

Methods for estimation of model accuracy in CASP12

Article

Accepted Version

Elofsson, A., Joo, K., Keasar, C., Lee, J., Maghrabi, A. H. A., Manavalan, B., McGuffin, L. J., Ménendez Hurtado, D., Mirabello, C., Pilstål, R., Sidi, T., Uziela, K. and Wallner, B. (2018) Methods for estimation of model accuracy in CASP12. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics*, 86. pp. 361-373. ISSN 1097-0134 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/prot.25395> Available at <http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/72973/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Published version at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/prot.25395>

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/prot.25395>

Publisher: Wiley

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online



Methods for estimation of model accuracy in CASP12.

Journal:	<i>PROTEINS: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics</i>
Manuscript ID	CASP-00148-2017 .R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Sep-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Elofsson, Arne; Science for Life Laboratory, Dept. of Biochemistry and Biophysics Joo, Keehyoung; Korea Institute for Advanced Study, School of Computational Sciences Kesar, Chen; Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Departments of Computer Science and Life Sciences Lee, Jooyoung; Korea Institute for Advanced Study, School of Computational Sciences Maghrabi, Ali; The University of Reading, School of Biological Sciences Manavalan, Balachandran; Korea Institute for Advanced Study, School of Computational Sciences McGuffin, Liam; The University of Reading, School of Biological Sciences; Menendez-Hurtado, David; Science for Life Laboratory, Dept. of Biochemistry and Biophysics Mirabello, Claudio; Linkopings universitet, Department of Physics, Chemistry and Biology Pilstål, Robert; Linkopings universitet, Department of Physics, Chemistry and Biology Sidi, Tomer; Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Departments of Computer Science and Life Sciences Uziela, Karolis; Science for Life Laboratory, Dept. of Biochemistry and Biophysics Wallner, Björn; Linkopings universitet, Department of Physics, Chemistry and Biology
Key Words:	protein structure prediction, quality assessment, CASP, Estimates of model accuracy, Consensus predictions, Machine learning

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Methods for estimation of model accuracy in CASP12

Arne Elofsson^{*SU}, Keehyoung Joo^{*CAC}, Chen Keasar^{*BGU}, Jooyoung
Lee^{*KIAS}, Ali H. A. Maghrabi^{*UR}, Balachandran Manavalan^{*KIAS}, Liam J.
McGuffin^{*UR}, David Ménendez Hurtado^{*SU}, Claudio Mirabello^{*LiU}, Robert
Pilstål^{*LiU}, Tomer Sidi^{*BGU}, Karolis Uziela^{*SU}, Björn Wallner^{*LiU}

- * All authors contributed equally and the list is sorted alphabetically.
- ^{SU} Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics and Science for Life Laboratory, Stockholm University, Box 1031, 171 21 Solna, Sweden
- ^{LiU} Department of Physics, Chemistry, and Biology, Bioinformatics Division, Linköping University, 581 83 Linköping, Sweden
- ^{UR} School of Biological Sciences, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, RG6 6AS, United Kingdom
- ^{BGU} Department of Computer Science, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Israel
- ^{CAC} Center for In Silico Protein Science and Center for Advanced Computation, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-722, Korea
- ^{KIAS} Center for In Silico Protein Science and School of Computational Sciences, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-722, Korea

Keywords: protein structure prediction; quality assessment; CASP; estimates of model accuracy; consensus predictions; machine learning

Short title: Estimation of model accuracy in CASP12

Abstract

Methods to reliably estimate the quality of 3D models of proteins are essential drivers for the wide adoption and serious acceptance of protein structure predictions by life scientists. In this paper, the most successful groups in CASP12 describe their latest methods for Estimates of Model Accuracy (EMA). We show that pure single model accuracy estimation methods have shown clear progress since CASP11; the three top methods (MESHI, ProQ3, SVMQA) all perform better than the top method of CASP11 (ProQ2). While the pure single model accuracy estimation methods outperform quasi-single (ModFOLD6 variations) and consensus methods (Pcons, ModFOLDclust2, Pcomb-domain and Wallner) in model selection, they are still not as good as those methods in absolute model quality estimation and predictions of local quality. Finally, we show that when using contact based model quality measures (CAD, IDDT) the single model quality methods perform relatively better.

Introduction

Estimates of Model Accuracy (EMA) have been a part of protein structure prediction since its infancy. EMA methods are built into virtually all protein 3D modelling methods as the energy functions that they optimize. Yet, these energy functions provide relative accuracy estimate, with only moderate power in properly ranking models. Further, when one tries to use models from different methods, their associated energies are not directly comparable. Thus, accurate posterior quality estimation methods are essential for protein structure prediction tools to fulfill their potential as useful tools for biologists.

1
2
3
4
5 Motivated by the intriguing experiment of Novotny et al.¹ early model accuracy assessment methods
6
7 focused on distinguishing wrong models (or decoys) from the native structure^{2,3}. **Historically,**
8
9 knowledge based energy functions were developed to solve this problem and they **were used in**
10
11 **threading methods**, as well as to guide protein folding and fragment assembly. Notably, the methods
12
13 by Sippl, which used knowledge based energy function for threading, were quite successful in
14
15 CASP1-3^{4,5}. **However, in later CASP experiments, pure threading methods were not been able to**
16
17 **compete with methods that also made use of use evolutionary information from the rapidly growing**
18
19 **sequence databases.**

20
21
22
23 None of the energy functions that were developed to distinguish native and non-native protein models
24
25 showed any major success in **the Quality Assessment (QA) category** in CASP. **Instead, methods that**
26
27 **aim to predict the quality of a model starting with ProQ⁶,** have been more successful. One of the
28
29 notable features separating these methods from the earlier knowledge-based energy terms were the
30
31 use of compatibility with predicted structural features, such as secondary structure. These methods are
32
33 nowadays referred to as single model quality assessment methods to distinguish them from methods
34
35 that use clustering (or **a consensus**) of many models. Since the introduction of ProQ other methods
36
37 based on the same idea **have** been introduced, including QMEAN⁷ that has performed **comparably**
38
39 with ProQ in earlier CASPs. **Initially** the single **model** methods have not been as successful as **those**
40
41 that take into account structural similarity of models, i.e. consensus based methods⁸. **Since** CASP11,
42
43 **however,** they perform on par **or even better than the** consensus methods in some of the tasks⁸.
44
45

46
47 The first successful attempt of **model** quality estimation, in the context of CASP, was when the first
48
49 meta-predictor, **CAFASP-CONSENSUS**, was introduced in CASP4⁹. **CAFASP-CONSENSUS**
50
51 **combined** the results from several servers **and provided** better models than any of the individual
52
53
54

1
2
3 servers. However, in CASP4 the model quality estimates were carried out manually. From this
4
5 exercise, it was discovered that using simple rules for combining the predictions from several servers
6
7 could outperform all individual servers. This algorithm simply chose the most frequent fold predicted
8
9 by all servers, i.e. it chose the consensus fold^{9,10}.

10
11
12
13 Soon after CASP4, the first automatic consensus method, Pcons, was introduced¹¹. This was later
14
15 followed by a simpler (and more robust) method, 3D-Jury¹². Later versions of Pcons are very similar
16
17 to 3D-Jury¹³, the only difference being in the details of the superposition method. In CASP5 it was
18
19 clear that these methods could be used to outperform all individual servers if the results were
20
21 combined. In CASP7 model accuracy estimation became a new category in and of itself for the first
22
23 time¹⁴.

24
25
26
27 Quasi-single model methods, such as the latest ModFOLD servers^{15,16} compare a model with models
28
29 generated by a local prediction-pipeline using the consensus approach. These methods, as well as
30
31 Pcomb¹³ that uses the Pcons consensus approach, combine the consensus score with one or several
32
33 pure single model approaches. The performance of the best quasi-single approaches often match the
34
35 performance of the consensus methods, but with the ability to evaluate a single model at a time given
36
37 that a set of external predictions exist.

