Community-wide evaluation of methods for predicting the effect of mutations on protein–protein interactions
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ABSTRACT

Community-wide blind prediction experiments such as CAPRI and CASP provide an objective measure of the current state of predictive methodology. Here we describe a community-wide assessment of methods to predict the effects of mutations on protein–protein interactions. Twenty-two groups predicted the effects of comprehensive saturation mutagenesis for two designed influenza hemagglutinin binders and the results were compared with experimental yeast display enrichment data obtained using deep sequencing. The most successful methods explicitly considered the effects of mutation on monomer stability in addition to binding affinity, carried out explicit side-chain sampling and backbone relaxation, evaluated packing, electrostatic, and solvation effects, and correctly identified around a third of the beneficial mutations. Much room for improvement remains for even the best techniques, and large-scale fitness landscapes should continue to provide an excellent test bed for continued evaluation of both existing and new prediction methodologies.

© 2013 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
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INTRODUCTION

Protein–protein interactions are crucial in biology.1–3 Understanding the thermodynamics of protein–protein interactions is important for quantitative understanding of biological function and for enabling the design of proteins, small molecules and other compounds to modulate these interactions.4,5 A large number of computational methods have been developed to predict protein–protein binding affinity.6–9

Blind community-wide tests of computational methods provide a means to objectively assess the current state of the art and identify potentially promising approaches. CASP has actively evaluated protein structure prediction methodology, and CAPRI has evaluated protein–protein docking methodology,10–13 but there has been no similar test of methods for predicting the effects of mutation on protein–protein interactions.

Here we describe the results of a community wide test of methods for evaluating the effect of mutations on protein–protein interaction affinity. This test employed two comprehensive datasets on the effects of every point mutant on the enrichment under yeast display selection of two designed protein binders of influenza hemagglutinin (HA).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Description of data

Enrichment data were derived from experiments described previously.14 Briefly, single-point mutant variants were created, corresponding to all 20 amino acids at each of 53 and 45 positions for the computationally designed influenza binders HB36.4 and HB80.3, respectively. These were expressed as yeast cell surface-conjugates, and subjected to a nonpurifying selection for hemagglutinin binders using FACS (Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorting) by using concentrations of HA roughly at the K_D of the respective interaction. The pre-sort and enriched libraries were subjected to high-throughput sequencing on an Illumina GA-II sequencer,
and the enrichment value for each sequence was calculated as the base-2 logarithm of the ratio of the number of times the sequence was seen in the enriched library to the number seen in the naïve library.

**Prediction**

Participants in CAPRI round 26 exercise for targets T55 (HB36) and T56 (HB80) were asked to predict both the ranking (on an arbitrary 0–1 scale) and the mutational class (beneficial/neutral/deleterious) of each of mutation. A full description of the methods for each group is included in the Supporting Information. Predictions were completed prior to the public release of Whitehead et al.\textsuperscript{14}

For the initial prediction round, participants were provided with a description of how the experimental data were derived, the starting sequences (Supporting Information Table S3), the positions at which mutations were made, and structures for HB36.3 (PDBID 3R2X)\textsuperscript{15} and HB80.4 (provided as a prerelease structure, further refined and submitted as PDBID 4EEF)\textsuperscript{14} complexes. (The structures for the HB36.4 and HB80.3 complexes were not provided, as they have not been crystallized.) HB36.3 differs from HB36.4 by a K64N mutation, and HB80.4 from HB80.3 by G12K, L17I, L21I, A35K, and S42K. Additionally, in the prereleased structure, the first HB80 chain, chain G, had been modeled with an additional K28A mutation.

To see if more specific knowledge of deep mutational scanning experimental data would help prediction, a second round of prediction was run. In addition to the information available from the first round, participants were also provided with the enrichment values of one half of the mutations, randomly selected (9 aa at each of the mutated positions plus the starting identity). Participants were free to modify their procedure how they saw fit to account for the additional information—details on how each group used the additional data are provided in the Supporting Information.

Exhaustive list of mutation pairs, considering them concordant (e.g., $x_1 < x_2$ & $p_1 < p_2$) or discordant (e.g., $x_1 < x_2$ & $p_1 > p_2$). The tau-b metric is then $(C–D)/\sqrt{(N_xN_p)}$, where $C$ is the number of concordant pairs, $D$ the number of discordant pairs, and $N_x$ and $N_p$ the number of total pairs not tied on experimental and predicted values, respectively. To evaluate the correlation of mutants for a single position, a derivative of Kendall’s tau-b was used, where pairs were evaluated only between mutations at the same position, but summed across all positions. AUC values were calculated with the ROCR package in R.\textsuperscript{18} Predictions were evaluated on recall ([number of correctly predicted mutations for a class]/[total number of mutations in that class experimentally]) and precision ([number of correctly predicted mutations for a class]/[total number of mutations predicted to be in that class]).

