrometry data processing and upload, such as OpenMS,[113] TidyMass,[114] XCMS,[115, 116] metaboscape,[117] progenesis,[118] mztab-m,[119] mzMine,[120] and MS-DIAL [121]. Furthermore, the GNPS database offers a feature-based molecular networking tool which connects feature processing to molecular network modeling [122].

Another important data management feature mitigates provenance variability. In LC-MS/MS mass spectrometry (as in other soft ionization techniques), data collected at different experimental conditions can vary in appearance. To mitigate such spectral variability, certain database providers have developed the concept of spectral trees [103] and merged spectra [110] that combine spectra collected under different conditions for the same analyte.

6 Compound identification: approaches and software

The primary purpose of mass spectral databases is to facilitate compound identification. Traditionally, compounds were identified by searching libraries or databases for matches. With the emergence of digital mass spectral databases more sophisticated approaches were developed, such as in-silico fragmentation,[123, 124, 125, 126, 127] fragmentation trees,[128, 129, 114, 130] and machine learning approaches [131, 128, 132, 133, 134].

In the traditional library search, the measured mass spectrum is compared to all spectra in a mass spectral database. The compound is identified (be it correctly or not) as the one with the most similar mass spectrum, out of those in the database. A mass spectral library search is inherently limited by the size of the database, which typically is some orders of magnitude smaller than the target compound space [135].

The state-of-the art methods also use database information, but go significantly beyond library searches. Classical rule-based in-silico fragmentation methods rely on a pre-defined set of chemical bond fragmentation rules to predict mass spectra [135] while combinatorial in silico fragmentation searches all possible fragmentation paths [123, 124, 125, 126]. During compound identification, spectra predictions are made for all entries in a compound database and compared to the measured spectrum to find the best match. In contrast to traditional mass spectral library search, in-silico fragmentation methods search through compound databases (e.g., PubChem) and not mass spectral libraries. Compound databases cover a larger portion of chemical space than mass spectral databases, and are thus less limited in content and size. Rule-based in-silico fragmentation methods are limited by the available fragmentation models that rely on heuristic bond energies (measured or estimated), while combinatorial methods generally need to limit the amount of fragmentation allowed by the model. In a similar vein, fragmentation tree methods find the optimal fragmentation tree that matches a recorded spectrum. Fragmentation trees are used for de novo molecular formula annotation through Gibbs sampling and Bayesian statistics [136, 130]. In in-silico fragmentation and fragmentation tree methods, machine learning is not necessarily a component, but can be included (e.g., competitive fragmentation modeling (CFM) method) [125, 126, 127].

The third category of compound identification algorithms is referred to as machine learning approaches, which are emerging as powerful property and structure inference tools in spectroscopy [137]. **Figure 5** illustrates the working principle of most compound identification machine learning algorithms [131, 128, 132, 133, 134]. In the first step, a mass spectrum is mapped to a feature space represented by a so-called fingerprint vector. A fingerprint vector is a vector that encodes the presence or absence of certain molecular features, or their counts. Molecular fingerprints can be calculated in different ways from a molecular representation, like a 2D- molecular geometry (e.g., refs [138, 139]). The mapping from

spectra to molecular fingerprints requires a reference dataset of spectrum-molecule pairs. Supervised machine learning algorithms are then trained to assign fingerprints to spectra. Examples include kernel methods, such as support vector machines,[131] vector valued kernel ridge regression, [132, 140, 141] and multiple kernel learning support vector machines,[114, 128, 87, 133] or a combination of deep learning and multiple kernel learning [134]. In the second step, the fingerprint vector is compared to the molecular fingerprints of compounds in compound databases. Moreover, compounds not present in any database can be annotated through hybrid searches [142, 143, 144, 99]. Additional information channels such as LC retention times, [143, 145, 146, 147, 148] pairwise retention orders [149] or retention indexes [145, 146, 147, 148, 143] (both relating to elution order of compounds from LC), or collision cross sections [150] can further improve the identification success. For retention time data, the heterogeneity of data across different laboratories is a hindrance, as the retention times tend to vary according to the configuration of the chromatography machinery. Machine learning techniques have been developed to map retention times between laboratories [151] and learn from retention orders of molecules,[152, 153] which are known to be more invariant across laboratories than absolute retention times [149].




Figure 5: Schematic of the operating principle of most machine learning for compound identification tools. A machine learning model learns to map a mass spectrum to a feature space, here represented by a molecular fingerprint vector. In a second step, The similarity is scored between the predicted fingerprint and the molecular fingerprints of a compound database.

Open access mass spectral databases containing high quality reference mass spectra have been essential for the development of machine learning based compound identification. For example: FingerID [131] was trained on approximately 1200 compounds in MassBank,[110] IOKR and Adaptive on a 4138 molecule subset of the GNPS library,[132, 134] CSI:FingerID 1.0 on 6158 molecules from the GNPS database and the MassHunter Forensics/Toxicology PCDL library (Agilent technologies, Inc)[128] and CSI:FingerID 1.1 on 16083 structures from the NIST17 database;[87] represented by 19118 positive mode and 10823 negative mode spectra. The increase in compound identification accuracy during the past decade can largely be attributed to the growth of the spectral databases. In these examples, Agilent technologies, Inc and the NIST mass spectral library are the only commercial datasets.

In summary, a variety of approaches and software are now available for compound identification. Open access mass spectral databases have been integral to the development of machine learning approaches and have facilitated the emergence of data-driven mass spectrometry in metabolomics. We will review in the next section how these insights, concept, tools and infrastructures can be transferred to atmospheric science.

7 Towards data-driven compound identification in atmospheric mass spectrometry

In principle, the compound identification approaches we reviewed in this perspective could be directly used in atmospheric science. Suitable training or reference data, however, might be a limiting factor. The identification success rate would strongly depend on the number of atmospheric compounds in available mass spectral databases, or at least on the similarity between these compounds and those in the databases. Furthermore, the preferred mass spectrometric techniques in atmospheric science may differ from those prevalent in current databases. While compound identification algorithms may be able to extrapolate to the chemical space of atmospheric compounds, such generalization would be algorithm dependent and mostly incur large uncertainties. Below we address these points, highlight challenges and suggest an action plan to improve data-driven compound identification in atmospheric science.

7.1 Are available compound identification approaches useful in atmospheric science?

As alluded to before, atmospheric compounds are currently underrepresented in mass spectral databases. Compound identification approaches, that were developed for specific database compounds, will almost certainly perform worse for atmospheric compounds, than for compound classes in the databases. This is true for traditional library searches, which can only identify structures stored in a mass spectral database, as well as for algorithms build with database compounds and spectra.

How well compound identification algorithms perform for atmospheric compounds depends on the overlap of atmospheric compound space with available mass spectral databases. **Figure 6** shows a first visualization of this overlap. The figure presents a t-stochastic neighbourhood embedding (t-SNE) analysis for three atmospheric molecular datasets (Gecko,[154, 155] Wang[156] and quinones[157, 158]) and two datasets of drug and metabolite compounds found in mass spectral databases (nablaDFT[159, 160] and Massbank of North America[92]). t-SNE clustered the compounds according to the similarity of their (molecular) topological fingerprints.[138, 139] Figure 6 shows that the atmospheric compounds cluster closer together and are therefore more similar. Their clusters do, however, not overlap strongly, which indicates that these three datasets cover different parts of atmospheric compound space. The drug and metabolite compounds form their own clusters, most notable the dense ring of MassBank molecules surrounding the clusters of the other datasets. The two drug and metabolite datasets share some similarity in the inside of the ring, but only the MassBank has some small overlap with the three atmospheric datasets. The implications of Figure 6 are: i) most atmospheric compound classes are absent from mass spectral databases; ii) most atmospheric compounds therefore belong to a chemical space unknown by current compound identification algorithms; iii) the performance of compound identification algorithms in atmospheric science is unpredictable. Three traditional library searches report identification rates of only 2-35% for atmospheric molecules,[58, 56, 57] providing further evidence for our three suppositions.




Figure 6: Similarity between molecular datasets containing drug molecules (nabraDFT), metabolites (Massbank of North America) and atmospheric molecules (Gecko, Wang and quinones) shown through t-SNE clustering. The molecules were compared based on their topological fingerprint.