38
39
40
41 In this paper, we will briefly describe each of the EMA methods used by our groups in CASP12.
42
43 Additionally, we will compare the relative performance of the methods, discuss their relative strengths
44
45 and weakness and we will share our insights on what we learned from the experiment this time round.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

Methods

A summary of all methods discussed in this paper is presented in Table 1. Below, each group briefly presents their methods.

Elofsson group

We participated with several accuracy estimation methods in CASP12. Here, we will highlight the two methods that performed best; the single model accuracy estimation tool ProQ3¹⁷ and our consensus based method Pcons¹¹. Our other methods included an early version of ProQ3D¹⁸ the deep learning version of ProQ3. ProQ3_diso is a version of ProQ3 where disordered residues are ignored and RSA_SS is a simple quality assessment method that only utilizes predicted secondary structure and surface area. For details see the CASP 12 abstracts at http://predictioncenter.org/casp12/doc/CASP12_Abstracts.pdf.

ProQ3¹⁷ is the latest version of our single model accuracy estimation methods^{6,19–21}. In Table 2 we describe the most important developments in the history of ProQ. In addition to using the same descriptions of a model as ProQ2²¹ it also uses Rosetta energy functions. All input features are combined together to train a linear SVM. The training data set is a subset of CASP9 with 30 models per target. We also tested a few developmental methods of ProQ in CASP12, but none of these performed significantly better than ProQ3 and they are therefore not discussed here. However, it can be noted that we have recently developed an improved version of ProQ3, ProQ3D that uses a deep-learning approach but identical inputs as ProQ3¹⁸. The final version was not ready for CASP12 and the preliminary version used did not perform better than ProQ3. ProQ3 is available both as source code from <https://bitbucket.org/ElofssonLab/proq3>, and as a web-server at <http://proq3.bioinfo.se/>.

1
2
3
4
5 **Pcons**¹¹ is used with default setting. This means that the score is calculated by performing a structural
6
7 superposition using the algorithm described by Levitt and Gerstein²² of a model against all other
8
9 models. To avoid bias, comparisons between models from the same method are ignored. After
10
11 superposition, the “S-score” is calculated for each residue in the model²³. The average S-score for all
12
13 residues and pairs of models is then used to calculate the final Pcons score. For local predictions, the
14
15 average S-score is converted to a distance as described before¹³. Pcons is freely available from
16
17 <https://github.com/bjornwallner/Pcons/>. It should be noted that a number of heuristic optimizations
18
19 have been implemented in Pcons to enable the pairwise comparison of hundreds of proteins in a short
20
21 time²⁴.
22

23 24 25 Keasar Group

26
27
28 We participated in CASP12 with two EMA methods, MESHI-score (implemented by the
29
30 MESHI_server group) and MESHI-score-con (MESHI_con_server), the latter being a slight variation
31
32 on the former. Below we first present the general scheme, which is used by both methods, and then
33
34 conclude with the variations tried in MESHI-score-con.
35

36
37
38 While preliminary versions of MESHI-score were used in CASP10 and CASP11, it has reached
39
40 stability only after CASP11²⁵. The software architecture, however, is modular, extendable by design,
41
42 and under continuous development. Thus, the version that took part in CASP12 was more advanced
43
44 than what was presented earlier²⁵.
45

46
47
48 The MESHI-score pipeline (Figure 2) starts with a regularization step that includes sidechain
49
50 repacking by SCWRL^{26,27} and restrained energy minimization (Figure 2 II). This step sharpens the
51
52
53
54

quality signal of structural features by reducing noise, which is due to peculiarities of decoy generating methods. Features are extracted from the regularized structures (Figure 2 *III*) and fed to an ensemble of 1000 independently trained predictors (Figure 2 *IV*). Each predictor outputs (s_i, w_i) , a pair of an EMA score and weight (Figure 2 *VI*). The weighted median of this set of pairs is the final MESHI-score (Figure 2 *VII*). In addition, we also calculate the weighted interdecile range and entropy of the pairs set:

$$\text{entropy}(S) = \sum_{j=1}^{100} P_j \log_2(P_j)$$

where S is the set of 1000 (s_i, w_i) pairs and

$$P_j = \sum_{i=1}^{1000} \frac{w_i}{Q} I_j(s_i), Q = \sum_{i=1}^{1000} w_i$$

and

$$I_j(s) = 1 \text{ iff } (j-1) \leq s < 0.01j \text{ otherwise } I_j(s) = 0$$

The larger these numbers are the less reliable is the score, as they suggest disagreement between the predictors.

The feature set that was used in CASP12 included 82 features (for details see

<https://www.cs.bgu.ac.il/~frankel/TechnicalReports/2015/15-06.pdf>)

These features may be clustered into nine broad categories:

1. Pairwise energy terms, which represent interactions between atoms, adopted from the literature²⁸⁻³⁰.
2. Compatibility of the decoy secondary structure and solvent accessibility with their PSIPRED³¹ prediction.

3. Standard bonded energy terms (e.g., a quadratic bond term).
4. Torsion angle terms (compatibility with Ramachandran plot and rotamer preferences³²)
5. Hydrogen bond terms³³
6. Solvation and atom environment terms that quantify the cooperativity between hydrogen bond formation and atom burial.
7. Radius of gyration and contact terms that quantify the compatibility of decoys with the expected, length dependent, ratios between the radii of gyration and numbers of contacts in different subsets of protein atoms (e.g., polar and hydrophobic).
8. Meta-features that quantify the frustration within decoys (native structures tend to be minimally frustrated) by considering the distribution of the pairwise and torsion energies within the decoys.
9. Combinations of the above features, which were developed in previous studies²⁵.

The predictors (Figure 2 *V*) are nonlinear functions that get feature vectors as an input and output a pair of numbers: an EMA score, and a weight that represents the reliability of the score. The parameters of the predictor functions, as well as the subset of features that they use, are learned by stochastic optimization. Each predictor is trained to minimize a different objective function and thus tends to be more sensitive in a specific GDT_TS subrange. Scores within the predictor's sensitivity region are considered more reliable and thus, have a higher weight. A more detailed description of the predictor's training may be found in Mirzaei et al²⁵.

MESHI-score-con is a variant on the MESHI-score theme, which aims to improve the consistency of MESHI-score by a post-processing step that takes into account the similarities between decoys.

Ideally, after regularization (Figure 2 *II*) very similar decoys should produce similar feature vectors, and thus have similar MESHI-scores. Yet, careful examination of MESHI-score results indicates that this is not always the case, and often very similar decoys have quite different scores. MESHI-score-

1
2
3 con aims to alleviate this problem by improving the agreement between the scores of very similar
4 decoys. To this end, we associate the MESHI-score of each decoy with a weight, which is inversely
5 proportional to the entropy of the score-weight pairs (Figure 2 *VIII*). We also associate each decoy
6 with a neighbors-set that includes very similar ($GDT_TS \geq 95$) neighbors as well as the decoy itself.
7
8 MESHI-score-con is a weighted average of the decoy's MESHI-score and the average score of its
9 neighbor-set. Thus, a low weight decoy (presumably a less reliable one) with higher weight neighbors
10 is strongly biased towards the average score of its neighbors. Yet the score of a decoy without
11 neighbors is unaffected regardless of its weight. Thus, unlike consensus methods MESHI-score-con
12 may pick an exceptionally good decoy.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Lee Group

24
25
26 We participated in CASP12 with two methods, namely SVMQA and quasi-SVMQA (qSVMQA).
27 qSVMQA augments TM-score between GOAL_TS1 and the server model with an appropriate value
28 of weight w to the SVMQA score:
29
30
31

$$32 \quad qSVMQA = SVMQA + w * (TM\text{-score between GOAL_TS1 and the server model}).$$

33
34 The value of w was set separately for stage1 models (0.84) and for stage2 models (0.15). We
35 determined the optimal value of w using CASP11 single-domain targets. Below, we briefly describe
36 SVMQA and highlight its results in the model selection of stage2 targets in CASP12.
37
38
39
40
41

