## Supplemental materials

## Materials and Methods

Studies were performed under the supervision of the NYU Institutional Human Subjects Committee, and all subjects provided written informed consent, with samples obtained during visits for routine care. Exclusion and inclusion criteria for patients and healthy controls have previously been described [1]. Ethnicity and race were self-declared based on standard questionnaire. All subjects were females, and age-range for patients and controls were not significantly different. These specific criteria, other aspects of the clinical studies, and the collection and characterization of the gut microbiota are described in Tables S1, S2 and S3. Control subjects were sampled quarterly.

## Microbiota analyses

As previously described [1], fecal sampling was performed following a standardized and validated collection protocol using a special media for later recovery of viable bacteria. Microbial DNA from fecal samples was isolated following a validated standard protocol, with extraction directly or after frozen and stored at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (as per Human Microbiome Project website).
For phylogenetic assignments, we analyzed diagnostic 16S ribosomal RNA (16S rRNA) gene sequences in libraries for each fecal sample[2-4]. Briefly, to determine the distribution of operational taxonomic units (OTUs )[5, 6] the diagnostic V4 region of 16 S rRNA gene is amplified with flanking oligo primers with embedded 16 bp barcodes, producing a 254 bp read length. From each sample, three replicate libraries were generated with the same bar-coded oligonucleotide primer pair, which were then pooled, then purified[2], and stored until sequencing. With the MiSeq instrument (Illumina) in a 96 -well format, these amplimers were generated and later characterized based on $\sim 150$ bp reads in both directions.

Upstream informatics analysis. The quality-filtered pre-processed sequences of the community sequence data were analyzed using QIIME pipeline [7]. The pipeline consists of the following steps: (i) clustering of the sequences into operational taxonomical units (OTUs) using UCLUST program at 97\% similarity level [8]; (ii) taxonomical assignment of each OTU by running RDP Classifier [9] at 80\% bootstrap confidence on a representative sequence from each OTU; (iii) alignment of representative sequences using PyNAST [7] with the Greengenes core-set alignment template; (iv) building a phylogenetic tree for the OTUs using FastTree program[10]; and (v) calculating Unifrac distances between each sample[11]. The data was then exported into R phyloseq[12] data structures and analyzed using custom reproducible RMarkdown scripts. Alpha diversity analyses, association and correlation analyses, as well as most visualizations were performed in R.
Corroboration of results obtained with the QIIME pipeline was done by inference of amplicon sequence variants (ASV) as with the DADA2 pipeline[13] with Silva reference database[14]. To determine the relative abundances with respect to renal disease, univariate testing of ASVs was performed using the PESAME (Predictive Effect Size Analysis in Multivariate Ensembles) protocol[15] and our 16S rRNA amplicon data and the Greengenes database, which assessed the significance of pairwise differences using the Mann-Whitney test. This study was not powered adequately for multiple comparison
correction; however, we examined the significance of our results by false discovery rate[16]. Predictive effect sizes were estimated by converting the $U$ statistics to area under receiver operator characteristic curve. Confidence intervals on the area under receiver operator characteristic curve metrics were estimated by normal approximation [17].

## Isolation, characterization, genome sequence determination of RG colonies

To identify and recover RG colonies, fecal samples were streaked onto TSBA or BHI plates and grown under anaerobic conditions. Individual colonies, identified based on morphology and growth characteristics of the strains ATCC 21492 (termed RG1) and CC55_001C (termed RG2), were sub-streaked, then sub-cultured. From each colony genomic DNA was recovered with the power soil (Qiagen ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ ) kit, according to the manufacturer's instructions, quantified on a Nanodrop 1000 (Thermo Scientific).
To assess total and RG specific 16S rRNA gene representation [18], PCR assays were performed with the T100 thermocycler (Bio-Rad ${ }^{T M}$ ) using the primers:
UniF340(5'-ACTCCTACGGGAGGCAGCAGT-3')
UniR514(5'-ATTACCGCGGCTGCTGGC-3').
For the following cycles: an initial $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 min, followed by 35 cycles of $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 45 seconds, $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min ; and followed by extension at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min and $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ hold.

The RG species-specific 16S rRNA was determined with the previously reported oligonucleotide primers [18]:

## Fwd 5'-GGACTGCATTTGGAACTGTCAG-3'

## Rev 5'-AACGTCAGTCATCGTCCAGAAAG-3'

for the following cycles: an initial $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 min , followed by 35 cycles of $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 45 seconds, $58^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min ; and followed by extension at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min and $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ hold.
Colonies of interest were named based on the Lupus patient donor that provided the faecal sample of origin, S47- and S107-, followed by the number of the bacterial isolate. DNA from each isolate was then subjected to whole genome sequencing, using both NextSeq 550 Illumina and PacBio technologies.

## Bacterial whole-genome sequence analysis

Raw short-read sequence reads were preprocessed using fastp [19] version 0.22 using default settings. Preprocessed reads were screened for within-species contamination using ConFindr [20] as well as cross-species contamination using MetaPhIAn [21]. Preprocessed short reads were assembled using Unicycler [22] using its conservative mode.

Processing and assembly of PacBio long reads was performed using the PacBio SMRT Link software suite. Assemblies were further assessed by BLAST search [23] against the NCBI nt database. Contigs matching Cutibacterium acnes, a common skin bacterium, were removed from long-read assemblies, and it was verified that the remaining contigs mapped to corresponding uncontaminated short-read assemblies genome assemblies
were annotated using Prokka [24]. The BEDTools software suite [25] was used to divide genome assemblies into 1 kbp windows and to analyze GC content per window. Each window was compared to RG1 (NCBI accession GCF_009831375.1) and RG2 (GCF_000507805.1) using BLAST [23], keeping only alignments with E values below $10^{-}$ ${ }^{20}$. Visualizations of each genome assembly were produced using the circlize $R$ package [26].

For classical multi-dimensional analyses of whole genome sequences (WGS) of a dissimilarity matrix paired end sequencing reads were de novo assembled into contigs with SPAdes [27]. We then computed whole genome-wise nucleotide similarity with FastANI [28] where collected draft genomes from health control ( $n=35$ ), inflammatory bowel disease ( $\mathrm{n}=11$ ), SLE strains ( $\mathrm{n}=26$ ) and reference genomes of R. gnavus ( $\mathrm{n}=4$ ) were utilized. The distance of each pair of draft genome was defined as $1-($ ANII,j+ANIj,i)/2 where $i$ is the first draft genome, and $j$ is the second draft genome. Iterating over all pairs of draft genomes, a distance matrix of $76^{\star} 76$ was then constructed and subject to classical multidimensional scaling decomposition. The samples were then projected on the first two eigenvectors with health conditions as different colors and reference patterns as different shapes.