Having established that atmospheric compounds differ from those in available mass spectral databases implies that compound identification algorithms would have to be able to extrapolate to be applicable in atmospheric science in the short term. Yet, classical rule-based in-silico fragmentation algorithms generalize poorly due to built-in rule-sets for chemical bond fragmentation.[135] while in silico fragmentation methods based on combinatorial search (e.g. MetFrag, CFM-ID) are expected to do slightly better. On the other hand, generalization is a common challenge for machine learning models in chemistry.[161] For example, a machine learning model is forced to generalize when it evaluates a new elemental composition,[162] molecular size[163] or functional group[164] that was not in the training data. Methods for quantifying uncertainty or confidence in model’s prediction have been developed through ensemble methods,[163, 165] Bayesian neural networks,[166] Gaussian Process regression,[167] support vector machines,[168] and Monte Carlo dropout.[169] In metabolomics, it has been shown that machine learning methods predicting molecular fingerprints from spectra out-perform in silico fragmentation approaches.[87, 153] However, it is not known if this also holds true in atmospheric science, where the coverage of the reference spectra of the relevant chemical space is significantly smaller.

Until atmospheric data is available in large enough volumes in mass spectral databases, it would seem prudent to develop new and adapted existing techniques specifically for atmospheric science. Machine learning-based approaches, for example, could evolve from existing methods by means of transfer learning. For mass spectrometric techniques commonly found in mass spectral databases, such as tandem mass spectrometry or EI-MS, transfer learning would be particularly well-suited, as already developed models would likely only have to be retrained on atmospheric data. However, for underrepresented techniques such as Api-CIMS, transfer learning would not be applicable and new approaches would have to be developed. Api-CIMS applications are currently flourishing in atmospheric science,[41, 46, 170, 62, 29, 42, 30, 64, 65] but are practically absent from current databases (e.g., less than 0.1% of the European MassBank[91] data, see Figure 4b). If atmospheric science is moving towards data-driven compound identification, this severe lack of data needs to be addressed. In the following we outline an action plan to fill this data vacuum.

7.2 Action plan

In this perspective we reviewed the current challenges of implementing data-driven methods for mass spectrometry in atmospheric science. We next present practical strategies to address these challenges.

Our recommendations are summarized in Figure 7 and expanded on in the following.




Figure 7: Our proposed action plan is designed to overcome the challenges hindering an successful implementation of data-driven mass spectrometry in atmospheric science. The plan contains five steps A1-A5.

7.2.1 A1 – Relevant data.

A paradigm shift towards data-driven mass spectrometry in atmospheric science begins with access to relevant data (Section 7.1). For atmospheric mass spectrometry, data would have to be collected for the vast range of compounds taking part in atmospheric chemistry, including the atmospheric gas-phase, small clusters and nanoparticles (see Section 2). The collection could begin with representatives of each type and expand from there. Finding such relevant molecules and aggregates is no simple feat, because the chemical space of atmospheric compounds is large and largely uncharted. We suggest to use the VBS description of atmospheric compound space (see Section 2) to ensure data collection of compounds with varying properties of interest, such as, e.g., volatility and O:C ratio. Data collection should furthermore include the multiple mass spectrometry techniques used in atmospheric science for compatibility with existing databases and compound identification tool and for a holistic description of atmospheric chemistry. It is particularly important to include presently underrepresented techniques (e.g., Api-CIMS, as addressed in Section 7.1) to improve their data coverage in the databases. The methodology portfolio could be augmented with synthetic data generated with computational tools as discussed further in A4 below. For example, computational studies in atmospheric chemistry have shown that the binding energy between molecules and reagent ions can be used to predict the experimentally measured CIMS sensitivity e.g., refs [66, 171, 60].

7.2.2 A2 – Standardization.

To utilize the collected data in atmospheric science to its full extend, standards and standardized practices for data collection, curation, management and sharing need to be agreed on and implemented. For certain mass spectrometric techniques (e.g., EI-MS and LC-MS/MS), such practices have already been developed in other fields (e.g., metabolomics, see 5.1) to ensure data standardization and reproducibility (for example platform-independent data formats, data analysis pipelines and spectral trees or merged spectra). They could be directly applied to atmospheric mass spectral data and should be embraced by atmospheric scientists. Conversely, for techniques currently underrepresented in mass spectral databases (e.g., Api-CIMS) appropriate standardization practices still need to be developed. Such practices also need to consider the specific use-cases in atmospheric science (e.g., the lack of sample pre-treatment and

separation by chromatography). For example, we believe Api-CIMS data should be easy data to standardize, although to our knowledge no such attempt has been made. The collection of different Api-CIMS instruments used in the field has stayed relatively small, with a dominant fraction of the data being acquired by similar such as chemical ionization atmospheric interface time-of-flight (CI-Api-ToF) instrumentation, or the recently introduced orbitrap CIMS systems.[49, 172, 45, 170, 173]

7.2.3 A3 – Infrastructure.

Data collection and sharing require dedicated infrastructures. En route towards data-driven science, atmospheric science could proceed in two different ways: i) establish dedicated mass spectral database for atmospheric science data that are operated by the atmospheric science community, or ii) contribute atmospheric science data to existing mass spectral databases. A dedicated database in option i) offers better control over the data (for example, data curation, labeling and quality control), but requires concerted actions of key stakeholders and sustained funding.[174] Adopting existing mass spectral database as in option ii), is therefore easier in the short term and contributing to a existing, interdisciplinary mass spectral database promotes data sharing with the broader mass spectrometry community, which expands the user base. We recommend a third option, which is an amalgamation of the two approaches above: curating dedicated databases, that can be local to research groups or consortia, but are regularly uploaded and synchronized with large open access databases (such as the MassBanks or GNPS). Dedicated databases could, for example, be linked to field campaign repositories. In addition, community datasets, such as refs [56, 175, 176, 155], could complement data infrastructures. They offer distinct advantages such as having been purposefully curated with design criteria like similarity and balance in mind.

7.2.4 A4 – Dedicated machine learning methods.

In sections 6 and 7.1, we reviewed the potential and challenges of available machine learning-based compound identification tools in atmospheric science and observed that the identification performance depends strongly on the availability of relevant data (see A1). For tandem and EI - mass spectrometry, data is available for other compounds and we propose to begin applying existing machine learning techniques to atmospheric data and to then refine the models accordingly. Over time, such models could be improved through transfer-learning, possibly with active learning scheme, as new atmospheric data becomes available (Section 7.1). For mass spectrometric techniques, which lack existing machine learning models, but are used for compound identification in atmospheric science (e.g., MION-CIMS), new, dedicated models need to be developed. Figure 8 shows outlines our proposal for a machine learning-based compound identification scheme for MION-CIMS. The CIMS sensitivity for different reagent ions acts as the molecule-specific MION-CIMS fingerprint. The machine learning model learns how to map the MION-CIMS fingerprint to a molecular representation. The development of such a new machine learning-based models could make use of computational mass spectral databases until experimental counterparts become available (see A1). To that end, machine learning could also assist in building computational databases by expediting calculations of the binding energies used to predict CIMS sensitivity.




Figure 8: A proposed workflow for machine learning based compound identification with MION-CIMS. The model learns how to map the molecule specific MION-CIMS fingerprint (set of CIMS sensitivity values for different reagent ions) to a molecular representation.

7.2.5 A5 – Community endorsement.

Wide-spread adoption of standardised data practices requires a community wide effort. Together, the atmospheric science community needs to commit to open data sharing and publishing. The data should preferably be shared through open access databases, or with FAIR sharing rights, if published with commercial parties.[177] Adoption of community wide-data practices can be encouraged through education in data literacy and machine learning, for example in summer schools, webinars or workshops. Further dissemination at atmospheric science conferences and through research networks would create awareness and rally the community to endorse the new paradigm.

8 Take-home message

In this perspective, we reviewed the current state and potential for data-driven compound identification in atmospheric mass spectrometry. Although developments of experimental techniques now enable a direct monitoring of atmospheric chemical processes, an accurate method for high-throughput compound identification is still missing. Community-wide efforts to improve data standardization and collection can support the transition towards reliable identification of atmospheric compounds with mass spectrometry. Integration of data-driven approaches, such as machine learning, into mass spectrometric data analysis will facilitate knowledge gain. At the same time, this paradigm change requires a community effort to curate and share collected data in a standardized manner. Successful examples in parallel fields can be used to guide and inform this shift towards a digital era in atmospheric mass spectrometry.