42 SVMQA is a support-vector-machine-based protein single-model global QA method. SVMQA
43 predicts the global QA score as the average of the predicted TM-score and GDT_TS score by
44 combining two separate predictors, SVMQA_GDT and SVMQA_TM. For SVMQA we used 19
45 features (8 potential energy-based terms and 11 consistency-based terms between the predicted and
46 actual values of the model) for predicting the QA score (TM-score or GDT_TS score). Among these
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 19 features, 3 features (orientation dependent energy, GOAP angular energy and solvent accessibility
4 consistency score) were not used in earlier versions, while the other 16 have been used in existing
5 methods. The description of each feature along with the selection of the final set of SVM parameters
6 and the final set of features for these two predictors have been published recently³⁴. In short,
7 SVMQA_TM uses all of the 19 features to predict TM-score of a given model, whereas
8 SVMQA_GDT uses only 15 features to predict the GDT_TS score.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 In CASP11, we used our old QA method, RFMQA³⁵. The result of RFMQA on CASP11 targets was
18 quite successful but not as good as that of SVMQA on CASP12 targets. Prior to CASP12, we
19 benchmarked the performance of SVMQA on CASP11 targets and compared it to that of RFMQA.
20
21 **We** found that SVMQA significantly outperformed RFMQA in terms of both ranking models and
22 selecting a more native-like model. The major updates of SVMQA over RFMQA is as follow: (i) The
23 choice of machine learning method was different, an SVM (support vector machine) was used in
24 SVMQA while a random forest was used in RFMQA; (ii) we used CASP8-9 domain targets as the
25 training dataset for RFMQA, while CASP8-10 domain targets were used in SVMQA; (iii) 19 input
26 features were used in SVMQA, whereas, only 9 of these features were used in RFMQA; (iv) The
27 objective function to train for RFMQA was TM_{loss} (difference between the TM-score of the selected
28 model and the best TM-score), while that for SVMQA was the correlation coefficient between the
29 actual ranking and the predicted ranking; and (v) SVMQA used two separate predictors for TM-score
30 and GDT_TS score, while RFMQA used only a predictor for TM-score.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

McGuffin Group

We participated in CASP12 with three new quasi-single model method variants, ModFOLD6, ModFOLD6_cor and ModFOLD6_rank (Figure 1), and one older clustering method, ModFOLDclust2.

ModFOLD6

The ModFOLD6 server¹⁶ is the latest version of our freely available public resource for the accuracy estimation of 3D models of proteins^{15,38,39}. The ModFOLD6 server combines a pure-single and quasi-single model strategy for improving accuracy of local and global model accuracy estimates. Our initial motivation in the development of ModFOLD6 was to increase the accuracy of local/per-residue assessments for single models¹⁶.

For the local/per-residue error estimates, each model was considered individually using two new pure-single model methods, the Contact Distance Agreement (CDA) and the Secondary Structure Agreement (SSA) scores¹⁶, as well as the best pure single method in earlier CASPs, ProQ2^{21,40}. Additionally, three alternative quasi-single model methods were used to score models including: the newly developed Disorder B-factor Agreement (DBA), the ModFOLD5_single (MF5s) and the ModFOLDclustQ_single scores (MFcQs)¹⁶ - each of which made use of a set of 130 reference 3D models that were generated using the latest version of the IntFOLD-TS^{41,42} pipeline from the IntFOLD server^{43,44}. The component per-residue scores from each of the 6 alternative scoring methods, mentioned above, were combined into a single score for each residue using an Artificial Neural Network, which was trained to learn the local S-score²³ as the target function¹⁶ (i.e. the same target function as ProQ2, described below and in Table 2 was used, but with d_0 set to 3.9).

1
2
3 For global scoring, in the ModFOLD6 variant we simply took the mean local score for each model
4 (i.e. the sum of the per-residues scores divided by the target sequence length). However in our internal
5 benchmarks, using CASP11⁸ and CAMEO⁴⁵ data prior to CASP12, we realized that simply taking the
6 mean per-residue score from ModFOLD6 alone was not optimal and performance differed depending
7 on the intended use case, i.e. selecting the best models or accurately reproducing the model-target
8 similarity scores. Therefore we also exhaustively explored all linear combinations of each of the
9 alternative global scores, in order to find the optimal mean score (OMS) for each major use case¹⁶.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 18 19 **ModFOLD6_cor**

20 The aim of developing the ModFOLD_cor global score variant was to optimize the correlations of
21 predicted and observed global scores. **In other words**, the predicted global accuracy estimation scores
22 produced by the method should **have** close to linear correlations with the observed global accuracy
23 estimation scores. The OMS for the ModFOLD6_cor global score was found as:
24
25
26
27
28

$$29 \text{ModFOLDclustQ_single_global} + \text{DBA_global} + \text{ModFOLD6_global})/3$$

30 where the _global suffix indicates that the mean local score was taken for the scoring method
31 indicated above.
32
33
34
35
36

37 38 **ModFOLD6_rank**

39 The aim of developing the ModFOLD6_rank global score variant was to optimise for the selection of
40 the best models **namely** the top ranked models (top 1) should be closer to the highest accuracy,
41 regardless of the relationship between the absolute values of predicted and observed scores. The OMS
42 for the ModFOLD6_rank global score was found as:
43
44
45
46
47

$$48 \text{ModFOLDclustQ_single_global} + \text{ProQ2_global} + \text{CDA_global} + \text{DBA_global} +$$
$$49 \text{SSA_global} + \text{ModFOLD6_global})/6.$$

1
2
3 Note that the local scores submitted for each of the three ModFOLD6 variants were identical and it
4 was only the global scores (and therefore the ranking of models), which differed between the three
5
6
7 ModFOLD6 variants. All three of the ModFOLD6 variants are freely available at:

8
9 http://www.reading.ac.uk/bioinf/ModFOLD/ModFOLD6_form.html
10

11 12 13 **ModFOLDclust2**

14
15 The ModFOLDclust2 method⁴⁶ is a leading automatic clustering based approach for both local and
16
17 global 3D model accuracy estimation assessment^{47,48}. The ModFOLDclust2 server tested during
18
19 CASP12 was identical to that tested during the CASP9, CASP10 & CASP11 experiments. The local
20
21 and global scores have been previously described⁴⁶ and are unchanged since CASP9. . Thus, the
22
23 ModFOLDclust2 method serves as a useful gold standard/benchmark against which progress may be
24
25 measured **in the development of single model methods**. ModFOLDclust2 can be run as an option via
26
27 the older ModFOLD3 server

28
29 (http://www.reading.ac.uk/bioinf/ModFOLD/ModFOLD_form_3_0.html). The ModFOLDclust2
30
31 software is also available to download as a standalone program

32
33 (<http://www.reading.ac.uk/bioinf/downloads/>).
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Wallner group**

40
41
42 We participated with three EMA methods; ProQ2²¹, Pcomb-domain, and Wallner.
43
44
45

46
47 **ProQ2** is a single model accuracy estimation program based on a linear kernel support vector
48
49 machine trained on a set of structural descriptors of a model. ProQ2 is trained to predict the local S-
50
51 score²³:
52
53
54
55

$$S_i(d_i) = \frac{I}{(I + (\frac{d_i}{d_0})^2)}$$

where d_i is the local distance deviation for residue i in the optimal superposition that maximize sum of S over the whole protein, and d_0 is a distance threshold put to 3.0 here. The global score is the sum of local S_i divided by the target length yielding a score in the range [0,1]. Local S -scores, S_i , were converted to local distance deviation using the formula:

$$d_i(S_i) = d_0 * \sqrt{\left(\frac{I}{S_i} - I\right)}$$

ProQ2 has participated in CASP since CASP10. Before CASP11 we implemented ProQ2 as a scoring function in Rosetta⁴⁰, enabling scoring and integration in any Rosetta protocol. ProQ2 was top-ranked in both CASP10 and CASP11. This inspired the development of novel methods including SVMQA, MESHI-score and ProQ3. ProQ2 is also included in several hybrid methods used here. Therefore it could be claimed that ProQ is laying the foundation for the improvement in model quality assessment apparent in CASP12. ProQ2 is also included in the top-ranked structure prediction methods BAKERROSETTA-SERVER⁴⁹ and the IntFOLD4 server for TS prediction⁵⁰.