Assessment of gene content across assemblies was performed using Orthofinder [29]. The resulting presence/absence matrix of orthogroups was used to generate pairwise Jaccard dissimilarities between isolates using the vegan R package [30]. Snippy was used to produce a core genome alignment [31], using the downloaded RefSeq genome assembly for strain RG1 as reference (NCBI accession number GCF_009831375.1). A phylogenetic tree was inferred from the core alignment using RAxML [32] with a GTRGAMMA model and 100 bootstrap replicates.
Lipoglycan purification and mass spectrometric analysis. RG strains were individually expanded in an anerobic biofermeter to 300 ml of a chopped meat media culture, grown to stationary phase and then pelleted, and used in an established extraction procedure designed to isolate lipoteichoic acids from Gram-positive bacteria [33], which were performed as previously described [1] from which earlier analysis of the RG2 purified moiety was shown to contain a diacylglycerol- (DAG-) containing lipid anchor characteristic of a lipoglycan (LG). Briefly, to purify the cell wall lipoconjugates, bacterial cells were disrupted with a French press, then the precipitate was removed by ultracentrifugation. The supernatant was subjected to butanol-water extraction and the water-soluble component then passaged over a Hydrophobic Interaction Chromatography (HIC) to isolate lipoglycan-containing fractions.
The mass spectrometric analyses of LG preparations were performed on a Q Exactive Plus (ThermoFisher Scientific, Bremen, Germany) using a Triversa Nanomate (Advion, Ithaca, NY) as nano-ESI source. LG extracts were initially dissolved in a concentration of $1 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mu \mathrm{l}-1$ in water and $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of this solution were mixed with $150 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of water/propan-2ol/7 M triethylamine/acetic acid (50:50:0.06:0.02, [v/v/v/v]). Mass spectra were recorded for 0.50 min in the negative mode in an $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$-range of $400-2000$ or $500-3000$ applying a spray voltage of -1.1 kV . Depicted $\mathrm{MS}^{1}$ spectra were charge deconvoluted (Xtract module of Xcalibur 3.1 software; ThermoFisher Scientific, Bremen, Germany) and all provided values refer to mono-isotopic masses of neutral molecules. Single scan *.mzmL files were generated with MSconvert [34] and used as import for LipidXplorer 1.2.8 [35] to compute
an aligned data set. From this data set the top hundred intense peaks were used to prepare the heatmap shown in Fig. 5D and to compute the similarity score depicted in Fig. 5E based on Spearman rank correlation. For MS² experiments aiming to analyze the glycolipid linker composition, the de-O-acyl LG3 preparation described earlier [1] was used. Doubly charged ions of interest were selected and spectra were recorded in the negative ion mode at different normalized collision energies (NCE). With the derived data, a structural model (Fig. 5F) was generated with Biorender software (Biorender.com).

Immunoblotting. Electrophoretic separation used Bis-Tris mini gels (Novex, Thermo Fisher) with bacterial extracts loaded at the same concentration, then transferred to membranes, which were incubated with sera diluted at 1:100, and incubated overnight at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. For detection, anti-human IgG biotin conjugated (Jackson ImmunoResearch Labs, USA) was added and developed by IRDye ${ }^{\circledR} 800 \mathrm{CW}$ Streptavidin (LI-COR ${ }^{\circledR}$ ).

## Generation of LG-specific murine monoclonal antibodies

A commercial vendor (Envigo Bioproducts Inc., Indianapolis) immunized 10 BALB/c mice with extract of the RG2 strain emulsified into complete Freund's adjuvant and later boosted with lipoglycan purified from the Lupus S47-18 strain, which was emulsified in incomplete Freund's adjuvant. All LG were purified from an RG strain by a method that included fractionation by hydrophobic interaction chromatography, as previously described [1]. The spleen from the mouse with the strongest post-immunization was fused with Ig-deficient NS-1 myeloma cells. The spent supernatants subclones were evaluated for IgG-reactivity, which demonstrated highly correlated reactivity with whole extracts of the immunizing RG strain and purified RG lipoglycan, with the subcloned hybridoma cell lines, termed mAb 33.2.2 and mAb 34.2.2. Antibody gene sequences were determined by Abterra bio, San Diego) (see Supplementary Figure S12).

## Direct binding ELISA

To detect the reactivity of the murine monoclonal antibodies 33.2 .2 and mAb 34.2.2 with the different RG strains, the ELISA plates were coated with the bacterial extracts from RG2, S47-18, S107-48, S107-86, RG1 as well as with the purified lipoglycan from the strains RG2 and S47-18. Next, the murine monoclonal antibodies were added at $100 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ and $25 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ in duplicate, after incubation for 2 hrs at RT. Binding was detected with goat anti mouse IgG HRP conjugated at 1:10,000 (Jackson ImmunoResearch), then TMB substrate was added to develop the plate.

To detect human serum IgG antibody responses to RG lipoglycan, microtiter wells were coated with purified lipoglycan at $0.5 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{ml}$ in BBS overnight at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After blocking with $1 \%$ BSA in PBS, for 1 hr at RT, serum samples were added to at 1:3,200 for total $\operatorname{lgG}$, and at 1:800 for IgG subclass-specific detection and incubated for 2 hrs at RT. Binding was detected with goat anti-human IgG F'ab'2 biotin-conjugated (Cat. 109-066-006, Jackson ImmunoResearch) at 1:20,000, murine anti-human IgG1 biotin-conjugated (Cat. A10650, Invitrogen) at 1:1000, murine anti-human IgG2 biotin-conjugated (Cat. 05-3540, Invitrogen) at 1:1000, murine anti-human lgG3 biotin-conjugated (Cat. 05-3640, Invitrogen) at 1:1000, murine anti-human lgG4 biotin-conjugated (Cat. A10663, Invitrogen) at 1:500, incubated for 1 hr at RT. Then, washed with $0.05 \%$ Tween20-PBS, then HRP-conjugated Streptavidin (Thermo-Fisher) at 1:20,000 was added, and
incubated for 1 hr at RT, washed then followed by addition of TMB substrate to develop wells.

## Multiplex Bead based immunoassay

The assays performed as previously described in [1]. Briefly, serum samples from patients and healthy controls underwent to 4 -fold serial dilutions starting at 1:200 to 1:12,800 against a panel of antigens, including extracts of the Lupus strains RG2, S4718 and RG1, and the purified lipoglycan from the strains RG2 and S47-18, then detecting using goat anti-human IgG PE conjugate (eBioscience).