Acknowledgements

This project has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant No. 101002728. The support from the Academy of Finland (334790, 339421, 345802, 346373, 346377, 353836, 358066) is greatly appreciated.

References

References

- [1] S. Stein, *Analytical Chemistry* **2012**, *84* 7274.

- [2] E. Stenhagen, S. Abrahamsson, F. W. McLafferty, editors, *Atlas of Mass Spectral Data*, John Wiley & Sons, **1969**.
- [3] R. P. Wayne, *Chemistry of Atmospheres: An Introduction to the Chemistry of the Atmospheres of Earth, the Planets, and Their Satellites*, Oxford University Press, 3 edition, **2000**.
- [4] J. H. Seinfeld, S. N. Pandis, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: From Air Pollution to Climate Change*, Wiley-Interscience, **2006**.
- [5] B. J. Finlayson-Pitts, J. N. Pitts, *Chemistry of the Upper and Lower Atmosphere*, Academic Press, San Diego, **2000**.
- [6] J. H. Kroll, J. H. Seinfeld, *Atmospheric Environment* **2008**, *42* 3593.
- [7] M. Ehn, J. A. Thornton, E. Kleist, M. Sipilä, H. Junninen, I. Pullinen, M. Springer, F. Rubach, R. Tillmann, B. Lee, F. Lopez-Hilfiker, S. Andres, I. H. Acir, M. Rissanen, T. Jokinen, S. Schobesberger, J. Kangasluoma, J. Kontkanen, T. Nieminen, T. Kurtén, L. B. Nielsen, S. Jørgensen, H. G. Kjaergaard, M. Canagaratna, M. D. Maso, T. Berndt, T. Petäjä, A. Wahner, V. M. Kerminen, M. Kulmala, D. R. Worsnop, J. Wildt, T. F. Mentel, *Nature* **2014**, *506* 476.
- [8] N. M. Donahue, J. H. Kroll, S. N. Pandis, A. L. Robinson, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2012**, *12* 615.
- [9] J. Kirkby, J. Duplissy, K. Sengupta, C. Frege, H. Gordon, C. Williamson, M. Heinritzi, M. Simon, C. Yan, J. Almeida, J. Trostl, T. Nieminen, I. K. Ortega, R. Wagner, A. Adamov, A. Amorim, A. K. Bernhammer, F. Bianchi, M. Breitenlechner, S. Brilke, X. Chen, J. Craven, A. Dias, S. Ehrhart, R. C. Flagan, A. Franchin, C. Fuchs, R. Guida, J. Hakala, C. R. Hoyle, T. Jokinen, H. Junninen, J. Kangasluoma, J. Kim, M. Krapf, A. Kurten, A. Laaksonen, K. Lehtipalo, V. Makhmutov, S. Mathot, U. Molteni, A. Onnela, O. Perakyla, F. Piel, T. Petaja, A. P. Praplan, K. Pringle, A. Rap, N. A. Richards, I. Riipinen, M. P. Rissanen, L. Rondo, N. Sarnela, S. Schobesberger, C. E. Scott, J. H. Seinfeld, M. Sipilä, G. Steiner, Y. Stozhkov, F. Stratmann, A. Tomé, A. Virtanen, A. L. Vogel, A. C. Wagner, P. E. Wagner, E. Weingartner, D. Wimmer, P. M. Winkler, P. Ye, X. Zhang, A. Hansel, J. Dommen, N. M. Donahue, D. R. Worsnop, U. Baltensperger, M. Kulmala, K. S. Carslaw, J. Curtius, *Nature* **2016**, *533* 521.
- [10] M. Simon, L. Dada, M. Heinritzi, W. Scholz, D. Stolzenburg, L. Fischer, A. C. Wagner, A. Kürten, B. Rörup, X. C. He, J. Almeida, R. Baalbaki, A. Baccarini, P. S. Bauer, L. Beck, A. Bergen, F. Bianchi, S. Bräkling, S. Brilke, L. Caudillo, D. Chen, B. Chu, A. Dias, D. C. Draper, J. Duplissy, I. El-Haddad, H. Finkenzeller, C. Frege, L. Gonzalez-Carracedo, H. Gordon, M. Granzin, J. Hakala, V. Hofbauer, C. R. Hoyle, C. Kim, W. Kong, H. Lamkaddam, C. P. Lee, K. Lehtipalo, M. Leiminger, H. Mai, H. E. Manninen, G. Marie, R. Marten, B. Mentler, U. Molteni, L. Nichman, W. Nie, A. Ojdanic, A. Onnela, E. Partoll, T. Petäjä, J. Pfeifer, M. Philippov, L. L. J. Quéléver, A. Ranjithkumar, M. P. Rissanen, S. Schallhart, S. Schobesberger, S. Schuchmann, J. Shen, M. Sipilä, G. Steiner, Y. Stozhkov, C. Tauber, Y. J. Tham, A. R. Tome, M. Vazquez-Pufleau, A. L. Vogel, R. Wagner, M. Wang, D. S. Wang, Y. Wang, S. K. Weber, Y. Wu, M. Xiao, C. Yan, P. Ye, Q. Ye, M. Zauner-Wieczorek, X. Zhou, U. Baltensperger, J. Dommen, R. C. Flagan, A. Hansel, M. Kulmala, R. Volkamer, P. M. Winkler, D. R. Worsnop, N. M. Donahue, J. Kirkby, J. Curtius, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2020**, *20* 9183.
- [11] C. Rose, Q. Zha, L. Dada, C. Yan, K. Lehtipalo, H. Junninen, S. B. Mazon, T. Jokinen, N. Sarnela, M. Sipilä, T. Petäjä, V. M. Kerminen, F. Bianchi, M. Kulmala, *Science Advances* **2018**, *4*.
- [12] J. D. Crouse, L. B. Nielsen, S. Jørgensen, H. G. Kjaergaard, P. O. Wennberg, *Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **2013**, *4* 3513.

- [13] M. P. Rissanen, T. Kurtén, M. Sipilä, J. A. Thornton, J. Kangasluoma, N. Sarnela, H. Junninen, S. Jørgensen, S. Schallhart, M. K. Kajos, R. Taipale, M. Springer, T. F. Mentel, T. Ruuskanen, T. Petäjä, D. R. Worsnop, H. G. Kjaergaard, M. Ehn, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **2014**, *136* 15596.
- [14] J. Tröstl, W. K. Chuang, H. Gordon, M. Heinritzi, C. Yan, U. Molteni, L. Ahlm, C. Frege, F. Bianchi, R. Wagner, M. Simon, K. Lehtipalo, C. Williamson, J. S. Craven, J. Duplissy, A. Adamov, J. Almeida, A. K. Bernhammer, M. Breitenlechner, S. Brilke, A. Dias, S. Ehrhart, R. C. Flagan, A. Franchin, C. Fuchs, R. Guida, M. Gysel, A. Hansel, C. R. Hoyle, T. Jokinen, H. Junninen, J. Kangasluoma, H. Keskinen, J. Kim, M. Krapf, A. Kürten, A. Laaksonen, M. Lawler, M. Leiminger, S. Mathot, O. Möhler, T. Nieminen, A. Onnela, T. Petäjä, F. M. Piel, P. Miettinen, M. P. Rissanen, L. Rondo, N. Sarnela, S. Schobesberger, K. Sengupta, M. Sipilä, J. N. Smith, G. Steiner, A. Tomè, A. Virtanen, A. C. Wagner, E. Weingartner, D. Wimmer, P. M. Winkler, P. Ye, K. S. Carslaw, J. Curtius, J. Dommen, J. Kirkby, M. Kulmala, I. Riipinen, D. R. Worsnop, N. M. Donahue, U. Baltensperger, *Nature* **2016**, *533* 527.
- [15] F. Bianchi, T. Kurtén, M. Riva, C. Mohr, M. P. Rissanen, P. Roldin, T. Berndt, J. D. Crouse, P. O. Wennberg, T. F. Mentel, J. Wildt, H. Junninen, T. Jokinen, M. Kulmala, D. R. Worsnop, J. A. Thornton, N. Donahue, H. G. Kjaergaard, M. Ehn, *Chemical Reviews* **2019**, *119* 3472.
- [16] N. M. Donahue, S. A. Epstein, S. N. Pandis, A. L. Robinson, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2011**, *11* 3303.
- [17] M. Schervish, N. M. Donahue, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2020**, *20* 1183.
- [18] A. H. Goldstein, I. E. Galbally, *Environmental Science and Technology* **2007**, *41* 1514.
- [19] B. Nozière, M. Kalberer, M. Claeys, J. Allan, B. D’Anna, S. Decesari, E. Finessi, M. Glasius, I. Grgić, J. F. Hamilton, T. Hoffmann, Y. Iinuma, M. Jaoui, A. Kahnt, C. J. Kampf, I. Kourtev, W. Maenhaut, N. Marsden, S. Saarikoski, J. Schnelle-Kreis, J. D. Surratt, S. Szidat, R. Szmigielski, A. Wisthaler, *Chemical Reviews* **2015**, *115* 3919.
- [20] A. Pozzer, S. C. Anenberg, S. Dey, A. Haines, J. Lelieveld, S. Chowdhury, *GeoHealth* **2023**, *7*.
- [21] S. Khomenko, M. Cirach, E. Pereira-Barboza, N. Mueller, J. Barrera-Gómez, D. Rojas-Rueda, K. de Hoogh, G. Hoek, M. Nieuwenhuijsen, *The Lancet Planetary Health* **2021**, *5* e121.
- [22] J. Lelieveld, A. Pozzer, U. Pöschl, M. Fnais, A. Haines, T. Münzel, *Cardiovascular Research* **2020**, *116* 1910.
- [23] V. Masson-Delmotte, A. Z. P. Pirani, S. C. S. L. Péan, C. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M. I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J. B. R. Matthews, T. K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu, B. Zhou, editors, *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, **2021**.
- [24] J. Laskin, A. Laskin, S. A. Nizkorodov, *Analytical Chemistry* **2018**, *90* 166.
- [25] S. K. Grebe, R. J. Singh, *The Clinical Biochemist Reviews* **2011**, *32* 5.
- [26] G. L. Glish, R. W. Vachet, *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery* **2003**, *2* 140.
- [27] R. G. Sadygov, D. Cociorva, J. R. Yates, *Nature Methods* **2004**, *1* 195.
- [28] Q. Yang, H. Ji, Z. Xu, Y. Li, P. Wang, J. Sun, X. Fan, H. Zhang, H. Lu, Z. Zhang, *Nature Communications* **2023**, *14* 1.
- [29] A. Skyttä, J. Gao, R. Cai, M. Ehn, L. R. Ahonen, T. Kurten, Z. Wang, M. P. Rissanen, J. Kangasluoma, *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **2022**, *126* 5040.