Wallner method in this CASP is what was called Pcomb in earlier CASPs^{13,51}. It combines ProQ2 and Pcons using the following linear combination for global prediction²⁰:

$$Pcomb=0.2*ProQ2+0.8*Pcons$$

For local prediction the same formula was used to calculate weighted local S -scores, which then were converted to distances using the $d_i(S_i)$ formula, described above.

Pcomb-domain method is a new domain-based version of Pcomb. Traditionally, consensus methods, including Pcons¹¹ (<https://github.com/bjornwallner/pcons>), have always used rigid-body superposition for the full-length models, thereby selecting models that overall have the highest consensus, ignoring the fact that smaller domains from other models could have higher consensus over that region. To try

1
2
3 to overcome this problem we developed a domain-based version of Pcons, which uses an initial
4 domain definition. The domain-based Pcons scores were combined with local predicted scores from
5 ProQ2. Two different methods were used to predict the domain boundaries of the target sequences,
6
7 the first used the domain definitions from the Robetta server and the second was based on spectral
8
9 analysis of the top ranking server models according to the regular Pcomb method. The results from
10
11 these two methods were manually evaluated to decide the final domain boundaries. In addition, the
12
13 Pcons and ProQ2 scores were weighted in a slightly different way compared the regular Pcomb
14
15 method; following a parameter optimization based on targets released in the last two editions of CASP
16
17 the relative weight for ProQ2 was increased to 0.3 resulting in this formula:
18
19

$$\text{Pcomb-domain} = 0.3 * \text{ProQ2-domain} + 0.7 * \text{Pcons-domain}$$

20
21
22
23 Furthermore, d_0 was increased from 3.0Å to 5.0Å as it showed improved model selection on CASP11,
24
25 results not shown. Increasing d_0 shifts the sensitivity to lower quality (higher RMSD) residues, which
26
27 is an advantage in CASP. As for both ProQ2 and Pcons all predictions are performed in the S-score
28
29 space, global scores are sum of local scores, and the local S scores are transformed to distances in the
30
31 final step, using the $d_i(S_i)$ formula above.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

A detailed analysis of CASP12 EMA methods is provided in the accompanying EMA assessment paper⁵². In this section, we refer to the results provided in this paper pertaining to our methods and also perform an additional analysis based on the correlation between different scores for different types of methods.

Global accuracy estimations in CASP12

Here, we describe our analysis of our global accuracy estimation methods described in Table 1. As shown in the EMA assessment paper⁵² three single model accuracy estimation methods (ProQ3, SVMQA and MESHI) are ranked highest for identifying the best model with the average error (i.e., difference between the GDT_TS of the selected model and the best GDT_TS) around 5 GDT_TS units. The individual ranking of these methods depends on the evaluation criteria and according to the assessment paper⁵² the difference between the top methods is not significant. The best consensus and quasi-single methods are only marginally worse than the pure single methods using these criteria. However, this is a significant progress in single model method performance since last CASP.

Distinguishing good models from bad

From Figure 5 of the accompanying paper⁵² it is clear that the best approaches at detecting the top ranked models according to GDT_TS use consensus or quasi-single methods and combine them with single model approaches. The top three methods (Wallner, Pcomb-domain and ModFOLD6_rank) are using the single model method ProQ2 as part of their scoring. Wallner and Pcomb-domain scores are weighted sums of ProQ2 and Pcons scores, while ModFOLD6_rank uses ProQ2 together with many other scores. While such methods are statistically better⁵², the much simpler pure consensus methods Pcons and ModFOLDclust2 are not far behind ranked 6th and 9th when using S-score and even better than ModFOLD6 when using IDDT.

Ranking of models

The ability of methods to rank the top models for each target was evaluated using the per target correlation, i.e. the correlation of estimated and observed accuracy for each target. In Figure 3, the distribution of per target correlation for the all methods studied here (see Table 1) and the three different model accuracy estimation measures (IDDT, CAD and GDT_TS) are shown. The distributions are sorted by the median. It can be seen that the individual rankings of the methods are

1
2
3 quite different depending on **the** accuracy measure is used. When using GDT_TS⁵³, consensus and
4
5 quasi-single based methods clearly outperform the single model accuracy estimation methods. In
6
7 contrast when using CAD⁵⁴ or IDDT⁵⁵ the best correlation is obtained with ProQ3 and all the top
8
9 methods are single model accuracy estimations. A similar difference in ranking can be seen in the
10
11 AUC analysis on the CASP homepage (http://predictioncenter.org/casp12/qa_aucmcc.cgi). Here,
12
13 ProQ3 is ranked 20th when using GDT_TS but 7th when using CAD. In contrast Pcons is ranked 4th
14
15 using GDT_TS and 12th using CAD. Interestingly, it can be seen that the “pure” consensus methods
16
17 (Pcons, MODFOLDClust2) show only a modest per target correlation with CAD or IDDT (Figure 3).

20 Comparison of global accuracy estimation predictions

21
22
23 How similar are the model accuracy estimation scores produced by the different methods? To answer
24
25 this we calculated the correlation between **predicted accuracy estimates** from all methods (Figure 4).
26
27 **The methods were then clustered using Weighted Pair Group Method Centroid (WPGMC) with the**
28
29 **median correlation as linkage**. It can be seen that all methods (except qSVMQA) that use some sort of
30
31 consensus (quasi-single or consensus) are clustered. Within this group the separation is primarily not
32
33 between quasi-single methods and consensus methods, but rather between the methods that primarily
34
35 use consensus and those **that** combine the consensus score with ProQ2 (Pcomb-domain,
36
37 ModFOLD6_rank, Wallner, and ModFOLD6). ModFOLD6_cor is more similar to the pure consensus
38
39 methods (Pcons and ModFOLDclust2) than the other combined methods as it does not use ProQ2
40
41 global scores directly in its classification. Since the combined methods include single methods they
42
43 are also more similar to all the single methods than the pure consensus methods.

44
45
46
47 Single model accuracy estimation methods show the largest performance diversity. SVMQA is the
48
49 least similar to the others, being more similar to the consensus methods than to any other single model
50
51 accuracy estimation method. The other three methods are more correlated, with the newer methods
52
53
54

1
2
3 ProQ3 and MESHI showing the highest correlation. It can also be noted that in general ProQ2 is the
4
5 outlier, showing the lowest correlation with the consensus methods.
6
7

8
9 When comparing the three different quality measurements (GDT_TS, CAD and IDDT) it can be seen
10
11 that they do not correlate with each other better than the consensus methods with GDT_TS, see Figure
12
13 4. The correlation between the quality measures CAD and GDT_TS is 0.88; while the correlation of
14
15 the predicted values from the consensus methods to GDT_TS is 0.92 or higher. While some of the
16
17 problems might origin from domain division, as mentioned in the Wallner sections, it is clear that the
18
19 accuracy of model quality estimation is getting close to a point where they challenge the notion of
20
21 measuring the quality of a model given a known native structure.
22
23

24 25 Local accuracy estimation in CASP12

26
27 In terms of estimation of local accuracy, the best performance is obtained by the pure consensus
28
29 methods followed by quasi-single model approaches⁵². In Figure 5, a heat map of the correlation
30
31 between all local predictions by the methods discussed in this paper is shown. Unfortunately, of the
32
33 single predictors evaluated here only ProQ2 and ProQ3 produce local predictions, nevertheless the
34
35 trend is similar as for the global methods. All the consensus and quasi-single methods provide very
36
37 similar accuracy estimates, while the two single model methods are outliers. It is clear from this
38
39 analysis that the consensus methods correlate better with S-score (cc~0.85) than with IDDT (cc~0.77).
40
41

42 As the consensus methods are based on superposition algorithms, similar to those used when
43
44 calculating the S-score, this might not come as a surprise. Interestingly both ProQ2 and ProQ3
45
46 correlate better with IDDT (cc~0.71) than with S-score (cc~0.65). It can also be noted that ProQ3
47
48 correlates better than ProQ2 with both IDDT and S-score. This highlights the improvements achieved
49
50 in single model quality estimates since CASP11.
51
52
53
54
55

Discussion

For the first time single model quality estimators can challenge the consensus based methods when it comes to ranking of targets. However, the consensus based estimators are still superior when it comes to local quality estimation, at least when using the CASP defined criteria. Below we will continue the CASP style of presentations by summarizing what each group learned during CASP12.