## Generating a recombinant monoclonal chimeric antibody to the RG lipoglycan

To generate a recombinant monoclonal antibody for use as a standard in a human IgG anti-LG assay, we designed a chimeric antibody with the variable regions, for the 33.2.2 hybridoma cell line (see Figure S14), fused to human IgG2-kappa constant regions. For antibody gene synthesis, DNA sequences were generated in which the VH region of the parental 33.2.2 B-cell hybridoma cell line were placed upstream (i.e., $5^{\prime}$ ) to the gene encoding the human g 2 subclass constant region. In parallel, the light chain variable region for this cell line was placed upstream of the human kappa constant region gene. These target genes were amplified by PCR, with oligonucleotide primers that facilitated cloning into a compatible mammalian expression vector, which was transfected into HEK293 cells (Sino Biological).
For transfection, the plasmids were mixed with transfection reagents at an optimal ratio and then added into the culture of HEK293 cells, which were grown in a serum-free medium and maintained in Erlenmeyer flasks in a bioreactor with stirring at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 6 days. Cells were removed by centrifugation, and the cell culture supernatant was loaded onto a protein-A affinity purification column, then $\lg G$ was eluted with a mild acid buffer with rapid neutralization and dialysis into a physiologic pH buffer.
The purified protein was analyzed by, SDS-PAGE and size exclusion chromatography (SEC). We characterized the capacity of the chimeric antibody to bind the purified lipoglycan antigen in a validated immunoassay, with a method using the Magpix instrument (Luminex) as previously described [1]. Taken together, a functional recombinant antibody was produced and purified, which was demonstrated to retain high level binding activity for the lipoglycan produced by a strain of R. gnavus.

## Statistical analysis

Data are presented as mean $\pm$ SD. The student unpaired $t$ test with Welch correction was used in 2-group comparisons of normally distributed data, whereas the Mann-Whitney nonparametric test was used when the normality assumption was not met. Fisher's exact test was performed to evaluate bivariate associations between categorical variables, or as described. To test for correlations between two variables Spearman test was used. $p$ values were considered significant at <0.05 for two-tailed tests. Prism software Version 9 (GraphPad) was used for all analyses.

## Supplemental figures



Figure S1. Consistent libraries composition between the two 16 S rRNA gene amplimer Miseq batches. Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) on libraries generated from samples of same individuals/samples sequenced in the two different 16S rRNA sequencing runs ( $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ ) as an inter-run technical control, shows no consistent bias or batch effect.


Figure S2. Dysbiosis in in SLE microbiota communities. (A) The number of distinct taxa were estimated based on observed ASV, and alpha diversity richness was reduced in samples from Lupus patients (SLE) compared to healthy controls (CTL) (Wilcoxon, $p=0.0023$ ). (B) Compared to CTL, alpha diversity was reduced in Lupus patients with low disease activity (based on SLEDAI score), with even greater contractions in the group with high disease activity, (Wilcoxon, $p=0.034, p=0.0045$, respectively). (C) Compared to CTL, alpha diversity was reduced in those with inactive renal disease, and further contracted in those with active renal disease (Wilcoxon, $p=0.0006$ and $p=0.0033$, respectively). The purpose was to assess correlations in this data set, and hence these analyses did not consider statistical adjustments for multiple samples from the same patient.


Figure S3. Alpha diversity is reduced in libraries from patients with high Lupus disease activity. Analyses are as shown in Fig. 1. High disease activity is defined as a composite SLEDAI score of $\geq 8$.


Figure S4. Alpha diversity is reduced in libraries from patients with active renal disease compared to inactive renal disease. Analyses performed as shown in Fig. 2. Active renal disease was defined by standard clinical laboratory criteria.


Figure S5. RG expansions occur at the time of high Lupus disease activity and active LN. (A) All samples from SLE patients have a numerical but non-significant trend toward increased RG abundance compared to healthy CTL (Wilcoxon, $p=0.0760$ ). (B) Samples from patients with high disease activity (based on SLEDAI) showed a greater RG abundance, compared to low disease activity and CTL (Wilcoxon, $p=0.81, p=0.01$, respectively). (C) RG expansions were common in the active LN group compared to healthy CTL (Wilcoxon $p=0.02$ ), but not significantly different in the inactive LN group. Wilcoxon, $p=0.27$, NS. RG relative abundance is shown in $\log 2$ values.


Figure S6. Variance within the microbiota communities of an SLE affected individual did not shift in a time-dependent manner. As an independent means to evaluate whether there is evidence of a time-dependence of community variance in these SLE patients sampled over time (Figure 2), we have performed a Spearman correlation analysis of time interval vs. variance. These values did not show significant correlation.


Figure S7. Blooms of Veillonella do not occur concurrent with Lupus disease activity. (A) Veillonella abundance in healthy individuals. (B) Veillonella abundance in SLE patients. (C) Veillonella abundance in SLE patients with above-described RG blooms concordant with Lupus disease activity flares. Abundance based on ASV representation in total amplicon libraries.


Figure S8. Blooms of Fusobacterium do not occur concurrent with peak flares of Lupus disease activity. (A) Fusobacterium abundance in healthy individuals. (B) Fusobacterium abundance in SLE patients. (C) Fusobacterium abundance in SLE patients with above-described RG blooms concordant with Lupus disease activity flares. Abundance based on ASV representation in total amplicon libraries.

## R. gnavus



Figure S9. Abundance of R. gnavus in SLE fecal genomic samples as determined by $16 s r$ RNA and shotgun metagenomic analysis is highly correlated. Here, the abundance of R. gnavus species was determined by these two approaches for 16 SLE fecal samples. Values for Spearman analysis with $p$ value for two-tailed analysis are shown.

Methods for shotgun metagenomic analysis. Fecal genomic DNA was used from 16 SLE patients was used to generate individual metagenomic sequencing runs. After quality filtering using fastp v. 0.23.2 [36], the number of reads in each run ranged from 62 million to 79 million. MetaPhIAn v. 4.0.6 [37], which were used to quantify the relative abundance of taxa from each sequencing run. The relative abundance of Ruminococcus gnavus in these 16 patient samples, as determined by metagenomic shotgun sequencing, were then compared with results as determined by 16S rRNA library analysis. The calculated correlation coefficients of the relative abundances obtained with each of the two methods for R. gnavus, by Pearson correlation was 0.66 and by Spearman correlation was 0.81 .


Figure S10. Lack of dynamic changes in RG abundance documented at sequential time points in healthy and many Lupus-affected individuals. (A) All healthy control subjects displayed a stable low abundance in RG representation. (B) For 11 of the 16 SLE patients under investigation, a stable low abundance in RG representation was detected. By comparison, in Figure 2, data for $5 / 16(31 \%)$ of the SLE patients evaluated overtime, which documented that the abundance of RG fluctuated greatly overtime. In those cases, RG abundance at much higher levels were present in fecal samples obtained proximal to visits in which disease flares were documented. Clinical and demographic data are shown in table S1\&S3. Dotted line depicts an arbitrary 1\% threshold of 16 S rRNA amplicon representing RG abundance that is highly above the mean $0.15 \%$ level in these healthy controls.


Figure S11. Classical multi-dimensional analyses of whole genome sequences (WGS) of a dissimilarity matrix reveals inter-person RG variability and SLE-unique clades. Within these comparisons are strains from healthy adults [38], IBD-related strains [39] and 27 strains from SLE patients with LN flares. The LN strains are shown to distribute into four subgroupings for which a representative strain is identified. The LN strains show differences from all other strains. Reference refers to genome sequences for RG1 (ATCC29149) and RG2 (CC_001C).