**RESULTS**

The HA binders HB36.4 and HB80.3 were designed previously using Rosetta.\textsuperscript{15} Starting with these base designs, exhaustive single point mutant libraries were made and subjected to yeast display enrichment for binding to HA using nonpurifying FACS (Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorting) selection.\textsuperscript{14} By comparing the frequency of mutations in the enriched and unenriched libraries, an estimate of the effect of each point mutant on binding was obtained (the enrichment value, the log\textsubscript{2} of the ratio of amino acid frequencies in the enriched library to that of the unenriched library).

Using crystal structures of design variants of HB36 and HB880 bound to HA as a guide (Fig. 1), participants made predictions of the effects of mutation on HA binding. These predictions were then compared to the

---

Figure 1
The structures of (A) HB36 (B) HB80 in complex with HA (blue) which were provided to participants. Residues probed in the deep sequencing enrichment experiment are in orange; the remainder are in grey. Residues at the interface are represented as sticks.
Experimental enrichment values (Supporting Information Fig. S1). The 22 groups that made submissions varied considerably in their ability to distinguish beneficial and deleterious mutations (Fig. 2A and B). Only two groups (G15, Weng, and G21s, Dehouck) had Kendall correlations above those of the BLOSUM62 model for both HB36 and HB80, although a few others (including G47, Flores, who only submitted predictions for HB36) were improved for a single protein (Supporting Information Table S1).

Of particular interest for applications of the prediction methods are the recall—the fraction of the experimentally beneficial mutations which are identified as such—and the precision—the fraction of predicted beneficial mutations which actually are. For HB36, 3.4% of the substitutions are experimentally beneficial, and for HB80, 2.4%. The precision of a method that selected randomly would hence be ~3%; the BLOSUM model is roughly at 0.667, 0.657; 0.705, 0.668) and G21 (Fernandez-Recio; 0.610, 0.726; 0.743, 0.651) on the Pareto front (Supporting Information Fig. S4).

The groups showing good performance were particularly successful in predicting deleterious mutations: low-ranking predictions were generally observed to be deleterious, whereas only a subset of the high-ranking predictions were beneficial (Supporting Information Fig. S1).

Mutations can influence binding if they disrupt the folded state, an effect particularly relevant for mutations away from the interface. To focus more on the ability of the methods to model-binding affinity independent of monomer stability, we also compared results on the subset of residues at the protein–protein interface (Fig. 2C, D, Supporting Information Fig. S1 and Table S1). The overall ranking of the groups did not change significantly on this subset.

It is instructive to break the results down based on the polarity of the initial and substituted residue. While the best groups did well predicting the effects of apolar to polar mutations, they overestimated the affinity of polar to polar and polar to apolar mutations (Fig. 3). This could be due to inaccuracies in treating electrostatics in the interfaces, as five of the six polar residues in the starting sequence for HB36 and three of the nine for HB80 are charged.

To test whether participants would be able to do better if they had additional data, in a second round nine mutations were randomly selected at each position of the two designed binders, and the experimental enrichment values for those mutations and for the starting amino acid were provided to participants. Fourteen groups submitted updated results, with improved results in most cases (Fig. 4A, B, Supporting Information Figs. S2, S3, and Table S1). Groups using machine learning techniques showed the greatest gains, though others using simpler reweighting strategies also improved performance. The top performing of these groups (G05s, Bates, and G21, Fernandez-Recio) included information from position/site specific models derived from the unblinded portion of the data, which, while potentially useful for evaluating combinations of mutations or modeling from sparse experimental data, would not be generalizable to other binding systems lacking experimental enrichment data.
Features contributing to good predictions

We used three approaches to identify factors which contributed to good predictions. First, to identify overall trends we evaluated the scoring and methodological features used by high performing groups. Second, we evaluated individual scoring terms used by several of the top-performing groups. Third, we released all of the experimental data to predictors, and asked groups to retrospectively identify which terms contributed to their performance.

The various protocols differ in how the mutant complexes are modeled. Some groups used coarse-grained models which do not require side-chain modeling, others kept all side chains other than the mutated one fixed, and others carried out various combinations of side-chain rotamer optimization, off-rotamer sampling, and backbone optimization. Many of the top performing groups optimized surrounding residues with off-rotamer sampling and backbone flexibility (Table 1). Groups which normalized the score of the optimized mutant based on that of a similarly optimized reference structure also did somewhat better than average.