- [30] J. E. Krechmer, M. Groessl, X. Zhang, H. Junninen, P. Massoli, A. T. Lambe, J. R. Kimmel, M. J. Cubison, S. Graf, Y. H. Lin, S. H. Budisulistiorini, H. Zhang, J. D. Surratt, R. Knochenmuss, J. T. Jayne, D. R. Worsnop, J. L. Jimenez, M. R. Canagaratna, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* **2016**, *9* 3245.
- [31] C. Rose, M. P. Rissanen, S. Iyer, J. Duplissy, C. Yan, J. B. Nowak, A. Colomb, R. Dupuy, X. C. He, J. Lampilahti, Y. J. Tham, D. Wimmer, J. M. Metzger, P. Tulet, J. Brioude, C. Planche, M. Kulmala, K. Sellegri, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2021**, *21* 4541.
- [32] H. Berresheim, T. Elste, C. Plass-Dülmer, F. L. Eisele, D. J. Tanner, *International Journal of Mass Spectrometry* **2000**, *202* 91.
- [33] J. N. Smith, K. C. Barsantia, H. R. Friedli, M. Ehnd, M. Kulmala, D. R. Collins, J. H. Scheckman, B. J. Williams, P. H. McMurry, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **2010**, *107* 6634.
- [34] S. Tamara, M. A. D. Boer, A. J. Heck, *Chemical Reviews* **2022**, *122* 7269.
- [35] M. Wilm, *Molecular & Cellular Proteomics* **2011**, *10* M111.009407.
- [36] J. B. Fenn, M. Mann, C. K. Meng, S. F. Wong, C. M. Whitehouse, *Science* **1989**, *246* 64.
- [37] X. Fei, G. Wei, K. K. Murray, *Analytical Chemistry* **1996**, *68* 1143.
- [38] J. T. Jayne, D. C. Leard, X. Zhang, P. Davidovits, K. A. Smith, C. E. Kolb, D. R. Worsnop, *Aerosol Science and Technology* **2000**, *33*, 1-2 49.
- [39] M. S. Munson, F. H. Field, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **1966**, *88* 2621.
- [40] B. Munson, *Analytical Chemistry* **1977**, *49*.
- [41] F. D. Lopez-Hilfiker, C. Mohr, M. Ehn, F. Rubach, E. Kleist, J. Wildt, T. F. Mentel, A. Lutz, M. Hallquist, D. Worsnop, J. A. Thornton, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* **2014**, *7* 983.
- [42] F. Partovi, J. Mikkilä, S. Iyer, J. Mikkilä, J. Kontro, S. Ojanperä, P. Juuti, J. Kangasluoma, A. Shcherbinin, M. Rissanen, *ACS Omega* **2023**, *8* 25749.
- [43] K. D. Bartle, P. Myers, *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry* **2002**, *21* 547.
- [44] W. Lindinger, A. Hansel, A. Jordan, *Chemical Society Reviews* **1998**, *27* 347.
- [45] T. Jokinen, M. Sipilä, H. Junninen, M. Ehn, G. Lönn, J. Hakala, T. Petäjä, R. L. Mauldin, M. Kulmala, D. R. Worsnop, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2012**, *12* 4117.
- [46] M. P. Rissanen, J. Mikkilä, S. Iyer, J. Hakala, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* **2019**, *12* 6635.
- [47] M. Rissanen, *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **2021**, *125* 9027.
- [48] A. Tiusanen, J. Ruiz-Jimenez, K. Hartonen, S. K. Wiedmer, *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts* **2023**, *25* 1263.
- [49] H. Junninen, M. Ehn, Petäjä, L. Luosujärvi, T. Kotiaho, R. Kostianen, U. Rohner, M. Gonin, K. Fuhrer, M. Kulmala, D. R. Worsnop, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* **2010**, *3* 1039.
- [50] J. Almeida, S. Schobesberger, A. Kürten, I. K. Ortega, O. Kupiainen-Määttä, A. P. Praplan, A. Adamov, A. Amorim, F. Bianchi, M. Breitenlechner, A. David, J. Dommen, N. M. Donahue, A. Downard, E. Dunne, J. Duplissy, S. Ehrhart, R. C. Flagan, A. Franchin, R. Guida, J. Hakala, A. Hansel, M. Heinritzi, H. Henschel, T. Jokinen, H. Junninen, M. Kajos, J. Kangasluoma, H. Keskinen, A. Kupc, T. Kurtén, A. N. Kvashin, A. Laaksonen, K. Lehtipalo, M. Leiminger, J. Leppä,