Figure S12. Phylogenetic tree based on core alignment of Blautia (Ruminococcus) gnavus (RG) genome assemblies downloaded from NCBI RefSeq, together with five newly generated genome assemblies. Newly sequenced isolates are shown in blue, along with downloaded RG1 (ATCC 29149) strain for reference.


Figure S13. $\mathrm{MS}^{2}$ analysis of the basic de-O-acyl LG without hexose extension (composed of 1 Gro, $8 \mathrm{Hex}, 5 \mathrm{HexNAc}, 3 \mathrm{HexU}$; calc. mono-isotopic mass: 2931.963 Da) of strain RG2 obtained after hydrazine-treatment [1]. In the experiment shown here, we isolated the double charged peak for this molecule and applied an NCE of 30 to induce fragmentation. Full spectrum is depicted in the upper panel. A zoom into the region of $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ 140 to 650 comprising the small molecular fragments generated under these conditions is depicted below. Fragments indicative for the presence of a glycerol-hexuronic acid unit (221.0665 Da: glycerol-hexuronic acid (decarboxylated); 249.0614 Da: glycerolhexuronic acid, with loss of water) which is extended by at least two hexoses (545.1723 Da: glycerol-hexuronic acid (decarboxylated)-hexose-hexose) can be observed. The loss of the glycerol-hexuronic acid unit including loss of water can also be observed from the selected ion. $\left(z=1\right.$, single charged ions $[M-H]^{;} ; z=2$, double charged ions $\left.[M-2 H]^{2-}\right)$.

## Murine monoclonal antibodies recognize structurally related LGs from Lupus RG strains

To independently investigate the antigenic diversity expressed by different RG strains, we generated murine monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) by RG bacterial immunization and boosting with a purified RG LG (see methods). By ELISA, both the mAb 33.2.2 and mAb 34.2.2 strongly react with the purified LGs from the S47-18 strain used for the immunization boost as well as the purified LG from the RG2 strain (Fig. S12A). Both mAbs were reactive with the oligo bands of the same apparent MW in extracts from the RG2 strain and Lupus strains, S47-18, S107-48 and S107-86, that were isolated from two different LN patients (Fig. S12). In immunoblotting studies, these two mAbs recognized the same non-protein oligo band antigen of the same MW recognized in extracts of the Lupus RG strains from two patients, S107-48, S107-86 and S47-18, as well as the index RG2 strain, as well as purified LG from both the S47-18 strain and RG2. Notably, the mAb 33.2.2 is of the murine IgG2a subclass while mAb 34.2.2 is of the $\operatorname{lgG} 1$ subclass, and antibody gene analysis documented the same antibody germline gene usage in both hybridomas in independent rearrangements with only limited somatic hypermutations (fig. S13), which strongly suggests these are products of B-cell clones that are convergent in encoding for binding with the same RG LG antigen-specificity. In an attempt to further characterize their antigenic targets, these same mAbs were tested for reactivity with a collection of 313 purified bacterial glycans, predominantly capsular polysaccharides (see table S6), Yet, none displayed binding reactivity by the LG-specific mAbs, which supports the notion that in the RG LGs express a novel type of cross-reactive antigen.


Figure S14. Reactivity of post-immunization murine monoclonal antibodies is restricted to conserved cross-reactive determinants on the oligobands of proteaseresistant lipoglycans from RG strains derived from clinically active LN patients. (A) Direct binding ELISA demonstrates reactivity of both mAbs, 33.2.3 and 34.2.2, with the purified RG2 and S47-18 LGs, and bacterial extracts from the RG2 strain and Lupusderived strains; S47-18, S107-48 and S107-86. In this assay, LG or nuclease-treated RG strain extracts were precoated directly onto microtiter wells, then after blocking mAbs or isotype control were incubated, then washed and developed (see methods). (B) Immunoblots with 33.2 .3 mAb or (C) with the 34.2 .2 mAb detect antigenically related LG oligo bands in extracts of $R G$ strains isolated from active LN patients. In each panel are shown samples of purified lipoglycan (LG) from the Lupus S47-18 strain, and the RG2 strain. At left, extracts of whole bacteria are shown for the RG1 strain (from a healthy donor), and the Lupus-derived RG strains; S107-48, S107-86, S47-18, as well as the RG2 strain.
A) VH regions of anti-lipoglycan hybridoma antibodies


Figure S15. Antibody gene sequences and deduced amino acid sequences of the murine anti-RG LG antibodies. Alignments were based on Immunogenetics (IMGT) information systems web-based analysis.


Figure S16. Binding curve for serial concentration of the 33.2.2 chimeric antibody binding (see Fig S14 for variable region genes) to custom beads coated with purified R. gnavus lipoglycan. Production and purification of the chimeric human anti-lipoglycan is described in the Methods section. On the Y axis is the mean fluorescence intensity detected for antibody binding by the Magpix instrument (Luminex). On the X axis is the concentration of the anti-lipoglycan antibody, wherein 1 ng represents 1 antibody binding activity unit (U). Each point is the mean of duplicate measurements for this sample a 2000 -fold dilution. Binding activity was detected with a signal above background for the assay with a $\operatorname{lgG}$ concentration of below $400 \mathrm{pg} / \mathrm{ml}$, with activity also documented that was below saturation of the assay using $1500 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ of the chimeric antibody. Curve-fit was performed with Prism 9 for macOS software (Graphpad, San Diego). Lipoglycan, LG.

Table S1A. Demographic, clinical and treatment features of Lupus patients with renal involvement evaluated overtime.

| Patient ID | Age | Ethnicity | Sample | Collection | SLEDAI | Renal | Renal active | ME |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { R. gnavus } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | week span | SLEDA |  |  | Prednisone | MMF |  |
|  |  |  | 1st | 0 | 8 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.1 |
| S47 | 39 | Asian | 2nd | 256 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.3 |
| S78 | 38 | White Hispanic | 1st | 0 | 8 |  | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  |  |  | 2nd | 176 | 6 |  | 0 | 7.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 3rd | 205 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0.2 |
|  |  |  | 4th | 246 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 5th | 268 | 4 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0.1 |
|  |  |  | 6th | 291 | 8 |  | 1 | 5 | 0 | 9.5 |
| S89 | 37 | Asian | 1st | 0 | 8 |  | 1 | 40 | 0 | 0.2 |
|  |  |  | 2nd | 142 | 6 |  | 0 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.5 |
|  |  |  | 3rd | 163 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0.4 |
|  |  |  | 4th | 233 | 10 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 |
| S107 | 32 | White Hispanic | 1st | 0 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 1.0 |
|  |  |  | 2nd | 38 | 22 |  | 1 | 25 | 0 | 3.1 |
| S120 | 37 | African | 1st | 0 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 40 | 0 | 3.9 |
|  |  | American | 2nd | 215 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| S124 | 35 | White Hispanic | 1st | 0 | 16 |  | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 2nd | 114 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 3rd | 228 | 10 |  | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0.0 |
| S134 | 33 | White | 1st | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 2nd | 201 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 3rd | 236 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 4th | 260 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| S172 | 24 | Asian | 1st | 0 | 12 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 2nd | 34 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 3rd | 49 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| S202 | 38 | White | 1st | 0 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 60 | 1 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 2nd | 57 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 |

Control subjects (HC) were resampled on a quarterly basis (see fig.S8).