What the Elofsson group learned

An interesting trend in CASP12 is that ProQ3 is better than our consensus method, Pcons, at picking up the best model, see EMA assessment paper⁵². In earlier CASPs this was not the case and until CASP10 it was clear that consensus based methods were superior even in this aspect. We do believe that the main reason for this is that single model accuracy estimation methods have improved in the last few years.

However, consensus-based methods such as Pcons are **still** superior at separating correct and incorrect models⁵². Interestingly, when using CAD, ProQ3 performs slightly better than Pcons even on this measure, see Figure 3, indicating that some part of the superior performance of consensus methods might be due to multi-domain properties of the targets or the choice of target function.

One issue at CASP is that the definition of the target function for local prediction used in CASP might not be ideal. The goal is to predict the error in distance for a particular residue. However, this is dependent on the superposition used, which can be problematic for multi-domain targets. It could therefore be useful in future CASPs to consider changing the target function to one of the non-superposition based quality evaluations, such as CAD or IDDT. The stated goal in CASP12 is to predict the distance after superposition and for this consensus methods are better. However, the

1
2
3 performance of ProQ3 is getting closer to the performance of the consensus methods when using
4
5 IDDT for model quality estimation, see Figure 3 and 5.
6
7

8 9 What the Keasar group learned

10
11 The major rationale behind the design of MESHI-score pipeline (Figure 2) is to keep the feature set
12
13 painlessly extendable. To this end we employed an ensemble-learning scheme, in which the feature
14
15 selection is part of the training of each predictor (i.e. ensemble member). This way each feature has a
16
17 “fair chance” to be included in some of the predictors and provide its unique contribution to the
18
19 overall score. Overfitting at the single predictor level is avoided by restricting the number of selected
20
21 features. Combining the set of predictor scores to form the single ensemble score (MESHI-score) does
22
23 not require any adjustable parameters and thus, does not introduce overfitting at the ensemble level. In
24
25 this experiment we put to test the modularity of our ensemble learning approach. Indeed, in this
26
27 experiment we were able to get better results than before, simply by adding more features to the same
28
29 machinery, with neither considerable computational burden nor overfitting. This encourages us to
30
31 work on the development and adoption of more informative features.
32
33

34
35
36 In CASP12 we also tested MESHI-score-con for the first time, and its performance was a bit superior
37
38 to that of MESHI-score. We take this as a proof of concept and wish to extend it in two directions:
39
40 have a data-driven less restricted definition of the neighbors set, and apply the same idea also to
41
42 decoys of high score. High scores to two dissimilar decoys must imply that at least one of them (often
43
44 both) is wrong.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

What the Lee group learned

According to the CASP12 assessment, SVMQA is one of the best methods for selecting good quality models from a set of given decoys in terms of GDT-LOSS. The newly implemented features (five potential energy-based terms and consistency-based terms³⁴) a systematic benchmarking approach on the selection of the final set of features, the optimization of machine learning parameters on a balanced training and testing dataset, and the usage of two separate predictors made SVMQA to perform significantly better than our old method used in CASP11 (RFMQA) when benchmarked on CASP11 targets. Additionally, SVMQA made valuable contribution to our tertiary structure prediction server (GOAL) and human predictors (LEE and LEEab) of CASP12 in terms of model selection. In terms of the model selection, SVMQA performed well. However, in term of assigning proper absolute global accuracy value to a model it didn't perform as desired⁵². We believe that one way to improve on estimating the absolute score of a given model is to consider other types of objective functions to train separately for absolute global accuracy, which is one of the goals that we should work on for the next CASP.

What the McGuffin group learned

The ModFOLD6 series of methods (ModFOLD6, ModFOLD6_rank and ModFOLD6_cor) perform particularly well in terms of assigning absolute global accuracy values. As expected the ModFOLD6_cor variant is the best of these as it was optimized for this task. The ModFOLD6 series of methods also perform competitively with clustering approaches for differentiating between good and bad models; the ModFOLD6_rank method being the best of these, which is only outperformed by two clustering groups (Wallner and Pcomb-domain). Furthermore, as we anticipated, the ModFOLD6_rank variant is better at selecting the top models than the ModFOLD6 and ModFOLD6_cor variants, however it is outperformed by the latest pure-single model methods.

1
2
3 Overall, in terms of global scores, the ModFOLD6 variants rank within the top three methods for
4 nearly every global benchmark according to IDDT and CAD scores, as well as ranking within the top
5
6
7 10 according to other scores.
8
9

10
11 It is gratifying to see progress in CASP12 from many groups in both pure-single and quasi-single
12 model approaches to estimate model accuracy. However, it is also clear there is still room for
13 improvement of our methods. For instance, we are outperformed in terms of model selection by the
14 newer pure single model methods. Further integration of methods is probably needed. Different
15 methods are clearly better suited for different aspects of model accuracy estimation, therefore all
16 approaches to the problem are still important to pursue. Perhaps the most difficult problem faced by
17 all groups is how to optimize a global score for all aspects of model accuracy estimation, as there
18 seems to be no one-size-fits-all solution presently. One potential solution to this might be to use a
19 deep learning approach that outputs multiple scores depending on the intended use case. A global
20 score for ranking models on a per-target basis, irrespective of the observed model-target similarity
21 scores, is clearly very useful, if it can consistently select the better models. On the other hand a global
22 score that can produce a near 1:1 mapping between predicted and observed scores, that is consistent
23 across all targets, will allow us to assign accurate confidence scores to individual models (which is
24 arguably more useful to an experimentalist than a top ranked, but nevertheless poor quality, model).
25 Of course, as model accuracy estimation methods continue to improve and approach perfect
26 optimization for each use case, eventually the scores may converge on a single answer.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 What the Wallner group learned

46
47 Wallner and Pcomb-domain were **the two best methods** for differentiating between good and bad
48 models (see assessment paper⁵²). We were disappointed with the performance of Pcomb-domain,
49 since in our benchmarks before CASP it performed significantly better than Wallner. However, the
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3 true advantage of Pcomb-domain can only be seen if the assessment is based on domains or **on** using
4
5 superposition independent evaluation measures like IDDT⁵⁵ and CAD-score^{54,55}. We calculated the
6
7 per-residue correlation of local predicted S-scores transformed using S-score formula (see above)
8
9 based on either full-length target or target domains, **see** Figure 6. For full-length assessment, methods
10
11 based on global structural superposition (Wallner, Pcons, and ModFOLDclust2) for single domains
12
13 are indeed superior. Also the performance based on multi-domain targets seems to be better for these
14
15 methods (Figure 6a). However, the reason for this seemingly good performance for multi-domain
16
17 targets is an artifact of the full-length assessment on multi-domain proteins that will only superimpose
18
19 on one domain, if the domain-domain orientation is wrong. **This superposition will assign high quality**
20
21 **scores to the residues from one domain (usually the larger), and relatively low quality scores to the**
22
23 **residues from the other domain.** This effect accentuates the performance for prediction methods using
24
25 global superposition, which will also predict high quality scores for one domain and low scores for the
26
27 others. If instead performance is measured using the official CASP domain definitions, this artifact
28
29 can be avoided, and then Pcomb-domain performs better for multi-domain targets, and better than
30
31 other methods when it uses a correct domain prediction (Figure 6b). Unfortunately, correct domain
32
33 prediction was only achieved for 6 out of 21 multi-domain targets. Still, it pinpoints that there should
34
35 be clear room for improving Pcomb-domain by improving the domain prediction algorithm.
36
37