Groups which explicitly accounted for the effect of the mutant on structural stability generally performed better (Table 1). Mutations which disrupt folding will necessarily...
disrupt binding: P(binding) = P(folding)P(binding|folded), and mutations can affect either term. Methods which assume a stably folded protein will miss the effects of mutation on the first term. Accounting for stability is likely to be of particular importance for proteins with low starting stability.20

The highest performing groups employed packing metrics such as Lennard–Jones potentials (Table I). For example, the attractive portion of the van der Waals potential term was identified as one of the important terms by the Weng group (Table III), and statistical contact and distance scores, such as the OPUS_PSP group potential21 and the Tobi coarse-grained potentials,22 were among the single terms with the highest correlation to the enrichment data (Table II).

Other measures of packing such as convoluted fit and volume delta also correlated with improved performance (Table I). Of particular note is the PoPMuSiC packing defect term23 from the Dehouck group, which correlated well with experimental results in both all residue and interface-only contexts (Table II), and was identified as the most influential term in the Dehouck group models (Table III). This coarse-grained metric measures the difference in residue volume between the starting and mutated residues, weighted for solvent accessibility.

Top groups also explicitly modeled electrostatics and solvation. Short range electrostatics were important for HB36, and Lazaridis-Karplus solvation24 for HB80, according to the Weng group’s analysis (Table III). While the ACE solvation term25 by itself was correlated with the HB80 experimental results (Table II), adding it to a model with other terms had no appreciable benefit (Table III).

**DISCUSSION**

In the community wide test of methods for predicting the effects of point mutations on protein interaction reported here, the best groups are able to identify one-third of the beneficial mutations with less than a 10×

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I</th>
<th>Evaluation of contribution of individual terms to prediction performance. Difference in Pearson correlation on omitting terms from all-data linear refits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dehouck Group23,40,41</td>
<td>HB36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>packing defect</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvent accessibility</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairwise interactions</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backbone conformational preference</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weng Group42</td>
<td>HB36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vDW attractive</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vDW repulsive</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvation</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short range elec</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long range elec</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen bond</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table II**

Kendall correlation of individual metrics against experimental enrichment values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HB36 All Residues</th>
<th>HB80 All Residues</th>
<th>HB36 Interface</th>
<th>HB80 Interface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PoPMuSiC Packing Defect (Da)23</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobi T2 AP (F)22</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobi T1 AP (F)22</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPUS PSP (F)21</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobi TSC CP (F)22</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skolnick SJKQ CP (F)30</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floudas RMECA CP (F)31</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DComplex (F)32</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoldX hydrophob solv (B)26</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park-Levitt HLPL CP (F)33</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li &amp; Liang GEOMETRIC (F)</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boniecki Qo CP(F)34</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendruscolo BFKV CP (F)35</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skolnick SKoA CP (F)36</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoldX bb_hbod (B)26</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyazawa-Jernigan MJ2h CP (F)37</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFRE2 (B)38</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE (W)25</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobi TB CP (F)22</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanaka-Scheraga TS CP (F)39</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Calculated by (D)ehouck, (F)ernandez-Recio, (B)aker, (W)eng groups.

*b*AP—atomistic statistical potential; CP—coarse-grain statistical potential.

*c*Not calculated.

The FoldX hydrophobic solvation term26 correlates with interface enrichment values in both proteins (Table II), and the FoldX electrostatic terms ranked high in model feature importance (Supporting Information Table S2). Poisson–Boltzmann electrostatics have previously been shown to improve modeling this enrichment data.14
The development of improved energy functions would also benefit from additional data from lower through-scan experiments. As more comprehensive scanning datasets become available, further community wide experiments also reveal that there is considerable room for improvement in current methods; predicting the effect of mutations on polar starting positions appears to be a particular challenge.

We anticipate that many more comprehensive single-site scanning datasets should become available over the next several years as next generation sequencing methodology is increasingly applied to problems in biophysics. When modeling these data sets, it is important to recognize that there are a number of factors beyond binding affinity, such as stability, which contribute to the observed enrichment ratios in these experiments, and must be accounted for. Although enrichment results do not directly represent binding ΔΔG values, consideration of stability effects in making predictions is generally useful, as a theoretically tight binder is not useful if it is difficult or impossible to produce a folded protein. For those proteins which are stably folded, the values from deep mutational scanning experiments have been shown to match binding affinities. In particular, McLaughlin et al. found good correlation with the measured enrichment value and the ΔΔG of binding for 85 selected mutants (ref. 29, Supporting Information Fig. S2d).

The thousands of mutations which can be analyzed in parallel under identical conditions should compensate for many of the limitations of the high-throughput binding assays. For example, the prediction of small molecule-binding affinity to proteins is confounded by the fact that the available datasets consist of a small number of mutations on many different scaffolds with affinities measured by different groups using different techniques. As more comprehensive scanning datasets become available, further community wide experiments should continue to be useful for assessing methods and determining how best to model the effects of mutations on protein–protein interactions. The development of improved energy functions would also of course benefit from additional data from lower through-put but more accurate direct K_D measurements.
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