Table S1B. Demographic, clinical and treatment features of Lupus patients without renal involvement evaluated overtime.

| Patient ID | Age | Ethnicity | Sample | Collection week span | SLEDAI | Renal ACR | Renal active | MEDs |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { R. gnavus } \\ \% \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prednisone | MMF |  |
|  |  | African | 1st | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 |
| S49 | 52 | American | 2nd | 41 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 |
|  |  |  | 1st | 0 | 8 |  | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0.6 |
| S61 | 42 | Asian | 2nd | 27 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3.75 | 0 | 4.7 |
| S188 | 57 | Asian | 1st | 0 | 9 |  | un | 0 | 0 | 0.1 |
|  |  |  | 2nd | 24 | 5 |  | un | 2.5 | 0 | 0.4 |
| S190 | 34 | White | 1st | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Hispanic | 2nd | 67 | 4 |  | un | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 1st | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| S191 | 43 |  | 2 nd | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 3rd | 83 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.2 |
| S198 | 35 | White | 1st | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 |
| S198 | 35 | Hispanic | 2nd | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 1st | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| S205 | 46 | Asian | 2nd | 31 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 |
|  |  |  | 3rd | 52 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table S2A. SLEDAI domain scoring in patients with Lupus nephritis.

| Patient ID | Sample | SLEDAI | Involvements in the SLEDAI Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S47 | 1st | 8 | proteinuria, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 8 | proteinuria, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S78 | 1st | 8 | rash, alopecia, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 6 | rash, pericarditis, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 3rd | 4 | rash, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 4th | 5 | rash, $\downarrow$ WBC, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 5th | 4 | rash, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 6th | 8 | proteinuria, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S89 | 1st | 8 | proteinuria, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 6 | pleurisy, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 3rd | 8 | proteinuria, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 4th | 10 | proteinuria, pleurisy, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S107 | 1st | 15 | proteinuria, rash, alopecia, ulcers, $\downarrow$ complement, $\downarrow$ WBC, $\uparrow d s$ DNA |
|  | 2nd | 23 | arthritis, proteinuria, pyuria, rash, alopecia, pleurisy, $\downarrow$ complement, $\downarrow \mathrm{WBC}, \uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S120 | 1st | 15 | myositis, proteinuria, pleurisy, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA, fever |
|  | 2nd | 2 | $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S124 | 1st | 16 | visual disturbances, arthritis, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 8 | arthritis, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 3rd | 10 | arthritis, pericarditis, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S134 | 1st | 4 | $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 6 | rash, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 3rd | 6 | rash, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 4th | 6 | rash, alopecia, $\downarrow$ complement |
| S172 | 1st | 12 | hematuria, proteinuria, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 9 | proteinuria, $\downarrow$ complement, $\downarrow$ WBC, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 3 rd | 7 | proteinuria, $\downarrow \mathrm{WBC}, \uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S202 | 1st | 16 | hematuria, proteinuria, pyuria, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 2 | $\uparrow$ dsDNA |

Table S2B. Organ involvements reflected by SLEDAI in non-renal Lupus patients.

| Patient ID | Sample | SLEDAI | Involvements in the SLEDAI Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S49 | 1st | 2 | $\downarrow$ complement |
|  | 2nd | 3 | $\downarrow$ complement, $\downarrow$ WBC |
| S61 | 1st | 8 | rash, alopecia, $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 11 | arthritis, alopecia, $\downarrow$ complement, $\downarrow$ WBC, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S188 | 1st | 9 | arthritis, $\downarrow$ complement, $\downarrow$ WBC, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 5 | $\downarrow$ complement, $\downarrow \mathrm{WBC}, \uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S190 | 1st | 4 | $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 4 | $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
| S191 | 1st | 4 | arthritis |
|  | 2nd | 0 | - |
|  | 3rd | 4 | arthritis |
| S198 | 1st | 6 | arthritis, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 0 | - |
| S205 | 1st | 4 | $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |
|  | 2nd | 6 | $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA, alopecia |
|  | 3rd | 4 | $\downarrow$ complement, $\uparrow$ dsDNA |

Table S3. RG abundance in healthy control subjects

| No of collection | CF803 | CF813 | CF801 | CF842 | C026 | C027 | C028 | C031 | CF844 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.00119 | 0.0717 | 0.000836 | 0.8264 | 0.2046 | 0.00177 | 0.1787 | 0.1599 | 0.00568 |
| 2 | 0.00094 | 0.044 | 0.00235 | 0.9167 | 0.2914 | 0.0735 | 0.682 | 0.0874 | 0.00115 |
| 3 | 0.00437 | 0.00162 | 0.2827 |  | 0.0882 | 0.2357 | 0.6005 | 0.1598 | 0.00216 |
| 4 | 0.00159 | 0.000769 | 0.00119 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.000701 |
| 5 | 0.0215 | 0.00339 | 0.00209 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 0.00307 | 0.00126 | 0.0278 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 0.00256 | 0.00113 | 0.00723 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 0.00205 | 0.00292 | 0.0127 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 0.0473 | 0.000804 | 0.2387 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 0.00143 | 0.000782 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 0.0147 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 0.00227 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table S4A. Other medications of patients with Lupus Nephritis

| Patient ID | Sample | Other medications |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S47 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , azathioprine 150 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
| S78 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , milatuzumab/placebo trial |
|  | 3rd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , methotrexate 20 mg |
|  | 4th | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , methotrexate 20 mg |
|  | 5th | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , methotrexate 20 mg |
|  | 6th | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , methotrexate 20 mg |
| S89 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , belimumab 10 mg , azathioprine 100 mg |
|  | 3rd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , belimumab 10 mg , azathioprine 100 mg |
|  | 4th | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , methylprednisolone 1000 mg |
| S107 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , anifrolumab/placebo study |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
| S120 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 200 mg , azathioprine 100 mg |
| S124 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 3rd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
| S134 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 300 mg , belimumab 10 mg |
|  | 3rd | hydroxychlorquine 300 mg , belimumab10 mg |
|  | 4th | hydroxychlorquine 300 mg |
| S172 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 3 rd | hydroxychlorquine 300 mg |
| S202 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , methotrexate 12.5 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 300 mg |

Table S4B. Medications of patients without Lupus Nephritis.

| Patient ID | Sample | Other medications |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S49 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , azathioprine 100 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg , azathioprine 150mg |
| S61 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
| S188 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
| S190 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 300 mg |
| S191 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 200 mg |
|  | 3rd | hydroxychlorquine 200 mg |
| S198 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
| S205 | 1st | hydroxychlorquine 300 mg |
|  | 2nd | hydroxychlorquine 400 mg |
|  | 3rd | hydroxychlorquine 300 mg |

