MMRefiner A Deep Learning Guided Protein Complex Refinement Protocol

MOHIMENUL KARIM

## Protein Complex



## Motivation

Experimental methods are expensive and time consuming
Computational methods can generate structures with deviation from the native

Orientation of the individual monomers are not always optimal

No deep learning method to refine the near native protein complexes

## Method

A deep learning method to predict the refined protein complex structure

Predict the transformation matrix of individual chains

- Translation matrix
- Rotation matrix

Apply the transformation on the individual chains
Generate the refined protein complex
Considered only chain 2 in this study


## Dataset

Dockground
35 complexes (deviation spanning from $1 \AA$ to $6 \AA$ )
10 decoys for each
Training: 1647 complexes
Test: 480 complexes
No overlap in training and test dataset

## Features

Relative position (residue number/chain length)
Residue type (one hot encoded)
Secondary structure (three state; one hot encoded)
Solvent accessibility
Phi (both sine and cosine)
Psi (both sine and cosine)

## Translation

$t_{i} \in t_{x}, t_{y}, t_{z}$
$S_{\text {Score }}=\frac{1}{1+\left(\frac{t i}{d 0}\right)^{2}}$ where, $t_{i} \in t_{x}, t_{y}, t_{z}$ and $d_{0}=10$
If $t_{i}<0$, then $s_{\text {score }}$ is negative

After prediction
Calculate $t_{i}$ using equation 1
If $s_{\text {score }}$ is negative, then $t_{i}$ is negative

## Rotation

Calculate the angles of rotation along $x, y$ and $z$ axis from the rotation matrix
Predict sine and cosine of the angles of rotation
Calculate the angles back from the prediction using the following equation

$$
\theta=\tan ^{-1} \frac{\sin \theta}{\cos \theta}
$$

Calculate the rotation matrix from the angles

## Architecture 1

Conv2D (input channels=60, output channels=128)
ReLU
Max pool (2x2)
Conv2D (input channels=128, output channels=256)
ReLU
Max pool (2x2)
Fully connected layer (256)
Output layer (3 for translation and 6 for rotation)

## Architecture 2

Conv2D (input channels=60, output channels=128)
ReLU
Max pool (2x2)
Conv2D (input channels=128, output channels=256)
ReLU
Max pool (2×2)
Dropout (0.25)
Fully connected layer (256)
Dropout (0.5)
Output layer (3 for translation and 6 for rotation)

## Architecture 2



## Input and Training

Dimension: 160×160
Each pixel (i, j)

- Feature of residue i from chain 1
- Feature of residue j from chain 2
- Concatenate the features of $i$ and $j$

Training

- Learning rate: 0.001
- Optimize MSE loss


## Experiments

Exp1

- Architecture 1
- Epochs: 500
- Batch size: 100


## Exp2

- Architecture 2
- Epochs: 500
- Batch size: 100


## Exp3

- Translation from Exp1
- Rotation from Exp2


## Experiments

Exp4

- Resnet18
- Epochs: 35


## Exp5

- Translation from Exp4
- Rotation (Exp4; stops training if loss<0.2 and at least 20 epochs)


## Result

| Experiment | Average TM score <br> before | Average TM score after |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Exp1 | 0.52258 | 0.4991 |
| Exp2 | 0.52258 | 0.4957 |
| Exp3 | 0.52258 | 0.4986 |
| Exp4 | 0.52258 | 0.4965 |
| Exp5 | 0.52258 | 0.4972 |

## Result

| Experiment | TM increased | TM decreased | TM same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Exp1 | 136 | 276 | 68 |
| Exp2 | 107 | 301 | 72 |
| Exp3 | 103 | 303 | 74 |
| Exp4 | 101 | 300 | 79 |
| Exp5 | 104 | 301 | 75 |


| Experiment | \#Significant Improve <br> (out of 480) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Exp1 | 75 |
| Exp2 | 68 |
| Exp3 | 70 |
| Exp4 | 70 |
| Exp5 | 69 |

## Result

Significant improve -> TM is increased by at least 0.04

## Result

| Experiment | Average IDDT before | Average IDDT after |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Exp1 | 0.678 | 0.669 |
| Exp2 | 0.678 | 0.66784 |
| Exp3 | 0.678 | 0.66785 |
| Exp4 | 0.678 | 0.668 |
| Exp5 | 0.678 | 0.66783 |

## Result

| Experiment | IDDT increased | IDDT decreased | IDDT same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Exp1 | 48 | 386 | 46 |
| Exp2 | 2 | 420 | 58 |
| Exp3 | 0 | 422 | 58 |
| Exp4 | 11 | 411 | 58 |
| Exp5 | 1 | 422 | 57 |


| Experiment | \#Significant <br> Decrease (out of <br> $480)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Exp1 | 22 |
| Exp2 | 23 |
| Exp3 | 22 |
| Exp4 | 23 |
| Exp5 | 23 |

## Result

Significant decrease -> Decrease by at least 0.05

## Findings

Refinement is sensitive to the prediction of sign
Chain 2 was taken far away in many of the complex structures
Convolutional neural networks may not work
Many of the structures had the same TM score after the transformation, because only chain 1 was considered during the alignment and chain 2 was ignored (chain 2 was too far to be aligned)

A few number of structures had significant improvement and therefore, the proposed method has potential to work better

## Future work

Graph Neural Network (on progress)
More decoys for training and testing
Flexible refinement to capture conformational changes

## Questions