38 Conclusions

39
40
41
42 It is our belief that the most important insight from the QA groups in CASP12 is the progress in single
43
44 model accuracy estimations. Three new methods, SVMQA, MESH1 and ProQ3, are all better than the
45
46 best single model method in CASP11 (ProQ2). **These methods are also better at selecting the top-**
47
48 **ranked model compared to consensus-based methods.** However, quasi-single **model** method and
49
50 consensus methods are still superior when it comes to distinguishing correct and incorrect models **as**
51
52 **well as** for local predictions. In those targets that have a wide spread of quality there is a clear
53
54
55

1
2
3 distinction between the correlations of single and consensus methods with the later performing better.
4
5 These are typically subunit of protein complexes, for which templates are available. Here, estimating
6
7 the accuracy of a single model might not make sense without taking the entire complex into account.
8
9 In CASP12 this is most dramatic for target T0865, where correlations for consensus-based methods
10
11 are high and correlations for all single model methods are negative. By comparing the predictions to
12
13 each other it is seen that all consensus and quasi-single methods actually are very similar, while there
14
15 is larger variation between the single methods, hence combining them may provide additional value in
16
17 the future.
18

19
20
21 During this evaluation we noted issues for multi-domain targets where the individual domains are
22
23 correct but not their relative arrangement. Here, the GDT_TS score (and any superposition based
24
25 score) is based on the superposition of the largest domain. This causes problems when the evaluation
26
27 is not domain based. For model quality estimations the problem is most notable when evaluating local
28
29 quality assessments. It could therefore be useful, in future CASPs, to use CAD⁵⁴ or IDDT⁵⁵ to evaluate
30
31 the quality of a model without using domain division. We do also notice that single model estimation
32
33 methods perform better when assessed with CAD or IDDT see Figure 3 and 5.
34
35

36 37 Acknowledgements

38
39 First of all we are very grateful to all the work done by the late Prof. Anna Tramontano who has been
40
41 fundamental for CASP. Her contribution will never be forgotten. We also thank Dr. Andriy
42
43 Kryshtafovych for his evaluation of our methods in CASP including providing additional data for our
44
45 evaluations. We also thank the rest of the CASP team for their efforts with CASP12. Finally we
46
47 acknowledge all the CASP participants who contributed with predictions that we could evaluate.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

Funding

This work was supported by grants from the Swedish Research Council (VR-NT 2012-5046 to AE and 2012-5270 to BW) and Swedish e-Science Research Center (BW). Computational resources were provided by the Swedish National Infrastructure for Computing (SNIC) at NSC. Manavalan, Joo and Lee were supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MEST) (No. 2008-0061987). We are grateful for the Saudi Arabian Government Studentship to A.H.A Maghrabi. Chen Keasar and Tomer Sidi are grateful for support by grant no. 2009432 from the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) and grant no. 1122/14 from the Israel Science Foundation (ISF).

Bibliography

1. Novotný, J., Brucoleri, R. & Karplus, M. An analysis of incorrectly folded protein models. Implications for structure predictions. *J. Mol. Biol.* **177**, 787–818 (1984).
2. Samudrala, R. & Levitt, M. Decoys ‘R’ Us: a database of incorrect conformations to improve protein structure prediction. *Protein Sci.* **9**, 1399–1401 (2000).
3. Lüthy, R., Bowie, J. U. & Eisenberg, D. Assessment of protein models with three-dimensional profiles. *Nature* **356**, 83–85 (1992).
4. Domingues, F. S. *et al.* Sustained performance of knowledge-based potentials in fold recognition. *Proteins Suppl* **3**, 112–120 (1999).
5. Sippl, M. J., Lackner, P., Domingues, F. S. & Koppensteiner, W. A. An attempt to analyse progress in fold recognition from CASP1 to CASP3. *Proteins Suppl* **3**, 226–230 (1999).
6. Wallner, B. & Elofsson, A. Can correct protein models be identified? *Protein Sci.* **12**, 1073–1086 (2003).

- 1
2
3 7. Benkert, P., Tosatto, S. C. E. & Schomburg, D. QMEAN: A comprehensive scoring function for
4
5 model quality assessment. *Proteins* **71**, 261–277 (2008).
- 6
7 8. Kryshchuk, A. *et al.* Methods of model accuracy estimation can help selecting the best
8
9 models from decoy sets: Assessment of model accuracy estimations in CASP11. *Proteins* **84**
10
11 **Suppl 1**, 349–369 (2016).
- 12
13 9. Bujnicki, J. M., Elofsson, A., Fischer, D. & Rychlewski, L. Structure prediction meta server.
14
15 *Bioinformatics* **17**, 750–751 (2001).
- 16
17 10. Fischer, D. *et al.* CAFASP2: the second critical assessment of fully automated structure
18
19 prediction methods. *Proteins* **Suppl 5**, 171–183 (2001).
- 20
21 11. Lundström, J., Rychlewski, L., Bujnicki, J. & Elofsson, A. Pcons: a neural-network-based
22
23 consensus predictor that improves fold recognition. *Protein Sci.* **10**, 2354–2362 (2001).
- 24
25 12. Ginalski, K., Elofsson, A., Fischer, D. & Rychlewski, L. 3D-Jury: a simple approach to improve
26
27 protein structure predictions. *Bioinformatics* **19**, 1015–1018 (2003).
- 28
29 13. Wallner, B. & Elofsson, A. Prediction of global and local model quality in CASP7 using Pcons
30
31 and ProQ. *Proteins* **69 Suppl 8**, 184–193 (2007).
- 32
33 14. Cozzetto, D., Kryshchuk, A., Ceriani, M. & Tramontano, A. Assessment of predictions in the
34
35 model quality assessment category. *Proteins* **69 Suppl 8**, 175–183 (2007).
- 36
37 15. McGuffin, L. J., Buenavista, M. T. & Roche, D. B. The ModFOLD4 server for the quality
38
39 assessment of 3D protein models. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **41**, W368–72 (2013).
- 40
41 16. Maghrabi, A. H. A. & McGuffin, L. J. ModFOLD6: an accurate web server for the global and
42
43 local quality estimation of 3D protein models. *Nucleic Acids Res.* (2017).
44
45 doi:10.1093/nar/gkx332
- 46
47 17. Uziela, K., Shu, N., Wallner, B. & Elofsson, A. ProQ3: Improved model quality assessments
48
49 using Rosetta energy terms. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 33509 (2016).
- 50
51 18. Uziela, K., Menéndez Hurtado, D., Shu, N., Wallner, B. & Elofsson, A. ProQ3D: improved
52
53
54
55