- V. Loukonen, V. Makhmutov, S. Mathot, M. J. McGrath, T. Nieminen, T. Olenius, A. Onnela, T. Petäjä, F. Riccobono, I. Riipinen, M. Rissanen, L. Rondo, T. Ruuskanen, F. D. Santos, N. Sarnela, S. Schallhart, R. Schnitzhofer, J. H. Seinfeld, M. Simon, M. Sipilä, Y. Stozhkov, F. Stratmann, A. Tomé, J. Tröstl, G. Tsagkogeorgas, P. Vaattovaara, Y. Viisanen, A. Virtanen, A. Vrtala, P. E. Wagner, E. Weingartner, H. Wex, C. Williamson, D. Wimmer, P. Ye, T. Yli-Juuti, K. S. Carslaw, M. Kulmala, J. Curtius, U. Baltensperger, D. R. Worsnop, H. Vehkamäki, J. Kirkby, *Nature* **2013** *502:7471* **2013**, *502* 359.
- [51] M. Sipilä, N. Sarnela, T. Jokinen, H. Henschel, H. Junninen, J. Kontkanen, S. Richters, J. Kangasluoma, A. Franchin, O. Peräkylä, M. P. Rissanen, M. Ehn, H. Vehkamäki, T. Kurten, T. Berndt, T. Petäjä, D. Worsnop, D. Ceburnis, V. M. Kerminen, M. Kulmala, C. O'Dowd, *Nature* **2016** *537:7621* **2016**, *537* 532.
- [52] R. L. Mauldin, T. Berndt, M. Sipilä, P. Paasonen, T. Petäjä, S. Kim, T. Kurtén, F. Stratmann, V. M. Kerminen, M. Kulmala, *Nature* **2012** *488:7410* **2012**, *488* 193.
- [53] M. Wang, W. Kong, R. Marten, X. C. He, D. Chen, J. Pfeifer, A. Heitto, J. Kontkanen, L. Dada, A. Kürten, T. Yli-Juuti, H. E. Manninen, S. Amanatidis, A. Amorim, R. Baalbaki, A. Baccarini, D. M. Bell, B. Bertozzi, S. Bräkling, S. Brilke, L. C. Murillo, R. Chiu, B. Chu, L. P. D. Menezes, J. Duplissy, H. Finkenzeller, L. G. Carracedo, M. Granzin, R. Guida, A. Hansel, V. Hofbauer, J. Krechmer, K. Lehtipalo, H. Lamkaddam, M. Lampimäki, C. P. Lee, V. Makhmutov, G. Marie, S. Mathot, R. L. Mauldin, B. Mentler, T. Müller, A. Onnela, E. Partoll, T. Petäjä, M. Philippov, V. Pospisilova, A. Ranjithkumar, M. Rissanen, B. Rörup, W. Scholz, J. Shen, M. Simon, M. Sipilä, G. Steiner, D. Stolzenburg, Y. J. Tham, A. Tomé, A. C. Wagner, D. S. Wang, Y. Wang, S. K. Weber, P. M. Winkler, P. J. Wlasits, Y. Wu, M. Xiao, Q. Ye, M. Zauner-Wieczorek, X. Zhou, R. Volkamer, I. Riipinen, J. Dommen, J. Curtius, U. Baltensperger, M. Kulmala, D. R. Worsnop, J. Kirkby, J. H. Seinfeld, I. El-Haddad, R. C. Flagan, N. M. Donahue, *Nature* **2020**, *581* 184.
- [54] F. L. Eisele, D. J. Tanner, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* **1993**, *98* 9001.
- [55] L. M. Mayr, D. Bojanic, *Current Opinion in Pharmacology* **2009**, *9* 580.
- [56] D. R. Worton, M. Decker, G. Isaacman-VanWertz, A. W. Chan, K. R. Wilson, A. H. Goldstein, *Analyst* **2017**, *142* 2395.
- [57] E. B. Franklin, L. D. Yee, B. Aumont, R. J. Weber, P. Grigas, A. H. Goldstein, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* **2022**, *15* 3779.
- [58] J. F. Hamilton, P. J. Webb, A. C. Lewis, J. R. Hopkins, S. Smith, P. Davy, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2004**, *4* 1279.
- [59] S. Tomaz, D. Wang, N. Zabalegui, D. Li, H. Lamkaddam, F. Bachmeier, A. Vogel, M. E. Monge, S. Perrier, U. Baltensperger, C. George, M. Rissanen, M. Ehn, I. E. Haddad, M. Riva, *Nature Communications* **2021**, *12* 1.
- [60] N. Hyttinen, R. V. Otkjær, S. Iyer, H. G. Kjaergaard, M. P. Rissanen, P. O. Wennberg, T. Kurtén, *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **2018**, *122* 269.
- [61] S. Iyer, X. He, N. Hyttinen, T. Kurtén, M. P. Rissanen, *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **2017**, *121* 6778.
- [62] P. Brophy, D. K. Farmer, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* **2015**, *8* 2945.
- [63] N. Hyttinen, O. Kupiainen-Määttä, M. P. Rissanen, M. Muuronen, M. Ehn, T. Kurtén, *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **2015**, *119* 6339.
- [64] T. Berndt, B. Mentler, W. Scholz, L. Fischer, H. Herrmann, M. Kulmala, A. Hansel, *Environmental Science and Technology* **2018**, *52* 11069.

- [65] (Accepted). X.-C. He, J. Shen, S. Iyer, P. Juuti, J. Zhang, M. Koirala, M. M. Kytökari, D. R. Worsnop, M. Rissanen, M. Kulmala, N. M. Maier, J. Mikkilä, M. Sipilä, J. Kangasluoma, Characterisation of the multi-scheme chemical ionisation inlet-2 and the detection of gaseous iodine species, URL <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2023-30>.
- [66] S. Iyer, F. Lopez-Hilfiker, B. H. Lee, J. A. Thornton, T. Kurtén, *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **2016**, *120* 576.
- [67] U. W. Liebal, A. N. Phan, M. Sudhakar, K. Raman, L. M. Blank, *Metabolites* **2020**, *Vol. 10*, Page *243* **2020**, *10* 243.
- [68] D. J. Phares, K. P. Rhoads, A. S. Wexler, D. B. Kane, M. V. Johnston, *Analytical Chemistry* **2001**, *73* 2338.
- [69] D. M. Murphy, A. M. Middlebrook, . M. Warshawsky, *Aerosol Science and Technology* **2003**, *37* 382.
- [70] M. Äijälä, K. R. Daellenbach, F. Canonaco, L. Heikkinen, H. Junninen, T. Petäjä, M. Kulmala, A. S. H. Prévôt, M. Ehn, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2019**, *19* 3645.
- [71] M. A. Zawadowicz, K. D. Froyd, D. M. Murphy, D. J. Cziczo, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2017**, *17* 7193.
- [72] C. D. Christopoulos, S. Garimella, M. A. Zawadowicz, O. Möhler, D. J. Cziczo, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* **2018**, *11* 5687.
- [73] H. L. Lu, Z. M. Su, L. Li, X. Li, *Analytical Chemistry* **2022**, *94* 17861.
- [74] F. Wang, H. Yu, Z. Wang, W. Liang, G. Shi, J. Gao, M. Li, Y. Feng, *Science of the Total Environment* **2021**, *762*.
- [75] G. D. Bland, M. Battifarano, Q. Liu, X. Yang, D. Lu, G. Jiang, G. V. Lowry, *Environmental Science and Technology Letters* **2022**.
- [76] X. Gong, H. Wex, T. Müller, S. Henning, J. Voigtländer, A. Wiedensohler, F. Stratmann, *Atmos. Chem. Phys* **2022**, *22* 5175.
- [77] P. Pande, M. Shrivastava, J. E. Shilling, A. Zelenyuk, Q. Zhang, Q. Chen, N. L. Ng, Y. Zhang, M. Takeuchi, T. Nah, Q. Z. Rasool, Y. Zhang, B. Zhao, Y. Liu, *ACS Earth and Space Chemistry* **2022**, *6* 932.
- [78] C. Song, S. Becagli, D. C. S. Beddows, J. Brean, J. Browse, Q. Dai, M. Dall'Osto, V. Ferracci, R. M. Harrison, N. Harris, W. Li, A. E. Jones, A. Kirchgäßner, A. G. Kramawijaya, A. Kurganskiy, A. Lupi, M. Mazzola, M. Severi, R. Traversi, Z. Shi, *Environmental Science and Technology* **2022**, *56* 11189.
- [79] C. Giri, H. J. Cleaves, M. Meringer, K. Chandru, *Sustainability (Switzerland)* **2021**, *13*.
- [80] J. Ruiz-Jimenez, M. Okuljar, O.-M. Sietiö, G. Demaria, T. Liangsupree, E. Zagatti, J. Aalto, K. Hartonen, J. Heinonsalo, J. Bäck, T. Petäjä, M.-L. Riekkola, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2021**, *21* 8775.
- [81] J. J. Y. Zhang, L. Sun, D. Rainham, T. J. B. Dummer, A. J. Wheeler, A. Anastasopoulos, M. Gibson, M. Johnson, *Science of the Total Environment* **2022**, *806*.
- [82] T. Feng, T. Chen, M. Li, J. Chi, H. Tang, T. Zhang, H. Li, *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **2022**, *231*.
- [83] H. Jiang, J. Li, R. Sun, C. Tian, J. Tang, B. Jiang, Y. Liao, C.-E. Chen, G. Zhang, *Environmental Science and Technology* **2021**, *55* 10268.

