BAKER-experimental (Assembly): Protein oligomer structure prediction guided by predicted inter-chain contacts

Minkyung Baek, Ivan Anishchenko, Hahnbeom Park, Ian Humphrey, and David Baker CASP14 meeting, Dec 2020



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

Protocols used in assembly prediction



DL-based inter-chain contact & distance prediction



DL-based inter-chain contact & distance prediction



Protocols used in assembly prediction



Performance of our group in CASP14



Gradient-based fold-and-dock protocol

- Why simultaneous folding and docking?
 - Local inaccuracy at the interface \rightarrow hard to predict correct oligomer structures by ab initio docking
 - Induced fit effect \rightarrow hard to be captured by typical docking after subunit modeling approach



Gradient-based fold-and-dock protocol



Entire process is symmetry-aware for homo-oligomers



Example: T1084 (C2, medium) oligoTM of model1: 0.91

Centroid representation

all-atom representation

Successful examples w/ fold-and-dock approach



Model 3 fold-and-dock (F1: 57.9 / TM: 0.828) Next best group - (F1: 16.1 / TM: 0.326)

H1065 (A2, hard) trRosetta-discont Joint MSA



125

150

175

200

125 150 175 200



Model 1 fold-and-dock (F1: 39.7 / TM: 0.792)

What we did relatively well, but could do better in the future

T1080 (C3, hard)



Experimental structure



Model 4 fold-and-dock (Jacc: 0.38 / F1: 13.3 / TM: 0.611) Intra-chain contacts



Inter-chain contacts



T1083 (C2, medium)

Intra-chain contacts



Experimental structure



Model 1 fold-and-dock (Jacc: 0.69 / F1: 22.5 / TM: 0.627) Inter-chain contacts

60



trRefineSymm: Refining trRosetta models with symmetry from templates



Examples: found distant templates



Hard to make good interface contacts by refinement due to its size & qualities of initial subunit and templates

Examples: found distant templates

H1060v5 (D6, medium)

H1060v4 (C12, medium)



Hard to make good interface contacts by refinement due to its size & qualities of initial subunit and templates

ab initio docking w/ reasonable building blocks

H1081 (D5+D5, medium)



Template-based (2vyc, 5xx1)

Model 1 (F1: 35.3 / TM: 0.970)

Stacking decamers by rigid-body sampling along symmetry axes

T1078 (C2, hard)



Model 5 SymmDock (F1: 24.7 / TM: 0.671)

Could do better if we use better subunit models (GDT-TS of our subunit: 63.9; best server model: 81.2)

Did assembly modeling improve subunit qualities?



Summary

- New simultaneous fold-and-dock approach
 - Reasonable complex structures were predicted even if there were no templates
 - Inter-chain contact/distance prediction is the key
 - In some cases, it improved subunit qualities too
- Progress in template-based approach
 - Mainly thanks to the better subunit structures with deep learning
 - distant templates were detected based on structural similarity
- Ab initio docking was rarely successful
 - Only when we have good subunit structures, restrictions in sampling space, etc.
- Huge progress on TS modeling (AlphaFold2) \rightarrow What would happen next time?
 - Higher F1-score / Easier to make complex structure by *ab initio* docking / Even end-to-end complex modeling?

Acknowledgements



Ivan Anishchenko



Ian Humphrey



Hahnbeom Park



David Baker

CASP14/CAPRI organizers, target providers, assessors, and participants!