Table S5. Orthologues of IBD-associated RG genes found in strains from LN patients.

| PanPhlAn identifier | Old annotation | KEGG <br> Ortholog ID | Ortholog Name | S107-61 | S107-48 | S107-86 | S47-18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RG1/ATCC } \\ & 29149 \end{aligned}$ | RG2/CC_001d |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| xg000037 | PTS sugar transporter <br> [[Ruminococcus] gnavus] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000038 | fibronectin [[Ruminococcus] gnavus] | K15923 | AXY8, FUC95A, afcA; alpha-L-fucosidase 2 [ $E C: 3.2 .1 .51$ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000086 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{xg} 000091 \\ \mathrm{xg} 000096 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ABC transporter <br> X-X-x-Leu-X-X-Gly heptad <br> repeats protein | K01421* | putative membrane protein |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000183 | MFS transporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000314 | GNAT family $\mathbf{N}$ acetyitransferase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000605 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000616 | plasmid mobilization relaxosome protein Mobc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000619 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000625 | Signal transduction histidine kinase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000685 | prepilin peptidase | K02654* | leader peptidase (prepilin peptidase) / N-methyitransferase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000698 | peptide ABC transporter permease | K02034 | ABC.PE.P1; peptide/nickel transport system permease protein |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000699 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000713 | homoserine dehydrogenase | K00003 | hom; homoserine dehydrogenase [EC:1.1.1.3] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000714 | ABC transporter | K09817* | zinc transport system ATP-binding protein [EC:7.-2.2.20] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000796 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X $\times 000797$ | diguanylate cyclase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg000866 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001053 | transcriptional regulator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001176 <br> xg001180 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001199 | histidine kinase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001226 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001227 | stage Il sporulation protein D | K06381 | spolld; stage II sporulation protein D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001228 | peptidase M23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001327 | glycosyl transferase family 1 | K19002* | 1,2-diacylglycerol 3-alpha-glucosyitransferase [EC:2.4.1.337] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001329 | glycosyl transferase family 1 | K19002* | 1,2-diacylglycerol 3-alpha-glucosyitransferase [EC-2.4.1.337] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001333 | acylphosphatase | K001512* | acylphosphatase [EC:3.6.1.7] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001345 | Methionine--tRNA ligase | K06878 | K06878; tRNA-binding protein |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg001349 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { xg001425 } \\ \text { xg003868 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | peroxiredoxin | K03564* | thioredoxin-dependent peroxiredoxin |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| xg009760 | serine <br> hydroxymethyltransferase | K00600 | glyA, SHMT; glycine hydroxymethyitransferase [EC:2.1.2.1] |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table S6. Calculated and experimentally determined monoisotopic masses of LG species observed in MS ${ }^{1}$ spectra of the LG mixture isolated from RG2 strain (shown in Figure 5A). Only species with a monoisotopic mass peak abundance $>2 \%$ are listed. Annotation accuracy of chemical composition to mass measurements are stated as $\Delta \mathrm{ppm}$.

| Acylation status | Fatty acid sum composition | Glycan composition | $\begin{gathered} \text { Calculated } \\ \text { exact } \\ \text { mass [Da] } \end{gathered}$ | Observed monoisotopic mass [Da] | Error $[\Delta \mathrm{ppm}]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| monoacyl | 16:0 | ```1 Gro, } Hex,5 HexNAc, 3 HexU``` | 3170.193 | 3170.201 | 2.5 |
| monoacyl | 16:0 | 1 Gro, 8 Hex, 5 HexNAc, 3 HexU + 1 Hex | 3332.246 | 3332.254 | 2.4 |
| monoacyl | 16:0 | 1 Gro, 8 Hex, 5 HexNAc, 3 HexU + 2 Hex | 3494.298 | 3494.306 | 2.3 |
| monoacyl | 16:0 | ```1 Gro, } Hex,5 HexNAc, 3 HexU + 3 Hex``` | 3656.351 | 3656.358 | 1.9 |
| monoacyl | 17:0 | 1 Gro, 8 Hex, 5 HexNAc, 3 HexU | 3184.208 | 3184.217 | 2.8 |
| di-acyl | 30:0 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { Gro, } 8 \\ \text { Hex, } 5 \\ \text { HexNAc, } 3 \\ \text { HexU } \end{gathered}$ | 3380.391 | 3380.399 | 2.4 |
| di-acyl | 31:0 | 1 Gro, 8 Hex, 5 HexNAc, 3 HexU 1 Gro, 8 Hex, 5 | 3394.407 | 3394.415 | 2.4 |
| di-acyl | 31:0 | HexNAc, 3 <br> HexU + 1 <br> Hex | 3556.460 | 3556.466 | 1.7 |


| di-acyl | $31: 0$ | 1 Gro, 8 <br> Hex, 5 <br> HexNAc, 3 <br> HexU + <br> Hex | 3718.512 | 3718.519 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | 1.9



| tri-acyl | 47:0 | HexNAc, 3 <br> HexU + 4 <br> Hex <br> 1 Gro, 8 <br> Hex, 5 | 4442.901 | 4442.907 | 1.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexNAc, 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexU + 5 |  |  |  |
| tri-acyl |  | Hex | 3646.652 | 3646.657 | 1.4 |
|  | 48:0 | 1 Gro, 8 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Hex, 5 HexNAc 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexU |  |  |  |
| tri-acyl | 48:0 | 1 Gro, 8 | 3808.705 | 3808.709 | 1.1 |
|  |  | Hex, 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexNAc, 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexU + 1 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Hex |  |  |  |
| tri-acyl | 48:0 | 1 Gro, 8 | 3970.758 | 3970.760 | 0.5 |
|  |  | Hex, 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexNAc, 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexU + 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Hex |  |  |  |
| tri-acyl | 48:0 | 1 Gro, 8 |  |  | 0.0 |
|  |  | Hex, 5 | 4132.811 | 4132.811 |  |
|  |  | HexNAc, 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexU + 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Hex | 4294.863 | 4294.871 | 1.9 |
| tri-acyl | 48:0 | 1 Gro, 8 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Hex, 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexNAc, 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexU + 4 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Hex |  |  |  |
| tri-acyl | 49:0 | 1 Gro, 8 | 3660.668 | 3660.669 | 0.3 |
|  |  | Hex, 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexNAc, 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexU |  |  |  |
| tri-acyl | 49:0 | 1 Gro, 8 | 3822.721 | 3822.722 | 0.3 |
|  |  | Hex, 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexNAc, 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexU + 1 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Hex | 3984.773 | 3984.770 |  |
| tri-acyl | 49:0 | 1 Gro, 8 |  |  | -0.8 |
|  |  | Hex, 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexNAc, 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | HexU + 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Hex |  |  |  |



Table S7. Bacterial polysaccharides not recognized by the mAb 33.2.2 and mAb 34.2.2.