- [84] Y. Sun, Y.-B. Chen, M.-J. Chu, X.-H. Jiang, Y. Wang, B.-Q. Guo, *Journal of Chinese Mass Spectrometry Society* **2018**, *39* 513.
- [85] M. Guillevic, A. Guillevic, M. K. Vollmer, P. Schlauri, M. Hill, L. Emmenegger, S. Reimann, *Journal of Cheminformatics* **2021**, *13*.
- [86] T. Kind, O. Fiehn, *Bioanalytical Reviews* **2010**, *2* 23.
- [87] K. Dührkop, M. Fleischauer, M. Ludwig, A. A. Aksenov, A. V. Melnik, M. Meusel, P. C. Dorrestein, J. Rousu, S. Böcker, *Nature Methods* **2019**, *16* 299.
- [88] M. Wang, J. J. Carver, V. V. Phelan, L. M. Sanchez, N. Garg, Y. Peng, D. D. Nguyen, J. Watrous, C. A. Kaponov, T. Luzzatto-Knaan, C. Porto, A. Bouslimani, A. V. Melnik, M. J. Meehan, W. T. Liu, M. Crüsemann, P. D. Boudreau, E. Esquenazi, M. Sandoval-Calderón, R. D. Kersten, L. A. Pace, R. A. Quinn, K. R. Duncan, C. C. Hsu, D. J. Floros, R. G. Gavilan, K. Kleingrewe, T. Northen, R. J. Dutton, D. Parrot, E. E. Carlson, B. Aigle, C. F. Michelsen, L. Jelsbak, C. Sohlenkamp, P. Pevzner, A. Edlund, J. McLean, J. Piel, B. T. Murphy, L. Gerwick, C. C. Liaw, Y. L. Yang, H. U. Humpf, M. Maansson, R. A. Keyzers, A. C. Sims, A. R. Johnson, A. M. Sidebottom, B. E. Sedio, A. Klitgaard, C. B. Larson, C. A. Boya, D. Torres-Mendoza, D. J. Gonzalez, D. B. Silva, L. M. Marques, D. P. Demarque, E. Pociute, E. C. O'Neill, E. Briand, E. J. Helfrich, E. A. Granatosky, E. Glukhov, F. Ryffel, H. Houson, H. Mohimani, J. J. Kharbush, Y. Zeng, J. A. Vorholt, K. L. Kurita, P. Charusanti, K. L. McPhail, K. F. Nielsen, L. Vuong, M. Elfeki, M. F. Traxler, N. Engene, N. Koyama, O. B. Vining, R. Baric, R. R. Silva, S. J. Mascuch, S. Tomasi, S. Jenkins, V. Macherla, T. Hoffman, V. Agarwal, P. G. Williams, J. Dai, R. Neupane, J. Gurr, A. M. Rodríguez, A. Lamsa, C. Zhang, K. Dorrestein, B. M. Duggan, J. Almaliti, P. M. Allard, P. Phapale, L. F. Nothias, T. Alexandrov, M. Litaudon, J. L. Wolfender, J. E. Kyle, T. O. Metz, T. Peryea, D. T. Nguyen, D. VanLeer, P. Shinn, A. Jadhav, R. Müller, K. M. Waters, W. Shi, X. Liu, L. Zhang, R. Knight, P. R. Jensen, B. Palsson, K. Pogliano, R. G. Linington, M. Gutiérrez, N. P. Lopes, W. H. Gerwick, B. S. Moore, P. C. Dorrestein, N. Bandeira, *Nat. Biotechnol.* **2016**, *34* 828.
- [89] J. Hummel, N. Strehmel, C. Bölling, S. Schmidt, D. Walther, J. Kopka, *Mass Spectral Search and Analysis Using the Golm Metabolome Database*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, **2013**.
- [90] M. Sud, E. Fahy, D. Cotter, A. Brown, E. A. Dennis, C. K. Glass, A. H. Merrill, R. C. Murphy, C. R. Raetz, D. W. Russell, S. Subramaniam, *Nucleic Acids Research* **2007**, *35* D527.
- [91] MassBank consortium, MassBank/MassBank-data: Release version 2022.12, <https://zenodo.org/record/7436494>, Accessed: 2023-08-22.
- [92] MassBank of North America, <https://mona.fiehnlab.ucdavis.edu/>, Accessed: 2023-08-22.
- [93] Y. Sawada, R. Nakabayashi, Y. Yamada, M. Suzuki, M. Sato, A. Sakata, K. Akiyama, T. Sakurai, F. Matsuda, T. Aoki, M. Y. Hirai, K. Saito, *Phytochemistry* **2012**, *82* 38.
- [94] Advanced mass spectral database (mzcloud), www.mzcloud.org, Accessed: 2023-08-22.
- [95] D. S. Wishart, A. Guo, E. Oler, F. Wang, A. Anjum, H. Peters, R. Dizon, Z. Sayeeda, S. Tian, B. L. Lee, M. Berjanskii, R. Mah, M. Yamamoto, J. Jovel, C. Torres-Calzada, M. Hiebert-Giesbrecht, V. W. Lui, D. Varshavi, D. Varshavi, D. Allen, D. Arndt, N. Khetarpal, A. Sivakumar, K. Harford, S. Sanford, K. Yee, X. Cao, Z. Budinski, J. Liigand, L. Zhang, J. Zheng, R. Mandal, N. Karu, M. Dambrova, H. B. S. Oth, R. Greiner, V. Gautam, *Nucleic Acids Research* **2022**, *50*.
- [96] K. Watanabe, E. Yasugi, M. Oshima, *Trends in Glycoscience and Glycotechnology* **2000**, *12* 175.
- [97] T. Kind, K. H. Liu, D. Y. Lee, B. Defelice, J. K. Meissen, O. Fiehn, *Nature Methods* **2013**, *10* 755.

- [98] R. J. Weber, E. Li, J. Bruty, S. He, M. R. Viant, *Bioinformatics* **2012**, *28* 2856.
- [99] NIST23: Updates to the nist tandem and electron ionization spectral libraries, <https://www.nist.gov/programs-projects/nist23-updates-nist-tandem-and-electron-ionization-spectral-libraries#tand>, Accessed: 2023-08-29.
- [100] R. Taguchi, M. Ishikawa, *Journal of chromatography. A* **2010**, *1217* 4229.
- [101] D. K. Wissenbach, M. R. Meyer, D. Remane, A. A. Weber, H. H. Maurer, *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry* **2011**, *400* 79.
- [102] D. K. Wissenbach, M. R. Meyer, D. Remane, A. A. Philipp, A. A. Weber, H. H. Maurer, *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry* **2011**, *400* 3481.
- [103] C. A. Smith, G. O'Maille, E. J. Want, C. Qin, S. A. Trauger, T. R. Brandon, D. E. Custodio, R. Abagyan, G. Siuzdak, *Therapeutic Drug Monitoring* **2005**, *27* 747.
- [104] C. Guijas, J. R. Montenegro-Burke, X. Domingo-Almenara, A. Palermo, B. Warth, G. Hermann, G. Koellensperger, T. Huan, W. Uritboonthai, A. E. Aisporna, D. W. Wolan, M. E. Spilker, H. P. Benton, G. Siuzdak, *Anal. Chem* **2018**, *90* 11.
- [105] J. R. Montenegro-Burke, C. Guijas, G. Siuzdak, *Methods in molecular biology (Clifton, N.J.)* **2020**, *2104* 149.
- [106] F. W. McLafferty, Wiley, *Wiley Registry of Mass Spectral data*, Wiley, 12 edition, **2020**.
- [107] H. Oberacher, *Wiley Registry of Tandem Mass Spectral Data: MS for ID*, Wiley, **2012**.
- [108] M. Vinaixa, E. L. Schymanski, S. Neumann, M. Navarro, R. M. Salek, O. Yanes, *TrAC - Trends in Analytical Chemistry* **2016**, *78* 23.
- [109] M. N. Eckberg, L. E. Arroyo-Mora, D. R. Stoll, A. P. Decaprio, *Journal of Analytical Toxicology* **2019**, *43* 170.
- [110] H. Horai, M. Arita, S. Kanaya, Y. Nihei, T. Ikeda, K. Suwa, Y. Ojima, K. Tanaka, S. Tanaka, K. Aoshima, Y. Oda, Y. Kakazu, M. Kusano, T. Tohge, F. Matsuda, Y. Sawada, M. Y. Hirai, H. Nakanishi, K. Ikeda, N. Akimoto, T. Maoka, H. Takahashi, T. Ara, N. Sakurai, H. Suzuki, D. Shibata, S. Neumann, T. Iida, K. Tanaka, K. Funatsu, F. Matsuura, T. Soga, R. Taguchi, K. Saito, T. Nishioka, *Journal of mass spectrometry* **2010**, *45* 703.
- [111] K. M. Mendez, L. Pritchard, S. N. Reinke, D. I. Broadhurst, *Metabolomics* **2019**, *15* 1.
- [112] P. G. Pedrioli, J. K. Eng, R. Hubley, M. Vogelzang, E. W. Deutsch, B. Raught, B. Pratt, E. Nilsson, R. H. Angeletti, R. Apweiler, K. Cheung, C. E. Costello, H. Hermjakob, S. Huang, R. K. Julian, E. Kapp, M. E. McComb, S. G. Oliver, G. Omenn, N. W. Paton, R. Simpson, R. Smith, C. F. Taylor, W. Zhu, R. Aebersold, *Nature Biotechnology* **2004**, *22* 1459.
- [113] H. L. Röst, T. Sachsenberg, S. Aiche, C. Bielow, H. Weissner, F. Aicheler, S. Andreotti, H.-C. Ehrlich, P. Gutenbrunner, E. Kenar, et al., *Nature methods* **2016**, *13*, 9 741.
- [114] H. Shen, K. Dührkop, S. Böcker, J. Rousu, *Bioinformatics* **2014**, *30* i157.
- [115] C. A. Smith, E. J. Want, G. O'Maille, R. Abagyan, G. Siuzdak, *Analytical Chemistry* **2006**, *78* 779.
- [116] R. Tautenhahn, C. Bottcher, S. Neumann, *BMC Bioinformatics* **2008**, *9* 1.
- [117] Metaboscape, <https://www.bruker.com/en/products-and-solutions/mass-spectrometry/ms-software/metaboscape.html>, Accessed: 2023-06-27.