- 1
2
3 model quality assessments using deep learning. *Bioinformatics* **33**, 1578–1580 (2017).
- 4
5 19. Wallner, B. & Elofsson, A. Quality Assessment of Protein Models. in *Prediction of Protein*
6
7 *Structures, Functions, and Interactions* 143–157 (2008).
- 8
9 20. Wallner, B. & Elofsson, A. Identification of correct regions in protein models using structural,
10
11 alignment, and consensus information. *Protein Sci.* **15**, 900–913 (2006).
- 12
13 21. Ray, A., Lindahl, E. & Wallner, B. Improved model quality assessment using ProQ2. *BMC*
14
15 *Bioinformatics* **13**, 224 (2012).
- 16
17 22. Levitt, M. & Gerstein, M. A unified statistical framework for sequence comparison and structure
18
19 comparison. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **95**, 5913–5920 (1998).
- 20
21 23. Cristobal, S., Zemla, A., Fischer, D., Rychlewski, L. & Elofsson, A. A study of quality measures
22
23 for protein threading models. *BMC Bioinformatics* **2**, 5 (2001).
- 24
25 24. Skwark, M. J. & Elofsson, A. PconsD: ultra rapid, accurate model quality assessment for protein
26
27 structure prediction. *Bioinformatics* **29**, 1817–1818 (2013).
- 28
29 25. Mirzaei, S., Sidi, T., Keasar, C. & Crivelli, S. Purely Structural Protein Scoring Functions Using
30
31 Support Vector Machine and Ensemble Learning. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinform.*
32
33 (2016). doi:10.1109/TCBB.2016.2602269
- 34
35 26. Wang, Q., Canutescu, A. A. & Dunbrack, R. L., Jr. SCWRL and MolIDE: computer programs
36
37 for side-chain conformation prediction and homology modeling. *Nat. Protoc.* **3**, 1832–1847
38
39 (2008).
- 40
41 27. Krivov, G. G., Shapovalov, M. V. & Dunbrack, R. L., Jr. Improved prediction of protein side-
42
43 chain conformations with SCWRL4. *Proteins* **77**, 778–795 (2009).
- 44
45 28. Summa, C. M. & Levitt, M. Near-native structure refinement using in vacuo energy
46
47 minimization. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **104**, 3177–3182 (2007).
- 48
49 29. Samudrala, R. & Moult, J. An all-atom distance-dependent conditional probability
50
51 discriminatory function for protein structure prediction. *J. Mol. Biol.* **275**, 895–916 (1998).
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 30. Zhou, H. & Skolnick, J. GOAP: A Generalized Orientation-Dependent, All-Atom Statistical
4 Potential for Protein Structure Prediction. *Biophys. J.* **101**, 2043–2052 (2011).
5
6
7 31. Jones, D. T. Protein secondary structure prediction based on position-specific scoring matrices. *J.*
8 *Mol. Biol.* **292**, 195–202 (1999).
9
10
11 32. Amir, E.-A. D., Kalisman, N. & Keasar, C. Differentiable, multi-dimensional, knowledge-based
12 energy terms for torsion angle probabilities and propensities. *Proteins* **72**, 62–73 (2008).
13
14
15 33. Levy-Moonshine, A., Amir, E.-A. D. & Keasar, C. Enhancement of beta-sheet assembly by
16 cooperative hydrogen bonds potential. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 2639–2645 (2009).
17
18
19 34. Manavalan, B. & Lee, J. SVMQA: Support-vector-machine-based protein single-model quality
20 assessment. *Bioinformatics* (2017). doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btx222
21
22
23 35. Manavalan, B., Lee, J. & Lee, J. Random forest-based protein model quality assessment
24 (RFMQA) using structural features and potential energy terms. *PLoS One* **9**, e106542 (2014).
25
26
27 36. Jones, D. T. & Ward, J. J. Prediction of disordered regions in proteins from position specific
28 score matrices. *Proteins* **53 Suppl 6**, 573–578 (2003).
29
30
31 37. Jones, D. T., Singh, T., Kosciolk, T. & Tetchner, S. MetaPSICOV: combining coevolution
32 methods for accurate prediction of contacts and long range hydrogen bonding in proteins.
33 *Bioinformatics* **31**, 999–1006 (2015).
34
35
36 38. McGuffin, L. J. The ModFOLD server for the quality assessment of protein structural models.
37 *Bioinformatics* **24**, 586–587 (2008).
38
39
40 39. McGuffin, L. J. Prediction of global and local model quality in CASP8 using the ModFOLD
41 server. *Proteins* **77 Suppl 9**, 185–190 (2009).
42
43
44 40. Uziela, K. & Wallner, B. ProQ2: estimation of model accuracy implemented in Rosetta.
45 *Bioinformatics* **32**, 1411–1413 (2016).
46
47
48 41. McGuffin, L. J. & Roche, D. B. Automated tertiary structure prediction with accurate local
49 model quality assessment using the IntFOLD-TS method. *Proteins* **79 Suppl 10**, 137–146
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (2011).
4
5 42. Buenavista, M. T., Roche, D. B. & McGuffin, L. J. Improvement of 3D protein models using
6 multiple templates guided by single-template model quality assessment. *Bioinformatics* **28**,
7 1851–1857 (2012).
8
9
10
11 43. Roche, D. B., Buenavista, M. T., Tetchner, S. J. & McGuffin, L. J. The IntFOLD server: an
12 integrated web resource for protein fold recognition, 3D model quality assessment, intrinsic
13 disorder prediction, domain prediction and ligand binding site prediction. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **39**,
14 W171–6 (2011).
15
16
17
18
19 44. McGuffin, L. J., Atkins, J. D., Salehe, B. R., Shuid, A. N. & Roche, D. B. IntFOLD: an
20 integrated server for modelling protein structures and functions from amino acid sequences:
21 Figure 1. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **43**, W169–W173 (2015).
22
23
24
25 45. Haas, J. *et al.* The Protein Model Portal—a comprehensive resource for protein structure and
26 model information. *Database* **2013**, bat031–bat031 (2013).
27
28
29 46. McGuffin, L. J. & Roche, D. B. Rapid model quality assessment for protein structure predictions
30 using the comparison of multiple models without structural alignments. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 182–
31 188 (2010).
32
33
34
35 47. Kryshchuk, A., Fidelis, K. & Tramontano, A. Evaluation of model quality predictions in
36 CASP9. *Proteins* **79 Suppl 10**, 91–106 (2011).
37
38
39 48. Kryshchuk, A. *et al.* Assessment of the assessment: evaluation of the model quality estimates
40 in CASP10. *Proteins* **82 Suppl 2**, 112–126 (2014).
41
42
43
44 49. Chivian, D. *et al.* Automated prediction of CASP-5 structures using the Robetta server. *Proteins*
45 **53 Suppl 6**, 524–533 (2003).
46
47
48 50. McGuffin, L. J. *et al.* Accurate template-based modeling in CASP12 using the IntFOLD4-TS,
49 ModFOLD6, and ReFOLD methods. *Proteins: Struct. Funct. Bioinf.* (2017).
50
51 doi:10.1002/prot.25360
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 51. Larsson, P., Skwark, M. J., Wallner, B. & Elofsson, A. Assessment of global and local model
4 quality in CASP8 using Pcons and ProQ. *Proteins* **77 Suppl 9**, 167–172 (2009).
5
6
7 52. Kryshchuk, A., Monastyrskyy, B., Fidelis, K., Schwede, T. & Tramontano, A. Assessment of
8 model accuracy estimations in CASP12. *Proteins* (2017). doi:10.1002/prot.25371
9
10
11 53. Zemla, A. LGA: A method for finding 3D similarities in protein structures. *Nucleic Acids Res.*
12 **31**, 3370–3374 (2003).
13
14
15 54. Olechnovič, K., Kulberkytė, E. & Venclovas, C. CAD-score: a new contact area difference-based
16 function for evaluation of protein structural models. *Proteins* **81**, 149–162 (2013).
17
18
19 55. Mariani, V., Biasini, M., Barbato, A. & Schwede, T. IDDT: a local superposition-free score for
20 comparing protein structures and models using distance difference tests. *Bioinformatics* **29**,
21 2722–2728 (2013).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Flowchart outlining the principal stages of the ModFOLD6 server prediction pipeline. The initial input data are the target sequence and a single 3D model. The output data are the local/per-residue scores from the ModFOLD6 NN and the global score variants - ModFOLD6, ModFOLD6_rank and ModFOLD6_cor. The ModFOLD6 pipeline is dependent on the following methods PSIPRED³¹, DISOPRED³⁶ and MetaPSICOV³⁷.


Figure 2: The MESHI-score pipeline starts with a regularization step that includes side-chain repacking by SCWRL^{26,27} and restrained energy minimization. Features are extracted from the regularized structures and fed to an ensemble of independently trained predictors. Each predictor outputs a pair of values: an EMA score and weight, and the weighted median of this set of pairs is the final MESHI-score.