| Providencia stuartii O49 | PO49 Core-linked |
| :--- | :--- |
| Providencia stuartii O52 | PO52 Core-linked |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O4 (Habs serotype 4) | PO4 Core-linked |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O1 (Fisher immunotype 4) | PO1 Core-linked |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O2 (Fisher immunotype 3) | PO2 Core-linked |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O13 (Sandvik serotype II) | PO13 Core-linked |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O9 (9a, 9b, 9d) | PO9 Core-linked |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O6a (Habs serotype6, <br> fraction Ila) | PO6a Core-linked-O-unit |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O6a (Habs serotype6, <br> fraction Ilb) | PO6a unsubstituted core |
| Salmonella typhimurium SL 11881 (Re mut) | LPS-L9516 |
| Salmonella typhimurium TV 119 (Ra mut) | LPS-L6016 |
| Salmonella typhimurium SL 684 (Rc mut) | LPS-L5891 |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O10 | L8643 |
| Salmonella typhimurium dodeca saccharide | 4809 |
| Salmonella enteritidis dodeca saccharide | 1262 |
| Salmonella typhimurium LPS | L2262 |
| Serratia marcescens LPS | L6136 |
| Escherichia coli K235 LPS | L2143 |
| Escherichia coli O128-B12 LPS | L2755 |
| Salmonella enterica abortus equi LPS | L5886 |
| Salmonella typhosa LPS | L2012 |
| Salmonella enteritidis LPS |  |
| Shigella bodyii type2 |  |
| Shigella bodyii type4 |  |
| Shigella bodyii type10 |  |
| Shigella dysennteriae type 3 |  |
| Shigella dysennteriae type 8 (batch 12) |  |
| Shigella dysennteriae type 11 |  |
| Shigella dysennteriae type 13 |  |
| Escherichia coli O29 |  |
| Escherichia coli O40 |  |
| Escherichia coli O106 |  |
| Escherichia coli O130 |  |
| Escherichia coli O148 |  |
| Escherichia coli O150 |  |
| Escherichia coli O180 |  |
| Proteus mirabilis O3a, 3c (G1) |  |
| Proteus mirabilis O8 (TG326) |  |
|  |  |


| Proteus mirabilis O10 (HJ4320) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proteus mirabilis O29a, 29b (2002) |  |
| Proteus mirabilis O50 (TG332) |  |
| Proteus mirabilis O54a, 54b (10704) |  |
| Proteus mirabilis O57 (TG319) |  |
| Proteus penneri O8 (106) |  |
| Proteus penneri O64a, 64b, 64d (39) |  |
| Proteus penneri O66 (2) |  |
| Proteus penneri O69 (25) | IATS 10, OPS |
| Proteus penneri O71 (42) | IATS 16 OPS |
| Proteus penneri O72a, 72b (4) | IATS NO, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O2 (2a),2d,2f | IATS 5 OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O2 2a,2b | IATS 18, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O2 2a,2b,2e | IATS NO, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O2 2a,2d | IATS NO, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O2 Immuno 7 | IATS NO, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O3 3a,3b | IATS 6, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O3 3a,3b,3c | IATS NO, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O3 3a,3d | IATS NO, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O4 4a,4c | IATS 7,LPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O6 6a | IATS 8,LPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O6 6a,6c | IATS NO, LPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O6 Immuno 1 | IATS 10, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O7 7a,7b,7c | IATS 19, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O7 7a,7b,7d | IATS 11, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O7 7a,7d | IATS 12, OPS Habs 12 |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O10 10a,10b | IATS 14, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O10 10a,10c | IATS 17,OPS Meitert X |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O11 11a,11b | IATS 15, OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O12 12 | LPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O13 13a,13c | OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O14 14 | OPS |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa O15 15 | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O1 (18984)* | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O4 (PrK 9/57) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O12 (PrK 25/57) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O13 (8344) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O15 (PrK 30/57) |  |
| Proteus vulgaris O17 (PrK 33/57) |  |
| Proteus vulgaris O19a (PrK 37/57) |  |
| Proteus vulgaris O21 (PrK 39/57)* |  |
| Proteus vulgaris O22 (PrK 40/57) |  |
| Proteus vulgaris O25 (PrK 48/57) |  |
|  |  |


|  | LPoteus vulgaris O34 (4669)* |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proteus vulgaris O37a,b (PrK 63/57) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O37a,c (PrK 72/57) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O44 (PrK 67/57) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O45 (4680) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O53 (TG 276-10) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O54a,54c (TG 103) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O55 (TG 155) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O65 (TG 251) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O6 (PrK 14/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O11 (PrK 24/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O13 (PrK 26/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O14a,14b (PrK 29/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O16 (4652) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O17 (PrK 32/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O23a,b,d (PrK 42/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O26 (PrK 49/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O27 (PrK 50/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O28 (PrK 51/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O29a (PrK 52/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O40 (10703) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O41 (PrK 67/57) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O51 (19011)* | LPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O74 (10705, OF) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O75 (10702, OC) | OPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O77 (3 B-m) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O31a (26) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O52 (15) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O58 (12) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O59 (9) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O61 (21) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O62 (41) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O63 (22) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O64a,b,c (27) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O65 (34) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O67 (8) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O68 (63) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O70 (60) | OPS |
| Proteus penneri O73a,b (103) | OPS |
| Proteus myxofaciens O60 | OPS |
| Proteus O56 (genomospecies 4) |  |
|  |  |


| Providencia stuartii O4 | OPS |
| :---: | :---: |
| Providencia stuartii O18 | OPS |
| Providencia stuartii O20* | LPS |
| Providencia stuartii O43 | OPS |
| Providencia stuartii O44 | OPS |
| Providencia stuartii O47 | OPS |
| Providencia stuartii O47, Core 9 | OPS |
| Providencia stuartii O49, Core 1 | OPS |
| Providencia stuartii O57 | OPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O5 | OPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O6* | LPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O19 | OPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O19 | LPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O19 | LPS/ NaOH |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O21 | OPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O23 | OPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O27 | OPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O29 | OPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O30 | OPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O32 | OPS |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O36* | LPS-NH4OH |
| Providencia alcalifaciens O39 | OPS |
| Providencia rustigianii O14 | OPS |
| Providencia rustigianii O16 | OPS |
| Providencia rustigianii O34 | OPS |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)- $\Delta 0187$ | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)- $\Delta 0187$ | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)-drfe | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)-drfe | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, 1146-25 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis 1146-25 | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, 1146-37 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, 1146-37 | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, 0KM218-37 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, KM218-37 | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, KM218-25 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, KM218-25 | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)- $\Delta \mathrm{pmrF}$ | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)- $\Delta \mathrm{pmrF}$ | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)- $\Delta 0186$ | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)- $\Delta 0186$ | Core oligo saccharide |