- [118] Progenesis QI, <https://www.nonlinear.com/progenesis/qi/>, Accessed: 2023-06-27.
- [119] N. Hoffmann, J. Rein, T. Sachsenberg, J. Hartler, K. Haug, G. Mayer, O. Alka, S. Dayalan, J. T. Pearce, P. Rocca-Serra, D. Qi, M. Eisenacher, Y. Perez-Riverol, J. A. Vizcaíno, R. M. Salek, S. Neumann, A. R. Jones, *Analytical Chemistry* **2019**, *91* 3302.
- [120] R. Schmid, S. Heuckeroth, A. Korf, A. Smirnov, O. Myers, T. S. Dyrlund, R. Bushuiev, K. J. Murray, N. Hoffmann, M. Lu, A. Sarvepalli, Z. Zhang, M. Fleischauer, K. Dührkop, M. Wesner, S. J. Hoogstra, E. Rudt, O. Mokshyna, C. Brungs, K. Ponomarov, L. Mutabdžija, T. Damiani, C. J. Pudney, M. Earll, P. O. Helmer, T. R. Fallon, T. Schulze, A. Rivas-Ubach, A. Bilbao, H. Richter, L. F. Nothias, M. Wang, M. Orešič, J. K. Weng, S. Böcker, A. Jeibmann, H. Hayen, U. Karst, P. C. Dorrestein, D. Petras, X. Du, T. Pluskal, *Nature Biotechnology* **2023**, *41* 447.
- [121] H. Tsugawa, T. Cajka, T. Kind, Y. Ma, B. Higgins, K. Ikeda, M. Kanazawa, J. Vandergheynst, O. Fiehn, M. Arita, *Nature Methods* **2015**, *12* 523.
- [122] L. F. Nothias, D. Petras, R. Schmid, K. Dührkop, J. Rainer, A. Sarvepalli, I. Protsyuk, M. Ernst, H. Tsugawa, M. Fleischauer, F. Aicheler, A. A. Aksenov, O. Alka, P. M. Allard, A. Barsch, X. Cachet, A. M. Caraballo-Rodriguez, R. R. D. Silva, T. Dang, N. Garg, J. M. Gauglitz, A. Gurevich, G. Isaac, A. K. Jarmusch, Z. Kameník, K. B. Kang, N. Kessler, I. Koester, A. Korf, A. L. Gouellec, M. Ludwig, C. M. H. L. I. McCall, J. McSayles, S. W. Meyer, H. Mohimani, M. Morsy, O. Moyne, S. Neumann, H. Neuweger, N. H. Nguyen, M. Nothias-Esposito, J. Paolini, V. V. Phelan, T. Pluskal, R. A. Quinn, S. Rogers, B. Shrestha, A. Tripathi, J. J. van der Hooft, F. Vargas, K. C. Weldon, M. Witting, H. Yang, Z. Zhang, F. Zubeil, O. Kohlbacher, S. Böcker, T. Alexandrov, N. Bandeira, M. Wang, P. C. Dorrestein, *Nature Methods* **2020**, *17* 905.
- [123] S. Wolf, S. Schmidt, M. Müller-Hannemann, S. Neumann, *BMC Bioinformatics* **2010**, *11* 1.
- [124] C. Ruttkies, E. L. Schymanski, S. Wolf, J. Hollender, S. Neumann, *Journal of Cheminformatics* **2016**, *8* 1.
- [125] F. Allen, A. Pon, M. Wilson, R. Greiner, D. Wishart, *Nucleic Acids Research* **2014**, *42* W94.
- [126] F. Allen, R. Greiner, D. Wishart, *Metabolomics* **2015**, *11* 98.
- [127] Y. Djoumbou-Feunang, A. Pon, N. Karu, J. Zheng, C. Li, D. Arndt, M. Gautam, F. Allen, D. S. Wishart, *Metabolites* **2019**, *9* 72.
- [128] K. Dührkop, H. Shen, M. Meusel, J. Rousu, S. Böcker, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **2015**, *112* 12580.
- [129] K. Dührkop, S. Böcker, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* **2015**, *9029* 65.
- [130] M. Ludwig, M. Fleischauer, K. Dührkop, M. A. Hoffmann, S. Böcker, *Methods in Molecular Biology* **2020**, *2104* 185.
- [131] M. Heinonen, H. Shen, N. Zamboni, J. Rousu, *Bioinformatics* **2012**, *28* 2333.
- [132] C. Brouard, H. Shen, K. Dührkop, F. D'Alché-Buc, S. Böcker, J. Rousu, *Bioinformatics* **2016**, *32* i28.
- [133] D. H. Nguyen, C. H. Nguyen, H. Mamitsuka, *Bioinformatics* **2018**, *34* i323.
- [134] D. H. Nguyen, C. H. Nguyen, H. Mamitsuka, *Bioinformatics* **2019**, *35* i164.
- [135] D. H. Nguyen, C. H. Nguyen, H. Mamitsuka, *Briefings in Bioinformatics* **2019**, *20* 2028.