Figure 3: Boxplots of per target correlation for the methods presented in this paper for GDT_TS, CAD, and IDDT, (a)-(c) global evaluations, (d)-(e) local evaluations. To avoid bias from bad models only models with $Z > 0$ are included in the global analysis. For local correlation CAD values were not available so only the distances, turned into S-scores, and IDDT values are compared. Single-model methods are colored blue, quasi green, clustering light grey and combination models dark grey. Using GDT_TS the clustering-based methods are slightly better than the single-model predictors, while this is not the case using the alternative measures CAD and IDDT. Clustering methods benefit from having low quality models in the pool while the single model methods appear better at ranking higher quality models. For both local measures the single-model evaluation methods have lower correlation than the superposition based ones, but the difference in correlation is smaller when using IDDT.

1
2
3 **Figure 4:** Pairwise correlations between predicted global accuracy scores from different methods and
4 actual accuracy scores according to three measures. The methods are clustered hierarchically using
5 WPGMC algorithm with the median correlation as similarity measure. Methods are colored as
6 follows. Dark grey - pure consensus methods, light grey - combined single/consensus methods, green
7 - quasi-single methods and blue pure single methods. It can be noted that (i) both quasi, pure and
8 combined consensus methods are very similar ($cc > 0.94$), while the single model quality methods are
9 more different ($cc < 0.90$ between the groups). ProQ2 is the real outlier having a $cc < 0.82$ to most
10 **methods. Interestingly** ProQ2 and ProQ3 are less similar to each other than any pair of consensus
11 based methods. It can also be noted that the combined methods are more similar to the single-model
12 methods than the pure consensus methods (Pcons, ModFOLDClust2).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 **Figure 5:** Pairwise correlation between local predicted S-scores calculated from the predicted distance
26 using S-score formula (see above) with $d_0=5$ and local IDDT values (unfortunately local CAD scores
27 were not available). Only methods that predicted local quality are included. As the ModFOLD6
28 methods only differ in their global scores and provide identical local estimates they were all
29 represented by the ModFOLD6 method. Methods are colored as follows. Dark grey - pure consensus
30 methods, light grey - combined single/consensus methods, green - quasi-single methods and blue pure
31 single methods.

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 **Figure 6:** Per residue correlation of local predicted S-scores transformed using S-score formula with
43 $d_0=5$; based on full-length targets (A) and target domains (B) for selected methods and targets divided
44 into multi and single domain targets. For full-length assessment methods based on superposition are
45 superior. However, Pcomb-domain performs better than other methods when (and only when) it gets
46 the domain prediction correct.



Flowchart outlining the principal stages of the ModFOLD6 server prediction pipeline. The initial input data are the target sequence and a single 3D model. The output data are the local/per-residue scores from the ModFOLD6 NN and the global score variants - ModFOLD6, ModFOLD6_rank and ModFOLD6_cor. The ModFOLD6 pipeline is dependent on the following methods PSIPRED, DISOPRED and MetaPSICOV.

19x10mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 2. The MESHI-score pipeline starts with a regularization step that includes sidechain repacking by SCWRL37,38 and restrained energy minimization. Features are extracted from the regularized structures and fed to an ensemble of independently trained predictors. Each predictor outputs a pair of values: an EMA score and weight, and the weighted median of this set of pairs is the final MESHI-score.

176x244mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3. Boxplots of per target correlation for the methods presented in this paper for GDT_TS, CAD, and IDDT, (a)-(c) global evaluations, (d)-(e) local evaluations. To avoid bias from bad models only models with $Z > 0$ are included in the global analysis. Single methods (blue), quasi (green), clustering (light grey) and combination models (dark grey). It is clear that using GDT_TS the consensus based methods are slightly better than the single-model predictors, while this is not the case using alternative measures. Clustering methods benefit a lot from having low quality models in the pool while the single model methods appear better at ranking higher quality models. For local correlation CAD values were not available so only the distances, turned into S-scores, and IDDT values are compared. Here, for both measures the single evaluation methods are less good than the superposition based ones, but the difference is smaller when using IDDT.

309x221mm (300 x 300 DPI)






Figure 4. Pairwise correlations between predicted global accuracy scores from different methods and actual accuracy scores according to three measures. The methods are clustered hierarchically using WPGMC algorithm with the median correlation as similarity measure. Methods are colored as follows. Dark grey - pure consensus methods, light grey - combined single/consensus methods, green - quasi-single methods and blue pure single methods. It can be noted that (i) both quasi, pure and combined consensus methods are very similar ($cc > 0.94$), while the single model quality methods are more different ($cc < 0.90$ between the groups). ProQ2 is the real outlier only having a $cc > 0.82$ to ProQ3 and the consensus methods that uses ProQ2 as a part of their score. In fact ProQ2 and ProQ3 are less similar to each other than any pair of consensus based methods. It can also be noted that the combined methods are more similar to the single-model methods than the pure consensus methods (Pcons, ModFOLDclust2).

254x254mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 5. Pairwise correlation between local predicted S-scores calculated from the predicted distance using S-score formula (see above) with $d_0=5$ and local IDDT values (unfortunately local CAD scores were not available). Only methods that predicted local quality are included. As the ModFOLD6 methods only differ in their global scores and provide identical local estimates they were all represented by the ModFOLD6 method. Methods are colored as follows. Dark grey - pure consensus methods, light grey - combined single/consensus methods, green - quasi-single methods and blue pure single methods.

254x254mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 6. Per residue correlation of local predicted S-scores transformed using S-score formula with $d_0=5$; based on full-length targets (A) and target domains (B) for selected methods and targets divided into multi and single domain targets. For full-length assessment methods based on superposition are superior. However, Pcomb_domain performs better than other methods when (and only when) it gets the domain prediction correct.

112x39mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Table 1. Summary of the best performing QA methods in CASP12 and comments about their strength and weaknesses. Methods basically identical have been merged

Methods	Type	Comment about Global performance	Comment about Local Performance
MESHI ³²	Single	Top model selection	N/A
MESHI_con ³²	Single*	Top model selection	N/A
ProQ2 ²¹	Single	Good model selection	Acceptable local scores
ProQ3 ¹⁷	Single	Top model selection	Good local scores
SVMQA ³⁴	Single	Top model selection	N/A
ModFOLD6 ¹⁶	Quasi-single	Balanced performance	Good assignment of local scores
ModFOLD6_rank ¹⁶	Quasi-single	Acceptable model selection	Identical to ModFOLD6
ModFOLD6_cor ¹⁶	Quasi-single	Best absolute but suboptimal model selection	Identical to ModFOLD6
qSVMQA ³⁴	Quasi-single	Assignment of the absolute score is not accurate.	N/A
ModFOLDclust2 ⁴⁶	Clustering	Good assignment of absolute global scores but suboptimal model selection	Top assignment of local scores
Pcons ¹¹	Clustering	Good assignment of absolute global scores	Top assignment of local scores
Pcomb-domain ¹³	Combined	Good assignment of absolute global scores, requires good domain prediction	Top assignment of local scores
Wallner	Combined	Good assignment of absolute global scores	Top assignment of local scores

* = MESHI_con is not pure single methods but requires multiple models to average the predictions

Table 2. Description of the evolution of ProQ methods used in CASP and their relative performance.

Method	Major Novelty	Correlation global/local
ProQ ⁶	First method trained to predict “quality” of a model. Using a combination of structural descriptions and agreement with predicted secondary structure.	0.71 ^A /-
ProQres ²⁰	Predicting <i>local</i> qualities - global quality is sum of local quality.	-/0.56 ^B
ProQ2 ²¹	Global agreement with predicted RSA and SS plus profile weighting. Uses a linear kernel SVM.	0.80/0.71 ^B 0.84/0.72 ^C
ProQ3 ¹⁷	Added rosetta energies to the inputs.	0.87/0.74 ^C
ProQ3D ¹⁸	Linear kernel SVM is replaced by a two-layer perceptron.	0.91/0.77 ^C

^A from original ProQ publication ⁶

^B from ProQ2 publication ²¹

^C on CASP11 dataset trained on CASP9 and CASP10