|  | Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)--waaQ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)-- waaQ | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)-- waaL | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)-25 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)-25 | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, KM260(11)-37 | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, KIMD1-37 | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, KIMD1-25 | Core oligo saccharide |
| Yersinia pestis, 11M-25 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis, 11M-37 | LPS |
| Proteus mirabilis O23a, 23b, 23c (CCUG 10701) | OPS |
| Proteus vulgaris O24 (PrK 47/57) | LPSOH |
| Yersinia pestis KM260(11)-6C | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis 260(11)-37C-186 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis 260(11)-37C-187 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis 260(11)-37C-416 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis 260(11)-37C-417 | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis P-1680-25C | OS |
| Yersinia pestis P-1680-37C | LPS |
| Yersinia pestis I-2377-25C | OS |
| Yersinia pestis I-2377-37C | LPS |
| Francisella novicida OPS | OPS |
| Francisella tularensis OPS | OPS |
| Klebsiella O1 OPS | OPS |
| Klebsiella O2a OPS | OPS |
| Klebsiella O2ac OPS | OPS |
| Klebsiella O3 OPS | OPS |
| Klebsiella O4 OPS | OPS |
| Klebsiella O5 OPS | OPS |
| Klebsiella O8 OPS | OPS |
| Klebsiella O12 OPS | OPS |
| Shigella boydii type 1 | LPSOH |
| Shigella boydii type 3 | OPS |
| Shigella boydii type 5 | OPS |
| Shigella boydii type 9 | OPS |
| Shigella boydii type 11 | OPS |
| Shigella boydii type 12 | OPS |
| Shigella boydii type 15 | OPS |
| Shigella boydii type 16 | OPS |
| Shigella boydii type 17 | OPS |
| Shigella boydii type 18 | OPS |
| Escherichia coli O49 |  |
| Escherichia coli O52 |  |
|  |  |


| Escherichia coli O58 | OPS |
| :---: | :---: |
| Escherichia coli O61 | LPSOH |
| Escherichia coli O73 | OPS |
| Escherichia coli O112ab | OPS |
| Escherichia coli O118 | OPS |
| Escherichia coli O125 | OPS |
| Escherichia coli O151 | OPS |
| Escherichia coli O168 | OPS |
| Shigella dysenteriae type 2 | LPSOH |
| Shigella dysenteriae type 4 | OPS |
| Shigella dysenteriae type 5 | OPS |
| Shigella dysenteriae type 6 SR-strain | SR-strain |
| Shigella dysenteriae type 7 | OPS |
| Shigella dysenteriae type 8 (Russian) | OPS |
| Shigella dysenteriae type 9 | OPS |
| Escherichia coli O111:B4 LPS- solution at $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { L5293-2ML (LPS) } \\ & \text { (Sigma) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Escherichia coli O26:B6 LPS- solution at $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ | L5543-2ML (LPS) <br> (Sigma) |
| Escherichia coli O55:B5 LPS- solution at $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { L5418-2ML (LPS) } \\ & \text { (Sigma) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Escherichia coli O127:B8 LPS- solution at $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { L5668-2ML (LPS) } \\ & \text { (Sigma) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 1 (Danish type 1) | 161-X // Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 2 (Danish type 2) | 165-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 3 (Danish type 3) | 169-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 4 (Danish type 4) | 173-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 5 (Danish type 5) | 177-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 8 (Danish type 8) | 185-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 9 (Danish type 9N) | 189-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 12 (Danish type 12F) | 193-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 14 (Danish type 14) | 197-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 17 (Danish type 17F) | 201-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 19 (Danish type 19F) | 205-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 20 (Danish type 20) | 209-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 22 (Danish type 22F) | 213-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 23 (Danish type 23F) | 217-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 26 (Danish type 6B) | 225-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 34 (Danish type 10A) | 229-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 43 (Danish type 11A) | 233-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 51 (Danish type 7F) | 237-X// Capsular PS |


| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 54 (Danish type 15B) | 241-X// Capsular PS |
| :---: | :---: |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 56 (Danish type 18C) | 245-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 57 (Danish type 19A) | 249-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 68 (Danish type 9V) | 253-X// Capsular PS |
| Streptococcus pneumoniae type 70 (Danish type 33F) | 257-X// Capsular PS |
| Yersinia pestis KM218-6C | OS |
| Yersinia pestis KM260(11)-yjhW-6C | OS |
| Yersinia pestis KM260(11)-wabD/waaL | OS |
| Yersinia pestis KM260(11)-wabC/waaL | OS |
| Yersinia pseudotuberculosis 85pCad-37C | OS |
| Yersinia pseudotuberculosis 85pCad-20C | OS |
| Yersinia pseudotuberculosis 0:2a | PS |
| Yersinia pseudotuberculosis O:2a-dhmA | PS |
| Yersinia pseudotuberculosis O:2c | PS |
| Yersinia pseudotuberculosis 0:3 | PS |
| Yersinia pseudotuberculosis O:4b | PS |
| Proteus vulgaris O2 (OX2) | PS |
| Proteus mirabilis O3ab (S1959) | PS |
| Proteus mirabilis O5 (PrK 12/57) | PS |
| Proteus mirabilis O9 (PrK 18/57) | PS |
| Proteus mirabilis O11 (9B-m) | PS |
| Proteus penneri O17 (16) | PS |
| Proteus mirabilis O18 (PrK 34/57) | LPSOH |
| Proteus mirabilis O20 (PrK 38/57) | LPSOH |
| Proteus penneri O31ab (28) | PS |
| Proteus mirabilis O33 (D52) | PS |
| Proteus mirabilis O43 (PrK 69/57) | PS |
| Proteus vulgaris 047 (PrK 73/57) | Not stated |
| Proteus mirabilis O49 (PrK 75/57) | PS |
| Proteus mirabilis O54ab (OE) | PS |
| Proteus penneri O73ac (75) | PS |
| Proteus vulgaris O76 (HSC438) | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type 1a | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type 1b | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type 2a | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type 2b | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type 3a | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type 3b | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type 4a | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type 4b | PS |


| Shigella flexneri type 5b | PS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shigella flexneri type 6a | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type 6 | PS |
| Shigella flexneri type X | PS |
| Shigella dysenteriae type 1 | PS |
| Shigella boydii type 6 | PS |
| Shigella boydii type 7 | PS |
| Shigella boydii type 8 | PS |
| Shigella boydii type 13 | LPSOH |
| Shigella boydii type 14 | LPSOH |
| Escherichia coli O71 | PS |
| Escherichia coli O85 | PS |
| Escherichia coli O99 | PS |
| Escherichia coli O145 | LPSOH |
| Escherichia coli O107 | PS |
| Salmonella enterica O17 | PS |
| Salmonella enterica O28 | PS |
| Salmonella enterica O47 | PS |
| Salmonella enterica O55 | PS |
| Escherichia coli K92 | CPS |
| Escherichia coli K5 | CPS |
| Escherichia coli K13 | CPS |
| Neisseria meningitidis Group C | CPS |
| Davanat |  |
| Laminarin |  |
| Yeast Mannan |  |
| Escherichia coli O86 |  |
| Galactomannan DAVANT (160102) Pro-Pharmacenti |  |
| Yeast Mannan Sigma M-3640 |  |
| 1-2 Mannan Acetobacter methanolieus MB135 |  |
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