- [136] M. Ludwig, L. F. Nothias, K. Dührkop, I. Koester, M. Fleischauer, M. A. Hoffmann, D. Petras, F. Vargas, M. Morsy, L. Aluwihare, P. C. Dorrestein, S. Böcker, *Nature Machine Intelligence* **2020**, *2* 629.
- [137] H. J. Kulik, T. Hammerschmidt, J. Schmidt, S. Botti, M. A. L. Marques, M. Boley, M. Schefler, M. Todorović, P. Rinke, C. Oses, A. Smolyanyuk, S. Curtarolo, A. Tkatchenko, A. P. Bartók, S. Manzhos, M. Ihara, T. Carrington, J. Behler, O. Isayev, M. Veit, A. Grisafi, J. Nigam, M. Ceriotti, K. T. Schütt, J. Westermayr, M. Gastegger, R. J. Maurer, B. Kalita, K. Burke, R. Nagai, R. Akashi, O. Sugino, J. Hermann, F. Noé, S. Pilati, C. Draxl, M. Kuban, S. Rigamonti, M. Scheidgen, M. Esters, D. Hicks, C. Toher, P. V. Balachandran, I. Tamblyn, S. Whitelam, C. Bellinger, L. M. Ghiringhelli, *Electro. Struct.* **2022**, *4*, 2 023004.
- [138] C. James, D. Weininger, J. Delany, Daylight theory manual, **1995**.
- [139] G. Landrum, Rdkit: Open-source cheminformatics, **2022**.
- [140] C. Brouard, E. Bach, S. Böcker, J. Rousu, *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* **2017**, *77* 407.
- [141] C. Brouard, A. Bassé, F. D'alché-Buc, J. Rousu, *Metabolites* **2019**, *9* 160.
- [142] K. Dührkop, L. F. Nothias, M. Fleischauer, R. Reher, M. Ludwig, M. A. Hoffmann, D. Petras, W. H. Gerwick, J. Rousu, P. C. Dorrestein, S. Böcker, *Nature Biotechnology* **2020**, *39* 462.
- [143] M. A. Stravs, K. Dührkop, S. Böcker, N. Zamboni, *Nature Methods 2022 19:7* **2022**, *19* 865.
- [144] B. T. Cooper, X. Yan, Y. Simón-Manso, D. V. Tchekhovskoi, Y. A. Mirokhin, S. E. Stein, *Analytical Chemistry* **2019**, *91* 13924.
- [145] F. Qiu, Z. Lei, L. W. Sumner, *Analytica Chimica Acta* **2018**, *1037* 316.
- [146] V. K. Gupta, H. Khani, B. Ahmadi-Roudi, S. Mirakhorli, E. Fereyduni, S. Agarwal, *Talanta* **2011**, *83* 1014.
- [147] T. H. Miller, A. Musenga, D. A. Cowan, L. P. Barron, *Analytical Chemistry* **2013**, *85* 10330.
- [148] M. Jalali-Heravi, M. H. Fatemi, *Journal of Chromatography A* **2001**, *915* 177.
- [149] M. Witting, S. Böcker, *Journal of Separation Science* **2020**, *43*, 9-10 1746.
- [150] P.-L. Plante, E. Francovic-Fontaine, J. C. May, J. A. Mclean, E. S. Baker, F. Laviolette, M. Marchand, J. Corbeil, *Analytical Chemistry* **2019**, *91* 5191–5199.
- [151] J. Stanstrup, S. Neumann, U. Vrhovsek, *Analytical chemistry* **2015**, *87*, 18 9421.
- [152] E. Bach, S. Szedmak, C. Brouard, S. Böcker, J. Rousu, *Bioinformatics* **2018**, *34* i875.
- [153] E. Bach, E. L. Schymanski, J. Rousu, *Nature Machine Intelligence* **2022**, *4* 1224.
- [154] G. Isaacman-Vanwertz, B. Aumont, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2021**, *21* 6541.
- [155] V. Besel, M. Todorović, T. Kurtén, P. Rinke, H. Vehkamäki, *Sci. Data* **2023**, *10*, 1 450.
- [156] C. Wang, T. Yuan, S. Wood, K. U. Goss, J. Li, Q. Ying, F. Wania, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2017**, *17* 7529.
- [157] M. Krüger, J. Wilson, M. Wietzoreck, B. A. M. Bandowe, G. Lammel, B. Schmidt, U. Pöschl, T. Berkemeier, C. T. Berkemeier, *Natural Sciences* **2022**, *2* e20220016.
- [158] D. P. Tabor, R. Gómez-Bombarelli, L. Tong, R. G. Gordon, M. J. Aziz, A. Aspuru-Guzik, *Journal of Materials Chemistry A* **2019**, *7* 12833.

- [159] K. Khrabrov, I. Shenbin, A. Ryabov, A. Tsy-pin, A. Telepov, A. Alekseev, A. Grishin, P. Strashnov, P. Zhilyaev, S. Nikolenko, A. Kadurin, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **2022**, *24* 25853.
- [160] D. Polykovskiy, A. Zhebrak, B. Sanchez-Lengeling, S. Golovanov, O. Tatanov, S. Belyaev, R. Kurbanov, A. Artamonov, V. Aladinskiy, M. Veselov, A. Kadurin, S. Johansson, H. Chen, S. Nikolenko, A. Aspuru-Guzik, A. Zhavoronkov, *Frontiers in Pharmacology* **2020**, *11* 1931.
- [161] L. H. Mervin, S. Johansson, E. Semenova, K. A. Giblin, O. Engkvist, *Drug Discovery Today* **2021**, *26* 474.
- [162] Y. Hu, J. Musielewicz, Z. W. Ulissi, A. J. Medford, *Machine Learning: Science and Technology* **2022**, *3* 045028.
- [163] A. Ghose, M. Segal, F. Meng, Z. Liang, M. S. Hybertsen, X. Qu, E. Stavitski, S. Yoo, D. Lu, M. R. Carbone, *Physical Review Research* **2023**, *5* 013180.
- [164] G. Scalia, C. A. Grambow, B. Pernici, Y.-P. Li, W. H. Green, *J. Chem. Inf. Model* **2020**, *60* 29.
- [165] S. Wan, R. C. Sinclair, P. V. Coveney, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **2021**, *379*.
- [166] Y. Zhou, B. Yang, *Journal of Energy Chemistry* **2023**, *81* 118.
- [167] L. Fang, E. Makkonen, M. Todorović, P. Rinke, X. Chen, *J. Chem. Theory Comput* **2021**, *17*.
- [168] M. A. Hoffmann, L.-F. Nothias, M. Ludwig, M. Fleischauer, E. C. Gentry, M. Witting, P. C. Dorrestein, K. Dührkop, S. Böcker, *Nature Biotechnology* **2022**, *40*, *3* 411.
- [169] M. Wen, E. B. Tadmor, *npj Computational Materials* **2020**, *6* 1.
- [170] M. Riva, M. Ehn, D. Li, S. Tomaz, F. Bourgain, S. Perrier, C. George, *Analytical Chemistry* **2019**, *91* 9419.
- [171] N. Hyttinen, M. P. Rissanen, T. Kurtén, *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **2017**, *121* 2172.
- [172] T. Kurtén, T. Petäjä, J. Smith, I. K. Ortega, M. Sipilä, H. Junninen, M. Ehn, H. Vehkamäki, L. Mauldin, D. R. Worsnop, M. Kulmala, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2011**, *11* 3007.
- [173] M. Riva, M. Brüggemann, D. Li, S. Perrier, C. George, H. Herrmann, T. Berndt, *Analytical Chemistry* **2020**, *92* 8142.
- [174] L. Himanen, A. Geurts, A. S. Foster, P. Rinke, *Adv. Sci.* **2019**, *6*, *21* 1900808.
- [175] L. D. Yee, G. Isaacman-VanWertz, R. A. Wernis, M. Meng, V. Rivera, N. M. Kreisberg, S. V. Hering, M. S. Bering, M. Glasius, M. A. Upshur, A. G. Bé, R. J. Thomson, F. M. Geiger, J. H. Offenberg, M. Lewandowski, I. Kourtchev, M. Kalberer, S. D. Sá, S. T. Martin, M. L. Alexander, B. B. Palm, W. Hu, P. Campuzano-Jost, D. A. Day, J. L. Jimenez, Y. Liu, K. A. McKinney, P. Artaxo, J. Viegas, A. Manzi, M. B. Oliveira, R. D. Souza, L. A. Machado, K. Longo, A. H. Goldstein, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2018**, *18* 10433.
- [176] C. N. Jen, L. E. Hatch, V. Selimovic, R. J. Yokelson, R. Weber, A. E. Fernandez, N. M. Kreisberg, K. C. Barsanti, A. H. Goldstein, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2019**, *19* 1013.
- [177] M. D. Wilkinson, M. Dumontier, I. J. Aalbersberg, G. Appleton, M. Axton, A. Baak, N. Blomberg, J. W. Boiten, L. B. da Silva Santos, P. E. Bourne, J. Bouwman, A. J. Brookes, T. Clark, M. Crosas, I. Dillo, O. Dumon, S. Edmunds, C. T. Evelo, R. Finkers, A. Gonzalez-Beltran, A. J. Gray, P. Groth, C. Goble, J. S. Grethe, J. Heringa, P. A. t Hoen, R. Hooft, T. Kuhn, R. Kok, J. Kok, S. J. Lusher, M. E. Martone, A. Mons, A. L. Packer, B. Persson, P. Rocca-Serra, M. Roos, R. van Schaik, S. A. Sansone, E. Schultes, T. Sengstag, T. Slater, G. Strawn, M. A. Swertz, M. Thompson, J. V. D. Lei, E. V. Mulligen, J. Velterop, A. Waagmeester, P. Wittenburg, K. Wolstencroft, J. Zhao, B. Mons, *Scientific Data* **2016**, *3*.